



PUBLIC HEARING
Tuesday, June 8, 2021 @ 5:30 PM
George Fraser Room, Ucluelet Community Centre,
500 Matterson Drive, Ucluelet

LATE AGENDA

	Page
1. LATE ITEMS	
1.1. Add the following to Item 6.2. "Written Submissions Received During the Notice Period" after page 17 of the Agenda: 2021-06-04 Tatchen	3
1.2. Add the following to Item 7.2. "Written Submissions Received During the Notice Period" after page 167 of the Agenda: 2021-06-06 Drake 2021-06-06 Kite 2021-06-06 Sargent 2021-06-07 Bird 2021-06-07 Drake 2021-06-04 Walton 2021-06-07 Schramm	5 - 19

From: [liz tatchen](#)
To: [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Subject: District of Ucluelet Bylaw No. 1291, 2021 (829 Rainforest Dr) - Public Hearing
Date: June 4, 2021 10:42:57 AM

[External]

Dear Council,

I am writing strongly in favor of the zoning amendment bylaws allowing an accessory residential building at 829 Rainforest Drive.

I believe this type of thing would be a great way to provide additional, much-needed housing for Ucluelet workers, without any negative impact on the neighbourhood.

Respectfully,
Liz Tatchen
1768 Rainforest Lane

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Alistair Drake](#)
To: [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Subject: District of Ucluelet Zoning Amendment bylaw No. 1284, 2021
Date: June 6, 2021 5:38:26 PM

[External]

Hey,

Alistair Drake here. I've been living at 1317 Victoria rd since 1998. I spent a good chunk of my childhood playing in the forest and wetland land behind my house, "Proposed Lot 16". There were so many frogs it was deafening at night. The salamanders, ducks, and wildlife were plentiful. Then in the early 2000's ukee sellout Elke Loof-Koehler filled in the wetland with "big plans" of housing and a swimming pool with no regard for the land. All the water from this now elevated wetland is in the green space between victoria rd and lot 16. This water is flooding the forest and our foundations on Victoria rd. Making the trees unstable and dangerous. My family has to clear the drains coming from "Lot 16" every few months to manage the water. I'm worried this development is only going to make things worse for our community and sensitive ecosystem. It's been painful watching the natural watershed and environment get destroyed by careless developers with only money in mind. This isn't ukee.

Thanks,
Alistair Drake,
1317 Victoria rd

From: [Elke Kite](#)
To: [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Subject: District of Ucluelet Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1284, 2021
Date: June 6, 2021 9:00:15 PM

[External]

Dear Mayor and Council of Ucluelet:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input regarding the proposed development of Lot 16.

We are the owners of 392 Marine Drive located downstream from Lot 16 and we are glad to see more housing being made available, we do however have the following concerns:

Excess run off surface water

With the proposed higher density and reduced setbacks & greenspace we are concerned about excess run off surface water. This excess of water would drain into the ditch along Victoria Road, further into the natural creek that runs through our property and into the ocean. This may cause erosion and potentially endanger our driveway and adjacent properties.

How will the development address the excess surface water running into the creek or will the municipality be responsible?

Sewer pump station

As you know the sewer pump station on the corner of Victoria Road and Marine Drive periodically malfunctions and overflows into the creek and thus the ocean.

What extra infrastructure is being planned to deal with the extra sewer volume, and to save guard against future contamination of the creek?

We trust that all this has already been taken into account and we respectfully request access to the engineering and planning documents that are currently available.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Andrew & Elke Kite

392 Marine Drive, Ucluelet

Re: District of Ucluelet Zoning Amendment Bylaw NO. 1284, 2021

June 06, 2021

Dear Mayor & Council,

Please accept this letter as my objection to this proposed bylaw amendment. I have reviewed the Staff Report to Council dated March 23, 2021 and did not note any proposed steps to address the water and drainage issues related to "Lot 16" that are a direct result of a previous developer ruining a wetland area by filling it with rock and who knows what else.

I was surprised to read that this filled in area may be an archaeological site. I would like to know more about that and what, if anything is being done to manage such a site.

