



BOARD OF VARIANCE

MINUTES

A Hearing of the Board of Variance was held in the Council Chamber, Burnaby City Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C., on Thursday, **2017 October 05** at 6:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

STAFF: Ms. Margaret Malysz, Supervisor – PPA/Subdivision Approvals
Ms. Monica Macdonald, Administrative Officer

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

2. MINUTES

(a) [Minutes of the Board of Variance Hearing held on 2017 September 07](#)

MOVED BY MR. POUND

SECONDED BY MR. NEMETH

THAT the minutes of the Burnaby Board of Variance Hearing held on 2017 September 07 be adopted.

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. 6303

APPELLANT: Dimas Craveiro

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Madalena Eusebio

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [7629 Stanley Crescent](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 147; DL 86; Plan 24947

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Section 101.6(1)(a) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for construction of a new single family dwelling with a detached garage at 7629 Stanley Crescent. The relaxation would allow for a principal building height of 34.08 feet measured from the rear average grade, where the maximum height of 29.50 feet is permitted. The principal building height measured from the front average grade will be 28.33 feet. Zone R1

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Dimas Craveiro, Architect submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of his client's new home.

Mr. Dimas Craveiro and Ms. Madalena Eusebio, homeowner, appeared before members of the Board at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject site, zoned R1 Residential District, is located in a stable single family neighbourhood in the Morley-Buckingham area. This slightly irregular interior lot is approximately 62.75 ft. wide and 169.08 ft. long at its longer northwest side property line. The subject site fronts onto Stanley Crescent to the southwest; the southwest front property line is a rough curve approximately 64.79 ft. long. Vehicle access to the site is provided from the rear lane to the northeast. The subject lot adjoins single family dwellings on all four sides. The lot observes a downward slope of approximately 10.0 ft. from the southwest corner to the northeast corner.

The subject property is proposed to be redeveloped with a new single family dwelling and detached garage.

The appeal is for a building height of 34.08 ft. measured from the rear average grade, where a maximum height of 29.5 ft. is permitted for a building with a sloping roof.

The intent of the height requirements of the Zoning Bylaw is to mitigate the massing impacts of new buildings or structures on neighbouring properties and to preserve the view.

The proposed dwelling would observe a front elevation height of 28.33 ft. (as viewed from the Stanley Crescent property line), which is 1.17 ft. less than the allowed maximum height. Therefore, this proposal would not impact the existing streetscape and the neighbouring properties directly across Stanley Crescent to the southwest; particularly as these properties are at higher elevation in relation to the subject site.

The requested variance is for the rear elevation height. In this case, the height calculation is based on the building height measured from the proposed rear average grade to the highest peak of the roof. The over height portion (4.58 ft.) of the roof occurs over the main ridgeline of the roof peak running in a northwest-southeast direction, which is approximately 23.0 ft. wide and set back by approximately 40.5 ft. in relation to the outermost rear building face at the main floor.

The design of the proposed dwelling is staggered at the rear of the building; the second floor is set back 12.77 ft. at the southeast portion and approximately 21 ft. at the northwest portion. This is reflected in the proposed roof form, which consists of two smaller gabled roofs running perpendicular at both ends of the main ridge. Such stepped design of the rear elevation of the building will help minimize negative impacts on the neighbouring properties across the rear lane to the northeast. These properties, which are at a lower elevation than the subject property, feature large yards fronting onto Canada Way further to the northeast (away from the subject site). Further, the neighbouring property directly across the lane (northeast) features a two car garage bordering the lane which would help mitigate negative impacts the subject over height might have on this neighbour. Also, the submitted site plan indicates an existing large deciduous tree in the northeast corner of the subject lot, which would provide, to a degree, screening for the proposed dwelling from the rear lane views.

With respect to the neighbouring dwellings to the sides of the subject lot, the neighbouring residence to the northwest would not be affected by this variance. This residence is set further forward and the over height portion of the subject dwelling would not be essentially within its sidelines. The neighbouring residence to the southeast, however, would be impacted by this height variance. This residence features windows along the upper floor of its northwest elevations (facing the subject site) which would have a direct view of the over height portion of the subject dwelling.

