BOARD OF VARIANCE:

BOARD OF VARIANCE

Wednesday, January 17th, 1973,
1111 Brunette Avenue,
COQUITLAM, B.C.

A meeting of the Board of Variance convened in the Committee Room of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B.C. on Wednesday, January 17th, 1973 at 7.30 p.m.

Members present were Mr. R. C. Parsons, Chairman; Mr. G. Crews, Mr. R. J. Arrell, Mr. A. H. Kennedy and Mr. L. A. Miles. Also attending the meeting was Mr. T. Klassen, Deputy Municipal Clerk who acted as Secretary to the Meeting.

Mr. Parsons explained to those present that all appeals would be heard and the Board would rule on them after and all applicants would be informed by a letter from the Municipal Clerk's Office.

1. Appeal of Mrs. H. Shuttleworth,
   2050 Hillside Avenue.
   Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements.

Mr. R. Boileau addressed the Board and stated that he was appearing as the representative of Mrs. Shuttleworth.

Mr. Boileau stated that Mrs. Shuttleworth was applying for relaxation of side yard requirements in order to be able to subdivide her property. He stated that it was proposed to subdivide the property maintaining a five foot side yard setback at the northeast corner of the existing dwelling.

Mr. Boileau informed the Board that the applicant would be removing two portions of the existing dwelling as shown on a site plan submitted with the application and that she was requesting permission to make a conforming addition to the non-conforming building.

Mr. Boileau stated that it would be too expensive to move the house as it would require a complete new foundation.

The meeting was also informed that the new access to the dwelling would come from Concord Avenue.

2. Appeal of Villa Builders Ltd.,
   2234 Park Crescent.
   Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements.

Mr. Tony Kosko addressed the Board on behalf of Villa Builders Ltd. and stated the lot in question was very shallow and has a sanitary sewer easement at the rear which makes it very difficult to locate a dwelling any further back on the lot.

Mr. Kosko stated that the forms for the dwelling were located 26.5 feet from the front property line but the living room of the dwelling is cantilevered out over the foundation by three feet. This means that the dwelling encroaches on the front yard setback requirement by 1.5 feet.

Wednesday, January 17th, 1973,
Board of Variance Mtg., cont'd.

3. District of Coquitlam -
Subject - Cypress Street Storm Sewer Easements.

Mr. D. Simm, the Assistant Municipal Solicitor for the District of Coquitlam, addressed the Board on behalf of the applicant and stated that the Municipality was seeking approval for easements which are more than 10 feet from the nearest property line and this action was being taken in accordance with special legislation giving the Municipality authority to obtain easements for utilities.

Mr. Simm stated that with respect to this particular application, four lots were being encroached upon by more than 10 feet, these being lots 195, 194, 193 and 173 as shown on the plan presented to the Board, with all lots facing onto Cypress Street.

Mr. B. Holitzki, of the Municipal Engineering Department, explained the proposal to install the storm sewer in the location as shown on the plans. He stated the reason for requiring an easement wider than 10 feet on four lots was to allow the design of the storm sewer to be put in a straight line rather than follow the curve of the property lines. He stated the storm sewer will be installed about 3 feet below ground and will be 10 inches in diameter.

The reason for locating the sewer on properties facing Cypress Street was to avoid cutting a row of trees, to avoid removal of fences and landscaping and to also be at the low point of land in order to be of the most benefit with regard to the collection of drainage water.

Mr. Holitzki stated that connections for individual properties will be brought to the edge of the easement for all properties.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Mrs. H. Shuttleworth

MOVED BY MR. MILES
SECONDED BY MR. KENNEDY:

That the appeal of Mrs. Shuttleworth be approved and she be allowed to subdivide her property maintaining a 5 foot side yard setback for the existing dwelling in accordance with her submission to the Board and further that she be allowed to construct an addition to the non-conforming dwelling provided the addition is in accordance with applicable municipal by-laws.

CARRIED

2. Villa Builders Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL:

That the appeal of Villa Builders be approved in accordance with their submission to the Board.

CARRIED

Wednesday, January 17th, 1973,
Board of Variance Mtg., cont'd.,

3. District of Coquitlam.

MOVED BY MR. KENNEDY
SECONDED BY MR. MILES:

That the plan entitled Right of Way Plan over portions of Lot 363, Group 1, N.W.D. drawn by Hunter, Crockford & Scobbie be approved with regard to the easements shown thereon.

CARRIED

RESIGNATION FROM BOARD OF VARIANCE

Mr. Kennedy stated that he has submitted his resignation from the Board as he has sold his home in Coquitlam and will be moving to Vancouver. He expressed his pleasure of having had the opportunity of serving on the Board and of having had the opportunity also of serving with the present members.

The Chairman expressed the thanks of the Board for the service extended to the Municipality by Mr. Kennedy and also expressed his personal pleasure of having had the opportunity of serving with Mr. Kennedy.

The Board as a whole also expressed a vote of thanks to Mr. Kennedy for his service to the community.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 8.30 p.m.

R. Clemons. CHAIRMAN

BOARD OF VARIANCE

Wednesday, March 14th, 1973,
1111 Brunette Avenue,
Coquitlam, B.C.

A meeting of the Board of Variance convened in the Council chambers of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B.C., on Wednesday, March 14th, 1973 at 7:30 P.M.

Members present were Mr. R.C. Parsons, Chairman; Mr. G. Crews, Mr. R.J. Arrell and Mr. B. Aabjerg. Also attending the meeting were Mr. T. Klassen, Deputy Municipal Clerk who acted as Secretary to the meeting; Mr. N. Wainman, Building Inspector; Mr. S. Jackson, Current Planner.

Mr. Parsons explained to those present that all appeals would be heard and the Board would rule on them after and all applicants would be informed by letter from the Municipal Clerk's office.

1. Meridian Heights Farmers' Institute,
   3435 Victoria Drive.
   Subject: Request permission to make addition to non-conforming dwelling.

Representatives of the Meridian Heights Farmers' Institute addressed the Board and stated that they wished to put an addition onto the rear of the existing hall which at present is non-conforming in that it does not have the required side-yard setback from Soball Street. The representative went on to explain that the maintenance of the hall is achieved by volunteer labour and in the past year they had spent approximately 625 man-hours.

It was stated that they hall usually closes during the months of June, July and August and it was during this period that they wished to make the alterations.

The Deputy Clerk explained to the Board that the property on which the hall is situated is owned by the Municipality and a by-law to close the lane to the rear of the property will be placed before Council in the very near future and as well the property will be consolidated into one lot in Order that negotiations may be undertaken with the Meridian Heights Farmers' Institute to grant a lease for the portion of the property as well as the hall.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

2. Mr. H. Anutooshkin,
   1057 Cottonwood Avenue.
   Subject: Permission to alter existing garage for living quarters.

Mr. Anutooshkin addressed the Board and stated that he currently has a closed-in garage attached to his house and he wishes to use the front portion of this garage to enlarge his living quarters. He stated that he requires the room as the house apparently only has two bedrooms and he requires the extra

room to accommodate his family.

On a question from a member of the Board, Mr. Anutooshkin stated that he would be parking his car in his drive way from now on and that he hoped sometime in the future when the lane to the rear of his property is opened up, to be able to place the driveway in from the rear.

3. Appeal of Mr. T. Clayton,
572 Rochester Avenue.
Subject: Permission to make addition to non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Clayton addressed the Board and stated that he wished to add a carport to the rear of his property giving him access off of Clayton Street and he required the approval of the Board as the existing dwelling did not have the required sideyard setback from Clayton Street.

Mr. Clayton stated that he requires this parking space because of the apartments in the area whose tenants have taken up the parking area on Rochester Street.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

4. Mr. A. DiCicco,
719-721 Blue Mountain Street.
Subject: Permission to site duplex into front yard setback requirement.

Mr. DiCicco addressed the Board and stated that his contractor has erected forms for the proposed duplex which are located to far into the frontyard setback.

He stated that it was not his intention to violate the provisions of the Bylaw but however, they had measured from the iron peg and sited the forms in accordance with that measurement and he had only found out after the site survey was done that the iron peg had a two-foot offset from the property line.

Mr. DiCicco stated that the builder does not intend to move the foundation unless he receives extra payment for this and this would cost approximately $2000.00 and as a result of this dispute, a lien has been placed on his property.

Mr. DiCicco went on to state that the two-feet overhang is only a balcony and if he is required to move the forms it will mean a court battle with the contractor in order to have the forms moved to their property location and this could mean a long delay in the erection of the building.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting cont'd.

A neighbour to the property stated that he had no objection to the proposal as put forth by Mr. DiCiccio.

5. Appeal of Mr. W.A. Winsley
2310 Austin Avenue.
Subject: Permission to make addition on non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Winsley addressed the Board and stated that he wished to make an addition of a garage and sun-deck to the back of his currently non-conforming dwelling, in order to have room to park his two cars and the boat.

He stated that he wished to enclose the present carport which exists under his house in order to use as a workshop, and his reasons for doing this were that he quite often has water running down his driveway into his sump carrying with it sand which clogs his drain and causes flooding in his carport, as well as his basement.

He stated that the reason he wanted to put the garage in the present location was two-fold in that he has no access off a unopened lane allowance to the rear of his property and also he wished to provide a sundeck for the use of his family.

