

**CITY OF VICTORIA
BOARD OF VARIANCE MINUTES
FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 2017
ESQUIMALT NATION MEETING ROOM**

Present: Andrew Rushforth, Chair
Jaime Hall
Rus Collins
Margaret Eckenfelder
Trevor Moat

Staff: Thom Pebernat, Zoning Administrator
Nina Jokinen, Zoning Technician
Quinn Anglin, Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 12:35 pm.

1. **Minutes:** Meeting of March 9, 2017

Moved: Jaime Hall

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the minutes of March 9, 2017 be adopted as presented

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **Appeals**

**12:30 Board of Variance Appeal #00633
Nicholas Bantock, Owner/Applicant
1175 Chapman Street**

Present Zoning: R1-B - Single Family Dwelling District
Present Use: Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is for a new rear addition and deck.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation(s) Requested

Part 1.2.5 c.

Relaxation for internal side yard setback (west)
from 1.50m to 0.80m.

Note: The existing internal side yard setback (west)
is 0.70m.

Part 1.2.5 d.

Relaxation for combined side yard setbacks from
4.50m to 1.80m

Note: The existing combined side yard setbacks is
1.70m.

Nick and Joyce Balfour, Owners/Applicants; Bruce Cox, Notified Neighbour of 1174 May Street were present.

Applicant

- Have a small house on a very narrow lot, just over 900 sq. ft.
- The kitchen also acts as the dining room, and their bathroom is directly off the kitchen so when you sit at the kitchen table, the bathroom door is almost touching the table
- Would like to add 200 sq. ft. to build a proper dining room so they can add some space
- Want to be able to eat without having to pull the table away from the wall
- Have six children between them and although not all of them live at home, at holidays it makes for a very squished space.

Board

- How long have you lived in the house?
 - Almost 5 years
- Bruce Cox, notified neighbour of 1174 May Street is in support, and all other neighbours are also in support, they have had no concerns from any of the neighbours that could potentially be affected by the proposal.
- The neighbors directly behind, Mark and Elli are also in support and happy about the proposal

Public portion of the meeting closed

There is clearly a case of hardship with simply attempting to add a little square footage to the home to make the space more usable, no neighbours are affected nor have any concerns and the variance requests are reasonable and supported as presented.

Moved: Trevor Moat

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the following variance be allowed;

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation(s) Requested

Part 1.2.5 c.

Relaxation for internal side yard setback (west)
from 1.50m to 0.80m.

Part 1.2.5 d.

Relaxation for combined side yard setbacks from
4.50m to 1.80m.

Carried (unanimous)

12:50 Board of Variance Appeal #00634

**Brian Trenchard, Envirotec, Applicant; Mike Mackwood, Owner
1540 Montgomery Avenue**

Present Zoning:
Present Use:

R1-A - Rockland Single Family Dwelling District
Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is for a newly constructed single family dwelling.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation Requested

Part 1.1.4 a.

Relaxation for height from 7.60m to 7.72m.

Brian Trenchard, Builder; Mike Mackwood, Owner; Kathryn Lasueur and Steven Jones 1541 Rockland Avenue; Lawrence Boutoluzzi, Rockland Community Association, 730 Pemberton Road; were present.

Applicant

- Home was built over height
- The error is believed to be when the foundation was done, and not because the framer didn't follow instructions, but more so that because the lot is significantly higher at the back of the property
- When the foundation was poured it is believed to have been formed to have acceptable clearance from the bottom of the siding to the side of the house and landscaping. At that time they believed (the framer and the builder) that they had enough room to accommodate for the adjustment (about 4-5") and went ahead with building
- It would be extremely difficult to change or adjust the building and this mistake now
- The neighbour directly behind them is not affected by it nor felt it would be detrimental and he would be the one neighbour that would be the most affected by it – Ryan Campbell of 1551 Rockland Avenue
- The houses on either side are both higher by over a meter than the subject property as they were built under the old zoning bylaws. The house therefore certainly does not look over height at all in reference to streetscape
- They understand why the rules apply, and there was an error at some point but it was an unintentional mistake
- There may have been a little confusion with Anderson and Associates, or the designer about how the average grade is calculated
- They have been building houses since 1991 in Victoria
- The landscaping in the front of the house will mature to a decent height which will mask any sort of over height perspective, if there was one, from the front of the home
- Went through an extensive design process to have the house fit in with the Rockland neighbourhood before building it, and feel that that they have done a good job with making it work

