

**MINUTES
BOARD OF VARIANCE
COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 2, SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL
SEPTEMBER 12, 2018 AT 6:00 P.M.**

Members: H. Charania, D. Gunn, M. Horner (Chair), R. Riddett
Absent: R. Gupta
Staff: D. Blewett, Zoning Officer, T. Douglas, Senior Committee Clerk
Minutes: Moved by H. Charania and Seconded by D. Gunn: "That the minutes of the Board of Variance meeting held August 8, 2018 be adopted as amended."

CARRIED

Revelstoke **Applicant: Latitude 48 Design Ltd. OBO Elizabeth Herring**
Place **Property: 3618 Revelstoke Place**
Addition **Variance: Relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 99.5%**

BOV #00742

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Two letters expressing concern were received. Signatures of support received from two residences.

Applicants: Ryan Wyllie, applicant and Elizabeth Herring, owner, were present in support of the application. Mr. Wyllie and Ms. Herring stated:

- The existing house was built in 1971 and the space has a unique and restrictive layout.
- They looked at the existing architecture and put a lot of thought into trying to create a home that meets the owner's needs.
- The plans indicate that there is a new sink, however this is an existing sink they are required to label as new because it is being replaced.
- They have two vehicles that require parking spots.
- The space is needed for the family, they would like to have three bedrooms plus an office using the existing footprint.
- There is a pool at the back of the property.
- Building over the existing dining room makes the best sense.

Public input: Two residents, 3620 Doncaster Drive:

- Are opposed to the application as it will affect the enjoyment of their property.
- They purchased in an established neighbourhood as they felt it was less likely for development to occur around them.
- The proposed plan will take away sunset views and ocean glimpses, and will result in a loss of privacy, create shadows and affect their resale value.
- Asked if there was any way to add to the lower floor.
- The applicant's gain is our loss if the variance is approved.

The applicant stated:

- They did look at expanding the main floor however the parents would like the children's rooms on the same floor. Expansion elsewhere is difficult due to the existing pool and established landscaping.
- They did consider neighbour's privacy; the proposed windows are not full size and are only meant to bring in light.
- The proposed height is well below the existing height and they have received signatures of support from two residences.
- The shadow study shows a minimal impact on the neighbours and there is also privacy and noise reduction with the existing bamboo trees.

- There is limited floor area because there is no existing basement.

The owner stated that they purchased the home in March 2018. It is a good home in the right location and has a view, but there are no perfect homes and they wish to renovate to make it more suitable for their family.

The applicant and owner responded to questions from the Board as noted:

- The current house exceeds the allowable floor space in non-basement areas; it is 88.5% (existing non-conforming).
- It makes the most sense to build on top of the existing space.
- They did not consider reducing the proposed room sizes. The design is based on the best cost efficiencies. Structural costs would increase if they make changes.
- The distance between the east property line to the main building is 54 feet.
- They need private office space for their home occupation; they are self-employed and currently operate out of the living room.
- They did inquire about rezoning but a panhandle lot does not qualify for rezoning.
- The pool is used by the owner.
- The reason for the clear storey is that it complements the existing architecture. This is lower than what can legally be built.

In reply to a Board member comment about rezoning the property to RS-8, the Zoning Officer confirmed that the Official Community Plan does not support the rezoning of panhandle lots.

Board comments:

- The massing is of concern given the size of the existing dwelling.
- No mitigation seems to have been done; the design principles are a factor.
- Hardship is not clear.
- This seems like a major variance and rezoning is not possible. Applicant may wish to consider a Development Variance Permit.
- There is a significant impact on the neighbours.
- The intent of the Bylaw for non-basement areas is to reduce the massing of the building. This proposal goes against the intent of the bylaw as the massing has increased.

MOTION:

MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: “That the request for variance to relax the allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 99.5% from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 210.4(c), further to the construction of an addition to the house on Lot 2, Section 43, Victoria District, Plan 24614 (3618 Revelstoke Place) be DENIED.”

CARRIED

Owlwood Place
Existing deck

Applicant: Erika Weide
Property: 982 Owlwood Place
Variance: Relaxation of interior side lot line from 1.5 m to 0.90 m

BOV #00750

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received. Letter with comments received from one residence. Mr. Charania and Mr. Gunn stated they met with the applicant during the site visit.

Applicants:

Jordan and Erika Weide, applicant/owners, were present in support of the application. They stated that a nearby neighbour recently told them that the

deck where the pillars are (lower deck) is original to the house. A Board member confirmed that a 2007 GIS photo shows a deck in place at that time. The Zoning Officer stated that if the Board wishes, staff could research whether the deck was approved with permits. Ms. Weide stated she did some research but did not find anything about the deck.