A letter from a Mr. R. Demaniuk of 2303 Warrenton Avenue was read to the meeting in which no opposition to Mr. Winsley's proposal was expressed.

6. Appeal of Mr. W.G. Gresham,
930 Harris Avenue.
Subject: Permission to renovate the existing non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Gresham addressed the Board and stated that he wished to make renovations to the inside of an existing non-conforming dwelling and that he does not intend to make any additions to the outside of the house. He stated that it would be too expensive for him to relocate the house and place it on a new foundation.

There was no opposition expressed to his application.

7. Appeal of Mr. Dwaine Lindvik,
837 Runnymede Avenue.
Subject: Relaxation of sideyard requirements.

Mr. Lindvik addressed the Board and stated that he wished to build a carport on the side of his house and that he has only 14'5" setback on the side of his house and he would like a 12' carport. It is necessary for the Board to approve a relaxation to allow him to construct the carport to within two feet of the side property line.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting cont'd.

Mr. Lindvik stated that he felt a 10' carport would be too small and make it difficult to park should there be any ice on his driveway. He stated that at present he has no carport whatsoever.

Mr. Lindvik also stated that he has spoken to all surrounding neighbours and they have not expressed any objection to his proposal.

8. Appeal of Mr. H. Heinz,
1710 Como Lake Avenue.
Subject: Permission to make additions to non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Heinz addressed the Board and stated that he wished to make an addition to his currently non-conforming dwelling in order to provide an extra bedroom and enlarge the kitchen, as well as to have a covered sundeck. He stated that he will have a carport only on one side of the house whereas the covered area on the other side of the house will be used for storage of a boat or trailer.

He stated that he will also build a complete new roof over the whole house as a part of the total improvement.

Mr. Heinz stated that he wishes to provide a new entrance to the dwelling by extending the upper floor into the front yard; this will provide a cover for the entrance and give protection from the elements.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

The Deputy Clerk read a letter from Mr. & Mrs. Milne of 1721 Grover Avenue in which they stated they had no objection to the proposal as put forward by Mr. Heinz.

9. Appeal of G & H Holdings Ltd.,
1111 Austin Avenue.
Subject: Permission to make addition to non-conforming office building.

Dr. Gains, speaking on behalf of G & H Holdings Ltd., stated that the Company wished to erect a canopy on the office building situated at 1111 Austin Avenue but because the building was non-conforming in that it didn't have the required parking spaces, the Board of Variance approval was required.

Dr. Gains stated that the alterations to the building did not in any way increase the occupancy of the building and also the Design Panel of the District of Coquitlam have looked into his plans and have approved of them.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1973.
Board of Variance Meeting cont'd.

10. Appeal of Mr. Feliks Swib,
214 Jackson Street.
Subject: Appealing decision of Building Inspector with respect to amount of Fire Damage and also seeking to alter and make additions to a non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Swib addressed the Board and stated that he has a home on Jackson Street which had been damaged by fire approximately one year ago. He stated that the only damage to the house was to the gyproc in the interior and to a portion of the roof.

He stated that he had settled with his insurance company and had received the amount of $5,600.00 with respect to the damage and he now wished to re-build the house but had been denied a permit as the Building Inspector have ruled that it was damaged more than 75%. Mr. Wainman, the Building Inspector, stated that in his opinion, the damage on the house is more than 75% and as well he feels the building is non-conforming in that it is not set back the required 25' from the front lot line.

On a question from the Board, Mr. Swib stated that he had had a price from the Contractor to repair the house and this price had been $5,000.00.

Some neighbours suggested that possibly the house should be torn down because it is in a very dilapidated state.

11. Appeal of N.W. Canine Plus Limited,
500 Clarke Road.
Subject: Appealing ruling of Municipal Officials with respect to an interpretation of a Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Motiuk, a Barrister and Solicitor, addressed the hearing on behalf of the applicants stating that his clients wished to operate a dog grooming parlour at 500 Austin Avenue which is currently zoned C2, neighbourhood commercial, but that they had been denied a business licence as the Planning Department had ruled that this was not an allowable use within that zone.

Mr. Motiuk quoted from the Zoning Bylaw in Burnaby as well as the Zoning Bylaw in Surrey, which he said were comparable to our C2 neighbourhood commercial zones in which just such a business would be allowed.

He also stated that in his opinion, a dog grooming parlour could be classified as a profession or under the term "barbering" which are allowable uses within C2 zones.

Mr. Motiuk went on to state that there is definitely a need for this type of business within the district and that his client intends to spend over $6,000.00 on interior alterations to the office.

It was stated by one of the applicants that there would be no boarding or keeping of animals overnight in the shop and that they have already expended funds to begin the store.

The applicant also stated that she had phoned into the License Department prior to entering into an Agreement to Lease the property and had been advised that the type of business they proposed could be located in this building. She went on to state that they had entered into the Agreement for the Lease on December 16, 1972 and that if they cannot carry through, they could be liable for $2,500.00 as they would be in breach of their lease.

Mr. Jackson, speaking on behalf of the District of Coquitlam opposed the application on the basis that it had been the ruling of the Planning Department on more than one occasion that just such a type of business was not an allowable use in a C2 zone and as a matter of fact had prepared a Bylaw Amendment for Councils consideration which would make such a use an allowable use within a CS-1 service commercial zone.

The applicant pointed out to the Board that a Pet Shop was an allowable use within a C2 zone and that one did exist in a shopping centre just up from their proposed location and that animals and dogs were in fact sold from this establishment as well as kept in the store overnight. She further stated that they will not do this but will provide a pickup service and this should also alleviate any traffic problems from people delivering and picking up dogs. She also stated that she currently holds a Home Occupation Licence and operates just such a type of business from her home in Chineside.

12. Appeal of Mr. G.J.C. Rondeau,
2156 Brookmount Avenue.
Subject: Permission to subdivide property allowing existing dwelling to remain on a non-conforming location.

Mr. G.A. Verheul spoke on behalf of Mr. Rondeau and stated that he wishes to subdivide his property situated on the corner of Brookmount Avenue and Moray Street, but that he could not do this without approval of the Board of Variance as the existing house and the property was non-conforming in that it did not have the required rear yard setback. As well, the side yard setback was not in conformity with regulations.

Wednesday, March 14th. 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting cont'd.

A neighbour in the area opposed the subdivision as he felt the size of the lot would be too small and would increase the traffic problem in the area.

Another neighbour to the west stated that Port Moody is going to allow a condominium development in this area and this, together with a smaller lot, would, in his opinion, decrease the value of his property. He also stated that parking in this area is becoming a problem and allowing another dwelling with one or two more cars would only increase that problem.

Other residents of the area stated that they would like to see the subdivision face Moray Street and it was explained that this was not done because the present house does face onto Brookmount Avenue.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Meridian Heights Farmers' Institute

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the Meridian Heights Farmers' Institute be allowed to place an addition onto the non-conforming hall at 3435 Victoria Drive in accordance with their submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

2. Mr. H. Anutooshkin

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That Mr. Anutooshkin be allowed to convert his existing garage into living quarters and a utility area in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

3. Mr. T. Clayton

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That Mr. T. Clayton be allowed to make an addition of a carport to the rear of his non-conforming dwelling in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

4. Mr. A. DiCicco

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That Mr. DiCicco be allowed to construct a duplex at 719-721 Blue Mountain to within 34.3 feet of the front property line in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting cont'd.

5. Mr. W.A. Winsley

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That Mr. W.A. Winsley be allowed to construct a garage and sundeck to the rear of his existing dwelling and as well he be allowed to enclose the existing carport under his dwelling in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

6. Mr. W.G. Gresham

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That Mr. Gresham be allowed to renovate the existing non-conforming dwelling at 930 Harris Avenue in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

7. Mr. Dwaine Lindvik

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS

That Mr. Lindvik be allowed to construct a carport attached to his dwelling but that the width of the carport is to be only 11½' wide measured to the interior walls of the proposed carport.

CARRIED.

8. Mr. H. Heinz

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That Mr. Heinz be allowed to make renovations to his dwelling in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

9. G. & H. Holdings Ltd.

MOVED BY CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That G & H Holdings Ltd. be allowed to construct a canopy on the front of their existing non-conforming building at 1111 Austin Avenue in accordance with their submission to the Board.

CARRIED.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting cont'd.

10. Mr. Feliks Swib

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That Mr. Swib be instructed to secure a survey certificate to determine the location of the dwelling on the property and if it is determined that the house is not situated in compliance with zoning bylaws that he reappear before the Board and present independent evidence of the amount of fire damage which was incurred, at which time the Board will reconsider his application.

CARRIED.

11. N.W. Canine Plus Limited

By Law 157 C3-1 Zone allowed such a use

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That Section 702 (1) (a) (iv) of the District of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw 1928 1971 as amended by Bylaw No. 149 be interpreted to include a household pet shampoo and beauty parlour in view of the fact that no provision for such an establishment in any other zone is currently made.

CARRIED.

12. G.J.C. Rondeau

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. Rondeau be approved and he be allowed to subdivide his property and that the existing non-conforming dwelling be allowed to remain in its current location in accordance with the plans submitted to the Board dated January 17th, 1973.

