# BOARD OF VARIANCE <br> <br> NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING 

 <br> <br> NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING}

DATE: THURSDAY, 2016 JUNE 02
TIME: 6:00 PM
PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, MAIN FLOOR, CITY HALL

## AGENDA

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

2. MINUTES
(a) Minutes of the Board of Variance Hearing held on 2016 May 05

## 3. APPEAL APPLICATIONS

(a) APPEAL NUMBER:
B.V. 6227
6:00 p.m.

APPELLANT: Mayumi Hasegawa
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Vivek and Anju Soni
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 4688 Alpha Drive
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 25; DL 122/123/124; Plan NWP16792
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 110.6(2)(a) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home (currently under construction) at 4688 Alpha Drive. The principal building height would be 25.74 feet where a maximum building height of 24.90 feet is permitted. (R10)
(b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6228 6:00 p.m.

APPELLANT: Ron Lee

## REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Ron and Karen Lee

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 6624 Charles Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 9; DL 132; Plan NWP2419
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 6.14(5)(b) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home at 6624 Charles Street. The fence at the rear of the lot would have varying heights up to a maximum of 6.83 feet where the maximum permitted height is 5.91 feet. (R4)

(c) APPEAL NUMBER:<br>B.V. 6229<br>6:15 p.m.<br>APPELLANT: Beverly Kitasaka and Daniel Piskacek<br>REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Beverly Kitasaka and Daniel Piskacek<br>CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5469 Keith Street<br>LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot N; DL 158; Plan NWP14508

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 6.3.1, 6.6(2)(a) and 6.14(5)(b) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home with detached garage at 5469 Keith Street. The following variances are being requested:
a) The distance between the principal building and the detached garage would be 14.22 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required;
b) The accessory building height would be 21.28 feet where the maximum building height of 15.1 feet is permitted. The building height is measured from the average grade which is 144.85 feet; and
c) A rear yard retaining wall would be of varying heights, to a maximum of 11.7 feet, where the maximum permitted height is 5.91 feet. (R2)
(d) APPEAL NUMBER:
B.V. 6230

## 6:15 p.m.

APPELLANT: Malkit Athwal
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Malkit and Rajwinder Athwal
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 6011 10th Avenue

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 17; DL 173; Plan NWP1034

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 6.6(2)(a) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of two new accessory buildings at 6011 10th Avenue. The following variances are being requested:
a) The height of the detached garage would be 17.64 feet, where the maximum permitted height is 15.1 feet; and
b) The height of the accessory building would be 17.54 feet, where a maximum permitted building height is 15.1 feet. (A2)

## 4. NEW BUSINESS

## 5. ADJOURNMENT

## CITY OF BURNABY

## BOARD OF VARIANCE <br> 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 May 05 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. 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 April 07

MOVED BY MR. DHATT
SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH

THAT the minutes of the Burnaby Board of Variance Hearing held on 2016 April 07 be adopted as circulated.

## 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. 6223

APPELLANT: Tommy Ngo
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Coastalwind Development Inc
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 6654 Walker Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 19 and 20; DL 91; Plan 1346
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 103.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family home at 6654 Walker Avenue. The front yard setback would be 22.60 feet to the post where a minimum front yard setback of 36.43 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The roof overhang would be 1.5 feet beyond the post. (Zone R3)

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Tommy Ngo submitted an application to allow for the construction of a single family dwelling.

Mr. Ngo and Mr. Sohal, appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject site is located the Richmond Park area, in a mature single family neighbourhood. The site is zoned R3 Residential District, which is intended to preserve the minimum density of development in mature single family areas. This interior lot, approximately 65 ft . wide and 122.5 ft . long, fronts onto Walker Avenue to the southwest. The subject site abuts single family lots to the northwest, southeast and northeast. Vehicular access to the subject site is provided via Walker Avenue; there is no lane access. The site is relatively flat with a downward slope of approximately 2 ft . in the southeast-northwest direction. The subject site is restricted by a 5 ft . wide sanitary easement along the northeast (rear) property line.