Board

- In the as built drawings – where is the mid-point measurement and what does T.O.P. mean?
 - Do not know what T.O.P. means...the next number above it is the midpoint of the roof
- The elevation calculation that has been used is from this number so it is a problem as to what this number is referencing
- The original plans were surveyed by Victoria Design, the builder was then given the instructions and they were then calculated onsite by Anderson & Associates. At this stage when the trusses and shingles were on they came back to make certain that they

were within height restrictions and discovered there was a problem and they were 4-5" over height at the midpoint

- The problem wasn't identified until the roof was done
- Went back and examined the elevation at the top of the foundation and believe this was where the problem was made, not in the trusses, at which point they brought this information to the City
- When was the date you brought the over height error to the City?
 - It was sometime in September, but it wasn't until October that the Zoning Department communicated that there was a problem to the applicant

Nina Jokinen, Planning Technician clarified that she wasn't aware of the Survey Certificate for the height until December 23, 2016 at which point she emailed the surveyor to confirm that those were the correct numbers. He confirmed they were and said that to the peak of the roof it is 45.64 and to the eave is 42.81.

- The 42.81 referenced on the drawings is not T.O.P. then, it must be referencing the eave?
 - Yes
- Which eave is the measurement of 42.81 referencing to?
 - Not the lowest or the highest one
- If it is anything, it looks like it should be the referencing the eave of the master bedroom?
 - If you look at the back of the house, it is easier to identify as there is only one line across the whole roof but the front is misleading because of the gables
- What is the highest eave?
 - That is the highest eave as they all run the same height around the house
- The drawings do not indicate that it is the same plane all the way around the house and 42.82 is not the midpoint of eave, they seem to indicate that the highest eave is the one of the small roof above the master bedroom
- It is not clear in the drawings what the average eave calculation is, so how exactly did they arrive at the centre point?
 - If there is a problem with the drawings, they have no idea of how they got to this mid-point calculation. They would have to assume that after 20 years of using Victoria Design and JE Anderson that they have a clue what they are doing and the calculations that they make are correct and produce accurate information.
- It may be that the elevations are being compared to the drawings and the drawings aren't accurate? There was indication that the Planning Department received an email confirming from the surveyor that the height to the eave was 42.81?

Nina Jokinen, Planning Technician, confirmed that yes this was correct.

- The lines they have calculated the midpoint eave from, or if T.O.P. was referencing that; is wrong on the drawings as they are taking from a number somewhere lower. Therefore, the drawings have a minor error in them. Regardless, the City has confirmed that the surveyor has confirmed that the 42.81 calculation *is correct*
- Would like an answer to be clear about when the builder found out about the error?
 - September was when the surveyor was there and noticed the mistake
- So as of December the City was made aware by the surveyor? Therefore from September to December there was awareness that there was a height problem but the City was not made aware of that?
 - Yes, there seems to be a delay. First of all there was a delay with getting the surveyor there, and then the surveyor communicating with the designer and then

the builder and then following that, the City of Victoria. Thinks that it was given to the City by October sometime and was waiting for a call back from them about it but it wasn't until December.

- Applicant stated he called for a home inspection and the City said they would not do any more inspections until they dealt with the variance issue. Does not believe that he has any record of email or otherwise of this.
- So the builder was made aware from the surveyor that there was a height problem in September/October and was also aware that it was designed very close to its maximum height level so it would be presumed to have triggered that there was a problem that needed to be addressed?
 - Was not made aware by Victoria Design that they were so close to height max until they notified them of the over height issue
- Inspections came and said they would do another inspection for insulation so that they could continue with dry walling but they would not be responsible for anything as a result of the variance if it needed to come out. The builder accepted it at that time. If they were 2 feet over height they would have stopped right away but felt it was marginal and they had the wiggle room.
- It was mentioned that 1551 Rockland Avenue has no objection to the height but what does 1541 have to say?
 - They are present and would like to speak to when appropriate

