# BOARD OF VARIANCE 

## NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

DATE: THURSDAY, 2015 APRIL 02
TIME: $1: 00$ PM
PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, MAIN FLOOR, CITY HALL

## AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER PAGE
2. MINUTES
3. APPEAL APPLICATIONS
(a) APPEAL NUMBER:
B.V. 6151
1:00 p.m.
APPELLANT: Dharam Kajal
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Sudesh and Dharam Kajal
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5469 Forglen Drive
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 9; District Lot 32; Plan 17168
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 104.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5469 Forglen Drive. The front yard setback will be 28.67 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 35.66 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The window seat projects 1.0 foot beyond the foundation. The overhang projects 2.0 feet beyond the foundation and the porch stairs project 3.5 feet beyond the foundation. (Zone R-4)
(b) APPEAL NUMBER:
B.V. 6152
1:00 p.m.

APPELLANT: Tom Harman
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Tom Harman
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 16 Holdom Avenue North
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 5; District Lot 218; Plan 4953
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 105.3(1) and 105.8(1) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new deck at the rear of a single family dwelling at 16 Holdom Avenue North. The following variances are being requested:
a) the lot coverage will be 1709.6 square feet where a maximum lot coverage of 1603.7 feet is permitted; and,
b) the depth of the principal building will be 72.06 feet where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted. (Zone R-5)
(c) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6153 1:15 p.m.

APPELLANT: Reid Thompson, Woodbridge NW (Deer Lake) Homes Ltd.
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Woodbridge NW (Deer Lake) Homes Ltd.

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 4991 Claude Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 171; District Lot 85; Plan NWP40315
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 104.8(1) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new temporary residential sales centre building at 4991 Claude Avenue. The principal building depth will be 70.0 feet where a maximum building depth of 60.0 feet is permitted. (Zone R-4)
(d) APPEAL NUMBER:
B.V. 6154

1:15 p.m.
APPELLANT: Gurdeep Sandhar
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Gurdeep and Aneeta Sandhar
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5591 Marine Drive
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 9; District Lot 159 and 162; Plan 20185

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.8, 6.14(5)(b) and 800.6 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5591 Marine Drive. The following variances are being requested:
a) the front yard setback will be 51.46 feet to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 65.05 feet is required based on front yard averaging;
b) construction of a retaining wall at the rear of the lot with varying heights up to a maximum of 9.0 feet where the maximum permitted height is 5.91 feet; and,
c) construction of an accessory building in a required front yard, located 4.0 feet from the North property line abutting Eleanor Street and 2.0 feet from the West property line, where siting of an accessory building in a required front yard is prohibited by the Zoning bylaw. (Zone R-2)
(e) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6155 1:30 p.m.

APPELLANT: Avtar Basra.

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Canada Haojun Development Group Co. and A-G Tej Construction Ltd

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 6696 Aubrey Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 3; District Lot 132; Plan 20814
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 6.3.1 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new two family dwelling with a detached garage at 6696 Aubrey Street. The distance between the principal building and detached garage is 6.01 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required. (Zone R-4). A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61402015 January 08) allowed: a) the principal building front yard setback from the east property line of 36.0 feet where a minimum 40.0 feet is required; and b) the detached garage measured from the north property line of 16.0 feet where a minimum 24.6 feet is required.
(f) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6156 1:30 p.m.

APPELLANT: Afsana Malik

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Darmendra and Shoba Singh

## CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5875 Royal Oak Avenue

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 50; District Lot 32; Plan 17623
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 104.8(1), 104.9 and 104.11 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for construction of a new single family dwelling at 5875 Royal Oak Avenue. The following variances are being requested: a) the depth of the principal building will be 41.17 feet where a maximum depth of 30.88 feet is permitted based on 50 percent of the lot depth; b) the front yard setback will be 11.00 feet to the porch post where a minimum front yard setback of 42.75 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The porch overhang and stairs project 2.0 feet and 1.83 feet respectively beyond the foundation; and,c) the rear yard setback will be 11.33 feet to the foundation where a minimum setback of 29.5 feet is required. The overhang projects 2.5 feet beyond the foundation. (Zone R-4)

## CITY OF BURNABY

BOARD OF VARIANCE

## MINUTES

A Hearing of the Board of Variance was held in the Council Chamber, City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C., on Thursday, 2015 March 05 at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Ms. C. Richter
Mr. B. Pound
Mr. S. Nemeth
Mr. G. Clark
Mr. B. Bharaj
STAFF: Ms. M. Malysz, Planning Department Representative
Mr. S. Cleave, Deputy City Clerk
Ms. K. O’Connell, Deputy City Clerk

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The Secretary called the Hearing to order at 1:08 p.m.

## 2. MINUTES

MOVED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:
"THAT the minutes of the Hearing of the Burnaby Board of Variance held on 2015 February 05 be adopted as circulated."

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## 3. APPEAL APPLICATIONS

The following persons filed application forms requesting that they be permitted to appear before the Board of Variance for the purpose of appealing for the relaxation of specific requirements as defined in the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Bylaw No. 4742:

## (a) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6147

APPELLANT: Joe Wong
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Tseng-an Chen and Chao Guo
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 8276 Burnlake Drive

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 94; District Lot 40; Plan 44446

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.7(b), 101.9(1) and 101.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for an addition to 8276 Burnlake Drive. The following variances are being requested:
a) depth of the principal building is 92.3 feet where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted;
b) north side yard setback is 5.9 feet to the foundation where a minimum side yard setback of 7.9 feet is required;
c) sum of the side yard setbacks is 15.7 feet where a minimum sum of 18.0 feet is required; and
d) rear yard setback is 17.4 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required.(Zone-R1)

A previous Board of Variance (B.V. 60252012 December 6) allowed b) and c), but denied variances a) and d).

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Joe Wong submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of an addition to his client's home.

Mr. Wong and Mr. Tseng-an Chen, homeowner, appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.7(b), 101.9(1) and 101.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for an addition to 8276 Burnlake Drive. The following variances are requested:
a) a principal building depth of 92.3 feet where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted;
b) a side yard setback from the north property line of 5.9 feet to the foundation where a minimum side yard setback of 7.9 feet is required;
c) a sum of side yard setbacks of 15.7 feet where a minimum sum of 18.0 feet is required;
d) a rear yard setback of 17.4 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required.

This property was the subject of an appeal before the Board on 2003 September 04 (BV\#5157) and on 2012 December 06 (BV \#6025).

In the 2003 September 04 appeal, a variance was sought to allow for the construction, to the rear of the existing single family dwelling, of a detached garage with a gross floor area of $1,048.8$ sq. ft., where a maximum of 602.8 sq. ft. is permitted. While this Department did not support this request, the Board granted the appeal.

In the 2012 December 06 appeal, four variances were sought to allow for the construction of an addition to the existing single family dwelling.

