

DISTRICT OF HIGHLANDS
REPORT OF PUBLIC HEARING

Highlands Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 261, 2005
Highlands Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw No. 262, 2005

Report of the Public Hearing regarding *Highlands Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 261, 2005* and *Highlands Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw No.262, 2005* held Tuesday, June 21, 2005 at Isabelle Reader Theatre, 1026 Goldstream Avenue at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Roessingh, Chair
Councillor K. Brotherston
Councillor M. Brotherston
Councillor Cardinal
Councillor Kardar
Councillor McPherson
Councillor Mendum

IN ATTENDANCE: Scott Coulson, Administrator
Terry Trace, Municipal Clerk
Laura Beckett, Municipal Planner
Sandi Chesley, Administrative Assistant
Sonja Zupanec, Planning Department Student

Opening Statement by the Chair:

The Mayor welcomed everyone to the public hearing and outlined the format for the evening. He advised that as required by the *Local Government Act*, the Public Hearing had been convened as an opportunity for all persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by the proposed Bylaws to be heard by Council or to present written submissions respecting matters contained in the Bylaws. He noted that each person would be granted 5 minutes to speak at one time, however may return to the microphone to speak again once everyone has had the opportunity to be heard. He announced there was no limit to the number of times a person may speak.

He then noted that comment sheets were available to fill out and hand in and advised that persons reading a letter should submit the letter prior to leaving the public hearing that all written material would be included in the record of the Public Hearing and would be available for public viewing until the end of the hearing.

The Mayor also noted that the meeting was not for open debate of the issues or for Council to state positions on the merits of the proposed Bylaws, noting that Council will have its opportunity to discuss and debate the Bylaws at a Regular Council meeting.

The Mayor announced that the meeting will be taped and then opened the floor to a question and answer period and proceeded to ask the audience if anyone had a question for Council.

Question and Answer period:

1. Scott Richardson, 499 Millstream Lake Road, noted that the developer had requested that the Group of Six provide advice to the developer while this application was ongoing. He questioned how many times has the Group of Six met since the last public hearing.

The Mayor advised that the group has not met.

2. Marcie McLean, 1321 Millstream Road, noted that the Bylaws require that the golf course be irrigated by treated septage. She questioned what body of government requires this?

The Mayor responded by indicating that the Council requires it by a bylaw formed by Council.

3. Judy Smith, 767 Finlayson Arm Road, noted that her notice was postmarked on the 13th of June and noted that this is not 10 days prior to the public hearing.

The Mayor noted that the notices were sent on the 10th and some notices were returned.

4. Bob Justice, 398 Millstream Lake Road, questioned the Public Hearing Notice's reference to the OCP providing for an alternate water supply system reliant on non-aquifer sources to the site and to the industrial lands. He also questioned the OCP allowing for natural gas from a private utility supplier to the site and the industrial lands. He questioned how the District can describe lands not in the designated area.

The Municipal Planner noted that the OCP is currently written that the Industrial land will receive services when the Urban Containment Boundary Area is amended.

5. Carole Lester, 787 Finlayson Arm Road, noted that her notice was also post marked June 13, 2005. She questioned that if Council did not pass Bylaws No. 261 and 262, then would it leave the District with Bylaws 236 and 237 still in affect? She also questioned that if the motion was to pass the bylaws would they rescind the previous bylaws. She further asked if Council did not pass Bylaws No. 261 and 262 could they at that time pass an additional motion to rescind the previous bylaws so that there are no bylaws in affect?

The Mayor advised that yes Council has this power.

6. Vicky Husband, 301 Ross-Durrance Road, indicated that notices were not posted on the mail boxes and that she does not receive the Gazette. She questioned if all referrals had been received yet for the Bylaws.

The Mayor advised that the District was following routine procedures and that all deadlines have been met.

Ms. Husband noted that Council was setting unrealistic deadline for referrals and questioned if the District anticipated not receiving all of the referrals. She further questioned what the situation was if CRD says no to piped water for the area.

The Mayor advised that the District's agreement for any housing over 62 requires piped water, so if the District is not permitted to receive piped water the developer will only be permitted to build 62 homes and there will probably be no hotel built. He further noted that the CRD must follow their own bylaws.

Ms Husband then questioned if the hotel was not built, will the property still be zoned commercial and will the District still receive the commercial taxes.

