



**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, 2016 April 07 at 6:00 PM

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

PRESENT: Ms. Charlene Richter, Chair  
Mr. Guyle Clark, Citizen Representative  
Mr. Rana Dhatt, Citizen Representative  
Mr. Stephen Nemeth, Citizen Representative  
Mr. Brian Pound, Citizen Representative

STAFF: Ms. Margaret Malysz, Planning Department Representative  
Ms. Joy Adam, Development Plan Technician  
Ms. Eva Prior, Administrative Officer

The Administrative Officer called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**2. MINUTES**

**(a) Minutes of the Board of Variance Hearing held on 2016 March 03**

MOVED BY MR. POUND:

SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

THAT the minutes of the Burnaby Board of Variance Hearing held on 2016 March 03 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. 6218

APPELLANT: Roger Johal

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Keren and Maxim Alterman

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [4052 Marine Drive](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 185; DL 175; Plan 41124

APPEAL: An Appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.6(1)(a) and 102.8(1) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home at 4052 Marine Drive. The following variances are being requested:

a) The principal building height, measured from the rear average elevation would be 33.0 feet, where a maximum building height of 29.5 feet is permitted. The principal building height, measured from the front average elevation would be 26.39 feet; and,

b) The front yard setback would be 62.5 feet to the foundation, where a minimum front yard setback of 66.47 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The roof overhang would be 2.5 feet beyond the foundation.

**APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:**

Roger Johal submitted an application to allow for the construction of a single family dwelling.

Ms. Keren Alterman, homeowner, appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

**BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:**

The subject site, zoned R2 Residential District, is located in the Big Bend neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single family dwellings vary. This interior lot, approximately 69.8 ft. wide and 176.5 ft. deep, has an 82 ft. frontage on the south side of Marine Drive. This portion of Marine Drive runs on an angle; as a result, seven out of nine lots in the subject block, including the subject lot, have a parallelogram shape. Abutting the subject site to the east and west are residential lots that are in the process of redevelopment. Currently, the lot to the immediate east (4062

Marine Drive) contains an older single family dwelling, but is the subject of a pending building permit for a new single family dwelling (BLD # 15-01478). A new single dwelling on the lot to the immediate west (4042 Marine Drive) is in the early stages of construction (BLD # 15-01588). Across the lane to the south, the subject site is bordered by a green buffer area, which is part of a large industrial development on a property zoned M5 Light Industrial District. The properties to the north, across Marine Drive, contain single family dwellings. Vehicular access to the site is provided from the existing rear lane. The site observes a significant downward slope from the northeast corner of the lot, at Marine Drive, to the southwest corner, at the rear lane, dropping 24.05 ft. over approximately 229 ft.

A new single family dwelling with a secondary suite and attached garage is proposed for the subject site, for which two variances to building height and front yard setback requirements are requested.

It should be noted that similar variances were granted for the development proposals at the neighbouring sites immediately east and west of the subject site (4062 and 4042 Marine Drive) at the Board of Variance hearing on 2016 February 02 (BV # 6206 and BV # 6207 respectively).

The first a) appeal requests a building height of 33 ft., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum building height of 29.5 ft. is permitted for sloped roofs.

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

In this case, the height calculation is based on existing natural grade at the rear elevation. As noted above, the grade difference from the northeast (front) to the southwest (rear) corner of the subject site contributes to the excess height. The proposed height encroachment of 3.5 ft. would be limited to the upper portion of the main roof, approximately 2 ft. above the fascia board. This roof encroachment would occur approximately 11 ft. away from the outermost rear face of the subject dwelling and at least 35 ft. away from the rear property line, as measured to the closest point at the southeast corner of the lot. The substantial setback from the rear property line, and the screening effects of the intervening green belt, would effectively eliminate any massing impacts when viewed from the neighbouring property to the south.

The height encroachment area, when viewed from the neighbouring properties to the west and east, would be generally limited to small roof peak areas on the main roof. Considering the small scale of these encroachments, which are related to the downward sloping terrain in the north-south direction, little impact is expected on the neighbouring properties to the northwest and southeast.

The proposed dwelling would observe a front elevation height of 26.39 ft. from the Marine Drive property line, which is well under the maximum 29.5 ft. building height allowed by the Zoning Bylaw.

In summary, considering the site's challenging topography and the proposal's minimal

impacts on neighbouring properties, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) variance.

