Our total lot area is 17000 ft2 which equals 1579.35 m2 rounded to 1579.4 m2

The shed that was proposed and is now existing is $19' 4" \times 32' = 618.56$ ft2 by a calculation of $19.33 \times 32 = 618.56$ ft2 which equals 57.46 m2

The site plan also included 3 other proposed or existing buildings. Being a 10' x16' proposed building = 160 ft2 which equals 14.86 m2. Also an outhouse $5' \times 5' = 25$ ft2 which equals 2.3 m2 also an existing shed $12' \times 16' = 192$ ft2 which equals 17.83 m2

The aggregate of the site plan is 57.46 + 14.86 + 2.3 + 17.83 = 92.45 m2 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° x 18° = 180 ft2 which equals 16.72 m2 and a cement pad 16° x 32° = 512 ft2 which equals 47.56 m2. The aggregate of existing and proposed now equal 92.45 + 16.72 + 47.56 = 156.73 m2 = 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.