- The first a) appeal was to allow a principal building depth of 92.3 ft ., where a maximum building depth of 60 ft . is permitted.
- The second b) appeal was to allow a side yard setback from the north property line of 5.9 ft., where a minimum side yard setback of 7.9 ft . is required.
- The third c) appeal was to allow a sum of side yard setbacks of 15.7 ft ., where a minimum sum of side yard setbacks of 18.0 ft . is required.
- The fourth d) appeal was to allow a rear yard setback of 17.4 ft ., where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 ft . is required.

While this Department objected to all of the requests, the Board denied the first a) appeal (building depth) and fourth d) appeal (rear yard setback) and allowed the second b) appeal (side yard setback) and third c) appeal (sum of side yard setbacks).

This Department's comments on the 2012 December 06 appeal, which also references the 2003 September 04 appeal, are included as Item 1 in the attached Supplementary materials.

Section 14 of Burnaby Bylaw No. 5843 (Board of Variance Bylaw, 1971) states:
"The Board shall not, within one (1) year of the date of the decision of the Board, re-hear an appeal previously denied covering the identical grounds or principals upon which the Board has rendered a decision."

The applicant requests the Board re-hear the appeal presented at the 2012 December 06 meeting, which occurred approximately two (2) years and three (3) months ago.

Since this proposal is identical to the 2012 December 06 appeal, this Department's comments remain unchanged.

In summary, it is difficult to find a hardship in this case. All four relaxations are the result of a design decision to connect the principal building to the accessory building, and are driven by convenience rather than necessity.

In view of the above, this Department cannot support the granting of either appeal.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

An undated petition letter was received from homeowners and occupants of $8265,8275,8282$, 8285 and 8288 Burnlake Drive. The petition read as follows:
"The following list of people below support the attachment between two buildings of 8276 Burnlake Dr."

An email dated February 27, 2015, was received from Monika and Brian Bonney, 8306 Government Road, in support of this appeal.

An email dated February 28, 2015 was received from Mario Giardini, 8270 Burnlake Drive, in opposition to the appeal.

No further correspondence was received regarding this appeal.

## DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part a) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
MS. C. RICHTER
CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part b) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B. POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
MS. C. RICHTER
OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part c) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B.POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
MS. C. RICHTER
OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
CARRIED
MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part d) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B.POUND
MR. G. CLARKE

OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
MS. C. RICHTER

## CARRIED

## (b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6148

APPELLANT: Steven Chen
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Yu Zhao
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5890 Empress Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 190; District Lot 92; Plan 25859
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.7(a) and 102.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for construction of a new single family dwelling at 5890 Empress Avenue. The following variances are being requested:
a) depth of the principal building will be 42.0 feet where a maximum depth of 40.0 feet is permitted; and
b) rear yard setback will be 13.40 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required. (Zone R-2)

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Steven Chen submitted an application for the relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of a new single family dwelling.

No one appeared to represent the applicant before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.7(a) and 102.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for construction of a new single family dwelling at 5890 Empress Avenue. The following variances are requested:
a) a principal building depth of 42.0 feet where a maximum depth of 40.0 feet is permitted; and
b) a rear yard setback of 13.4 feet to the foundation where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required.

The subject site, which is zoned R2 Residential District, is located in the Kingsway Beresford neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single dwellings vary. This interior lot, which is approximately 80.0 ft . deep and 124.2 ft . wide, fronts Empress Avenue to the west. Abutting the subject site to the north, east and across the lane to the south are single family dwellings. Vehicular access is provided from the lane. The site observes a substantial downward slope of approximately 21.6 ft . from the southeast (rear) corner to the northwest (front) corner. The subject lot is unusual in that it is oriented laterally to its only road frontage along the western property line.

The subject site is proposed to be redeveloped with a new single family dwelling including an accessory detached garage, which is the subject of two appeals. The appeals are co-related.

The first a) appeal is for the construction of a new single family dwelling, observing a principal building depth of 42.0 ft . where a maximum building depth of 40.0 ft . is permitted based on $50 \%$ of the lot depth.

The Bylaw's intent in limiting building depth is to prevent the visual intrusion and sense of confinement that a long building wall can impose on neighbouring properties.

The second b) appeal is for the construction of a new single family dwelling observing a rear yard setback of 13.4 ft ., with a further projection of roof eaves of up to 3.0 ft ., where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 ft . is required.

The intent of the Bylaw is to mitigate the massing impacts of new buildings and structures on neighbouring properties and to ensure sufficient outdoor living area in the rear yard is provided.

Both variances are related to site orientation. Under Section 3 of the Zoning Bylaw, the front lot line of the property is the lot line that abuts Empress Avenue, resulting in a lot depth that is measured in the shallower west-east direction. City records indicate that the existing building on the subject site was constructed with all necessary approvals consistent with this orientation. However, the actual placement of the existing dwelling, which is at an angle to the front property line, differs slightly from these records. The existing dwelling observes an approximately 25.0 ft . setback from the west front lot line to the southwest corner; an approximately 12.0 ft . setback from the east rear lot line to the northeast corner; and a building depth of approximately 43.0 ft ., as projected on the lot depth line.

The proposed dwelling, sited parallel to the front property line, would observe a west front yard setback of 24.6 ft ., which is the minimum required front yard setback; an east rear lot setback of 13.4 ft ., and a building depth of 42 ft .

With respect to the first a) appeal, although the allowable building depth is exceeded by 2.0 ft., given the orientation of the subject dwelling, the proposed additions would not result in a long wall effect as viewed from the neighbouring property to the north and south. In addition, the proposed building depth would be approximately 1.0 ft . less than the existing depth. The generous north side yard of approximately 40.12 ft . would further mitigate any impacts on the neighbouring property to the north. With respect to the neighbouring property across the lane to the south, although the proposed side yard setback is only 5.08 ft ., as measured to the attached garage on the south side of the dwelling, the main body of the dwelling would be set back an additional 22.0 ft . This generous setback and the spatial separation provided by the lane would help alleviate any impacts on the neighbouring property to the south.

With respect to the second b) appeal, although the required rear yard is reduced by 16.1 ft ., the proposed setback is 1.0 ft . less than the existing rear yard setback. Also, two existing large trees would be maintained within the rear yard, which would partly screen the proposed dwelling. Further, the neighbouring property to the east observes higher grades than the subject property and is generally orientated towards Walker Avenue to the northeast. Therefore, a relatively low impact would be expected with respect to the neighbouring property to the east.

With respect to outdoor living area, although green space would be reduced within the rear yard, plenty of green area would be provided in the generous north side yard.

In addition, this Department will pursue a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to address the hardship encountered on lots, such as the subject site, where the only abutting street is parallel to the longest lot line. This should help resolve concerns about the develop ability of the lot over the long term.

In summary, because the shallow depth of the subject lot represents a hardship and limits design options, and considering this proposal's limited impact on neighbouring properties, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) and second b) variances.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No correspondence was received regarding this variance.

## DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part a) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
MOVED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part b) of this appeal be ALLOWED."