The second b) appeal requests a front yard setback of 62.5 ft., measured to the foundation of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of 2.5 ft., where front yard averaging requires a minimum setback of 66.47 ft. from the front property line.

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

In this case, the front yard averaging calculations are based on the front yard setbacks of the two dwellings at 4032 and 4042 Marine Drive immediately west of the subject property, and on the front yard setbacks of the two dwellings at 4062 and 4072 Marine Drive immediately east of the subject site. These front yards are: 74.59 ft., 61.30 ft., 77.06 ft., and 52.94 ft. deep respectively. The existing dwellings at 4032 and 4062 Marine Drive affect the front yard averaging calculations.

It should be noted that the front yard measurements for 4042 and 4062 Marine Drive are based on the existing dwellings. As mentioned above, the Board of Variance granted front yard setbacks of 45.0 ft. and 54.96 ft. respectively, for new single family dwellings on these properties. Both of the granted setbacks are significantly less than the requested variance for the subject property. If these setbacks were substituted in the front yard averaging calculations, the required front yard setback for the subject site would be approximately 57 ft.

The front yard setback is measured to the foundation at the northwest corner of the proposed dwelling. Due to the parallelogram geometry of the site, this distance would gradually increase up to 79 ft. at the opposite corner of the dwelling, where the covered deck/patio is proposed, or to approximately 90 ft. at the main building face. As a result, the front yard encroachment of 3.97 ft. is limited to a small triangular area at the northwest corner of the proposed dwelling.

It should be noted that the current dwelling is sited approximately 10 ft. north of the proposed northwest corner location.

With respect to the neighbouring properties, considering the small scale of the front yard encroachment, the front yard setback of the existing dwelling, and the generous distance of 11.75 ft. to the shared (west) side property line, no massing impacts are expected on the neighbouring property to the west. Similarly, given the minor nature of the variance, in combination with the distant siting, this encroachment would not be perceived from the properties on the opposite side of Marine Drive. With respect to the neighbouring property to the east, the proposed dwelling would greatly exceed the

required front yard setback at the shared (east) side property line, due to the angled alignment of Marine Drive, and would therefore have no impacts.

In the broader neighbourhood context, most frontages in the subject block are heavily screened by mature landscaping. However, this may change with future redevelopment. For instance, the subject proposal includes a new pathway along the front property line, where a mature landscape hedge currently exists. Nevertheless, the proposed placement of the subject dwelling would be consistent with the “staggered” alignment of the neighbouring residences in the subject block. Further, the proposed minor front yard encroachment would not be noticeable from the Marin Drive streetscape.

In summary, considering the challenging geometry of the site and the absence of any anticipated negative impacts on the adjacent properties and the existing streetscape, this Department does not object to the granting of this second b) variance.

ADJACENT OWNER’S COMMENTS:

A petition letter was received advising of no objections to the front yard variance. The petition was signed by owners/occupants of 6036, 6066, 6081, 6124 and 6131 Brantford Avenue and 6109 Empress Avenue.

No further correspondence was received.

MOVED BY MR. POUND:

SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. POUND:

SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**(b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6219**

APPELLANT: Jeff Chong

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Anne Kang

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [4035 Brandon Street](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 41; DL 34; Plan 24339

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 105.6(1)(b) and 105.8(1) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling with attached garage at 4035 Brandon Street. The following variances are being requested:

a) The principal building height measured from the rear average elevation would be 28.0 feet, where a maximum building height of 24.30 feet is permitted. The principal building height measured from the front average elevation would be 23.9 feet, where a maximum building height of 24.30 feet is permitted;

b) The principal building depth would be 66.0 feet measured to the rear deck post, where a maximum depth of 60.0 feet is permitted. The rear deck would project 3.0 feet beyond the post.

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Jeff Chong submitted an application to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling.

Jeff Chong and Diego Lin, representatives for the homeowner, 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 Garden Village neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two family dwellings vary. This interior lot, approximately 50.0 ft. wide and 230.8 ft. deep, fronts onto the north side of Brandon Street. Immediately to the east of the subject site is a single family dwelling and to the north is a two family dwelling. Along the west side property line the subject site borders three lots, two of which contain two family dwellings, with the middle lot containing a single family dwelling. Vehicle access to the site is proposed via Brandon Street; there is no lane access, although there is a 20 ft. wide private easement along the rear property line of the subject lot and the three lots to the immediate east. The site is also restricted by a 15 ft. wide sanitary/storm easement along the rear property line, which overlaps the private access easement. The site observes a moderate downward slope of approximately 13 ft. from the front to the rear.

