



PUBLIC HEARING
Tuesday, August 23, 2022 @ 5:30 PM
George Fraser Room, Ucluelet Community Centre,
500 Matterson Drive, Ucluelet

LATE AGENDA

	Page
1. LATE ITEMS	
1.1. Add the following correspondence received after August 18, 2022 to Item Number 7.3. "Written Submissions Received During the Notice Period": 2022-08-22 - C. Sweazey 2022-08-22 P. Freimuth & D. Uy 2022-08-23 J. Holliday 2022-08-23 B. Moriarty 20220-08-23 E. Chernis 2022-08-23 D. Dievert 2022-08-23 M. Gaudet 2022-08-23 A. Murray	3 - 17

Dear Council,

We recently purchased a building lot on Rainforest Drive. We are writing to you in regards to Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw No. 1310, 2022.

Under 404.1, number 10 states that “A bed and breakfast use is an integral part of the home and must not have a separated or locked-off common area.” We strongly disagree with this part of the bylaw. When we move to the community, we plan to find jobs in the area. We should be able to lock off our home while we are at work, sleeping or just out enjoying the beautiful area.

We are asking that council please remove number 10 before approving this bylaw.

Sincerely,

Nick & Courtney Sweazey

Paul Freimuth and Diana Uy
 PO Box [REDACTED]
 Ucluelet, BC
 V0R-3A0

August 22, 2022

RE: Proposed Bylaw No. 1310 and Bylaw No. 1313

Dear Mayor Noël and Members of Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the revisions of the proposed subject bylaws. Since we have already submitted our comments to the original proposed bylaw, we will not repeat our comments here. Below are our questions and concerns to the revisions:

Following all the input to the Public Hearing on June 28, 2022, these revisions seem punitive to the homeowners and principal residents of Ucluelet that have followed the building rules and purposely built their homes to run, or potentially run a B&B should they need to in the future. Moreover, these revisions do not accomplish the claimed purpose of this proposed bylaw of solving long term and affordable housing issue.

The revisions states:

“A bed and breakfast use must be accessed from the main entry of the home in which it operates, and cannot operate remotely utilizing coded entry locks and or key lock boxes. (9) Any exterior door to rooms used for bed and breakfast uses must not be utilized as the principal entrance and exit to the bed and breakfast use. (10) A bed and breakfast use is (10) A bed and breakfast use is an integral part of the home and must not have a separated or locked-off common area.”

This is a privacy and security issue. Though we have not and currently do not operate a B&B, we followed the building rules and purposely built our home to allow for a B&B rental with a separate entrance in case we need to use this as a mortgage helper at some point. This incurred more costs but we did so to facilitate privacy and security for both ourselves and the guests should we need to use our guest room as a B&B.

How is this going to be enforced? Will district staff be monitoring B&B room entrances day and night to ensure that the separate entrances are not being used by the guests?

“APPENDIX C – DRAFT UCLUELET BUSINESS REGULATION AND LICENSING BYLAW AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 1313, 2022:”

“Require that businesses with accommodation classification operating in residential areas (i.e., B&B’s, Guest Houses and Vacation Rentals) must display a sign complying with the District’s standard - in an exterior location near the property line and visible from the street (e.g., adjacent to the required civic address sign) - noting the business licence number, maximum occupancy, maximum number of guest vehicles and a contact number.”

Is this draft part of the Business Regulation and Licencing Bylaw or the Sign Bylaw that regulates the number, size, type, design and location of signs within the District of Ucluelet? Business licence numbers change year after year and signs will have to accommodate this. In the sign bylaw, it states the Council wishes to preserve and enhance the character of Ucluelet’s esthetic environment. Requiring these signs seem to contradict Council wishes stated in the sign bylaw and does not accomplish solving the lack of long term and affordable housing.

Are current B&B Licence holders going to be grandfathered in for some or all exceptions to the rules? This creates division and is not fair to the residents that purposely built or bought homes for possible future B&B, or residents that are currently unable to, or have recently suspended their B&B due to life circumstances.

What are the fees going to be per room? Please consider the same amount per room rather than charging more for the first room and less for the added 2nd and 3rd room. Charging more for the first room penalizes the home owner that could not afford to build a bigger house. Shouldn’t it be the other way around or at least the same per room since more rooms would garner more income?

