

The motions **SRD 58/24 through 61/24** record the final legislative victory for the **Bylaw No. 519** rezoning application, representing the formal conclusion of what the sources identify as the most severe instance of "**quasi-judicial abuse**" and "**administrative malpractice**" in the current board term. While these motions successfully adopted the bylaw, the requirement for a **second public hearing (SRD 59/24)** serves as a permanent record of the legal and financial risks created by the "rural block's" obstructionist tactics.

The Technical Scope of Bylaw No. 519

Bylaw 519 involved a coordinated "infill" proposal for **eight adjoining residential lots** (approximately 18 hectares) located on **Neigel Crescent, Jody Lynne Way, and Craig Road** in Electoral Area D.

- **The Transformation:** The parcels were rezoned from **Country Residential Four (CR-4)** to **Country Residential Three (CR-3)**.
- **Density Increase:** This reduced the minimum lot area requirement from 2.0 hectares to **1.0 hectare**, allowing the eight existing parcels to be subdivided into **16 individual fee-simple lots**.
- **Housing Alignment:** Planning staff and the applicants' representative, Peter Zaschke, emphasized that this project directly supported the **Housing Action Plan** and the SRD's application for the **CMHC Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF)**.

The Necessity of the "Second Public Hearing" (SRD 59/24)

The motion to receive the report on a **second public hearing** highlights a significant failure in governance. Despite the application having full community support, unanimous alignment with the **Official Community Plan (OCP)**, and strong endorsement from professional planners, Directors **Gerald Whalley and Robyn Mawhinney** initially voted to defeat the bylaw.

- **Legal Extortion:** The sources state that the directors only rescinded their "No" votes after being faced with the **explicit threat of a major private lawsuit** for bad-faith decision-making.
- **Procedural Reset:** Because the bylaw had already been defeated, the board could not simply "reverse" the vote; they were legally required to restart the final statutory phases, forcing **eight local families**—who were regular homeowners rather than corporate developers—to endure the stress and cost of a redundant second hearing.
- **Wasted Resources:** This "legal blunder" resulted in the waste of taxpayer dollars on **unnecessary staff hours**.

Strategic Impact: Securing \$640,000 in HAF Funding

The final adoption of the bylaw (SRD 61/24) was a critical "pro-stability" win for the region's financial health.

- **Meeting Growth Targets:** Bylaw 519 is a primary contributor to Area D's goal of raising its 3-year growth rate from 0.77% to **1.23%**.
- **Incentive Awards:** Successfully passing this compliant development ensured the SRD remained eligible for an estimated **\$640,000 in federal HAF incentive funding**, which can be reinvested into affordable housing or community infrastructure.

2026 Significants

- **Accountability for Incumbents:** This record allows for sharp debate questions asking the rural directors why they chose to use **local residents as "political pawns"** and why they risked a massive bad-faith lawsuit to settle unrelated regional disputes.

In summary, while the final motions (SRD 58/24 to 61/24) provided a just outcome for these eight families, the sources suggest that the path to adoption was a **"Phase 3" obstruction** that nearly scuttled over half a million dollars in federal funding and exposed the regional district to severe legal liability.