

**MINUTES
BOARD OF VARIANCE
COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 2, SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL
MAY 9, 2018, AT 6:00 P.M.**

Members: H. Charania (Chair), D. Gunn, M. Horner, R. Riddett
Regrets: R. Gupta
Staff: D. Blewett, Zoning Officer, T. Douglas, Senior Committee Clerk
Minutes: Moved by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the minutes of the Board of Variance meeting held April 11, 2018 be adopted as amended."
CARRIED

Cadboro Bay Road New house **Applicant: Daniel Boot OBO Daniel Weinberger & Carolyn Brandly**
Property: 3796 Cadboro Bay Road
Variance: Relaxation of front lot line from 7.5 m to nil

BOV #00702 The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Signatures of no objection received from six residences.

Applicants: Daniel Boot, applicant, and Daniel Weinberger, owner, were present in support of the application. A model of the project was presented to show rationale and the following was noted:

- At present the driveway is difficult to negotiate and they can only back out, which is dangerous.
- The proposed home has a 3-point turn into the garage.
- They would like to have a smaller footprint.
- The overall house complies, it is the carport that requires a variance.
- The old house encroached on the neighbours.
- The intent is to create one wall to support the carport.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 230.4(a)(i), further to the construction of a new house with a carport on Lot 2, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 22401 (3796 Cadboro Bay Road):

a) relaxation of front lot line from 7.5 m to nil

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire."

Board comments:

- The hardship is that this is an odd shaped, sloped lot with environmental restrictions.
- There is a need to turn the cars to safely leave the property.
- The variance sounds major but it affects a small portion of the lot.
- The closest affected neighbour does not have any objections.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Darwin Avenue
Deck addition
BOV #00705

Applicant: GVA Contracting Inc. OBO Lesley Crawford
Property: 852 Darwin Avenue
Variance: Relaxation of interior side lot line from 1.5 m to 1.00 m
Relaxation of combined side yards from 4.5 m to 3.45 m

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Mr. Gunn stated that he met with the applicant during the site visit.

Applicants: Fred Doucette, applicant, and Lesley Crawford, owner, were present in support of the application. The following was noted:

- They would like to start with this project as soon as possible.
- It will be of benefit to have a second entrance onto the deck. Currently the only entrance is via the master bedroom.
- The property was purchased in 2005.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: **MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 210.4(a)(ii), further to the construction of a deck addition to the house on Lot 43, Section 33, Victoria District, Plan 1397 (852 Darwin Avenue):**

- a) relaxation of interior side lot line from 1.5 m to 1.00 m
- b) relaxation of combined side yards from 4.5 m to 3.45 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variances so permitted by this Order will expire."

Board comments:

- There is no increase to the dimensions of the present encroachment, though the mass is increased.
- This is an appropriate response to the current house design and siting.
- The applicant has made improvements to the home and the proposed variance is reasonable.
- This will give access to the back yard from the other side of the house.
- This meets the intent of the bylaw and does not negatively affect neighbours or the environment.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Cordova Bay
Road
Sea wall
BOV #00706

Applicant: Douglas Beale and Heidi Rachlin
Property: 4971 Cordova Bay Road
Variance: Relaxation of maximum height for a structure within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 3.00 m
Relaxation of maximum height for a retaining wall within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 1.25 m

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received.

Applicants: Doug Beale, applicant/owner, was present in support of the application. The following was noted:

- A description of the erosion rate was given. They need to protect their property and the variance will allow them to address the erosion issues.
- The original sea wall was built in 1994. They would like to have a more stable wall.
- Discussions have been held with Environmental Services regarding the issues on this property.
- They will essentially be replacing fallen rocks and maintaining the existing slope. They will not be going any higher than what is existing.
- They were not aware of the manhole until the erosion exposed it.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: MOVED by R. Riddett and Seconded by M. Horner: “That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 5.16(b), further to the construction of a sea wall and a retaining wall on Lot 13, Section 29, Lake District, Plan VIP857 (4971 Cordova Bay Road):

- a) relaxation of maximum height for a structure within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 3.00 m
- b) relaxation of maximum height for a retaining wall within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 1.25 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variances so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- There is a hardship with the erosion that is occurring and this is supported by the Engineer’s report.
- They are restoring an existing wall.
- The loose natural rock is attractive.
- The intent of the Bylaw is to prevent a building so they are not going against the Bylaw intent.
- Environmental considerations have been taken, this protects the shoreline.
- This is a reasonable request.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Cordova Bay Road Sea wall	Applicant: Allen Dakin Property: 4965 Cordova Bay Road Variance: Relaxation of height for a structure within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 1.10 m
---------------------------	---

BOV #00707

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received.

