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

1. Minutes

Minutes from the meeting held February 13, 2020

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder  Seconded: Jaime Hall
That the minutes from February 13, 2020 be adopted as presented.  Carried

Minutes from the meeting held February 27, 2020

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder  Seconded: Rus Collins
That the minutes from February 27, 2020 be adopted as amended.  Carried

2. Appeals

12:30  Board of Variance Appeal #00825
Sean Katz, Applicant
1915 Fairfield Road

Present Zoning:  R1-G - SFD
Present Use:  R1-G – Subdivision and new SFD with secondary suite

The proposal is to construct a new single-family dwelling with secondary suite on a newly subdivided lot.

Bylaw Requirements  Relaxations Requested
Section 1.6.5 (a)  Decrease the minimum front yard setback from 7.5m to 4.61m.
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
March 12, 2020

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 300m2 to 372.77m2.

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 that 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?
  o Yes.
- Has the slab been poured?
  o Yes.
- Prior to getting the building permit what geotechnical investigation was taken?
  o 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?
  o 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
**Motion:**

Moved: Jaime Hall  
Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the following variances be declined:

Section 1.6.3 (c)  
Increase the maximum floor area of all floor levels combined from 300m² to 372.77m².

Carried Unanimously

---

1:10  
Board of Variance Appeal #00826  
Dan Grecco, Applicant  
1550 Begbie Street

Present Zoning:  
R3-2 - Twelve-unit apartment

Present Use:  
R3-2 - Twelve-unit apartment

The proposal is to permit newly installed heat pump units to project into the west side yard setback.

**Bylaw Requirement**  
Relaxation Requested

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.

Dan Grecco, owner; Vidas Stukas, neighbour at 1536 Vining street were present.

**Applicant**

- The owner wanted to be environmentally friendly and has decided to go with a heat pumps as a result.
- There will be one heat pump per unit, for a total of twelve.
- The heat pumps could be placed on the Vining street side, but I don’t think it would be a nice thing to do as they are unsightly and could be noisy.
- The neighbour at 1529 Vining already has one heat pump on that side.
- These pumps will not be seen from the street.

**Neighbour:**

- The neighbour has lived in his residence for 41 years and is worried about the noise and unsightliness of the units.
- The neighbour requests that some shrubbery be planted to cover and decrease noise.

**Board**

- What is the setback from vining street?  
  - 3 meters.
• When did the issue of the heat pumps come to light?
  o 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?
  o 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?
  o 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?
  o 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