# BOARD OF VARIANCE 

## NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

DATE: THURSDAY, 2015 DECEMBER 03
TIME: $1: 00$ PM
PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, MAIN FLOOR, CITY HALL

## AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER PAGE

## 2. MINUTES

(a) Minutes of the Board of Variance Hearing held on 2015 November 05

## 3. APPEAL APPLICATIONS

(a) APPEAL NUMBER:
B.V. 6196
1:00 p.m.

## APPELLANT: Tony Gill

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Belltown Homes LTD and A-Pacific Development LTD

## CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 7357 Newcombe Street

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 32; District Lot 25; Plan 14945
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 6.3.1 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home at 7357 Newcombe Street. The distance between the principal building and the detached garage and carport would be 3.43 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required. (Zone R10)

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61772015 July 09) denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 24.93 feet measured to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 40.63 feet is required.

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61902015 September 03) denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 33.86 feet measured to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 40.63 feet is required; and allowed the distance between the principal building and the detached garage of 9.75 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61942015 November 05) denied an appeal requesting the distance between the principal building and the detached garage of .53 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.
(b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6197 1:00 p.m.

## APPELLANT: Edward Vega

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Darlene Sorel
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 175 Delta Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 10; DL 122/188; Plan NWP4953
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 105.6(1)(b) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which, if permitted, would allow for interior alterations and an addition to an existing single family dwelling, with secondary suite and detached garage, at 175 Delta Avenue. The following variances are being requested:
a) The principal building height, measured from the rear average elevation, would be 33.55 feet where a maximum height of 24.3 feet is permitted;
b) The principal building height, measured from the front average elevation, would be 25.71 feet where a maximum height of 24.3 feet is permitted; and,
c) The principal building height would be 3 storeys where a maximum of 2.5 storeys is permitted. (Zone R5)
(c) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6198 1:15 p.m.

APPELLANT: Ying Muoi Ho
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Ying Muoi Ho
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 8210 Burnlake Drive
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 202; District Lot 40; Plan 48688

APPEAL: An Appeal for the relaxation of Sections 101.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of an addition and interior alterations to main and upper floor of an existing single family dwelling with a secondary suite and detached garage at 8210 Burnlake Drive. The front yard setback from the Winston Street property line would be 74.10 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 85.24 feet is required based on front yard averaging. A balcony would project 1.5 feet beyond the foundation and two window bays would project 1.0 feet beyond the foundation. (Zone R1)

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61752015 July 09) decision allowed a front yard setback on Winston Street of 72.62 , as well as, a roof overhang projecting 2.5 feet on all sides beyond the foundation of the addition, except with a roof overhang of 3 feet where 2 roofs meet.
(d) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6199 WITHDRAWN

APPELLANT: Amitoj Sanghera
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Agiakar and Pritpal Gill
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 3526 Colter Court
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 100; District Lot 43; Plan NWP39458
(e) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6200 1:30 p.m.

APPELLANT: Helder Baptista
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Helder Baptista
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 6200 Buchanan Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 119; District Lot 130; Plan 61236
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 6.2(2) and 800.6(1) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of an accessory building in a required front yard at 6200 Buchanan Street, located 9.0 feet from the south property line abutting Parkcrest Drive and 13.61 feet from the east property line, where siting of an accessory building in a required front yard is prohibited. (Zone R2)
(f) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6201 1:30 p.m.

APPELLANT: Helen Soderholm
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Peter Buchanan and Helen Soderholm

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5724 Eglinton Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 79; District Lot 83; Plan 24961
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 6.14(5)(b) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the retention of a fence to an existing family home at 5724 Eglinton Street. The fence height, in the required side and rear yard, would be of varying heights of up to 9.97 feet where a maximum height of 5.91 feet is permitted. (Zone R-2)

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61782015 July 09) denied an appeal for a fence height, in the required side and rear yard, of varying heights of up to 10.13 feet where a maximum 5.91 feet is permitted.

## 4. NEW BUSINESS

5. ADJOURNMENT

## CITY OF BURNABY

## BOARD OF VARIANCE NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

## MINUTES

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

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Ms. C. Richter, Chair
Mr. B. Bharaj, Citizen Representative
Mr. B. Pound, Citizen Representative
ABSENT: Mr. G. Clark, Citizen Representative
Mr. S. Nemeth, Citizen Representative
STAFF:
Ms. M. Malysz, Development Plan Approvals Supervisor
Ms. J. Adam, Planning Assistant
Ms. E. Prior, Administrative Officer
The Chair for the Board of Variance called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

## 2. MINUTES

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
THAT the Hearing of the Burnaby Board of Variance held on 2015 October 01 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. 6192 WITHDRAWN