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 22.6 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 36.43 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 northwest of the subject site at 6630 and 6642 Walker Avenue and the two single family dwellings immediately southeast of the subject site at 6666 and 6678 Walker Avenue. The front yard setbacks for these properties are 61.84 ft ., 41.28 ft ., 20.13 ft . and 22.48 ft . respectively. The existing dwelling at 6630 Walker Avenue affects the front yard averaging calculations.

The proposed 22.6 ft . front yard setback is measured from the southwest property line to the posts of the proposed front porch, located slightly off center to the southeast of the front elevation. The front face of the dwelling would observe various additional setbacks on both levels. At the main level, the southeastern portion of the front face would be set back 5.5 ft . in relation to the front porch posts and the northwestern portion would be set back 2.19 ft . At the upper level, the central portion would be set back 4.4 ft . in relation to the front porch posts, with areas to the side recessed an additional 1 ft . In addition, the upper floor would be generously set back from the side faces of the main floor, 12.48 ft . at the southeast side elevation and 8.75 ft . at the northwest elevation.

The proposed siting would place the subject dwelling 18.68 ft . in front the neighbouring dwelling to the northwest and 2.47 ft . in front of the neighbouring dwelling to the southeast. If the actual 'corner to corner' relationship is considered, the subject dwelling would project 16.49 ft . in front of the residence to the northwest, but would be positioned 2.88 ft . behind the residence to the southeast (according to the provided survey, this residence observes a distance of 25.22 ft . from the front property line at its northwest corner).

Although it appears that this proposal would impact the neighbouring property to the northwest, there are several mitigating factors to consider.

First, the siting of the proposed dwelling, with the exception of the small front porch, would be closely in line with the placement of the existing dwelling on the subject site, which observes a front yard setback of approximately 25 ft . Therefore, the existing
horizontal massing relationship with the adjacent neighbouring residences would not be substantially changed.

Further, with respect to the broader neighbourhood context, with the exception of the two lots immediately northwest of the subject site, the placement of the proposed dwelling would be consistent with the majority of dwellings in the subject block, with front yard setbacks of approximately 22-25 ft. These setbacks are consistent with the minimum front yard setback required in the R3 District, which is 19.7 ft ., whereas the front yard setbacks on the two properties to the northwest of the subject site are two to three times greater than the minimum required.

In summary, considering the development pattern in the subject block, the proposal would have minimal effects on neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape. However, it is noted that the proposal is the result of a design choice, rather than hardship, as a greater front yard setback could be achieved by shifting the proposed residence rearward on the lot. As such, this Department cannot support the granting of this variance.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No submissions were received regarding this appeal.
MOVED BY MR. CLARK
SECONDED BY MR. POUND
THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED.
CARRIED
OPPOSED: Mr. Pound Mr. Nemeth
(b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6224

## APPELLANT: Dat Huynh, Christopher Bozyk Architects

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: 0883893 BC LTD
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 4050 Graveley Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 67; DL 117; Plan NWP43259
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 403.5(1) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a warehouse addition to an existing warehouse building at 4050 Graveley

Street, with a nil side yard setback where a minimum side yard setback of 19.69 feet is required. (Zone M3)

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Mr. Dat Huynh, agent for the appellants submitted an application to allow for the construction of a warehouse addition.

Margaret and Doug Bezdan, appeared before members of the Board of Variance at the Hearing.

## BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject site, zoned M3 Heavy Industrial District, is located in the West-Central Valley neighbourhood. The M3 District is intended for the accommodation of special types of industry and heavy industrial activities.

This interior lot, approximately 145.5 ft . wide and 131.8 ft . deep, fronts onto Graveley Street to the north. Directly across Gravely Street to the north are two lots containing residential dwellings. To the west, east and south the subject site is bordered by lots containing various industrial developments. Vehicle access to the site is provided from Graveley Street; there is no lane access. The subject site is restricted by the 10 ft . wide sanitary easement along the south (rear) property line.

The subject site is improved with a two-storey warehouse building, built in 1972, and associated parking and landscape areas. In 1988, the Board of Variance granted the subject property permission to retain an attached accessory building (storage shed) to the rear of the existing warehouse building for two years (BV3440). The accessory building observed a nil rear yard setback where a minimum rear yard setback of 9.84 ft . is required. This Department did not object to the temporary retention of the accessory building, which has since been removed.