The Mayor advised that the taxes will still be paid on the land as per zoned even though there are no buildings constructed.

7. Bob Justice, 398 Millstream Lake Road, questioned Council if they would be proceeding with the meeting even though there is a problem with the notice.

The Mayor advised that the District will be proceeding with the Hearing.

8. Mr. Bob Flitton, 680 Stewart Mountain Road, questioned what was the problem with the notice and questioned if the notice was done in accordance to the law?

The Mayor advised that there was no problem with the notice and yes it was done according to the law.

9. Sue Johnson, 635 Lost Lake Road, noted that she received notification of the Public Hearing from the Highland Newsletter that is sent to all residents.
10. Evelyn Samuels, 405 Hazlitt Creek Road, noted that the Goldstream Gazette was available to residents at the 3 way stop at Millstream Lake Road and Ross Durrance Road for those who wished to obtain a copy. She then recapped her understanding for the Public Hearing. She noted that she understood the need for the new hearing to be:
 - a. Rezoning has already been approved;
 - b. Bylaws were passed;
 - c. Bylaws were then challenged by a small group of residents with a lawsuit;
 - d. If new bylaws are not passed, the old bylaw will stand;
 - e. The new bylaws are to protect the Highlands from a lawsuit.

The Mayor noted that the intent of the new bylaws was to improve the old bylaws.

The Mayor advised that anyone wishing to speak to Council be asked to state his or her name and address for the record.

The Mayor further advised that after all persons who so wished had expressed their views, that he would ask three times "Is there anyone else who wishes to be Heard", and if no further views were forthcoming, the Public Hearing would be declared closed.

Public Hearing Notice:

The Mayor read out the following:

Generally, the purpose of this application is to permit the creation of a newly zoned area known as Bear Mountain Comprehensive Development Zone 1 to include Residential, Resort, Golf Course, Commercial and Park – each of which contain uses and densities specific to their area; and to create a new OCP land use designation called Bear Mountain Comprehensive Development.

Highlands Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 261, 2005.

Specifically, under Bylaw 236, the OCP land use designation called Bear Mountain Comprehensive Development will be created. In addition, the background and context of the OCP will be changed to reflect the intensive residential nature of the development in conjunction with a golf course and its need for a non-aquifer water source, public sewers or an alternative

method of sewage disposal within the site and acknowledging the Bear Mountain development with respect to the Regional Growth Strategy.

Highlands Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 262, 2005.

Specifically, under Bylaw 237, the zoning of the subject property will be changed from Greenbelt 2 (GB2), Rural Residential 9 (RR9), Rural Residential 10 (RR10), rural Residential 11 (RR11), Rural Residential 12 (RR12), Park 1 (P1) and Golf Course 1 (GC!), to a new zone, Bear Mountain Comprehensive Development Zone 1 (BMCDZ1) which will include residential, resort, golf course, commercial and park. With the creation of this new zone, the permitted uses will include: golf course, licensed establishments, recreation facilities for guests, restaurant, lodge, light manufacturing, medical clinic, retail sales, golf academy, golf clubhouse, golf course maintenance facility, hotel, resort area with a maximum of 250 tourist accommodation units and townhouses and single family dwellings to a maximum of 150 residential units.

Public Hearing Opens:

The Mayor declared the Public Hearing pertaining to Bylaw No. 261 and Bylaw No. 262 open at 7:20 p.m.

The Mayor called for presentations.

Elaine Limbrick, 3836 Munn Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. She indicated that she is a member of the 77% of residents who indicated they wished to protect the rural Highlands. She noted that the only way to protect the Highlands was to allow controlled and limited development to ensure a sustainable economy for the District. She noted that the developer has worked actively and responsibly with all residents and interest groups to ensure that the development respect the needs for water, proper sewage facilities and the ecological values of the area. She noted that Bear Mtn. has agreed to prepare a complete environmental plan that meets Federal and Provincial Standards and that assures no net loss of riparian or wetland habitat. She noted that the land is only 5% of all of the Highlands with a proposed 1/10 housing density of the Langford side of Bear Mtn. and 85% of the Bear Mtn. property will be left as green space. She noted that the District can't do any better and that the District needs this development to meet expenditures. She further noted that the future of Highlands is at stake and will become a place too expensive to live in.

