

Heather Miller

September 15, 2026

To: Mayor and Council

Copy: Kristen Watson, Acting Chief Administrative Officer; Sophie Idsinga, Corporate Officer; Official Community Plan Steering Committee

Re: Committee of the Whole, 21 September 2026, Official Community Plan Update

Dear Mayor and Council,

This letter is sent on 15 September 2026.

Nobody has seen the plan.

The staff report for 21 September lists the draft Official Community Plan as Attachment 1. What that attachment links to is the engagement draft of May 2026, the version the sixty-six recommended changes in Attachment 8 would replace.

So there is no draft incorporating the changes. The Committee is being asked to recommend that Council direct staff to prepare a bylaw adopting the plan as presented and as amended, where the plan as presented is the document that preceded the amendments.

A second draft was promised, twice, in writing.

The Official Community Plan Steering Committee minutes of 14 July 2026 record staff advising that comments would be considered "as part of the preparation of the next draft of the Official Community Plan before the document proceeds through the bylaw approval process."

The What We Heard Report states: "BIM will prepare a second draft of the OCP, with support from members of the OCPSC, to be shared with the community ahead of a public hearing process and Council consideration."

Neither has happened. No second draft exists, and none will be prepared before the bylaw stage.

Amendments cannot be considered in isolation.

Whether a policy change does anything depends on what the rest of the plan says: the other policies on the same subject, the development permit area requirements, the land use designations and the definitions. Sixty-six changes presented without the

document they change is a list of sentences. Neither the Committee nor the public can assess a single one of them.

Four hundred and ninety-nine people completed the Round Two survey and made approximately four thousand comments. Some can now read that their submission produced an amendment. None can read the plan the amendment sits in, or judge whether it does what they asked for.

This is not an omission from a package.

Every other attachment listed in the report was published on the Official Community Plan Steering Committee agenda of 10 September. The What We Heard Report. The McElhanney technical memorandum of recommended changes. The emails from the public, sixty-four pages. The responses from interest holders, seventy-two pages. The public event comments. The survey summaries. The land use map amendments.

All of it. The only document that does not exist in current form is the plan.

The Steering Committee asked for it and was refused.

At the meeting of 10 September a member asked why a draft incorporating the agreed amendments could not be prepared before the 21st. The answer was that it felt premature, and that the numbering would change when the bylaw was drafted.

The Chair said: "we don't have a full draft that we as a committee can say, here's draft [sic], we recommend this go to council."

A member asked whether the draft would be sent to the Committee before first reading. The answer was that the expectation is no.

The Chair confirmed the Committee would have no further consideration of the plan before first reading.

The Committee's Terms of Reference require it to "review and provide comments and recommendations on each version of the draft OCP." It has not been given this version. It has been told it will not see it before first reading, and that the expectation is that it will not see the bylaw draft either.

Nor did the Committee review the amendments. At that meeting staff said there were "60 something on the spreadsheet" and that "we don't have time to go through 60 something changes individually in great depth", and offered to highlight the ones staff considered most relevant. The Chair said that was the Committee's preference. So the changes now before the Committee of the Whole were not each considered by the Steering Committee, and which of them were discussed was chosen by staff.

This is not a fair process.

Section 475 of the Local Government Act requires the Municipality to provide opportunities for consultation during the development of an Official Community Plan, and to consider whether those opportunities are early and ongoing. Consultation on a document that has not been produced is not consultation.

A fair process requires notice of what is proposed and a real opportunity to respond to it before the decision is taken. Here there is no notice, because the plan has not been published. There is no opportunity to respond, because a document released shortly before a meeting, if it is released at all, cannot be read and responded to meaningfully, and any response could not itself be read or considered before the decision is taken.

A public hearing will follow first reading. That does not answer this. A hearing is on a bylaw, after readings, and the version the public sees at a hearing may be changed afterwards by referral responses, including the Islands Trust's approval for consistency with its Policy Statement. That approval comes after the hearing. So it is possible for the plan to reach adoption without the public ever having seen and commented on its completed text. Section 475 requires consultation during the development of the plan. That is what has not happened.

What I am asking.

That the item not proceed on 21 September.

The plan should be prepared and published in the form it now takes, and the Committee of the Whole should consider it only after the public and the Steering Committee have had a reasonable opportunity to read it and to comment.

Council having sight of the plan would not answer this. The duty under section 475 is to consult the public. It is not discharged by the decision-maker being shown the document.

Nor would the alternatives in the staff report answer it. Both would return the amendments or the draft bylaw to the Steering Committee, which is what that Committee's Terms of Reference already require. The Steering Committee is not the public, and sending the document to a committee does not answer a duty owed to the public.

This is an Official Community Plan. It governs land use and water protection on this island for a generation. It should not be moved toward a bylaw on the strength of a list of changes to a document nobody has been permitted to read.

Yours sincerely,

Heather Miller.