In summary, the requested variance is directly related to design choice; however, measures have been made to limit the massing impacts on the neighbouring dwellings. Despite these measures some negative impacts are anticipated on the neighbouring dwelling to the southeast. Therefore, this Department cannot support the granting of this variance.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

A letter was received from the homeowner of 7619 Stanley Crescent opposing the appeal. The homeowner expressed his concern that if the variance were allowed, the new home would restrict his view even more so than if the owner built in compliance with the bylaw. He states if the zoning bylaws are not maintained, it may become "a game of up-mans-ship".

A letter was received from the homeowner of 7639 Stanley Crescent in support of the appeal.

No further submissions were received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. POUND

SECONDED BY MR. DHATT

THAT based on the plans submitted, this appeal be ALLOWED.

DEFEATED

OPPOSED: C. RICHTER
S. NEMETH
W. PEPPARD

(b) APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6304

APPELLANT: David Lin

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Wen Liang & Guang Wang

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [5661 Bessborough Drive](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 11; DL 218; Plan 4953

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 102.6(1)(a), 102.7 & 102.8 of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for construction of a new single family dwelling with a secondary suite and detached garage at 5661 Bessborough Drive. The following variances are requested:

a) A front yard setback of 0 feet, where a minimum setback of 24.60 feet is required based on front yard averaging;

b) A principal building depth of 73.11 feet, where a maximum depth of 58.24 feet is permitted; and,

c) A principal building height of 35.45 feet measured from the rear average grade, where the maximum height of 29.50 feet is permitted. The principal building height measured from the front average grade will be 21.83 feet. Zone R2

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

David Lin, Architect, submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of his clients' new home.

Mr. Lin appeared before members of the Board at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject site, which is zoned R2 Residential District, is located in the Capitol Hill neighbourhood, in which the age and condition of single family dwellings vary. This trapezoid interior lot, approximately 50.0 ft. wide and 123.7 ft. deep along its longer northwest property line, fronts onto Bessborough Drive to the southwest and borders a lane at the rear to the northeast. The rear lane runs at angle in relation to Bessborough Drive, which is reflected in the angled alignment of the rear property line. The subject site abuts single family residential lots to the northwest and southeast. Vehicular access to the subject site is proposed to be retained from the rear lane to the northeast. The site observes a significant downward slope from the front southwest portion of the lot to the rear northeast portion, dropping 37.4 ft. over 123.7 ft.

The subject lot is proposed to be re-developed with a new single family dwelling, with a secondary suite and detached garage, for which three variances have been requested.

The first a) appeal proposes the relaxation of Section 102.8 – "Front Yard" of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw from 24.6 ft. to nil. The purpose of this variance is to allow construction of a new single family dwelling encroaching into the required front yard abutting the Bessborough Drive. Section 6.128 – "Yards" of the Zoning Bylaw allowing specific projections into the front yard will also be applicable.

The intent of the front yard requirements the Zoning Bylaw is to mitigate the massing impacts of the buildings and structures on the neighbouring properties and to preserve a unified streetscape.

The second b) appeal is to vary Section 102.7(b) – "Depth of Principal Building" of the Zoning Bylaw from 58.24 ft. to 73.11 ft. (based on 50 percent of the lot depth) to allow construction of a new single family dwelling.

The intent of the principal building depth requirements of the Zoning Bylaw is to prevent construction of the dwellings that present long imposing walls, where the massing of the building impacts the neighbouring properties.

The third c) appeal is to vary Section 102.6(1)(a) – “Height of Principal Building” of the Zoning Bylaw from 29.5ft. to 35.45 ft., as measured from the rear average grade, to allow construction of a new single family dwelling with a sloping roof.

The intent of the height requirements of the Zoning Bylaw is to mitigate the massing impacts of the new buildings and structures on neighbouring properties and to preserve the views.

