

-----Original Message-----

From: Iman Makaremi [REDACTED] >

Sent: May 18, 2026 1:09 AM

To: Community Input Mailbox <communityinput@ucluelet.ca>

Subject: Formal Objection to OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 1394 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1395 (Hyphocus Island)

[External]

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed amendments concerning District Lot 543. The current plan to establish 85 single-family parcels on Hyphocus Island fails to respect the long-term vision established by the community, and it introduces risks that our municipal planning process should no longer accept.

The property in question was purchased under an explicit RU Rural Residential classification, matching its designation as a low-density rural reserve within the 2022 Official Community Plan. The purchaser was fully aware of these regulatory boundaries at the time of acquisition. Land-use regulations exist to provide stability and predictability for the entire community, and they should not be dismantled simply to accommodate a business model built on the assumption that public policy will bend to private interests. Ucluelet needs to transition away from a pattern where properties are acquired under restrictive designations only for the owner to immediately seek significant up-zoning.

The precedent set by the Big Beach developments demonstrates the vulnerability of this approach. When custom zoning is granted to satisfy a specific proposal, those expanded land-use entitlements remain legally attached to the property even if the project is stalled, altered, or entirely abandoned due to shifting economic conditions. If this application is approved and subsequently fails to progress, the original rural reserve protections are permanently lost. The community is then left with a vacant property carrying an intact, high-density zoning framework that any subsequent owner can execute by right, completely detached from any of the initial commitments or discussions presented by the current applicant.

Furthermore, the application fails to meet the core housing objectives outlined in Section 3 of the OCP. Our municipal policies dictate that new residential expansions must prioritize

legally protected, non-market, or below-market options to serve local income brackets. This proposal offers market-rate inventory. By including Vacation Rental (VR-1) permissions within the text of the proposed R-7 zone, the amendment actively invites real estate speculation. Rather than securing housing for residents, this framework creates an environment where lots can be utilized for high-yield short-term tourist accommodation, driving up local land values and compounding the challenges facing our local workforce.

The local infrastructure is also inadequate for this scale of development. Directing the traffic generated by 85 primary households, secondary suites, and short-term rentals onto a causeway that narrows to six meters introduces a structural public safety bottleneck. The Helen Road corridor lacks the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure required to handle this volume safely, creating a clear risk for residents and a major liability in an emergency evacuation scenario. Additionally, local taxpayers should not be exposed to the long-term capital costs of upgrading utility infrastructure and servicing the sewage lagoons to support a private subdivision on the periphery of our growth boundaries.

The OCP represents a shared commitment between local government and residents to manage growth in an orderly, predictable manner. It should not be treated as a flexible document to be amended whenever a development proposal conflicts with our established growth management boundaries. I request that Council protect the integrity of our planning frameworks and deny Third Reading to OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 1394 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1395.

Thank you for your time and your consideration of this submission.

Sincerely,

Iman Makaremi

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.