

Edward and Bodil Sim, Owners, Sean Dance, Designer, and neighbour Yang Jian of 1761 Rockland Avenue were present.

A survey in support of the application from neighbours of Belinda Robbins of 1051 Beverley Place, Shannon Close of 1016 Richmond Avenue, Yang Jian of 1761 Rockland Avenue, Philip and Jenifer Butterfield of 1763 Rockland Avenue and Helen Reid of 1050 Beverley Place was acknowledged. A second petition was acknowledged, which noted support from neighbours of 1763 and 1761 Rockland Avenue, 1016 Richmond Avenue and 1051 Beverley Place, and a neutral response from neighbours of 1036 and 1040 Richmond Avenue.

Owners

- The owners purchased the house three years ago and the house no longer meets the owners' needs. An additional bedroom and ensuite bathroom are required on the main level, necessitating the front yard variance, and the existing upstairs bedroom and ensuite would be converted to a dressing room.
- The owners discovered through the building permit process that the rear deck was built without permits. A second variance is requested to legalize this existing deck.
- The house will not be rented out, although the owners have another house that they do rent out.
- The proposal will make the living space all on one floor, and the entertainment area will all be in the basement.

Designer

- The main floor addition extends approximately 14ft. into the front yard. The addition needs to be in this location for convenience in construction and in cost; the plumbing for the ensuite is located on this side of the house and this is the best place for an addition in the house without encroaching into the side setback.
- The addition will accommodate the owners' daily living needs and will provide space for a dressing room and home gym upstairs.

Board

- Is no work on the rear deck proposed?
 - No, the variance is to legalize what is already built.
 - Steps from the deck would be convenient.
 - The planning technician noted that the stairs are not included in this application, so another application would be required to allow stairs.
- If stairs from the deck are desired, the applicants could request that the Board's decision be adjourned and revised plans could be submitted to include stairs.
 - The owners do not wish to delay the project, and stairs are not necessary.
- What features of the property create hardship?
 - There are two ends of the house; the living quarters and the formal/social quarters. The proposal would maintain this balance and would allow for a reasonably-sized bedroom on the main floor.
 - Running the plumbing to the other side of the house would create undue hardship.
 - There are trees and fence at the front, so the addition will not be visible to the street and will not impose upon neighbours.
 - The proposal will maintain the character of the house and will not require extending the foundation, demolishing the garage or constructing a new house, which would significantly increase construction and engineering costs.

Neighbour

- Yang Jian of 1761 Rockland Avenue noted that he respects the project for the neighbourhood. However, he is concerned for the privacy between his back yard and the applicants' deck.
 - The owners clarified that a large hedge surrounds their property; can the neighbours see the deck?
- The neighbour confirmed that a large tree used to obscure the view to the owners' deck, but the tree has now blown down.
- Seeing as the deck already exists, the neighbour has no issues with the proposal.

Board

- On whose property was the tree?
 - The tree was on the property at 1045 Beverley Place.
- Would the neighbour desire for the existing deck to be removed?
 - The neighbour is not certain.
 - The owner noted that the hedge between the properties is growing regularly and helps mitigate privacy impacts.
 - The neighbour replied that at this time, the deck is still visible over the hedge. However, the plan to relocate the master bedroom is supportable.
- The Board recommends that the neighbours continue working together to mitigate any privacy issues through landscaping.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- The proposal is the best way to construct the addition of the master bedroom in this location.
- There has been sufficient correspondence between neighbours and canvassing of the neighbourhood.
- There are no changes to the deck that would worsen existing privacy concerns. The Board encourages dialogue between neighbours.

Motion:

Moved: Trevor Moat

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the following variances be approved as requested:

Section 1.2.5 (a) Decrease the minimum front yard setback to the addition from 7.50m to 6.31m

Section 1.2.5 (b) Decrease the minimum rear yard setback to the deck from 7.50m to 5.23m.

Carried Unanimously

12:50 Board of Variance Appeal #00781

**Brad Johnson, Applicant / Owner; Gary Streight, Studio Ink, Designer
3024 Jackson Street**

Present Zoning:
Present Use:

R1-B – Single Family Dwelling District
Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is to construct an addition to the rear and side of the house, which contains a secondary suite and a deck.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxations Requested

Section 1.2.4 (a)

Increase the maximum height from 7.60m to 8.20m

Section 1.2.4 (a)

Increase the maximum number of storeys from 2 to 2.5.

Brad Johnson, Applicant / Owner, was present.

Owner

- The slope of the yard is such that it lowers the average grade of the site, which causes a technical increase in height.
- The project will create a one-bedroom suite for the owner's family, with a deck above.
- The owner has spoken to almost all neighbours and has had support from all neighbours except one, who the owner could not reach.
- A concern from neighbours was what would happen with the existing retaining wall. The owner has contacted geotechnical engineers, who have confirmed that the project would not cause issues for the neighbours.

Board

- The property at 3022 Jackson will have a partially obscured view of the deck doorway; is this an issue for them?
 - These neighbours are very supportive of the project and have indicated no concerns about this.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- The proposal makes sense given the sloped site.
- It is clear that the house will not appear any higher than it does presently.
- The neighbours appear to be supportive of the project.

Motion:

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder

Seconded: Jaime Hall

That the following variances be approved as requested:

Section 1.2.4 (a)

Increase the maximum height from 7.60m to 8.20m

Section 1.2.4 (a)

Increase the maximum number of storeys from 2 to 2.5.

Carried Unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.