Before any changes are made to the property or to bylaws related to it, I propose that the developer facilitate a hydrological study of the property and how it currently affects neighbouring properties. With that we can then discuss what remediations are needed and how these may impact the proposed green corridors and setbacks. I don't think 10 meters will be sufficient if the trees and vegetation need to be disturbed to address the flooding that the previous developer caused.

I am generally concerned about a pattern whereby developers come in with big ideas for important spaces in our community and for one reason or another, botch the job and leave an eyesore and/or a liability for neighbouring properties. 1914 Peninsula quickly comes to mind.

Other concerns I have about this proposed amendment, and the project itself, are related to parking, access and the setbacks/green corridors.

Parking: From what I have seen, these higher density developments tend to look good on paper, and in theory, but in practice, they quickly get overwhelmed with parked cars, boats, and other large toys. And that overwhelm tends to spill over into the surrounding community. I imagine that, if this project goes ahead as proposed, the parking lots at Big Beach and the community centre will get filled with vehicles from Lot 16. Evidence of this phenomenon can be seen daily at the parking area across from Forest Glen. Victoria Road will also see many more parked vehicles making what is now a relatively safe street (without sidewalks) for many local children and animals, more dangerous.

Access: I am not in favour of Lot 16 being accessed via Victoria Road as I believe this will make the road more dangerous due to an increase in vehicle traffic and the likelihood of more cars being parked on Victoria (as noted above). These changes will forever alter the neighbourly culture of this special road. Might it be an option to have the second access road integrated with the Ridge's access road off of Marine?

Setbacks/Green Corridors: We don't yet have enough information to know if a 10-meter setback from the Victoria Road properties will be sufficient for its intended purpose (carried over from the last proposed development plan). The site preparations from the last go-around destroyed important animal habitat and has caused serious drainage issues. The necessary work to remediate this issue will likely alter the area currently proposed as a green corridor. Establishing what the sizes of these setbacks and areas are cannot be done until we know what those areas will look like post remediation.

Heather Sargent
1317 Victoria Road



Laurie Bird

██████████ 1547 Imperial Lane
Ucluelet, BC V0R 3A0

Re: District of Ucluelet Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1284, 2021

To the Ucluelet Council and Members of the Public

I have reviewed the proposal for the building proposal for the residential housing development on District Lot 281, Clayoquot District, Plan VIP76214 and the aforementioned zoning amendment associated with the proposals. I wish to voice my questions, concerns and comments and have them included in the public hearing on June 8.

Initially I will comment that I am in favour of adding additional rental properties, in the form of an apartment building, to the existing district housing options.

I have the following questions/concerns/comments regarding the aforementioned zoning document:

- Point #2 – *“adding a new zone, R-6 Zone – INFILL SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL...lots larger than 480 m²”*
 - I find this point is not well described/explained. 480 m² is not a very large lot yet from what I read there may be an option for an additional rental ‘cottage’ or ‘suite’ on a lot this size or larger.
 - How many of that size lots are included in this development?
 - Given the significant number of proposed housing lots/townhouses and the apartment, additional ‘cottages and suites’ would significantly impact the density and traffic in the proposed development.
 - Would such suites/cottages be only for residential use, or would tourism activities be permitted? Such as Air B and B rentals which already significantly impact long-term rental options in town?
- Point #3 (1) (a) – *“the lot is exempt from the minimum on-site outdoor recreation space requirement for multiple family residential properties”*
 - Why would no assigned on-site outdoor rec space be an acceptable option for a multi-family build (apartment building)?
 - Apparently, there could be 48 families if the building is built to the maximum number of units. This could equate to a significant number of residents including children.
 - Is there the expectation that these residents will simply utilize our existing parks and playgrounds?

- I am concerned that the existing rec sites, particularly playgrounds, in town are already well used by residents and visitors. Many are in need of updated equipment, and residents already default to the school district playground sites given the District options and the distance between them – i.e. lack of accessibility particularly for foot traffic.
- I do not agree with this exemption.
- Point #3 (1) (c) – *“the maximum height is 16 m. (52 ft.)”*
 - Two questions in reference to this point
 - What does this 16 m. equate to in terms of floors/or stories in this proposed apartment building?
 - Does our fire department have equipment to adequately service a multi floored building of this height should there be a fire on the top floor?
- Point #3 (2) – *“On proposed Lot A the minimum setbacks for principal building from adjacent lot lines shall be 8 m from Matterson Drive, 10 m from Marine Drive, and 6 m from all other lot lines”.*
 - Why the differences in these setbacks?
 - In particular, why should an adjacent residential property have less of a setback? District residents in their own home are significantly more affected by an adjacent apartment building and should have at least the same setback as roads. Residents will have their privacy impacted, have to deal with increased noise, and people and vehicular traffic.
 - I do not agree with the setbacks as stated in this amendment.

