

May 14, 2026

Dear Mayor and Council of the District of Ucluelet,

The letter is in reference to the most recent proposed rezoning/development on Hyphocus island by Ekistics and Mr. Liu.

I am a homeowner and resident near the Southern end of Helen road located on Hyphocus island and have significant concerns with the recently proposed zoning changes and largescale development proposal on Hyphocus Island. The concerns are as follows:

1. Housing supply and rezoning

Ucluelet needs long term housing for residents. The angle that Ekistics, builders and realtors (with much profit to gain through completion, or partial completion of this development) is significant, and it is done under the guise of community-building and increase in housing. In reality, this development will destroy neighbourhoods, heavily increase traffic through the downtown core and quiet residential neighbourhoods, supply housing to wealthy out-of-town investors and line the pockets of the land owner, developer, builders and realtors whilst having no guarantee to increase housing supply for locals. (Please also consider that the realtor stands to earn significant income from the sale of lots if this development does go through, as they earn 7% on the first \$100,000.00 and 2.5-3% on the remaining balance, split between the selling and buying realtor).

Perhaps, the District of Ucluelet would consider a more balanced approach to increased housing by way of the Gentle Density strategy that is in the works. Through this proposal, gentle density developments could be located in multiple neighbourhoods of Ucluelet. Spreading out Gentle Density to multiple neighbourhoods would serve to increase housing for locals rather than a massive, disruptive development on the scale proposed by Ekistics on Hyphocus Island (of note, the District of Ucluelet recently passed a rezoning change to a property on Hyphocus Island where a townhouse complex will be developed).

Additionally, when our family went through a Temporary Use Permit (TUP) last year (for a short-term rental in our home), we were told that the way forward in our proposal was either through a TUP or through a request for rezoning of our property. Before our application, we were told by District staff that we should not "waste our time" applying for rezoning because it would not be granted (and on the off chance that it were it would be precedent-setting). However, it is extremely disheartening to know that when a wealthy developer waltzes into the community with a rezoning proposal, that he is treated with more consideration and probability of success than individual community members.

2. Goal of affordable housing

This development will not provide housing for local families, but rather become a market for upper-middle class investors with expensive housing.

It is also notable that Ekistics has removed its proposal to keep the homes it intends to build from meeting any "affordable" (spending 30% of 130% of median income on mortgage) or "attainable" (spending 30% of 130% of median income on mortgage) criteria, an idea which it initially touted.

(According to the Government of BC website, it is considered that affordable housing would cost no more than 30% of household income before taxes. According to Statistics Canada, the average individual

income in Ucluelet is \$53000 annually, and average family income is \$122000 annually. With this data we are unable to calculate the median family income in Ucluelet, however the median annual Canadian family income is \$107000. Using this value, and in looking at current Ucluelet listings and picking a newer built two-bedroom townhome for \$800000, if the Ekistics lower-end properties were this much, with a down payment of 10%, the monthly mortgage at the current rate (5.79% for 5 year fixed) for a 30-year amortization would be approximately \$4200, or \$50400 annually. This would be 36% of 130% if median income on mortgage, which is higher than the “attainable” definition in their presentation. If looking at a definition of “affordable” housing, a \$800000 unit would be 51% of income spent on mortgage, which is 21% higher than the median income of 30% used for the definition of affordability. The percentage of income compared to mortgage cost would obviously increase as home prices increased or for a single-family home.)

In relation to affordability, it is also important to consider the fourth point in this letter. To get appropriate services and infrastructure to this proposed Hyphocus development would be very costly, and with those costs being passed on to the buyer, we cannot imagine that even the lowest priced units of the development would meet the “attainable” definition of affordability for Ucluelet residents. The costs of all upgrades to civic infrastructure, originally paid for by the developer, will inflate the property costs pushing the properties further away from affordable status and further out of reach for local buyers.

3. The impracticality of developing Hyphocus Island

Aside from a financial disadvantage of developing the end of Hyphocus Island, there is also the practical disadvantage. It simply does not make sense to put high densification living on the end of a small island that is only connected to Ucluelet through one small capillary road which is accessed through precious residential streets into the town itself. If a major goal was affordable housing through densification, would not a suitable site be along a major thoroughfare such as Peninsula road where topography and access were simplified and civic waste water lagoons were not in proximity? The OCP currently states Single family residences inclusive of only half the proposed area away from the sewage lagoons which seems like the most logical option for this area.

Putting in 195 new units on Hyphocus Island does not make sense at all (proposed 25 large scale single family lots with secondary suites and ADU's = 75 residences, 51 compact single-family homes with secondary suites = 102 residences, 9 smaller homes with secondary suites = 18 residences). It is unsafe for the community.

For a community with a population of approximately 2300 people, adding 195 units (approximately 600 people) is adding an additional 20% population on a precarious geographical dead-end zone that is only supposed to be attached to Ucluelet via a bridge.

Perhaps the District could look to encourage developers in building on areas such as Wynd and Sea or Minato, which lie along the main road into Ucluelet rather than cutting through Ucluelet, or focus on selling the Shore Pine development first (and consider how that area was transformed from a forested area to a barren moonscape).