This appeal concerns proposed revisions to an approved building permit for a new single family dwelling with an attached garage on the subject site (BLD # 14-01849). The contemplated revisions are mainly related to the rear deck, which is proposed to be increased in depth. As a result, two variances have been requested.

The first a) appeal is for a building height of 28.00 ft., measured from the rear 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 impacts of new buildings or structures on neighbouring properties.

In this case, the height calculation is based on the existing natural grade at the rear elevation, including the enlarged rear deck. A moderate grade difference from the front to the rear of the subject site contributes to the excess height of the rear elevation. The proposed height encroachment of 3.7 ft. extends from approximately the top of the window line of the upper storey to the top of the roof overhang above. Considering the proposed siting of the subject dwelling over 120 ft. from the rear property line, and the siting and orientation of the existing dwelling on the neighbouring site immediately to the north, which is approximately 260 ft. distant and fronts onto Price Street, the excess height would have little impacts on this neighbouring property.

When viewed from the west and east side property lines, only portions of the roof overhang feature would be over height. Since views of the neighbouring residences to the west and east are predominantly oriented to the north and these residences do not feature upper windows within the overlap area where the excess height occurs, few impacts are expected on these neighbouring residences.

The proposed dwelling would observe a front elevation height of 23.9 ft. from the Brandon Street property line, excluding the chimney feature, which is 0.4 ft. less than the permitted maximum height.

The second b) appeal is for a principal building depth of 66 ft., measured to the posts of the rear deck of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for the rear deck overhang of 3.0 ft., where a maximum building depth of 60.0 ft. is permitted.

The Bylaw's intent in limiting building depth is to prevent the creation of dwellings that present a long imposing wall, such that the massing of the building impacts neighbouring properties.

In this case, the main body of the dwelling would be 53.58 ft. deep with the remaining 12.42 ft. of depth contributed by the rear deck. This rear deck would be approximately 16.67 ft. wide and approximately 6 ft. above the adjacent grade. The deck would be approximately 18 ft. from the west side property line and approximately 15 ft. from the east side property line. Considering these generous setbacks, the massing impacts of the excess depth would be minimal on the neighbouring properties to the west and east.

In summary, neither variance would significantly impact neighbouring properties or the existing streetscape. However, the proposed excess building height and building depth are the result of a design choice rather than hardship. Full compliance with the Zoning Bylaw can be achieved on this site, as demonstrated by the original design, which has already been issued a building permit.

For this reason, this Department cannot support the granting of the first a) and second

b) appeal.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Correspondence was received from residents of 4064 and 4066 Price Street in opposition to this appeal. The residents relayed concerns regarding loss of sunlight and privacy. They also advised that the variances were a result of design choice.

A petition letter was submitted by the applicants at the time of the hearing from residents/occupants at 4034, 4049, 4055 and 4065 Brandon Street, 5050 and 5108 Inman Avenue and 4036, 4038 and 4052 Price Street in support of the requested variances.

No submissions were received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. CLARK:

SECONDED BY MR. POUND:

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

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Mr. Nemeth

MOVED BY MR. CLARK:

SECONDED BY MR. DHATT:

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

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Mr. Nemeth

(c) **APPEAL NUMBER:** B.V. 6220

APPELLANT: Jonathan Ehling

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Hong Hu

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [5635 Oakglen Drive](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 8; DL 32; Plan 18542

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 6.3.1 and 104.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 5635 Oakglen Drive. The following



variances are being requested:

- a) The distance between the principal building and the detached garage would be 12.22 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is permitted;
- b) The principal building height measured from the rear average elevation would be 29.9 feet where the maximum building height of 29.5 feet is permitted;
- c) The principal building height measured from the front average elevation would be 31.15 feet where the maximum building height of 29.5 feet is permitted; and,
- d) The front yard setback would be 36.25 feet to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 41.48 feet is permitted based on front yard averaging. The roof overhang would be 1.5 feet beyond the post.

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 6214, 2016 March 03) allowed the principal building height measured from the rear average elevation to be 29.6 feet, and the principal building height measured from the front average elevation to be 31.3 feet where a maximum building height of 29.5 feet is permitted. The Board denied an appeal requesting the front yard setback of 33.75 feet to the post, where a minimum front yard setback of 41.48 feet is permitted.

**APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:**

Jonathan Ehling submitted an application to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling.

Jonathan Ehling and Hong 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 2016 March 03 (BV # 6214). Three variances were sought to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling with a detached garage observing: a) a building height of 29.6 ft., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft. is permitted for sloped roofs, b) a building height of 31.3 ft., measured from the front average elevation, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft. is permitted for sloped roofs, and c) a front yard setback of 33.75 ft. where a front yard setback of 41.48 ft. is required. The first a) and second b) appeals concerning building height were supported by this Department and the Board of Variance granted both appeals. The third c) appeal was not supported by this Department, and the Board of Variance denied the appeal.

Subsequently, in response to the concerns raised at the hearing, the applicant has revised the proposal. The revised design locates the principal building 2.5 ft. further from the front property line, which results in a 2.5 ft. reduction in the distance between

the principal building and detached garage; otherwise, except for a small reduction in building height, the proposal is essentially the same as in the previous 2016 March 03 appeal.

The subject site, which is zoned R4 Residential District, is located in the Marlborough neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two family dwellings vary. This interior lot, approximately 60 ft. wide and 112 ft. deep, fronts onto Oakglen Drive to the northeast. Abutting the subject site to the northwest, southeast, directly across Oakglen Drive to the northeast and across the lane to the southwest are single family dwellings. The site observes an upward slope of approximately 14.3 ft. in the north-south (front to rear) direction. Vehicular access to the site is provided from the rear lane.

The applicant proposes to redevelop the site with a new single family dwelling including an accessory detached garage, which is the subject of four appeals.

The first a) appeal would permit a distance of 12.22 ft. from the accessory detached garage to the principal building, with a further roof projection of 1.5 ft., 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 proposed revised siting of the principal building. In order to achieve the greater front yard setback, the proposed dwelling has been located 2.5 ft. closer to the accessory detached garage.

The proposed 22.0 ft. wide by 20.5 ft. deep detached garage would be located in the south corner of the site, in the rear yard. The garage would observe a 4.0 ft. setback from the rear lane and a 4.0 ft. setback from the northeast side property line, which are the minimum setbacks required for an accessory building. The principal dwelling, approximately 48.5 ft. wide and 36.5 ft. deep (excluding the front porch and covered rear deck), would overlap almost the entire width of the detached garage. However, because the south corner of the proposed dwelling is recessed, only a 10 ft. section of the overlap area provides less than the required separation.

Given the relatively small scale of the encroachment, and the small number of windows facing the garage (one kitchen window), the reduced separation between the two structures would have few impacts on the interior of the dwelling. With respect to outdoor living space, this appeal would marginally reduce the green area available on this site, but a sizable outdoor living area (over 1,000 sq. ft.) would remain in the rear yard to the northwest of the proposed detached garage.

Further, since the compromised separation between the two structures would occur in the interior of the site, approximately 17 ft. and 34 ft. away from southeast and

northwest side property lines respectively, this relaxation would have little massing impacts on adjacent properties.

In view of the above, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) appeal.

The second a) and third b) appeal concern building height and are co-related.\*

The second b) appeal proposes a building height of 29.9 ft., measured from the rear average elevation, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft. is permitted for sloped roofs.

The third c) appeal proposes a building height of 31.15 ft., measured from the front average elevation, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft. is permitted for sloped roofs.

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

Both height variances differ slightly from those previously requested in the 2016 March 03 appeal, with the second b) variance (rear elevation) slightly increased (by 0.3 ft.) and the third c) variance (front elevation) slightly reduced (by 0.15 ft.). These differences are related to the revised siting of the dwelling, further away from the front property line, in relation to the sloping terrain of the subject site. Considering the minor nature of these differences, this Department's comments remain similar to those on the previous appeals.

In both cases, the height calculation is based on existing natural grade at the rear and front elevation respectively. As noted above, the grade difference from the south (rear) to the north (front) corner of the subject site contributes to the excess height of both elevations. The proposed height encroachment of 0.4 ft. and 1.65 ft. would be limited to a small roof peak area of the main roof. This roof encroachment would occur approximately 10 ft. away from the front face of the subject dwelling and approximately 18 ft. away from the rear face. Both the scale of the encroachment and the substantial setbacks from the front and rear property line would be mitigating factors with respect to the massing impacts of the overheight portion of the residence on the neighbouring property across Oakglen Drive to the northeast and across the lane to the southwest.