APPELLANT: Ron Bijok
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Kevin Snelgrove and Sabrina Machel
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5883 Monarch Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 22; District Lot 80; Plan 1798
This appeal was WITHDRAWN prior to the Hearing.
(b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6193

APPELLANT: Rosa Alexander
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Rosina Alexander
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 175 Ranelagh Avenue North
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 22; District Lot 189; Plan 4953
APPEAL: An Appeal for the relaxation of Sections 105.6(1)(a) and 6.12(3)(a) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the substantive reconstruction of the basement, main floor and upper floor of an existing single family home at 175 Ranelagh Avenue North. These would include interior alterations to the basement and main floor; a new porch, deck and addition to the main floor; and a new upper floor. The following variances are being requested:
a) the principal building height, measured from the rear average grade, would be 30.41 feet where a maximum of 29.5 feet is permitted. Note the height measured from the front average grade would be 28.31 feet, and
b) the side yard setback would be 2.6 feet where a minimum side yard setback of 3.3 feet is required. (Zone R5)

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Rosa Alexander submitted an application to allow for substantive interior and exterior reconstruction of an existing single family home at 175 Ranelagh Avenue.

Rosa Alexander and Michael Haig appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject site, which is zoned R5 Residential District, is located in the Capitol Hill neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two-family dwellings vary. This interior lot, which is approximately 33 ft . wide and 121.4 ft . deep, fronts onto the west side of Ranelagh Avenue North. The subject site observes a downward slope of approximately 7.3 ft . in the northeast - southwest direction. Single family dwellings are located immediately north, south, directly across Ranelagh Avenue North to the east and directly across the lane to the west of the subject site.

The subject site was originally improved with a two storey single family dwelling (main floor and basement), built in 1956. In 2014, a building permit (BLD14-01151) was issued for further improvements to the dwelling, including an upper floor addition and various exterior/interior alterations to the basement and main floor. Subsequently, when construction started, a deviation from the building permit drawings was identified by the City staff. As a result, the applicant is requesting two variances in order to legalize the unpermitted construction.

The first a) appeal proposes a building height of 30.41 ft ., measured from the rear average elevation to the upper floor addition, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft . is permitted for sloping roofs.

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

The second b) appeal proposes a side yard setback of 2.6 ft . from the north property line to the existing dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of up to 2.0 ft ., where a minimum side yard setback of 3.3 ft . is required.

The intent of the Bylaw is to mitigate the impacts of building massing on neighbouring properties.

In this case, the existing dwelling observes a north side yard setback of 2.6 ft ., and is legal-non-conforming with respect to the side yard setback requirement ( 3.3 ft .).

The approved building permit drawings indicate that the non-conforming part of the dwelling, particularly the outermost north wall and adjacent floor area at the basement and ground level, were to be retained. However, during construction, the wall and floor were removed and rebuilt, as they were in poor condition. The portion of this new floor and wall that encroaches into the required side yard is approximately 0.7 ft . wide and 31 ft . long, and is the subject of the second b) appeal.

In addition, this new wall/floor construction required slightly higher wall studs, which increased the overall building height. The proposed increase in building height from the
originally approved 29.5 ft . to the constructed 30.41 ft ., as viewed from the rear property line, is the subject of the first a) appeal.

With respect the second b) variance, the increased side yard encroachment does not materially change the massing relationship, at the ground floor, between the existing dwelling and the neighbouring property to the north of the subject site. In addition, the new upper floor is proposed to be set back an additional 3.25 ft . from the outermost north face of this encroachment area. The resulting total upper floor setback of 5.85 ft . is well over the minimum side yard setback requirement of 3.3 ft .

With respect to the first a) appeal, the proposed height encroachment of 0.91 ft . would be limited to a very small triangular area at the top fascia board junction of the upper roof (the small roof over the upper deck would not be part of this encroachment). In addition, the proposed upper floor is set back 10.18 ft . from the outermost west face of the rear elevation at the ground level, which further mitigates any impacts. Also, when viewed from the front property line, the proposed building height of 28.31 ft . is well under the dimensional height requirement for the R5 District ( 29.5 ft .).

In summary, considering the small scale of the proposed side yard and height encroachments, no significant impacts are expected to neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape.

In view of the above, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) and second b) variances.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Correspondence was received from Mr. Michael Wong, concerned that the height variance would block their view. The writer also expressed concern that allowing this variance would set a precedent in the neighbourhood.

No further correspondence was received regarding this appeal.
MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
THAT based on the plans submitted part (a) of this appeal be ALLOWED.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:

THAT based on the plans submitted part (b) of this appeal be ALLOWED.

