



Tel: 250-714-2425

Email: dmcs@telus.net

Municipality of North Cowichan
7030 Trans-Canada Highway
Duncan, BC. V9L 6A1
Atten: Rick Brundrige

3 November 2023

Re: Proposed Development Variance Application – 9928 Maple Street, Chemainus

Dear sir:

Thank you for taking the time to visit the site and review the DVP with myself, it was greatly appreciated. As discussed, I am the authorized agent for the Owner, Mrs. Kay Porter (mother in law) to make this application for a Development Variance Permit for the residential property zoned R3, PID No. 006-143-750 of Lot 72, Section 18, Range 5, Chemainus District Plan 303A located at the above noted address.

Zoning bylaw No. 2950 indicates R3 zoned lots to have a maximum floor space ration (FSR) of 0.50 and site coverage of 30%.

The existing site coverage calculation of 30% established from the 1999/2000 building permit appears over by approximately 6%. The site coverage calculation is based on a building location certificate in lieu of a registered survey, and the submitted BP drawings of the time did not provide a summary of the site coverage and/or, the FSR. The Surveyors document of Sept 2, 1999, prepared by W.R. Hutchinson (no longer in business) clearly states the document is provided for convenience purposes only, with lot dimensions derived from the Registered Plan and the document shall not be used to define property lines or property corners.

We suggest the building permit and associated occupancy permit from 1999/2000 were issued, based on the noted documents yet, the associated calculations and the subsequent sign off of 30% calculates to approximately 36%.

Our current calculations provided for this DVP are a result of merging the recent survey of July 26, 2022, prepared by B.C.L.S. Gerald W. Lindberg, and CAD drawings derived from the original building permit drawings. Please see R3 Zoning requirements summary on Page A1 of 2 of the attached drawings submitted with this application for a breakdown of these figures. Our application for this DVP is to request an increase of the existing site coverage by 2.2%.

We note the calculated site coverage calculation we have provided does not include the rear yard paving stone patio area. We intend to remove the hard surface area to make room for greater soft landscaping that include fruit trees, some grass, and additional shrubs.

Rationale for the DVP:

The age of the existing accessory building is unknown and is constructed with the finished floor elevation and exterior finishes slightly below and, at-grade resulting with water, insect and rodent ingress that have caused deterioration to the finishes and structure. Without a raised perimeter foundation, the structure will continue to deteriorate. The structure cannot be rehabilitated and/or, reconstructed using the existing slab-at-grade foundation as this would not conform to code regarding exterior finishes requiring a minimum of 8" above grade.

My wife, Debbie Mattson and I now live in the home with her mom since the passing of Kay's husband. Debbie and I provide Kays' company, help with day-to-day activities and in the future, the care-at-home she will inevitably require. Debbie is a registered care aide.

In addition, like many I want to do my part for our environment and will now work from home. Although our proposed accessory building does not exceed the total maximum FSR at 0.47 it exceeds the existing site coverage

by an additional 2.2%. We have worked to establish a clean and simple low-profile building that does not impact our neighbours site lines, will improve the landscaping to benefit our yard and be pleasing to the neighbours, and suggest the proposed design will blend well with the current form and character of the old Chemainus neighbourhood atmosphere. We have a wonderful neighbourhood and note our fantastic neighbours support the proposed building to accommodate a small shop and office space.

Our hardship is we need the proposed building so we can plan for making interior spaces of the house fully accessible. We are requesting consideration for an additional 2.2% and ask that council approve the accessory building space. This will allow for future improvements to make the home accessible for future needs so our ageing parent can age in place in her home. Without this we would need to relocate to an accessible residence with someone who is nearly 80 years old and has been in this house for nearly 20 years.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Darcy Mattson
Agent for Kay G Porter