
Under the Electoral Area “F” Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 2790, 2018, the subject property is currently designated Small Holdings (SH), and is shown on Schedule “H” (ESDP Areas) as comprising Important Ecosystem Areas (IEA), but has not been designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Development Permit (ESDP) Area.

Under the Electoral Area “F” Zoning Bylaw No. 2461, 2008, the property is currently zoned Small Holdings Six (SH6) which allows for single detached dwellings as a principal use and accessory buildings, among other uses, as a secondary use.

BC Assessment has classified the property as “Residential” (Class 01) and is rated high in the Community Wildfire Protection Plan, with a small portion in the northeast corner rated as moderate.

Public Process:

Adjacent property owners will have received notification of this application with written comments regarding the proposal being accepted until the commencement of the regular Board meeting. Any comments will be on the agenda as separate item.

Analysis:

In considering this proposal, Administration notes that the Zoning Bylaw’s use of setback regulations is generally to provide physical separation between neighbouring properties in order to protect privacy and prevent the appearance of overcrowding. When a parcel is also adjacent a roadway, setbacks are further employed to maintain adequate sightlines for vehicle traffic movements.

Minimum setbacks from parcel lines are used to maintain a minimum space between houses in a residential neighbourhood to allow access to sunlight, to provide separation for fire safety or to mitigate nuisances (like noise) that might come from an adjacent building.

Regulating the height of accessory structures through the Zoning Bylaw is done to ensure that a building does not impact the shade and outdoor privacy of adjacent properties, or views to significant landmarks, water bodies or other natural features.

Building height is also an important component of the built form of a neighbourhood and, depending upon the location of an accessory structure (i.e. near a street frontage) an excessive height can have an impact upon established streetscape characteristics.

Accordingly, when assessing variance requests a number of factors are taken into account, including the intent of the regulation; the presence of any potential limiting physical features on the subject property; established streetscape characteristics; and whether the proposed development would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the area and/or adjoining uses.

Administration recognizes the purposes of interior parcel line setbacks and height restrictions, but notes that the proposed building is located behind the principal dwelling and will not be visible from Forsyth Drive. The topography immediately rises at the edge of the eastern property line, which mitigates the potential impacts to privacy or overshadowing of the neighbour parcel.

In this instance, although there are several slopes in some locations, Administration notes that there are reasonable alternative locations to site an accessory building that would comply with the setback regulation.

For these reasons listed above, Administration supports the variance request to reduce the minimum interior side parcel line setback and increase the maximum height.

Alternatives:

1. That the Board approve Development Variance Permit No. F2021.031-DVP.
2. That the Board deny Development Variance Permit No. F2021.031-DVP.

Respectfully submitted

Colin Martin

Colin Martin, Planning Student

Endorsed by:



C. Garrish, Planning Manager

Attachments: No. 1 – Site Photo (Google Streetview)

Attachment No. 1 – Aerial Photo



Attachment No. 2 – Site Photo (Google Streetview)