Applicants: Allen and Elaine Dakin, applicant/owners, was present in support of the application and had nothing to add.

The Board noted that this application is almost identical to the previous one, with the same Geotechnical report. No questions were asked.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: **MOVED** by R. Riddett and **Seconded** by M. Horner: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 5.16(b), further to the construction of a sea wall on Lot 10, Section 29, Lake District, Plan VIP14458 (4965 Cordova Bay Road):

- a) relaxation of height for a structure within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 1.10 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- There is a clear hardship. Their lot will be eroded if there is no action taken.
- This is a reasonable request.
- They are not going against the intent of the Bylaw.
- This will not take away any of the public enjoyment of the beach.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Major Road
Accessory
building

Applicant: Clive and Claudette Cross
Property: 4847 Major Road
Variance: Relaxation of front lot line from 7.5 m to 3.66 m

BOV #00708

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received. Mr. Charania stated that he met with Ms. Cross during the site visit.

Applicants:

Claudette Cross, applicant/owner, was present in support of the application. The following was noted:

- The foundation and pad has been there since 1979. It is well-built and in good condition.
- They have never had a garage on the pad but would like to construct a double car garage with one big door.
- The garage will be constructed as per the specifications provided in the application.
- The siding could change but the design will not change.
- There is no intention to make this building into a secondary suite.

Public input:

Nil

MOTION: **MOVED** by D. Gunn and **Seconded** by M. Horner: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 295.4(a)(i), further to the construction of an accessory building (garage) on Lot 2, Section 121, Lake District, Plan 1308 (4847 Major Road):

- a) relaxation of front lot line from 7.5 m to 3.66 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- The rock outcrop on the property is a hardship that merits relief.
- The adjacent narrow road is unlikely to be developed.

- The existing foundation wall is 12 metres from the road.
- This is a minor variance.
- This will suit the neighbourhood and will not negatively impact the environment.
- The lot shape is unique.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Regina Avenue
Addition

BOV #00709

Applicant: Rick Humphries
Property: 79 Regina Avenue
Variance: Relaxation of height from 6.0 m to 6.81 m
Relaxation of single face height from 6.0 m to 7.00 m
Relaxation of combined side yards from 4.5 m to 3.00 m
Relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 99.95 %

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received.

Applicants:

Rick Humphries, applicant/owner, and Peter Johannknecht, and Will Grizonski, designers, were present in support of the application, and they submitted signatures of no objection for the record. The following was noted:

- The proposed house has three bedrooms.
- They have tried to keep the variances to a minimum. They have proper front setbacks, and trees have been saved where possible.
- Saanich owns 77 Regina Ave. and the applicant owns 81 Regina Ave.
- The home will fit into the neighbourhood.
- This will be a good example of how micro houses will work on smaller lots.
- A lot of time has gone into the design of this project.
- This is a small lot that only permits a 10' wide house. A house that width would look odd in the neighbourhood
- The existing garage is less than 1' away from the neighbouring property.
- Joining 79 and 81 Regina Avenue may be possible but this would be a loss.
- This is a typical 2-storey home and they are keeping things in proportion to the size of the lot.
- The size of the lot is the hardship. A variance would be needed for any house proposed for this lot.
- The applicant is undecided as to whether his family will live in this home or sell it.

Public input:

Nil

MOTION:

MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 5.27(a), 210.4(a)(ii) and 210.4(c), further to the construction of a new house on Lot W7, Section 14, Victoria District, Plan 877 (79 Regina Avenue):

- a) relaxation of height from 6.0 m to 6.81 m
- b) relaxation of single face height from 6.0 m to 7.00 m
- c) relaxation of combined side yards from 4.5 m to 3.00 m
- d) relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 99.95 %

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variances so permitted by this Order will expire."

