

From: [Mike Wilson](#)
To: [Zoning; legislativeservices](#)
Subject: Fw: Opposition to Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw No. 4710 and the rezoning of rural property
Date: Sunday, March 29, 2026 9:22:00 AM

With Best Regards

Mike

mike.wilson@cvrd.bc.ca
(250) 715 6874

From: Adam Ascroft [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:41 PM
To: Mike Wilson <mike.wilson@cvrd.bc.ca>
Cc: Adam Ascroft [REDACTED]
Subject: Opposition to Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw No. 4710 and the rezoning of rural property

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

Attention:: Mike Wilson
CVRD Director, Area C - Cobble Hill
c/o Cowichan Valley Regional District
175 Ingram Street, Duncan, BC, V9L 1N8

Dear Mr Wilson,

We are writing to you as a family that owns property here in Cobble Hill. We have just been made aware of the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw No. 4710, that is intended to replace the currently standing zoning system, simultaneously aiming to make sweeping, restricting changes of established property zoning and permissible land usage in rural areas. We do not agree that this bylaw should proceed without a public hearing and adequate public input. The lack of awareness in the general population and the speed at which this shift is moving forward make it extremely challenging for an average resident to get a clear understanding as to how this may impact them.

The need to simplify zoning is understandable, but Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw No. 4710, given the changes it proposes, we have found to be greatly concerning.

Although there arises a number of concerns with this bylaw draft, the primary is with regards to the proposed rezoning of a large number of properties in the area, shifting them from RR-2 and RR-3 to R-1. As is defined in the draft CZB, that transition would take away from those properties the permitted land uses of "Agriculture" or "Limited Agriculture." We own one of these properties and this change would directly negatively impact us in a myriad ways.

For us personally, the loss of the ability to keep a flock of free range hens enough to generate eggs for a family of four, along with the potential of being legally unable to keep roosters to protect them and replenish the flock is very unsettling. Especially in light of mounting pressures from the risings costs of living that are placing many families into the category of food insecure!

There are numerous small hobby farms in the area and the ability to keep livestock and/or poultry is a vital and inseparable part of the way landowners have been legally using their

property for decades, and now the draft CZB, as it currently stands, puts that in jeopardy. Under the proposed new zoning of R-1 that ability to supplement our food would be taken away, to be replaced with the restriction of no more than 6 hens, and those to be confined at all times, without the ability to keep roosters to ensure the safety and replenishment of the flock. Furthermore, even if the zoning didn't change, in the draft CZB under "4.42 Uses Prohibited in All Zones" it says that the keeping of roosters would not be allowed within a growth containment boundary. This also affects us as we are on the edge of a GCB. We find it deeply disturbing how this bylaw, even in a draft stage, could show such little regard toward the current legal usage of property in this area.

In a time when food prices are inflated and every dollar affords a family less and less, this draft is completely backwards and in contradiction with how the CVRD talks about supporting food sustainability.

When people purchase property, the zoning of that land and the way they can legally use it is one of the largest considerations of their investment, and many, if not most, landowners cannot afford to simply relocate if their land is rezoned from under them. Thus the adoption of this bylaw in any semblance of its current state would be unacceptable and damaging to many families and residents throughout the region.

With that said, we would respectfully ask of the CVRD:

1. That the adoption of this Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw No. 4710 be put on hold until residents are properly informed and consulted, including clear, property-specific explanations detailing how zoning would change for individual parcels.
2. That a public hearing be held. Resident's voices must carry legal weight when proposed changes would impact them to this degree.
3. That it be ensured that existing property rights are not reduced or restricted without explicit public consent.
4. That properties currently zoned for Agriculture or Limited Agriculture retain that permitted usage in all forms, including the ability to keep roosters within growth containment boundaries.

Questions:

1. How would the existing usage of a parcel be effected if its zoning were to change and specific permitted usages were lost? Especially with regards to the loss of "Agriculture" or "Limited Agriculture."
2. It is our understanding that the CVRD Board of Directors is not obligated to take into consideration the concerns of residents over this proposed bylaw, because it is argued to be in alignment with the current OCP, Bylaw No. 4373 - a bylaw which also saw much opposition in the community. To what extent is this true?

Respectfully,
Adam Ascroft
Gerald Ascroft
Vedrana Ascroft
Adrian Ascroft