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

R. Clarsons.

CHAIRMAN.

TK

BOARD OF VARIANCE

501

Wednesday, May 9th, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
COQUITLAM, B. C.

A meeting of the Board of Variance convened in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, May 9th, 1973.

Members present were Mr. R. C. Parsons, Chairman, Mr. R. J. Arrell, Mr. B. Aabjerg and Mr. L. Garrison. Also attending the meeting were Mr. T. Klassen, Deputy Municipal Clerk who acted as Secretary to the meeting, Mr. M. Robinson, Building Inspector and Mr. S. Jackson, Current Planner.

Mr. Parsons explained to those present that all appeals would be heard and the Board would rule on them after and all applicants would be informed by letter from the Municipal Clerk's Office.

1. Appeal of R. S. Kane
   900 Robinson Street
   Subject: Relaxation of rear yard requirements

Mr. Kane addressed the Board and stated that he wished to extend his present carport and in order to do this he would be encroaching on a rear yard setback by approximately 4 feet 3 inches.

Mr. Kane stated that he requires the extra space as he now has two cars and finds it very difficult to park them.

Mr. Kane stated that he understands that he could build a separate carport as long as he did not attach it to the existing one, however he wishes to maintain the appearance of the dwelling and feels this is the easiest and best way of doing that.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

2. K. J. McCartney
   433 Marmont Street
   Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. McCartney addressed the Board and stated that he wished to subdivide his property, however he can not do this without the approval of the Board of Variance as the existing dwelling is not conforming as to the side yard setback from Dansey Avenue.

He stated that it would be a hardship insofar as the expense is concerned if he were required to move the dwelling to make it conform to setback regulations.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

3. V. Uttaro
   408 Marmont Street
   Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. F. Finley addressed the Board on behalf of Mr. Uttaro and stated that his client wishes to subdivide the property, however the existing house is non-conforming with respect to the side yard requirements from the lane.

Mr. Finley stated that the lane is not currently in use and therefore the setback does not interfere with any of the surrounding property owners.

Mr. Finley also stated that the existing garage on the property will be removed prior to the subdivision being completed.

Mr. Finley also stated that the lot on which the old house will be situated will be 50 feet by 150 feet and the newly created lot will be 72 feet by 150 feet.

4. Royal Canadian Legion
1025 Ridgeway
Subject: Relaxation of side yard and rear yard requirements and parking requirements

Mr. Bremner, representing the Royal Canadian Legion addressed the Board and stated that his organization wishes to make an addition to their currently non-conforming building on Ridgeway Avenue as they require space for a Board Room and storage.

Mr. P. Hansen, the Architect for the project, addressed the Board and stated that the building as it now exists is non-conforming with respect to setbacks and does not meet the proper requirements under the zoning by-law.

Mr. Hansen went on to state that the old garage on the property adjacent to the Legion building is currently being used for storage, however once the addition is made this garage will be removed and additional parking created.

Mr. Hansen did state that while they are creating more parking they still will not meet the parking requirements as stipulated under the by-law, however he asked the Board to take into consideration that most functions of the Legion take place during the evening and a considerable amount of parking is available in the area during those hours.

A resident of the area who lives at 1017 Austin Avenue addressed the Board and stated that he would like to see some policing of the area with respect to the amount of litter and garbage deposited on his property from people attending at the legion and feels that this is caused as a result of parking on Ridgeway Avenue to the rear of his property with people discarding litter prior to driving away in their cars.

Mr. Bremner stated that he will definitely look into this to see if this problem can be eliminated.

5. F. R. Flintoff
696 Folsom Street
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Flintoff addressed the Board and stated he is presently building a new dwelling and he wishes to construct a dining room alcove which would project into the side yard setback requirement by 1 foot 6 inches.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

6. G. Beaudette
225 Blue Mountain
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Beaudette addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to make an addition to the rear of his presently non-conforming dwelling in order to provide two more bedrooms as he requires the space for his family. He went on to state that he wishes to also put a basement under the whole dwelling if he finds it economically feasible to so do.

Mr. Garrison asked Mr. Beaudette how old the existing dwelling was and he stated that it was approximately 30 years old.

Mr. Beaudette also enquired as to the future of this area as he understands it is in a designated area for apartments, however the Board was not able to give any assistance to Mr. Beaudette in this regard.

A neighbour rose to state that she had no objection to the proposed addition, however she felt that as this was a designated apartment area that possibly any additions to dwellings in this area would be a waste of money.

7. N. F. Tyrrell
510 Roxham
Subject: Relaxation of rear yard requirements

Mr. Tyrrell addressed the Board and stated that he wished to make an addition to the front of his existing non-conforming dwelling as the building is too small for his needs and he requires another bedroom, a larger living room and also wishes to update the kitchen and bathroom.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

8. W. B. Scott
802 Crestwood
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Scott addressed the Board and stated that he wished to close in the area above his double carport in order to give him more living room and also to solve a problem he is having with his roof with respect to water leaking through.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

9. B.C. Telephone Company
Blue Mountain and Smith
Subject: Permission to make addition to non-conforming building

Mr. Waters, an Architect with the firm of McCarter, Nairne & Partners, spoke on behalf of B.C. Telephone and stated that they wish to make an addition to the building at Smith and Blue Mountain, this addition to be made in two stages. The first stage would be an 8500 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the existing building and would be designed to be compatible with the existing building. He went on to state that about 1984 a further extension of the facility would be needed and they propose to place an additional storey on top of the whole building. He stated that, at that time, the building would be

conforming as to siting requirements but would not conform with respect to height requirements.

Mr. Waters also stated that the B.C. Telephone Company will provide parking on site in line with the number of people working in the building and that at this time it would mean 11 spaces with appropriate landscaping screens to shield the parking and that space would be available to expand the parking to 20 spaces in the future.

Mr. Waters stated at this time that the company was asking for approval for both additions as well as approval with respect to the 20 parking spaces available being sufficient with respect to the structure.

The gentleman representing B.C. Telephone Company went on with the presentation and stated that the present building is only large enough to accommodate the needs of the company until 1976, as the present exchange is growing at approximately 1800 lines per year.

Mr. Parsons asked the representative of the B.C. Telephone Company what his alternatives would be were the Board to refuse this application and was informed that the company had planned this exchange area and had been laying lines to meet in this location and should they have to move the exchange it would mean the replacement of all the cables leading to this location.

Mr. Aabjerg enquired of the Architect as to how many employees would be working out of the building and the B.C. Telephone Company representative stated that at present there are 12 persons at the exchange however with the installation of new equipment and the expansion of the building it would mean that there would be 24 employees working out of this location, however this would be spread out over a 24 hour period.

A resident in the area enquired as to the deliveries to the building late at night and the representative of B. C. Telephone Company stated that the deliveries at night will be stopped almost immediately and he promised to indicate this in writing to the Municipality.

An enquiry was also made as to whether the houses on the north side of the building will be purchased by B.C. Telephone and the answer was "no".

The representative of B. C. Telephone Company also stated that the major loading bay for equipment will be at the rear of the proposed new addition.

Mr. Jackson of the Municipal Planning Department expressed concern about the large mass of this building and the Architect stated that this is a very difficult problem to deal with, however it is one that he feels can be overcome by design and selection of material and felt that it could be made compatible with the residential area.

Mr. Aabjerg stated that if B. C. Telephone were to acquire the land to the north of the building it would be a very small percentage of the cost of this exchange and felt that it would be desirable.

Some of the neighbours in the area complained about deliveries being made off of Blue Mountain and it was suggested that possibly, if the building is expanded, that the main entrance could be placed in off of Smith, where very few, if any, residents would be disturbed by deliveries.

10. R. A. Englund
970 Rochester Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Englund addressed the Board and stated that he wished to subdivide his property at 970 Rochester Avenue but that the existing house on the property was non-conforming as to the front yard from Lebleu Street.

Mr. Jackson of the Municipal Planning Department asked Mr. Englund if he had any plans with respect to altering the existing house and Mr. Englund stated that the back porch would be taken off.

Mr. Englund was questioned as to whether or not the appearance of the existing dwelling could be changed in order to make the appearance of the entrance to be from Lebleu Street rather than from Rochester Avenue and would he possibly consider the building of the carport fronting on to Lebleu Street in order to give just such appearance. Mr. Englund said that he could do this.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

11. N. B. Hancock
826 Como Lake Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of rear and side yard requirements

Mr. Hancock addressed the Board and stated that he wished to subdivide his property at 826 Como Lake Avenue, however the existing dwelling is not conforming to rear and side yard requirements and he therefore required the approval of the Board of Variance before being able to complete the subdivision.

Mr. Hancock stated that he had contacted the property owner to the rear of his property and this gentleman had no objection to the proposal.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

12. I. Dussault
2177 Lorraine Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Dick of Block Bros. Industries appeared forMrs. Dussault and stated that Mrs. Dussault wished to subdivide her property at 2177 Lorraine Avenue which currently consists of two lots and it is proposed to create a total of three lots. He stated that the existing house is non-conforming as it is only set back 18.5 feet from Lorraine Avenue.