Ucluelet is a resort municipality. A large portion of our economy is based on tourism. There is a need for long term housing as well as tourism accommodation. B&Bs help contribute to both these needs as B&B homes first houses long term residents and allows the said long term resident to stay should they need a mortgage helper. Please consider allowing Accessory Residential Dwelling Units as well as B&B use while taking into consideration the comments in this letter. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
 Paul Freimuth and Diana Uy

Add the following correspondence received after August 18, 2022 to Item ...

From: [Jacqueline Holliday](#)
To: [Info Ucluelet](#)
Subject: Bnb bylaw proposal
Date: Monday, August 22, 2022 8:56:58 PM

[External]

Dear council,

Once again you are proposing a two-tiered system with the proposed B and B bylaws only applying to new applicants. In addition the new proposal penalize home owners with ridiculous rules.

I disagree with visitors having to use the main entrance to home and have full access to common areas. We are still dealing with a constant pandemic, and the separate entrances/areas promote health and safety. It also allows visitors to feel like they have their own privacy and place to rest. It also ensures they can feel safe to leave their belongings.

I disagree with having to serve breakfast. Current B and B's do not all do this, it takes away from local restaurants serving breakfast, and how on earth do you plan on enforcing this.

Charging more money for the first room and less for each subsequent room doesn't make sense. Why not charge a set amount for each room. That way the more you have, the more you pay.

I agree a road sign saying you operate a B and B might make sense. The requirement to post a phone number does not. Phone calls at all hours of day or night would not be welcomed, and again, grandfathered B and B's are not required to do this.

All I see from these proposed changes is an attempt at making the license application so unattractive that no one would want to run a B and B. What I do agree with is that applicants should either live in their primary residence to run a B and B, or provide long term housing to someone who will run it for them.

I am requesting that council drop all of these proposed changes to B and B bylaws for now. First council should give Ucluelet residents answers on when the First Light Development will finally provide the housing project it promised 3 years ago. Give us a timeline! Provide tangible timelines for future affordable housing projects (not \$500K units that are 900 square feet).

Jacqueline Holliday
311 Marine Drive

From: [Brendan Moriarty](#)
To: [Info Ucluelet](#)
Subject: Aug 23 Hearing
Date: Monday, August 22, 2022 7:13:55 PM

[External]

Dear Mayor Noel and members of Council,

This email is regarding public hearing for August 23rd, 2022.

I have lived in Tofino for the past 14 years. My partner and I purchased and operated a successful, legal, vacation rental property in Tofino from 2015 until the start of 2022. Throughout this time we have spent a lot of time in Ucluelet. We really love the community here and have realized that this is the place we want live, work and grow our family. Therefore we decided to sell our property in Tofino and purchased land in Ucluelet with the intention of building a Bed and Breakfast (as per the current zoning bylaws). This transition has taken us years to pull off and we have sacrificed a lot in order to make this move.

This year we have spent countless time and tens of thousands of dollars on design work, land surveys, geo-tech, tree fallers and so on. We are nearly complete with our design work and are close to applying for a building permit. The proposed changes to the current by-laws would negatively impact our plans for the future and would negatively affect our building design, business and personal lives. We hope that you and council will reconsider the following;

(7) Consistent with a traditional bed and breakfast use a bed and breakfast use must include a minimum service of a continental breakfast.

(8) A bed and breakfast use must be accessed from the main entry of the home in which it operates, and cannot operate remotely utilizing coded entry locks and/or key lock boxes.

(9) Any exterior door to rooms used for bed and breakfast uses must not be utilized as the principal entrance and exit to the bed and breakfast use.

(10) A bed and breakfast use is an integral part of the home and must not have a separated or locked-off common area.

Breakfasts are not expected by most people staying at short term accommodation. ^{[[SEP]]}This is an extra cost to the homeowner when food inflation is extremely high (as it is currently). This also disincentivizes tourists from eating at local businesses for breakfast. ^{[[SEP]]} My partner and I are planning to have kids soon. We want to be financially stable, and have time to spend with our kids and be able to raise them in the community of Ucluelet (which have worked hard to call our home). It would negatively impact our financial wellbeing to make 6 breakfasts every morning for our guests, especially as the demand for this service is coming from a by-law and not from our guests themselves. In our experience this is not something a majority of people want in 2022.

Shared entry between our primary residence and our B&B guest suites would negatively impact the expectations of our guests and their experience staying with us, in addition to our personal lives. Entering a guest suite through the main door is disruptive and loud for the other guests and us as home owners. We have a large dog with anxiety that would be disrupted every single time someone walked through the door. Some guests won't feel safe to walk into

a strange house, meet a stranger and receive a key, especially solo women travelers. This is a completely outdated practice and not in line with competitive tourist accommodations.