A discussion occurred regarding the cantilevered deck projection. In reply to concern expressed by Board members that the Bylaw could be subject to interpretation, the Zoning Officer stated that the post supporting a deck is not considered the building face and this interpretation by staff has been in place for years. Personal opinions regarding the Bylaw and/or interpretation may affect judgement, however the focus needs to be on whether or not undue hardship has been established.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: **MOVED by H. Charania and Seconded by R. Riddett: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 230.4(a)(ii), further to allowing the existing deck to remain as is on Lot 8, Section 8, Lake District, Plan 38338 (982 Owlwood Place):**

- a) relaxation of interior side lot line from 1.5 m to 0.90 m.”

Board comments:

- The deck is existing and this is a minor variance.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Falmouth Road
New house

BOV #00749

Applicant: Aspire Custom Designs Ltd. OBO Luke Nadiger
Property: 1049 Falmouth Road
Variance: Relaxation of interior side lot line from 1.5 m to 1.20 m
Relaxation of combined side yard setback from 4.5 m to 3.94 m
Relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 88.89%

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

Applicants: Lindsay Baker, applicant and Luke Nadiger, owner, were present in support of the application. Mr. Baker advised that a neighbour in attendance has expressed concern about saving mature Oak trees and has asked if the house can be moved forward.

The Zoning Officer noted that changes to the plans can be made at this meeting but could result in the average grade changing. Re-notification would be necessary if this was the case.

*****At the request of the applicant consideration of this item was recessed at 7:10 pm in order for the applicant, owner, and neighbour to have a discussion. Consideration of this item continued at 7:50 pm.*****

The applicant and owner stated that in reply to the neighbour’s concerns, they are requesting that the plans be amended by moving the proposed residence towards the front lot line to the minimum permitted setback of 6.00 metres.

Public input: Resident, 1051 Falmouth:

- They are in support of the application. This is a young person with a family trying to build a home.

Resident, 1047 Falmouth:

- They have lived here for 26 years and signed in support of this application.
- They were concerned when the stakes went in near the mature oak tree and they asked if the house could be moved to help protect the tree.
- They do not want to hold up the project and if moving the house forward is not feasible they withdraw their objections.

In reply to questions from the Board, the applicant stated:

- They feel they have proved their hardship with the challenging lot shape.
- The bump out in the upper level area is similar to a bay window and is not part of the footprint.
- Digging into the bedrock is very costly.
- They are still under the gross area.
- There are no plans for a secondary suite.

***** As the setback and non-basement variance requests were not affected by moving the house toward the front lot line, the plans were amended by moving the house forward to the minimum front lot line setback of 6.00 metres. *****

MOTION: MOVED by H. Charania and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 210.4(a)(ii) and 210.4(c), further to the construction of a new house on Lot 10, Section 33, Victoria District, Plan 5918 (1049 Falmouth Road):

- a) relaxation of interior side lot line from 1.5 m to 1.20 m
- b) relaxation of combined side yard setback from 4.5 m to 3.94 m
- c) relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 88.89%

And further that if construction in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board and amended at this meeting, 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 variances are minor in nature and are necessary.
- There is no real opposition and if the tree can be saved that is a plus.
- The rock outcropping makes a basement impractical.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Maynard Street
New house

Applicant: AJB Home Design OBO Kerry and Carla Davies
Property: 2581 Maynard Street
Variance: Relaxation of single face height from 6.5 m to 6.80 m for a flat roof

BOV #00752

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

Applicants: Taylor Simpson-Bisson, applicant, was present in support of the application and commented that the single face height rule is meant for stepped lots and this lot on Maynard Street is fairly flat.

In reply to questions from the Board, Mr. Simpson-Bisson stated:

- The house was purchased in January 2018.
- The home may be deconstructed rather than demolished.
- The proposed house will sit slightly into the ground and will be lower than the existing house.
- The existing Bylaw is the hardship as they do not have a huge face and the bylaw is not intended for flat lots.
- The left side elevation is the lowest face. The raised areas are the dining and living rooms.
- They did think about digging down a bit lower but staff recommended that the proposed plans appear to be the best solution.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: MOVED by H. Charania and Seconded by R. Riddett: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 230.4(b)(ii), further to the construction of a new house on Lot 1, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 16894 (2581 Maynard Street):

- a) relaxation of single face height from 6.5 m to 6.80 m for a flat roof

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:

- They could build higher with a pitched roof but that would look larger to the neighbours.
- The variance is minor.
- No objections have been received.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Altamont Road
Accessory
building

Applicant: John Griffin
Property: 4062 Altamont Avenue
Variance: Relaxation of rear lot line from 7.5 m to 1.50 m
Relaxation of height from 3.75 m to 4.35 m

BOV #00747

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received. Signatures of no objection received from 15 residences. Letter not in support from one residence. Mr. Charania stated he met with Ms. Griffin on the site visit.