Board comments:

- The height is not excessive and is not higher than the other homes in the area.
- The Bylaw intent is to curtail massing. This proposal meets that intent.
- The width of the lot is a hardship.
- There is no basement and they are making sure of maximum lot use.
- The lot next door owned by the municipality will not be built on so this gives the appearance of an adequate side setback.
- This is a creative proposal that is suitable for the neighbourhood.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Duke Street
Deck addition

BOV #00710

Applicant: Evan Jones
Property: 1205 Duke Street
Variance: Relaxation of rear lot line from 7.5 m to 2.80 m
Relaxation of combined front and rear lot lines from 15.0 m to 7.35 m

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Letter of support received from one residence. Letter not in support received from one residence.

Mr. Gunn stated that he knows Mr. Jones personally, and they met on the site visit.

Applicants:

Evan Jones, applicant/owners, was present in support of the application and he stated that the deck is the only way he can enjoy his back yard as he has limited mobility and the yard is sloped and not level. The deck needed repair and he felt extending it a little in order to accommodate a table and barbecue would help him be able to age in place and enjoy the outdoors.

Public input:

H. Radtke, 3685 Kathleen Street:

- Supported a variance request for the original house when it was built because the lot was small.
- Feels that the new deck is too large and is concerned that the tree it is built against could fall over and take out the power lines.
- Feels that this should be denied because the applicant just built the deck without following the rules and obtaining necessary permits.

V. Kuhl, 1202 Duke Street:

- The deck is not highly visible from her house, she can see the end of it.
- She knows that permits should have been obtained, but hopes for an exception as the applicant has a walking disability and his property has a steep slope.

The following responses to questions are noted:

- The applicant has lived there for three years.
- The deck was built a month ago. It is not finished.
- He did not go through the permit process. It started as a deck repair, and he did not think a permit was required for a repair. Then the decision was made to extend the deck.
- He apologized to the neighbour as he did not think this would cause a negative impact to them.
- He has bad knees and walking is difficult in general.
- There is a legal suite with tenants in the home.

When asked if he would be agreeable to reduce the deck to the measurements originally granted by the Board in 2009, the applicant stated that he could try to bring the deck in and trim it back. With this, the Zoning Officer worked with the applicant to amend the plans at the table. **The Plans were amended to allow for a variance of the rear lot line from 7.5 metres to 3.5 metres, and relax the combined front and rear lot lines from 15.0 metres to 8.03 metres.**

MOTION: MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 210.4(a)(i), further to allowing an existing deck addition to remain as is on Lot 2, Section 32, Victoria District, Plan VIP1399 (1205 Duke Street):

- a) relaxation of rear lot line from 7.5 m to 3.50 m
- b) relaxation of combined front and rear lot lines from 15.0 m to 8.03m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variances so permitted by this Order will expire."

Board comments:

- This is a good compromise. There is a hardship with the narrow lot.
- Relief has already been granted for the house. The deck will have a new setback.
- The deck design is a creative solution for a challenging lot.
- The neighbours should be satisfied that they are not adding to the previous variance.
- They built the deck without a permit and they cannot support this.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
With H. Charania OPPOSED**

Laval Avenue
Addition

BOV #00711

Applicant: Villamar Construction OBO Ivor and Cecelia Behenna
Property: 1829 Laval Avenue
Variance: Relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 83.03%

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Signatures of support received from three residences.

Applicants:

Duane Ensing, applicant and Ivor and Cecelia Behenna, owners, were present in support of the application. The following was noted:

- They are wanting to add a suite to their home to accommodate their family who is moving back to Canada.
- The current home has no basement.
- They are asking for about 90 m² to build the addition.
- They are trying not to waste space. Adding a basement wastes space with the need for stairs, and it also costs more to excavate and put in drainage.
- Hardship, if a basement was required, includes the high cost of excavation, loss of floor space and an awkward design.
- This addition will not negatively affect neighbours and will not be seen from the street. They have letters of support.
- They are under the allowable lot coverage and floor area ratio.

In response to the comment that this feels like a duplex, the Zoning Officer stated that the proposed design is permitted in the Bylaw and it meets the regulations surrounding secondary suites.

Board comments:

- This request is to allow for the unification of family.
- This is an extension of the house that results in a minor 83.03% non-basement area.
- It does look like two houses being stuck together.
- Adding a basement could cause more problems. There is no request for additional setback relaxations.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: **MOVED by R. Riddett and Seconded by M. Horner: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 210.4(c), further to the construction of an addition to the house on Lot 22, Section 38, Victoria District, Plan 21661 (1829 Laval Avenue):**

a) allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 83.03%

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- This is a minor variance. Having to build a basement to comply with the bylaw is unreasonable.
- The design is good, albeit odd looking.
- They are only dealing with non-basement area; all other areas are in compliance.
- There is no objection from neighbours.
- Concerned the hardship is based on personal circumstances, but because this is minor and will fit in the neighbourhood, will support it.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Santa Clara Avenue Addition
BOV #00712

Applicant: Ryan Hoyt Designs OBO Patrick Armstrong and Michelle Tousignant
Property: 5153 Santa Clara Avenue
Variance: Relaxation of interior side lot line from 3.0 m to 1.40 m

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received.