With respect to the first a) and second b) variance, it appears that the front yard relaxation request and the building depth relaxation request is related to the applicant's desire to provide a level access from the front property line to the proposed dwelling. This desire is proposed to be accomplished by adding/connecting an open bridge structure to the front of the dwelling. The 4.18 ft. wide bridge, consisting of metal railing/decking, would be slightly raised (1.1 ft.) from grade at the front property line towards the dwelling and connect at the upper floor level to the fully recessed front porch (proposed slightly off center to the northwest of the front elevation).

Due to the site's dropping terrain, the bridge structure would have to span across the entire front yard of 24.61 ft. As a result, the front yard setback would be reduced to nil. The main body of the dwelling (excluding the bridge structure) would observe the 24.61 ft. setback which is the minimum front yard setback required.

Consequently, the bridge structure would contribute 24.61 ft. to the overall building depth. Otherwise, the main body of the dwelling would observe a building depth of 48.5 ft. which is substantially less than the maximum allowed building depth by the Zoning Bylaw (58.24 ft.).

The small massing of the bridge structure would not create noticeable impacts on the neighbouring properties to the sides and the neighbouring properties across Bessborough Drive to the southwest which are at higher levels.

In summary, considering the challenging topography of the subject site and the negligible impacts on the neighbouring properties, this Department does not object to the granting of the first a) and the second b) variance.

With respect to the third c) variance, it appears that the building height relaxation request is partly related to the topography of the site and partly related to the design choices. In this case, the height calculation is based on the proposed grade at the rear elevation. A substantial grade difference from the front to the rear of the subject site contributes to the excess height. It is also noted that the proposed dwelling would observe a height of 21.83 ft. when viewed from the front property line, which is considerably less than the maximum height allowed by the Zoning Bylaw (29.5 ft.).

The proposed 5.95 ft. height encroachment occurs over the entire building width (38.5 ft.) as viewed from the rear elevation. The encroachment starts just above the top of the window/door level at the upper floor and continues to the highest point of the roof

which, in this case, is the top of the main roof fascia board. The roof is proposed to slope up and out ("reversed" slope), in a ratio of 4 in 12 which meets the criteria of a sloping roof, along the entire rear elevation.

The main body of the proposed dwelling, where the roof height encroachment occurs, will be sited at least 37.58 ft. from the rear property line (at its east rear corner which is the closest corner to the angled rear property line). This siting would not affect the views of the neighbouring residence immediately to the northwest, which are predominantly directed to the northeast. Also, due to the sloping terrain, the proposed dwelling would be partly underground, thus substantially reducing the building height as viewed from the northwest side elevation. However, with respect to the neighbouring property to the southeast, the existing residence on this property is placed on angle in relation to other dwellings in the subject block, with views oriented more to the north (as compared to the views oriented to the northeast of the other residences in the subject block). Therefore, there is a concern that the over height portion of the proposed dwelling, at its east rear corner would be in direct conflict with the views to the neighbouring residence to the southeast.

Further, the proposed "reversed" roof edge would appear as a flat roof edge along the rear (and front) elevation. A flat roof is typically associated with stronger massing impacts along the edges, which is reflected in lower height allowances permitted by the Zoning Bylaw. A sloping roof typically involves a sloping design that minimizes the roof massing above the fascia board level, which is reflected in higher height allowances permitted by the Zoning Bylaw. Therefore, there is a concern that the proposed excess height will create a large negative impact on the neighbouring dwelling directly opposite the subject site to the northeast (across the lane) which is at a lower level.

In summary, although it is recognized that the challenging topography of the subject site is a contributing factor, the requested major height variance is a result of the design choices and will create negative impacts on the neighbouring properties. Therefore, this Department cannot support the granting of this third c) variance.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

A letter was received from the homeowners of 5640 Bessborough Drive opposing the appeal to the principal building height. The owners expressed concern that, if the variance were allowed, the new construction would significantly block their view and diminish their enjoyment of their own property, and reduce the value of their home.

