

Heather Miller

From:

To:

Cc:

Sun, Jul 19 at 7:03 p.m.

Please redact my email address and any personal contact details before this correspondence is published in any meeting agenda or public record.

19 July 2026

Dear Chair Patrick and Members of the Executive Committee,

I am writing to follow up on my letter of 27 June 2026, which was on the Committee's agenda for its meeting of 8 July 2026 (item 12.2). That letter put three specific questions to the Committee. At the 8 July meeting the correspondence was received for information; while it was acknowledged in discussion that the 2021 response had not been provided, none of the three questions were addressed. So that there is no doubt about what is being asked, I put the same three questions to the Committee again below, clearly numbered, and would be grateful for a substantive reply to each.

The trajectory here is worth stating plainly: the cidery was first allowed under a Temporary Use Permit issued on 22 March 2021, renewed in December 2023, and is now the subject of a rezoning that would make it permanent. In parallel, the draft Official Community Plan, which the Trust is or will be engaged in reviewing, newly lists "agricultural processing" as a supported use in Rural Residential and leaves it undefined, where the current Plan does not use the term at all. The concern the Committee was first asked to consider in 2021 is therefore no longer confined to a single bylaw; the same treatment of "agriculture" now runs through the Land Use Bylaw, this rezoning, and the Official Community Plan under review, at the same time.

Before restating my three questions, I would draw the Committee's attention to two matters that make these questions more pressing rather than less.

First, the current rezoning application does not merely coincide with the 2021 removal of the vineyard definition. The applicants expressly rely on it. Their application, at page 17, describes that removal as a "*material*

change” to the Land Use Bylaw, reasons that with the “Vineyard” definition repealed the only applicable definition is now “Agriculture”, and concludes on that basis that the cidery *“fully meets the definition of a permitted Agricultural Use”*. The absence of that definition, and of the prohibition it carried, is therefore not incidental to the application; it is the footing on which it is built. That is precisely the change my mother and I asked the Committee to reconsider in 2021, and it is now doing active work in 2026.

Second, the Municipality has already set the public hearing aside. On 25 May 2026, by motion 26-217, Council directed that notice be given at first reading in place of a public hearing. A hearing on a zoning bylaw may be waived only where the bylaw is consistent with the Official Community Plan (Local Government Act, section 464(2)); yet that motion cited only the notice provision (section 467), consistency was not discussed, and no determination of consistency appears anywhere on the record. That consistency is exactly what my submissions dispute, because the OCP’s water, groundwater and aquifer policies have never been engaged. With the public hearing set aside, the referral of the bylaw to the Islands Trust, which falls between first and second reading, becomes one of the few remaining points of external review. That elevates, rather than diminishes, the significance of the Trust’s role, and is why I am seeking clarity on it now rather than later.

With that in mind, my three questions remain:

1. On the 2021 concern. My mother and I asked the Executive Committee to look again at EC-2021-001 and were told, twice, that a written response would follow, once in a recorded motion, and once by the Chair directly. No response arrived. If the Committee is able to provide a substantive response to that original concern now, even at this distance, I would be grateful to receive one.

2. On records. I would be grateful to know whether the Trust holds any records bearing on the vineyard or winery provisions in the Bowen Island Land Use Bylaw, their origin, or their removal.

3. On the current OCP update. I would welcome clarification of the nature of the Trust’s involvement in the Official Community Plan update, in particular whether the Trust has been engaged before now, and how and in what capacity it will be engaged at the upcoming stages.

Finally, so that the Committee has the full picture before it if and when it considers this rezoning under its preserve-and-protect mandate, or engages with Bowen Island’s draft OCP, I attach the applicants’ rezoning

application itself, together with the further submissions I have made on these matters.

What the Committee would review on referral is a site-specific Land Use Bylaw amendment: a rezoning of 620 Laura Road from RR2 to a new “RR2(a)” variation that adds “cidery” as a permitted principal use. On its face it inserts a single permitted use; in substance it rests on the treatment of “Agriculture” in the Land Use Bylaw following the 2021 removal of the “Vineyard” definition. My submissions set out, with sources, that the Official Community Plan’s policies bearing on water, groundwater, aquifers and light-industrial use have not been cited or engaged at any stage of this file, through the temporary use permit, its renewal, or the rezoning, and that the one assessment ever required was removed in the same revised report that led to the public hearing being set aside. I provide these not to add to the Committee’s burden, but to ensure that nothing material is absent from the record on which the Trust would be relying.

Attachments:

- The applicants’ rezoning application, Riley’s Cidery, Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Rezoning) Application, 620 Laura Road (RZ-2026-0014). The proposed guest-house / sleeping-unit use was subsequently withdrawn by the applicants’ revised application of 25 May 2026, though the application package still contains it.
- Submission to the Advisory Planning Commission, Rezoning RZ-2026-0014, 620 Laura Road cidery (water, aquifer, groundwater and watershed)
- “What each report said about the Official Community Plan, 2021–2026”, a comparison of the OCP policies cited across the temporary use permit and rezoning staff reports (submitted to the Advisory Planning Commission)
- “Aquifer, groundwater and watershed evidence: 620 Laura Road cidery rezoning (RZ-2026-0014)”, documentary evidence record prepared for the Parks, Environment and Climate Action Advisory Committee, 7 July 2026
- Submission to the Official Community Plan Update (Round Two engagement), 19 June 2026, water and governance in the draft Official Community Plan

I would welcome the Committee’s considered response.

Yours sincerely,

Heather Miller

[Download all attachments as a zip file](#)

-

[270126 Riley_s - LUB Amendment Application FINAL_Redacted.pdf](#)

[2.6 MB](#)

-

[RZ-2026-0014_APC_03_Cidery_Submission_Water-Aquifer-Groundwater-Watershed.pdf](#)

[262 kB](#)

-

[RZ-2026-0014_APC_02_Cidery_OCP-Policy-Comparison-Table.pdf](#)

[122.8 kB](#)

-

[620-Laura-Road-cidery-RZ-2026-0014-aquifer-groundwater-watershed-wells-evidence.pdf](#)

[918.3 kB](#)

-

[OCP Submission Round Two Public Consultation HMiller.pdf](#)

[273.4 kB](#)

-

-

-

-

