

PUBLIC HEARING REPORT
Monday, November 24, 2025 @ 6:00 PM
In the City Hall Council Chambers | 4850 Argyle Street, Port Alberni, BC

PRESENT: Mayor S. Minions (Chair)
Councillor D. Dame
Councillor D. Haggard
Councillor C. Mealey
Councillor T. Patola
Councillor C. Solda
Councillor T. Verbrugge

Staff: M. Fox, CAO
S. Darling, Director of Corporate Services
S. Smith, Director of Development Services/Deputy CAO
B. McLoughlin, Manager of Planning
K. Motiuk, Deputy Director of Corporate Services

Gallery: 37

CALL TO ORDER & APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

MOVED AND SECONDED, THAT the agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

Chair Minions noted that the Public Hearing is held pursuant to sections 465 and 466 of the *Local Government Act*. Chair Minions then invited the Director of Corporate Services to provide a summary of the application.

A1. 5405 Argyle Street – Description of the Application:

The Director of Corporate Services provided a summary of the application as follows:

- The applicant [R. Lemkay] has applied to change the zoning of a portion of the property located at 5405 Argyle Street to enable the development of a restaurant expansion and commercial kitchen.

The proposed bylaw is:

- i. "Zoning Amendment (5405 Argyle Street), Bylaw No. 5134".

If amended, this bylaw changes the zoning classification of 5405 Argyle Street from a split-zoned 'W1 Waterfront Commercial' and 'W2 Waterfront Industrial' to 'W1 Waterfront Commercial' in the Zoning Bylaw.

A2. Background Information from the Development Services Department:

The Manager of Planning provided background information regarding the proposed amendment by way of summarizing the report of November 17, 2025.

A3. **Correspondence:** None.

A4. **Late Correspondence Regarding the Matter:** None.

A5. **Questions/Comments from Council:** None.

A6. **Questions/Comments from the Public:** None.

A7. **Closing Remarks from the Chair:**

Chair Minions reminded those present that once this portion of the Public Hearing has closed, members of Council may not, as a group or as individuals, receive any further oral or written presentations on this matter, including what might be perceived as informal discussions immediately after the termination of this meeting. She asked all parties to comply with this.

Before closing this portion of the Public Hearing, Chair Minions called three times for any further speakers on any of the matters contained in the proposed bylaws.

Chair Minions called the first time for input from the public.

Chair Minions called for a second time for input from the public.

Chair Minions called for a third time for input from the public.

There being no further speakers, Chair Minions declared this portion [Part A – 5405 Argyle Street] of the Public Hearing closed at 6:07 pm.

B1. **15th Avenue at Montrose Street – Description of the Application:**

The Director of Corporate Services provided a summary of the application as follows:

- The applicant [Windward Homes] has applied to change the land use designation and zoning of the property located at 15th Avenue at Montrose [a portion of Lot A (DD F39405) of District Lot 113, Alberni District, Plan VIP1044 Except part in Plan VIP55450] to enable sale and subdivision for residential development of 13 lots.

The proposed bylaws are:

- i. "Official Community Plan Amendment (15th Avenue at Montrose Street), Bylaw No. 5110".

If amended, this bylaw changes the land use designation from 'Future Residential' to 'Residential' in the OCP.

- ii. "Zoning Amendment (15th Avenue at Montrose Street), Bylaw No. 5111".

If amended, this bylaw changes the zoning classification 'FD Future Development' to 'R Primary Residential' in the Zoning Bylaw.

B2. Background Information from the Development Services Department:

The Director of Development Services/Deputy CAO provided background information regarding the proposed amendment by way of summarizing the report of November 17, 2025.

B3. Correspondence:

- Email dated October 29, 2025 from B. Eschuk
- Email dated November 17, 2025 from J. King
- Email dated November 18, 2025 from D. Johnson

B4. Late Correspondence Regarding the Matter:

- Email dated November 20, 2025 from K. Dewey
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from S. Rust
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from K. Garner
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from A. Mullin
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from J. Rowley
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from A. Eschuk
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from A. Gurney
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from A. Chahal
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from J. Cruikshank
- Email dated November 23, 2025 from C. Reynolds
- Email dated November 24, 2025 from V. Goss
- Email dated November 24, 2025 from Charlotte H.
- Email dated November 24, 2025 from M. Martin
- Email dated November 24, 2025 from S. Bone
- Email dated November 24, 2025 from T. Rust
- Email dated November 24, 2025 from A. Anaka

B5. Questions/Comments from Council:

1. How long has it been deemed Future Residential?

Staff Response (S. Smith): *The City property has been noted in the two previous OCP's as future residential development, and has been owned by the City for several decades.*

2. How would the trail system in that greenspace be impacted?

Staff Response (S. Smith): *The proposed development would not impact the wildlife.*

3. How would wildlife in the area be affected?

Staff Response: *No answer.*

B6. Questions/Comments from the Public:

Earl: Inquired about the current and historical ownership of the land.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *The property is currently owned by the City and has been for many decades.*

M. Hill: Expressed objections regarding the location and density of the proposed development. Raised concerns about the public engagement radius and water runoff mitigation, including potential flooding issues.