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
THAT the Hearing do now recess until 1:15 p.m.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
The Hearing recessed at 1:08 p.m.
MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:

THAT the Hearing do now reconvene.

The Hearing reconvened at 1:15 p.m.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## (c) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6194

APPELLANT: Tony Gill
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Belltown Homes LTD and A-Pacific Development LTD

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 7357 Newcombe Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 32; District Lot 25; Plan 14945
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 6.3.1 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home at 7357 Newcombe Street. The distance between the principal building and the detached garage would be 0.53 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required. (Zone R10)

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61772015 July 09) denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 24.93 feet measured to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 40.63 feet is required.

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61902015 September 03) denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 33.86 feet measured to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 40.63 feet is required; and allowed the distance between the principal building and the detached garage of 9.75 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Tony Gill, Belltown Homes Ltd and and A-Pacific Development Ltd, submitted an application to allow for the construction of a new home at 7357 Newcombe Street.

Tony Gill and Inderjit Dhillon, designer, appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

This property was the subject of an appeal before the Board on 2015 July 09 (BV6177) and 2015 September 03 (BV6190).

In the 2015 July 09 appeal, a variance was sought for the construction of a new single family dwelling and detached garage observing a front yard setback of 24.93 ft ., where a front yard setback of 40.63 ft . is required. This Department did not support this request, and the Board of Variance denied the appeal.

In the 2015 September 03 appeal, two variances were sought for the construction of a new single family dwelling with a detached garage. The first a) appeal was for a distance of 9.75 ft . from the accessory building to the principal building, where a minimum distance of 14.8 ft . is required. The second b) appeal was for a front yard setback of 33.86 ft . where a front yard setback of 40.63 ft . is required. While this Department did not support the first a) appeal for a reduced distance between the garage and residence, the Board granted it. Similarly, this Department supported the request for a reduced front yard setback, but the Board denied the second b) appeal.

This Department's comments on the 2015 September 03 appeal, which also references the 2015 July 09 appeal, are included as Item 1 in the attached supplementary materials.

Subsequently, in response to concerns raised by neighbours at the hearing, the applicant has revised the proposal. The revised design locates the principal building 40.63 ft . from the front property line, which meets the minimum front yard setback; however, this is achieved by a further reduction in the distance between the residence and the garage. Some changes to the windows, sunken patio and detached garage are also proposed. Otherwise, the revised proposal is similar to that presented in the 2015 July 09 appeal.

More specifically, the following relaxation is requested:
The appeal would permit a distance of 0.53 ft . from the detached garage to the principal building, with a 2.94 ft . roof projection from the principal building, where a minimum distance of 14.8 ft . is required.

The Bylaw requires a separation between buildings on the same lot in order to prevent massing impacts on the occupants of the subject property and neighbouring properties, as well as to provide for sufficient outdoor living space.

This variance relates directly to the revised siting of the principal building. In order to achieve the minimum required front yard setback, the proposed dwelling has been located 6.77 ft . closer to the accessory detached garage.

The siting of the detached garage remains the same, in the south corner of the rear yard, approximately 4 ft . from the southwest (rear) property line and 4 ft . from the southeast (side) property line. The detached garage has been reduced in width from 22.6 ft . to 20 ft .; in length from 20 ft . to 19.5 ft .; and in height
from approximately 12.19 ft . to the top of a hip roof to 9.45 ft . high to the top of a flat roof as viewed from the lane. This reduction in size and height helps mitigate, to a degree, the impacts of the reduced separation.

The proposed detached garage contains two parking spaces, accessed off the rear lane, and is consistent with the existing detached garage immediately to the southeast of the subject lot.

The 0.53 ft . distance is measured from the detached garage to the rear deck, which is proposed over the sunken patio immediately northwest of the garage. The proposed horizontal overlap between the deck and the garage is only 2.57 ft . The small overlap area, in this case, would not create substantial impacts, given the openness of the deck area. However, the proposed location of the deck itself is questionable. The proposed deck is located over the sunken patio, which is a primary source of daylight for the proposed secondary suite in the cellar. The deck would cover almost $2 / 3$ of the sunken patio, which would result in substantial shading of this area.

In addition, the proposed distance of 3.43 ft . between the garage and the dwelling, which represents a dramatic reduction from the previously approved 9.75 ft ., is a concern. The dwelling/garage overlap would be 18.5 ft ., which is almost the entire width of the garage. It is noted that an attempt has been made to minimize impacts on the occupants of the residence, by removing all windows from the area of overlap (including the previously proposed two bay windows at the upper floor of the dwelling). As such, no primary living space would face the garage. However, with the required separation reduced by 11.37 ft . or $77 \%$, the dwelling and garage would effectively appear as a single building form. The neighbouring property immediately southeast of the subject site would be most affected by this proposal.

