

**Regular Council  
July 26, 2022  
Public Input**

<b>Item Type</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Item Name</b>
Public Input – Decker, Chad	July 11, 2022 10h58	9.2	Development Variance Permit – (Riparian Protection and Enhancement Area) – 2304 Henry Street (Satinderjit Wahlla)

**From:** Chad Decker <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2022 10:58 AM

**To:** Clerks <Clerks@portmoody.ca>

**Subject:** Variance Request 2304 Henry - Hope Street (Proposed Variance to Zoning Bylaw No. 2937)

Dear council and staff,

With respect to the applicant's request to reduce the Riparian Protection and Enhancement Area setback from 5m to 2m (16.4 feet to 6.56ft) we firmly request that the Port Moody's council decline this request for the 3 reasons outlined below.

### **Impact to light corridors**

Firstly, as the notice states we'd like to comment on how our "property is affected", to best illustrate this I'd like to give a vision of the geography of the area. The Henry \ Hope street area is eclipsed by the mountainside and forests of the greenbelt which rise steadily to the south. Its a beautiful area we agree, but the one caveat is that this rising terrain blocks a great deal of natural daylight for all but the summer months. Instead the community relies on the short window of sunlight as the sun goes towards the SFU mountains during the later afternoons and evenings. Property setbacks allow for this minimal sunlight to cascade along the street lanes providing for needed light for our veggie gardens, plants, and flowers alike.



The above photo beyond the fence-line shows the propose area of impact, and placing multiple large secondary accessory structures in this setback area next to the main "dwelling" structures will mean that the adjacent properties up this street lane will be deprived of essential sunlight. Light corridors are and essential part of urban planning and this proposal runs counter to established progress that cities have been making in the area.

## **RPEA**

The second point is that variances are not a tool to expand the usable footprint for property development. If the lot itself cannot support 2 main dwellings and 2 accessory buildings then simply build 2 main structures, or 2 smaller structures. Why are we encroaching on the rights of our natural habitat so that the property might be developed to maximize profit. Its a Riparian Protection area for a reason and if we are not going to draw the line here then why are we concerning ourselves with RPEAs in the first place.

## **Development permit**

It had been over 2 years since this property was put forward with the original request for development (Dharam Kajal May 31, 2018), pre Covid, and we are now on year 4 and tenants have been displaced for over a year now and one has to ask if the aim here is to actually construct a building, or to get a variance approved to maximize the subsequent resell of these lots. I dont see many lots sitting around 4 years after subdivision.

In summary we're happy to see a family have an opportunity to once again reside next door, and development is a necessary course to remedy the shortage of available housing in our communities. However development can be done well, whereby the environmental impacts on the neighbour, our green space, and riparian areas are respected, and then there is this proposal which runs afoul of these basic principals of our community.

It is for this reason that we request council deny this request for variance and to ask the applicant to consider appropriate alternatives such as reducing the 4 structure sizes so that variances aren't needed, or perhaps go with a single main structure on each of these subdivided lots as 1 house into 2 dwellings (likely 4 with respective basement suites - without the accessory dwellings) is already a significant win for community densification.

Respectfully,

Chad Decker, Anna Mikitchuk and family

[REDACTED] Street

Port Moody