Michael Bocking, 405 Hazlitt Creek Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. He expressed that Council supported the proposed changes to the bylaws and noted that a frivolous and vexatious lawsuit has been brought against the District by a small group of residents whose intent was trying to overturn the democratic wishes of Council to support the Bear Mtn. OCP and Zoning bylaw amendments. He noted that approving the new bylaws will avoid a lawsuit against the District, whereby the taxpayers would incur all costs. He noted that are no substantial changes to the bylaws and he noted that a form letter had been distributed to residents and he wondered how many people who signed the form letter in opposition actually read the bylaws and understand the purpose of the public hearing.

Mara Dhillon, 3813 Munn Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. She noted that the proposed development is on less than 5% of all of Highlands land and will have little impact on the Highlands. She noted that the proposed development will bring in 8 million dollars to the District over the next 10 years, which will take the pressure off of the taxpayers.

Eleanor Rayner, 600 Stewart Mountain Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. She noted that the development would be good for the long term sustainability of the District, while having a

minimum impact on the rest of the Highlands. She noted that the proponent has been very patient and accommodating during the process and has tried to make this project one that the Highlanders can be proud of.

Andrew Fall, 220 Old Mossy Road, spoke against the bylaws as they are written. He noted that sustainable development requires a balance between ecological, economic and social values and that it is his view that this development does not do this. He noted that legal flaws in the previous bylaws have led to the need for revisions. He noted that this is an opportunity for Council to address the community's concerns. He noted that this development trades ecological and social values for potential financial rewards. He further noted that the ecological risk of this proposal is high and noted that Highlands is in the Coastal Douglas-Fir ecological zone, which is a thin, fragile strip on the Gulf Islands and southeast Vancouver Island. He noted that under these bylaws, no core forest habitat will remain and that the District stands to lose the last opportunity to maintain connectivity between Saanich Peninsula and the Sooke Hills. He requested that Council rethink the bylaws and negotiate a win win solution with the developer.

Carol Lester, 787 Finlayson Arm Road, spoke against the bylaws as they are written. She indicated that the bylaws were no different than 236 and 237. She requested that Council work together for a more acceptable plan for the area. She indicated that the community is unhappy and the only one who will win is the developer. She expressed a concern with environmental protection, adequate wild life corridors, strict protection guidelines of aquifers, protection of rural life style, larger buffer than 30 metres between the proposed development and Finlayson Arm Road, and reducing proposed density. She requested Council not to cut the trees on proposed fairways 6, 7 & 8 and the golf course be relocated to avoid the creek and Matson Lake.

Libby McMinn, 499 Millstream Lake Road, spoke against the Bear Mountain Project as defined in Bylaws 261 and 262. She indicated that it allowed too many houses and a greater buffer should be provided at the north end of the property. She noted that the bylaws need to be revised to ensure that the commercial component proceeds. She requested that Council reject the bylaws.

Hans Waelti, 3813 Munn Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. He noted that the bylaw changes were necessary to reduce the possibility of a lawsuit. He noted that the bylaws adopted in February were the result of years of negotiation with the landowners and many public meetings. He noted that should the project be quashed that the District would have to reimburse the developers for work already done and the taxpayers would be responsible for these costs. He noted that this is why the Mayor publicly stated that he supports the changes to the bylaws and that he supports Council's decision, as he is required to do under the Community Charter. He noted that it is Council's responsibility to ensure the financial stability of the District. He requested the Council adopt the bylaws.

Bob McMinn, 499 Millstream Lake Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted that amenity bylaws provided substantial increases in parkland and money for building the District office with little more than 10% increase in the number of houses. He indicated that 3rd party covenants on new lots were to protect against further subdivision. He noted that he supported the commercial components of the bylaws, but that the bylaws do not give assurance that the commercial component will be built. He noted that there should be a reduction in the number of houses permitted and Council should consider a "Wilderness Golf Course".

Marcie McLean, 1321 Millstream Road, spoke against the bylaws. She indicated that the bylaws are in major conflict with the current OCP and vision statement for the Highlands. She indicated that the bylaws were contrary to the character of the Highlands. She indicated that the District's financial position was fine and that District was able to provide for an adequate tax

base. She noted that a referendum should be held for piped water, sewers and natural gas being brought into the Highlands. She indicated that the proposal would not uphold the vision of the OCP, maintain peace and quiet, protect integrity of natural environment, protect the Millstream Watershed, protect critical wildlife habitat and intact ecosystems, provide connectivity, support 3rd party covenants and would not diversify the tax base or maintain a rural ambience.