Notified neighbours, Kathryn Lasueur and Steven Jones of 1541 Rockland Avenue

- Have lived in the house for 22 years, and are attending today because the neighbouring houses to the subject property were built in the old zoning bylaw before the zoning changed, and these houses, in their opinion, were built way too high.
- Based on the original plans submitted to the City in March 2016 there was a 4.33' margin allowable for the home to comply with height requirements, and there is now a completed non-compliant structure before the Board of Variance.
- It is understood that the grade may have changed, but how does this vertical change result in a change from eaves to midpoint and midpoint to peak as detailed in the March 2017 plans?
- How can you order trusses that are a foot and a half vertical difference in July and August and not know when you put those on that you are going to have a height problem, when there was only 4" to play with?
- The hardship seems to be manufactured from the fact that a survey was done after the house was completed and the problem identified to the builder at that time
- November 8 was when the applicant applied to have the surveyor come out for a height survey and it was not until the end of December that the City was notified
- R1-A Bylaw would have allowed the applicant to go up to 1.3m on either side of the midpoint in height, and they believe the error occurred when they ordered the trusses. Regardless, they realized they had an error and the earlier they could have dealt with this the less impact it would have had on everyone.
- What is the ceiling height of the master bedroom on the top floor?
 - The ceiling is 8ft, but has a 9ft release in coffered ceilings into the dormer area, but the plate height is 8ft.
- What were the dimensions of the original roof trusses that were ordered, did they comply with the March 2016 plans?
 - The drawing show a 5' 12" slope and if the error had been detected before the trusses were ordered than there is no doubt that they could have fixed this problem earlier.
- The entire new building has taken out and devalued their property.

Lawrence Builosse, representative from the Rockland Neighbourhood Community Association;

- Attending to monitor the meeting and see what kind of faith the community can put into the Board for these type of variance applications. Currently, there seems to be a lot of pressure on the neighbourhood and a lot of people wanting to increase the density through variances and rezoning. He would like to reinforce that this is being watched very closely by the community and the message that they are sending is significant. They are very concerned and want to see that the Board is doing their due diligence and watching that the quality and state of the neighbourhood are upheld.

- Is the ridge line 4-5" over is it 9", as if you are 4" higher at your midpoint than you will be 8" over at your high line?
 - So in this case, it is actually approx. 9" over.
- Due diligence should play a better role in this if it is a major amount over height, but this is a minor height variance and was unintentional
- Corrections could have been made by having more inspections at different points as it would be a better system if a more rigorous application of surveying was upheld at different stages to avoid these possible problems so late into the project when it isn't as easy to correct.

Public portion of the meeting closed

- Have heard suggestions that there was a compounding of errors with the trusses being ordered incorrect, although there seems to be no indication of any correspondence or documents that would indicate that. It appears that the only error was that the foundation was laid too high, and that there is now a lack of clarity in the drawings to represent what has happened or been built.
- The drawings are not clear, they need a confirmation of the mid-point of eave, and the drawings to match.
- It would be recommended that the designer attend the next time around

Moved: Rus Collins

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the application be adjourned until correct plans are provided and request that the designer attend at the next meeting for clarification.

Carried (unanimous)

Jaime Hall recused himself 1:48pm

**1:10 Board of Variance Appeal #00635
Ernest Hanson, Ernest Hanson Design, Applicant; David and Valerie Coopersmith,
Owners
1704 Hollywood Crescent**

Present Zoning:
Present Use:

R1-G - Gonzales Single Family Dwelling District
Single Family Dwelling

The proposal for the single family dwelling requires variances for storeys, roof deck and front and rear yard setbacks. The accessory buildings require variances for the location, rear and side yard setbacks and separation space between it and the principal building.

Bylaw Requirements	Relaxation(s) Requested
Part 1.6.4 a.	Relaxation for number of storeys from 2 to 3.
Part 1.6.4 b.	Relaxation to permit a roof deck.
Part 1.6.5 a.	Relaxation for front yard setback from 7.50m to 3.50m. Note: The existing setback is 2.40m.
Part 1.6.5 b.	Relaxation for rear yard setback from 9.10m to 2.28m. Note: The existing setback is 1.40m.
Schedule F, Part 1.	Relaxation for location in rear yard to the front and side yard (north).
Schedule F, Part 4.a.	Relaxation for rear yard setback from 0.60m to 0.50m.
Schedule F, Part 4.b.	Relaxation for side yard (north) setback from 0.60m to 0.08m.
Schedule F, Part 4.d.	Relaxation for the separation space between an accessory building and the principal building from 2.40m to 1.50m

Dave & Val Coopersmith, Owners/Applicants; Ed Hanson, Designer; Notified neighbours, Katherine Davies, Keith Rodrigue, 117 Wildwood Avenue, Ricki Goltmon, 109 Wildwood Avenue, John Booth, 114 Wildwood Avenue, Fran and Barry Sadler, 1710 Hollywood Crescent, Dee van Straaten, 110 Wildwood Avenue, Adelle & Wayne Hatch, 1661 Hollywood Crescent, Laurie Clarke & Harry Weiler, 1665 Hollywood Crescent were present.

