

---

**From:** Carlo & Anita Elstak  
**Sent:** December-11-19 3:21  
**To:** Julie Mundy  
**Subject:** Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park  
  
**Categories:** Cultus

December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Ms. Julie Mundy  
Planning Technician  
Fraser Valley Regional District  
4950 Cheam Ave.  
Chilliwack, BC  
V2P 1N6

Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Variance: DVP 2019-32

Dear Ms. Mundy,

We are residents of Cultus Lake, residing at 349 Pine Street. We are writing you to express our full support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces in relation to the above mentioned property.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there will be no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes, the 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. In light of the Cultus Lake by-laws and general practice, it is highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.
- As our home is closely located to the homes on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, we can confirm that the practice of residents on 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. parking in front of their homes has not in any way impeded on either traffic flow or parking availability on that, or any of the streets in close proximity.

With all of the above in mind, we are in every respect in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

We also fully support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor as a living space and not for parking a car.

Sincerely,

Carlo & Anita Elstak  
349 Pine Street  
Cultus Lake BC.

**From:** Brad Shears  
**Sent:** December-11-19 8:55 AM  
**To:** Julie Mundy  
**Subject:** Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front or back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

George Bradley Shears  
8 Lakeshore Drive  
Cultus Lake  
V2R 4Z9

New Build as of Sept. 2017 completing May 2018 – one of the last builds prior to the new bylaws

Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Rose Turcasso

300 Second Avenue

Cultus Lake, BC

Sent from my iPhone

**Application for Development**  
**Variance Permit DVP 2019-32**

Date: December 10, 2019

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements as set out in Zoning By-law 1375 for the two 'on-site' parking spaces for the above-referenced property.

The 'lake front' lots, along with many other lots on First Avenue which are not lake front, are small (only 25 feet wide and either 60 or 65 feet in depth). Allowing for required setbacks, a 65 foot lot results in the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. The waterfront lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular to the road on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the intention of the by-law is to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes this is not practical. Parking in the off-site portion would impede access by the homeowners to their parking space. According to Cultus Lake by-law 1154, 2019 : "7.3 A vehicle parked in the Designated Area that prevents the Registered Leaseholder or Current Occupant from parking a motor vehicle in the Designated Area without .... consent will be in violation of this Bylaw". So the way I read that is that no other vehicle can use this as overflow parking. Which means, essentially, that Zoning By-law 1375 is actually reducing parking spaces by 1.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being amended so that all leaseholders on 25 foot lots with only one access are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living and not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Burrows

226 First Avenue , Cultus Lake

---

**From:** Gwen McKenzie  
**Sent:** December-10-19 3:48 PM  
**To:** Julie Mundy  
**Subject:** Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

Date: December 10, 2019

Attention: Julie Mundy

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Neil and Gwen McKenzie

125 First Avenue, Cultus Lake, BC



---

**From:** Neil McKenzie  
**Sent:** December-11-19 8:47 AM  
**To:** Julie Mundy  
**Cc:** Smit Gail  
**Subject:** DVP 2019-32

Re: [126 First Ave.](#) Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

On-site parking on the tiny lake-front lots are as silly as asking us to put tents over our metal roofs!

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to [126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave](#) now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for [126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.](#)

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Neil McKenzie

---

**From:** Ken  
**Sent:** December-10-19 2:36 PM  
**To:** Julie Mundy  
**Subject:** Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

Hi Julie,

Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.


- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Ken & Tamara Hendsbee





---

**From:** Gary

**Sent:** December 9, 2019 9:58 AM

**Subject:** Re: Variance Application - Casey and Gail Smit - lot 126

Good morning to you all,

We would like to express our support for the Smit family application for Variance.

However, the support is not only for the Smit's, but for all small lot leaseholders. The bylaw requiring 2 parking stalls, to be totally within the confines of the leased lot, is a huge disincentive and also a potential loss of lot value, due to the parking requirement, utilizing almost 40% of the lot and greatly reducing the living space. In addition, the parking layout, for the garage entrance, with a one stall garage and the other stall located parallel to the street, effectively, either blocks the entrance to the garage or the entrance to the home. Would this cause an access/egress, fire safety hazard and the resultant liability?

The solution is to exempt all small lots, from the parking requirement. Lots that are 28' wide or more, could possibly deal with the parking bylaw as written. But a 25' lot with the setbacks required, is simply too small to effectively build a liveable/useable home.

Please allow/approve the Variance for the Smit family and change the bylaw, as soon as possible, to avoid every small lot, needing to apply for a parking Variance.

Best regards,

Gary Senft

122 First Ave.

Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.
- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Darin Elliott  
119 First Ave, Cultus Lake

Re: 126 First Ave. Lot 126, New Westminster District Lease Cultus Lake Park

Regarding Variance: DVP 2019-32

I am fully in support of waiving the requirements for the two 'on-site' parking spaces.

The 'lake front' lots are small with the main living space being 21' in width by 44' in length. These lots have only one access for parking (no front *and* back accesses as most of the larger lots at the lake do). With the small footprint, as well as only one access for parking, this by-law would take away a considerable amount of the home's 'main' living area. In addition, there is no gain in the number of parking spaces with the new bylaw for the lake front properties.

- Three cars can park perpendicular on the driveway allotted to 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave now, (as do many other and both of their immediate neighbours, 125 & 127 1st) and each car can easily come and go without issue.



- The new bylaw, as written, means that the car parked in the garage could not leave without moving the parallel parked car.
- If the hope was to provide additional parking on the 'off-site' Park property area for the general public visiting other homes.... The 'off site' portion of these driveways does, in fact, appear as a home's driveway. Therefore it's highly unlikely that people, other than those who are known to the homeowners, would consider parking in this space.

With all of the above in mind, I am wholly in favour of supporting the variance for 126 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.

I also wholly support this new by-law being rescinded so that all of our neighbours with similar lot sizes are able to park their cars easily and utilize their main floor for living, not parking a car.

Sincerely,

Sacha Iley  
119 First Ave, Cultus Lake