The height encroachment area, when viewed from the neighbouring properties to the northwest and southeast, would be generally limited to small triangular roof peak areas on the main roof. Again, considering the small scale of these encroachments, which are related to the downward sloping terrain in the south-north direction, little impact is expected on the neighbouring properties to the northwest and southeast.

In summary, given the site's challenging topography and the proposal's limited impacts on neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape, this Department does not object to the granting of the second b) and third c) variances.

The fourth d) appeal requests a front yard setback of 36.25 ft., measured to the front porch posts of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of 1.5 ft., where front yard averaging requires a minimum setback of 41.48 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 made 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.

As a reminder, in this case, the front yard averaging calculations are based on the front yard setbacks of the two dwellings at 5615 and 5625 Oakglen Drive immediately northwest of the subject site and on the front yard setbacks of the two dwellings at 5645 and 5655 Oakglen Drive immediately southeast of the subject site. These front yard setbacks are 39.6 ft., 35.3 ft., 43.9 ft. and 47.1 ft. respectively.

As noted above, the front yard setback is measured to the front porch posts. With the exception of the two bay windows at the main floor and two bay windows at the upper floor, the main body of the proposed dwelling would be set back an additional 2.5 ft., resulting in a distance of 38.75 ft. to the front property line. This is an improvement from the 36.25 ft. distance proposed in the 2016 March 03 appeal (incorrectly noted as 35.25 ft. in this Department's previous comments). In addition, there are 13 ft. wide by 8 ft. deep open decks (with corner posts) proposed on both the main floor and the upper floor at the northeast corner of the dwelling.

The proposed revised siting would place the subject dwelling 0.95 ft. behind the neighbouring dwelling to the northwest and 7.65 ft. in front of the neighbouring dwelling to the southeast.

With respect to the neighbouring dwelling to the northwest, if the actual 'corner to corner' relationship is considered, the subject dwelling would project 6.96 ft. in front of this residence (according to the provided survey, this residence observes a distance of 45.7 ft. from the front property line to its southeast corner). However, if the recessed corner areas (open decks) are considered, the north corner of the subject dwelling would be 1.05 ft. behind the southeast corner of this neighbouring residence. Also, the upper floor is proposed to be further set back 2.5 ft. from the main floor face at the northwest side elevation. This increased setback, in combination with the proposed 6.7 ft. northwest side yard setback, and the absence of facing windows in the neighbouring dwelling, would mitigate the massing impacts of the proposal.

With respect to the neighbouring dwelling to the southeast, if the actual 'corner to corner' relationship is considered, the subject dwelling would project 5.15 ft. in front of this residence. However, it appears that the revised siting of the subject dwelling would be sufficient to maintain the existing views from the front feature windows of this neighbouring dwelling, which are oriented to the northeast.

The revised siting of the proposed dwelling would be 3.12 ft. closer to the front property

line than the existing one-storey dwelling on the subject site (which observes a 39.37 ft. front yard setback) or only 0.62 ft. closer if the main body of the dwelling is considered. Therefore, the existing horizontal massing relationship between the subject property and the adjacent properties to the northwest and southeast would be similar.

With regard to the broader neighbourhood context, there is an established block front, with the majority of lots observing average front yard setbacks of approximately 42 ft., with deeper front yards (averaging approximately 47.5 ft.) to the southeast of the subject site and shorter front yards (averaging approximately 36 ft.) toward the northern terminus of the subject block. The revised siting of the proposed dwelling would provide for a better transition between these varying frontage depths than the previous design.

Lastly, it is noted that the proposed building depth is only 36.5 ft., significantly less than the 60 ft. depth permitted in the R4 District. This reduced building depth reflects the applicant's efforts to address the constraints imposed by the historic development pattern of the area, specifically the large front yard setbacks, and the more recently adopted separation requirements between detached garages and principal buildings.

Since this revised proposal appears to reach a balance between minimizing impacts on the neighbourhood and meeting the applicant's development needs, this Department does not object the granting of this third c) variance.\*\*

The Administrative Officer to the Board advised of two corrections to the Planning Comments:

\*The second b) and third c) appeal concern building height and are co-related.

