

September 05,2017

3090-20 / DV 5B 17

B. Lebutte

Re Development Variance Permit Application Lot A District Lot 177, Comox District, Plan VIP78574, PID 026-236-753- 2029 Stevedor Road

With regards to the proposed bylaw change to reduce the side set back from 7.5 meters to 3.5 meters, I would like to submit my concerns and opposition to the change.

Having purchased the five-acre parcel of land at _____ in 2009 for our future retirement property, both my wife and I were looking for a quiet piece of land that we could build our future forever home and one that had a second dwelling for our children or other family members that might need a place to stay or even a bed & breakfast.

When purchasing the land, I had concerns about how close the neighboring house on 2029 Stevedor was to the property line knowing that the previous owner could have situated the house further away when it was built.

After some consideration, we decided to purchase the property anyway as the original developer had put in all the infrastructure needed (**Septic Field, Secondary Hydro Meter, and Water Hook Up**) for a second dwelling at the front of the property.

Our first intention was to build our home and accessory building on the north side of the property, as far away from the property line to the south at 2029 Stevedor. This would eliminate the concern of the neighboring house being so close to the property line and would eliminate the noise that we hear from the subject properties heat pump.

Unfortunately, this would involve moving the **3 Hydro Poles** (one of which has a **Transformer**) and **Water Supply** that currently feeds the existing dwelling on the back half of the property not to mention the existing **Septic Field** that may need to be relocated.

After consulting with Electrical Contractors, Water Well Companies, and Septic Companies I was informed that the cost of moving the existing infrastructure would be cost prohibitive to us and was encouraged to utilize the existing systems put in place when the property was developed in 1996.

In other words, it would be in our best interest to work with what is in place now and situate our construction around it. In doing this we are looking at building in such away that we have a South Westerly exposure. This would put the proposed building directly in our sightline and on the edge of the property line that would do nothing for the value of our property not to mention our own dislike of looking at a building as opposed to trees.

I have also noted that the proposed 1200 SQ FT building (**equal to the existing dwelling on our property**) would require several trees being removed which currently creates a bit of a buffer zone between the subject property's driveway and our own. I have also noted that the proposed building has doors on the back side of the building which would require some type of landing outside the door. This would result in more trees being cut and further encroachment to the side property line with a walkway from those back doors.

I would also like to point out that the property line or (**Road**) was created by the pre-mature subdivision of our property as under the Regional Growth Strategy, we were forced to subdivide or forever hold our peace before the new by law came in. I was also informed that if we were to default on the mortgage that the property would revert to the original state as when we bought it and the road would no longer be there. I was also informed that I could also apply to undo the subdivision if I chose to do so, therefore the property line would revert as well.

My wife and I went to look at the proposed site for the applicants building and feel it is far too close and would create a visual detractor to our property and our view once we build our house.

I would also like to point out that the bylaws were put in place for a reason and the other accessory buildings in the neighborhood appear to be following them with the appropriate setbacks.

I do not want to be the guy that stands in the way of progress or halts the ambition of others or creates problems for the neighbors as I have met the applicants and they are very nice people, but I must look out for my best interests and feel that allowing this exception to the bylaw will only have a negative effect on our property from a visual and resale point of view over all.

I ask that you deny the applicants request for changing the set back rules in the current bylaw and that you work with him for an alternate solution.

Thanks