BOARD OF VARIANCE PLANNING COMMENTS

| BV \# | 6426 | Address | 313 Ellesmere Ave N |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| X-Reference | BOV \#21-00010 | Hearing | 2021 April 08 |


| Project | New single family dwelling with a secondary suite and detached garage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning | R2 Residential District |
| Neighbourhood | Capitol Hill - Single Family Neighbourhood |


| Appeal(s) to vary: | 1) Section 6.14.1(1) - "Retaining Walls" of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow the maximum retaining wall height of 1.37 $\mathrm{m}(4.50 \mathrm{ft}$.) where maximum $1.2 \mathrm{~m}(3.94 \mathrm{ft}$.$) is permitted;$ <br> 2) Sections 6.14.1(3) - "Retaining Walls" of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow the shortest horizontal distance between the outer face of two adjacent retaining walls of $1.12 \mathrm{~m}(3.67 \mathrm{ft}$.) where the shortest distance shall not be less than the height of the retaining wall with greater height of $1.37 \mathrm{~m}(4.50 \mathrm{ft}$.); <br> 3) Sections 6.14.1(3) - "Retaining Walls" of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow the shortest horizontal distance between the outer face of two adjacent retaining walls of $0.61 \mathrm{~m}(2.00 \mathrm{ft}$.) where the shortest distance shall not be less than the height of the retaining wall with greater height of 1.20 m ( 3.94 ft .); and <br> 4) Section 6.14.1(1) - "Retaining Walls" of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw which, if permitted, would allow the maximum retaining wall height of 1.87 $\mathrm{m}(6.16 \mathrm{ft}$.) where maximum $1.20 \mathrm{~m}(3.94 \mathrm{ft}$.) is permitted. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Zoning Bylaw intent: | 1), 2), 3) and 4) The intent of the Zoning Bylaw is to mitigate the massing impacts of retaining walls on neighbouring properties. |
| Variance Description: | 1) Retaining wall height is measured vertically from the bottom of the wall from the lower of natural or finished grade at the base of the wall, to the surface of the ground which it supports. <br> 2) and 3) Required distance between retaining walls should not be less than the height of the retaining wall with greater height. |


|  | 4) Retaining wall height includes the sloped part of the grade due to the Bylaw <br> requirement of a relatively level grade between walls. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site Considerations |  |

- The subject site is a large irregular lot with a varied width of $20.32 \mathrm{~m}-28.69 \mathrm{~m}(66.68$ $\mathrm{ft} .-94.14 \mathrm{ft}$.) and a varied depth of $42.92 \mathrm{~m}-45.92 \mathrm{~m}$ ( $140.82 \mathrm{ft} .-150.67 \mathrm{ft}$.).
- The subject site fronts onto Ellesmere Ave N to the east; this portion of Ellesmere Ave N is undeveloped. The immediately adjacent property to the south is currently under construction and there is a vacant lot to the north of the subject site.
- The subject site is encumbered with an existing approximately $3.00 \mathrm{~m}(0.91 \mathrm{ft}$.) wide statutory right-of-way for a sanitary main and an emergency access (to the neighbouring lot immediately to the north) which reduces an effective lot depth by approximately 6.50 m ( 1.95 ft .) along the front property line to the east.
- Vehicular access to the site is provided at the south-east corner of the lot (through an emergency access noted above) and from the rear lane to the west.
- The approximately $1.50 \mathrm{~m}(0.46 \mathrm{ft}$.) wide legal easement for sanitary service lines along the north-west side property line is not related to the requested variances.
- The site observes a substantial downwards slope of approximately $12.95 \mathrm{~m}(42.50 \mathrm{ft}$.) from the west (rear) to the east (front).
- The accessory detached garage is proposed at the rear portion of the site, where the existing grades are the highest. The garage slab is proposed however, at much lower level by approximately 3.60 m ( 1.10 ft .) as compared to the lane level. A vehicular access to the garage is proposed through the driveway along the south side property line, which continues to the emergency access (at the south east corner of the lot). It appears that the proposal is to include a portion of the principal building (the south wing) as a drivethrough to facilitate this access.
- The retaining walls which are subject of this appeal are proposed to accommodate a lowered access to the detached garage.
- Two parking stalls accessible off the lane are proposed on top of the accessory detached garage.


## Neighbourhood Context Considerations

- The subject site is located in the neighbourhood with relatively new single family dwellings observing similar extreme slope conditions.
- The requested retaining walls will be visible only from the immediate neighbour to the south (dwelling under construction). No other sites are expected to be impacted by the requested variances.


## Specific Project Considerations

- There are three stepping down retaining walls proposed to resolve the extreme slope at the back of the property (please refer to the Attachments 1 \& 2):
- 1.37 m ( 4.50 ft .) high top wall (Variance 1)) along rear property line
 (Variance 2)). Distance should be based on the height of the top wall.
- $1.22 \mathrm{~m}(4.00 \mathrm{ft}$.) high bottom wall, $0.61 \mathrm{~m}(2.00 \mathrm{ft}$.) away from the middle wall (Variance 3)). Distance should be based on the height of the bottom wall.
- $1.88 \mathrm{~m}(6.16 \mathrm{ft}$.) high top wall (Variance 4)) in the south west corner of the property.
- The requested variances are driven by a design choice despite the steep slopping site. It should be noted that a solution which would not require any variances was presented to the City in the original application for Building Permit BLD 20-00714.
- The revised application proposes the space between the bottom wall and the middle wall to be decreased by 0.51 m ( 1.66 ft .) creating the necessity of Variance 3 ) and the middle wall height to be reduced from $1.06 \mathrm{~m}(3.50 \mathrm{ft}$.) to $0.91 \mathrm{~m}(3.00 \mathrm{ft}$.) creating the necessity of Variances 1) and Variance 2) from the original Building Permit submission.
- Although there was no section presenting the corner condition in the original application for the Building Permit, Variance 4) near the south-west corner of the property, could be resolved by adding on an interim retaining wall between the top wall and the middle wall.
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