An email was received from the homeowners of 5649 Bessborough Drive opposing the appeal to the principal building height. The owners advised that they feel the height of 35.45 feet takes away from the aesthetics of the street, and disrupts the neighbours' views.

A letter was received from the homeowner of 5660 Bessborough Drive requesting the principal building height variance not be allowed. The owner stated that he and others

in the neighbourhood purchased their homes for the views. If allowed, this appeal would severely impact his and 5640 Bessborough Drive's view as both properties overlook the subject property to the North Shore Mountains, Indian Arm and Burrard Inlet. The owner noted that the variance is one of design choice and not hardship and made the following points: 1) a flat roof design would lessen the height impact and still provide the same floor area and number of storeys; 2) the floor to ceiling heights in each of the levels is 9 feet or greater; and, 3) the applicant has chosen a large, monolithic shed roof design presenting a large expansive unattractive face to the homes south.

Nick Tabako, 5655 Bessborough Drive, appeared and spoke in opposition to the appeal for a front yard setback and principal building depth. Mr. Tabako stated he does not oppose the principal building height if it is going to be the same height or lower than his home.

Edward Jones and Elisabetta Chioccarello, 5640 Bessborough Drive, appeared and spoke in opposition to the appeal for the principal building height.

**Mr. Pound left the Hearing at 7:20 p.m.*

**Mr. Pound returned to the Hearing at 7:22 p.m.*

No further submissions were received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH
SECONDED BY MR. POUND

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

CARRIED

OPPOSED: C. RICHTER

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH
SECONDED BY MR. POUND

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

CARRIED

OPPOSED: C. RICHTER

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH
SECONDED BY MR. POUND

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(c) **APPEAL NUMBER: B.V. 6305**

APPELLANT: Hitesh Neb

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Crescent Holdings Inc

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: [4679 Alpha Drive](#)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY: Lot 39; DL 123; Plan 16792

APPEAL: An appeal for the relaxation of Sections 110.12(2) and 6.13(1)(b) of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling with a secondary suite and detached garage at 4679 Alpha Drive. The following variances are being requested:

a) Construction of a 6.0 foot high fence in the required front yard along the North property line where no fence or other structure is permitted in front of the face of the principal building facing the front yard;

b) Construction of a 4.0 foot high retaining wall in the required front yard along the North property line where no fence or other structures are permitted in front of the face of the principal building facing the front yard; and,

c) Construction of a 6.0 foot high fence along the North property line where the fence cannot exceed 3.51 feet within 19.69 feet from the point of intersection of a lane and a street. Zone R10

A previous Board of Variance appeal (B.V. 6241, August 4 2016)

Allowed:

- *a distance of 5.6 feet between principal building and detached garage;*
- *a principal building height of 21.04 feet;*
- *a principal building depth of 57.02 feet; and,*
- *a front yard setback of 16.55 feet.*

A previous Board of Variance (BV 6237, 2016 July 07)

Allowed:

- *a distance of 5.6 feet between principal building and detached garage; and,*
- *a principal building depth of 57.27 feet.*

Denied:

- *a principal building height of 22.65 feet;*
- *a front yard setback of 16.39 feet to the foundation; and,*
- *retaining walls at the frontage of Alpha Dr. with heights up to 2.5 feet.*

APPELLANT'S SUBMISSION:

Hitesh Neb, designer, submitted an application for relaxation of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw to allow for construction of his client's new home.

Mr. Neb appeared before members of the Board at the Hearing.

BURNABY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

The subject property is located in the Brentwood Park area, in a mature single family R10 District neighbourhood that is characterized by low-scale single family dwellings. The R10 District in this area was established through a resident-initiated area rezoning process in order to control the form and character of new development, including fences and other structures. This irregular interior lot, which is roughly kite-shaped, is approximately 52.0 ft. deep along the southwest (side) property line and has a frontage of approximately 115.0 ft. on Alpha Drive to the southeast. Abutting the subject site to the southwest and across the lane to the north are single family dwellings. Vehicular access to the site is from the north lane. The site observes a substantial downward slope of approximately 10.0 ft. in the north-south direction.

