

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** August 3, 2018 at 10:31:36 AM PDT

**To:** "Laura Busheikin" <[lbusheikin@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:lbusheikin@islandstrust.bc.ca)>, "David Critchley" <[dcritchley@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:dcritchley@islandstrust.bc.ca)>, "Susan Morrison" <[smorrison@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:smorrison@islandstrust.bc.ca)>

**Subject:** Proposed agri-tourism accommodation

**Reply-To:** [REDACTED]

This email is a comment about the CIM last night, specifically about the proposed provisions for accommodating guests subject to obtaining a TUP. I have no difficulty with the idea of allowing three un-serviced campsites on properties with farm status, but I am against the idea of allowing cottages for this purpose in any zone. I understand that the rationale for allowing agri-tourism is to increase the income potential of islanders with commercial farming operations, a goal that, in itself, is commendable. With respect to the proposed cottages, however, I believe this advantage is outweighed by the following two serious risks:

1. Although built for agri-tourism, these cottages could, over time, become residences. Land changes hands and newcomers often fail to understand the intricacies of land use regs. A new owner, not interested in offering agri-tourism, or even the original owner at a later date, might well decide to rent the cottages, in theory providing a form of affordable housing. As seasonal units, however, these cottages would likely be unheated and poorly insulated, and would therefore add to the existing supply of housing unsuitable for year-round use. As past housing assessments have shown, a number of individuals on this island live in grossly substandard housing; this proposal would, in time, increase that number. Further, as pointed out last night, used this way, the cottages would increase our "build-out," a number that translates into a population cap acknowledged and honoured in our OCP.
2. I believe that cottages would be more attractive to tourists than campsites. Thus, offering accommodation in cottages might well bring more summer tourists than are desirable. The introduction of our OCP contains the following: Guiding Principle 11 To ensure that tourism is managed in a way that respects our community's foremost function as a home for its residents. We have a stunning example next door of what happens when tourism swamps a community. And Hornby is not the only Gulf Island with this problem. Not only is the ferry, which is shared by Hornby and Denman, negatively affected by Hornby's tourist load, but the grocery store, the beaches, the trails and much more are overrun. As our summer market and other community events expand, and with our expansive new provincial park, we risk attracting too many visitors. Limiting agri-tourism accommodation to campsites is a good way to keep tourism at a manageable level.

Thanks for considering my views.

Louise Bell