| PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:  |   |
|--|---|
| Civic address: 750 Languedoc Road, Naramata BC.  | . Canada V0H 1N1  |
| Legal Description  |   |
| Lot: A Plan: KAP90206 Block: Dis   | strict Lot: 211 Section: SDYD Township:   |
| Current Zoning: AG1  | OCP designation: Electoral Area "E"   |
| Current land use:<br>Agriculture and Residential   |   |
| Surrounding land uses: Agriculture and Residential   |   |
| Current method of sewerage disposal: Comm  | nunity Sewer X Septic Tank Other  |
| Current method of water supply: X Community W  | /ater Well Other  |
| Any restrictive covenants registered on the subject pro  | roperty: X Yes (if yes, provide details) No   |
| Any registered easements or rights-of-ways over the s  | subject property: X Yes (If yes, provide details) No  |
| Does the subject property possess a legal road access:   | :: X Yes No (if no, provide details)  |
| Agricultural Land Reserve: X Yes No  | Riparian Area: Yes X No   |
| Environmentally Sensitive: X Yes No  | MoT Approval: Yes X No  |
|  | (required for setbacks within 4.5 metres of a road reserve)   |
| DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION:   |   |
| Provide a description of the proposed development (please attach as a separate sheet, as required):            |   |
| Renovation of existing house, demolition of existing detached garage.  |   |
| Building of new detached garage and pool.  |   |
|  |   |
| REQUESTED VARIANCE(S):   |   |
| List all requested variances to the regulations in bylaw the applicable drawings. A variance cannot be conside | ws of the Regional District. Each variance should be marked lered where use or density would be affected. |
| 1. Bylaw (Include No.): No.2453, 2008 Section: 7.27 Retaining Walls  |   |
| Proposed variance: Build a retaining wall higher than the maximum 2m allowable height as                       |   |
| described in Section 7.23  | 7 of bylaw Electoral Area "E" Zoning bylaw No. 2459   |
|  |   |
| 2. Bylaw (Include No.):  | Section:  |
| Proposed variance:   |   |
|  |   |
|  |   |

## SUPPORTING RATIONALE:

All new development should meet the Regional District's applicable bylaw standards. A variance is considered only as a <u>last resort</u>. An application for a development variance permit should meet most, if not all, of the following criteria, in order to be considered for approval (please attach as a separate sheet, as required).

1. The variance should not defeat the intent of the bylaw standard or significantly depart from the planning principle or objective intended by the bylaw. Please elaborate how the requested variance meets this criteria:

Section 7.27 of the zoning by-law looks at retaining walls in isolation and was presumably written with the good intention of minimizing the impact of retaining wall faces to streets and neighbours on sloping sites. None of those conditions exist here. It is a courtyard located centrally on an almost 2-hectare lot and the wall is more properly interpreted as part of the buildings.

2. The variance should not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or public lands. Please elaborate how the requested variance meets this criteria:

As the retaining wall in question is located between the main house and sloping hill of the site, it is not visible from any adjacent properties or from public lands. This is a small, private courtyard in the middle of a large orchard.

3. The variance should be considered as a unique solution to an unusual situation or set of circumstances. Please elaborate how the requested variance meets this criteria:

The retaining wall is the continuation of the exterior wall of the garage and pool room, and is integral to the foundation walls of the garage. It provides definition for the pool courtyard, and the height is determined by the existing slope. A lower wall would channel water into the courtyard.

4. The variance represents the best solution for the proposed development after all other options have been considered. Please elaborate how the requested variance meets this criteria:

A terraced solution, as described in the bylaw, would result in a "dead space" between the retaining walls that would need to be protected with guardrails on all sides. It would require more concrete, be more costly, and provide no benefit to the community.

5. The variance should not negatively affect the natural site characteristics or environmental qualities of the property. Please elaborate how the requested variance meets this criteria:

The proposed retaining wall minimizes the amount of concrete required to retain the soil. Providing a single wall also results in a greater control over water drainage from the site (orchard) above.