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## (c) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6149

APPELLANT: Krishan Anand
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Krishan and Raj Anand
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 7495 Whelen Court
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 2; District Lot 86; Plan 24141
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.6(1)(b) and 101.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 7495 Whelen Court. The following variances are being requested:
a) principal building height will be 31.98 feet measured from the rear average elevation and 23.82* feet measured from the front average elevation where a maximum building height of 24.3 feet is permitted; and
b) front yard setback will be 17.17 feet to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 29.5 feet is required based on minimum front yard. The roof will project 3.0 feet beyond the post. (Zone R-1)
*It should be noted the front average elevation was corrected to read 23.82 feet instead of the originally noted 24.48 feet. The revised elevation complies with the bylaw requirement.

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Krishan Anand submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of a new home.

Mr. Anand appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.6(1)(b) and 101.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 7495 Whelen Court. The following variances are requested:
a) a principal building height of 31.98 feet measured from the rear average elevation and 24.48 feet measured from the front average elevation where a maximum building height of 24.3 feet is permitted; and
b) a front yard setback of 17.17 feet to the porch post where a minimum front yard setback of 29.5 feet is required. The proposed roof projects 3.0 feet beyond the post.

The subject site, zoned R1 Residential District, is located in a stable single-family neighbourhood in the Morley-Buckingham area. This irregular interior lot, approximately 91.7 ft . wide and 121.3 ft . deep along the southwest property line, fronts Whelen Court to the southeast. The front lot line reflects the irregular alignment of Whelen Court, which jogs to the east in front of the subject property. Abutting the site to the southwest and the northeast are single family dwellings. A wooded ravine within the Haszard Trail and Conservation Area borders the subject site to the northwest. A 25.5 ft . wide sanitary right of way is located along the northwest property line. Vehicular access to the property is from Whelen Court; there is no lane access. The site slopes downward approximately 24.4 ft . towards the north.

A new single-family dwelling with attached garage is proposed on the subject site, for which two variances are requested.

The first appeal a) proposes: 1) a building height of 31.98 ft ., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft . is permitted for flat roofs; and 2 ) a building height of 24.48 ft ., measured from the front average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft . is permitted for flat roofs.

The intent of the Bylaw is to mitigate the massing of new buildings or structures and their impacts on neighbouring properties.

In reference to part 1) of the appeal, the height calculation is based on the proposed natural grade at the rear elevation. A substantial grade difference contributes to the excess height. The proposed dwelling would extend further to the northwest by approximately 12 ft . as compared
to the existing dwelling. Accordingly, the rear of the proposed dwelling, where the grades are lower, is where the excess height would occur. The proposed height encroachment of 7.68 ft . would occur over the entire upper floor, from approximately 1 ft . above the window sill level, as viewed from the rear property line. This area of encroachment would be set back from the rear outermost building face, which is at the north corner of the dwelling, by approximately 9.5 ft . The remaining approximately $2 / 3$ of the upper floor would be set back further by approximately 22 ft .

Although the height encroachment is substantial in this case, the foliage of the Haszard Trail and Conservation Area, located to the immediate northwest of the site, in combination with the generous rear setback would mitigate any massing impacts on the neighbouring residences further to the northwest.

With respect to the northeast (side) elevation, the height encroachment would include a triangular area in the middle portion of the upper floor, above the bottom sill of a high window. This encroachment would occur approximately 8 ft . from the northeast property line, as measured to the building face. The height encroachment would also occur at the rear portion of the upper floor, from the top of the upper deck railing. This portion of the proposed northeast elevation is set back further 9.5 ft . from the outermost face of the northeast elevation, which is a mitigating factor.

With respect to the southwest (side) elevation, the height encroachment would be essentially limited to the small roof area at the front portion of the upper floor, starting approximately at the fascia board level. The encroachment would occur approximately 10.4 ft . from the southwest property line, as measured to the building face. The rear portion of the upper floor would be set back a further 47.25 ft . from the outermost face of the southwest elevation. Although encroachment in this case would be larger, up to approximately 3 ft . below fascia board level, the generous setback would mitigate any potential visual impacts.

In summary, considering the limited scale and distant siting of the encroachment areas at the rear and side elevations, few impacts to neighbouring properties are expected.

With respect to part 2) of the appeal, the proposed dwelling would observe a height of 24.48 ft . when viewed from the Whelen Court front property line, which is 0.18 ft . more than the maximum height of 24.3 ft . allowed by the Zoning Bylaw. This minor height encroachment would be limited to the small area of the highest peak of the roof, which would occur approximately 23.5 ft . from the outermost face of the front elevation.

In summary, given the site's topographical constraints, and the proposal's limited impacts on neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) variance.

The second b) appeal is for a front yard setback of 17.17 ft ., measured to the front porch posts of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of 3.0 ft ., where a minimum front yard setback of 29.5 ft . from the Whelen Court property line is required.

The intent of the Bylaw in requiring a minimum front yard setback is to mitigate the massing of new buildings or structures and their impacts on neighbouring properties and the existing street frontage.

This variance request is related to the irregular alignment of the front lot line of the subject site. As the front lot line nears the east corner of the property, it turns 90 degrees inward and forms a notch that extends approximately 12.53 ft . towards the rear of the property. The front yard setback is measured from the point of the notch, which is approximately12.53 ft. inward of the remainder of the front lot line. If measured from the more uniform portions of the front lot line, which more closely conform to those of neighbouring properties, the proposed dwelling would observe a front yard setback of 29.7 ft ., which is slightly more than the minimum required.

The irregular alignment of the front property line presents a hardship with respect to the front yard setback requirement. With the exception of the irregular indentation, the proposal meets front yard setback requirements.

In view of the above this Department does not object to the granting of this second b) variance.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Judith Robertson, 7485 Whelen Court, appeared before members of the Board opposing the appeal. Ms. Robertson provided a power point presentation, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

No further comments were received regarding this appeal.

## DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part a) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
FOR: MR. B. BHARAJ
MR. B.POUND
MR. G. CLARKE
MS. C. RICHTER
OPPOSED: MR. S. NEMETH
CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
SECONDED BY MR. B. POUND:
"THAT based on the plans submitted part b) of this appeal be ALLOWED."
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## (d) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6144

## APPELLANT: Vikram Tiku

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Zhuting Wu
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5824 Burns Place
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 6; District Lot 93; Plan 21802
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 104.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5824 Burns Place. The front yard setback will be 36.08 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 41.86 feet is required based on front yard averaging. (Zone R-4)

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Vikram Tiku submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of a new home.

Mr. Tiku appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENTS COMMENT:

An appeal for the relaxation of Section 104.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5824 Burns Place. The proposed front yard setback is 36.08 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 41.86 feet is required based on front yard averaging.

