

**DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
BOARD OF VARIANCE**

Minutes of the Board of Variance of the District of North Vancouver held at 5:03 p.m. on Thursday, June 19, 2025, 2025 in the Committee Room of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

Present: James Paul, Chair
Laura Lee Richard
Neville York

Absent: Guy Akester, Vice-Chair
Robert Griesdale

Staff: Rhonda Schell, Deputy Corporate Officer
Lisa Koncsik, Acting Supervisor – Residential Plans Review
Veronica Milburn-Brown, Acting Supervisor – Residential Plans Review
Cheryl Archer, Confidential Council Clerk
Allison James, Administration Clerk

Also in

Attendance: Joseph Aydon, Owner/Applicant
George Chen, Owner
Curtis Krahn, Applicant
Pedro Serrano, Applicant
David Chen, Resident
Jean Wu, Notified Person
Lina, Notified Person

1. Adoption of Minutes

1.1 April 17, 2025, Board of Variance Meeting

**MOVED by James Paul
SECONDED by Neville York**

THAT the minutes of the April 17, 2025 Board of Variance meeting are adopted.

CARRIED

2. Hearing of Applications

James Paul, Chair, welcomed members of the public to the meeting and provided an overview of the procedures for the meeting.

2.1 1059 Frederick Road

Staff Presentation

Staff reported that the property is located in the RS3 Zone and is located in a Development Permit Area for Wildfire Hazard, noting that the applicant is working with the Environment Department. The lot size is 8,748 square feet and the house is on a corner lot, was built in 1955, and is not on the Heritage Registry. The proposal is for new construction of a single-family dwelling and attached garage structure.

The variance requested on the property is as follows:

1. Maximum Building Depth variance of 13.05 ft (3.98 m)

In response to a question from the Board, staff advised that the variance is different on the two sides of the property as the front is not straight across.

Applicant Presentation of Hardship

The applicant drew attention to the following points and hardships:

- He has lived at the site for 25 years and purchased the home from his parents;
- They have four children;
- They are not increasing the density of the original home;
- The variance is requested to accommodate all bedrooms on the same upper floor;
- The layout is very important for safety and practicality;
- The building depth limit restricts their ability to build what they need;
- It is difficult to find houses designed for large families; and,
- They have worked with their architect and changed designs in an attempt to comply with the Zoning Bylaw but were not able to find a solution that fits their needs.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the proposal is for a house on slab foundation.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that they had spoken with some neighbours, not including the adjacent property. The applicant opined that he could ask for support and the neighbours would be in favour of the proposal.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that they considered 10 to 15 other designs, including building below grade and changing the upper floor to fit within the maximum 65 feet allowed for building depth. The other options had inefficient bedroom designs, split components they wanted to keep together, or had less than optimum floor sizes.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the outdoor seating area could have reduced the length of the house but the primary concern is the upper floor.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised their hardship is not being able to use the outdoor space and the functionality of the upper floor. The applicant noted that they could have made the design work without the patio but were not able to find a design that made the upper floor work with all the bedrooms.

In response to a question from the Board, staff advised that the corner lot does not impact the requested variance.

Representations from Notified Persons

Nil

Representations from the Public

Nil

Discussion

Laura Lee Richard spoke in opposition to the application, noting that the design choice to have all the bedrooms on the same floor does not constitute a hardship and there is nothing about the site that prevents building a home in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. Richard stated that the application is therefore not within the mandate of the Board of Variance.

Neville York spoke in support of the application, noting that while there is not a strong case that there is a hardship, the applicant has tried to find a design that works, the requested variance is relatively minor, and the proposed residence does not impede any neighbouring properties' views.

The Chair spoke in opposition to the application, noting that the requested variance is not minor, the applicant has not demonstrated hardship, and there are ways to design a home in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw.

MOVED by Laura Lee Richard

SECONDED by James Paul

THAT Board of Variance Application BOV2025-00009 1059 Frederick Road presented at the June 19, 2025 Board of Variance meeting is DENIED as follows:

Zone	Regulation	Required/ Allowed	Existing	Proposed	Variance
RS3	Maximum Building Depth	65 ft (19.81 m)	n/a	78.05 ft (23.79 m)	13.05 ft (3.98 m)

CARRIED

Opposed: Neville York

2.2 4688 Eastridge Road

Staff Presentation

Staff reported that the property is located in the RS4 Zone 18475 ft with a steep slope from the road at the top of the property to the water at the bottom. The main dwelling was built in 2009, is not on the Heritage Registry, and is located in Development Permit Areas for Slope Hazard and Wildfire Hazard. The applicant is working with the Environment Department. The proposal is alterations to an existing accessory building with a higher roof height than the existing structure.

