

Schedule F, section 4 (b) Decrease the minimum (west) side yard setback from 0.60m to 0.28m.

Schedule F, section 4 (d) Decrease the minimum separation space to the primary building from 2.40m to 1.41m.

Casey Herman, Owner & Fiancé were present.

The correspondence submitted in favour of the application from adjoining neighbour Sara DePol was read aloud.

Applicant

- This project started small to close in the garage and reduce break-ins.
- The hardship is that the garage is large and would be very hard to relocate.
- Neighbours are on board with the location of the garage.
- The variance gives neighbours more space as the garage is now and extra 6 inches further from their property line.
- The back yard has a green buffer which neighbours do not want to be disturbed.

Board

- Do the owners live at the house?
 - No.
- How long have the owners owned the property?
 - 12-13 years, the owners have rented it for the past 3 years
- Has the conflict of the garage possibly encroaching on the neighbour's property been resolved?
 - Yes, the owner phoned her last night. The garage is not encroaching on the neighbour's property, so the neighbour is happy with the location.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- This is the best location for the garage. Meeting the zone requirements would adversely impact the neighbours.

Motion:

Moved: Trevor Moat

Seconded: Rus Collins

That the following variances be approved:

Schedule F, section 1 Relaxation to the required location of the rear yard, to be located in the side yard and partly in the front yard.

Schedule F, section 4 (b) Decrease the minimum (west) side yard setback from 0.60m to 0.28m.

Schedule F, section 4 (d) Decrease the minimum separation space to the primary building from 2.40m to 1.41m.

Carried Unanimously

Jaime Hall recused himself from appeal #00807 due to conflict of interest.

**12:50 Board of Variance Appeal #00807
Chris Hansen, Owner; John Keay, Architect
820 Fisgard Street**

Present Zoning: R3-C - Central Area Residential District
Present Use: 25 Housekeeping units, 3 suites

The proposal is for interior repairs to housekeeping units damaged by fire.

Bylaw Requirement

Relaxation Requested

Section 531 (1)

To allow for structural alterations while continuing the non-conforming use of housekeeping units.

Chris Hansen, Owner; Jessica Allerton, Applicant; John Keay, Keay Architecture; Nicole Parker, Keay Architecture; Gord Peabody, Insurer; and Donald McLeod, neighbour of 832 Fisgard street were present.

Applicant

- This application is for a structural change.
- The owner would like to bring the current layout into conformity.
- During remediation from a fire that occurred a year ago, the owner discovered discrepancies between building plans from a previous permit and the current one.
- The applicant would like to have the ability to put the walls back up where they were before the fire.

Neighbour

- Donald McLeod of 832 Fisgard street noted concerns that the east wall is not secure. This wall has cracks and concrete pieces are falling off. The rain spout falls out over the neighbour's garbage shed, and the furnace vent sticks out to the property line over the neighbour's parking lot and emits gas.
- The neighbour asks that the down spout be redirected, and the furnace be inspected.

Board

- The issues with the structure and inspection of the building are something to be brought to the City specifically, not the Owner of the subject property.

Neighbour

- Donald McLeod noted he has not been given a substantive response from the City.
- Donald McLeod asked that approval of this application be on condition that the deterioration of the subject property be taken care of.

Insurer

- Gord Peabody, Insurer noted that these issues are outside the insurance claim. If there is an issue between the City and the Owner about the condition of the building that is a separate issue.

Owner

- The owner is addressing the issues raised by the neighbour.
- The owner was not aware of the gas pipe. New gas was recently installed. I will look into all these matters to make things better.

Board

- There is no window on unit #100. Is this an oversight?
 - Yes, there is a window in that suite.
- Are these alterations to bring the building back to what was on file previous to the fire?
 - Yes, correct.
- The board is sympathetic to what the neighbours are requesting. The building does have sections of brick coming down. It also looks like there is a window without a lintel. This is a safety issue and I recommend the owner have that inspected.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- The board recommends the variances be approved as requested.

Motion:

Moved: Rus Collins

Seconded: Trevor Moat

That the following variance be approved:

Section 531 (1)

To allow for structural alterations while continuing the non-conforming use of housekeeping units.

Carried Unanimously

1:10 Board of Variance Appeal #00808

**Peter Sundberg & Sonya Sundberg, Owners; John Keay, Architect
117 Maddock Avenue**

Present Zoning:
Present Use:

R1-B Single Family Dwelling District
Single Family

The proposal is to construct a two-storey addition located at the side and rear which includes a new secondary suite.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxations Requested

Section 1.2.5 c)

Decrease the minimum side yard setback (north west) from 3.00m to 1.63m.

Note: The existing setback to the house is 1.63m. The proposal changes the greater setback requirement of 3.00m to this side.

Section 1.2.5 d)

Decrease the minimum combined side yard from 4.50m to 3.16m.

Peter Sundberg, Owner; Nicole Parker, Applicant and John Keay, Architect were present.

The correspondence submitted in favour of the application from Deborah Chadwick of 121 Maddock Avenue, Stephanie Young of 125 Maddock Avenue, Susan Adams of 120 Maddock Avenue, Josephine Zupanc of 111 Maddock Avenue, Annabel Younes of 114 Maddock Avenue and Darryl Tindall of 3093 Harriet Road was read aloud.

Applicant

- The owner is proposing an addition to the east side, and relaxation on the west.
- This addition would create more living space, including a secondary suite.
- The current density with the suite is under what is allowed.
- The owners have spoken with neighbours. All are supportive.
- The applicant has designed this to try and keep as much privacy as possible for all neighbours.

Board

- Will there be adequate drainage for rainwater from the southeast portion of the roof?
 - The architect did consider that. The roof of the addition is lifted so that the interior layout flowed.
- Is there no way to tie the two roof lines together?
 - That was the original intention, but the roof would be more complicated if the architect tried to combine the two.
- The owner has some room to the rear yard setback to add additional space. The applicant is asking for the side variance. Is there an option available to increase floor space in the rear yard set back to reduce the variance?
 - That was discussed with the owners, the owners would like to keep the green space in the back yard. The neighbours would prefer this option.
- How long have the owners lived in the house?
 - 15 years

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- The request to utilize the side yard rather than the back is supportable. Neighbours are supportive.

Motion:

Moved: Trevor Moat

Seconded: Jaime Hall

That the following variances be approved:

Section 1.2.5 c)

Decrease the minimum side yard setback (north west)
from 3.00m to 1.63m.

Note: The existing setback to the house is 1.63m. The proposal changes the greater setback requirement of 3.00m to this side.

Section 1.2.5 d)

Decrease the minimum combined side yard from 4.50m to
3.16m

Carried Unanimously

Meeting Adjourned at 1:20 pm.