Furthermore, this variance could be substantially lessened by reducing the proposed two-car garage to a one-car garage and providing an additional surface parking space to satisfy parking requirements.

With respect to outdoor living space, a small yard area would remain to the northwest of the garage, but would be insufficient to meet the needs of both a primary dwelling unit
and a secondary suite. Additional outdoor space would be available in the sizable front yard; however, this area would not afford the privacy of a rear yard.

For the above reasons, the Department cannot support the requested variance.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. R. Arseneault, 8249 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and Mr. D. Grant, 7391 Newcombe Street, appeared before the Board in opposition to the appeal.

No correspondence was received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED.

## (d) APPEAL NUMBER: <br> B.V. 6195

APPELLANT: Xiao Jia Hu
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Yang and Xiao Hu
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 4862 Gilpin Court

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 3; District Lot 34; Plan 15142

APPEAL An appeal for the relaxation of Section 105.6(1)(b) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for: additions to the basement, main floor and upper floor; interior alterations/finishing to the basement and main floor; new main porch and deck; new upper floor deck, and a new basement attached garage at 4862 Gilpin Court. The following variances are being requested:
a) the principal building height, measured from the rear average elevation, would be 28.57 feet where a maximum of 24.3 feet is permitted, and
b) the principal building height, measured from the front average
elevation, would be 27.45 where a maximum of 24.3 feet is permitted. (Zone R5)

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 61112014 June 05) allowed a principal building height of 27.95 feet measured from the rear yard and 26.83 measured from the front yard, a principal building depth of 38.75 feet, a front yard setback of 14.08 feet and a rear yard setback of 7.92 feet.

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Xiao Jia Hu submitted an application to allow for additions and interior alterations of an existing home at 4862 Gilpin Court.

Xiao Jia and Yang Hu appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

This property was the subject of an appeal before the Board on 2014 June 06 (BV6111). The following variances were allowed for the construction of new additions to an existing single family dwelling:
a) a building height of 27.95 ft ., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft . is permitted.
b) a building height of 26.83 ft ., measured from the front average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft . is permitted.
c) a principal building depth of 38.75 ft . where a maximum building depth of 30.45 ft . is permitted.
d) a front yard setback of 14.08 ft ., where a minimum front yard setback of 19.7 ft . is required.
e) a rear yard setback of 7.92 ft ., where a minimum rear yard setback of 24.6 ft . is required.

Subsequently, a building permit (BLD14-00573) was issued and the construction of various additions and alterations to the existing dwelling began. When construction progressed to the framing stage, deviations from the permitted building height were identified by the City staff. As a result, the applicant is requesting two appeals for a further relaxation of building height, in attempt to legalize the as-built construction.

The first a) appeal proposes a building height of 28.57 ft ., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft . is permitted for a flat roof.

The second b) appeal proposes a building height of 27.45 ft ., measured from the front average elevation, where a maximum height of 24.3 ft . is permitted for a flat roof.

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

Both requests propose a 0.62 ft . (7.5 inch) increase to the previously relaxed building heights, as viewed from the front and rear of the dwelling. This additional overheight area is generally limited to an approximately 22 ft . by 10 ft . flat roof area. This area is centrally located at the top of the upper roof at the northern portion of the existing dwelling, where the new $21 / 2$ storey addition is being constructed.

Considering the relatively minor scale of the proposed increase to the granted height variances, this Department's comments remain similar to the comments for the 2014 June 06 appeal.

The subject site, which is zoned R5 Residential District, is located in the Garden Village neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two-family dwellings vary. This interior lot, which is approximately 60.9 ft . deep and 115.5 ft . wide, observes a frontage of approximately 50 ft . along Gilpin Court to the west. Abutting the subject site to the north, south and around the Gilpin Court cul-de-sac to the west are single family dwellings, and across the lane to the east are two-family dwellings. Vehicular access is provided from the Gilpin Court cul-de-sac. The site observes a downward slope of approximately 6 ft . in the south-north direction. The subject site contains a single family dwelling that was constructed in 1968 along with an attached carport.

The subject lot is unusual in that it is oriented laterally to its only road frontage, at the terminus of Gilpin Court along the western property line. It appears that because of this, the front yard has historically been measured from the shorter northern lot line, despite its lack of road frontage; and the rear yard has historically been measured from the southern lot line.

