

Re: 3971 Yale Street

Prepared by: Elton Donald

The hardship: the unique conditions of the lot combined with a home that was built more than 60 years ago, prevent the approval of a very practical well designed plan that proposes to retain and reuse the existing solid structure and location of the home.

1. My home is on a steep lot sloping front to back
2. The home was built using a flat roof
3. The existing roof sits at a height above rear average grade of 27 feet which is 3 feet higher than currently permissible.
4. My home was built in a location that is no longer approved as it relates to the west side yard setback rules. Current rule states a side yard setback of 4.9 feet and my house is sitting at 4.54 feet, a difference of about 4-5 inches.

Particulars and descriptions

The home is on a steep lot, in rough terms, for just the depth of the house, I lose about 8-7 feet going from the front to back of my house on my property. This relates to the rule stating that the roof height for flat roofs can only be 24ft above the lesser of the front or rear averages. My existing home is sitting at 27ft above the rear grade average. On the front it reads fairly low especially compared to the home on the west.

The hardship of these rules plays in to my case because I am planning to re-construct the home as opposed to tearing it down. It has good bones and seems to be very well framed. For my plans, I want to keep the height that I have now and simply add onto the back of it. This is both good for the recycling of old and still quite useful material, and it is the most efficient way to gain usable space on the upper floor. Unfortunately for my case the planning department can't permit that

That structure was built over 60 years ago and it doesn't conform to the current by law the home is really grounded well into the street scape and doesn't interfere with anyone's view lanes. Having to have an upper floor that would "step down 3ft" which would then satisfy the bylaw requirement, would not be an attractive, efficient, or practical plan at all for this property. Neither would it be practical to have to jog in the new rear addition by 4-5 inches because of the side yard setback.

The home I have is an old time home built sometime after the Second World War, and it was built with a forward thinking design, it had a flat roof. It was one of the things that I liked about the building and something that I thought that I could make use of in my designs that would re-use the existing structure in future design plans. I plan on salvaging the entire structure of the home and doing a very modest addition to the back of the home extending the rear wall back by roughly 2.5 feet, this also relates to the section that violates side yard.

I do not plan to add any height to the home. I think that this is an important point.

I don't want to have to switch my plans to utilise a pitched roof, and I am sure that my neighbours don't want me to do that either, as it will then raise my ridge height and potentially obstruct their views. The massing of a pitched roof will be significantly larger than what is currently in place now.

Due to the fact that my plan does not propose to change the roof to be any higher, and due to the length of time that the structure has already stood as it relates to both the side yard and roof height I would like to propose that I be granted an exception to the current rules and be allowed to keep my existing roof height and extend my current wall by the 2.5 feet I am proposing in my addition plans.

Yours truly,

Elton and Ryoko Donald