Mr. Sidney Orpwood, a resident of the area, objected to the proposal stating that to allow this dwelling to remain would perpetuate a blight on the whole area, as the existing house is an eyesore and Mr. Orpwood proceeded to show slides of the dwelling.

Mr. Orpwood went on to state that the house does not conform as to status or quality in comparison to the other homes in the neighbourhood and felt that the approval of the Board should not be given so that eventually this house would be removed.

Mr. Dick stated that if the subdivision does not proceed, the owner will be applying for rezoning for a duplex on one lot and the old

dwelling will remain and therefore, possibly the choice is between the duplex and the existing dwelling or between the single dwelling and two single family dwellings.

Mr. Orpwood then went on to explain that he felt there was no hardship created by not allowing the subdivision and he felt it was economically feasible for the existing dwelling to be lifted, turned around and moved back to be in conformity with the Municipal by-laws as they now exist. He stated that he had checked with a moving company, had been informed that to relocate the building and put a new basement underneath would cost in the vicinity of $6800.00. He felt that this amount could be more than regained in the final selling of an improved property.

A letter of objection to the proposed subdivision from a Mrs. D. Leowen of 2173 Lorraine Avenue was received and read to the Board.

On questioning from the Board Mr. Dick stated that they will make changes to the entrance of the house in order to make the front entrance face Lorraine Avenue, that they would put evetroughs on all around the dwelling and connect them to downpipes and lead this drainage water directly out to the road, that they would put a curb on the driveway to redirect drainage water from the said driveway and that there would be a general cleanup of the property.

Mr. Dick went on to state this property has been sold subject to approval of the subdivision and that the total price of $46,000.00 had been paid for the property and therefore it was necessary to obtain the three lots in order to make any sort of profit at all as the servicing costs for this property would be an additional $7300.00.

13. J. Keay
530 Ebert Avenue
Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Keay addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to make an addition to the end of his carport to use as a workshop and he wished to keep this addition in line with the existing line which is only set back 4 feet 3 inches from the side prope-ty line.

He stated that the garage to the rear of the property will be removed and that he had contacted the neighbour to the side of the property on which the carport would be constructed and this neighbour had no objection.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

14. Engineered Homes Ltd.
3126 and 3130 Mariner Way
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Harry Blom, representing Engineered Homes Ltd., addressed the Board and stated that he was seeking approval to site two dwellings to within 30 feet of Mariner Way instead of the required 37 feet as the two lots drop off very steeply at the rear of the property which makes it very difficult to site the dwellings designed for this area.

He stated that in order to site the building in compliance with the by-law would mean excavating to a depth of 20 feet in order to reach solid ground which would be a great expense.

CONCLUSIONS

1. R. S. Kane

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. R. S. Kane be approved and he be allowed to make an addition of a carport to his dwelling maintaining a 15 foot 9 inch rear yard setback in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

2. K. J. McCartney

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That Mr. McCartney be allowed to subdivide his property maintaining the existing dwelling in its current location in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

3. V. Uttaro

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. Vincent Uttaro be approved and he be allowed to subdivide his property and that the existing non-conforming dwelling be allowed to remain in its current non-conforming location in accordance with his submission to the Board. This approval is subject to the existing garage on the property being removed.

CARRIED

4. Royal Canadian Legion

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of the Royal Canadian Legion be approved and they be allowed to make additions to the rear of the non-conforming building at 1025 Ridgeway Avenue in accordance with their submission to the Board.

CARRIED

5. F. R. Flintoff

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. F. R. Flintoff be approved and he be allowed to construct the dining room alcove extending one foot six inches from the side of his dwelling in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

6. G. Beaudette

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That Mr. Beaudette be allowed to construct an addition measuring 14 feet by 24 feet to the rear of his non-conforming building but that approval is not granted to construct a basement under this section or under the existing dwelling.

CARRIED

7. N. F. Tyrrell

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Mr. Tyrrell be approved and that he be allowed to make an addition to the front of his existing non-conforming dwelling in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

8. W. B. Scott

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. W. B. Scott be approved and he be allowed to close in the area above his carport for living quarters in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

9. B. C. Telephone Company

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of B.C. Telephone Company be declined at this time and the applicant be advised to explore alternatives open to him, such as rezoning or relocation of the facility. The Board takes this action as they feel this proposal has some very far reaching aspects with respect to planning of this area and feels that this is a matter that should be the jurisdiction of the Municipal Council.

The Board recognizes that an appeal may be forthcoming in the future with respect to setbacks and parking should the Municipality feel expansion of this facility in this area is desirable.

CARRIED

10. R. A. Englund

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Mr. Englund be approved and he be allowed to subdivide his property at 970 Rochester Avenue subject to the following changes being made to the existing dwelling:

1. Changes to the front entrance to give the appearance of fronting on to Lebleu Street.

2. The erection of a carport on to the side of the dwelling facing on to Lebleu Street.

3. The removal of an old porch on the south side of the existing dwelling.

CARRIED

11. N. B. Hancock

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of N. B. Hancock be approved and he be allowed to subdivide his property maintaining the existing dwelling in its current location in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

12. I. Dussault

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of I. Dussault be approved and she be allowed to subdivide her property maintaining the existing dwelling in its current location in accordance with her submission to the Board subject to:

1. Changes to the front entrance to the dwelling to give the appearance of fronting on to Lorraine Avenue.

2. The construction of a garbage shelter at the rear of the property.

3. Evestroughs being placed all around the dwelling connected to downpipes which in turn are to be connected to tiles leading directly to the drainage ditch.

4. The placing of evestroughs all around the existing garage.

5. The curbing of the existing driveway to divert water from the neighbour's property.

The Board also instructed that the By-law Enforcement Officer be requested to visit the property to see that the general clean-up of the property is done.

CARRIED

13. J. Keay

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. J. Keay be approved and he be allowed to construct an addition to the rear of his existing carport in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

14. Engineered Homes Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Engineered Homes Ltd. be approved and they be allowed to construct dwellings on Lot 160 and Lot 159 maintaining a front yard setback of 30 feet in accordance with their submission to the Board.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

R. E. Parsons.
CHAIRMAN

BOARD OF VARIANCE

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
COQUITLAM, B. C.

A meeting of the Board of Variance convened in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, May 9th, 1973 at 7:00 p.m.

Members present were Mr. G. Crews, Mr. R. J. Arrell, Mr. B. Aabjerg and Mr. L. Garrison. Also attending the meeting were Mr. T. Klassen, Deputy Municipal Clerk who acted as Secretary and Mr. N. Wainman, Chief Building Inspector.

Mr. Parsons, the Chairman, was unable to attend the meeting and therefore had appointed Mr. G. Crews to act as Chairman.

Mr. Crews explained to those present that all appeals would be heard and the Board would rule on them after and all applicants would be informed by letter from the Municipal Clerk's Office of the decision of the Board.

12. Appeal of the District of Coquitlam
1111 Brunette Avenue
Subject: Easements - Selkirk Crescent Sanitary Sewers

Mr. D. Simm, the Municipal Solicitor, appeared on behalf of the District of Coquitlam and stated that the Municipality was seeking approval for easements which are more then 10 feet from the nearest property line and this action was being taken in accordance with special Legislation giving the Municipality authority to obtain easements for utilities.

Mr. Simm went on to state that the location of the sewer was determined as a result of the request of residents in the area who wished it placed to the rear of their properties rather than on the road allowance.

Mr. Simm stated that the sewer has been completed and all property owners affected have signed releases indicating that they are satisfied with the restoration work which has been done.

1. Appeal of Mr. K. D. Johnson
504 Hickey Street
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition and alterations to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Johnson appeared before the Board and stated that he wishes to make an addition of a carport and sundeck to the side of his non-conforming dwelling.

He stated that this carport would be conforming as to setback. Mr. Johnson also stated that he wishes to make some alterations to his house by constructing an "A" frame entrance as well as the addition of a one storey fireplace.

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting, cont'd.

2. Appeal of Mr. C. G. Warren
2038 Hillside Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Warren addressed the Board and stated that he has a garage presently situated on a lot which is proposed to be sub-divided off and sold. He wishes to relocate the garage to in front of his existing dwelling as this is the only suitable location for his building.

Mr. Warren was asked whether he could not place the garage to the other side of the dwelling and Mr. Warren stated that if he did this when the lot on that side of the dwelling is eventually sub-divided off and sold the garage would again be on the wrong lot.

Mr. Warren stated that if he is not allowed to place the garage in the location in which he desires that he will have to do away with the garage altogether as it would not be aesthetically pleasing in any other location or indeed accessible.

3. Appeal of Mr. R. Denesiuk
725 Alderson
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to make alterations to non-conforming dwelling

The secretary informed the Board that a phone call had been received from Mrs. Denesiuk on July 13, 1973 withdrawing the application.

4. Appeal of Mr. M. Begg
508 Laurentian
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Begg addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to add a carport to his existing non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Begg stated this addition would be to the rear of the dwelling and access would be gained off of the lane and therefore no problem would be created once Laurentian Crescent is fully developed to arterial standards.

5. Appeal of Mrs. A. Erickson
1012 King Albert Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mrs. Erickson was not in attendance to explain her appeal. The Board therefore did not deal with the application.

