Our total lot area is 17000 ft 2 which equals 1579.35 m 2 rounded to 1579.4 m 2
The shed that was proposed and is now existing is $19^{\prime} 4^{\prime \prime} \times 32^{\prime}=618.56 \mathrm{ft} 2$ by a calculation of $19.33 \times 32=618.56 \mathrm{ft} 2$ which equals 57.46 m 2

The site plan also included 3 other proposed or existing buildings. Being a 10' x16' proposed building $=160 \mathrm{ft} 2$ which equals 14.86 m 2 . Also an outhouse $5^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}=25 \mathrm{ft} 2$ which equals 2.3 m 2 . also an existing shed $1^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}=192 \mathrm{ft} 2$ which equals 17.83 m 2

The aggregate of the site plan is $57.46+14.86+2.3+17.83=92.45 \mathrm{~m} 2$ which is between 5.85 and $5.86 \%$ rounded should be $5.9 \%$. So we believe the intent of the Bylaw is rounded numbers I.E. 3\% 4\% 5\% 6\% etc. so the calculations should have been rounded to $6 \%$ as per the intent of the Bylaw.

Now we go to the aerial view that shows what was existing on our property 5474 Firelane 22 at the time of our variance. 2 sheds $=10^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}=180 \mathrm{ft} 2$ which equals 16.72 m 2 and a cement pad $16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}=512 \mathrm{ft} 2$ which equals 47.56 m 2 . The aggregate of existing and proposed now equal $92.45+16.72+47.56=156.73 \mathrm{~m} 2=9.9 \%$ rounded to $10 \%$. This is why our application for the variance was for $10 \%$.

Because of Ms.Larocque`s departure from the City the $10 \%$ was reduced to $5.8 \%$ without informing or consulting us. Because our application was not completed by Ms.Larocque but by another staff member the true scope of what existed on our property was not followed.

