
Fwd: Feedback on proposed backyard hen regulations (Bylaw 4710)

From Meagan Sugrue [REDACTED]
Date Fri 3/27/2026 4:11 PM
To legislativeservices <legislativeservices@cvrld.bc.ca>
Cc Sierra Acton <sierra.acton@cvrld.bc.ca>; Zoning <Zoning@cvrld.bc.ca>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

I'm looping in the Legislative Services address.

Meg

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Meagan Sugrue** [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Mar 25, 2026, 2:44 p.m.
Subject: Feedback on proposed backyard hen regulations (Bylaw 4710)
To: <sierra.acton@cvrld.bc.ca>
Cc: <Zoning@cvrld.bc.ca>

Dear Director Acton,

I'm writing as a resident of Shawnigan Lake with a 2.5-acre R2-zoned property to share concerns about the proposed backyard hen regulations in the draft of Bylaw 4710. I understand the intent behind these regulations, particularly to address nuisance concerns and create consistency across the CVRD. I also appreciate that the bylaw clearly considers the health and wellbeing of the animals.

I'm wondering, however, if the current approach fully reflects differences in parcel size and rural context. While the bylaw includes some scaling based on parcel size, the distinction between parcels above and below around one acre is limited. In the current draft, a property of 2.5 acres with with considerable distance between dwellings and natural buffering (trees, terrain) would have the same restrictions as a much smaller parcel with close proximity to neighbours. A flat limit of six hens on a property of this size feels unnecessarily restrictive, particularly where impacts to neighbours can be well managed and enclosure requirements are met.

I am also concerned about the prohibition on roosters. For some households, roosters are part of an existing flock and are essentially pets. A blanket ban without transition provisions could result in the forced removal or euthanization of healthy animals, which would be a difficult outcome to justify.

These limits also have implications for household-level food security. Many residents keep chickens as a way to supplement their food supply. While small-scale, the ability to maintain a slightly larger flock on a larger property can make a meaningful difference, particularly as food costs continue to rise.

I would encourage the CVRD to consider refining this section of the bylaw to better reflect the range of rural parcel sizes and uses. In particular:

- Introduce more graduated scaling of permitted flock size beyond the current threshold, and differentiate between smaller lots and larger rural properties.
- Include transition or grandfathering provisions for existing flocks, particularly where roosters are already present.

I appreciate the work that has gone into this draft and the opportunity to provide input. I hope these comments are helpful as you continue refining the bylaw.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

All the best,

Meg Sugrue