This property was the subject of an appeal before the Board twice before: on 2016 July 07 (BV # 6237) and on 2016 August 04 (BV # 6241).

With respect to the first 2016 July 07 appeal, five variances were sought to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling with a detached garage observing: a) a distance of 5.60 ft. from the accessory building to the principal building where a minimum distance of 14.8 ft. is required; b) a building height of 22.65 ft. where a maximum height of 19.0 ft. is permitted; c) a principal building depth of 57.27 ft. where a maximum building depth of 38.23 ft. is permitted; d) a front yard setback of 16.39 ft. where a minimum front yard setback of 24.9 ft. is required; and e) to permit retaining walls at the Alpha Drive frontage where no fence or other structure is permitted in front of the face of the principal building facing the front yard.

The first a) and third c) appeals concerning distance between two structures and building depth were supported by this Department and the Board of Variance granted both appeals. The second b) appeal concerning building height, while was supported by this Department, was denied by the Board of Variance. The fourth d) and fifth e) appeals concerning front yard and retaining walls were not supported by this Department, and the Board of Variance denied both appeals.

Subsequently, in response to the concerns raised by the neighbours at the hearing, the applicant has revised the proposal, which resulted in a 1.61 ft. reduction to building height, a 0.25 ft. reduction to the building depth and a 0.16 ft. increase to the front yard setback. In addition, the previously indicated retaining walls within the front yard were no longer proposed, and therefore, a related variance was no longer needed.

Consequently, with respect to the second 2016 August 04 appeal, only four variances were sought to allow for the construction of a new single family dwelling with a detached garage observing: a) a distance of 5.60 ft. from the accessory building to the principal building where a minimum distance of 14.8 ft. is required; b) a building height of 21.04 ft. where a maximum height of 19.0 ft. is permitted; c) a principal building depth of 57.02 ft. where a maximum building depth of 38.23 ft. is permitted; and d) a front yard setback of 16.55 ft. where a minimum front yard setback of 24.9 ft. is required.

While this Department supported the first a), second b) and third c) appeal concerning distance between two structures, building height and building depth respectively, and did not support the fourth d) appeal concerning front yard, the Board of Variance granted all four appeals.

The subject site is currently in the last stages of construction for a new single family dwelling with detached garage in accordance to the building permit BLD # 16-00408 (issued in August 2016). However, the omissions/modifications from the approved plans were identified on site by City staff; these omissions/ modifications include the already built fence and retaining wall along the north side (lane) property line within the required front yard (Alpha Drive). As a result, this appeal requests three variances in order to permit the applicant to continue with the modifications into the approved plans.

The first a) appeal is to vary Section 110.12(2) – “Fences” of the Zoning Bylaw to permit the already built 6.0 ft. high fence at the Alpha Drive frontage where no fence or other structure is permitted in front of the face of the principal building facing the front yard.

The second b) appeal is to vary Section 110.12(2) – “Fences” of the Zoning Bylaw to permit the already built 4.0 ft. high retaining wall at the Alpha Drive frontage where no fence or other structure is permitted in front of the face of the principal building facing the front yard.

The third c) appeal is to vary Section 6.13(1)(b) – “Vision Clearance” of the Zoning Bylaw to permit the already built 6.0 ft. high fence to encroach into the vision clearance area at the intersection of Alpha Drive and the lane, where a maximum height of 3.51 ft. is permitted.

With respect to the first a) and second b) appeal, the intent of the R10 District is to maintain the existing development pattern of the neighbourhood, which generally contains open lawns and a minimum of fencing. The R10 zone was created in response to the residents’ desire to ensure that all new development recognized the unique R10 architectural and landscape context. The R10 streetscape is characterized by low building profiles, uniform front yards, and the absence of fences.

