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

1. Minutes

   Approval of the August 27, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

   Approval of the September 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

2. Appeals

   12:30 Board of Variance Appeal #00855

   Duane Ensign, Villamar Designs, Applicant; Benjamin Allard & Elizabeth Bullen, Owners

   720 Selkirk Place

   Present Zoning: R1-B

   Present Use: SFD

   The proposal is to construct a new building on top of the existing foundation.

   **Bylaw Requirements**

   **Relaxations Requested**

   Section 1.2.3 b) Increase the maximum combined floor area of the first and second storeys from 280.00m² to 282.00m².

   Section 1.2.4 a) Increase the maximum number of storeys from 2 to 2.5.

   Section 1.2.5 c) Decrease the minimum (east) side yard setback to the building from 2.29m to 1.00m and to the steps to 2.00m.

   Duane Ensign, Designer; Elizabeth Bullen, Owner were present.

   **Applicant**

   - We are before the board seeking minor alterations to the plans approved at a previous hearing.
• This is the same house in the same location.
• This quickly became a project that went beyond what we had anticipated, especially with delays because of Covid-19.
• The house still has the same foundation. The only thing that has changed is the look of the house with a more contemporary design.
• The major hardship is if the application is not approved today, we would have to pull down the foundation and start over.
• All the neighbours we have spoken to have been in support of the application.

Board

• Is there a variance associated with the front entry porch?
  o No
• Is the side yard setback on the east side encroaching down to 1 meter?
  o Correct, the existing garage currently is within the setback (1.5m), but because of the angle of the house compared to the property line, as we extend it out it goes down to 1m.
• Is the main change from what we initially saw the design of the front of the house?
  o That is the main change yes, the main reason we are here is because it’s new construction for the framing. It hit the 75% threshold representing new construction from the City.
• How are you ending up at the 2.5 storeys instead of the 2 storeys?
  o There was a basement. It’s an existing situation.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

Motion:

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder  Seconded: Rus Collins

That the following variance be approved as requested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bylaw Requirement</th>
<th>Relaxation Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.2.3 b)</td>
<td>Increase the maximum combined floor area of the first and second storeys from 280.00m² to 282.00m².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.2.4 a)</td>
<td>Increase the maximum number of storeys from 2 to 2.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.2.5 c)</td>
<td>Decrease the minimum (east) side yard setback to the building from 2.29m to 1.00m and to the steps to 2.00m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried unanimously

1:00 Board of Variance Appeal #00856
Mark Laver & Kristyn Laver, Owners
955 Maddison Street

Present Zoning: R1-G
Present Use: SFD

The proposal requires a variance to side yard (south) setback and combined side yard setbacks.

Bylaw Requirements Relaxations Requested

Section 1.6.5.d Side yard setback (south) relaxed from 2.4m to 2.0m
Section 1.6.5.e Combined side yard setbacks relaxed from 5.4m to 4.5m

Mark Laver, Applicant was present.

Applicant

- Previously I proposed a detached studio in the front yard. The variance was denied because the suggestion was made that in order to approve the relaxation there had to be no other options. It was suggested that we attach the studio to the house instead.
- I’m now proposing to remove the old carport and attach an addition to the house.
- The hardship is that we have a driveway running down the north side of our property and the easement takes up such a large part of the property we are unable to use that space.
- The way we have proposed the addition is now works for the main entrance

Board

- In the letter and on the plans provided it shows the potential that this space could be used as a suite, is that correct?
  - Yes correct, I would still need a permit to use it as a secondary suite. It’s going to be my studio for at least a few years. Eventually it could be used as a suite for our children.
- Can you outline the correspondence with neighbours since the last application?
  - Yes, I have spoken with the neighbours again they seem to be happy with the changes and with the new layout.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- The request seems supportable given the easement along the north property line.

Motion:

Moved: Rus Collins Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the following variances be approved as presented:
### Bylaw Requirements vs. Relaxations Requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bylaw Requirements</th>
<th>Relaxations Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.6.5.d</td>
<td>Side yard setback (south) relaxed from 2.4m to 2.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.6.5.e</td>
<td>Combined side yard setbacks relaxed from 5.4m to 4.5m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried Unanimously

Meeting Adjourned at 1:15 pm