\*\*this Department does not object to the granting of this fourth d) variance.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

A petition letter was received from residents/occupants at 5645 and 5655 Oakglen Drive in support of the variances being requested.

A letter was received on April 07, from a neighbour, in opposition to the appeal. They raised concerns regarding loss of the neighbourhood character, and loss of sunlight, views and privacy.

No further correspondence was received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. POUND:

SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. POUND:  
SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. POUND:  
SECONDED BY MR. DHATT:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. POUND:  
SECONDED BY MR. DHATT:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(d) **APPEAL NUMBER:** B.V. 6221

APPELLANT: Eva Wang

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Hsiao Chi

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [5150 Irmin Street](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 48; DL 98; Plan 2066

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 105.9 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling with secondary suite and attached garage at 5150 Irmin Street. The front yard setback would be 19.7 feet measured to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 24.84 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The roof overhang would be 2.0 feet and the steps would be 3.0 feet beyond the post.

**APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:**

Eva Wang submitted an application to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling.

Eva Wang appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject site, zoned R5 Residential District, is located in the Sussex-Nelson neighbourhood in which the age and condition of single and two family dwellings vary. This rectangular interior lot is approximately 90 ft. deep and has a frontage of approximately 66 ft. along the Irmin Street cul-de-sac to the north. Immediately to the west of the subject site is a single family dwelling and to the east is an existing commercial building with frontage onto Royal Oak Avenue further to the east. To the rear (south) the site borders an existing single family dwelling. The subject site is essentially flat with a downward slope of approximately 1 ft. from the front (north) to the rear (south). Vehicular access to the subject site is provided from Irmin Street; there is no lane access.

The subject site is proposed to be redeveloped with a new single family dwelling with a secondary suite and attached garage.

The appeal proposes a front yard setback of 19.7 ft. measured to the front porch posts of the proposed single family dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of 2.0 ft., where front yard averaging requires a minimum setback of 24.84 ft. from the front property line.

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 setbacks of the two single family dwellings immediately west of the subject site at 5136 and 5118 Irmin Street. The front yard setbacks for these properties are 24.99 ft. and 24.69 ft. respectively.

The proposed 19.7 ft. front yard setback is measured from the north property line to the posts of the front porch/veranda, located at the eastern half portion of the front elevation, which aligns with the proposed attached garage located at the western portion of the front elevation. The main body of the dwelling would observe various additional small setbacks on both levels. The siting of the proposed dwelling would be closely in line with the placement of the current dwelling (built in 1956) on the subject site, which observes a front yard setback of 20 ft.

It should be noted that, due to the Irmin Street cul-de-sac frontage, the north (front) property line of the subject site is located 10 ft. south of the neighbouring front property lines to the west. This also results in a shallower lot depth of 90 ft., where 100 ft. is typical for the majority of lots in the subject block.

As a result of the offset front property line, the proposed dwelling would actually be located approximately 4.71 ft. behind the immediately adjacent dwelling to the west, despite the lesser front setback. Therefore, the proposed front yard setback reduction would not affect this residence. Similarly, no impacts are expected on the neighbouring property to the east, which is oriented to Royal Oak Avenue and is screened by an approximately 8 ft. high hedge along the shared (east) side property line.

With respect to the broader neighbourhood context, the placement of the proposed dwelling would be consistent with the existing streetscape.

In summary, given the shallow depth of the site, and the minimal effects this proposal would have on the neighbouring properties and the streetscape in general, this Department supports the granting of this variance.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No submissions were received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH:

SECONDED BY MR. POUND:

THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(e) **APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6222**

APPELLANT: Angelo Marrocco

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Manda and Ivica Barisic

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [7476 19th Avenue](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 1; DL 30; Plan BCP 222

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 112.7(1) and 112.10 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of a deck addition with an aluminum roof cover to an existing single family dwelling at 7476 19th Avenue. The following variances are being requested:

a) The depth of the principal building would be 71.0 feet where a minimum depth of 56.61 feet is permitted; and,

b) The rear yard setback would be 18.72 feet measured to the covered deck face where a minimum rear yard setback of 24.60



feet is required. The roof overhang would be .5 feet beyond the covered deck face.

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Angelo Marrocco submitted an application to allow for the retention of a covered deck.