Applicant

- Have owned the home for nearly 4 years, and is a 2 bedroom, 1 bathroom bungalow and is inadequate in space for their family
- When they purchased the house in 2013 it came with a complete set of architecturally approved plans for an addition to the top floor, which was one of the main reasons that they purchased this property
- The intention has always been to renovate this property when they retire, but keeping with the character of the home and enhance the neighbourhood not diminish it
- The largest body of requested variances are due to the structures that were already on the property when they purchased it and the defining fact by the City that the front yard

is considered to be on Wildwood and not on Hollywood. Due to this factor the existing structure violates many of the setbacks outlined in the current bylaws

- Any renovation would require them to demolish large sections of the house at a huge and unnecessary cost
- A large volume of materials would also be required for the landfill
- R1-G allows any home to have 1.5 stories as long as roof of the basement does not exceed 1.2 meters above the grade of the property
- The most recent survey that was done on the property shows that the basement ceiling is exactly 11.5 inches over this limit, forcing them to claim their basement as their first floor
- The maximum clearance of their ground floor is 6.5 feet, and protruding bedrock from this area reduces the height to under 5ft in more than 5 locations. There is an area of 20sq feet that the ceiling is reduced to less than 5 ft.
- Due to this they would like to build an upper floor addition, similar to many of the other homes in the area
- They have asked for the consideration a full "3rd story as if they ask for a half story they would have to count the square footage of the garage on the main floor which greatly reduces the allowable space for the upper floor
- The addition they have presented does not exceed the height allowed, nor the site occupancy and total allowable square footage with the zoning
- House design has been carefully decided to be considerate of the homes original character and also the neighbourhood
- They are asking permission to add a balcony to the upper addition and by definition it is considered a roof top deck, although it is not on the roof. It is a south facing balcony directly on to Hollywood Crescent, and minimally impacts any of the neighbours. Many houses have second floor patios and balconies in the neighbourhood so this would not be out of keeping with that character
- They do not wish to demolish the home to be able to build to their needs, but if they cannot achieve this through way of reasonable variances they would entertain this as an alternative. They need to make more space to accommodate visiting family and friends in their retirement.
- A tear down and re-build would be much more disturbing to the neighbourhood and would be of greater time concern.

Ricki Goltsman, Notified Neighbour, 109 Wildwood Avenue

- If the application were approved it would adversely affect the home and quality of life for her and the impact would be immense
- The character of her own home will be changed from the daylight and ocean views that would be compromised
- Spends lots of time in the garden and a large structure will adversely affect her landscaping, gardens, sunshine and plants
- Property value will fall and a recent appraisal suggested that the value would fall approx. 50-75K if the application is approved
- The homes in the neighbourhood are predominantly 2 storeys
- The accessory buildings on the subject property are a problem – one shed is on the north east side of the subject property and the second to the north of that one. They block both view and light, and she believes that they are both potential fire hazards
- Would like to see that the efforts to balance the needs of all are considered with this application; the applicants, the neighbours and as a whole the Fairfield neighbourhood.

Keith Rodrigue, Notified Neighbour, 117 Wildwood Avenue

- If they approved the variance request for the house would the existing sheds be in compliance or would they still require relaxations?
 - No, they would not be in compliance if the house relaxations were granted and would require their own relaxations.

John Booth, Notified Neighbour, 114 Wildwood Avenue

- The house as it stands is a beautiful house and of a large size, and thinks that 2 floors in homes should be maintained, regardless of height of floors of the basement.