Sue Johnson, 635 Lost Lake Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. She indicated that she supported the bylaws for the same reasons as she did for Bylaws 236 and 237. She questioned if there would be bath-tubs in the resort, as the bylaw refers to "water closet" on page 2 and this means toilet.

Diana McMinn, 587 Millstream Lake Road, spoke against the bylaws. She noted that the number of houses is too high, they would impact the lifestyle of the Finlayson Arm Road residents, there is no guarantee that the commercial components will be built and there is no guarantee that the developer will not come back to ask for more housing. She indicated that she did feel that the monetary benefits would not justify the damage that would be done by this development.

Ken Williams 2281 Bukin Place, spoke against the bylaws. He indicated that the developers are thinking 20 years down the road and that changing the urban containment boundary is only the first step of this special interest group. He indicated that he would like to see the District maintain their unique character.

Bob Flitton, 680 Stewart Mountain Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. He indicated that a lawsuit had been filed by a few residents and includes allegations against four members of Council. The bylaws have received very minor changes to alleviate the legal action. He noted that the proposed development is only 5% of Highlands located in the south end where it will have the least impact on Highlands. He noted that the project will diversify the District's tax base and will increase Highland's cash flow by \$8 million within ten years. He noted that Bear Mtn. agreed to environmental management and monitoring plans to Federal and Provincial standards to ensure no net-loss of riparian or wetland habitat and that 85% of the property will remain as green space and the density will be 1/10 of what it is for the Langford side. Mr. Flitton advised that the Matson Dam will be reconstructed, which will raise the level and restore Matson Lake and that the Bear Mtn. Trail Plan conforms to the CRD Master Parks Park. He then noted that Bear Mountain has committed to construct a new road through from Millstream Road at Hanington Road, to the Island Highway west of Spencer Road to take pressure off Millstream Road. He noted that Bear Mtn. has agreed to shield and recess all outdoor lighting. He noted that Highlands received land for their municipal office in 1997 in part, in support of development of the Bear Mountain property. He noted that the District approved a five year financial plan based on its recent approval of the Bear Mountain project. He noted that with the development of Bear Mountain, the Highlands would have funds to purchase a new fire truck and replace the West Fire Hall. He noted that if the bylaws are not adopted then the District will end up in a deficit at the time they need to buy a new fire truck, as they will have to borrow the money.

Ambrose Marsh, 360 Hazlitt Creek Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted that her biggest concern was the density. He indicated that the increased density would bring additional voters that could change the Highlands.

Karen Burns, 746 Caleb Pike Road, spoke against the bylaws. She indicated that the minor changes to the bylaws were merely a way to address the legal challenge. She indicated that Council has the opportunity to incorporate the concerns of residents of the Highlands and that Council should request greater concessions and that water withdrawal from the Highlands aquifer supplying water to the golf course on the Langford side of Bear Mountain be stopped.

Eric Bonham, 5216 Stag Road, spoke against the bylaws. He indicated that the new bylaws provide an opportunity to reassess the project to reach the goal of the developer while reducing the density and protect the natural environment. He indicated that he supports a "Wilderness Golf Course". He indicated that he attended Bear Mountain's open house and noted that the viewscape from the new clubhouse restaurant is spectacular and feels that the green space should be preserved. He noted that he found it disappointing that Council is proceeding with these bylaws with a split community.

Ken Faris, 1201 Millstream Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted that Highlands have built an inventory of assets in a natural setting, such as private rural acreages, medium-sized lots, and larger lot subdivisions with an abundance of green space. He noted that Highlands offers an attractive rural lifestyle that allows for agriculture, outdoor recreation and home-based businesses. He noted that the Master Development Agreement does not represent Highlands values and beliefs.

Neville Grigg, 685 Lost Lake Road, spoke against the bylaws in their current form. He noted that he feels that the Bear Mtn. Development proposal has torn the community apart.

Dave Mackas, 746 Caleb Pike Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted the bylaws do not provide sufficient protection for the Highlands aquifer and for the rural ambience and environmental services valued by the residents. He noted that he is opposed to Bear Mountain Langford drawing from the aquifers for irrigation of the existing golf course. He noted that he is not completely opposed to developing the properties or a golf course, but not the current proposal.

Peter and Mandy Schuttinga, 1617 Millstream Road, expressed their support for Bylaws No. 261 and 262.

