

**From:** Ben Hechter FIPPA Sec. 22 (1)  
**Sent:** October 25, 2021 11:05 PM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Cc:** Yu, Andrew  
**Subject:** Comments: Rezoning Reference 21-09 Public Hearing Report 20210927  
**Categories:** PH - Info Complete, Public Hearing

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to [phishing@burnaby.ca](mailto:phishing@burnaby.ca)

Dear Sirs,

These are my comments on Rezoning Reference 21-09 Public Hearing Report 2021092, as a 30 year resident of Greentree Village, with undergraduate architecture coursework at UCLA (1974) and student experience as a planning intern (Los Angeles City Hall 1973).

1. With all due respect, privacy is a state and not a scalable community design value. It either exists or it does not. For Greentree Village single family homes, the courtyard that faces the zero lot line wall is currently in a state of privacy.

Under the proposed rezoning, this courtyard would change state to non-private due to windows being permitted on the "zero sideyard" side with an 8ft., set back. This is significant, given the narrower, non-standard higher density lot sizes.

Privacy is on record as a density tradeoff factor in the original City Manager Report (1972) with which Council approved these narrower , non-standard lot sizes.

2. Again, with all due respect I think that a better rezoning process would be to use other similar non-detached communities as a model, rather than trying to harmonized regulations for narrower, non-detached lots with standard full-size detached lots.

The ground-level reality is that this is a non-detached, quasi-strata community that probably should have been made a strata, since non-detached strata is the model adopted by the City going forward. This makes Greentree Village zoning peculiarly unique and peculiarly difficult.

For example, there are really only 4 or 5 house design templates. It would be much simpler for the Architect son of the original architect. to extend the existing 4 or 5 design templates with additions that reflect the values of the original design, many of which are unrecognized by the proposed rezoning.

For example, all existing Greentree Village houses have a standard footprint, typically 600 sq. ft. It would seem more reasonable to limit expansion based on a percentage increase in footprint. 50% of lot size seems unduly large, given the scale of these narrower pre-compacted, higher density lots.

Regards.

1/4

Benjamin Hechter  
3818 Garden Grove Dr.  
Burnaby BC V5G 4A7

**From:** Ben Hechter FIPPA Sec. 22 (1)  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 10:09 AM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** Re: Comments: Rezoning Reference 21-09 Public Hearing Report 20210927  
**Categories:** PH - Info Complete, Public Hearing

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to [phishing@burnaby.ca](mailto:phishing@burnaby.ca)

Dear Mr. Yu,

Just to add that, even with an 8ft. setback, windows on the zero sideyard are 100% unacceptable.

Final Comment:

I suggest that a strata style process and vote is more appropriate than pushing disruptive amendments through Council.

In the context of a master-planned community, requests to the City to demolishing existing affordable housing stock that is structurally sound or build out-of-scale 3-story additions are:

a) inappropriate and unworthy of consideration and Planning resources

b) disruptive to the existing Community Plan

and reflect owners who would put self-interest above an existing harmonious community design that was professionally master-planned.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Regards,  
- Ben Hechter

in a planned community

Cheers.  
- Ben

On Mon, Oct 25, 2021 at 11:04 PM Ben Hechter FIPPA Sec. 22 (1) wrote:  
Dear Sirs,

These are my comments on Rezoning Reference 21-09 Public Hearing Report 2021092, as a 30 year resident of Greentree Village, with undergraduate architecture coursework at UCLA (1974) and student experience as a planning intern (Los Angeles City Hall 1973).

1. With all due respect, privacy is a state and not a scalable community design value. It either exists or it does not. For Greentree Village single family homes, the courtyard that faces the zero lot line wall is currently in a state of privacy.

Under the proposed rezoning, this courtyard would change state to non-private due to windows being permitted on the "zero sideyard" side with an 8ft., set back. This is significant, given the narrower, non-standard higher density lot sizes.

Privacy is on record as a density tradeoff factor in the original City Manager Report (1972) with which Council approved these narrower , non-standard lot sizes.