Consequently, the height of the residence was measured from the average natural grade of the lower of its north facade or its south facade, rather than from its actual front and rear elevations, which face Gilpin Court and the rear lane respectively. The height of the existing one and a half storey dwelling is proximately 18 ft . as measured from the actual rear elevation.

The proposed height relaxations are reviewed in the context of the rear elevation facing the lane (east) and the front elevation facing the Gilpin Court (west). In both cases, the height calculations are based on the existing natural grade at the rear elevation and front elevation respectively. The 6 ft . grade change from the rear to the front of the subject site contributes to the excess height of the building.

With respect to the first a) variance, the proposed 4.27 ft . (previously 3.65 ft .) height encroachment, as viewed from the rear elevation, consists of the upper roof of the proposed addition, above the approximate mid-point of the fascia board. Considering
that views from the neighbouring properties across the lane to the east are predominantly oriented to the east, it is not expected that the additional massing created by the proposed height encroachment would negatively impact these neighbouring sites.

With respect to the second b) variance, the proposed 3.15 ft . (previously 2.53 ft .) height encroachment, as viewed from the front elevation, consists of the upper roof of the proposed addition above the fascia board as well as a small decorative dormer in the center. This area of encroachment is relatively limited.

Considering the distant siting of the upper roof from the neighbouring properties to the north and to the southwest, and the absence of any direct conflict with views from these properties, it is not expected that the additional massing created by the proposed height encroachment would negatively impact these neighbouring sites.

Further, the proposed 4 in 12 roof pitch would result in a gently sloping design that minimizes the roof massing above the fascia board level, as viewed from the rear and front elevations.

Given the incremental nature of the proposed height encroachments, which increase the previously granted height relaxation by only 0.62 ft ., and the limited impacts of this increase on the neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape, this Department does not object to the granting of both first $a$ ) and second b) variances.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Correspondence was received from a resident expressing concern regarding loss of privacy in his home and backyard as well as the enjoyment of his home due to the significant renovations being done to 4862 Gilpin Court.

No further correspondence was received regarding this appeal.
MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
THAT based on the plans submitted part (a) of this appeal be ALLOWED.

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:

THAT based on the plans submitted part (b) of this appeal be ALLOWED.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## 4. NEW BUSINESS

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

MOVED BY MR. B. POUND:
SECONDED BY MR. B. BHARAJ:
THAT this Hearing do now adjourn.

The Hearing adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Ms. C. Richter

Mr. B. Bharaj

Mr. B. Pound

Ms. E. Prior
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

## 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



## Property

Name of Owner
Bebltown themes ito/a-paukic devil
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.


## Office Use Only

Appeal Number BV\# $6196 \quad \sigma 1: 00 \mathrm{pm}$.
Required Documents:

- Hardship Letter from Applicant
- Site Plan of Subject Property
■ Building Department Referral Letter


## Letter of Hordship

The city of Burnaby
4949 Canada Way, Burnaby

# Bellown Homes Ltd <br> A-Pacific Developments Ltd 

9558-134 St
Surrey, BC
I am the owner of the property located at. 7357 Newcombe st, Burnaby. I am hoping to get an approval for relaxing the setback between the principle building and the accessory building from $14^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ to 3.43 ft . Our hardship begins with the lot being an R10 Zoning, which allows for a second story of the building to be half the size of the main floor. Currently the average setback as assessed by the survey of the property comes in at 40.63 ft . So, this does not leave enough room in the rear to build the garage in the back with the required setback as the lot is only $109^{\prime} \mathrm{ft}$ deep. We have moved the retaining walls to make better use of the lot, and this lot also slopes quite a bit from the rear to the front and that makes it not possible to have a built in garage in the main building. We have also changed the Double car garage to a single car garage with a carport for more light to get through to the basement \& in the backyard. We have also redesigned the rear deck and made it smaller and it now sit further away from the Garage/carport. The whole neighborhood wanted the house to be moved back, so now we are trying to keep everyone happy in the neighborhood and accommodate everyone. We have moved the house to the average front yard setback of 40.63 ft . With our new proposal we would like a relaxation for the rear yard setback so we can keep the whole neighborhood happy and still be able to bulld a decent house. We are further limited to the size of the second floor of the building being only half of the main floor else, it would be feasible to build a bigger in the second floor and decrease the size of the footprint of the main bulling. We have made every effort possible to design the house in such a way that would have the minimal impact on the surrounding area but it is not feasible to buid a new house with these limitations. We have spent a lot of tme trying to make diferent styes of plans and none of them work. I hope everyone can understand the hardship we are facing and make an accurate fudgement for tht variante application. I would like to thank everyone for their time and consideration in this process and hope to go forward with the proposed building plans.

