



MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF VARIANCE MEETING

Wednesday, September 22, 2021

7:03 p.m.

Remote Video / Teleconference

Present: Andrew Evindsen, Board Member, Acting Chair
Kurtis Williams, Board Member
Jim Wuest, Board Member
Evan Williams, Board Member
Darin Jefferies, Applicant

Absent: John Meagher, Board Member

Staff Present: Paula Kusack, Deputy Corporate Officer
Bev Endersby, Manager of Building & Licensing

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 7:03pm

The Acting Chair explained the procedures of the hearing.

2. **MINUTES**

Adoption of the December 9, 2020 Board of Variance minutes.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the December 9, 2020 Board of Variance meeting be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

3. **APPLICATION No: BoV00025**

Application No: BoV00025
Civic Address: 19920 46 Avenue
Owner: Darin Jefferies
Applicant: Darin Jefferies

The Acting Chair invited the applicant to present the application.

Mr. Jefferies thanked everyone for the opportunity to address the board and proceed to explain the reason for the request. He has lived at 19920 46 Ave for 4 years and is asking that the east and rear lot lines be reduced by 30cm to allow the door to his garage to align with the driveway. If he built the garage within the

setbacks in the zoning bylaw it would require him to drive around the corner of his house to access the door. It would be difficult to navigate and a safety issue driving around the blind corner of the home. The rear setback request is to enable the garage to be built long enough to accommodate the length of one small car behind a closed door. He noted the rear setback relaxation would allow enough room between the house and the front of the garage to access the backyard. He welcomed questions from the board members.

The board members had the following questions:

To the building inspector Mr. Wuest asked for clarification about whether the request is 1.2m from the property line to the wall of the building or the roof of the building.

The building inspector advised that it is from the property line to the foundation wall and that the building department does not have concern about the roofline.

Mr. K. Williams asked if the applicant explored any other options to accomplish the desired outcome, were there other options to consider?

Mr. Jefferies advise that he considered adding on to the existing garage but that would cut of access to the back yard. He noted that there is only 25 feet from the back of the house to the rear lot line and that there is 50 feet from the front of the house to the front lot line. He would like to maintain the small backyard that he currently has.

In response to a question about the possibility of extending the garage toward the front yard instead, Mr. Jefferies noted he would have to eliminate trees and resurface the driveway to accommodate that. He didn't want to lose the trees and it would be a further expense.

The building inspector noted that if the garage was detached, as proposed, the Zoning Bylaw requires accessory buildings to be to the rear of the principle residence, so it would not be permitted.

Mr. Evindsen noted that it could have been extended forward if it was attached, however agreed that could be cost prohibitive.

Mr. E. Williams felt the request was minimal and agreed that if the driveway did not align with the garage door it would be an impediment and very difficult, if not impossible, to navigate without hitting the house, creating a hardship. He further noted that there is no impact to the neighbouring properties and felt he could support the request.

Mr. Wuest noted that to build the garage within the setbacks would bring it so close to the existing building that it would be difficult to walk between the buildings. He considered that a hardship. He further noted that adjacent neighbours have not submitted any correspondence objecting to the application and therefore assumes that the variance would not affect the use or enjoyment of the adjacent lands. The neighbours have been notified of the opportunity to

comment and seeing as there was not input received, he concluded no substantial effect.

Mr. E. Williams agreed that the variance has no effect on anyone else. He noted that city council can change setbacks and when the lots were subdivided they made this lot difficult to build on. He felt the addition of a new garage was beneficial for everyone.

There were no further questions or comments and no public in attendance.

The Board further deliberated and noted the following:

Mr. E. Williams clarified with staff that because one member of the board is not in attendance there could be a tie, and if so, the application fails. Staff confirmed that is the case. Mr. E. Williams noted he is in favour of the variance application for reasons he stated earlier.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Board of Variance application BoV 00025 to reduce the rear and side lot line accessory building setbacks from 1.5m (4'11") to 1.2m (3'11") to allow for the construction of a single car garage at the rear of the single family dwelling located at 19920 46 Avenue be approved

CARRIED

Staff advised Mr. Jefferies that his application passed and he would receive a formal letter stating that. He was advised to contact the building department to start the building permit process.

4. ADJOURNMENT

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the meeting adjourn at 7:27pm

CARRIED

ACTING CHAIR

DEPUTY CORPORATE OFFICER