The subject site, which is zoned R4 Residential District, is located in the Windsor neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two-family dwellings vary. This corner lot, approximately 59.3 ft . wide and 115.9 ft . deep, fronts onto Kisbey Avenue to the west. Abutting the subject site to the east, south and across Burns Place to the north are single family dwellings. Vehicular access to the subject site is proposed to be relocated from Burns Place to Kisbey Avenue; there is no lane access. The site observes a downward slope of approximately 5.3 ft . to the north.

The subject site is proposed to be redeveloped with a new single family dwelling including an accessory detached garage, which is the subject of this appeal.

The appeal requests a front yard setback of 36.08 ft ., measured to the foundation of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for cornices of 0.5 ft ., where front yard averaging requires a minimum setback of 41.86 ft .

In 1991, Council responded to public concerns regarding the bulk and massing of newer and larger homes that were being built in existing neighbourhoods. Several text amendments to the Zoning Bylaw were adopted to address these concerns, including a requirement to set new construction back from the front property line based on an average of the two dwellings on either side of the subject site. The intent was to help to ease new construction into existing street frontages with minimal impact.

In this case, the front yard averaging calculations are based on the front yard setback of the existing dwelling at 6436 Kisbey Avenue immediately south of the subject site, which is 41.86 ft . The subject block consists of only three lots; the third lot fronts Bryant Street and therefore is not included in front yard averaging calculations.

The proposed front yard setback is measured to the foundation of the northern portion of the front elevation. The southern portion of the front elevation is proposed to be set back further by 3.0 ft . The proposed siting would place the subject dwelling 5.78 ft . in front of the neighbouring dwelling to the south, or 2.78 ft . if the southwest corner of the subject dwelling is considered. In addition, the upper floor at the southwest corner of the dwelling is proposed to be set back a further 6.33 ft . With respect to the south side, the subject dwelling would observe a south side yard setback of 5.0 ft . which is just over the required minimum width ( 4.9 ft .). However, the upper floor at the southwest corner is proposed to be set back an additional 9.18 ft . Considering these upper floor setbacks in addition to a relatively minor reduction in the proposed front yard depth, little massing impact is expected on the neighbouring property to the south.

In addition, the siting of the proposed dwelling would be approximately 19 ft . further away from the front property line in comparison to the siting of the existing dwelling on the subject site. The existing dwelling observes a front yard setback of 17 ft . which was the subject of a successful appeal to the Board of Variance in 1978. The Board permitted the 17 ft . front yard setback where a front yard setback of 25 ft . was required at that time. In view of the above, the existing massing relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjacent properties, and particularly to the south, would be substantially improved.

Further, it is noted that the siting of the proposed dwelling would provide for a rear yard setback of approximately 29.83 ft ., where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 ft . is required. As such, there is little room for modifying this proposal.

In summary, since this request would improve the existing conditions in relation to the neighbouring property to the south and the existing streetscape in general, this Department supports the granting of this variance.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No correspondence was received regarding this appeal.

## DECISION:

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED."
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## 5. NEW BUSINESS

No items of new business were brought forward at this time.

## A DJ OURNMENT

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. S. NEMETH:
"THAT this Hearing do now adjourn."
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
The Hearing adjourned at 1:58 p.m.
Ms. C. Richter

Mr. B. Bharaj

Mr. G. Clark

Mr. S. Nemeth

Mr. B. Pound

[^0]
# Board of Variance Appeal Application Form 

## OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Burnaby City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby BC, V5G 1M2, Phone: 604-294-7290 Email: clerks@burnaby.ca

## Applicant



I hereby declare that the information submitted in support of this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct in all aspects, and further that my plans have no conflict with municipal bylaws other than those applied for with in this application.


## Office Use Only

Appeal Date April 02,2015 Appeal Number BV\#
Required Documents:

- Hardship Letter from Applicant
- Site Plan of Subject Property
$\square$ Building Department Referral Letter

CITY OF BURNABY
MAR 092015

CLERKS OFFICE

DHARAM KAJAL<br>$3565 \mathrm{MONMOUTH} A V E N U E, V A N C O U V E R, V 5 R \quad 5 S 1$ PHONE: $(604) .789 .9520$. FACSIMILE(604).412.0008

# Owner Hardship for Construction of New Home 

## Attention:

City of Burnaby
Board of Variance
Dear Sir;

## Re: Hardship for Construction of New Home at 5469 Forglen Drive Burnaby

Please note that we have purchase this property to build my dream home for my family and for parents at the above noted development. Now we are facing hardship to build my dream home due to front setback to be set at 35.66 ft ., rather than current R 424.6 ft . to construct to match with old homes built in 1940 after completing planning and engineering requirements.

My hardship points are as per following:

1. The front setback, to the foundation, shall be 28.67 where a minimum front yard setback of 35.66 feet is required based on front averaging based home built 70 years ago and do not compile with current by law zoning. Setback 35.66 ft . are very deep and which are non-coherent with the construction of new home and also are not realistic to current by law zoning which indicated minimum front setback shall be 24.6 feet. The neighbourhood home on the east of Forglen Drive mostly are new and are built with new current $R 4$ setbacks. The average extreme front setback depth by $R 4$ zoning by law is 24.6 feet.
2. Based on current offset, the distance between building foundation and garage shall be minimum 14.83 feet and this is not achievable to less depth available due to match with front setback 39.66 ft . with respect to 70 years old built homes.
3. Based on current 39.66 ft . front, rear setback deck depth is not enough deep and rear deck construction could not be achieved due to match with applicable 70 years old homes rather than current bylaws.
4. In order to build my dream home construction as well rear deck the anticipated cost is about $\$ 600,000$. (600 thousands). The land value of this home is about $\$$ $100,000.00$ and overall projected cost will be $1,600.000$ ( 1.6 million) which is not
worthwhile and realistic to match front setback 39.66 ft . depth in front of the home which is very deep. Secondly due to deep setback 39.66 ft . to build this dream home as well to match with existing averages front setback with old homes built in 1970, the dream home is not achievable as well no sustainable. This will not match with existing eastside of Froglen Drive as well as with existing neighbourhood concept.
5. The existing home built south of this lot has 28.67 feet setback and we should be allowed to match with existing south home which was recently built few years ago.
6. Exception should be allowed to build home on 5469 Forglen Drive to match home along south setback as well as allowed to match with front setback 28.67 ft . by R4 current by law of City of Burnaby rather than 35.66 ft . front setback averaging old home which were built in 1950 and do not match with current latest city standards, specification and building codes.

In view of the above, we kindly request that please allow us use current R4 bylaw depth equal to 28.67 ft . to match with south home as per applicable by law rather than to match averages with 70 years old built homes or allow us to relax rear setback from 14.83 ft . to 10 ft . between foundation of building and garage to build a deck so that we could be able to construct my dream home achievable and sustainable to match with new built homes as well as to coherent with existing neighbourhood concept at the project cost of $1,600,000$ ( 1.6 million).

We appreciate your positive response in near future.

Thanking you.