Thanks


BOARDOR VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: Nov 6, 2015 |  | DEADLINE: Nov 10, 2015 for the Dec <br> 3, 2015 hearing |  | This is not an application. Please take letter to Board of Variance. (Clerk's office Ground Floor) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Tony Gill |  |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 9558134 St., Surrey V3V 5 S5 |  |  |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604-728-3078 |  |  |  |  |
| PROJECT: |  |  |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: New single family dwelling |  |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 7357 Newcombe Street |  |  |  |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 32 |  | DL: 25 | AN: 14945 |

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) R10 [6.3.1] 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 distance between the principal building and the detached garage and carport is 3.43 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.

Note: A previous Board of Variance (B.V. 6177) denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 24.93 feet measures to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 40.63 feet is required.
Note: A previous Board of Variance (B.V. 6190) denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 33.86 feet measures to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 40.63 feet is required; and allowed the distance between the principal building and the detached garage of 9.75 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.
Note: A previous Board of Variance (B.V. 6194) denied an appeal requesting the distance between the principal building and the detached garage of 0.53 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.

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

## BHS

```
knvacmun
```


## Peter Kushnir

Deputy Chief Building Inspector

Nov 6 zuns
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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


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 $\qquad$ Appeal Number BV\# $\qquad$

Required Documents:
$\square$ Hardship Letter from Applicant

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

City of Burnaby

Board of Variance
November $10,2015$.

Re: 175 Delta Avenue, Bumaby $B C$

I am writing to you to ask for permission to increase the project height for my renovation at 175 Delta Avenue, Burnaby, $B C$.

While the overall height does not change much, it is still a change from a pointed roof now to a flat roof. The neighbouring houses on either side are taller than how my house currently sits.

We are renovating a small 800 sq ft foot print, by adding a 2 nd floor to get some much needed space for a main living quarters and to develop the basement into a 2 bedroom rental suite.

By renovating rather than rebuilding, the amount of waste going into landfills is seriously reduced. As well the completion dates will be roughly 4 months (considerably shorter time than building new)

With a flat roof, we are allowed $25^{\prime}$ from the lowest point. Our design is for $31^{\prime} .6^{\prime \prime}$ But I really want to point out that from the front of the house we are at height $22.8^{\prime \prime}$

This a sloping lot and the height from the road to the front door drops down roughly 4 feet;

Thanks and I appreciate your time and hope you will be able to grant us our request to build to this


Phone $778-873-7720$


## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: October 23, 2015 | DEADLINE: November 10, 2015 for <br> the December 3, 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: Edward Vega |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 2259 E 5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Vancouver |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: $\mathbf{6 0 4 . 4 4 2 . 1 9 0 0}$ |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: Int. alt. and addition to an ESFD with secondary suite and detached garage |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 175 Delta Avenue | DL: $122 / 188$ | PLAN: NWP4953 |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 10 |  |

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 [105.6(1)(b)]
of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to build an addition and undertake an interior alteration to an existing single family dwelling with a secondary suite and detached garage. The following relaxation is being requested.

1) The principal building height, measured from the rear average elevation will be 33.55 feet where a maximum of 24.30 feet is permitted.
2) The principal building height measured from the front average elevation will be 25.71 feet.
3) The principal building height will be 3 storeys where a maximum of 2.5 storeys is permitted.

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

## JQ

[^0]
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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



## Property

Name of Owner
Civic Address of Property
$\frac{\text { Ho, Ying mull }}{\text { 8210 BURNLAKE DRIVE }}$

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.
$01.19,2015$
Date

Applicant Signature

## Office Use Only

Appeal Number BV\# $\qquad$ e 1.15 pm.
Required Documents:

- Hardship Letter from Applicant
- Site Plan of Subject Property
- Building Department Referral Letter
t. 604.721 .7738 f. 604.222.0198
e. ian@gradualarchitecture.com
a. 200-1892 West Broadway, Vancouver, BC. Canada, V63, IY9
www.gradualarchitecture.com
Date: November 5,2015
Board of Variance. City of Burnaby 4949 Canada Way, Bumaby, BC V5G 1 M2


## Subject: Hardship Letfer for 8210 Burnlake Drive

Amendments on Architectural drawings for Previously Approved Setback BOV 6175

Dear Sir, dear Madam,

On behave of the property owner, I am writing to you to request minor amendments to Architectural drawings for Previously Approved BV 6175.

On BV 6175, the Board has granted the relaxation for the setback of 72.62 ft from Winston Street property line to the proposed addition. However, due to the plan discrepancies, the actual proposed setback is 74.62 ft measured to the new proposed addition. Within this two-foot space, the property owner would like to propose a two-foot balcony and 2 one-foot box-windows. With these three projections, the 72.62 ft approved setback is still being maintained.