S. Rust: Inquired about the public consultation process. Questioned if the Official Community Plan (OCP) is still under development why this application is being considered. Suggested that other non-greenfield spaces should be considered for development. Asked about the berm setback and potential impacts on fish habitats and tributaries in the area, as well as drainage concerns.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *Clarified that the OCP amendment application required engagement through a mailout identifying the proposed development. The staff report outlined the pre-engagement efforts. The draft OCP is delayed due to staff shortages, as such, staff recommended that the OCP and Zoning applications be considered in the interim.*

S. Boehm: Inquired when the zoning designation changed from undesignated to future residential. Raised concerns about flooding, as well as the size of the proposed lots in comparison to existing ones.

Ian: Expressed concerns about the reduction of greenspace and the alignment of the proposed development with the OCP's future residential plans.

Heidi R.: Raised concerns about the potential impact of development on foraging areas and the cumulative effects of development on the surrounding forest.

T. Rust: Opposed the rezoning considering the OCP has not been completed and stated that community feedback during the OCP update process has indicated a strong value for the land in its current state as per the alternative growth scenarios and climate action reports.

S. Turner: Requested clarification on the historical ownership of the property. Raised concerns about the density of the proposed development and potential water issues in the area. Asked about potential for fourplex development on the site.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *The residential zoning currently allows for fourplex development; however, the developer has not confirmed that this will be the primary focus. The submitted site plan allocated development as primary residential.*

P. McMillan: Concerned about the density of proposed fourplexes and the size of the lots. Suggested that sidewalks should be included in the future development. Voiced concerns about water availability and emphasized that primary residential use would be more suitable for the site.

D. Johnson: Asked whether the contract of purchase and sale for the property is subject to public scrutiny. Inquired if the accepted Request for Proposals (RFP) binds the developer to a specific type of development and if future amendments to the contract are possible. Voiced concerns about urban sprawl and the encroachment on the trail network.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *The City issued an RFP with eight proposals received. The City evaluates proposals based on development potential, purchase price offered, developer track record, long-term housing options proposed, and potential future tax revenue. Zoning dictates the types of development allowed, and the Province's regulations prevent local governments from obstructing developments required by provincial legislation.*

D. Cruikshank: Raised concerns about the density of the development and its consistency with the current neighborhood. Suggested that the maximum number of lots should be limited to nine, opposing triplexes and fourplexes. Voiced concerns about parking and increased sewage capacity.

K. A. Dewey: Expressed concerns about the diminished use of the trail system, the potential density issues, construction noise, and the impact on wildlife.

C. Reynolds: Concerned about the loss of green space and suggested considering other development areas within the City. Voiced concerns about road setbacks, increased traffic to the area, and previous vehicle accidents in the neighbourhood.

D. Cunningham: Enjoys the green space and emphasized that the trail system is a significant community asset that should be addressed in the OCP. Believes that higher-density housing would provide the greatest benefit. Raised concerns about wildfire protection.

Staff Response (M. Fox): *The City follows FireSmart principles and is working with the Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District (ACRD) to develop wildfire interface zones. Mitigation strategies are eligible for funding to reduce future risks.*

David S.: Asked for clarification on the housing needs requirement and how many homes are needed over the next five years.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *Explained development of the Interim Housing Needs Report; format follows provincial guidelines and is required to be updated every five years.*

Chair Response: *Emphasized the importance of appropriate space usage and balancing density with affordability.*

Staff Response (M. Fox): *Noted that the City has demonstrated to the Province that it is a willing partner in meeting legislated development requirements.*

N. Pattison: Believes there are more suitable locations for development within the City. Main concern is parking availability.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *Parking standards mandate one parking spot per residential unit.*

M. Hill: Inquired about why the property was offered for sale.

Chair Response: *The sale was aligned with the Municipality's strategic plan, which evaluates the best use of assets for improvements or potential sale.*

S. Boehm: Expressed concerns regarding the size of the proposed lots and appealed for reconsideration of the proposal.

B7. Closing Remarks from the Chair:

Chair Minions reminded those present that once the Public Hearing has closed, members of Council may not, as a group or as individuals, receive any further oral or written presentations on this matter, including what might be perceived as informal discussions immediately after the termination of this meeting. She asked all parties to comply with this.

Before closing the Public Hearing, Chair Minions called three times for any further speakers on any of the matters contained in the proposed bylaws.

Chair Minions called the first time for input from the public.

Chair Minions called for a second time for input from the public.

N. Pattison: Expressed concerns about the Province and developers making changes resulting in negative impacts to the community.

Chair Response: *Assured that the City follows processes to ensure appropriate development.*

T. Rust: Opposed the development and proposed that the land be rezoned to parkland.

S. Rust: Raised concerns regarding the primary proposed development of the site.

Chair Minions called for a third time for input from the public.

S. Boehm: Expressed a strong desire for the area to be preserved as a park.

L. Shepherd: Inquired whether any endangered species have been identified in the area.

Staff Response (S. Smith): *A preliminary biology report on the drainage ditch has been completed. If any future species at risk are identified, there are established processes to address concerns.*

There being no further speakers, Chair Minions declared the Public Hearing closed.

Termination of the Public Hearing:

MOVED AND SECONDED, THAT this Public Hearing terminate at 7:53 pm.

CARRIED



Sara Darling
Director of Corporate Services