Mr. Charania stated that he met with Mr. Armstrong at the site visit and was told that the sunroom would be turned into a dining room.

Applicants:

Ryan Hoyt, applicant, was present in support of the application. The following was noted:

- The present sunroom is 14’ and the proposed is 16’.
- The proposed new construction does not encroach further into the side yard.
- The deck size is 9’6” by 4”.

- The property was granted a variance previously and they are not increasing this.
- The house sits oblique to the property.

The Zoning Officer provided an explanation of the variances that were previously granted and about the lot size.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: MOVED by R. Riddett and Seconded by M. Horner: “That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 101.4(a)(ii), further to the construction of an addition to the house on Lot 2, Section 45, Lake District, Plan 15429 (5153 Santa Clara Avenue):

- a) relaxation of interior side lot line from 3.0 m to 1.40 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- The encroachment is not any bigger than existing.
- The legacy zoning for this property is not appropriate.
- The structure is already there.
- This is an improvement to the house and not a significant increase.
- The lot and house placement is a hardship.
- Because the site was not adequately marked this variance could not be supported.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
With D. Gunn OPPOSED**

Malton Avenue
New house

BOV#00713

**Applicant: Raminder Mahal
Property: 4088 Malton Avenue
Variance: Relaxation of combined front and rear lot lines from 15.0 m to 13.50 m
Relaxation of height from 7.5 m to 8.47 m
Relaxation of single face height from 7.5 m to 9.33 m**

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Letters of no objection received from four residences.

Applicants:

Rishi and Anika Sekhon, applicant/owners, and Lindsay Baker, designer, were present in support of the application. They stated that they spoke with neighbours, and submitted letters of support. They also submitted a geotechnical report that provided information about the water issues on the property. The following was noted:

- One family member is an elderly person that has mobility and other health issues and is looking at upcoming surgery. They will need a wheelchair and walker and the steep slope on the lot presents a challenge.
- The covenant is restrictive and makes design alternatives difficult. The variances requested all related to the slope of the land.
- A neighbour at 4080 Malton Avenue had the same problems and asked for a similar variance.

- They hope to have minimal impact on the environment. They must build a green gold-standard home. If they do not receive the variance they will have to excavate more which impacts the environment.
- The front and the rear of the building meets the setback, but the combined does not meet because of the restrictive building envelope.
- They are adhering to the design covenant and have spoken with other landowners and realtor to the whole development in this regard.
- A description of the various covenants and easements were given.
- They are proposing to bring the house up to the cul-de-sac level.

Public input: Nil

MOTION

MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by M. Horner: “That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 220.4(a)(i) and 220.4(b)(i) and (ii), further to the construction of a new house on Lot C, Section 32, Victoria District, Plan EPP70463 (4088 Malton Avenue):

- a) relaxation of combined front and rear lot lines from 15.0 m to 13.50 m
- b) relaxation of height from 7.5 m to 8.47 m
- c) relaxation of single face height from 7.5 m to 9.33 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variances so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- The covenants, roofline restrictions, natural area protection and the slope of the lot are a hardship.
- The footprint does not give space so they had to step the roof back.
- The neighbours are supportive.
- Not having to excavate is better for the environment.
- This request meets the intent of the Bylaw.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

<p>Santa Clara Avenue Gate</p>	<p>Applicant: Louis Webster OBO Pietro and Cicilia Granziera Property: 5231 Santa Clara Avenue Variance: Relaxation of height from 1.5 m to 2.08 m</p>
<p>BOV#00669</p>	<p>The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received.</p>
<p>Applicants:</p>	<p>Lou Webster, applicant and Cicilia Granziera, owner were present in support of the application and had nothing further to add. The following responses to questions were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing man-gate is 82” and is installed. The car gate (not yet installed) can be mounted at 78”. ▪ The caps on top of the posts are decorative. The decorative spikes on the gate could be removed as they are not integral to the structure. ▪ The gate is made of either iron or steel. The vertical slats provide a clear sightline and are not a visual obstacle. ▪ Mr. Granziera built the posts and then ordered the gate. He was not aware that the Bylaw for the front height was so low and had built based upon other posts and gates in the neighbourhood.