With above said, I believe that these minor amendments to the existing architectural drawings will have no impact on the approved BV 6175 .

Sincerely,


Ian Guan, Architect, ABC
Gradual Architecture Inc.

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: October 20, 2015 | DEADLINE: November 10, 2015 for the <br> December 03, 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: Ying Muoi HO |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 8210 Burnlake Drive |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 778.929.8918 | PROJECT |  |
| DESCRIPTION: Addition and interior alteration to main \& upper floor of an existing family dwelling |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 8210 Burnlake Drive | PLAN: 48688 |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ |  |

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) R1 R101.8]
> of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to build an addition to an existing single family dwelling. The following relaxation is requested:

1) The front yard setback from the Winston Street property line will be 74.10 feet to the foundation where a minimum front yard setback of 85.24 feet is required based on front yard averaging. A balcony will project 1.5 feet beyond the foundation and two window bays will project 1.0 feet beyond the foundation.

Note: A previows Board of Variance (B.V. 6175) decision allowed a front yard setback on Winston Street of 72.62 feet, as well as, a roof overhang projecting 2.5 feet at all sides beyond the foundation of addition, except with 3 feet where 2 roofs meet.

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

KL

Peter Kushnir
Deputy Chief Building Inspector, Buitding Deparment

|  |
| :---: |
|  |  |
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Board of Variance Appeal Application Form

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Applicant

Name of Applicant helderbaptista

Mailing Address
City/Town $\qquad$ burnaby Postal Code (BC)/5SZLT
Phone Number (s) (H) $\qquad$
Email heder $\rightarrow$ arpiscicaplunnimel.con
Preferred method of contact:
Property

Name of Owner


Civic Address of Property
Bumaby, B,C.V5B2L7

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.

Nov. $10 / 2015$


Office Use Only

Appeal Number BVH $\qquad$ 6200 1:3op.m.
Required Documents:
Hardship Letter From Applicant
D Site Plan of Subject PropertyBuilding Department Referral Letter

Letter of Hardship<br>Helder Baptista<br>6200 Buchanan Street, Burnaby, B.C. V5B 2 S5

To whom it may concern,
This is a letter of hardship as requested for the variance of the placement and completion of an existing built garage on my property ( 6200 Buchanan Street).

The block on which my home sits is a triangle, which means that my home and 2 others on this block have 2 front streets. In addition all lots on this block are pie shaped thus complicating the placement of buildings due to setbacks.

My garage sits within these setbacks. There is nowhere I can have a garage on the property that does not fall within the footprint of the setbacks. There are 2 ther homes on this block that already have had allowances on the placement of buildings due to having 2 front streets.

I consider myself a good and responsible neighbor and all of my neighbors understand the situation. My property has had extensive landscaping since I purchased the property in 1998. There are hedges that line Parkcrest Drive that actually hide the garage so it is also not a visual obstruction to anyone. I also consider myself to be a good member of the community and believe I have beautified the neighborhood over the years by acquiring approximately over 70 species and varieties of rhodos, azaleas, magnolias, rose of sharon, fruit trees etc. I also clean up the city semi-circle alley on my block. I do this approximately 4 times a year and pressure wash it in the spring.

In terms of hardship I could not afford to rebuild a new garage. I divorced in 2013 and in keeping the home 1 acquired a mortgage of over 1 million dollars. It would create extreme hardship to have to put out another $\$ 50,000.00$ which I estimate would cost to rebuild if I had to.

Please take all these circumstances in to consideration. I would really like to keep the garage as it provides an important function for myself and my family.

## Sincerely,

Helder Baptista
6200 Buchanan Street
604-444-4448

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: October 23, 2015 | DEADLINE: November 10, 2015 for <br> the December 03, 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: Helder Baptista |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 6200 Buchanan Street |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604.444.4448 | PROJECT |  |
| DESCRIPTION: Detached garage to an existing single family dwelling |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 6200 Buchanan Street |  |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 119 | DL: 130 |

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:

$$
\text { Zone/Section(s) R2 } 16.2(2) ; \mathbf{8 0 0 . 6 ( 1 ) ]}
$$

of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant has built a detached garage without a permit. The following relaxation is being sought.

1) The relaxation of 800.6 (1) of the Zoning By-law which, if permitted, will allow an accessory building in a required front yard, located 9.0 feet from the south property line abutting Parkcrest Drive and 13.61 feet from the east 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 contain additional characteristics in contravention of the Burnaby Zoning By-law a future appeal(s) may be required.