6. Appeal of Mr. D. G. Smith
1796 Charland Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Smith addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to make an addition to his existing non-conforming dwelling and that because Laurentian is now considered a major arterial street he is required to have a 24 foot sideyard setback whereas he only has a 21 foot 4 inch sideyard setback.

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting, cont.

7. Appeal of Mr. G. Roberts
1787 Como Lake Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition of non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Roberts addressed the Board and stated that he requires additional room to house his family and the existing house does not conform to by-law requirements in that he only has a 15 foot rear yard setback.

Mr. Roberts in answer to a question from the Board stated that it had been suggested to him that if he removed the rear laundry room his house would be in compliance with regulations, however, he stated that the laundry room currently contains all laundry facilities as well as a hot water tank and that it would be quite costly and inconvenient to remove this section of the dwelling.

Mr. Roberts further stated that he proposes to make a split level out of the existing dwelling as a result of the alterations which he now contemplates.

8. Mrs. P. Bonin
318 Marmont Street
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to make addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mrs. Bonin addressed the Board and stated that she wishes to make an addition to the front of her dwelling in order to sound-proof the front bedroom as she is having great difficulty sleeping as a result of the noise on Marmont Street and is presently on sleeping pills as a result of the noise.

9. Mr. A. J. Andre
416 Marmont Street
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Andre addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to raise his existing house and place a basement underneath as he requires the extra space due to an addition to the family.

Mr. Andre stated that he does not wish to make any other additions and that he will be using the existing foundation when raising the dwelling.

10. Mr. Leo Huppee
732 Alderson Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Huppee addressed the Board and stated he wishes to make an addition to his non-conforming dwelling at which time he will change the roof of the existing dwelling to conform with the new addition.

The existing house does not have the required 37 foot setback from Alderson Avenue as required for major arterial streets.

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting, cont'd.

11. Appeal of Mr. B. E. Ehlert
804 Miller Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to allow addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Ehlert addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to tear down the existing garage on the property and erect a carport attached to the dwelling. He stated that he requires the approval of the Board of Variance as the existing house is non-conforming as to front and sideyard setbacks.

He stated that the new carport would be a two car carport with a sundeck on the roof.

13. Mr. H. S. Seki
207 Bernatchey Street
Subject: Relaxation of by-law requirements to make addition to non-conforming dwelling

Mr. Seki addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to build a sunporch on the rear of his dwelling which would extend the full length of the dwelling.

14. Mr. Gerald Quan
2363 Oneida Drive
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Richard Brighton appeared on behalf of Mr. Quan and stated that Mr. Quan wishes to close in a portion of the existing sundeck to use as a kitchen and as well build a new sundeck to the rear of this dwelling.

Mr. Brighton stated the approval of the Board of Variance is required as the carport does not have a 6 foot sideyard setback which is required for any enclosed structure and Mr. Quan wishes to use the existing foundations for the addition.

15. Carson G. Bradley
1544 Como Lake Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements in order to subdivide

Mr. Bradley addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to subdivide his property at 1544 Como Lake Avenue, however, the existing dwelling was built prior to the new regulations requiring a 37 foot front yard setback from major arterial streets and therefore was non-conforming.

Mr. Bradley stated that the dwelling is in a good state of repair and would remain for a good many years.

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting, cont'd.

CONCLUSIONS

12. District of Coquitlam

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL:

That the plan entitled "Right of Way plan over portions of District Lot 370 Group 1, N.W.D." drawn by Hunter, Crockford, Scobie & Associates and dated the 23rd of May, 1973 be approved with regard to the easements shown thereon.

CARRIED

1. Mr. K. D. Johnson

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. K. D. Johnson be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board

CARRIED

2. Mr. C. G. Warren

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. C. W. Warren be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

3. Mr. R. Denesiuk

This item was withdrawn.

4. Mr. M. Begg

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. M. Begg be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

5. Mrs. A. Erickson

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mrs. A. Erickson not be dealt with and they be informed that they will be placed on the next agenda if they so desire, however, the Board will only deal with the application if the applicant or his representative is in attendance.

CARRIED

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting, cont'd.

6. Mr. D. G. Smith

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Mr. D. G. Smith be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

7. Mr. G. Roberts

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. G. Roberts be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

8. Mrs. P. Bonin

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mrs. P. Bonin be approved in accordance with her submission to the Board.

CARRIED

9. Mr. A. J. Andre

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. A. J. Andre be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

10. Mr. Leo Huppee

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Mr. L. Huppee be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

11. Mr. B. E. Ehlert

MOVED BY MR. GARRISON
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. B. E. Ehlert be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

Wednesday, July 25th, 1973,
Board of Variance Meeting, cont'd.

13. Mr. H. S. Seki

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Mr. H. S. Seki be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

14. Mr. Gerald Quan

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. Gerald Quan be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

15. Carson G. Bradley

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. GARRISON

That the appeal of Mr. Carson G. Bradley be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Gary R Brews
CHAIRMAN

501

BOARD OF VARIANCE

Tuesday, October 2, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

A meeting of the Board of Variance convened in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973 at 7:30 p.m.

Members present were Mr. R.C. Parsons, Chairman, Mr. G. Crews, Mr. R. J. Arrell, and Mr. B. Aabjerg. Also attending the meeting were Mr. T. Klassen, Deputy Municipal Clerk who acted as Secretary to the meeting, Mr. M. Robinson, Building Inspector and Mr. S. Jackson, Current Planner.

Mr. Parsons explained to those present that all appeals would be heard and the Board would rule on them after, and all applicants would be informed by letter from the Municipal Clerk's Office as to the outcome of the Board's deliberations.

1. Edward Blanchette
   995 Kelvin Street
   Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Edward Blanchette was not in attendance.

2. Howard Tullis
   1183 Kerwan Avenue
   Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

The Secretary informed the meeting that a letter had been received from Mr. Tullis withdrawing his application.

3. Jack Cewe Ltd.
   North End of Pipeline Road
   Subject: Permission to make an addition to non-conforming structure

No representatives from Jack Cewe Ltd. were in attendance.

A Mrs. Overland addressed the hearing and stated that she owned property to the east of Jack Cewe Ltd. and was opposed to any additions being allowed until Mr. Cewe does certain work on his property such as ditching to prevent flow of water onto her property. She also stated that Jack Cewe Ltd. has on several occasions done work without permits or permission of the Municipality and somehow seems never to suffer the consequences of his actions.

4. James W. Petrie
   1662 Charland Avenue
   Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Petrie addressed the Board and stated that he wished to close in a portion of his sun deck to provide a family room. He stated that at the present time he has some rot problems with the roof of the sun deck and feels that it is a good time, while doing this repair work, to construct the addition.

Mr. Petrie presented to the Board a letter dated September 29th, 1973 signed by four adjoining property owners stating they have no objection to his proposal.

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
COQUITLAM, B. C.

5. Mr. H. Rae
934 Porter Street
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Rae addressed the Board and stated that he wished to construct a carport in front of his dwelling and this carport would extend to within 21 feet of the front property line. He stated that he has no carport at the present time and this is the only location in which he could construct as he has no rear lane and non-sufficient room on either side of the dwelling to construct a carport.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

6. Rene Delaurier
1731 Sheridan Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of rear yard requirements

Mr. Delaurier addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to construct a three car carport in his rear yard and further stated that he has no carport at the present time.

It was brought to Mr. Delaurier's attention that he could not construct a building having a gross area of more than 800 square feet and he stated that he was aware of this and could comply with that regulation.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

7. Mr. Norman Angell
303 Dunlop Street
Subject: Relaxation of side and rear yard requirements

Mr. Angell addressed the Board and stated that when he purchased this property three years ago there had been an existing accessory structure upon the property and a new foundation had been poured with three walls already constructed on this new foundation. He stated that he wished to complete the building and was now seeking permission to leave the building in its non-conforming location.

Mr. Angell stated that he really requires this space as his home has no basement.

A Mr. Smith of 319 Dunlop Street stated that he was a neighbor of Mr. Angell's and had no objection to allowing the shed to remain and feels that it is of great improvement on his property.

8. Mr. M. G. Jones
2410 Austin Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Jones addressed the Board and stated that he has started construction of a carport to the side of his dwelling and although the side yard set back of the carport is in compliance with Municipal By-Laws his house is not conforming as he now requires a 37 foot set back from Austin Avenue as this road is classified as an Arterial Route.

He stated that he had had a carport to the rear of his property which has been removed as he had no rear access to his lot.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

9. Seymour Holdings Ltd.
2886 Dewdney Trunk Road
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Turchak addressed the Board and stated that his company had purchased a large piece of property at Dewdney Trunk Road and Norman Avenue in June with the idea of sub-dividing the property. He stated that they now wished to move the existing dwelling on the property which sits across future property lines and in order to get it on a more suitable lot they are requesting the Board to relax either the front or rear yard requirements by three feet.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

10. Mr. S. J. Magee
2223 Gale Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Magee addressed the hearing and stated that he wished to raise his existing house and use the existing foundation in order to construct a basement. He stated that the existing carport is within four feet of the side property line and as he would be closing in the top of his carport approval of the Board of Variance is required. He stated that he has talked to all his neighbors and they have no objection to what he proposes.