This appeal concerns a proposed second floor warehouse addition to the existing warehouse building.

The appeal is for the construction of a warehouse addition to the existing warehouse building observing a nil east side yard setback, where a minimum side yard setback of 19.69 ft . is required when the other side yard setback is nil.

The intent of the Bylaw, when adopted, was to upgrade the quality of industrial development in order to increase its compatibility with other land uses.

The existing approximately 21.5 ft . high warehouse building occupies the western twothirds of the site, with the remaining lot area utilized for parking/loading and frontage landscaping. The existing building observes a nil side yard setback along the west side property line.

The 58.75 ft . wide by 37 ft . deep second floor addition is proposed in the south-east corner of the subject site. The addition would be aligned with the existing building to the rear and would span across the entire remaining lot width, from the east building face to the east side property line. As a result, the 19.69 ft . wide portion of the proposed addition, along the east side property line, would encroach into the required east side yard setback. The proposed addition is raised approximately 12 ft . above grade level to permit the existing loading and parking function to continue underneath. The overall height of the proposed addition is 39 ft ., consistent with the four storey maximum building height permitted in the M3 District.

It appears that, although the massing of the proposed addition would be substantial, relatively few visual impacts would result. To the east, the proposed addition would abut the neighbouring single storey building, which observes a nil setback along the shared side property line (this building observes a nil setback at both side property lines and is legal non-conforming with respect to the side yard setback requirements). The front and rear face of the proposed addition would be in line with this existing building. Directly to the south, the proposed addition would face the parking area of the neighbouring property at 1679 Gilmore Avenue. The existing building on this property, as well as the existing building on the adjacent property to the west (4055 First Avenue), front onto Gilmore Avenue to the east and First Avenue to the south respectively. These buildings have no windows facing the subject property. Massing impacts on the neighbouring residential dwellings across Graveley Street to the north would be mitigated by a generous front yard setback of approximately 85 ft .

Further, the subject property is constrained by the lack of a rear lane, which increases the space required for on-site maneuvering of vehicles and thus reduces the buildable area of the site. By raising the floor of the proposed addition, the applicants have devised a creative solution to increase floor area while maintaining parking and loading functions underneath. Moreover, the location of the proposed addition at the rear of the property, as noted above, minimizes the impacts of the proposed nil setback. As such, this proposal appears to reach a balance between satisfying parking and loading requirements, minimizing impacts on the neighbourhood and meeting the applicant's development needs.

Further, there is precedent for a similar side yard setback relaxation within the subject block. The neighbouring property immediately to the west (4040 Graveley Street) was granted a relaxation of the side yard setback to nil, where a minimum side yard setback of 19.69 ft . is required, by the Board of Variance in 2002 (BV 5015). Several other properties in the vicinity, constructed prior to the adoption of the setback requirement, also enjoy nil side yard setbacks on both sides.

In view of the above, although the proposed variance is not strictly the result of hardship, this Department does not object to the granting of this variance.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

An email was received on May 05, from Jordan Parente, 4099 Graveley Street, in opposition to the appeal. Mr. Parente advised that the variance would negatively impact livability, aesthetics and property values in the neighbourhood. Mr. Parente also expressed concern regarding further parking congestion on Graveley Street.

No further submissions were received regarding this appeal.
In response to the parking concern, Ms. Bezdan advised that they will still be able to provide the required number of parking stalls.

MOVED BY MR. POUND
SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH
THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED.
CARRIED UNANOMIOUSLY
(c) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6225

## APPELLANT: Sanja Gavrilovic

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Marko and Jelena Markovic
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 1655 Howard Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 60; DL 126; Plan 25437
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 102.6(1)(a) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw, which if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling at 1655 Howard Avenue. The principal building height, measured from the Heathdale Drive front average elevation would be 32.28 feet where the maximum building height of 29.5 feet is permitted. The principal building height, measured from the Howard Avenue front average elevation would be 23.33 feet. (Zone R2)

A previous Board of Variance (BOV 6172, 2015 June 04) allowed an appeal for a front yard setback from Heathdale Drive to the post of 39.10 feet, where a minimum setback of 44.57 feet is required based on front yard averaging. The cantilevered deck joists would extend 2.0 feet beyond the post; and construction of an accessory building in a required front yard, located 3.94 feet from the West property line abutting Heathdale Drive and 4.0 feet from the South property line, where siting of an accessory building in a required front yard is prohibited by the Zoning Bylaw.