In general, various options exist with respect to sloping front yards: a downward slope can be gradually distributed over the yard area, or, if a flatter area is desired, a small berm can be introduced at the outer edge. This is a common front yard edge treatment

that is exhibited by the majority of properties in this neighbourhood. However, it is recognized that the subject site does not exhibit sufficient depth to accommodate the substantial grade difference, due to its geometry. Therefore, design options which require lowering of grades are limited, particularly at the subject lot's narrowest eastern part.

With respect to the first a) variance, it is noted that a 6.0 ft. high fence was indicated on the approved building permit drawings and therefore, the building permit was issued in error with respect to the Zoning Bylaw requirements for fences in the R10 District. The 6.0 ft. high fence is now built along the north side (lane) property line which connects at sharp angle to the front property line (Alpha Drive). The fence consists of horizontal wooden slats, which provide solid screening. Since the site exhibits the highest grades along the north side (lane) property, the fence is highly visibility from lower grades at Alpha Drive.

With respect to the second b) variance, the already built 4.0 ft. high retaining wall was not indicated on the approved building permit drawings. The retaining wall starts from the northeast corner of the dwelling, and runs approximately 20 ft. to the east and is offset 4.67 ft. from the north side (lane) property line. It appears that the need for the retaining wall is to accommodate the walkout patio immediately south of the retaining wall, in the subject lot's narrowest eastern part. The retaining wall is fully exposed and highly noticeable from Alpha Drive.

It is recognized that the unique site geometry and orientation of the subject site creates design challenges and limits the development options available on this site. Nevertheless, permitting a fence or other structure in the front yard of an R10 District, where it is expressly prohibited, is a major variance in that it is a complete reversal of the Bylaw provision and would defeat the intent of the Bylaw. Furthermore, the requested variances are a result of design choices rather than a hardship and will create major impacts on the existing streetscape. Therefore, this Department cannot support the granting of the first a) and the second b) appeal.

With respect to the third c) variance, the intent of the Bylaw in requiring the vision clearance is to facilitate vehicular, pedestrian and cyclists' safety at street and lane intersections. The vision clearance area is a triangular area formed by the property lines and a line joining two points along the property lines. In this case, the joining line must be 19.69 ft. from the intersection of the street and the lane.

It should be noted that the Zoning Bylaw requires that no hedge, shrub, tree or other growth be maintained or allowed to grow so as to obstruct vision clearance within a private property

In this case, the 6.0 ft. high solid wooden fence discussed under the first a) appeal encroaches 5.0 ft. into the vision clearance area (at the northeast corner of the site) along the north side (lane) property line, and therefore, is also the subject of the third c) appeal. The resultant obstruction of side views from the lane is further exaggerated by

the sharp angle alignment of Alpha Drive in relation to the lane and the steeply dropping terrain of Alpha Drive to the south, which is a safety concern.

In summary, despite the challenging geometry of the site, given ongoing concerns regarding traffic safety, this Department questions the advisability of reducing the vision clearance setback. Therefore, this Department cannot support the granting of the third c) major variance, which reduces traffic safety at the street intersection.

ADJACENT OWNER'S COMMENTS:

An email was received from the homeowner of 4578 Napier Street stating that he does not have any objections to this appeal.

No further submissions were received regarding this appeal.

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH
SECONDED BY MR. POUND

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH
SECONDED BY MR. POUND

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY MR. NEMETH
SECONDED BY MR. POUND

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(d) **APPEAL NUMBER:** B.V. 6306 **WITHDRAWN**

APPELLANT: Jonathan Ehling

REGISTERED OWNER OF PROPERTY: Joy Dalla-Tina & Stefano De Bei

CIVIC ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 465 Springer Avenue North

This appeal was **WITHDRAWN** on 2017 September 19 by the applicant.

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 7:50 p.m.

Ms. C. Richter, CHAIR

Mr. R. Dhatt

Mr. S. Nemeth

Mr. W. Peppard

Ms. M. Macdonald
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Mr. B. Pound