FORGLEN DRIVE

## PROPOSED SET BACK TO SOUTH HOME

 BY RS4 BYLAW ZONING

COGEDOEME




[^1]

Burnaby Board of Variance
Office of the Secretary
Burnaby City Hall
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, B.C.
VEG LM

## Dear Sir/Madam:

## Re: Board of Variance Application for 5469 Forglen Drive



In reference to the above application, we are concerned and object to the front yard setback of 25.02 feet to the foundation. The relaxation of the setback is excessive and will adversely affect the street view of the homes along Forglen Drive up to Buxton Street.

We would prefer to see a setback of 28.66 feet to the foundation which is the current setback of 4981 Buxton Street. This will bring the front of the new home in line with the foundation on the east side (the Forglen Drive side) of the home on 4981 Buxton Street.

We ask that, the Board of Variance, take our concern and objection on this matter into consideration when rendering the decision.

Yours truly,


5449 Forglen Drive, Burnaby, B.C.

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: February 19, 2015 | DEADLINE: March 10, 2015 for the <br> April 2, 2015 hearing | This is not an <br> application. <br> Please take letter to <br> Board of Variance. <br> (Clerk's office <br> Ground Floor) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Dharam Kajal |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 3565 Monmouth Ave., Vancouver V5R5S1 |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604-789-9520 |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: New single family dwelling |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 5469 Forglen Drive | DLAN: 17168 |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 9 |  |

The above mentioned application, which includes the attached plan of the proposal, has been refused by the Building Department on the basis of contravention of:

## Zone/Section(s) R4 [104.9]

of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to build a new single family dwelling. The following relaxation is being requested.

1) The front yard setback, to the foundation, will be 28.67 feet where a minimum front yard setback of 35.66 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The window seat projects 1 foot beyond the foundation. The overhang projects 2 feet beyond the foundation. The porch stairs project 3.5 feet beyond the foundation.

Note: The applicant recognizes that should the project contain additional characteristics in contravention of the zoning by-law a future appeal(s) may be required.

BHS
knomm

## Peter Kushnir

Assistant Chief Building Inspector, Permits and Customer Service

[^2]/

CLIMATE ZONE 4

##  <br> 
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# Board of Variance Appeal Application Form 

## OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK




I hereby declare that the information submitted in support of the application 点, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct in all aspects, and further that my plans have no conte with municipal bylaw sher ban those applied for with w the application.


## G1tiedursen







March 6, 2015

To the members of the Board

I write to you to request an accommodation in regard to a balcony I began to construct at the rear of my home in 2013. Upon surveying the area, I found that each and every home on North Holdom Avenue has a balcony on the rear of the house. A place for families to gather and enjoy the wonderful view and fresh outdoor air. I feel that it is a hardship for my family and I to not have the opportunity to enjoy this privilege. I am being penalized, I have learned, because I put my garage at the front and therefore added to the total length and total square footage of the house. I did this to make the back yard a larger place for my children to play.

Above and beyond the hardship to my use and enjoyment of my property, I am also suffering a financial hardship because I had recently begun renovating this deck. While I am a long-time resident of Burnaby, born and raised on Holdom Avenue, I moved to Kelowna for work, keeping my house on Holdom Avenue. I rented the house for 15 years while I was absent. During that time, the tenants added the original balcony. I assumed that this was all done properly and that nothing had been done against the city codes. When I returned to occupy the residence in 2012 I decided to renovate and refurbish the sundeck to its current dimensions. This involved shortening the deck which previously extended further into the yard and adding a sliding door into the house. It was when I was mid-way through my renovations that I received notice from the city about the balcony. That was almost two years ago - and the deck has been left unfinished (without railing) and unusable - while I have awaited city approval. I was only told last month that in order to go forward, I must seek approval from the Board of Variance if I am to be able to save my deck.

Had I been aware of the issues before me at the start, I would surely have followed the proper protocols. Unfortunately, I was not aware, and now have spent a considerable sum without the ability to benefit over these last years. I hope the Board will see my request for accommodation as a modest one that will disadvantage no one but will be greatly appreciated by my family and I.

Warm regards,

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER



The above mentioned application, which includes the attached plan of the proposal, has been refused by the Building Department on the basis of contravention of:

Zone/Section(s) R5 [105.3(1); 105.8(1)]
of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant has built a deck (without permit) at the rear of an existing single family dwelling. The following relaxations are being requested.

1) The lot coverage will be 1709.6 square feet where a maximum lot coverage of 1603.7 is permitted
2) The depth of the principal building will be 72.06 feet where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted.

Note: The applicant recognizes that should the project contain additional characteristics in contravention of the zoning bylaw a future appeals) may be required

DC


[^3]

Foundation: Floor Plan
Scale: $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime} .0$


Ju. 072014

BULDNG UEPARTMEMS


$\qquad$
Scale: $112^{\prime \prime}=1^{1}-0^{\prime}$
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# Board of Variance Appeal Application Form 

## OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Burnaby City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby BC, V5G 1M2, Phone: 604-294-7290 Email: clerks@burnaby.ca

## Applicant

Name of Applicant
Mailing Address
City/Town


Phone Number (s)
(H) $604-901-7686$
(C) $604-719-5365$

Email reidewadbridyenw.com
Preferred method of contact:
a email
$\checkmark$ phone
$\square$ mail

## Property

Name of Owner
Woodbridge Nw (Dear Lake) Homes LId.
Civic Address of Property $\qquad$

I hereby declare that the information submitted in support of this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct in all aspects, and further that my plans have no conflict with municipal bylaws other than those applied for with in this application.
$\frac{20 \cdot 5-03-09}{\text { Date }}$


Applicant Signature

## Office Use Only

Appeal Date April 02,2015 Appeal Number BV\# 6153

CITY OF BURNABY
Hardship Letter from Applicant
Site Plan of Subject Property

- Building Department Referral Letter

MAR O92015
CLERKS OFFICE

Woodbridge NW (Deer Lake) Homes Ltd.
$5^{\text {th }}$ Floor -210 West Broadway
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 3W2


NORYHESH

March 9, 2015

## City of Burnaby

Board of Variance
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2

## RE: Hardship Letter for Rez: 07-49 Temporary Sales Center at 4991 Claude Ave

Dear Board of Variance Members,

We write you this letter to explain the hardship associated with the maximum building depth of the Rez:07-49 temporary sales centre under the current R4 zoning. The temporary sales centre will be located at 4991 Claude Avenue, Burnaby, BC (PPA \#14-00278) and will be constructed for the temporary purpose of demonstrating and preselling homes in the subject future development. The building will subsequently removed or demolished upon the successful completion of the presales campaign or relocation of the sales facility to a finished permanent building in the project whichever occurs first.

