

Heather Miller

From:

To:

Mon, Jul 20 at 5:08 p.m.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I write on one point of process ahead of your Regular Council Meeting at 1:00 pm on Monday, 27 July 2026, at which the published notice states Council will consider first reading of Amendment Bylaw No. 726, 2026 (rezoning application RZ-2026-0014, 620 Laura Road). I ask Council to answer a single question, in writing, before first reading is taken:

- **how is the bylaw consistent with the Official Community Plan?**

On 25 May, by Motion 26-217, Council resolved to proceed without a public hearing. A hearing may be waived only where the bylaw is consistent with the OCP (section 464(2) of the Local Government Act). That consistency has not been determined.

The record addresses the timing of the application. Staff record that “the property owner is seeking to reduce the review needed on their application to seek a decision from Council prior to the TUP expiry in December 2026.” In May the planner set out the schedule in the staff report’s own diagram: first reading in July, referral to the Islands Trust and committees in August, and second and third reading taken together in September for adoption that month. At the meeting, a member asked whether an alternative route would “take us well beyond” the applicant’s window, and staff advised that only without a hearing could adoption be reached by September: “with a public hearing that wouldn’t be possible.”

The sequence on the record is as follows. The amendment bylaw has been prepared and is set for first reading. The public hearing has been set aside. The schedule for the remaining readings and for adoption is in place. The one determination on which setting the hearing aside depends, that the bylaw is consistent with the OCP, has not been made. The operative direction in Motion 26-217 was to “provide notice of First Reading of the Land Use Bylaw Amendment Bylaw as required under s. 467 of the Local Government Act.” It named section 467 alone, the notice given when no public hearing is held, and not section 464(2), which alone permits a hearing to be waived. Consistency was not discussed.

The staff report says only that the application amends the Land Use Bylaw “but not the Official Community Plan.” That is a different thing: a proposal can leave every word of the OCP intact and still run against what it requires.

The accompanying document sets this out. It compares every staff report from 2021 to 2026 against the Plan. Not one report, in five years, brings a single OCP policy, on water, waste, groundwater or light industry, to bear on the application. On that record, consistency with those policies has not been addressed.

The published notice for the application bears on this. As of 11 July 2026 it described the application and the single additional use sought, a cidery, and did not mention first reading, Bylaw No. 726, or any hearing. By 18 July it had been revised to the notice that now stands, which states that Council will consider first reading of Bylaw No. 726, 2026 at 1:00 pm on 27 July. Neither version states that no public hearing will be held on the bylaw. Both versions are on the public record.

On the public record, then, neither those OCP policies nor the fact that no public hearing will be held has been set before residents.

I therefore ask that Council and staff:

1. state how the bylaw is consistent with the Official Community Plan, and identify where on the record that consistency was determined;
2. place this letter and its accompanying document before Council on 27 July 2026, and acknowledge their receipt; and
3. answer the question, in writing, before first reading is taken.

My purpose is narrow and it is public: to place on the record the one condition on which the setting-aside of the public hearing depends, consistency with the Official Community Plan, and to have it answered in writing. The question is now on the record. Council’s answer, whatever it may be, will be too.

Yours sincerely,

Heather Miller

*Accompanying document: **What each staff report said about the OCP**, a policy-by-policy comparison of the 620 Laura Road reports, 2021 to 2026 (originally submitted as *RZ-2026-0014_APC_02_Cidery_OCP-Policy-Comparison-Table to the APC*, July 14, 2026).*

[RZ-2026-0014_620-Laura-Road_OCP-Policy-Comparison_Staff-Reports-2021-2026_Miller.pdf](#)

[122.8 kB](#)

- -
 -
 -
-