The federal government is telling us to distance ourselves socially. This law would force people to all use the same indoor space frequently. We would be forced to live amongst our guests, instead of hosting them in a purpose built guest room and guest appointed areas. Areas that are designed for privacy. Not only would there be no privacy for ourselves or for our guests, we would be offering an inferior product.

With the elimination of coded entry, we would be required to greet our guests at check-in. In our previous experience in Tofino, guests prefer flexible check-in times that accommodate to their own schedule. Guests often check-in at a different time than expected. Thus proving how the coded entry is an important feature for us and our guests. This a common procedure in 2022 not only in Tofino or Ucluelet but all over the world. The business we are looking to create, is one that can compete with other high-end businesses. Taking away this feature would immediately put our business at a disadvantage amongst the competition. ^[L]_[SEP]When guests have the convenience to check-in with a coded entry, it allows them to spend more time exploring and being patrons within the community.

We are currently living in the most transmissible viral pandemic in modern history. The government of Canada has made it very clear that people need to distance themselves socially. Our federal government has even gone as far as to offer financial aid to businesses to create socially distant spaces. This proposal is literally going against what we have been told to do to stay safe. By taking away flexibility to meet the now standard expectations of tourism, we are threatening the tourism industry that many people in our communities, including my own family, rely upon. We need to adapt to the times and not add more hardships for the people who live here and add economic value to this community.

In summary, I believe that these proposed changes are a bad idea. They are disadvantaging Ucluelet businesses compared to their counterparts in other towns. They are inconvenient, obtrusive, and are not desired by tourists or business owners. With these amendments, our business would be clunky and outdated. We would have to spend a significant amount of time and money to operate the same business while also de-incentivizing tourists to eat at a local Ucluelet restaurants. Our home would now have random people coming in and out and require constant interactions (key exchange etc.), which seems completely against the social distance message our government is sending us. I see a lot of businesses and homeowners being negatively affected and at what benefit? I don't think the result is a huge surge of long-term rental availability. House prices are extremely high and most people cannot afford a home here without a B&B mortgage helper. This is a problem but what is being proposed isn't a realistic solution.

I hope you reconsider the terms above. As I don't feel that this is in the community's best interest.

Sincerely,

Brendan & Nicola

From: [Ed Chernis](#)
To: [Info Ucluelet](#); [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw 1310 and 1313
Date: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 9:41:04 AM

[External]

Mayor and Council:

While I agree that there is a shortage of long-term rental housing in Ucluelet, I do not believe that this bylaw will do much to change things, as poor choices made by Council and the Planning Department have created the situation by allowing homes to be built that are not really family homes and do little to encourage a sense of community. Requiring that B&Bs be in the license holder's primary residence is a great idea. There are many homes in the area where the proprietor of a B&B lives elsewhere and may or may not have a full-time attendant on site, and I support this amendment. I find it interesting that there have been numerous grumblings about the proliferation of B&Bs in town over the years, but now everyone seems to want one.

The idea of "traditional bed and breakfast" being required to serve a "continental breakfast" is a little outdated. Travelers today want the convenience of being able to prepare their own meals, which is currently prohibited under the current bylaw. I don't understand the reason for this. I don't think that tourists are any more likely to cause a fire than a homeowner. When people go on vacation, they don't want to be regulated by a schedule created by the B&B owner, and vice versa. Few people who come here can afford to eat out every night, or want to, assuming that they can get a seat in a restaurant. I once waited for 15 minutes at the Floathouse for a table, and by the we sat down and had ordered, the wait was 40 minutes, and they were turning people away.