In answer to a question from the Board, Mr. Magee stated that he would be constructing a new living room over top of the sundeck and the existing living room will be made into a family room and a portion of the area will also be used as a new entrance way.

11. Mr. G. Pepke
1664 Brunette Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Pepke addressed the Board and stated that he has purchased a dwelling which he wishes to move on to the property at 1664 Brunette Avenue. But as he has a Trans Mountain Oil Pipeline right-of-way running through the lot, he is unable to site this dwelling maintaining a 37 foot front yard set back. In answer to a question from the Board, Mr. Pepke stated that when he had originally purchased the lot the set-back requirements had been 25 feet and that he had already purchased the dwelling and paid $5,000 for it and further he would be spending another $4,000 to have it placed on the lot and a basement constructed.

Mr. Pepke stated that he was therefore requesting that he be allowed to place the dwelling on the lot maintaining a 31 foot front yard set back.

A Mrs. Brummit of 1670 Sheridan Avenue stated that she had no objection to Mr. Pepke's proposal.

12. Mr. L. Lavigne
86 Mundy Street
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Lavigne addressed the Board and stated he wishes to close in the existing sun deck for use as a family room and due to the manner in which the dwelling was placed on the lot at the time of construction, one corner of his dwelling is set back four feet two inches from the property line, whereas he requires a six foot side yard set back.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

13. Mrs. S. Townsend
964 Stewart Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Townsend addressed the Board and stated that he had purchased the home in May of this year and the existing carport was too low to allow the entrance of his truck so he had attempted to raise it at which time it fell down and he had therefore constructed a new garage without first obtaining a permit and this garage had been constructed closer to the property line than was allowed under the By-Law, as well the garage was an addition to a non-conforming structure.

Mr. Townsend presented letters to the Board signed by owners at 961 Stewart Avenue, 962 Stewart Avenue and 975 Edgar Avenue stating that they had no objection to what Mr. Townsend had done.

14. Mr. E. Merz
1038 Stewart Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Merz was not in attendance.

15. Mr. I. Stopic
2300 Austin Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of rear yard requirements

Mrs. Stopic addressed the Board and stated that they had purchased this dwelling recently and had made certain alterations and additions to the dwelling without a permit having first been obtained and is now seeking approval of the Board to be allowed to retain the addition as constructed. She informed the hearing that the house is set far back on the lot and they only have a twelve foot rear yard and thus the house is not conforming with existing By-Law requirements.

Owners of property at 2303 Warrenton Avenue, 2310 Austin Avenue and 2294 Austin Avenue expressed support for Mrs. Stopic and stated that the work done on this property had improved its appearance considerably.

16. Mr. A. Gauthier
928 Quadling Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. Gauthier addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to construct a carport on the side of his dwelling maintaining no side yard set-back. Mr. Gauthier informed the hearing that he had talked to his neighbor and his neighbor had no objection to what he proposed to do.

Mr. Gauthier stated that he would have to build right to the property line in order to obtain a decent sized carport.

17. Austin Developments Ltd.
2683 Mathewson Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of rear yard requirements

Mr. Thomas addressed the Board and stated that the property at 2683 Mathewson Avenue was being subdivided and the existing house would be located on a new lot facing a new street and as a result the existing side yard becomes the rear yard of the dwelling. Mr. Thomas stated that if the appeal is not allowed that he will be forced to remove the carport from the dwelling in order to obtain the required rear yard set-back.

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

18. Bing G. Marr & Associates
Brunette and Adair Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. B. Marr addressed the Board and stated that his clients wished to erect a commercial building on three lots in the 900 Block Brunette Avenue area. He stated that the By-Law requires a thirty seven foot front yard set back for this structure which will mean they will be only able to construct a small building covering 28 per cent of the available land space whereas they were seeking relaxation to be able to build within 20 feet of the property line which would allow a 40 per cent coverage of site area.

Mr. Marr stated that the proposed structure would be two stories in height for most of the building with a portion being one storey.

Mr. Marr also informed the Board that the twenty foot front yard set-back would still allow for a 12 foot widening strip for Brunette Avenue as well as the construction of an eight foot sidewalk which his clients will be building.

In answer to a question placed by one of the surrounding property owners Mr. Marr stated that the second floor would be used for commercial rental space. Further that 17 parking spaces would be provided on site for this project.

19. Mr. George Turgeon
1031 Alderson Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of front yard requirements

Mr. Turgeon addressed the Board and stated that he wished to erect a double carport attached to his existing non-conforming dwelling as well as do some alterations and additions to an existing porch but that he would still retain a four foot side yard set back.

A neighbor of Mr. Turgeon who was in attendance stated that he had no objection to what was being planned.

20. Mr. V. W. Cross
705 Dansey Avenue
Subject: Relaxation of rear yard requirements

Mr. Cross addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to subdivide a lot that he owns which runs between Dansey Avenue and Sydney Avenue. He wishes to subdivide in such a manner as to have the rear lot line correspond to other lot lines in the area, and in order to do this the existing house will only have a fifteen foot rear yard.

Mr. Cross in answer to a question from a member of the Board stated that he would prefer not to relocate the proposed lot line in order to conform as it is his hope to eventually build on the newly created lot on Sydney Avenue at which time he wishes to put in a swimming pool and therefore requires all possible space.

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

21. Riverdale Lumber Ltd.
303 Schoolhouse Street
Subject: Relaxation of side yard requirements

Mr. E. Hedland the Vice-President and General Manager of Riverdale Lumber Ltd. addressed the Board and stated that they wished to place an addition onto an existing truss plant at 303 Schoolhouse Street and refusal of the proposed expansion will:

1. Make impossible the manufacture of trusses and prefab house components in the most economical manner in order to allow the Company to compete with other manufacturers and continue to provide employment for the 30 workers presently employed at this plant.

2. Deny employment for an additional 15 men.

3. Deny Riverdale a 10 per cent increase in overal output making it impossible to use a streamlined material flow.

4. Deny proper central storage area for raw materials needed in the manufacturing process and will deny the solution to the problem of lack of operating space presently encountered.

5. Deny the use of more advanced technical equipment (e.g. roll casing for the movement of materials) to improve safe working conditions and reduce fatigue, lost time and motion of the men employed in the manufacture of trusses and prefab house components.

6. Deny Riverdale the opportunity to improve the appearance of the north side of the yard by building a presentable truss plant addition.

In answer to a question from a member of the Board, Mr. Hedland stated that the reason they had not considered the addition on the other side of the building was they require the space for storage of trusses and movement of trusses.

Mr. Hedland stated that one of the reasons for the addition was to attempt to avoid a night shift which leads to greater costs for the company because of shift differential.

In answer to the question from a member of the Board, Mr. Hedland also stated that his company is proposing extensive landscaping and face lifting of the existing area.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Edward Blanchette

MOVED BY MR. B. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS

That the appeal of Mr. Blachette be not dealt with due to the fact that he did not appear to explain his application to the Board.

CARRIED

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

CONCLUSIONS

2. Howard Tullis

MOVED BY MR. B. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS

This application was not dealt with in view of the fact that Mr. Tullis had withdrawn his application.

CARRIED

3. Jack Cewe Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That this application be not dealt with in view of the fact that a representative of Jack Cewe Ltd. did not appear to explain the application.

CARRIED

4. James W. Petrie

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. Petrie be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

5. Mr. H. Rae

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. H. Rae be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

6. Mr. Rene Delaurier

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. Rene Delaurier be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

7. Mr. Norman Angell

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. Norman Angell be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

CONCLUSIONS

8. Mr. M. G. Jones

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. M. G. Jones be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

9. Seymour Holdings Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Seymour Holdings Ltd. be approved in accordance with their submission to the Board and they be allowed to site the dwelling maintaining the 34 foot front yard set back.

CARRIED

10. Mr. S. J. Magee

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. S. J. Magee be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

11. Mr. G. Pepke

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That appeal of Mr. G. Pepke be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board, provided, however, that the dwelling shall not be sited closer than 31 feet to Brunette Avenue.

CARRIED

12. Mr.L. Lavigne

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS

That the appeal of Mr. L. Lavigne be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

13. Mrs. S. Townsend

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mrs. S. Townsend be approved in accordance with her submission to the Board.

CARRIED

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

CONCLUSIONS

14. Mr. E. Merz

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. E. Merz not be dealt with in view of the fact that he did not appear to present his application to the Board.

CARRIED

15. Mr. I. Stopic

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. I. Stopic be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

16. Mr. A. Gauthier

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS

That the appeal of Mr. A. Gauthier be declined.

CARRIED

17. Austin Developments Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Austin Developments Ltd. be approved in accordance with their submission to the Board.

CARRIED

18. Bing G. Marr & Associates

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Bing G. Marr & Associates be approved in accordance with their submission to the Board and they be allowed to construct their commercial building to within 20 feet of Brunette Avenue.

CARRIED

BOARD OF VARIANCE
Tuesday, October 2nd, 1973
1111 Brunette Avenue
Coquitlam, B. C.

CONCLUSIONS

19. Mr. George Turgeon

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL

That the appeal of Mr. George Turgeon be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

20. Mr. V. W. Cross

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the appeal of Mr. V. W. Cross be denied.

CARRIED

21. Riverdale Lumber Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS

That the appeal of Riverdale Lumber Ltd. be denied.

