



Section 1.6.5 (d) Decrease the minimum side yard setback (for both sides) from 3.87m to 2.24m (south) and from 3.87m to 3.5m (north).

Wil Peereboom & Nick Salvador, from Victoria Design; Cam Brown, homeowner were present.

#### Applicant

- The owner is looking for variances only on Lot B to be equal or similar to the residence of Lot A.
- The frontage of Lot B is determining what setbacks are allowed.
- The owner would like to maintain the rear yard setback to keep away from neighbours and to have space for an accessory building in the back.

#### Board

- Is the intent to save the oak tree?
  - Yes.
- Has an arborist been spoken too?
  - Yes, the arborist said the tree would be fine with the current setbacks.
- Would there be interest in sliding the house back a couple more feet to lessen the impact on the critical root zone of the tree?
  - Yes, the owner wouldn't be opposed to it.
- Can the owner comment on the letters from neighbours?
  - I think the neighbours misunderstood the drawings of the driveway
- Why are there no windows on the south elevation?
  - Because of changes to code in the last few years, if you have a suite in the basement, there cannot be a window within 5 meters of an access point.
- Is there any option for relocation of that window access?
  - There may be room for a window high up. We would like to have skylights at least to have some light upstairs in those bathrooms

*Public portion of the meeting closed.*

- The applicant would like to adjourn the meeting to speak about pushing the house back further.

#### **Motion:**

To adjourn the application to the later date.

**Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder**

**Seconded: Jaime Hall**

**Carried Unanimously**

*Rus recused himself from appeal #00827 161 Robertson Street application*

---

**12:50 Board of Variance Appeal #00827**  
**David Yamamoto, Applicant; Alan Andrew, Owner**  
**161 Robertson Street**

---

Present Zoning: R1-G - Four single family dwellings (cottages)  
Present Use: R1-G - Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is to convert crawlspace to basement area in a single-family dwelling currently under construction.

***Bylaw Requirement***

***Relaxation Requested***

Section 1.6.3 (c)

Increase the maximum floor area of all floor levels combined from 300m<sup>2</sup> to 372.77m<sup>2</sup>.

David Yamamoto, applicant; Alan Andrew & Stephanie Andrew, homeowners; were present.

Applicant

- The basement is being claimed for floor space because the original excavation was only done to the depth in which to permit the original crawlspace areas.
- Hardpan conditions were much lower than expected, making excavation deeper than originally planned.
- The property is still under the floor area ratio limit.
- There is no aesthetic change to the house.
- Wheelchair accessible space is important for our family because of some past personal experiences.

Board

- Has the excavation taken place?
  - Yes.
- Has the slab been poured?
  - Yes.
- Prior to getting the building permit what geotechnical investigation was taken?
  - The owners had a specialist, but no digging was done. The consultant had worked on the neighbour's project beside our house in 2008 and thought he had a good grasp on the soil conditions.
- What are the options moving forward if this application was denied?
  - The applicant would have to look into building the floor up, dropping the ceiling down or to drop in a mezzanine level.

*Public portion of the meeting closed.*

- This is a significant amount of space, 800sq ft added to the residence



- When did the issue of the heat pumps come to light?
  - September, the building permit was approved and when we needed to amend the electrical permit is when the issue was brought to my attention.
- Is there an option to put the heat pumps on the roof?
  - I do not know the answer, my engineer has never brought that up to me as an option.
- Is there a third one already there?
  - No, not yet. There is only two on the survey the third has not been installed.
- Is there any plan to do any landscaping on the backside?
  - Yes, that is an option. The owner doesn't have an issue with that.

*Public portion of the meeting closed.*

- Appreciation that the applicant is willing to work with neighbours.

**Motion:**

**Moved:** Jaime Hall

**Seconded:** Rus Collins

That the following variances be approved:

Section 3.3 (12)

Decrease the minimum side yard setback (west) from 3.00m to 2.28m.

Note: existing is 2.70m to the building.

**Carried Unanimously**

Meeting Adjourned at 1:49 pm

---

---