Requiring B&Bs to have signage outside of their place of business with personal information out front makes absolutely no sense at all and is an invasion of privacy. The City of Vancouver has required Airbnb operators to indicate on the listing their business License number, and I agree that this is a good thing, however, most of the other information can already be found on the B&B's website. When I submitted my Business License application in 2013, I had to provide a plan of where the parking was located on my property, so this information is already available to bylaw and planning, which seems to have gone by the wayside in recent years, with on-street parking at many B&Bs. Will it enhance the look of the neighbourhood if suddenly signs were to appear on front lawns all across town? How big are these signs supposed to be – readable from the street, or are people supposed to trespass on my property to read the sign? I doubt that you will find any B&B owner in town that will accept a walk-in customer. People today book online, which provides a certain level of security for the host and the traveler, and travelers have access to all the information they need about a B&B listing, without having to read a sign on a lawn. Would anyone on Council allow anyone to just walk up to their door looking for a place to stay? If this requirement were to be put into place, it would mean a lot of nuisance knocks on doors from people who came here without a reservation looking for a place to stay. I do not want my phone number on display at the front of my property; we already receive enough nuisance calls as it is. This is totally unnecessary, and expensive. Will the B&Bs that already have signs be required to relace them to conform with the proposed changes? Forcing homeowners to bring guests in through their main entrance is a bad idea, given the current pandemic, not to mention the security risks.

I feel that is unfair to pick on Airbnb listings, as they are not the only way to book a stay in Ucluelet – Booking.com and VRBO are other ways to book accommodations in Ucluelet. Airbnb tends to be a target, as there are many operators who have commercialized it, buying homes purposely to rent them. It is the responsibility of the local municipality to set the rules on this, and primary home ownership is a good idea. Airbnb is just a business tool that allows people who have some extra space in their homes to make some money. Airbnb is collecting all the provincial and municipal taxes on rentals and sending them back to the community. It collects money from guests, so there is no need for a host to handle credit cards, and it deposits the money into the owners' bank account within a couple of days. It also maintains a calendar, so one doesn't have to worry about double booking, or missed reservations. Airbnb guests must provide government ID and other information to join, so a host can feel secure in knowing who is coming into their homes, and reviews by hosts of guests lets them know how they have behaved in the past. There is a certain amount of security in knowing who is coming to your home. Airbnb also provides \$1 million in liability insurance in case a guest causes damage to one's property. Overall, it is a great business tool.

If the District was serious about stopping the surge in nightly rentals, stop Tourism Ucluelet from promoting the town. Tourism is the lifeblood of this town, and without it, we wouldn't have all the great amenities and restaurants that we enjoy. Housing is a government issue that needs to be addressed at federal provincial and municipal levels. It will not be solved by honest people trying to be able to afford to live here, with the high cost of living and property taxes and utility bills. These bylaws will do little to solve the housing shortage and will just cause hardship and inconvenience for B&B operators. It is not a homeowners' (that's what most B&B operators are) responsibility to finance affordable housing, it's yours.

Respectfully,
Ed Chernis
947 Amphitrite Place
[REDACTED]

From: [Danielle Dievert](#)
To: [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Chris Young](#)
Subject: In response to bylaw 1310 2022 BNB and ADU
Date: August 23, 2022 10:49:30 AM

[External]

Hi,

I'm writing in response to bylaw 1310 2022 BNB and ADU proposed changes. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes.

I would like to first point out that I do agree that there is affordability and housing crisis in all of BC and I'm happy that Ucluelet is trying to help the situation.

My partner and I have been dealing with housing crisis while we build the funds to build our dream house in Ucluelet. We were kicked out of our rental spot of 5 years because the landlord was selling. With the lack of available affordable housing, we are living in our van at our job site. This was never the plan, but here we are. So we completely understand the housing issue but we disagree that this bylaw is helping the issue of affordable housing and causing undue stress to the Ucluelet community.

We used all of our savings to buy a tiny lot in R4 in Ucluelet last October. We have been designing our house and planning since the purchase. We bought the lot with the intention to build a house for ourselves and run a BNB because that is the only way we could manage the mortgage as it is a significant mortgage helper. We have many reasons why we want/need to have a BNB which include: mortgage helper, a place for family and friends to stay, that our lot is too small (tiny GFA allowable) to build a secondary suite, the additional costs to build a secondary suite, and long term retirement plans of running a BNB.

We originally planned to be building within a year of purchasing but with the economy and the substantial increase in building costs, this has become unfeasible. We have spent almost a year designing out house, dreaming of how we will build and operate in Ucluelet. Now this one bylaw would render the drawings useless. Minor adjustments will not make our design fit these rules (main entrance & parking) and I don't know how to make a feasible design with these rules on our tiny lot. There is no possible way to make minor adjustments to have both the BNB and house entry at the same location or adjust our parking to be only 7m wide. From being so excited to more build our dream home and move back here, we have been in constant onslaught of removal of our zoning to which we purchased.

