

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT



TO: Board of Directors

FROM: B. Newell, Chief Administrative Officer

DATE: September 23, 2021

RE: Development Variance Permit Application — Electoral Area “D” 420 Panorama Crescent

Administrative Recommendation:

THAT Development Variance Permit No. D2021.032-DVP, to permit the development of an addition to an existing accessory structure at 420 Panorama Crescent, be approved.

Legal: Lot 9, Plan KAP16380, District Lot 461, SDYD Folio: D-02894.040

OCP: Low Density Residential (LR) Zone: Low Density Residential Two (RS2)

Variance to reduce the minimum front parcel line setback from 7.5 metres to 0.0 metres.

Proposed Development:

This application is seeking a variance to the front parcel line setback from 7.5 metres to 0.0 metres to undertake the development of an addition to the existing garage.

The applicant has stated that “due to the steep slope on the Northeastern portion of the lot, site retaining walls or cut and fill slope would be required ... this would significantly increase costs and further disturb the natural vegetation.”

Site Context:

The subject property is 1,319 m² in area and is situated on the north side of Panorama Crescent. The property is currently developed to contain a single detached dwelling and attached garage. The surrounding pattern of development is characterised by similar residential development with single detached dwellings.

Background:

The property was created on June 15, 1966, while available Regional District records indicate that a building permit has been issued for a garage (1977).

Under the Electoral Area “D” Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 2603, 2013, the property is currently designated Low Density Residential (LR) and zoning is Low Density Residential Two (RS2), which allows for a single detached dwelling and accessory buildings as permitted uses and establishes setbacks from property lines.

BC Assessment has classified the property as “Residential” (Class 01).

On August 20, 2021, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) approved a reduced setback from Panorama Crescent for the proposed structure.

Public Process:

Adjacent property owners will have received notification of this application with written comments regarding the proposal being accepted, and had until 4:30 p.m. on September 16, 2021 to provide comment. All comments received are included as a separate item on the Board's Agenda.

Analysis:

Setback regulations 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.

Further, 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.

In this instance, the subject parcel has an irregular front parcel line, creating a varied setback requirement for structures on the property. The edge of Panorama Crescent is 12.5 metres from the recessed property line, which mitigates the perception of a reduced setback and the appearance of overcrowding. Also, the proposed variance has no impact to vehicular movement from the parcel.

There are several instances along Panorama Crescent of dwellings and accessory structures situated within the required front setback, thus contributing to a non-uniform streetscape. There are no immediate neighbouring properties that are anticipated to have concerns of overshadowing or loss of privacy if the proposed variance is approved.

There is room on the rear portion of the subject parcel to construct additional accessory structures that would meet the setback requirements. Thus, the variance is not considered a necessity for the enjoyment of the property. However, development on the northeast side *may* prove challenging for the landowner due to the presence of steep slopes. The request to encroach into the front setback appears reasonable as it is limited to only the "recessed" portion of the front parcel line of the property.

Alternatives:

1. That Development Variance Permit No. D2021.032-DVP be denied.
2. That consideration of the application be referred to the Electoral Area "D" Advisory Planning Commission.

Respectfully submitted

Nikita Kheterpal

Nikita Kheterpal, Planner I

Endorsed by:

C. Garrish, Planning Manager

Attachments: No. 1 – Site Photo (Google Streetview 2012)
No. 2 – Aerial Photo

Attachment No. 1 – Site Photo (Google Streetview 2012)



Attachment No. 2 – Aerial Photo