Applicants: John Griffin, applicant/owner, was present in support of his application. He stated he did not realize that the dormers would be an issue and he stopped building when he learned there was a problem. He also noted that the hardship is the A-1 zoning of his property. His property is zoned differently than the surrounding homes and he feels it should be the same as the neighbours’.

The Zoning Officer described the Zoning rules regarding pitch less than 3:12.

- Public input:
- Two residents, 4051 Santa Maria Avenue,
 - They can see the structure from their kitchen and second floor bathroom and are in support of the variance.
 - The design of the building is in keeping with the house.
 - The gable roof and dormers blends in with the rest of the property and they do not understand why this is an issue.
 - There are many other buildings in the neighbourhood that are not in compliance.

The Zoning Officer stated that regardless of the other neighbourhood sheds, this structure is non-complying and this is why it has come before the Board.

Resident, 4070 Altamont,

- Has no problem with the building and feels it enhances the property.

In reply to questions from the Board, the applicant stated:

- He felt he had done a good job of building the shed, and there are many other non-compliant sheds in the neighbourhood that are over height and sited illegally.
- If he is denied the variance he will have to cut the dormers off. This will be costly as there will be a loss in materials and time spent.
- He needs the shed to keep his yard tidy. He keeps tools, fishing materials and plants in the shed. The dormer lights bring sunlight to the plants inside.

MOTION: **MOVED by H. Charania and Seconded by D. Gunn: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 101.7(a)(i) and 101.7(b), further to allow an existing accessory building under construction to remain as is on Lot 22, Section 5, Lake District, Plan 1730 (4062 Altamont Avenue):**

a) relaxation of rear lot line from 7.5 m to 1.50 m.”

Board comments:

- There is a setback hardship with the current A-1 zoning.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

MOVED by R. Riddett and Seconded by H. Charania: “That the following variance be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 101.7(a)(i) and 101.7(b), further to allow an existing accessory building under construction to remain as is on Lot 22, Section 5, Lake District, Plan 1730 (4062 Altamont Avenue):

MOTION:

a) relaxation of height from 3.75 m to 4.35 m.”

Board comments:

- The applicant was not aware of the dormers needing a height variance.
- One member felt the Bylaw intent is to ensure sheds do not impose on neighbourhoods. The roofline creates massing and effectively a second storey, but they do not feel it affects the enjoyment of neighbours.
- It would be a hardship to demolish a portion of a well-built building.
- It does not have a negative impact on neighbours.
- Applicant should have done due diligence.

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

Agnes Street Addition
BOV #00753

Applicant: Shaun and Brooke Bradley
Property: 528 Agnes Street
Variance: Relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 87.39%

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant's letter received. Seven signatures of no objection were received. Mr. Gunn and Ms. Horner stated they met with the applicant during the site visit.

Applicants: Shaun Bradley, applicant/owner and Lindsay Baker, designer were present in support of the application. In reply to questions of the Board they stated:

- The owner has lived in the home for eight years.
- There is a big rock outcropping that restricts digging down.
- The house was renovated (house lift) in 2007.
- There are four cars to park as they bought the house with their parents.
- The door to the kitchen is non-functioning, a refrigerator stands in front of the door on the inside.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: MOVED by R. Riddett and Seconded by D. Gunn: "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 17, Section 50 & 82, Victoria District, Plan 1893 (528 Agnes Street):

a) relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 87.39%

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 underlying rock makes having a basement impractical.
- The massing is not increasing.
- There is neighbour support and no negative environmental impact.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Chimo Place Addition
BOV #00754

Applicant: Victoria Design Group OBO Jie Zhang
Property: 1818 Chimo Place
Variance: Relaxation of rear lot line from 7.5 m to 7.45 m
Relaxation of combined front and rear lot lines from 15 m to 13.55 m
Relaxation of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 95.32%

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

Applicants: Wil Peereboom, applicant, was present in support of the application. He stated:

- The rear variance request is existing non-conforming; because they are asking for a second storey they need a variance in order to line up the walls.
- The front lot line meets the bylaw requirement but the combined does not.
- The existing garage is not large enough to fit a car.
- A small addition in the front is being removed.

