

**Subject: RE: DVP Application: 324 Loach Place**

**Date:** Fri, 10 Sep 2004 21:59:26 -0700

**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**To:** "Allan Orr" <allandorr@shaw.ca>, "Don Bell2" <belld@dnv.org>, "Janice Harris" <Janice\_Harris@dnv.org>, "Maureen McKeon Holmes" <Maureen\_McKeonHolmes@dnv.org>, "Alan Nixon" <Alan\_Nixon@dnv.org>, "Lisa Muri" <lisa\_muri@dnv.org>, "Richard Walton" <richard\_walton@dnv.org>

**CC:** "James Ridge" <James\_Ridge@dnv.org>, "Irwin Torry" <Irwin\_Torry@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Dear Mr. Orr:

I too visited this site and I have very serious concerns as well. I find it incredible that in light of an "error" by the plan checker in 2000 resulting in a 13 foot variance over and above the existing allowance District staff should actually recommend YET ANOTHER VARIANCE on top of the 13 foot variance made in 2000. It is simply incredible but it is a fact.

You are also right that were it not for the green vegetation barrier which they can remove at any time the intrusion of the massive wall would have an even greater impact on the neighbors.

However, the most serious concern I have is that in a case where the variance is already so overwhelmingly intrusive and so massively in bad taste and so extensively over the existing guidelines our staff would actually RECOMMEND yet an additional variance.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

From: Allan Orr [<mailto:allandorr@shaw.ca>]

Sent: September 10, 2004 9:25 PM

To: Don Bell2; Ernie Crist; Janice Harris; Maureen McKeon Holmes; Alan Nixon; Lisa Muri; Richard Walton

Subject: DVP Application: 324 Loach Place

Acting Mayor Nixon,  
District Councillors.

September 10, 2004

Ref: Development Variance Permit 29.04  
324 Loach Point Place.

Dear Council:

At the request of Brian and Marnie Cox of 312 Loach Place, I visited this site. As a result of this visit and reading the correspondence related to the request for variance, I would like to make some observations.

There is concern on the part of the Cox family that the process involving this variance has been flawed due to the error made in the year 2000 by the plan checker. According to the staff report of August 27, 2004, the addition of an attached side-entry garage resulted in a 13 foot extension to the building depth over the permitted figure of 65 feet. No variance was sought.

The current request for a variance of the permitted building depth is for a new addition to the west side of 312 Loach Place. If this variance is approved, the combined building depth will exceed the permitted by 19 feet. As the staff report points out, <sup>3</sup> the building depth regulation was originally developed in order to prevent the construction of long block walls against adjacent property lines.<sup>2</sup> This is an excellent regulation.

Were it not for the vegetation screening the residents of 312 from the applicant, the residents of 312 would be looking at a combined building that would extend along almost the whole of their property line.

I have two questions about this variance application. What if that vegetation were to be removed for whatever reasons? The residents of 312 would indeed be faced by a massive wall of building next door. Secondly, if this variance is approved isn't Council sending the message to the community that huge variances in building depth are acceptable?


As chair of the community association, I review all variances in Seymour. I report to the Association at general meetings. Only when a variance exceeds a reasonable limit do I visit the site and only when a variance is of great concern to neighbours do I communicate to Council on the matter of a significant variance. I think this is one of those cases.

Yours truly,

Allan Orr,

Chair, Seymour Community Association.

---

 <a href="#">winmail.dat</a>	<b>Name:</b> winmail.dat <b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
---	---