The proposed temporary building has a depth of $70^{\prime}$ whereas a maximum building depth of $60^{\prime}$ is permitted under the R4 zoning. Based on the site configuration, project design and access required we have maximized the width of the sales centre. There is absolutely no flexibility for additional sales center width beyond the $25^{\prime}$ and our application for a three-story configuration was previously rejected. With the width and single story configuration established, $70^{\prime}$ is the resulting absolute minimum building depth needed for effectively demonstrating the product and creating an acceptable sales presentation area. Any reduction in building depth would result in the inability to provide a realistic product model, sales office, accessible washroom and presentation area. We are seeking a variance to allow this additional 10 feet of depth under the R4 zoning for a short period of time so the Preliminary Plan Approval and Building Permit may be released prior to the CD rezoning 'catching up.' Along with the hardship, the rationale for granting the much needed variance could be based on many factors including the temporary nature of the building, the temporary nature of the variance and/or the intent of the R4 Bylaw as it relates to bulling massing, shadowing and rear yard setbacks.

The temporary nature of the bullding and the short duration of the variance under the R4 zoning should be significant considerations. Under the Real Estate Development Marketing Act and the Superintendent of Real Estate's disclosure statement requirements, the proposed CD zoning must be adopted and replace the R4 zoning pror to the commencement of sales. The Final Adoption CD rezoning will ultimately permit the temporary sales facility proposed depth and will almost certainly be im place within a month or two of building construction completion. At that time, the variance under the R4 we are seeking will not be relevant because it would be permitted under the CD zoning. Even after the CD zoning will permit the temporary bulding's proposed depth, the buiding itself is not permanent

[^4]and will be demolished or moved when it has served its purpose to temporarily market the project. We we are looking to start construction on the sales centre immediately in anticipation of a mid-late spring Final Adoption and sales program commencement. Approximately $12-24$ months is the most likely timeline for demolition or relocation of the building. It is important to note that demolition bonding will be in place to ensure removal of the temporary building if the proposed CD zoning is not adopted or the sales program is unsuccessful.

Please review the attached site plan submission for the project showing the orientation of the sales centre as it relates to the access points for sales and phase 1 of construction. With the required separate access for sales activities immediately adjacent to the east side of the sales centre and with the construction/servicing access immediately adjacent to the west side of the sales centre it is apparent that the width of the building is maximized for the site. Please also review the attached Sales Centre design. Even with a $70^{\prime}$ depth we are only able to achieve a relatively small presentation area after modeling the main floor and ensuite of the typical unit. To reiterate, our $3^{\text {rd }}$ party marketing company and the ownership group agree that the presentation area cannot be made smaller without jeopardizing the sales experience.

An internal lot line cancellation with 4981 Claude has been deposited with LTO to eliminate any concerns with side yard setbacks and no accessory buildings will be constructed on the subject property prior to CD bylaw adoption. With a $20^{\prime}$ setback to the east and $55^{\prime}$ to the west adjacent properties, single story construction (of which $42 \%$ is flat roof) and no accessory buildings, there will be far less massing opposing these adjacent properties than typical even with the proposed building depth variance. Based on a generous side yard setbacks and single story massing the propensity for shadowing the adjacent property is effectively eliminated as compared to typical 2-3 story construction and less generous side yard setbacks. It is also critical to point out that there will be more rear yard depth and area than would normally be permitted under the R4 because of the lack of accessory buildings and as such the setback from the rear property line to the closest building face is $108^{\prime}$.

The success of our pre-sales campaign and therefore the viability of the project is dependent on an effective sales program which requires a timely start to its construction. We truly believe the above rationale for varying the building depth requirements under the R 4 zoning is reasonable.

We appreciate your consideration and attention to this matter.


[^5]From: Reid Thompson [reid@woodbridgenw.com](mailto:reid@woodbridgenw.com)
Date: March 11, 2015 at 5:06:44 PM PDT
To: "Adam, Joy" < Joy.Adam@burnaby.ca>

## Subject: Re: 4991 Claude Ave - Consolidation

Good Afternoon Joy,
Would you please pass along this sketch to the Board of Variance as it relates to the proposed variance for the temporary sales centre on the consolidated 4991 Claude Ave under PPA1400278 and Rezoning Application 07-49.

The sketch depicts the fencing treatment for the remainder of the lot:
A-We will construct a minimum length of 25 ' of 3 ' tall front yard fencing along the East PL and internally around the sales centre.
B-There is an existing 6' fence along the East PL which starts about halfway to the Southern PL and we will construct a 6 ' fence tying the new front yard fence into this existing fence C-Prior to Construction of the Sales Centre we will preload the area and the sales centre will be constructed on top of this preload. As such a portion of 4991 beyond the scope of the drawing will be preloaded and the remainder of the site will be existing vegetation until construction starts under the forthcoming CD Bylaw.

The existing grades at the corners of the proposed building are:
NW: 45.3'
NE: 46.1'
SE: 45.6'
SW: 45.6'
After the preload is in place the ground floor elevation will be approximately 47.5' but will not exceed $48.5^{\prime}$. The building will be constructed with a level interior to facilitate wheelchair accessibility but the grade along the length of the building will slope gently. We're anticipating a finished grade of pavers only 2 " below floor level at the SE/SW corner and approximately 6 " below floor level at the NE/NW corners.

Please let me know if there is any additional clarification required.
Thank You and Kind Regards,
Reid Thompson
VP Development
Woodbridge Northwest Communities Ltd.
604-719-5365
reid@woodbridgenw.com

Fencing Details
CLAUDE AVENUE


Planning and Building Department

| BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE: 2015 Mar. 03 | DEADLINE: 2015 Mar. 10 <br> Date of Hearing: 2015 Apr. 02 | This is not an application. <br> Please take referral letter to Board of |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Woodbridge NW (Deer Lake) Homes Lid. |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 200-1450 Creekside Dr. <br> Vancouver, BC, V6J 5B3 |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604-719-5365 |  |  |


| Preliminary Plan Approval Application: PPA \# 14-00278 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DESCRIPTION: New temporary residential sales centre building. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZONING: R4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 4991 Claude Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 171 | DL: 85 |  |  |  |

The above mentioned application for Preliminary Plan Approval, which contravenes the Zoning Bylaw under:

Section(s) 104.8 (1)

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to construct a new temporary residential sales center building, for which the following variance is requested:

1) The principal buiding depth will be 70.0 ft where anaximum building depth of 60.0 ft is permitted.


[^6]2.

3.(c)

$\cdots: \%$
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# Board of Variance Appeal Application Form 

## OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Burnaby City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby BC, V5G 1M2, Phone: 604-294-7290 Emall: clerks@burnaby.ca


I hereby declare that the information submitted in support of this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct in all aspects, and further that my plans have no conflict with municipal bylaws other than those applied for with in this application.