4. Road access and civic associated upgrades

Since Hyphocus is an island with only a single road access there will be immense pressure on that area of Helen road as a transport corridor. From both a safety lens and a point of impact to the greater surrounding neighbourhoods the area will struggle to manage the surge in users. The proposal suggests 85 properties to be developed, but this does not include suites within homes or ADUs. Though this is enticing with the current housing shortage experienced District and Province wide, effectively this will build a brand-new community and large-scale neighbourhood within Ucluelet. Currently there are on

average 20-30 vehicles at any time during the peak season on Hyphocus including residents, contractors and tourists traveling along Helen road to other parts of town. Following the Canadian average of 1.5 cars per household this will increase to nearly 400 vehicles utilizing this corridor if approved. This does not take into consideration tourists, employees for business areas, visitors, etc.

The impracticality of increasing traffic through historic and entrenched single family neighbourhoods seems misguided and dangerous. Currently children are able to play basketball in the street along Helen road. Families are able to walk without separated shoulders to Parks and cafes in town. We want our community and streets to feel safe for our children and our neighbours' children to grow up in.

Within the proposal the developer notes that area is within walking distance to schools. Between Marine drive and the land bridge the road narrows significantly and will require significant engineering to safely accommodate vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. Single family residence currently have driveways that enter Helen Road and the possibility of accidents will increase dramatically.

We compare the proposed development to an example in the lower mainland within the City of Coquitlam on Burke mountain. Ekistics architecture was also hired as the planning and architecture firm tasked with completing a new area plan and master plans in the early 2000's for this development. Significant land clearing occurred of rural properties with amendments to the OCP and rezoning allowing for similar densification of mixed-use housing. The Burke Mountain, however, has two different access points which were redeveloped into significant transport corridors with four lanes along each corridor. Neither of these have direct residential access via driveways and required significant civic upgrades in order to ensure safe transport routes to and from the community.

5. Proposed public trails and maintenance of green space around the island

Whilst we commend the developer with forethought to try and incorporate park, natural areas and keep the steep slopes protected along the backyards of the proposed single-family homes, it is apparent that the proposed safeguarding of a large amount of green space is likely steep slope space that is unusable. The cost of extending the 'safe harbour trail' will be a significant expense incorporating both engineered structures and land manipulation, if at all possible. Climate change and rising high-tide marks will also push the feasibility of non-engineered trails/pathways away from reality. With the change in sea level what will be the life span of this trail network? The topography of the island includes significant undevelopable slopes unless major engineering is utilized. In the presentation many of the single-family homes along the perimeter of the development show properties with what appear to be coastal covenants of protected greenspace. Does the district plan to enforce and hire staff to ensure these covenant areas remain natural when in such close proximity to building envelopes?

6. Loss of forest and natural habitat

Large scale developments that replace previously forested land present grave implications for destruction of green space and wildlife. With the recent human-pet-wolf interactions and frequent bear interactions, and with Hyphocus Island being a wolf run area, this development will have major negative impacts on these species.

7. The waste water lagoons challenge

The proposed development lot is located in a forested area surrounding the town's sewage lagoons. This area should remain forested to act as a buffer zone between the sewage lagoons and residences, and also as part of a natural habitat for wildlife.

Currently the waste water lagoons are shown as a simplification to be in close proximity of housing. The reality of having residents, either permanent or temporary, within any type of proximity to open sewage treatment seems unrealistic. The development team briefly mentions that an engineering team has been engaged to “assist in the resolution of the matter”. Beyond full relocation of the lagoons it seems unsatisfactory to deem this area as potential Park or open spaces. I suggest councillors visit the lagoon during the district’s high population summer months when a South West breeze occurs to understand the full impacts. I also worry for people in closer proximity with long term exposure from a health perspective.

In conclusion, we kindly ask Mayor and Counsel not to allow rezoning of the proposed property on Hyphocus Island. Please take into consideration that a townhouse complex is already going to be built on Hyphocus Island and that the proposed development by Ekistics on Hyphocus Island is merely a project aimed at enriching the developer, builders and realtors, presented under the guise of betterment of the Community and enriching the housing stock – neither of which are true.

The developer, realtors, and those who stand to substantially financially profit from this development are using community-minded buzzwords to increase the odds that this proposal will go forward, when in reality the community-minded parts of their proposal are no more than lip service hiding a development that will only serve to enrich an elite few whilst increasing housing stock for out of town investors, not locals.

This proposed development will destroy neighbourhoods and could not be placed in a more awkward and inaccessible area of Ucluelet, one that for safety, access, location and wildlife/greenspace reasons does not make sense to develop in such a fashion.

Small towns shouldn’t be for sale – people live here to avoid suburbia and large-scale development. If this proposal does go through, we would have to heavily consider moving, as it would no longer feel safe to let our children play where there are so many cars, and in case of an emergency, it would be difficult to safely evacuate off of Hyphocus Island with such extreme housing density and population.

As a resident on Hyphocus Island, I do not support the intended rezoning/development proposal where densification under the guise of a housing crises is put forth. I am strongly challenged to believe this development will be for the betterment of the District as a whole and question the feasibility of amending the OCP and rezoning areas on Hyphocus.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ayla Klein Stimpson

██████████, Ucluelet, BC