Fran and Barry Sadler, Notified Neighbours, 1710 Hollywood Crescent

- Their concern is with the height of the existing structure, and the impact of the daylight it will have on their house and the sunlight into their back garden
- Lived in their home for 43 years, and have become accustomed to the amount of sun and sunlight do not want to lose that

Dee van Straaten, Notified Neighbour, 110 Wildwood Avenue

- Is more concerned about the visual impact and mass of the home, it seems to be overpowering for the land mass that it will be built on and will be a significantly bigger home than most in the neighbourhood

Keith Rodrigue, Notified Neighbour, 117 Wildwood Avenue

- Have a 270 degree view and concerned about the design.
- They look over the top of Ricki's house to the mountains and would like to maintain their views
- If the house was expanded and resulted in one or more suites there would be a concern about density

Adelle & Wayne Hatch, Notified Neighbours, 1661 Hollywood Crescent

- Have lived in their property for 38 years
- Support the wish to remodel and modernize
- Also support the adjoining property owners concerns with respect to water views, sunlight, and loss of property values
- The proposal would have a small effect on her but a much larger effect on the others around them
- Quality of life with sunrises and sunsets, water views and light and sunshine in the winter are paramount for her and for all of the neighbours
- The proposal is for a large house on a smaller lot
- Will it be more than a family home or vacation rental? There have been homes that have had multiple owners with patios, decks, and hot tubs added, some used for vacation rentals and it detracts from the enjoyment of life for others in the neighbourhood with excessive noise that is created as a result
- Hope the applicants are not trying to overdevelop the lot and home and then sell it and move on

Laurie Clarke & Harry Weiler, Notified Neighbour, 1665 Hollywood Crescent

- Doesn't really affect them at all and would prefer to see the house built as is rather than digging below or tearing down to rebuild

Board

- What is the status of the sheds?
 - They inherited these with the purchase of the house, and were built by the previous owner without permits
- Applicant has been aware of the impact of their property to Ricki, and when they bought the house they removed all of the 10ft brambles, brushwood, and a troublesome holly tree close to their shared property lines to improve the property
- Are the sheds effectively in the side yard?

Nina Jokinen, Planning Technician, confirmed that yes, all sheds are considered in the side yard except the one closest to Wildwood which is considered to be in both the front and side yard

- If the side yard was considered a rear yard would the two sheds be too close to the setbacks there as well?
 - Yes, they would
- When the original house was built would the front yard be considered on Hollywood?
 - Yes
- What is the required height for habitable space in the basement?

Nina Jokinen, Planning Technician, stated that it would be a building code question and cannot confirm that.

- Believe for a legal suite the minimum legal ceiling height is 6'10"ft, but would have to have that confirmed.
- Did they consider lifting the house?
 - No, it wasn't part of their current plan but would also require variances and cannot obtain the square footage they desire by doing this, plus they will be below ground if they were to do this
- This is a retirement home? Somewhere you intend to spend rest of your life in?
 - Yes, this is true
- The plans indicate that you are adding 3 bedrooms on the top floor, plus a study. There is also a bedroom in the basement and a recreation room. There is also a potential to make this a suite?
 - Yes, they are adding this but the intention is not for a suite it is to accommodate the large extended family in Vancouver and overseas – they expect to have a steady stream of visitors to the home once the renovation to be completed
- The lot is small and the existing house are small, but with being a corner lot it is subject to challenges with setbacks as well
- It appears that the lot isn't wide enough to build anything at all given the current zoning bylaws for this property, what would be reasonable side yard or front yard setbacks that would be allowed, as it seems there are no guidelines?
 - It is not just the corner lot that proves problematic, it is the irregular shape of the lot, and is actually a reasonable sized City lot at 6000 sq. ft.
- Can the sheds be moved?
 - Yes, they can would just need to be dismantled. The two in the side yard that were inherited could certainly be disassembled and moved
- Would the sheds would still require a variance if they were moved anywhere else on the property?
 - Yes, but the variance would be less and would affect Ricki less

- Applicant is aware of the controversy of the plan for the home and are sorry they didn't have a better roll out of their ideas with the neighbourhood when they were making decisions with their plans but were working from Vancouver
- The applicant looks up at the rooflines of all of the surrounding rooflines when he stands on the top of their roof, and the proposed roofline of their property would still be lower than the houses around them by adding 7ft
- The plan that they put together for the current house and would change the direction of the secondary gable (which runs east/west and extends a foot beyond the foundation). The new plan would move it to run north/south– and would be 3ft shorter than current house
- Applicant has been a hot tub owner for 25 years, and is therapeutic for him as he has an artificial right knee. He plays approx. 90 soccer games a year and without it he is debilitated. Modern hot tubs are not noisy and the hot tub that they use is sized for 3 people, not 20.
- Will be retired in about 70 days and will then be in Victoria full time.
- Are hot tubs location considered in any way?
Nina Jokinen, Planning Technician, confirmed that they are considered an accessory structure and would need to be considered accordingly