CARRIED

Mr. Arrell registered his opposition to this motion.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS ON APPLICATIONS

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG

That the written comments presented by the Planning Department to the Board of Variance be read and made known and to the Applicant at the time of his appearance before the Board.

CARRIED

A copy of the Planning Department's comments dated September 27th, 1973 are attached hereto and form a part of these minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

R. Clemsons.
CHAIRMAN

September 27, 1973

BRIEF TO BOARD OF VARIANCE FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT
OCTOBER 2, 1973

Of the 21 items on the agenda for the October 2, 1973 hearing, most appear to be local issues which would involve neighbours' opinions more than questions of planning principle. This would include Items 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 19.

ITEM #2 - This is a localized issue, however, I note that the agenda should list this as a request for the relaxation of front and apparently side yard requirements.

ITEM #3 - This property was zoned CS-1 Service Commercial at one time, and a 48 foot setback was permitted. This parcel is now zoned A-1 Gravel Pit Service, which requires a 100 foot setback. The proposed addition will not increase the non-conformity and the Planning Department is not opposed to this appeal.

ITEM #4 - This appears to be a local issue, however, I note that the 13 foot side yard setback at Austin Avenue is considered an exterior side lot line, and the requirement is 12½ feet plus an additional 12 feet because Austin Avenue is a specified major arterial, for a total of 24½ feet. In addition, the south property line would be considered an interior side lot line. While a 4 foot setback is permitted from an interior side lot line for a carport, the requirement would be 6 feet if the carport were enclosed.

ITEM #9 - Lot 508, shown on the plan accompanying the agenda, is part of a subdivision plan which was given preliminary approval by the Municipal Subdivision Committee. The proposed location for this house appears to be the most desirable siting location. The problem arises because of the size of the house and the shape of the lot. The Planning Department has no objection to the granting of this appeal.

ITEM #16 - This application is to receive permission to erect a carport with no side yard setback. There may be circumstances where a no side yard setback situation is undesirable. As an example, it is conceivable that a neighbour may refuse permission for the owner of this particular lot to go on the neighbour's property to construct the carport or to paint the structure at some future time. It may be desirable to attempt to have an easement on the neighbouring property which states that the owner of this Lot 35 would be permitted on the neighbouring lot for purposes of doing maintenance work.

ITEM #17 - This parcel is part of a large subdivision application. One of the conditions of approval by the Subdivision Committee was Board of Variance approval for the 3.5 foot rear yard setback for the existing carport, noting that the B.C. Hydro right-of-way will likely remain open space and undeveloped in the foreseeable future. This right-of-way is shown as Lot D, Plan 22650 on the plan accompanying the agenda. The Planning Department has no objection to the approval of this application.

ITEM #18 - In view of the peculiarities of this site, the Planning Department believes that the applicant's request for a relaxation of the setback requirements to 20 feet is reasonable. This will permit the widening of Brunette Avenue by 12 feet when this is required by the Municipality. In addition, the applicant proposes to construct an 8 foot wide pedestrian sidewalk in front of the proposed commercial building for this site. The Planning Department has no objection to the request for a variance in this case.

ITEM #20 - This application arises as a result of a subdivision application (our file 8-1575B). The sketch upon which the conditional approval was granted indicated that there were 22 feet from the carport to the north property line. One of the conditions of approval was the submission of a surveyor's certificate showing the precise location of the existing house before the granting of

ITEM #20 cont'd

final approval. The survey plan now shows only 15 feet from the carport to the north property line instead of the required 20 feet. It appears then that final approval cannot be granted for this subdivision at the moment.

If this appeal is approved, it will be creating a non-conforming situation for this property, and any renovations of a structural nature which the owner of the property would like to carry out would require approval by the Board of Variance.

In view of the fact that this subdivision has not received final approval, it may be advisable to adjust the lot line 5 feet northward, thereby creating a subdivision which conforms with the requirements of the Zoning By-law. The Planning Department believes that this latter solution is more advisable than the granting of this appeal for a variance.

ITEM #21 - This application to relax the 25 foot exterior side lot line requirements to 7 feet is in an area in view of residential houses existing along Booth Avenue. The Planning Department would be interested in finding out if it is possible to design the addition in a manner which would retain the desirable setback in this location.

The Planning Department is opposed to the relaxation of this setback requirement unless the applicant can prove that no feasible alternative exists.

Respectfully submitted,

S. Jackson

S. Jackson
Current Planner

SJ/ci

Wednesday, October 10th, 1973,
Board of Variance -

BOARD OF VARIANCE

As a result of a special request from a Mr. D. Good of 735 Robinson Street, Coquitlam, B.C., I undertook to canvass the members of the Board of Variance to seek special permission to allow the applicant to proceed with an addition to a non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Good required quick approval for his application as his son would be coming home from hospital very shortly and would be confined to a wheel chair for several months. Additional space was required in order to allow the wheel chair to be moved from bedroom to living room as well as giving easier access to the outside.

The proposed addition is to be a sunporch, 10 feet by 28 feet built to the rear of the existing dwelling.

A petition signed by the owners of property surrounding indicating no objection to the proposed addition was filed with the Municipality.

The Members of the Board gave approval to this special application as noted below:

Mr. Parsons	October 12, 1973	4 p.m.
Mr. Arrell	October 11, 1973	2.15 p.m.
Mr. Crews	October 11, 1973	4.25 p.m.
Mr. Garrison	October 15, 1973	8.45 a.m.

The writer has instructed the Building Department to issue a permit for construction.

T. Klassen,
Deputy Municipal Clerk.

BOARD OF VARIANCE

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
1111 Brunette Avenue,
COQUITLAM, B.C.

A meeting of the Board of Variance convened in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B.C. on Tuesday, December 4th, 1973 at 7 p.m.

Members present were Mr. R. C. Parsons, Chairman; Mr. G. Crews, Mr. R. J. Arrell, Mr. B. Aabjergand Mr. L. Garrison. Also attending the meeting were Mr. T. Klassen, Deputy Municipal Clerk, who acted as Secretary to the Meeting; Mr. N. Wainman, Building Inspector; and Mr. S. Jackson, Current Planner.

Mr. Parsons explained to those present that all appeals would be heard and the Board would rule on them after and all applicants would be informed by letter from the Municipal Clerk's Office as to the outcome of the Board's deliberations.

1. Walter L. Johnson,
   236 LeBleu Street.
   Subject: Relaxation of Side Yard Requirements.

Mr. Walter Johnson addressed the Board and stated that he owns a forty foot lot on the corner of Alderson Avenue and LeBleu Street on which he proposed to erect a new dwelling. He informed the Board that Alderson Avenue is considered a major arterial street and he is, therefore, required to have a 24 1/2 foot setback from Alderson Avenue. Mr. Johnson explained that taking into consideration the required 24 1/2 foot setback and the required six foot side yard setback, he would only be allowed to construct the dwelling nine feet in width.

Mr. Johnson went on to explain that he wishes to tear down the existing house to erect the new dwelling and also informed the Hearing that the present house is only situated six feet from Alderson Avenue and 1 1/2 feet from the interior side lot line.

In answer to a question from a member of the Board, Mr. Johnson stated that while his plan shows a side yard setback of 7' 6", he would be willing to move the dwelling over to within 6' of the side yard.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

2. Claude Clarke,
   934 Harris Avenue.
   Relaxation of side yard requirements.

Mr. Clarke addressed the Board and stated that he had raised his dwelling last year to construct a basement and at the same time had started construction on a sundeck which would be situated within 5 1/2' of King Street. He stated he was, therefore, seeking permission of the Board to complete the addition, maintaining a 5' 6" setback from the property line.

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

Mr. Jackson informed the Board that there is a question as to whether the street in this area is in fact a street or a lane and if it is a lane this appeal is not required.

3. D. R. Symons,
832 Dogwood Street.
Relaxation of rear yard requirements.

Mr. Symons addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to subdivide his property and in order to be able to do this he requires the approval of the Board of Variance as the existing house, once the property is subdivided, will only have a rear yard of 17.9 feet whereas 20 feet is required.

Mr. Symons stated that he had obtained prices for moving the dwelling to meet by-law requirements and had discovered it would cost approximately $4,000.00.

A neighbour inquired of Mr. Symons whether the dwelling to be built on the newly created lot would be for himself or for sale and Mr. Symons stated that it would be for himself.

In answer to a question from the Board, the neighbour stated he would object to this application if the new dwelling were being built as a speculative venture as he had originally moved into this neighbourhood because of the large lots and does not want to see all of the lots in this area divided.

4. Michael Lafleche,
1723 Hie Avenue.
Permission to make addition to non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Lafleche addressed the Board and stated that he currently has a non-conforming dwelling and he wishes to construct an 18' carport. He stated that the addition would conform to municipal requirements.

5. Victor N. Buhler,
1032 Como Lake Avenue.
Relaxation of front and side yard requirements.

Mr. Buhler addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to subdivide his property, however, the existing dwelling and accessory building do not conform to present setback requirements in that the dwelling is only set back 29' from Como Lake Avenue instead of the required 37' and the accessory dwelling is only set back 3.9' from the side yard instead of the required six feet.