## KL

Peter Kushnir<br>Deputy Chiee Building Inspector, Building Department
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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


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\# $\qquad$
(a) 1:30p.m

Required Documents:
E Hardship Letter from Applicant

- Site Plan of Subject Property
- Building Department Referral Letter


# Melen Soderholm, Peter Buchanan <br> 5724 E - Mntum sumet <br> Wumabov. BC 

* City of Eurnaby - E Doard of Vardance

494 Camana Vay
Blammars. Be Cmmads
vac 1me

## Dear Board Members:

This letter supports a variance application for an over height fence built in 2007 on the western border of our property, 5724 Eglinton Street (Drawing I and Panels 1-4 Drawing 2B). The proposed retaining wall and fence shown on the attached drawings (Panels 5-11) are not part of this variance application as they comply with City of Burnaby by-laws. They were submitted to the City's Building Department for comment. We have been advised that this proposed wall and fence are in by-law compliance.

A typical panel of panels $1-4$ is shown in Drawing 2, (page 2 of 8 ), and consists of four $5^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ high solid prefabricated cedar panels topped with vegetation supports. The vegetation supports are 2 -foot high diagonal lattices and a $10 \frac{1}{2}$ inch high trellises constructed of 2 -inch by 2 -inch cross pieces. These panels now support climbing vines and a flower and shrub garden adjacent to the fence. (Photo I). All portions of the fence are situated on or over our property.

The fence panels that are the subject of this application were erected in 2007 to replace an English laurel hedge (approximately 12 feet in height and up to 12 feet in width). In 2013 and 2014 the remaining overgrown hedges along the property line were removed and a similar over height fence was erected. It was then that the residents of the adjoining property expressed their displeasure with the removal of the hedge and the fence and filed a complaint with the City. We applied for a Variance in June of 2015 for the entire fence but were denied a variance.

We have removed the top portions of the fence that was constructed in 2013-2014 which brings these newer panels into compliance: these changes have been accepted by the Burnaby bylaw officer. We are now applying for a variance for the original panels constructed in 2007 for the following reasons:

- This portion of the fence was in place for seven years without any concerns being raised;
- The residents of the adjoining property have now indicated that they would accept the original panels, see attached letter;
- Removing the entwined vines and lattice could damage the structure and integrity of the fence,
necessitating more costs to us in repair and/or replacement.
- Removing the vines will remove an attractive and diverse boundary that supports flowering plants and shrubs providing habitat for several bird and insect species;

Thank you for your consideration of this application.
Sincerely


Weien Soderholm, Peter 顛uchanan
Property Owners
5724 Eglinton Street



September 9, 2015
We are not interested in compensation. We would be willing to consider the compromise we offered in September 2014. This would be to retain the over height fence between the two houses and remove the lattice and pergola on the remaining seven panels. As this was our position last September we would be willing to withdraw our objection. This would leave ap to Cay Hall whether they wish to enforce the bylaw and the decision of se bead d Me ace. The bylaw offer who has been in contact with us regarding the fence is on holiday until September 14 and so we would want to clarity with her that this compromise would be acceptable to the city.


## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: November $9^{\text {th }}, 2015$ |  | DEADLINE: November $10^{\text {th }}, 2015$ for the December $3^{\text {rd }}, 2015$ hearing |  | This is not an application. Please take letter to Board of Variance. (Clerk's office Ground Floor) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Helen Soderholm |  |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 5724 Eglinton St, Burnaby, V5G 2K3 |  |  |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604.325.7758 |  |  |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: Fence for existing single family dwelling. |  |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 5724 Eglinton Street |  |  |  |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 79 | DL: 83 |  | AN: NWP24961 |

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 [6.14(5)(b)]<br>of the Bumaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant has constructed -new fences to an existing single family dwelling. The following relaxation is being requested.

1) The fence height, in the required side yard and rear yard, is of varying heights of up to 9.97 ' where a maximum 5.91' is permitted.

## Note:

The Board of Variance previously (July 10', 2015: BV帾778) dented a fence height, in the requred side and rear yard, of warying heights of up to $10.13^{\prime}$ where a maximum 5.9 I' ' is pemitted. $^{\text {por }}$

The applicant recognizes that should the project contan additonal characteristics in contravention of the zoning by-law a fume appealls) may be reaured.

BY

Peter Kushnit
Deputy Chef Building mspector

5724 Eglinton St
Draming - Ot.30,2015



Existing Typical Fence Panel, Lattice Trellis and Posts
Four Panels - Subject of Variance Application
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[^0]:    Peter Kushnir
    Deputy Chief Building Inspector, Permits and Customer Service
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