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Sanja Gavrilovic submitted an application to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling.

Stephen Gavrilovic, agent for the homeowners and Marko Markovic, homeowner, 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 June 04 (BV6172), in which two variances were sought for the construction of a new single family dwelling with a detached garage. The first a) appeal was for a front yard setback of 39.1 ft . where a front yard setback of 44.57 ft . is required from the Heathdale Drive property line. The second b) appeal was for an accessory building in the Heathdale Drive front yard where accessory buildings are prohibited. While this Department supported the first a) appeal and did not support the second b) appeal, the Board granted both appeals.

This Department's comments on the 2015 June 04 appeal are included as Item 1 in the attached supplementary materials.

A new single family dwelling with a detached garage is currently under construction on the subject site (BLD15-00542). However, the applicant is proposing modifications to the approved design, which are the subject of this appeal.

The subject site, zoned R2 Residential District, is located in the Parkcrest-Aubrey neighbourhood in which the majority of single family dwellings were constructed in the 1960s. This through lot, approximately 57.5 ft . wide and 123.5 ft . long, fronts Howard Avenue to the east and Heathdale Drive to the west. The 50 ft . wide Heathdale Drive right-of-way is not fully developed; the easternmost 20 ft . of the right-of-way is paved and as the remainder is undeveloped green space. A large R1 District property, which is currently vacant, is located across Heathdale Drive to the west. Single family dwellings abut the subject site to the north and the south. Vehicular access to the site is provided from Heathdale Drive. The site observes a substantial downward slope of approximately 18 ft . in the northeast-southwest direction.

The appeal proposes a building height of 32.28 ft ., measured from the Heathdale Drive front average elevation, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft . is permitted for sloped roofs.

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

This proposal differs from the 2015 June 04 appeal with respect to the site grading in the western portion of the subject site, fronting onto Heathdale Drive. In the previous proposal, grading in this portion of the site generally followed the natural terrain with a
downward slope of approximately 8 ft . from the west face of the dwelling to the west property line. Also, a small sunken patio was proposed at the west elevation. The current proposal lowers the grades by approximately 4.5 ft . around the western portion of the dwelling. The proposed new grades match the cellar level and allow for more flat area between the dwelling and the detached garage. Although the roof peak elevation remains unchanged, the proposed new grades increase the building height calculation by approximately 4.41 ft .

Considering the nature of this height encroachment, little impact is expected on the neighbouring properties. The additional exposed portion of the building at the cellar level would not be visible from the neighbouring property to the north and would be fully screened by the existing fence along the south side property line. In addition, a large portion of this additional exposed area would be screened by the detached garage when viewed from Heathdale Drive and the vacant property to the west.

In summary, given the challenging site topography and the lack of any negative impacts on neighbouring properties and the existing streetscape, this Department does not object to the granting of the proposed variance.

## ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

No submissions were received regarding this appeal.

## MOVED BY MR. POUND

SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH
THAT based on the plans submitted this appeal be ALLOWED.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
(d) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6226

APPELLANT: Matt Durocher, Enduring Construction
REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Jaimie and Lilian Tamayo
CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 8151 17th Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 21; DL 27; Plan NWP1049
APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 105.10(3) and 6.12(3)(a) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, will allow for the addition and interior alterations to an existing single family dwelling at 8151 17th Avenue. The side yard setback will be 3.0 feet to the foundation where a minimum side yard setback of 3.3 feet is required. (Zone R5)

## APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Matt Durocher submitted an application to allow for the construction of an addition and interior alterations.
Matt Durocher, agent for the homeowners, 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 Second Street neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single and two-family dwellings vary. This interior lot, approximately 33 ft . wide and 146.4 ft . deep, fronts onto the northwest side of Seventeenth Avenue. Single family dwellings are located immediately southwest, northeast and directly across the lane to the northwest of the subject site. Directly across Seventeenth Avenue to the southeast, is a parking area for the Second Street Community School. The subject site observes a downward slope of approximately 5 ft . in the south - north direction.

