



**Public Hearing  
Information Package**

**Monday, February 3, 2025 at 6:00 P.M.**  
*Council Chambers*  
 4450 Happy Valley Road, Victoria, BC, V9C 3Z3

---

**Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 693**

**Package 2**

<b>Proposed Bylaw:</b>	<i>Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 693.</i>
<b>OCP Amendment:</b>	<p>The general purpose of <i>Metchosin Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 693</i> is to rectify a procedural error from 2010 when <i>Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 565</i> was adopted to introduce a new “Village” land use designation, with supporting mapping, policies, objectives and a development permit area for properties in the Village Centre.</p> <p><i>Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 693</i> proposes to re-enact the amendments introduced in the 2010 <i>Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 565</i> and introduces minor housekeeping amendments such as clarification regarding maps, updated references to legislation, and minor changes to the drafting language to improve clarity. The properties shaded on the map are affected by <i>Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 693</i>.</p> <p>Endorsement of the <i>Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 693</i> has been received from the Agricultural Land Commission.</p>

**Information Package Contents:**

- a) Public Submissions received on or before January 31, 2025 as to Bylaw No. 693..... 1
  - Lisa Gee, January 30, 2025
  - Frank Mitchell, January 27, 2025

*Please note that written and verbal submissions will become part of the public record*



**Jennifer Miller**

---

**From:** Lisa Gee [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 30, 2025 5:43 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Notice of Public Hearing, Amendment Bylaw 693

To Mayor and Council.

I just received a Notice of Public Hearing in the mail, and was rather surprised that it was the first I had heard of it.

I have spoken with many on council individually, expressing my interest in the village core and the desire to be involved wherever possible including on a volunteer basis, which so far has not been acted on.

We are a small community that should be working closely together for the benefit of all. Having conversations together as neighbors certainly helps to promote this goal. However, receiving a notification like this without any discussion with the neighboring businesses creates the impression that our input is not valued. I understand that the public hearing is in theory a platform for input, but does not allow for the sharing of ideas and back and forth discussion that a face to face meeting does.

As I understand it from others that have reached out to me, this amendment is not just a small procedural correction, but in fact may allow for other uses in the village core.

I am hoping someone can respond before the weekend to clarify this point, as well as provide more information as to what the following statement means:

'clarification regarding maps, updated references to legislation, and minor changes to drafting language'

.  
This sounds like it has potential for a large impact on the OCP.

Thank you  
Lisa Gee  
Metchosin Centre  
[REDACTED]

Jennifer Miller

---

**From:** Frank Mitchell <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** January 27, 2025 9:44 AM  
**To:** Mayor and Council; Shelley Donaldson; Sharie Epp; Steve & Janet Gray; Marie-Terese Little; Lisa Urlacher; Jay Shukin  
**Subject:** Public Hearing Feb 3, 2025

Dear Mayor and Council

Unfortunately, I will be unable to attend the meeting this evening. But I would like to summarize my concerns.

The meeting is to hear public views on a proposed change in the OCP which would "change to a village designation that permits a wider range of uses."

Note that, *novel uses ARE allowed now*, but only following amendments to the OCP/LUB following public input. The new proposal is that Council should be able to make such changes without reference to the public.

Conferring such powers goes directly against the whole purpose of the Official Community Plan - Land Use Bylaw structure, which is designed to ensure land uses which have been agreed by the public and are enshrined in the OCP/LUBs, which in turn are administered by the Council. In addition to ensuring clear guidelines for Councils, this system also minimizes uncertainties by landowners about acceptability of their proposals, and minimize costs of administration and enforcement by the municipality. Not least, it makes corruption more difficult.

In brief, therefore, I feel there is no justification for the proposal, and recommend that Council reject it.

Yours sincerely

Frank Mitchell