- An 82” variance would include all aspects of the fence.
- If rejected they will have to rebuild the man-gate, re-order the car gate and lower the brick posts.
- They stopped building when it was brought to their attention that they were in non-compliance.
- They understand the concern about non-compliance but the structure is not imposing and is consistent with much of the neighbourhood.

In response to a question, the Zoning Officer stated that the Bylaw is to prevent gated communities from being built.

The applicant was asked if a compromise of 1.85 m for the maximum would be accepted. This would allow them to keep the posts with a light on top, but they would have to lower the man-gate and remove the spikes. The applicant agreed that this compromise would work.

Public input: Nil

MOTION **MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 6.2(f)(i), further to the existing driveway gate and posts at Lot 1, Section 44, Lake District. Plan 50126 (5231 Santa Clara Avenue):**

- a) relaxation of height from 1.5 m to 1.85 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- The stone posts are a design element that the applicant could keep. The gates should be modified by cutting the spikes.
- The look and design of the proposed gate is open.
- The post width is not cumbersome, you can see the house and it is not imposing.
- Similar posts on two or three nearby properties were in full compliance.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
With H. Charania OPPOSED**

Sapphire Road
Accessory
building

Applicant: Chelsea Ritchie
Property: 5218 Sapphire Road
Variance: Relaxation of rear lot line from 1.50 m to 1.45 m

BOV#00714

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received. Mr. Gunn stated that he met with the applicant during the site visit.

Applicants:

CJ Ritchie, applicant/owner, was present in support of the application. She stated she had spoken with a building inspector when inquiring about building an addition to her house and at that time learned that the existing structure is in non-compliance. She wishes to legalize the structure.

In reply to a question, the Zoning Officer stated that the request is to approve the building as is. If the applicant wishes to make any modifications to the home in the future she will need to apply accordingly.

Public input: Nil

MOTION **MOVED** by D. Gunn and **Seconded** by M. Horner: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 295.4(a)(ii), further to allowing an existing garage to remain as is on Lot 2, Section 32, Lake District, Plan 17068 (5218 Sapphire Road):

- a) relaxation of rear lot line from 1.50 m to 1.45 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variance so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- This is a minor variance and the structure is already built.
- This is a reasonable application, structure is existing, and has no impact.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Oldfield Road
New house

BOV#00715

Applicant: Ian Laing
Property: 5680 Oldfield Road
Variance: Relaxation of height from 7.5 m to 8.16 m
Relaxation of single face height from 7.5 m to 8.16 m

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received. All members of the Board stated they had met with Mr. Laing on site.

Applicants:

Ian Laing, applicant/owner, and Lindsay Baker, designer, were present in support of the application. The following was noted:

- It would take about 163 dump truck loads of earth to be moved if they have to push the elevation down.
- They have talked to the neighbours and received no objection. They are a located fair distance away from the neighbours.
- They are trying to move the front door up about 2’ as this would help with the driveway grade and make it easier to work with the elevations.
- The existing house is to become an accessory building and an agreement with Saanich will be made to this end.
- The septic system is at the back of the property.
- Excavated materials will be distributed around to fix the elevation, but overall they are hoping for minimal disturbance.

Public input: Nil

MOTION **MOVED** by D. Gunn and **Seconded** by R. Riddett: “That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 101.4(b)(i) and (ii), further to the construction of a new house on Lot 3, Section 69, Victoria District, Plan 13907 (5680 Oldfield Road):

- a) relaxation of height from 7.5 m to 8.16 m
- b) relaxation of single face height from 7.5 m to 8.16 m

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board in the application is not substantially started within two years from the date of this Order, the variances so permitted by this Order will expire.”

Board comments:

- This is a minor variance of 26" given the property size.
- The slope presents a challenge.
- Location is in the centre of the property with large setbacks and no impacts to neighbours or environment.
- The proposed building fits within the existing structures.
- Will be minimal impact from the road/not noticeable.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from R. Riddett, the meeting was adjourned at 9:28 pm.

Haji Charania, Chair

I hereby certify that these Minutes are a true
and accurate recording of the proceedings.

Recording Secretary