The subject site was originally improved with a two storey single family dwelling (main floor and basement), built in 1928, and further improved with an accessory detached garage, built in 1994. In 2016, a building permit (BLD16-00160) was issued for further improvements to the dwelling, including various interior alterations and a rear addition to the basement and main floor. This building permit was issued in error with respect to the side yard setback requirement, which was approved at 3.0 ft . instead of 3.3 ft . as required. This error was identified by City staff upon inspection of foundation work. As a result, a variance is requested in order to permit construction to continue according to the approved plans.

The appeal proposes a side yard setback of 3.0 ft . from the northeast property line to the proposed addition to the existing dwelling, with a further projection for roof eaves of up to 1.5 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 northeast side yard setback of 3.0 ft ., and is legal-non-conforming with respect to the side yard setback requirement ( 3.3 ft .). The approved building permit drawings permit a 21 ft . deep two storey (main floor and basement) addition to the rear of the dwelling, aligned with the northeast side face of the existing dwelling. As a result of this alignment, the outermost 0.3 ft . wide section of this addition encroaches into the required side yard.

The side yard encroachment does not materially change the massing relationship between the existing dwelling and the neighbouring residence to the northeast of the subject site. Given the small scale of the proposed side yard encroachment and the limited amount of windows in the overlap area, facing the subject site, no impacts are expected to this neighbouring property.

In view of the above, this Department does not object to 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

## 4. NEW BUSINESS

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

## 5. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY MR. POUND
SECONDED BY MR. DHATT
THAT this Hearing do now adjourn.

## CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Hearing adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

> Ms. C. Richter

Mr. G. Clark

Mr. R. Dhatt

Mr. S. Nemeth

Mr. B. Pound

# 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 2016 JUNE 02.
Appeal Number BV\# 6227
Required Documents:
[. Hardship Letter from Applicant

- Site Plan of Subject Property
- Building Department Referral Letter

Any documents submitted in support of this Board of Variance Appeal will be made available to the Public

# Raffaele \& Associates Design and Planning Consultants 

# Attn: Burnaby Board of Variance 

Re: 4688 Alpha Drive

Dear Honourable Board Members,

We are writing this letter to request a variance at 4688 Alpha Drive. The variance we are requesting is to allow for the maximum building height to be raised from 24.9 feet to 25.86 feet.
-As built, our current elevation for the top of the roof is 232.41 feet.
-The maximum elevation for the top of roof finish is 231.45 feet.
-Our proposal is 0.96 feet higher than the calculated allowance for an R10 zone.
This 0.96 feet height difference occurred at the framing stage and passed inspection at that time. We have already completed the electrical, the plumbing, the drywall, and the roof construction. To lower the house, all of the trades will need to return to rework what they have done. At this stage of construction, a major design change to lower the house will have massive, monetary consequences that will fall outside of the planned budget.

We respectfully request a variance for the maximum building height to be raised 0.96 feet allowance in order to finalize the construction within our budget.

We hope that you understand our situation and we thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Raffaele \& Associates

Anju \& Vivek Soni<br>3435 Worthington Drive<br>Vancouver, BC V5M3Y1<br>Attn: Burnaby Board of Variance

Re: 4688 Alpha Drive, Burnaby
Dear Honourable Board Members,
We, Anju \& Vivek Soni, as homeowners understand that the zoning bylaws are enacted for the purpose of regulating construction in the best interest of the residents. Height restrictions are enforced to protect and maintain the consistency of the neighbourhood, as well as to ensure unobstructed views.

At present, our home is unintentionally 0.96 feet above the maximum allowable height at its peak. This has most impact on our 4 nearest neighbours. However, these neighbours have all signed a letter of support stating that they do not object to our structure height. Furthermore, our house is on the low side of the street and the main floor elevation is significantly below street level. Therefore, we feel by approving the structure as it is will not cause any hardship to the neighbours who have so far supported us during the last 6 months of construction.

