

---

## Feedback on Proposed (and Current) Fencing Height Bylaw

---

**From** Eric Druyts [REDACTED]  
**Date** Thu 3/26/2026 9:14 PM  
**To** Sierra Acton <sierra.acton@cverd.bc.ca>  
**Cc** Ben Maartman <ben.maartman@cverd.bc.ca>; Kate Segall <kate.segall@cverd.bc.ca>; Hilary Abbott <hilary.abbott@cverd.bc.ca>; Alison Nicholson <alison.nicholson@cverd.bc.ca>; Ian Morrison <ian.morrison@cverd.bc.ca>; Mike Wilson <mike.wilson@cverd.bc.ca>; Karen Deck <karen.deck@cverd.bc.ca>; Jesse McClinton <jesse.mcclinton@cverd.bc.ca>; legislativeservices <legislativeservices@cverd.bc.ca>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Directors,

I'm writing regarding the proposed (and current) fence height limits, specifically the 1.2 m restriction within the front setback.

My concern is not simply that the limit is too low, but that it does not function in the context it is being applied to.

In much of the CVRD, front yards are not ornamental spaces, they are in fact actively used by property owners. At the same time, these areas are directly exposed to wildlife. Deer and elk do not distinguish between front and rear yards, and a 1.2 m fence does not meaningfully deter them.

The result is a regulation that looks reasonable on paper but fails in practice. It shifts the burden onto residents, who will either absorb ongoing damage, invest in alternative deterrents, or pursue variances. None of these outcomes are efficient or desirable from a planning or enforcement perspective.

More importantly, the distinction between front and rear yard fence heights introduces a rule that is difficult to justify in a rural setting. It prioritizes visual openness from the street over the basic ability of residents to protect and use their property.


A consistent allowance of 1.83 m (6 feet) across all property boundaries would be a more workable standard. It reflects what is already commonly built, provides a functional level of protection, and avoids creating a bylaw that residents are incentivized to work around.

This is less about maximizing fence height and more about ensuring the regulation aligns with how properties are actually used in the CVRD.

I would encourage you to revisit the proposed restriction with this in mind.

Sincerely,

Eric Druyts  
Area B



Shawnigan Lake