Judy Smith, 767 Finlayson Arm Road, spoke against the bylaws. She noted that it was a dramatic change both environmentally and socially and does not agree with the proposed density. She noted that the population would increase by 25% who will have different values from current Highlanders and will support different political decisions. She indicated that without a healthy environment and intact ecosystem we cannot be a healthy society and that this proposed development does not protect the green space. She expressed concerns with the affect to the current water supply and how the development will impact it.

Ron Cheeke, owner of Woodridge Property, spoke in support of the bylaws. He suggested that people speak for themselves and not as a majority. He noted that he finds it offensive how the Highlanders just think of themselves and do not want outsiders to join the Highlands and that the residents shouldn't be concerned about political votes. He noted that he would like to see more people in the community. He noted the community needs more firefighters and more community involvement. He noted that Council and staff are doing an excellent job.

Rebecca King, 861 Finlayson Arm Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. She indicated that her property backs onto the development and supports it. She indicated that she worries about wildfire and that this will assist with prevent wildfires.

Fred York, 743 Finlayson Arm Road, spoke in support of the bylaws. He noted that his property backs onto the development and sees no major impact.

Rick Lester, 787 Finlayson Arm Road, spoke against the bylaws, however noted that he supports part of the proposed development. He noted that he has no objection to a golf course if environmental protections and remedies were in place. He indicated that there was too much density and that the proposed development was not in keeping with the OCP or the rural nature of the Highlands. He noted that the proposed development was too close to his property and supported a 100 metre buffer rather than the 30 metre buffer as per the bylaw. He also noted that he would like a fence between his property and the proposed development, as if feels that this development will alter his rural lifestyle. He noted that the wetlands should be protected and that Bear Mtn. should be prohibited from using water from the aquifers. He noted that Council must take steps to ensure that if the wells of nearby property owners are damaged by Bear Mountain's activity that the situation be rectified by Bear Mtn. and/or the municipality, affected property owners would be permitted to connect to piped water and costs for remedial work be paid by Bear Mtn.

Janet Williams, 2281 Bukin Road, spoke against the bylaws. She noted that she was against the urban style residential component and did not approve of the proposed density.

Muriel Sibley, 178 Ross-Durrance Road, spoke against the bylaws. She indicated that she did not support the proposed density, as it does not conform to the vision of a rural Highlands setout in the OCP. She indicated that she did not support the change to the Urban Containment Boundary, as it will affect the Highland's water, sensitive ecosystems and rural lifestyle. She noted that the development will also affect the traffic.

Alan Philip, 671 Millstream Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted that Council now has the opportunity to go back to the developer and change the development. He expressed anger that people don't realize what is black and white with respect to the development. He noted that he did not support the proposed density and was opposed to the residential component being spread throughout the largest wetland bowl. He noted that the proposed cabins will also require services and will bring all kinds of people to the area.

Vicky Husband, 301 Ross-Durrance Road, spoke against the bylaws. She noted that she holds all members of Council accountable for their decision on this proposed development. She indicated that this development would end Highlands rural and peaceful lifestyle and that we do not need a luxury golf course that was suppose to be a "Wilderness Golf Course" with 30% park. She indicated that the development encroaches on people such as the Lesters. She noted that the District does not have a financial problem and that this development will not provide any advantage to the District. She indicated that she was opposed to the current density and that this massive change in zoning contravenes the OCP. She noted that the proposed development would destroy the environment, the forest, wildlife, wetlands and sensitive terrain.

Colleen Robertson, 1835 Millstream Road, spoke in support of the Bylaws, as they will provide the District with additional protection against the lawsuit. She noted that she was a part of the group of six and that the District has been dealing with the Bear Mountain application for two years now and no one can come up with a definite number that will work. She noted that we have a good proposal in front of us than can work. She indicated that if it had been approved before, Highlands side would have had a hotel built prior to the Langford side. She noted that these bylaws are in the best interest of all the residents in Highlands.

Warren Lee, 281 Ross-Durrance Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted that the density was too high.

Scott Richardson, 499 Millstream Road, spoke against the bylaws. He noted that he doesn't agree with Council's reasons for approving the bylaws, such as the community needing the development for affordability. He noted that Council said the community was split on the issue, but he doesn't agree – he feels 75% were opposed. He noted that misinformation was passed out by Bear Mtn. and that people were coerced into signing the petition in support of the development for the last public hearing. He noted that a council member claimed that a consensus was not possible and that he disagreed.