The subject accessory building was the original dwelling unit constructed in 1936 near the bottom of the property. A Development Variance Permit (DVP) was issued by Council in 2006 to allow the retention of the original dwelling unit as an accessory building and the construction of a new single-family dwelling and detached double garage at the top of the property. The DVP varied the maximum countable floor area, maximum permitted size for a parking structure and accessory building in combination, total floor space, maximum dwelling size, building heights, eave height,

building coverage, and building depth for the new construction and renovation. The conditions of issuance included the removal of the northeast wing of the building as well as kitchen facilities.

Renovation of the accessory building was started in 2024 without permits and a Stop Work Order was issued following an inspection in June 2024.

The variances requested on the property are as follows:

1. Accessory Building Height 3 in 12 or greater variance of 15.4 ft (4.69 m); and,
2. Roof Overhang variance of 2 ft (0.61 m).

Applicant Presentation of Hardship

The applicant drew attention to the following points and hardships:

- The property is located at the end of Eastridge Road;
- Many neighbouring properties have buildings at the south end of the property;
- The structure was built prior to the current Zoning Bylaw;
- The building is in disrepair and is salvageable;
- The proposal is to remove a portion of the upper floor and renovate within the existing building envelope to bring it up to code as well as simplifying the roof;
- The new roof is in compliance with the B.C. Building Code;
- The new upper floor ceiling height is nine feet, one inch;
- The lot is irregularly shaped;
- The structure is at an angle to the property line;
- The property is steeply sloped;
- The topography of the site is consistent with the neighbouring properties;
- Opined that the majority of the surrounding homes likely have non-conformities;
- The height of the accessory building is measured from the lowest floor;
- The building would be 14.2 feet overheight with the requested variance;
- The requested variance is a small increase to the original building height;
- The structure would be more durable with the building as proposed;
- The proposal removes an existing roof projection encroachment; and,
- Neighbours have provided letters of support.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised existing upper floor ceiling height is 6 feet, one inch and the proposed height is nine feet, one inch. The applicant acknowledged that a ceiling height of eight feet was possible, but they decided that they should make it more comfortable if they were already renovating the structure.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the roof overhang is currently encroaching by two feet and they want to eliminate the encroachment. They still need weather protection with an overhang around the building and, because the structure is existing, they do not have any other option but to build the overhang to the property line.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the footprint of the building is unchanged.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the building height variance requested is 15.4 feet and that the steepness of the property requires the upper levels of the structure to be staggered.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the posts are not part of the height calculation and that the height of the existing structure is approximately 29 feet.

In response to a question from the Board, the applicant advised that the neighbour to the west could not be reached.

Representations from Notified Persons

Nil

Representations from the Public

Nil

Discussion

Laura Lee Richard spoke in support of the application, noting there are challenges with waterfront properties in Deep Cove, the roof overhang is needed, and the requested height variance is a minor increase over the existing height.

Neville York spoke in support of the application, noting that the original structure was built without permits and was regularized when the main dwelling was built. The steep slope of the property creates a hardship, the proposal includes the removal of an existing encroachment, and the neighbours have expressed support.

The Chair spoke in support of the application, noting the structure is existing, the requested variances are minor, the encroachment is removed, and the steep slope and position of the building are hardships.

MOVED by Laura Lee Richard

SECONDED by Neville York

THAT Board of Variance Application BOV2025-00010 4688 Eastridge Road presented at the June 19, 2025 Board of Variance meeting is APPROVED as follows:

Zone	Regulation	Required/ Allowed	Existing	Proposed	Variance
RS4	Accessory Building Height 3 in 12 or greater	15 ft (4.57 m)	29.15 ft (8.88 m)	30.4 ft (9.27 m)	15.4 ft (4.69 m)
	Roof Overhang	2 ft (0.61 m)	0.58 ft (0.18 m)	0 ft (0 m)	2 ft (0.61 m)

CARRIED

3. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil

4. NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the Board of Variance is scheduled for Thursday, July 17, 2025.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Nil

6. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by James Paul

SECONDED by Laura Lee Richard

THAT the June 19, 2025 Board of Variance Meeting is adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

CARRIED

Chair



Committee Clerk


