

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT



TO: Board of Directors
FROM: J. Zaffino, Chief Administrative Officer
DATE: August 7, 2025
RE: Development Variance Permit Application — Electoral Area “H” (H2025.014-DVP)

Administrative Recommendation:

THAT Development Variance Permit No. H2025.014-DVP, to allow for the construction of an accessory building to a height of 5.5 metres at 1883 Columbia Street, be denied.

Legal: Lot A, Plan KAP86140, District Lot 99, YDYD Folio: H-00049.000

OCP: Low Density Residential (LR) Zone: Low Density Residential One (RS1)

Variance Requests: to increase the maximum building height for an accessory building from 4.5 m to 5.5 m

Purpose:

This application is seeking a variance to the maximum accessory building height that applies to the subject property in order to undertake the construction of a shop.

Specifically, it is being proposed to vary the maximum height for an accessory building or structure from 4.5 metres to 5.5 metres.

In support of this request, the applicant has stated that “we want to be able to work on things (like woodworking, tinkering on our vehicles, storage of our trailer, high shelves to store our junk) without a ceiling restriction of 8’.”

Strategic Priorities:

Operational

Background & Analysis:

The current boundaries of the subject property were created by a Plan of Subdivision deposited with the Land Titles Office in Kamloops on March 7, 2008, and BC Assessment has classified the property as “Residential” (Class 01).

Available Regional District records indicate that building permits for the construction of the single detached dwelling (2010) and two subsequent renovations to the same (2013 and 2016) have previously been issued for this property.

Under the Electoral Area “H” Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 2497, 2012, the subject property is currently designated Low Density Residential (LR) and is not subject to any development permit area designations.

Under the Electoral Area “H” Zoning Bylaw No. 3065, 2024, the property is currently zoned Low Density Residential One (RS1) which permit “accessory buildings or structures” but limits their maximum height to 4.5 meters.

Under Section 10.0 (Floodplain Regulations) of the Zoning Bylaw, the subject property is within the floodplain associated with the Tulameen River and any habitable area must comply with the applicable flood construction level.

Analysis:

In considering this proposal, Administration notes that restricting the height of accessory structures is generally done to ensure that such structures remain “subordinate, customarily incidental, and exclusively devoted to” the residential use of the parcel.

Other considerations can also include the impact of “hardships” such as limiting physical features related to slopes, floodplain, bedrock or rocky outcroppings, and environmental values as well as legal constraints related an irregular parcel shape of the existence of a covenant, easement or right-of-way.

Building height is also an important component of the built form of a neighbourhood and, depending upon the location of an accessory structure (i.e. near a street frontage) an excessive height can have an impact upon established streetscape characteristics.

To a much lesser extent, considerations such as the impact on shade, privacy, use and views from adjacent properties may be considered.

Accordingly, when assessing variance requests a number of factors are taken into account, including the intent of the regulation; the presence of any potential limiting physical features on the subject property; established streetscape characteristics; and whether the proposed development would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the area and/or adjoining uses.

In reviewing the proposed variance, Administration notes that the intent of the regulation is to ensure accessory structures remain subordinate to the principal residential use of a property and maximum building height is the principal method used to ensure this. Permitting an over-sized building is contrary to this and may encourage the introduction of non-residential uses in future (e.g. home industries).

In addition, there do not appear to be any physical or legal constraints that would warrant or speak in favour of a greater height for an accessory structure. Generally, any “hardship” claim should not merely be related to a desire for convenience or aesthetics.

It is further noted that there do not appear to be any other accessory structure in the immediate vicinity that have been constructed to a height exceeding that specified in the zoning bylaw (which has been in effect for many decades). Accordingly, an over-height accessory structure is not seen to be characteristics of this area.

In addition, other options are seen to be available to the applicant, such as adjoining the proposed garage / workshop to the principal dwelling unit in order to be entitled to the greater building height of 11.0 metres associated with a principal structure.

Alternative:

Conversely, Administration recognises that requested variance is not significant and will increase the maximum height of the structure 1.0 metre (e.g. 22%) above what is currently permitted by the zoning bylaw.

In addition, design elements such as a roof pitch of 4.5:12 results in only a narrow portion of the roof, representing a limited volume protruding above the maximum permitted height.

It is also noted that the potential impact from an increased maximum height on the privacy, use and overshadowing on adjacent properties will likely be minimal.

Lastly, it is recognized that existing vegetation found on the property may further mitigate the impact of an increase in height. It is noted, however, that vegetation is dynamic and can change significantly from year-to-year and its replacement and / or maintenance does not generally require approval from the Regional District in relation to variance approvals.

Summary:

For the reasons outlined above, Administration does not support the requested variances and is recommending denial.

Financial Implications:

Financial implications have been considered and none were found.

Communication Strategy:

The proposed variance(s) have been notified in accordance with the requirements of the *Local Government Act* as well as the Regional District's Development Procedures Bylaw No. 2500, 2011

Site Context:

The subject property is approximately 929 m² in area and is situated on the south side of Columbia Street, approximately 12.2 km northwest from the Town of Princeton. The property is understood to contain one (1) single detached dwelling.

The surrounding pattern of development is generally characterised by similar residential development to the north and east, and vacant Crown land to the south and west.

Referrals:

Not applicable

Public Process:

Adjacent property owners will have received notification of this application with written comments regarding the proposal being accepted, in accordance with Section 2.10 of Schedule '4' of the Regional District's Development Procedures Bylaw No. 2500, 2011, until 4:30 p.m. on July 9, 2025. All comments received are included as a separate item on the Board's Agenda.

Alternatives:

1. That the Board approve Development Variance Permit No. H2025.014-DVP.

Will a PowerPoint presentation be presented at the meeting? No

Respectfully submitted

Jerritt Cloney

Jerritt Cloney
Planner I

Endorsed by:



C. Garrish
Senior Manager of Planning

Endorsed by:



A. Fillion
Managing Director, Dev. & Infrastructure

Attachments: No. 1 – Aerial Imagery

No. 2 - Site Photo (Google Streetview)

Attachment No. 1 – Aerial Photo



Attachment No. 2 – Site Photo (Google Streetview)

