



COWICHAN VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT

175 Ingram Street, Duncan, B.C. V9L 1N8

Tel: 250.746.2620 | Fax: 250.746.2621

REFERRAL RESPONSES

CVRD File No.:	DVP23B03
Bylaw Enforcement <i>Rob Harris</i>	No Comments
Community Planning <i>Mike Tippett</i>	<p>The case for this requested variance is not compelling. It does raise a larger issue, namely: what is the difference between a detached suite and a second dwelling? The lines are being blurred as we get larger than the existing suite floor area limits.</p> <p>I speculate that the suite area limits were established for the purpose of keeping the second unit to a “less intrusive” visual/building massing level and also to indirectly limit the extra demand upon any on-site sewage treatment and disposal requirements.</p> <p>If this site had been in a community sewer service area, it would deal with the second issue and all that would be left to consider would be the first.</p> <p>I think we should take a deep look at suites, servicing and related matters in the zoning review</p>
Strategic Initiatives <i>Alison Garnett</i>	We have insufficient capacity to respond.
Building Inspections <i>Sonny Bryski</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Regarding the height variance <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ceiling heights will trigger extensive and costly structural engineering. b. The additional glazed openings may actually lead to negative overheating rather than positive solar gain when applying step code metrics. c. Regarding overheating; dwellings built through Building Permits issued on or after March 8, 2024 will require mandatory Air Conditioning – which may cause for increased electrical demand – not less. d. The math respecting height is incorrect, and the designer has not accurately portrayed the correct height as its defined in the Area B Zoning bylaw. The owners have stated in their rationale letter that this is a 6 inch variance; however, this is a 2.5m (8.2ft / 98 inch) variance request. The proposed structure appears to actually be 9.1m – 9.2m tall, and to clarify; 10m is not 30’, 10m is 32’8”. Therefore; a 1.65m or 5’5” request may be more accurate, albeit still a large deviation from 7.5m.

This form is provided for your convenience only. Responses are accepted in any format. Please note that referral responses may be attached to a staff report and published on the CVRD website as part of a CVRD Committee or Board meeting agenda.

Please return your response to the Planner listed above.

- 2) With regard to the floor area Variance,
- a. On a recent variance request to increase the suite size for similar reasons, the applicant was issued the DVP subject to the following:
 - i. *That the owner provide written confirmation from a professional engineer certifying the sufficiency of existing onsite waste disposal facilities to serve the proposed development prior to issuance of a building permit;*
 - ii. *That the owner provide written confirmation from a professional engineer certifying the sufficiency of the existing potable water supply to serve the proposed development prior to issuance of a building permit; and*
 - iii. *That the owner enter into a restrictive covenant agreement to prohibit subdivision of the parcel, at the owner's expense, prior to issuance of a building permit.*
 - b. In addition to the three conditions above, this structure may respond poorly to Energy Step Code metrics given the overall volume and amount of glazing. Therefore, building inspections recommends that the owners demonstrate step code compliance prior to DVP issuance.

- 3) Regarding the steepness of the lot and adjacent terrain.
- a. Based on the site photos as well as our local knowledge of the area; the building department will require professional geotechnical assurances for this proposal of which includes slope stability, bearing capacity, placement of fill and drainage.
 - b. Based on the site plan, it is unclear how the residence above will be accessed
 - c. The BCBC does not require a pedestrian path or protection from unprotected openings for cases like this. If a fire truck can get to the building, then that's all that's required via the BCBC.
 - d. We understand that the owners have advised that there will not be an interior connection between the garage below and the suite above. They have indicated that the garage below will be used for personal storage as well as a home-based business; however, some of the amenities for the residence (e.g. washer/drier) are located in the garage. In order to properly delineate these "tenancies" or floor areas; a fire and sound separation will be required. If an internal staircase is desired, it must too be rated for fire and sound be equipped with a lockable, self closing fire door.

Given the applicants concerns regarding the cost of living and illnesses associated with aging; the Building Department would encourage the placement of a premanufactured home that could be quickly made ready for occupancy without the need for variance or costly and lengthy

	construction. However; it may not be feasible to transport such a structure given the steepness of the lot.
Emergency Management <i>Robb Schoular</i>	Did not respond to referral request.
Utilities <i>Louise Knodel- Joy/Vanessa Thomson</i>	This property is not within any CVRD owned water or sewer systems, and have not comments regarding this development.
Environment <i>Keith Lawrence</i>	No significant environmental concerns.

This form is provided for your convenience only. Responses are accepted in any format. Please note that referral responses may be attached to a staff report and published on the CVRD website as part of a CVRD Committee or Board meeting agenda. Please return your response to the Planner listed above.