Bob McMinn, 499 Ross-Durrance Road, read a letter for Pam and Pat Martin, of 1813 Millstream Road, against the bylaws. They indicated that the proposed development violates the existing OCP and that a development which destroys 70% of the existing land cannot protect the natural environment. They indicated that they did not believe that the residential component will increase the Highland's tax base and that there is no guarantee that the commercial component will be built. They also noted that there is no guarantee that the well water will not be affected by LGB9's use of groundwater, by the use of fertilizers and pesticides on the golf course and the use of septage for irrigation.

Marcie McLean, 1321 Millstream Road, read a letter for Lynn Joy, 598 Millstream Lake Road, against the bylaws. She noted that the proposed development raises concerns with respect to water quality and quantity for the District. She further noted that the density is too high and questioned the financial benefits to the District.

Mary Nall, 5216 Stag Road, spoke against the bylaw. She noted that she attended the open house up at Bear Mountain and noted that the development was wonderful and sophisticated, and questioned why does there need to more houses on the Highlands side. She noted that the Highlands should be protected and expressed a concern with respect to water and sensitive areas. She indicated support for a "Wilderness Golf Course".

Bob Flitton, 680 Stewart Mountain Road, indicated that the property of the proposed development was taken out of the Urban Containment Boundary without the consent of Council. He noted that in 1992 the first application came in for a golf course and 2/3 of the community supported it. He noted that even with this support, Council rejected it and then regretted it. He noted that the District has been negotiating for a couple of years and if we don't accept this proposal, it will be another missed opportunity and a couple years from now the District will once again regret it. He noted that Council should vote with the knowledge they have before them.

Vicky Husband, 301 Ross-Durrance Road, questioned who will be accountable if the wells fail.

Les Bjola, proponent of the proposed development indicated that he is hearing nothing new. He noted that he is giving his best option to the District at this time. However, if this proposal is denied, then the next time an application is made the density will be far greater. He noted that it is financially onerous to build the entire development without infrastructure and the residential component. He noted that there would be no hotel without the residential component and noted that Bear Mtn. had deposited a cheque with the hotel chain in the amount of \$150,000 for the hotel on the Bear Mtn. side to be built by 2009. He noted that Highlands is being offered the opportunity of a life time. He noted that they are building a "Wilderness Golf Course" in his opinion.

Scott Richardson, 499 Millstream Lake Road, spoke further against the bylaws. He noted further reasons for Council's decision to approve the development. He noted that Council indicated that the District knows what you're getting with the commercial development component. He noted that nothing is tied down and there is nothing prohibiting the developing from seeking further change. He noted that the development is too urban and too spread out. He then noted that a Councillor indicated that the developer is a good guy and can be trusted. He noted that there is no reason that they are good people, as they cut trees without permission. He noted another comment made by Council was that if they approve this development, they won't have to approve any other. He indicated that in less than six months after this statement Council, supported changing the 30 acre minimum to 20 acres.

Ken Williams, 2281 Bukin Place, noted that 570 people signed a petition opposed to the original bylaws and development.

Peter Talavs, 690 Rockridge Place, spoke in support of the Bylaws. He commented on the lack of attendance at the hearing. He noted that we must take into consideration the District's population and that 570 does not represent the majority of the Highlands.

Carole Lester, 787 Finlayson Arm Road, indicated that there is a low attendance because people haven't changed their mind.

Steve Howell, 552 Caleb Pike Road, spoke against the bylaws. He indicated that Council now has a chance to rethink the proposed development.

Meri O'Hearn, 390 Hazlitt Creek Road, spoke against the bylaws. She noted that gives Council the opportunity to compromise. She indicated that this should not be about money.

SUMMARY:

This written public hearing report represents a total of 38 speakers of which 13 appeared to be in favour and 25 opposed.

In addition, submissions provided at the Public Hearing (some of which were read out loud representing some of the above), or emailed or faxed to the District on or before June 20, 2005 are as follows:

Approximately 191 written responses were received regarding Bylaws 261 and 262. Of those, approximately:

- 158 stated opposition;
- 14 stated support, and
- 14 offered comments.

Every attempt was made to not count duplicate responses.

I certify this report as being fair and accurate.

Karel Roessingh, Mayor