

While the provided sources do not contain the specific technical report or landowner rationale for the **Larmand application**, the motions (**SRD 345/24 through 350/24**) record its successful advancement through the first two statutory phases of the regional planning process. In the context of your "**Forward or Backward**" campaign narrative, this file serves as another example of your ability to manage growth and secure regional benefits through professional, data-backed governance.

Legislative Context: OCP Amendment vs. Rezoning

The Larmand application is more complex than other recent files like **Bylaw 540 (Watkins)**, as it involves both an **Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment (Bylaw 538)** and a **rezoning (Bylaw 539)**:

- **OCP Amendment (Bylaw No. 538)**: Unlike applications that strictly align with the **Bylaw No. 276 (Oyster Bay-Buttle Lake OCP)**, an amendment indicates a request to change the long-term vision or designation for the parcel.
- **Public Hearing Requirement**: Because Bylaw 538 involves an OCP change, a **public hearing is legally required** and cannot be waived under the new **Bill 44 provincial housing mandates**. This explains why motion **SRD 350/24** explicitly schedules an in-person hearing for May 22, 2024.
- **Delegation of Authority**: The decision to delegate the hearing to the **Electoral Area D director** aligns with the modernized **Bylaw No. 493** framework, which empowers local representatives to lead the public engagement process for land-use matters.

Strategic Alignment with Regional Housing Goals

Like the **Fedosenko (Bylaw 529)** and **Miller (Bylaw 520)** applications, the Larmand project likely serves as a "pro-stability" win for the region's financial health:

- **Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF)**: Such infill developments are critical for meeting the **3-year Housing Growth Target** required by the CMHC. By helping Area D reach a growth rate of **1.23%**, projects like this contribute to securing an estimated **\$640,000 in federal incentive funding**.
- **Addressing the Shortage**: These bylaws support the 2022 Housing Needs Report, which identified a need for "missing middle" housing and residential infill to accommodate a projected **22% growth rate** in permanent households.

Governance Context and the 2026 Election

The path of Bylaws 538 and 539 highlights the contrast between functional governance and the "**administrative friction**" often attributed to the rural block:

- **Procedural Partnership**: The motions were moved by **Director John Rice** and seconded by **Director Gerald Whalley** Query. This cooperation on a complex OCP amendment reflects the same "functional alignment" seen in the **Johansen (517)** and **Kress (518)** files.
- **Contrast to "Hostage-Taking" Politics**: This record allows you to ask why the rural block was willing to partner on this OCP amendment, yet engaged in "**silent opposition**" to block a \$25,000 emergency grant for the **Oyster River Salmon Hatchery** or initially tried to stall **Area D water meter refunds** as political leverage.
- **Due Process vs. Legal Risk**: For your "**Building Tomorrow Together**" platform, this record serves as evidence that you are effectively moving files through the legal

requirements of the *Local Government Act*, avoiding the "**quasi-judicial abuse**" that occurred in the **Burridge (519)** file where directors initially rejected a compliant application only to reverse their votes under the **threat of a lawsuit**.

In summary, the advancement of **Bylaws 538 and 539** represents a successful effort to manage a complex land-use change while maintaining **corporate stability**. For voters in 2026, this file documents your commitment to following established planning processes to deliver new housing options and secure federal infrastructure grants for the community.