- They basically meet the rear and the front setback but not the combined.
- The house is on a slab and they are asking to create a secondary suite over the garage. This is where the non-basement area request comes in.

In reply to questions from the Board, Mr. Peereboom stated:

- If denied they will remove the suite over the garage. They would also have to keep cars outside also as 16' is not a large enough size for a garage.
- They currently use the garage as a storage area.
- Regarding the secondary suite portion, they cannot create a basement under the existing slab.
- There are no objections from the neighbours and this is not a huge house from a zoning perspective. There are larger homes in the area.

In reply to a question the Clerk stated that the owner purchased the house in 2012. The Zoning Officer confirmed that there are no issues in terms of lot coverage.

Board members agreed that the setback and massing are two separate issues.

Public input: Nil

MOTION: MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by H. Charania: "That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 210.4(a)(i) and 210.4(c), further to the construction of an addition to the house on Lot 12, Section 58, Victoria District, Plan 27806 (1818 Chimo Place):

- a) relaxation of rear lot line from 7.5 m to 7.45 m
- b) relaxation of combined front and rear lot lines from 15 m to 13.55 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 and does not negatively affect neighbours; the rear of the property is adjacent to school property.
- The existing siting presents a hardship.
- There are no neighbour objections and this will not negatively affect the environment.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Board members discussed the request for allowable floor space in non-basement areas and the following was noted:

- The wish to have a suite is not a hardship.
- This is a 19% increase in floor space. The bylaw intent is to prevent massing.
- One member felt the plans presented show that the streetscape will be over-built with the proposed roofline.
- Another member felt secondary suites are encouraged by Saanich and the design is compatible with the neighbourhood.
- Other houses in the neighbourhood are being updated/renovated.

MOTION: **MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: “That the request for variance to relax the of allowable floor space in non-basement areas from 80% to 95.32% from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 210.4(a)(i) and 210.4(c), further to the construction of an addition to the house on Lot 12, Section 58, Victoria District, Plan 27806 (1818 Chimo Place) be TABLED until such time that a full Board is present to consider the application.”**

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

The Board stated that the applicant would benefit by returning with plans that show a reduction in the massing and size of the addition.

Waring Place
New house

BOV #00748

Applicant: 519 Design + Build OBO Kari Ericksen and Tom Wilson
Property: 3757 Waring Place
Variance: Relaxation of front lot line from 7.5 m to 3.04 m
Relaxation of rear lot line from 10.5 m to 1.50 m
Relaxation of single face height from 5.0 m to 5.90 m
Relaxation of the height for a structure within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 1.52 m

The Notice of Meeting was read and the applicant’s letter received. Signatures of objection received from sixteen residences. Letter not in support from Cadboro Bay Residents’ Association.

Applicants:

Chris Foyd, applicant and Kari Ericksen, owner, were present in support of the variance. Mr. Foyd noted that:

- This home was the first one built in this 1950’s era subdivision.
- The homes in the area were planned to have a water view.
- A Saanich sewer main runs through the middle of the property.
- Because the property is panhandle, the front and rear lots as defined by the bylaw are actually the side lots in terms of house siting.

A brief discussion occurred about the single face height request which is required due to the design of the house. The owner stated she does not want to build a higher/steeper roof so went with a flat roof design. She stated that she is willing to remove the request for single face height due to the neighbour’s concerns.

Public input:

Resident, 3753 Waring Place:

- Purchased their property two years ago for the view and suggested their house is not worth much but the view is of value.
- They estimate that up to half of their view will be affected with the proposed structure, and this will cause them loss in enjoyment and a decreased property value.

Resident, 2730 Hibbens Close:

- Is concerned about drainage. In the past the municipal storm drain (located between their property and the applicant’s property) failed causing extensive flooding.
- Feels changing the setbacks may cause natural drainage to be reduced which will impact adjacent properties.
- Bylaws should be followed and the effect on neighbours should have been considered.

Resident, 3749 Waring Place:

- Their main concern is the roof height and the environmental impact the renovation will have to the environment.
- The house size will impact their enjoyment of the bay view and the property values.

Two residents, 2734 Hibbens Close:

- Were concerned about the height and how this would impact their views.
- No neighbourhood consultation was done.
- Are a little more at ease with the applicant removing their request for height.

Two residents, 3775 Mystic Lane:

- Were concerned about the proposed height and are happy the applicant removed this request.

Resident 3759 Waring Place:

- Expressed concern about the size of the home as they will be impacted.