## Office Use Only

Appeal Number BV\# 6154
Required Documents:

- Hardship Letter from Applicant
- Site Plan of Subject Property

Building Department Referral Letter

CITY OF BUPNABY
MAR 102015
CLERKS OFFICE

BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { DATE: March 5, } 2015 & \begin{array}{l}\text { DEADLINE: March 10, } 2015 \text { for the } \\ \text { April 2, 2015 hearing }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { This is not an } \\ \text { application. } \\ \text { Please take letter to } \\ \text { Board of Variance. } \\ \text { (Clerk's office }\end{array} \\ \text { Ground Floor) }\end{array}\right\}$

The above mentioned application, which includes the attached plan of the proposal, has been refused by the Building Department on the basis of contravention of:

Zone/Section(s) R2 [102.8; 6.14(5)(b); 800.6]<br>of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to build a new single family dwelling. The following relaxations are being requested.

1) The front yard setback will be 51.46 feet to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 65.05 feet is required based on front yard averaging.
2) The relaxation of $6.14(5)(b)$ of the Zoning By-Law which. if permitted. will allow for the construction of a retaining wall at the rear of the lot with varying heights up to a maximum of 9.0 feet where the maximum permitted height is 5.91 feet.
3) The relaxation of 800.6 of the Zoning By-Law which. if permitted, will allow an accessory building in a required front yard. located 4.0 feet from the North property line abutting Eleanor Street and 20 feet from the West property line. where siting of an accessory building in a required front yard is prohibited by the Zoning By-Law.

Note: The applicant recognizes that should the project domain additional characteristics in comstaventon of the -owing bs-law a future appeal ls) mut be required.

BS

## Mosul

## Peter Kushnir

Assistant Chief Building Inspector. Permits and Customer Service

$$
\square) E(G E W W
$$




February 17, 2015
Gurdeep Sandhar
11751 Mellis Drive, Richmond, BC V6X1L9

Attention: Board of Variance Appeal - Hardship Letter

## Re: Address 5591 Marine Drive, Burnaby

Due to a very steep slope on the above property $\mid$ am requesting to build a detached garage on the north side (Eleanor Street) of the property. I would also need to increase the space between my house and the garage by building the house 10 ft . forward.

Building an attached garage is extremely dangerous, since the property is at an excessively steep slope. It would be extremely unsafe to build and use an attached garage. An attached garage would put me and my family at risk of a vehicle accidentally rolling into the house. I have spoken to and taken pictures of my neighbor's house, who has an attached garage and never uses it. He feels it is unsafe to have vehicles use the driveway as he fears the vehicles could easily roll into the house. He says that the handicapped and elderly have to enter his house from the front Marine Drive walkway. A person relying on the use of a wheelchair cannot enter from Eleanor Street to his house. He also mentioned that numerous times people have slipped and had injured themselves in the winter months. I did go over to try and walk down to his house from Eleanor St and found it very difficult. What I saw was that the neighbours were not using their garage or driveway's year round and was contributing to the congestion problem by parking on Eleanor St, which is a dead end street with no turnaround at the end.

After speaking to a building inspector I was told that the city will no longer allow an attached garage with a driveway at that severe slope because of safety concerns. Nor would they allow me to use Marine Drive as a vehicle access due to the busy traffic on the that street. The building department will accept and allow me to build an detached garage with access from Eleanor street with the approval from the Board of Variance.

My Brother who lives with me is disabled with a nerve disease(GBS), a detached garage would allow him access to a safe place to park and enter the home.

Thank you for your consideration and understanding in this matter.


Gurdeep Sandhar




# Board of Variance Appeal Application Form 

## OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Burnaby City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby BC, V5G 1M2, Phone: 604-294-7290 Email: clerks@burnaby.ca


I hereby declare that the information submitted in support of this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct in all aspects, and further that my plans have no conflict with municipal bylaws other than those applied for with in this application.


## Office Use Only

Appeal Date April O2,2015
Appeal Number BV\#


Required Documents:

- Hardship Letter from Applicant
$\square$ Site Plan of Subject Property
- Building Department Referral Letter

MAR 102015

Cl

The Secretary,
Board of Variance,
City of Burnaby,
4949 Canada Way,
V5G 1M2

March 05, 2015,
Subject: Appeal for varying the minimum distance between the principle \& accessory building for proposed two-family dwelling with detached garage at 1205 Sperling Ave.

Dear Sir,
Our client is proposing to construct a two-family dwelling with detached garages on the subject property, which is a corner lot towards the south-west of the intersection of Aubrey St. with Sperling Ave.

He had approached the Board previously with a request for variance to the front yard setback based on front yard averaging requirement and for a flanking side yard setback for a detached garage. Both of those appeals had been granted by the Board.

At that meeting, during the discussion, there were comments with reference to the lack of recreational open space for the unit towards the west. The developer has reviewed that aspect and revised the design for the detached garages. The new proposal has pushed back the garages towards the rear and taken their access directly off the lane. This allows for an open space to be created towards Aubrey St. which can be used by the unit to the west for private use.

The only consequence of this revision is that the detached garages observe a $6^{\prime}$ distance from the principle building where $14.8^{\prime}$ is required.

The intent of the bylaw is to ensure provision of ample open space for the property with adequate daylight. The wall portion adjacent to the garage has limited openings and rather allows for sufficient light and open space for this unit towards the front where it is required most.

Furthermore, the presence of the intervening lane and the fact that the adjacent house most impacted, has minimal windows towards the lane as also that the massing of the permitted principle building which articulates that street frontage and defines much more strongly that comer rather than the small single storey garage, which will get adequately hidden with some landscaping towards that street front.

On behalf of the owner / would like to request the members of the board to give our request for the variance their due consideration as it is attempting to address a genuine concern which was brought up
at the earlier meeting, without creating any negative impact and improving the livability of the unit to the west to a great extent.

Thanks,

Vikram Tiku
TD Studio
180-2250 Boundary Road,
Bumaby, B.C. V5M 323
ph: 604.299.3821
fax: 604.299.3826
e: tdstudio.vancouver@gmail.com

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAI, LETTER

| DATE: 03 March 2015 | DEADLINE: 10 March 2015 for the 02 April 2015 hearing | This is not an application. Please take letter to Board of Variance. (Clerk's office Ground Floor) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Avtar Basra |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 7357 Ridge Drive |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: (604) 537-5602 |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: New Two Family Dwelling with a detached garage |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 6696 Aubrey Street |  |  |
| LOT: 3 | DL: 132 | AN: 20814 |

The above mentioned application, which includes the attached plan of the proposal, has been refused by the Building Department on the basis of contravention of:

Zone/Section(s) R-4 [6.3.1]

of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to construct a new two family dwelling with a detached garage. The following relaxations are being requested:

1) The distance between the principal building and detached garage is 6.01 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.

Note: A previous Board of Variance (B.V. 6140) approved an appeal requesting: a) The principal building front yard setback, measured from the east property line to the principal building, will be $36.0^{\prime}$ where a minimum $40.0^{\prime}$ is required based on front yard averaging and b) The proposed detached garage (B-North), measured from the north property ine to the detached garage, will be $16.0^{\prime}$ where a minimum $24.6^{\prime}$ is required.