From the email that was sent out it seemed like any current BNB would not have to follow these rules or people who have put in their building permit. What about all of us who purposely spent more money to buy land with the current zoning and now is getting that taken away or altered? What about us who have spent hours upon hours on their design plans that would be considered useless because of these changes? How is it fair to have two properties in the exact same zoning following different rules? Grandfathering in is unacceptable as it creates a two tiered system completely unfair to locals within the same zoning and almost impossible to police. Will there be a map to show which house BNB renters can go in side doors and which have to enter the front?

Previously the bylaw that was proposed was to remove BNB from residential zoning and allow ADUs. This caused an uproar with the community as our rights and purpose that people bought and own the land was being taken away. This new bylaw is better but it is so restrictive and undesirable that it essentially does the same thing as removing BNBs.

Wasn't the final comments from the last meetings regarding bylaw 1310 were to leave the BNB as they are in current zoned areas and make adjustments to newly zoned areas? I don't see how that was implemented.

No one, renters or families running BNBs, want to have the same entrance. I am shocked to see that it was proposed.

Add the following correspondence received after August 18, 2022 to Item ...

This is archaic. With COVID over the past few years, we have been told directly by the government to socially distance. Isn't this in exact opposition to that? There are significant safety issues, privacy issues, trespassing issues, crime issues, and livability issues with this alone. No solo female will want to enter the main house and be in the space that is an 'integral part of the house'. My closest friend has had an experience while traveling that traumatized her. The room was part of the house and a male harassed her to the point she was scared for her life. I would like to believe there are no people in this world that would do that, but it happens, and this bylaw puts more people at risk. I want to raise my children here. I don't want to be concerned about the comings and goings of BNB renters and run a police check every time I rent out a BNB. People want their own space. They want to feel comfortable in a private space with the option to be social.

There was a comment in the meeting on Aug 2 that both the BNB and the family could enter the same door and use the foyer. The BNB and rest of house could be locked to prevent trespassing. This seems to be a waste of space as this is not a hotel. We do not need a common space that will sit completely unused for entry. There are already issues with GFA and now its potentially getting reduced to add this common space foyer. I am also struggling to see the issue with lock boxes or key pads. Most houses are using these now. Are we wanting to stay in the past or continue into our future?

The driveway restriction also needs to be updated. If the roadway doesn't have street parking, it shouldn't be applicable. Our lot and many others are so small they we need a larger driveway to allow 3 vehicles side by side. This doesn't take away from street parking as its not allowed on our street. People shouldn't have to limit their driveway size because of this.

I am also concerned about the signs as I don't think they will be ascetically pleasing for the community and posting of phone numbers does not seem like a good idea. The people who rent here and the online advertisement will give the required parties the phone number. Neighbours will already have their own neighbours number or can knock on the door if there is an issue. Does the business licence change every year? Would then people be required to re-make a sign each year just for this?

These rules drives out the middle class who already are having a hard time affording their own house/land and replaced by the rich. The rich don't need to run a BNB or have a secondary suite, they can leave the house empty. It's the middle class that, on top of their full time job, or retirees that need to run a secondary business like a BNB to be able to afford living here. These are the people that suffer with this Bylaw.

The goal of this bylaw is to increase more longterm housing/rental availably. However, this bylaw 1310 BNB rules does not seem to be addressing this. Targeting single family residential homes is adding an immense amount of stress to the locals, dividing the town, and not actually achieving the goal of more affordable housing. The ADU portion absolutely makes sense and should be passed.

What we need to be focused on is to commit to real affordability and housing issues and not punishing the current locals and land owners of Ucluelet.

Allow all BNBs, ADUs, and secondary suites. If housing is the issue, let people build more. Allow people to build up to 32' high so we can actually building secondary suites.

Allow free economy. Let people decide where they want to stay, at a bedroom in a house, in a separated bedroom and living space, a place that provides breakfast or a place that doesn't. The bylaw shouldn't be enforcing this. Free economy will.