In order to rectify this grave error, we would have to re-do a considerable amount of construction work on our home which would not only cause our family time, money, and hardship but will also leave a large ecological footprint of materials that cannot be reused or repurposed:

- Asphalt roofing: has an expecting lifespan of 45 years
- Trusses: Good for the life of the building
- Electrica//HVAC: wiring, venting and pot lights
- Built in Vacuum System: PVC Pipes

Also, by approving the structure this will allow us to stay within our budget to complete the construction. Lastly, and most importantly to us we will stay within our timeline as our children begin school in Burnaby in September 2016.

We acknowledge that our tradesmen/builder have made an error. We hope that you will humbly accept our apology for this oversight. We are open to any alternative recommendations that the Board would have for us; however we respect the decision regardless of the outcome.

Sincerely,
Vivek \& Anju Soni

G\&D Framing Ltd.
May 1st, 2016
8847160 St.
Surrey, BC V4N 2X8

Attn: Burnaby Board of Variance
Re: 4688 Alpha Drive, Burnaby
Our corporation was hired to frame the residential dwelling at 4688 Alpha Drive by the project coordinators. Due to our negligence the height of the building has gone 0.96 feet over the allowed height. We request that the members of the BOV relax the height and not penalize the owner of the project for a mistake that was made by us. We sincerely regret our error and wish that the homeowners are not harmed.

Sincerely,
G\&D Framing Ltd.


Jagdip Rupal
604-379-6798


Gurwinder Sandhu
604-764-8090

## Letter of Support for Board of Variance Application

Apr, 2016

## To: Board of Variance Bumaby City Hall

Re: \#4688 Alpha Drive (old address \#4684)
Dear Honourable Board Members,
We, the residents at _ 4690 Alpha Dr_, are writing this letter in support of our neighbours at \#4688 Alpha Drive and their Board of Variance Application for the height of the principal building.

Thank you for your time.
Signed,


## Letter of Support for Board of Variance Application

Apr, 2016

## To: Board of Variance Burnaby City Hall

Re: \#4688 Alpha Drive (old address \#4684)
Dear Honourable Board Members, We, the residents at 4681 Wentraun A., are writing this letter in support of our neighbours at \#4688 Alpha Drive and their Board of Variance Application for the height of the principal building.

Thank you for your time.

Signed,


## Letter of Support for Board of Variance Application

Apr, 2016
To: Board of Variance Bumaby City Hall
Re: \#4688 Alpha Drive (old address \#4684)
Dear Honourable Board Members,
We, the residents at 4678 , are writing this letter in support of our neighbours at \#4688 Alpha Drive and their Board of Variance Application for the height of the principal bullding.

Thank you for your time.
Signed,

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: May 3, 2016 | DEADLINE: May 10, 2016 for the <br> June 2, 2016 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: Mayumi Hasegawa |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 2642 E. Hastings St., Vancouver, B.C. V5K 1Z6 |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604-251-4610 |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: New Single Family Dwelling |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 4688 Alpha Drive | DL: $\mathbf{1 2 2 ~ \& ~ 1 2 3 ~ \& ~ 1 2 4 ~}$ | PLAN: 16792 |
| LEGAL: | LOT: $\mathbf{2 5}$ |  |

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[110.6(2)(a)]
of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to build a new single family dwelling (currently under construction). The following relaxation is being requested.

1) The principal building height of 25.74 feet where a maximum height of 24.90 feet is permitted.

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

DS
Kuncum~.
Peter Kushnir
Deputy Chief Building Inspector
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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 2016 June 02 Appeal Number BV\# 6228

Required Documents:

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


## Any documents submitted in support of this Board of <br> Variance Appeal will be made available to the Public

Burnaby Board of Variance<br>c/o Office of the City Clerk<br>4949 Canada Way<br>Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2<br>To the Board of Variance:

## Re: $\mathbf{6 6 2 4}$ Charles St. - Request for Fence Height Variance

As the owners of 6624 Charles St., we would like to request a variance to increase the height of a fence and gate area that spans just 10 ft . wide in the rear lane along our property from the current bylaw of $5^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ to $6^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ (ie. an extra 1 ft .).