Resident, 3755 Mystic Lane:

- Expressed concern about the loss of views and the proposed height. Noted the community association is opposed to the application.

Resident, 3743 Waring Place:

- They should comply with setbacks. No neighbourhood consultation was done by the applicant and they feel the requests are more than minor.
- Feel they will lose privacy and enjoyment of their own property. Concerned about potential water damage with the drainage issues

Ms. Ericksen spoke to the neighbour's concerns as follows:

- They built a house elsewhere three years ago with no issues, and did not realize it would be a problem in this neighbourhood.
- They are only asking for a 500 square foot addition to a modest bungalow.
- They do not want to block views.
- There is no way to conform with the Bylaw because the existing house does not conform.
- A long skinny house would be the only way to comply with the Bylaw.
- They are trying to keep the house low and appropriate to the neighbourhood.

Mr. Foyd stated:

- The setbacks for this property are the same as the houses along the beach.
- The hardship is the configuration of the existing site in addition to a Saanich right-of-way which takes a 20' swath through the middle of the property.
- The drainage will be Engineered and built to Building Code standards.
- The site coverage is only at 27.3%. They are building a house that is half the size of what is permitted.
- The overall height is legal, the single face height is the issue.
- They are asking for the same setbacks that are permitted for all the other houses along the beach.
- They have not considered relocating the carport and making a double garage. They have been working on this project for months and the proposed dwelling is the way the owner wishes to proceed.
- The footprint is tight. They are using the existing foundation and cantilevering off the foundation.

- The reason they want to use the existing foundation is this is an archaeological significant area and they want to minimize disturbance.
- They plan to re-establish the beach grass to stabilize the bank.

In reply to the concerns expressed about the drainage, the Zoning Officer stated that the right-of-way is Saanich's responsibility and is not relevant to this application. He also confirmed that there are multiple covenants on the property and the house cannot be moved due to the right-of-way.

The applicant and owner replied further to Board questions:

- They will flatten out the roof over the garage.
- The pool will need a guard. They propose a glass fence so visual impact is reduced. They would prefer to not have a guard but this is not permitted.
- The owner is a triathlete and needs the pool. It cannot be moved elsewhere due to the right-of-way.
- They are willing to work with the neighbours on landscaping.
- They had not intended to upset the neighbours with their application.

One neighbour noted that had the applicant spoken with them they could have given a history of the area. They spoke about the storms and the problems associated with them, and cautioned the owner about using a glass guard as it will likely be broken in the storm season.

The Zoning Officer advised that since they will be altering the great room with the roof redesign, they can make those changes at this meeting, or they can come back to the Board at a future meeting to submit the changes for approval. This would give the applicant the opportunity to discuss the application with the neighbours.

The Board discussed the application and the following comments were noted:

- The panhandle lot is oriented to the ocean and the proposed labeling of the front and sides is appropriate.
- The bylaw is restrictive with the present siting of the house and merits relief.
- The request looks significant but given the lot size and the panhandle this is a unique lot to work with.
- They propose to use the existing foundation which will not cause environmental damage.
- They did their due diligence and have attempted to mitigate the problems they face.
- The applicant agreed to consider vegetation and plantings.
- The drainage issue will be addressed during the permitting process.

MOTION:

MOVED by D. Gunn and Seconded by R. Riddett: "That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 255.4(a)(i) and (ii) 255.4(b)(ii), and 5.16(b), further to the construction of a new single family dwelling on Lot 3, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan VIP13254 (3757 Waring Place):

- a) relaxation of front lot line from 7.5 m to 3.04 m
- b) relaxation of rear lot line from 10.5 m to 1.50 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.”

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Board comments regarding the request for guard rail height:

- This meets the Bylaw intent to not affect views because the guard is glass.
- The guard is a safety issue and required by Code, which could possibly be considered a hardship.
- The applicant has agreed to use materials as per the plans submitted.
- This will be much less intrusive than other structures along the same beach.

The Zoning Officer stated that the Director of Planning has the authority to approve a minor change such as using a similar transparent material as glass.

MOVED by H. Charania and Seconded by D. Gunn: “That the following variances be granted from the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 2003, Sections 255.4(a)(i) and (ii) 255.4(b)(ii),and 5.16(b), further to the construction of a new single family dwelling on Lot 3, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan VIP13254 (3757 Waring Place):

- a) **relaxation of the height for a structure within 7.5 m of the natural boundary of the ocean from 0.6 m to 1.52 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.”

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from H. Charania, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 pm.

Melissa Horner, Chair

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

Recording Secretary