I encourage you to leave current BNB bylaw as is and add ADU to the bylaw.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,
Danielle Dievert and Chris Young
329 Pass of Melfort

August 23, 2022

RE: Bylaw 1310 Proposed Amendments

Dear Mayor Noël and Councillors

We would like to voice our opposition to the proposed changes to the bylaw 1310 & 1311, reiterating points many others have made:

1. Lack of safety and security for owners by having strangers in their home. (Exterior areas of Airbnb's with the owner on site are great ways to meet your guests without losing that security. Almost all Airbnb's we've stayed at with the owner onsite, we've met and interacted with).
2. Lack of safety and security for guests. Not feeling comfortable in a space, and not having a private entrance/ exit are all deterrents to guests.
3. Have and Have not Culture: Traditional B&Bs are not the future of travel. By forcing owners to operate in this manner, they'll see less success than those operating under the previous B&B terms. Vacationers want privacy and will undoubtedly choose Traditional B&B options as a last resort, or change their travel plans, as we would.
4. Changes to allowable appliances in a space (removing the toaster, microwave, smaller fridge) all feel very inhospitable.
5. Bylaw 1311: There may also be a number of people who have purchased property in Ucluelet recently and who either have a new house under construction or are in the design stage with new B&B rooms integral to their plans (both physical and financial). The recommended Council motion #5 at the outset of this report would give a 10-day period for such persons to identify their situation and request inclusion in the B&B zoning overlay. This would enable such cases to scoot in before the bylaw is adopted. – Is this still applicable? Under the previous Bylaw 1310 / 1311 change, our property was shown as included in the "Building stage". When is the 10-day period?

We are currently in the planning stage, and as of June, we no longer know if our plans are valid. This entire process has been so incredibly disheartening. We had so much excitement about building our future home in Ucluelet, with a small private B&B to help us to afford living there. That excitement has been replaced with a multitude of other emotions, none positive.

If this bylaw passes, and the above Point #5 is no longer permissible, we'll have to pay to have plans redrawn, remove the proposed B&B and all plans of a mortgage helper in our home.

We hope council considers the mostly negative impact this bylaw will have on many homeowners who are just trying to be a part of this community.

Mandi & Tristan Gaudet

Lot 8 – Pass of Melfort Place

Add the following correspondence received after August 18, 2022 to Item ...

Dear Mayor, Council & Staff,

Thank you for continuing to allow all of Ucluelet's fulltime residents and residential property owners to host visitors in privately owned spaces as they have been zoned to do for years.

We celebrate the proposed allowance of a nightly rental and ADU on the same property for those that have the space to conform and can afford to do so.

We do however have some concerns regarding the newly amended bylaw 1310 being presented. With a world still reeling from years of covid, pushing for shared entries and spaces with more communal living seems counter intuitive for our forward-thinking community. Furthermore, this creates safety concerns for both the residents and the guests. Supplying breakfast also takes away from local businesses providing this service. Both the proposed traditional B&B and the current B&B/ "guest suite" offer the same benefit to the community in that they are intimate, locally hosted, and managed onsite by the principal resident (non-property owner or property owner). However, a traditional B&B with up to 3 rooms is in fact the commercialization of a residential home whereas a single "guest suite" has lower impact on the community, is a safer way to host visitors and has the potential to be integrated back into the house or converted to a long-term rental. A traditional B&B is a business. A guest suite is a mortgage helper. For these reasons, perhaps in order to curb the commercialization of residential neighbourhoods, a single "guest suite" (with separate entry, private space, bedroom and conforming kitchenette) should be added to the proposed zoning as a permitted secondary use for homes in Ucluelet. A single "guest suite" better fits the fabric of our community, decreases impact on neighbouring residents, is more viable in terms of off-street parking and allows for a more integrated design into local homes. Clearly defined design perimeters such as off-street private parking, side or back entries and suites that are integrated visually within residential homes would address the goal of maintaining a strong community feel. The alternate option of up to 3 rooms with a traditional B&B can still give residents the choice to pursue this type of accommodation if they wish.

We appreciate that existing B&B business licenses and in-progress builds, conforming to the current B&B zoning requirements, will become 'lawful non-conforming' if the amended bylaw 1310 is passed. Unfortunately - per the government of BC link provided on the district website - the current zoning rights of existing license holders are restricted. Per the government of British Columbia 'lawful non-conforming' status could be removed from currently operating B&B's that have worked hard to meet existing zoning requirements, if their use is discontinued for up to 6 months or if they were to suffer excessive property damage due to unforeseen circumstances. We think that if council chooses to move forward with 1310 as it is proposed, then an overlay bylaw such as 1311 originally presented should be implemented. To be clear, we don't like the separation of zoning within residential areas, but feel that ensuring currently permitted B&Bs and builds in progress conforming to the existing bylaws should be able to confidently continue to operate as they are and/or sell their properties with this overlay zoning if they wish.

Thank you for considering our letter.

Sincerely,

Andrea Murray + Marc Fuller + family
482 Marine drive, Ucluelet.