

Good evening, I'm Terry Kellar I live on Lucille Wheeler Cr and I am the chair of the BMRA STA Committee

On behalf of our committee and neighbourhoods I have made many presentations to Town Council. Our goal is to try to protect the residential areas of our town from noise and other nuisances associated with STA use.

We believe we have been truthful and accurate in all of our statements. We have never asked staff to bend the bylaws in our favour; we have only asked the bylaws be enforced as written.

I would like to talk about a issue that has been exposed due to the occupancy load debate

The legal number of occupants in most STA's according to **Bylaw 2002-18 5.06** is : *" The Maximum number of occupants within a dwelling that is being operated as short term accommodation shall not exceed a total number based upon two(2) persons per bedroom plus an additional two(2) persons "* (known as the +2 model).

However the operators successfully lobbied the Town staff to contravene the Bylaw!

Quoting a portion of a letter to the Town dated March 26, 2018 from an owner and member of the owners association.

"In 2013 in order to avoid a legal challenge to the STA bylaw with respect to the occupancy limits, the STA Industry and the Municipality agreed to a reasonable solution, which was the + 4 model currently in place."

Staff then issued licenses based a on the + 4 model in violation of the bylaw. This agreement was not presented to Council or the public and it doesn't conform to the bylaw. Does it fit the definition of "a secret deal" or "a back room deal" or "a behind closed doors deal". You cannot have Policy that contravenes the Bylaw.

It would appear that the Staff who were involved with this deception as well as other improper licensing deals that benefited the operators, are no longer in the

employ of the Town and we are not privy to the circumstances of their departure. But it appears the owners and operators who negotiated these actions were not censored nor had restrictions placed on them. And as a matter of fact they still seem to have the influence to get what they want. The evidence is in what staff proposed and how the majority of Council voted on the +4 issue, as well as the proposals on The Responsible Person and Demerit Points which the owners have lobbied for and strongly support.

Is this the way this Town should do its business; supporting secret back room deals by later making them law? Is this good governance? What message are we sending; abuse the process and the staff and if the public finds out we will make it right for you?

Council be outraged by the violations and deals that happened on their watch and take steps to investigate and bring all the parties into account. Cancel the back room deals, don't endorse them!

Why does the Town give the owners and their lobbyists free reign considering their apparent lack of respect for staff, the Bylaws and proper process?

We strongly suggest that Council should review these decisions and reverse the direction they have given to staff.

Thank you