Our property is 66 ft . wide and there is a rear retaining wall $2^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ high for 56 ft . (the majority of the width of our property) to support the grading of our main floor and backyard. A fence on the retaining wall will be built at a height of $5^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ in accordance with the bylaws for security and privacy from the lane. In order to access the lane (for garbage/recycling and general access down to the lane elevation), our property has a landing area at the rear west corner of the lane that spans 10 ft . According to the bylaws, a fence can be constructed at $5^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ at the lane elevation but it would be significantly lower than the adjoining retaining wall and fence on our property at $8^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ ( $2^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ retaining wall $+5^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ fence) as well as lower than the neighbor's fence to the west at 6614 Charles St. at a height of $6^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ to support the grading of their backyard and for their security and privacy from the lane.

Accordingly, we would like to request a variance to increase the height of the fence and gate for this 10 ft. wide area from $5^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ to $6^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ to match the elevation of our neighbor's fence to provide for a more seamless transition to our retaining wall fence height of $8^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ which spans the majority of the width of our property. And more importantly, the requested higher fence variance would limit the direct sightlines into our main floor given the higher elevation of our main floor and yard providing for security and privacy from the back lane (please refer to attached photo for sightlines into our main floor from the lane).

Thank you for your consideration of our variance request.

Sincerely,



[^0]

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: May 4, 2016 | DEADLINE: May 10, 2016 for the <br> June 2, 2016 hearing | This is mot an <br> application. <br> Please take letter to <br> Board of Variance. <br> (Clerk's office - <br> Ground Floor) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Ron Lee |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 4818 Brentlawn Dr., Burnaby B.C. V5C 3V5 |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604.838.5899 |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: New Single Family Dwelling |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 6624 Charles Street | PLAN: 2419 |  |
| LEGAL: | LOTS: 9 | DL: 132 |

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

Zone/Section(s) R4 [6.14(5)(b)]<br>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 relaxation of $6.14(5)(b)$ of the Zoning By-Law which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a fence at the rear of the lot with varying heights up to a maximum of 6.83 feet where the maximum permitted height is 5.91 feet.

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

DS

[^1]
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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 206 June 02. Appeal Number BV\# 6229
Required Documents:
Hardship Letter from Applicant
q Site Plan of Subject Property
只 Building Department Referral Letter
Any documents submitted in support of this Board of
Variance Appeal will be made available to the Public

Beverly Kitasaka \& Daniel Piskacek<br>5469 Keith St<br>Burnaby, BC V5J 3C4

May 9, 2016
Board of Variance
City of Burnaby
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2
Dear Members of the Board of Variance:
Due to the sloping nature of our property, we would like to request variances on our plans to build our new home.

We currently reside at 5469 Keith Street and have submitted plans to rebuild a new home on our current property. We are located in the South Slope area of Burnaby, one block north of Marine Drive and Royal Oak. Our property is located on a steep slope and requires special consideration when planning a new home construction.

There are three variances we would like to request:

1. Height of retaining wall in the back yard
2. Height of detached garage located in the back
3. Distance between the house and garage

These variances would allow us to keep a decent sized back yard. Preserving a natural outdoor space is important to our family. If we had to put in several shorter retaining walls, it would leave us little space in the back yard. We would also like to have a double car garage - however we have been told that by doing this, the garage would be too close to the house by 7 inches. This house we are building is intended as our long term family home. We would like to have enough parking for when our kids start driving their own cars. Our house has been designed to not be at maximum size with the hope that we could retain the outdoor living space and have room for a garage.

We have made great efforts to design a livable family home on our steeply sloped lot. We hope you agree that our request for the above variances is reasonable and would greatly appreciate you granting our request.

