

Mayor and Council,

I appreciate the considerable work that has gone into this proposal and recognize the applicant's efforts to incorporate open space, trails, infrastructure upgrades and environmental considerations into the concept for Hyphocus Island (Huumaniš).

I also recognize that Ucluelet needs additional housing and that thoughtful growth will be necessary over time. I acknowledge that the applicant revised the proposal following public feedback and has included infrastructure upgrades, parkland, trails, and long-term housing components within the application.

However, acknowledging those efforts does not automatically mean this scale, density, location and zoning approach are appropriate for Hyphocus Island.

I remain opposed to the proposed OCP and zoning amendments in their current form.

This application represents a substantial departure from the long-established expectations attached to these lands. Adjacent property owners purchased and developed under the understanding that this area would remain rural residential and low density in character. Granting a major upzoning after acquisition because higher density is now argued to be financially necessary, further cementing a concerning trend for future speculative land acquisition and rezoning applications throughout Ucluelet (ie Minato Road, Wynd & Sea).

The argument that lower density "would not make financial sense" should not become sufficient justification to fundamentally alter the intended scale and character of a sensitive and highly visible coastal area.

My concerns are as follows:

1. Community Character and Tourism Identity

Ucluelet's defining strength is not urban-style density. It is its identity as a quiet coastal community integrated into nature. This proposal introduces a scale and intensity of development that risks permanently altering that character.

While the application repeatedly references environmental sensitivity and preservation, the reality remains that approximately 80 dwelling units, road widening, increased servicing infrastructure, lighting, traffic and expanded human activity will materially change the visual and environmental character of Hyphocus Island and surrounding neighbourhoods.

Growth should be directed toward more appropriate peripheral areas closer to the highway junction and existing growth corridors, rather than being concentrated within one of the community's most visible natural areas (by land and water).

2. Traffic and Infrastructure Concerns

The proposal acknowledges existing concerns regarding Helen Road, including limited width, lack of sidewalks and safety issues. Even with upgrades, this level of density will significantly increase traffic generation in an already constrained area.

In practical terms, much of this increased traffic will ultimately funnel through Peninsula Road and existing school zones as residents, service vehicles, tourists, and contractors move through town. Yet despite the scale of the proposal, there does not appear to be any publicly

presented traffic impact study quantifying projected daily vehicle trips, cumulative impacts, or long-term congestion implications.

Council should not be asked to approve a major rezoning of this scale without detailed and publicly available traffic impact analysis.

I am also concerned about the long-term wastewater servicing implications. While the report states that lands are being reserved for future lagoon expansion, it also confirms that additional wastewater capacity will eventually be required for long-term growth.

Has the District identified and secured sufficient long-term wastewater expansion capacity beyond the currently proposed lands? If future expansion becomes necessary, are there alternative sites available, or does this development further constrain future municipal infrastructure options? Is the developer reimbursing us for the reduced capacity?

These questions should be resolved before major upzoning occurs.

3. Housing Supply and Planning Quality

I also do not believe the discussion should be reduced to a simplistic choice between “approve this project as proposed” or “oppose housing.”

Ucluelet absolutely needs additional housing, including attainable housing for working residents and families. However, that does not mean every proposed scale, location, or zoning approach is automatically appropriate.

There are already examples within Ucluelet of approved or partially completed developments that have not yet fully delivered their anticipated housing outcomes. Reducing the scale of a proposal or requiring revisions does not automatically mean housing disappears entirely. It means growth can be calibrated more carefully to infrastructure capacity, neighbourhood compatibility and long-term community planning objectives.

The argument that “any increase in supply is inherently positive regardless of form or location” may apply differently in large urban centres than in small coastal communities with constrained infrastructure, sensitive ecosystems, tourism pressures and limited transportation networks.

The question before Council is not simply whether additional housing is needed. The question is whether this specific scale and form of development is appropriate for this specific location.

I also respectfully reject the suggestion that concerns regarding infrastructure, traffic, environmental impacts, or neighbourhood character are merely attempts by existing homeowners to protect property values. Many residents raising concerns are long-term renters, working residents, or community members who support housing while still questioning whether this proposal represents appropriate planning for Hyphocus Island.

I would also note that the proposal repeatedly references “attainable housing,” which is not necessarily the same as genuinely affordable or workforce housing. From the materials presented publicly, it is unclear what enforceable affordability mechanisms actually exist beyond smaller lot sizes and secondary suites. I do not see clear commitments such as price controls, workforce occupancy requirements, resale restrictions, or long-term affordability guarantees.

4. Short-Term Rental Policy Contradictions

I find it difficult to reconcile this proposal with the District's broader public messaging and ongoing discussions surrounding short-term rentals.

The District is currently reviewing and reconsidering STR regulations while existing operators face increasing licensing costs, scrutiny, uncertainty, and public criticism regarding housing availability. At the same time, this proposal creates a new R-7 Tourist Accommodation zone specifically permitting short-term rentals within secondary suites and accessory dwelling units.

I acknowledge that the proposal includes 60 units intended for long-term residential use, which is presented as a contribution toward housing supply. However, if long-term housing availability is truly the primary objective, it is difficult to understand why entirely new tourist accommodation permissions are simultaneously being embedded into this rezoning application.

This creates the appearance of inconsistent policy application: existing local operators face increasing restrictions and uncertainty, while a major new development proposal receives built-in tourist accommodation permissions from the outset.

If STRs are considered problematic elsewhere in the community, Council should explain why they are considered appropriate here.

Planning policy must be consistent and predictable. Residents and operators should not face one set of assumptions while large new developments are evaluated under another.

5. Need for Stronger Guarantees and Anti-Speculation Protections

I appreciate the proposed Section 219 covenant securing infrastructure and amenity obligations. However, Council should ensure that any rezoning approval is tied to meaningful and enforceable development timelines, phasing requirements, and completion obligations.

Significant increases in land value should not be granted without enforceable delivery of the promised infrastructure, housing outcomes, and community benefits.

6. Light Pollution and Environmental Impacts

The proposal references environmental sensitivity extensively, yet there appears to be little public discussion regarding nighttime visual impacts, light pollution and effects on neighbouring properties and wildlife corridors.

Dark skies and the natural nighttime environment are part of the character and experience that residents and visitors value in Ucluelet. Once lost, they are difficult to restore.

Have formal light impact assessments or mitigation strategies been completed?

What restrictions will exist regarding roadway illumination, exterior lighting, building lighting, and nighttime visibility from surrounding residential areas and shoreline viewpoints?

These impacts deserve meaningful consideration before approval of a project of this scale.

In summary, I believe this proposal exceeds an appropriate scale for this location and establishes problematic precedents regarding density, tourist accommodation expansion and speculative rezoning practices.

I encourage Council to pursue growth in locations better suited to increased density while preserving the natural character, infrastructure resilience, and long-term livability that define Ucluelet.

Sincerely,

, Ucluelet