Manda and Ivica Barisic appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

In 2001, the subject property was rezoned from the R5 Residential District to the R12 Residential District, as part of an area rezoning process (REZ # 01-15). In 2002, the subject lot was created through subdivision (SUB # 01-55), along with the lot to the immediate west (7478 Nineteenth Avenue).

The subject property is located in the Edmonds area, in a single and two-family neighbourhood characterized by smaller lot sizes. This interior lot, approximately 33 ft. wide and 113 ft. deep, fronts onto Nineteenth Avenue to the northwest. The subject site abuts single family lots to the northeast, southwest and southeast. Vehicular access to the subject site is provided via Nineteenth Avenue: there is no lane access. The site is relatively flat with a downward slope of approximately 1.5 ft. from the rear to the front.

The subject site is improved with a single family dwelling, built in 2003 (BLD # 02-01223). Sometime between 2004 and 2010, the site was further improved with various exterior/interior additions and alterations, including a rear covered deck addition and a new accessory building in the rear yard. The covered rear deck addition is the subject of two appeals that are co-related.

The first a) appeal is for a principal building depth of 71.9 ft. where a maximum building depth of 56.61 ft. is permitted based on 50% of the lot depth.

The Bylaw's intent in limiting building depth is to prevent the creation of dwellings that present a long wall, such that the massing of the building impacts neighbouring properties.

The second b) appeal is for a covered deck addition to the existing single family dwelling observing a rear yard setback of 18.72 ft., measured to the deck face, with a further projection for roof eaves of 0.5 ft., where a minimum rear yard setback of 24.6 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.

According to the building permit drawings approved under BLD # 02-01223, the existing dwelling was approximately 56.67 ft. deep and observed a rear yard setback of approximately 33.08 ft., which is within the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw. To the rear of the dwelling, at the southeast corner, an approximately 10.18 ft. wide by 3.67 ft. deep deck/balcony was shown at the upper level, with an access stair along its southeast edge. The deck/balcony/stair in this configuration did not increase the existing building depth.

City aerials from 2004 to 2010 indicate that a larger deck, including a roof cover, was built instead of the originally proposed deck as indicated on the building permit drawings. The current deck is approximately 11.75 ft. wide and 14.33 ft. deep with the stair running along its northeast edge. The deck floor is approximately 10 ft. above the ground and the deck cover, which consists of metal posts and a flat metal roof, is approximately at the gutter level of the main roof, 18 ft. above the ground.

It should be noted that a similar, “mirror image” design was approved for the second lot of the subject subdivision, immediately to the northeast of the subject site, under BLD # 02-01224. However, it appears that the rear deck component, in its current form, also differs from the approved design and is similar in size to the subject deck. In general, the majority of neighbouring houses in the subject block and the block immediately to the southeast feature decks or balconies on the rear elevations.

With respect to the first a) variance, the covered deck addition contributes its full length (14.33 ft.) to the excess depth of the principal dwelling. Although, in general, the massing of a covered deck may not be as intrusive as the massing of a solid wall, in this case, considering the close alignment of the neighbouring residences with the subject dwelling, the additional 18 ft. high deck structure creates a sense of protrusion and affects the privacy of the surrounding neighbouring rear yards.

With respect to the second b) variance, the covered deck addition encroaches 5.88 ft. into the required rear yard. Considering the “rear yard to rear yard” arrangement of the neighbouring lots, with no separating lane in between, the impact of the deck encroachment is significant, particularly in regards to the neighbouring residence directly to the southeast of the subject site. The outdoor living area in the rear yard is reduced by the deck structure (and by the new 8.33 ft. by 10.67 ft. accessory building), but remains sufficient on this site.

In summary, considering that this proposal negatively impacts the neighbouring properties, this Department cannot support the granting of the first a) and second b) variances.

#### ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

Petition letters were received from residents at 7470, 7472, 7478 and 7480 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and 7469, 7471 and 7477 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue advising that they have no concerns regarding the appeals requested.

An email dated 2016 April 05, was received from the resident of 7478 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue advising they have no objections to the variances and would be unable to attend.

MOVED BY MR. DHATT:  
SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. DHATT  
SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

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

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOVED BY MR. POUND:  
SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH:

THAT this Hearing do now adjourn.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Hearing adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

---

Ms. C. Richter

---

Mr. G. Clark

---

Mr. R. Dhatt

---

Mr. S. Nemeth

---

Ms. E. Prior  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

---

Mr. B. Pound