

**CITY OF VICTORIA
BOARD OF VARIANCE MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 13, 2018**

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

Absent: Jaime Hall

Staff: Chloe Tunis, Planning Analyst
Katie Lauriston, Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 pm.

1. Minutes

Minutes from the meeting held August 23, 2018

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder

Seconded: Trevor Moat

That the minutes from August 23, 2018 be adopted as amended.

Carried Unanimously

2. Appeals

12:30 Board of Variance Appeal #00738

**Susan Herman, Applicant / Owner; Karen Hillel of Hillel Architecture Inc., Architect
2949 Shakespeare Street**

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

The proposal is to construct a new bay window.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation Requested

Section 1.2.5 (a)

Reduce the front yard setback to the proposed bay window from 7.50m to 5.26m.

Susan Herman, Applicant / Owner and Karen Hillel, Architect were present.

Architect

- The applicants are looking to construct a bay window which will extend into the front yard setback.
- The owners' house and other homes on the block were built prior to the current zoning bylaws, and are located very close to the street. The house has a modest footprint.

Architect

- The owners are proposing renovations to the house, involving restoration and the addition of some modern pieces. A component will be removed at the back of the house.
- There is already a dormer on the south side of the house, and the proposal involves raising the roofline. There is already a dormer on the south side, but there is not enough headroom clearance for comfort or for building code compliance.
- The roofline will be raised, which technically increases the building's height due to how height is calculated. However, the peak and the bottom eave will remain as existing.
- The height is the only variance requested in this proposal.

Owner

An architectural model was shown to the Board, illustrating the proposed changes to the house.

- There are currently no bathrooms upstairs; the proposal will include three bedrooms and two upstairs bathrooms. Without the addition of higher dormers, it would not be possible to stand in the bathrooms.
- The spatter dash will be removed to expose the original shingle underneath, which is in good shape.
- The house was previously their neighbour, Lita's, house. The owners appreciate the house's original features and want to update the house to today's standards.

Board

- Will the eave of the dormers be higher than existing?
 - Yes, but the ridge will remain at the same height.
- Was a change in use for the coat room considered, to increase living space?
 - The owners appreciate the location of the coat room as it provides a walkway through the house. The view to the north is not as desirable and would not be an enjoyable room to sit in, so the room is well used as a utilitarian space.
 - The house originally had four rooms with no clear hierarchy, and the stair was moved to increase the functionality of the house.
 - The proposed layout allows for an expanded kitchen space while allowing light throughout the house.
- Was a window considered for the main floor bathroom?
 - The two bathrooms upstairs will have windows, so the main floor bathroom is more of a powder room.
- Is part of the house being removed at the south side?
 - Yes, the house is being made smaller.
 - Originally the front porch was open, but it is now enclosed as a room.
- Was the room being removed part of the original construction?
 - No; there was a lean-to with dark room and laundry room.

Neighbour

- The rear addition was constructed prior to 1972 when the previous owners moved in, and the house already had its stucco finish at that point.

- Why is the applicant not proceeding straight to building something of greater density?
 - The required approvals for a multi-family dwelling would take about a year, so the owner is looking to lift the building and have some construction completed before increasing the site's density.
- There is a sale sign on the building at the moment; is the designer acting for the current or prospective owner?
 - The designer is working for the current owner. The property is no longer for sale, but the sign has not been taken down.
- The building appears very close to the property line; have limiting distance calculations been completed for all the windows?
 - Yes; the building is located almost right on the property line, and a use with a greater density may allow for a zero lot line in the future.
 - Windows with egress will be added in the bedrooms, and there will be additional work completed to comply with fire code requirements.
- Was shifting the house to the centre of the lot considered?
 - If the building is moved from its current location, the existing driveway width would no longer be allowed, and parking would no longer be feasible.
 - It would also be considerably more costly to move the building than to have it lifted.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- The owner's approach is understandable and the proposed changes bring the building closer to the zone's intended use.

Motion:

Moved: Trevor Moat

Seconded: Rus Collins

That the following variance be approved as requested:

Local Government Act
Section 531 (1)

To permit structural alterations while non-conforming
use (duplex) is continued.

Carried Unanimously

Meeting Adjourned at 1:20 pm.
