

From:
To: [Andrea Antifaeff](#)
Subject: DVP 2019-19
Date: June-28-19 3:47:35 PM

We would like to submit this letter to the FVRD Board on behalf of our DVP application 2019-19.

Thank-you

Roger Burrows

1. Re the DVP Meeting

We understand that this was the first Cultus Lake DVP application to be heard by the APC under the new FVRD process.

To start the meeting, FVRD Planning made a presentation on the DVP. The applicant was asked only one question by the chair which was unrelated to the DVP.

The chair did not invite the applicant to make a presentation prior to the vote, as has been the usual practice in all previous Cultus Lake variances.

Before the vote, a discussion ensued among commissioners with no input from the applicant. The width of the roadway dominated the discussion.

The applicant did not ask to encroach on the roadway any more than that permitted by the by-law. In the applicant's opinion, the variance should have dealt solely with a variance of the by-law, and should not have been influenced by the width of the roadway.

The vote was split at 2:2, but the commissioners continued to discuss the issue. The applicant asked to speak after the vote, but it was too late to affect the vote.

The meeting was adjourned.

2. New Information (post meeting)

One of the commissioners who voted against the DVP asked to meet with the applicants and to apologize for the variance meeting outcome.

He admitted that the meeting was "all very confusing" to him, and he had

misunderstandings about the implications of the tie vote. He also misinterpreted the measurements on the drawings.

After hearing the applicant's position, he confirmed that he would have voted differently if the applicant had been invited to make a presentation.

He also confirmed that he would have voted differently if the applicant had a chance to speak with him and explain what was being asked for prior to the meeting.

He also said that if he were given another chance, that he would support the variance.

3. The Presentation That Wasn't

Following points would have been covered in the applicant's presentation, which was not invited by the chair.

The applicants are both in their 70's and the new home will be designed for ageing-in-place.

The lot is only 25 feet wide, and has vehicle access only from Lakeshore Drive.

Parking one vehicle parallel inside the yellow line will "trap" a second vehicle in the garage (or carport), or possibly parallel against the house.

A garage consumes desirable living space on the main floor, which is a huge concern on a small 25-foot lot.

Most 25-foot Cultus homes with garages are used for storage, not for vehicles. This results in an actual loss of parking spaces, rather than the desired increase in parking availability.

Vehicles will have to be moved frequently to other parking spaces, or to the roadway, to access trapped vehicles. This will disrupt traffic flow.

Parking at 90 degrees within the yellow line solves these problems and also provides for future EV charging of both vehicles.

Other homes built before this by-law change are able to properly accommodate two vehicles parked at 90 degrees to the street, and within the yellow line. (see photos)

We understand that the by-law will not be revised until next year at earliest. Graham Williams (Northface Construction) has been booked for construction, starting with the demolition of the existing cottage in September.

Property values will likely be reduced if a garage is required in the home.

It is recognized that the travelled portion of the road is narrow, but this has been unchanged for decades, and is unlikely to change in the future.

The travelled portion between the yellow lines is and has been acceptable for the passage of emergency vehicles, garbage trucks, etc.

The existing travelled portion is compromised much more by retaining walls for uphill homes which encroach on park property, than by downhill homes.

The 90 degree parking arrangement requested is within the area defined by the by-law, i.e. inside the yellow line.

The applicant's Lot #19 is only two houses away from a much-wider roadway surface.

The utility pole next door at Lot #18 is only approximately two feet from the yellow line, and would prevent widening of the travelled portion of the road. (see photos in FVRD Planning presentation).