Thank you.

Laurie Bird

From: [Alistair Drake](#)
To: [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Subject: District of Ucluelet Zoning Bylaw No.1284, 2021
Date: June 6, 2021 9:07:51 PM

[External]

Hey,

Alistair drake from 1317 Victoria rd here. Just wanted to share a few pictures of the drainage issues between Victoria Rd and "Lot 16". This used to be a well draining gravel Rd with healthy forest on either side. Now it's a muddy mess of skunk cabbage and swamp grass. Keep in mind this is June 6th. There's pooling water in the forest, even with the ditch somewhat clear.

Thanks,
Alistair Drake,







From: [Patricia Walton](#)
To: [Community Input Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Bob Walton](#)
Subject: Input for Bylaw No. 1284,2021
Date: June 4, 2021 9:00:05 AM

[External]

To Mayor and Council,

We have owned a home at 457 Marine Drive since 1990 and our property backs on to Lot 16. Although, we understand the need for housing in Ucluelet, we have concerns regarding this development that we would like addressed.

We are very concerned about the density of this development. The minimum setback of 10 metres between the property line of a single family home and a principle building in a high density development is not enough. In order to maintain the privacy and integrity in this established neighbourhood, we request that the minimum setback for a principle building be increased. Or, better yet, a green belt buffer zone provided.

It is our understanding that the Ucluelet fire department does not have the capability to deal with a 4 story apartment building and a build out of this high density. We feel the density needs to be reduced and setbacks increased for both safety and aesthetic reasons.

An outdoor area is essential for residents' health and safety. It is unconscionable in this day and age to not provide the minimum on-site outdoor recreation space required. Please do not exempt the lot from the minimum outdoor space required.

Finally, a development of this size will greatly increase traffic on existing roadways. It is unclear as to how this will be addressed. We ask that Council proceed thoughtfully and carefully with this application keeping in mind to balance the needs of existing residents and the community's need for long term housing.

Please maintain the wonderful and welcoming Ucluelet that we know!

Thank you

Pat and Bob Walton
457 Marine Drive
[REDACTED]

Dear Mayor and Council,

June 7, 2021

RE: Lot 16 public input

I would like to very briefly speak about the impact of the density at lot 16 on Big Beach Park. I am concerned that several hundred people living without private back yards and/or visiting these small lots will create a burden on Big Beach Park (imagine the beach fire problem alone). This density creates unsustainable numbers.

Private yards or shared green spaces for outdoor enjoyment are completely missing for a majority of the units on this proposal. Counting a thin path corridor and setback areas as park space does not create a playground, picnic area or neighbourhood space. The proposal speaks about a small contribution of cash to cover this lack of recreational space, but that does not create a place for that amenity to appear close to the high density development.

The apartment complex is greatly needed and I personally applaud that as urgently needed, but our desire for this should not overrule the density math. There will be plenty of sales income even with less lots. I would also like to see some sort of price indexing fixed to the townhome area so they do not still demand very high prices like units in Tofino have illustrated.

Developers will always press to maximize density and point to affordability of construction as an excuse to wave previously envisioned density and amenities. If affordability (not profit) is the driver, where are the guarantees of price control? Approving this density allows any future lot plan to infill every meter of space. Reducing that density with a request for interior park space would greatly reduce impacts to Big Beach and create a more livable community.

Lastly, parking should also be realistically counted on this proposal. Small lots and narrow roads force less than 2-car parking spaces per home, even for lots allowing B&B use. Where will all those extra cars go? I fear the community centre and Matterson Drive will be over-flow parking lots.

Again the apartment building is valuable, but the density is better suited to a city core than Ucluelet.

Sincerely, Barbara Schramm

1958 Bay Street