2. Again, with all due respect I think that a better rezoning process would be to use other similar non-detached communities as a model, rather than trying to harmonized regulations for narrower, non-detached lots with standard full-size detached lots.

The ground-level reality is that this is a non-detached, quasi-strata community that probably should have been made a strata, since non-detached strata is the model adopted by the City going forward. This makes Greentree Village zoning peculiarly unique and peculiarly difficult.

For example, there are really only 4 or 5 house design templates. It would be much simpler for the Architect son of the original architect. to extend the existing 4 or 5 design templates with additions that reflect the values of the original design, many of which are unrecognized by the proposed rezoning.

For example, all existing Greentree Village houses have a standard footprint, typically 600 sq. ft. It would seem more reasonable to limit expansion based on a percentage increase in footprint. 50% of lot size seems unduly large, given the scale of these narrower pre-compacted, higher density lots.

Regards.

Benjamin Hechter  
3818 Garden Grove Dr.  
Burnaby BC V5G 4A7

2 4/4

**From:** Rosemary Gander FIPPA Sec. 22 (1)  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 8:04 AM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** Greentree Village rezoning  
  
**Categories:** PH - Info Complete, Public Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email. If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to [phishing@burnaby.ca](mailto:phishing@burnaby.ca)

I would like to add my objections to the rezoning application for Greentree Village.

I am an original owner of a single family home having purchased our house in 1974 and live on the 3700 block (one of the blocks applying for rezoning permission).

Greentree Village is a unique neighbourhood and its uniformity of design is one of the things that makes it special.

The original sales agreement required that owners did not change the look of the homes and this has been maintained until recently when several owners have decided to change the look of the homes.

Changing the bylaw to allow windows to be installed on the zero lot line side removes the unique privacy we have in the design that prevents anyone looking into an adjoining home.

Zero lot lines mean that I am only several feet from my neighbour and changes would invade my space.

Permitting additional storeys would ruin the look of Greentree, invade the privacy of the neighbour and given that the homes are on 3 levels already seems unnecessary.

Parking is a major issue in Greentree because of BCIT students so adding another floor only invites more occupants and more parking issues. We are already having to deal with insane request by Symphony Homes to build 200 townhouses on the old Shriners site which would severely impact our village.

Please leave Greentree as it is, we love our unique neighbourhood.

Rosemary Gander  
3791 Garden Grove Drive

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Rafique Kheraj FIPPA Sec. 22 (1)  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 11:18 AM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** Re: Notice of Public Hearing  
  
**Categories:** PH - Info Complete, Public Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email. If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to [phishing@burnaby.ca](mailto:phishing@burnaby.ca)

Thank you for extending the invite for the virtual meeting this evening at 5:00pm. We will try to sign on.

I wonder if the City would allow us to tear down the property and rebuilt? The wirings and plumbing for these single family dwelling are also old and this would be a good option to consider?

As well, most of the houses are connected to the neighbors garage. If the neighbors fail to Maintain the roof of the garage, the water damages the neighbors walls. I wonder if any one has experienced that?

Thank you.  
Rafiq Kheraj  
4865 Greentree Place  
BURNABY, BC

**From:** Bill Walters <FIPPA Sec. 22 (1)>  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 11:50 AM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** Submission to October 26th Public Hearing for proposed rezoning of Greentree Village Community Plan Area  
**Attachments:** Greentree Village Public Hearing Submission\_Walters\_October 26.2021.pdf  
**Categories:** PH - Info Complete, Public Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to [phishing@burnaby.ca](mailto:phishing@burnaby.ca)

Susan Papadionissiou and Bill Walters  
4949 Thornwood Place  
Burnaby, BC  
V5G 3Z3

SENT VIA EMAIL TO: [clerks@burnaby.ca](mailto:clerks@burnaby.ca)

October 26, 2021

Dear Mayor Hurley and Council,

**RE: Submission to Public Hearing for proposed rezoning of Greentree Village Community Plan Area**

We are writing in general support of the proposed Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 23, 2021 - Bylaw No. 14375 Rez #21-09

We are long-term residents of Greentree Village, having moved here in 1990, and have raised our family in this community. We would like to continue to live in Greentree Village, but anticipate many barriers to aging in place given the current layout and design of our home.