Public portion of the meeting closed

- Awkward situation due to irregular shape of the lot due to the front yard and side yard setbacks, which would result in variance requests for them to be able to build anything. There is proven hardship for asking for additional storeys as the basement is low, mostly unusable and built on rock. There is support for saving the structure with renovating and not tearing down and rebuilding. There is no variance for height for the structure so this cannot be taken into consideration.
- Wanting to reuse the building is supportable, and is in actuality more expensive than a demo and building from scratch
- Sheds are extremely close to the property line and there is opportunity to reconfigure and make these less of an impact to the neighbours, and a better arrangement for the owner

Moved: Russ Collins

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

Carried - 2 for, 1 against

That the following variance be allowed;

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation(s) Requested

Part 1.6.4 a.

Relaxation for number of storeys from 2 to 3.

Part 1.6.4 b.

Relaxation to permit a roof deck.

Part 1.6.5 a.

Relaxation for front yard setback from 7.50m to 3.50m.

Part 1.6.5 b.

Relaxation for rear yard setback from 9.10m to 2.28m.

That the following variances be denied;

Moved: Trevor Moat

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

Schedule F, Part 1.

Relaxation for location in rear yard to the front and side yard (north).

Schedule F, Part 4.a.

Relaxation for rear yard setback from 0.60m to 0.50m.

Schedule F, Part 4.b.

Relaxation for side yard (north) setback from 0.60m to 0.08m.

Schedule F, Part 4.d.

Relaxation for the separation space between an accessory building and the principal building from 2.40m to 1.50m

Carried (unanimous)

Rus Collins recused himself at 2:40pm

1:30 Board of Variance Appeal #00636

**David and Gale Lale, and David and Lori Basich, Owners/Applicants
972 Walker Street**

Present Zoning: R1-B - Single Family Dwelling District
Present Use: Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is to replace the front deck, add new deck located at the west side yard and new dormer at the west side.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation(s) Requested

Part 1.2.5 a.

Relaxation for the front yard setback from 7.50m to 3.00m.

Note: The existing front yard setback is 3.00m.

Part 1.2.5 b.

Relaxation for the rear yard setback from 7.50m to 0.18m.

Note: The existing rear yard setback is nil.

Dave & Gale Lale, and David and Lori Basich, Owners/Applicants

Secretary read out list of the notified neighbours in support of the application, 933 Walker Street, Basement of 718 Pine Street, 711 Pine Street, 708 Pine Street, 963 Walker Street, 973

Walker Street, 841, 1025, 1017, 1021, 1031, 1020, 1007 McCaskill Street, and 890 Rock Heights

Applicant

- One variance request is to rebuild the front porch and stairs as they have no proper footings and is non-conforming
- The second request is for the need to put a dormer in as the existing interior stairwell is non-conforming, and they would like to open the house up to have a proper rise and run for the stairs with an open concept living area for the home. A dormer is needed to allow for this to also open up the access to bedrooms and stairwell upstairs.
- The third variance is for a little deck off the upstairs kitchen on the west side

Board

- Is the tree a cedar on the west side of the property?
 - Yes
- Long term intention with the property?
 - In the future, would entertain doing a development with both this property and the one next door that they own for them, maybe a townhome or something. For now, they are hoping to make a more habitable rental for a family
- In the relaxation requests – it states a nil existing rear yard setback?

Nina Jokinen, Planning Technician, answered that this property is actually two parcels of land, so the way the existing house is situated, it is actually going over the two property lines so becomes nil. Planning is only concerned with the new construction, not existing.

Public portion of the meeting closed

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder

Seconded: Trevor Moat

That the following variance be allowed;

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation(s) Requested

Part 1.2.5 a.

Relaxation for the front yard setback from 7.50m to 3.00m.

Part 1.2.5 b.

Relaxation for the rear yard setback from 7.50m to 0.18m.

Carried (unanimous)

Meeting Adjourned: 3:03 pm