

---

## Zoning Bylaw 4710

---

**From** Susanne Owen [REDACTED]  
**Date** Sat 3/28/2026 7:27 PM  
**To** legislativeservices <legislativeservices@cprd.bc.ca>

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing as a resident of Electoral Area B to express serious concern about the process surrounding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw 4710.

After reviewing the bylaw and recent reporting on it, it's clear this is not a routine consolidation. It is a 321-page regulatory overhaul that introduces 33 new Comprehensive Development zones, prescribes site-specific master plans, and authorizes over 2,800 new dwelling units across the electoral areas, all of which will rely on existing and already strained water and sewer systems.

Even more concerning is the recommendation that no formal public hearing be held. I understand this is being justified under Bill 44, which removes the requirement for a hearing if a zoning bylaw is "consistent" with the OCP. But given that the OCP itself was adopted in 2025 despite overwhelming public opposition, including a petition of more than 700 residents and statements from multiple Directors acknowledging unprecedented community pushback, it feels inappropriate to use that same OCP as the basis for bypassing public input now.

Residents deserve the opportunity to speak on the record, not merely at open houses where comments carry no legal weight. The difference between a public hearing and an open house is the difference between testimony and feedback - between a democratic right and a courtesy.

Specific issues that warrant formal public scrutiny include:

- \$50,000-per-day fines for bylaw violations, which could theoretically reach into the millions for ongoing infractions.
- Highly prescriptive rules governing everything from bedroom definitions to chicken coops, dock usage, and shipping container bans.
- Site-specific development blueprints embedded directly into the bylaw, including detailed architectural controls and density caps.
- Major infrastructure implications, with thousands of new units requiring water, sewer, drainage, and fire service capacity that many areas currently lack.

- Timing concerns, with adoption targeted for September - just five weeks before the October election, effectively locking in a near-permanent regulatory framework before voters can respond.

Given the scale, complexity, and long-term consequences of Bylaw 4710, I urge you to advocate for a formal public hearing. This is not about opposing growth or modernization. It is about ensuring transparency, accountability, and democratic legitimacy in decisions that will shape our communities for decades.

I would appreciate hearing your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Susanne Owen  
Shawnigan Lake, Area B

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)