Sincerely,


Beverly Kitasaka \& Daniel Piskacek

## BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: May 9, 2016 | DEADLINE: May 10, 2016 for the <br> June 2, 2016 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: Beverly Kitasaka \& Daniel Piskacek |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 5739 Hyde Street, Burnaby, BC, V5G 4C6 |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 604.437.5578 |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: New Single Family Dwelling w/ Detached Garage |  |  |
| ADDRESS: 5469 Keith Street |  |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: N | PLAN: 14508 |

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 [6.3.1; 6.6(2)(a); 6.14(5)(b)]
of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

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

1) The distance between the principal building and the detached garage is 14.22 feet where a minimum distance of 14.8 feet is required.
2) The accessory building height will be $21.28^{\prime}$ feet where the maximum building height of 15.1 feet is permitted. The building height is measured from the average grade which is 144.85 feet.
3) The relaxation of $6.14(5)(b)$ of the zoning by-law which, if permitted, will allow for the construction of a retaining wall at the rear of the lot with varying heights up to a maximum of 11.7 feet where the maximum permitted height is $5.91^{\prime}$.

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

MS


Peter Kushnir
Deputy Chiel Building Inspector
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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 2016 June D2 Appeal Number BV\# 6230 . Required Documents:

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

Any documents submitted in support of this Board of
Variance Appeal will be made available to the Public

To: The Board of Variance

City of Burnaby
Dear Madam/Sir

## LETTER OF HARDSHIP-GARAGE AND ACCESSORY BUILDING -6011 $10^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE

This is to bring to your kind attention that flood plain elevation imposed on my site is creating severe hardship in constructing a livable garage and accessory building.

The flood plain elevation as stated by the engineering department is 12.8 . The following hardship is experienced for both the garage and accessory building maximum ridge height due to the flood plain elevation:

1) Garage building: The average grade of the existing lot is $8.2^{\prime}$.The garage roof ridge height is 25.84 ' and we have been instructed to reduce this by $2^{\prime}-6$ " to fulfill the max ridge elevation height of $23.30^{\prime}$ for a sloping roof. This impacts the ceiling height for the garage and creates severe hardship in achieving a functional ceiling height.
2) Accessory Building: The average grade of the existing lot is $8.6^{\prime}$.The accessory building roof ridge height is 26.14 ' and we have been instructed to reduce this by $2^{\prime}-5$ " to fulfill the max ridge elevation height of 23.70 ' for a sloping roof. This impacts the ceiling height for the accessory building and creates severe hardship in achieving a functional ceiling height.

We have obtained the permit for the main house and planning to commence construction immediately and it would be beneficial to us if we can construct the accessory buildings at the same time. We request the Board of Variance to relax the ridge height for the garage and accessory building so that we can have a functional ceiling height which is matching with the sloping roof of the main house.

You kind consideration in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

## Thank you

Truly

BOARD OF VARIANCE REFERRAL LETTER

| DATE: April 27, 2016 |  | DEADLINE: May June 2, 2016 hearin | This is not an application. Please take letter to Board of Variance. (Clerk's office Ground Floor) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NAME OF APPLICANT: Malkit Athwal |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS OF APPLICANT: 87 Glover Ave, New Westminster V3L2A4 |  |  |  |
| TELEPHONE: 778.863.4248 |  |  |  |
| PROJECT |  |  |  |
| DESCRIPTION: Two new accessory buildings |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS: $601110^{\text {01h }}$ Ave. |  |  |  |
| LEGAL: | LOT: 17 | DL: 173 | AN: 1034 |

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) A2 [6.6(2)(a)] of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw No. 4742

## COMMENTS:

The applicant is proposing to build a new detached garage and an accessory building to a new single family dwelling under construction. The following relaxations are being requested.

1) The detached garage height, measured from the average elevation will be 17.64 feet. The maximum accessory building height of 15.1 feet is permitted.
2) The accessory building height, measured from the average elevation will be 17.54 feet. The maximum accessory building height of 15.1 feet is permitted.

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

## BHS
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 | FLOOR PLAN - TOTN AREA: | 148.00 ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| GOPAKE ALOWAKE: | 45210 Nz |






[^0]:    Ron and Karen Lee - Owners of 6624 Charles St.

[^1]:    Peter Kushnir
    Deputy Chief Building Inspector

[^2]:    

[^3]:    Peter Kushnir
    Deputy Chief Building Inspector

