

**CITY OF VICTORIA
BOARD OF VARIANCE MINUTES
AUGUST 12, 2021**

Present: Trevor Moat, Chair
Rosa Munzer
Margaret Eckenfelder
Jaime Hall

Absent: Rus Collins

Staff: Thom Pebernat, Zoning Administrator
Alena Hickman, Planning Secretary

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

1. Minutes

Minutes from the meeting held July 22, 2021

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder

Seconded: Rosa Munzer

That the minutes from July 22, 2021 be adopted as amended.

Carried Unanimously

2. Appeals

**12:30 Board of Variance Appeal #00914
Nathalie Thiffault, Applicant; Brent & Andrea Brice, Owners
935 Cowichan Street**

Present Zoning: R1-G – Single Family Dwelling District
Present Use: Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is for renovations which include lifting the house and new secondary suite.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxations Requested

Section 1.6.5 a)

Relaxation to the front yard setback from 7.50m to 7.38m (note: existing setback is 7.38m)

Nathalie Thiffault, Applicant; Andrea Brice owner; were present.

Applicant

- The main floor of the house sits very low and does not have enough height to allow for a full basement for the family.
- The owners would like to raise the house 3ft, pour a new foundation and lower the house back down onto the original footprint.

- We have added in a few steps and the stairs have been reconfigured to not face the street and stay within the allowed setbacks.
- The main hardship is that the existing porch is already within the setback, and we don't want to lose the front porch.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- Accept as requested, reflects the existing setback and the house will be enhanced.
- Delighted to see the house being preserved.
- Applicant has taken great consideration to limit the variances.

Motion:

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder

Seconded: Rosa Munzer

That the following variances be approved:

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxations Requested

Section 1.6.5 a)

Relaxation to the front yard setback from 7.50m to 7.38m (note: existing setback is 7.38m)

Carried Unanimously

**1:00 Board of Variance Appeal #00915
Taylor McCarthy, Applicant; Roderick & Melinda Maclean
87 Cambridge Street**

Present Zoning: R-B – Single Family Dwelling
Present Use: Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is for renovations which includes a new shed dormer at the rear.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation Requested

Section 1.2.4.a	Number of storeys relaxed from 2 to 3 (as a result of dormer addition)
Section 1.2.5.b	Rear yard setback (east) relaxed from 7.93m to 7.59m (to existing rear deck)
Section 1.2.5.c	Side yard setback (south) relaxed from 3.0m to 2.28m (new dormer)

Taylor McCarthy, Applicant: Keil Monette-Sailant; Engineer were present.

Applicant

- The house was built in 1912 on a small lot.

- The clients asked us to look at increasing the usability of the house with the intent of maintaining the style and character.
- We suggested a dormer option which would allow more usable space.
- The dormer triggers the interior lot setback which is the main hardship.
- We don't meet the 4.5m setback because of where the house is located, and our options are limited because the house is already existing.

Board

- Have you spoken to your neighbours and if so, are they supportive?
 - The applicant personally went door to door on four different occasions. There were no complaints. There was a worry that the dormer would increase the height but that is obviously not the case. We have full support from all neighbours. They are very appreciative that we took the time to consult them.
- How long have the homeowners owned the property?
 - Since 2010
- Was the deck built with permits?
 - No, the deck was not built with permits.
- How is the structural integrity of the deck?
 - Good for the most part. The back wing could use some help, mostly because of the footings, but we see that as an easy fix.
- If there is an opportunity to remove one variance by making a repair to the deck, it may not be a bad idea to investigate that.
 - We didn't know about the deck until the variance revision. The homeowners said they would be willing to repair it or remove the damaged section, so we would be willing to look into that.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- Modest ask the preserves the existing structure.
- Appropriate improvement.

Motion:

Moved: Jaime Hall

Seconded: Margaret Eckenfelder

That the following variances be approved:

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation Requested

Section 1.2.4.a

Number of storeys relaxed from 2 to 3 (as a result of dormer addition)

Section 1.2.5.b

Rear yard setback (east) relaxed from 7.93m to 7.59m (to existing rear deck)

Section 1.2.5.c

Side yard setback (south) relaxed from 3.0m to 2.28m (new dormer)

Carried Unanimously

**1:30 Board of Variance Appeal #00912
Cam Pringle, Applicant; Yvonne Staniforth, Owner
3065 Balfour Avenue**

Present Zoning: R1-B – Single Family Dwelling District
Present Use: Single Family Dwelling

The proposal is to subdivide the existing lot keeping the existing building.

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation Requested

Section 1.2.5.c	Side yard setback (south) relaxed from 3.0m to 2.56m from proposed property line.
Section 1.2.5.d	Combined side yard setback relaxed from 4.5m to 4.16m

Travis-Lee, on behalf of Cadillac Developments Applicant/owner, was present.

The correspondence concerning the application was acknowledged.

Applicant

- Asking for a variance because we have come across the opportunity to save the existing house with a small variance applied to the North lot.
- We would like to invest in and upgrade the existing house to provide a more affordable home rather than demolish and build from scratch.
- The side yard needs the small setback to be able to preserve the house on the North lot and build a new house on the South lot.
- I tried to reach all the neighbours; unfortunately, I was unable to reach the neighbours to the south.

Board

- If you have an opportunity to revisit this parking option to make use of the existing driveway, I think you would alleviate a lot of stress.
 - We will and appreciate the comments and feedback.

Neighbours

- Kyla Voyle, neighbour to the south noted her concerns with a boulder that extends across her property and the new South lot, and specifically the impact construction in this area will have on her foundation.
 - Whenever we do a project like this, we always have an engineer come in to do an evaluation to ensure there is no damage to adjoining property.
- Tom Sims of 3064 Balfour Avenue is concerned with the existing garage being removed and wonders how many on-site parking spots will be provided.
 - We will have a shared driveway with off street parking concurrent with the zoning requirements.

- Will it be a single driveway?
 - It will come in as a single driveway and then widen out on the property. The garage doors of the house would be facing the shared lot line.
- How much parking will that provide?
 - It will be adequate parking per the zoning requirements.
- What will the cosmetic upgrades be to the existing home?
 - Windows, painting, things that will improve energy efficiency. Anything needed to make sure the property is operating properly.
- What about internal upgrades?
 - We will leave those details up to the new owners unless something needs to be upgraded immediately.
- Are you putting in a basement suite into the existing home?
 - No.
- What are the plans for the other lot?
 - We will either sell or build a home compliant withing the current zoning.
- Jenn McKillop 3060 Albany voiced concerned about the trees along the perimeter, particularly of the South lot.
 - Board Chair pointed out that the present application concerns the North lot only.
 - Any future development permit on the South lot would require an arborist's report before permits to remove any trees would be issued.

Public portion of the meeting closed.

- Minor variances and the existing house will be maintained
- Hearing the application for lot 2 not lot 1

Motion:

Moved: Margaret Eckenfelder

Seconded: Rosa Munzer

That the following variance be approved:

Bylaw Requirements

Relaxation Requested

Section 1.2.5.c

Side yard setback (south) relaxed from 3.0m to 2.56m from proposed property line.

Section 1.2.5.d

Combined side yard setback relaxed from 4.5m to 4.16m

Carried Unanimously

Meeting Adjourned at 2:28 pm.
