

From: Darcy Bauer <darcy.bauer@cultuslake.bc.ca>
Date: September 3, 2019 at 8:00:58 AM PDT
To: Taryn Dixon <tdixon@fvrd.ca>
Cc: Joe Lamb <joe.lamb@cultuslake.bc.ca>, Bill Dickey <bdickey@fvrd.ca>
Subject: Re: Variance

Hi Taryn no the CLPB has not met any further on this matter however Joe, David and myself feel that the concerns I am bringing forward should be considered by the EA directors before granting this variance. When we met last time Joe and I did express that there would not be consensus on this matter wether the vote was 3-2 in favour or against. I don't believe all the factors were considered carefully enough by certain APC members especially if when they are friends and neighbors of the applicants. On July 16 Graham's stated that the EA directors place a great deal of importance on the recommendations of the APC and there will be instances where the FVRD Board will make decisions that aren't consistent with the recommendations of the APC. I believe this is one of those instances. It looks like you will also be absent for the next EASC meeting where this variance will be considered. If possible could we then meet with you Bill some time Thursday or Friday. Thanks Darcy

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 2, 2019, at 7:22 PM, Darcy Bauer
<darcy.bauer@cultuslake.bc.ca<mailto:darcy.bauer@cultuslake.bc.ca>> wrote:

Hi Taryn and Bill, Joe and I would like to meet with you either Thursday or Friday this week to go over some concerns with the Variance being proposed on 19 Lakeshore drive and a few other matters coming forward over the next few months. I will be sending this letter to the FVRD board for consideration

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: DarcyBauer
Date: September 1, 2019 at 12:33:47 PM PDT
To: Darcy Bauer
Subject: Fwd: Variance

The FVRD and the CLPB have gone through an extensive collaborative, consultative process to develop the current bylaws. It now appears that some of these bylaws need to be modified. As an interim solution, and prior to rewriting bylaws, the CLPB has agreed to develop a policy around parking requirements along First avenue. We have also requested the FVRD provide information on similar size lots elsewhere in the Park to help develop this policy. This information is still forthcoming.

Granting of variances along Lakeshore Drive for reduced parking area requirements is premature until the policy has been adopted for the following reasons:

- 1) Lakeshore Drives properties, and in particular Lot 19, are larger in size - 25ft x 70 ft vs 25ft x 60 ft on First Avenue.
- 2) Lot 19 accommodates the ability to build three floors above ground, totalling up to 3000 sq ft of living space.
- 3) The road width along Lakeshore Dr is less than the MOTI legal standard regulations of 28 ft, and as a result, restricts the ability for vehicles to pass, requiring them to back up to allow passage. This creates safety issues for pedestrians, and access problems for emergency, maintenance, waste management and residential vehicles. When new construction occurs, it affords the opportunity to increase the street width in this area on Park property.
- 4) By granting the requested variance for Lot 19, the FVRD will cause an encroachment to occur on Park Lands if any vehicle other than a small car is parked in that location. The current bylaw already addresses the minimum standard of 18 ft to accommodate two vehicles. By changing the minimum standard to 15 ft you will be shifting 3 ft of that area onto Park Land. Do we want to start granting future variance's based on the length of a vehicle an applicant is currently driving? If the FVRD were to grant this type of variance, the CLPB would then become responsible to address such an encroachment. As a result the CLPB now needs time to develop a policy around such an encroachment before a variance can be approved, as this will set a precedent for any other new builds in this area.
- 5) For any variance to occur the applicant should be required to demonstrate hardship. All that has been provided to date, is a diagram of the main floor dimensions, which fails to confirm hardship. A complete plan of all three floors should be provided before any decision can be reached.
- 6) The applicants are claiming hardship because they have purchased a lot that only allows for 60% lot coverage and they have to allow for parking within this area. Maximum 60% lot coverage has always been the requirement for the lots with this zoning and the set backs are no different than any other lot. Prior to recently purchasing Lot 19, the applicant should have been well aware of the current zoning bylaws.
- 7) Many homes along this stretch of Lakeshore Dr already conformed to the new Bylaw even before it was introduced.
- 8) The CLPB is in the process of making recommendations to improve the issues along Lakeshore Dr for the long term. The FVRD and the CLPB have an opportunity at this juncture to start the process that the bylaw was intended for, and this variance should be either denied or deferred until such a plan is implemented.