

Lesley Gibbons

From: ITC Eric Boutilier [REDACTED]
Sent: May 25, 2026 5:01 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: I oppose the shop variance at 149 2nd Street (No. H2026.013-DVP)
Attachments: IMG_1512.jpeg; IMG_1510.jpeg; IMG_1514.png

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

To the RDOS Planning Staff and Board,

Re: Development Variance Permit (DVP) Application No. H2026.013-DVP
149 2nd Street (Parcel D, Block 3, DL129)

I am writing to formally object to the requested height variance for the proposed accessory building at 149 2nd Street. My property is directly [REDACTED].

We have appreciated having a positive relationship with our neighbours over the past nine years, and I hope that continues. In that spirit, I spoke directly with the applicant in an effort to find a workable compromise. Despite those discussions, the variance application is still proceeding.

While we understand that some impacts between close neighbouring properties are expected, the proposed 20-foot-high structure along the shared boundary goes beyond what is typical under current zoning and would have significant impacts on our property.

• Loss of Sunlight

The increased height would create a substantial and persistent shadow over our yard, reducing morning light and winter sun exposure, with potential long-term effects on established plantings, including the lilacs along the fence line.

• Snow, Ice, and Safety / Liability Considerations

Reduced sun exposure would limit the natural melting of snow and ice on our property, leading to prolonged icy conditions on commonly used walkways. This raises ongoing safety concerns and may also introduce additional maintenance responsibilities and potential liability considerations if slip-and-fall incidents occur as a result of these conditions.

• Loss of Views and Livability

The structure would significantly obstruct existing views of trees and mountains from both our outdoor space and main living areas, including the living room, dining room, and primary bedroom, (see photos) affecting the overall enjoyment and livability of our home.

• Zoning Intent and Site Constraints

We are not aware of any unique site conditions, topographical constraints, or demonstrated hardship

that would justify a variance. The request appears to be driven by functional preference rather than necessity arising from the property itself.

- **Potential Reduction in Property Value**

I have been informed that a small townsite lot enclosed by an imposing over-height wall-like structure would reduce its primary appeal: light, openness, and tree and mountain views. If this variance is approved, it could permanently reduce the market value of our home.

We understand the applicant's desire to accommodate storage for a motorhome and a vehicle lift; however, these are discretionary design choices that, in our view, can be addressed within existing zoning limits or through alternative design solutions.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the RDOS Planning Staff and Board uphold the current bylaws and deny the requested variance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Eric Boutilier