With this in mind, we began an enquiry to obtain a Preliminary Plan Approval (PPA) in the fall of 2016, and note that our address is mentioned in the report to Council prepared by the Planning and Building Department. Given that we had previously obtained a PPA and building permits for a small 90 square feet addition over 20 years ago, we were surprised to hear that it could not be granted due to a number of issues, which in our opinion have been very vague and arbitrary.

Over the past 5 years we have had a number of conversations and exchanged correspondence and supporting documentation with City of Burnaby Planning and Building Department staff. The main purpose of our proposed renovation is our anticipation of the requirements to age in place. Bill is 68 years of age, and since we initiated our PPA request he has had two hip replacements and we have become grandparents. The experience of Bill's impaired mobility caused us to seriously contemplate

whether we can remain in our home as it is currently designed. We have particular concerns about the size and design of our 2nd floor main bathroom. It is the relative size of a clothes closet and we wonder how we will navigate into a shower if either of us has limited mobility and need assistance or a wheelchair.

We have conducted a basic inventory of Greentree Village detached homes and have provided the City staff with several comparable examples of modifications and additions that we know for a fact were granted PPAs and the necessary building permits. Additionally, we have cross-referenced other apparently renovated homes and compared them to the data on the BC Assessment website. We have the impression that many detached homes have been expanded without permits. While some of our neighbours might rather ask for forgiveness than permission, we would prefer to undertake any renovations of our home with the appropriate permits from the City of Burnaby and have the work done to standard that will outlast our ownership.

Our home is approximately 1980 square feet, on one of the larger lots in Greentree at 42 X 92 feet with 12 feet of clearance on the side we want to expand. We estimate that the renovations we have in mind will require an additional 200 square feet (4 X 25 feet X two floors).

According to a search of data on the BC Assessment website, there are a number of detached homes in Greentree that have anywhere from 2,280 to 2,669 square feet of registered floor space, so our request is not out-of-line. What we are proposing would be barely visible from the street and will not be a concern to the neighbours in our cul-de-sac whom we have spoken with.

We believe we have made a strong and reasonable case for allowing renovations such as we propose. The general recommendations pertaining to the proposed zoning amendments will meet our most basic requirements, although we think they could have gone further. As the report states, the 1970s housing stock in Greentree is aging and will one day have to be totally replaced. In the short or medium term, the Bylaw amendments may at least encourage other home owners to consider renovating or upgrading the aging housing stock in this community.

One final comment, which pertains to the incredibly frustrating 5 years that it has taken the City to get to this point. While we can appreciate that Burnaby is dealing with an overwhelming amount of growth which demands the attention of the Planning and Building Department, we hope that you can appreciate that long-time home owners also require attention and the respect of timeliness. Our patience is wearing thin but our aging process hasn't been put on hold while we wait for a common sense outcome.

Please pass this Zoning Bylaw Amendment.

Regards,

*Susan Papadionissiou*

*Bill Walters*



**From:** Lis Madsen FIPPA Sec. 22 (1)  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 12:23 PM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** Burnaby zoning bylaw 1965  
  
**Categories:** PH - Needs Addit'l Info, Public Hearing

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to [phishing@burnaby.ca](mailto:phishing@burnaby.ca)

---

I have been a resident in Greentree Village for 26 years. It is a quiet family oriented community with parking at a premium.

Allowing single dwelling homes to put in additions such as rental suites would increase traffic low and parking issues. At this point in time, BCIT students take up all our street parking.

I am very much opposed to allowing additions to existing single family dwellings.

I would also like to point out that if zoning bylaws are amended for single family dwellings, then this opportunity should also be afforded to townhome dwellers as well.

Regards,

Lis Madsen  
4788 Driftwood Place