Mr. Buhler informed the Board that he does have approval of the Subdivision Committee to subdivide his property provided the Board of Variance approves the location of the existing dwelling and accessory building.

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

6. J. W. Horstman,
813 Prospect Street.
Relaxation of side yard requirements.

Mr. Horstman addressed the Board and stated that he has a 19' house trailer which he would like to protect from the elements and he therefore wishes to construct a carport maintaining a 2'6" side yard setback instead of the required 4'. Mr. Horstman went on to state that the neighbour did not object to what he proposes and he informed the Hearing that the proposed carport would have a pitched roof with a concrete pad and would match the existing structure.

7. C. Weber,
706 Wilmot Street.
Permission to make alterations to non-conforming dwelling.

Mr. Weber addressed the Board and stated that he wishes to close in his existing carport for additional living space, however, his house is non-conforming in that he does not have the required front yard setback. He stated this violation of setback requirements came about as a result of the living room being cantilevered into the front yard and the dwelling was apparently built prior to the requirements for a survey certificate.

There was no opposition expressed to this application.

8. Edward Blanchette,
995 Kelvin Street.
Relaxation of side yard requirements.

Mr. Blanchette addressed the Hearing and stated that he wishes to close in his existing sundeck to provide a dining room and this would create a non-conforming structure as the present carport is only set back 4' from the side property line.

Mr. Blanchette stated that he requires the additional space as he has a large family living at home at the present time.

9. Jack Cewe Ltd.,
Pipeline Road.
Relaxation of by-law requirements to make addition to non-conforming building.

Mr. George Fenning addressed the Hearing on behalf of Jack Cewe Ltd. and stated that at present the Company have an equipment shed on their property on Pipeline Road which is essentially a fence with a roof on it and this shed is used to protect equipment from the elements. Mr. Fenning stated that they wished to extend this shed, however, they require the approval of the Board of Variance as the existing building is non-conforming as to setback.

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

Mr. Fenning said the Company has acquired additional equipment and more place for storage is required.

Mrs. Overland addressed the Hearing and stated that she was opposed to the Company being given special permission to make an addition to this non-conforming building as the company had not, in the past, proved to be a good neighbour. She informed the Hearing that the Company has placed gravel and fill on her property as well as diverting water on to her property. Mrs. Overland stated she feels the Company should have to clean up their operation prior to being given approval to do any more work.

Mr. Fenning stated that the Company is aware of Mrs. Overland's problem and is attempting to maintain a clean operation as well as attempting to forestall water going on to her property.

10. Canaveral Investments Ltd.,
435 North Road.
Relaxation of by-law requirements with respect to parking.

Mr. Bill Street, a solicitor, addressed the Hearing on behalf of Canaveral Investments and stated that the owners of the Cariboo Shopping Centre wish to expand the centre to keep pace with the growth of the community and as well the Royal Bank wishes to extend their premises in order to expand and keep pace with community development.

Mr. Street went on to explain that it is intended to add 5,235 square feet of shopping area and 17,338 square feet of office area to bring the centre to a total area of 93,385 square feet.

A plan dated October 15th, 1973 was submitted along with the application which showed parking spaces for 382 cars, whereas under the present regulations at six spaces per 1,000 square feet, 560 spaces would have to be provided.

The developers did submit a new parking plan on December 4th, 1973 which showed that they could provide 451 sparking spaces by utilizing all space on the centre, however, these parking bays were only shown as 8'6" wide by 18' deep and as well the parking plans showed parking on a residential lot on Austin Avenue which is not allowed under the Zoning By-law so this property would have to be rezoned and consolidated with the Shopping Centre property.

Further, the plan submitted on December 4th, 1973 showed parking for 32 cars on the eastern boundary of the centre which requires a 10' landscaping strip and, therefore, this parking would not be allowed. Also, the plans submitted indicated one parking space per 400 square feet for office area but this also is in error as office area in a shopping centre would require six spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

Mr. Street informed the Hearing that the Community Builders Handbook recommends 5.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet for a community shopping centre and, further, the handbook also states that up to 20% of the total square footage of the centre can be office space without creating any noticeable effect on parking. Mr. Street further went on to state that the parking currently existing in the centre is sufficient for all but peak periods such as during the Christmas rush or on Friday evenings and it is just too expensive to design for peaks.

The developer stated that a landscape architect had been commissioned to do a study on proposed landscaping for the centre and Mr. H. L. Haggart then addressed the Board and showed to them plans prepared for the landscaping of the centre. These plans were dated December 3rd, 1973 under Job No. 7331.

Mr. Jackson explained to the Board that the Planning Department had indicated to the developers of the Cariboo Shopping Centre that it was prepared to recommend to Council a reduction in the required parking spaces from 6 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet to 5.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. However, upon referring the matter to Council and receiving the advice of the Advisory Planning Commission and the Advisory Industrial Development Commission, both of these commissions had recommended against such a reduction and Council had indicated that until there is evidence to show that parking spaces are being under-used at the present time no consideration should be given to lowering the parking space requirements.

Mr. Crews inquired of the developers whether the centre controls the parking of employees of tenants of the centre and was informed that High Low has obtained 36 spaces off-site for staff parking and that every effort is made to control the parking of other employees working at the centre.

Mr. Street informed the Hearing that Canaveral Investments are prepared to employ a person to control parking on the lot at peak periods as apparently a great deal of parking takes place at Cariboo Shopping Centre for persons shopping at the Lougheed Mall.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Walter L. Johnson.

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS:

That the appeal of Mr. Walter L. Johnson be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

2. Claude Clarke.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL:

That the District of Coquitlam determine whether King Street between Harris Avenue and Roderick Avenue is in fact a street or lane.

CARRIED

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG:

That if the Municipality determines King Street to be in fact a street, then Mr. Clarke's appeal be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

3. D. R. Symons.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG:

That the appeal of Mr. D. R. Symons be approved in accordance with his submission to the Board and he be allowed to subdivide his property leaving the dwelling in its existing location.

CARRIED

4. Michael Lafleche.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL:

That the appeal of Michael Lafleche be approved and he be allowed to construct an addition of a carport to his non-conforming dwelling in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

5. Victor N. Buhler.

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG:

That the appeal of Mr. Buhler be approved and he be allowed to subdivide his property leaving the existing dwelling in its current location in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

6. J. W. Horstman.

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL:

That the appeal of Mr. J. W. Horstman be declined.

CARRIED

7. C. Weber.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG:

That the appeal of Mr. C. Weber be approved and he be allowed to close in his existing carport in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

8. Edward Blanchette.

MOVED BY MR. ARRELL
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS:

That the appeal of Mr. Blanchette be approved and he be allowed to close in his sundeck to create a dining room in accordance with his submission to the Board.

CARRIED

9. Jack Cewe Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. ARRELL:

That the appeal of Jack Cewe Ltd. be approved and they be allowed to make an addition to their non-conforming building in accordance with their submission to the Board and, further, that a letter be written to Mr. J. Cewe expressing the concerns of the Board that apparently employees of his Company are allowing construction to commence on buildings without first obtaining a permit or checking on the zoning regulations.

Mr. Aabjerg registered his opposition to this motion. CARRIED

10. Canaveral Investments Ltd.

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS:

That the appeal of Canaveral Investments Ltd. be declined.

CARRIED

Canaveral Investments Ltd. - Board of Variance Meeting - February 25, 1971

Mr. Crews read the following excerpt of the Board of Variance Minutes of February 25th, 1971:

"Mr. Crews inquired of Mr. McLaughlin what assurance the Board had that the landscaping would be done and Mr. McLaughlin stated that it was to their benefit to do it and it would add visually to the appearance of the shopping centre and also the Company had requests from the pensioners in the L. J. Christmas Centre for benches to be placed in this area so that they would have some place to rest on their visit to the shopping centre."

Mr. Crews explained to the Board that this promise was made at the time that Mr. McLaughlin was appealing to be allowed to erect a 50' sign on Austin Avenue because of the competition from the Lougheed Mall.

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG:

That a letter be written to Canaveral Investments Ltd. requesting that they carry out the commitment that they made to the Board on February 25th, 1971.

CARRIED

Tuesday, December 4th, 1973,
Board of Variance, cont'd.

Appeal of Mr. D. Good - 735 Robinson Street -
Subject: Relaxation of By-law Requirements to
Allow an Addition to a Non-Conforming Dwelling.

A special request had been received from Mr. D. Good of 735 Robinson Street to make an addition to a non-conforming dwelling in order to accommodate his son who was coming home from hospital and would be confined to a wheelchair.

The Secretary of the Board, Mr. T. Klassen, undertook to contact the Members of the Board by telephone to receive their approval and the Board did approve an addition of a sunporch 10' by 28' to be built to the rear of the existing dwelling on October 15th, 1973.

MOVED BY MR. AABJERG
SECONDED BY MR. CREWS:

That the verbal approval given by the Board as a result of a telephone poll to allow Mr. Good to make an addition to his non-conforming dwelling be ratified.

CARRIED

RESIGNATION OF MR. L. GARRISON

MOVED BY MR. CREWS
SECONDED BY MR. AABJERG:

That the Board express to Mr. Garrison their appreciation for his services rendered during his tenure on the Board of Variance.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 10 p.m.

CHAIRMAN