Note: The applicant recognizes that should the project contain aditional characteristics in contravention of the zoning by-law a future appeal(s) may be required

JQ





# Board of Variance Appeal Application Form 

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
Burnaby City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Bumaby BC, V5G 1M2, Phone: 604-294-7290 Emall: clerks@bumaby.ca


I hereby declare that the Information submitted in support of this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct in all aspects, and further that my plans have no conflict with municipal bylaws other than those applied for with in this application.


## Office Use Only

Appeai Number Bv* 101542
Required Documents:
$\square$ Hardship Letter from Applicant
Site Plan of Subject Property
Building Department Referrai Letter


MAR 112015 CLERK'S OFFICE

Attention: Burnaby Board of Variance
Project: 5875 Royal Oak Ave
Legal: Lot 50, DL 32, Plan 17623
I have given a brief description of the owner's hardship that they are facing if we follow the bylaw as described in Zone/Section(s) R4, 104.8, 104.9, 104.11 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742.

I really hope that the Board will consider everything before making a decision as this will affect the needs of this family and have a big impact on the land that they have invested all there saving into.

They are a family of 5 adults with 3 grandkids and many more to come. The design has been catered towards all their needs and children and grandchildren. They are hoping to raise their family in this new comfortable home which they have been desiring for a long time and they have invested all their savings to retain this land for their future dream home.

We have put together an amazing design that will fit really nicely in the neighbourhood and add great values to the surrounding neighbours and the city of Burnaby.

Below is our proposal:
OPTION 1 PROPOSED FOOT PRINT OF 2249 SQFT.
WITH THE PROPSOED SETBACKS WE ARE ONLY ABLE TO ACHIEVE A FOOTPRINT OF 2247 SQFT OUT OF WHICH 420 SQFT WILL GO TO THE GARAGE. FOR THE DEMANDS OF THE FAMILY NEEDS THIS LAYOUT SUITS THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY IN HIS BEST INTEREST.

IN THIS ZONE WE ARE ALLOWED TO BUILD A HOUSE OF 4736 SQFT + GARAGE. BUT WE ARE ONLY PROPOSEING A HOUSE SIZE OF 4092 SQFT + GARAGE. WE AREN'T ASKING FOR MORE THEN WHAT WE NEED. THE OWNERS WOULD ONLY LIKE TO GET APPROVAL FOR WHAT THEIR FAMILY NEEDS ARE AS PER THE PLAN.

WE HAVE ALSO NOTICED THAT AS THE STREET GOES SOUTH ON ROYAL OAK AVENUE EACH HOUSE HAS REDUCED THEIR FRONT YARD SIGNIFICANTLY.

EG: LOT 7 FRONT YARD IS $53^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ AND LOT 41 IS $31^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$. THAT IS A DIFFERENCE OF OVER 22 FEET. WHERE AS WE HAVE REDUCED OUR FRONT YARD BY ONLY 16.83 FEET.

THE ENTIRE LANE SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS THE REAR LANE AS EVERY HOUSE HAS A SIDE YARD. WE SHOULD COUNT $47.31^{\circ}$ AS THE REAR YARD AND $130^{\circ}$ AS THE SIDE YARD. please consider this as well during decision making.

OPTION 2 FOOT PRINT OF 328 SQFT.
BY USING THE SET BACKS AS PER THE BYLAW WE ONLY GET A FOOT PRINT OF 328 SQFT IN WHICH WE CAN'T EVEN DESIGN A SINGLE CAR GARAGE. THEREFORE PLEASE CONSIDER OPTION 1 AS OPTION 2 IS A HARDSHIP TO THE FAMILY WHO ARE HOPING TO RAISE KIDS IN A NICE HOME.

THE ENTIRE LANE SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS THE REAR LANE AS EVERY HOUSE HAS A SIDE YARD. WE SHOULD COUNT $47.31^{\prime}$ AS THE REAR YARD AND $130^{\prime}$ AS THE SIDE YARD.

Looking forward to a decision that will favour the residence of Burnaby.

Sincerely,


Afsana Malik


## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER



The above mentioned application, which includes the attached plan of the proposal, has been refused by the Building Department on the basis of contravention of:

Zone/Section(s) R4 [104.8(1); 104.9; 104.11]<br>of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

COMMENTS:
The applicant is proposing to build a new single family dwelling. The following relaxations are being requested.

1) The depth of the principal building will be 41.17 feet where a maximum depth of 30.88 feet is permitted based on 50 percent of the lot depth.
2) The front yard setback, to the porch post, will be 11.00 feet where a minimum front yard setback of 42.75 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The porch overhang projects 2 feet beyond the foundation. The porch stairs project 1.83 feet beyond the foundation.
3) The rear yard setback, to the foundation will be 11.33 feet where a minimum rear yard setback of 29.5 feet is required. The overhang projects 2.5 feet beyond the foundation.

Note: The applicant recognizes that should the project contain additional characteristics in contravention of the zoning by-law a future appeals) may be required.

## Kinsim

Peter Kushnir
Assistant Chief Building Inspector, Permits and Customer Service
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[^0]:    S. Cleave

    Deputy City Clerk

[^1]:    GIANS -DUE TO CURRENT BY LAW TO MET EXIST. 70 YR. OLD HOME
    GIANS -DUE TO CURRENT BY LAW TO MEET EXIST. 70 YR. OLD HOME
    FRONTING PROIECIONS:

    - GIGGER FRONT LAWN - USELESS EVEN AESTHETICALLY POOR LOOK
    AND NON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN NEGGBOURHOOD
    NO PRVACYIF YE USE FRONT YARD, NEIGHBOUHERS WIL FEEL
    UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT DOGS ATFRONYARD
    NEIGHBOURER'S WIL NOTACCEP DOGS PLYYNG AT FRONT YARD
    AND POOR LAND USE CONCEPT
    GIANS -DUE TO CURRENT BY LAW TO MEET EXIST. 70 YR. OLD HOME
    FRONTING PROIECIONS:
    - GIGGER FRONT LAWN - USELESS EVEN AESTHETICALLY POOR LOOK
    AND NON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN NEGGBOURHOOD
    NO PRVACYIF YE USE FRONT YARD, NEIGHBOUHERS WIL FEEL
    UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT DOGS ATFRNTYARD
    NEIGHBOURER'S WIL NOTACCEP DOGS PLYNG AT FRONT YARD
    AND POOR LAND USE CONCEPT
    
    
    
    
    

[^2]:    

[^3]:    Peter Kushnir
    Assistant Chief Building Inspector

[^4]:    $5^{\text {h Fioor }-210 ~ W e s t ~ B r o a d w a v, ~ V a n c o u v e r, ~ B C ~ C a r a d a v 5 y ~ 3 W 2-T a t: 604.901 .7686-F a x: ~ 604.200 .7834 ~}$

[^5]:    $5^{\text {th }}$ Floor-2 210 West Broadway, Vancouver, BC Canada VSy 3W2-Tel: 604,901.7686-Fax: 604.200.7834

[^6]:    Margaret Malysz
    Development Plan Approvals Supervisor

