

To: Board of Variance

File number: BV 2025-004622

BV 2025-004622, 12955 261A Street Board of Variance Application

BACKGROUND:

Applicant:	Claus Laundrup
Property Owner:	Jewel Fabrication, Welding and Coatings Ltd.
Legal Description:	Lot 1 Section 25 Township 12 New Westminster District Plan BCP44861
OCP Designation:	<u>Industrial</u>
Zoning:	<u>M-2 (General Industrial)</u>

ANALYSIS:

Site Characteristics:

The subject property is located on 261A Street and has a total site area of 1.46 ha (3.6 acres) (Attachments B, C, and D). The site, which slopes down from the northeastern corner to the southwestern corner by approximately 10 metres, includes steep slopes in the northeastern portion. There is an existing retaining wall in the northeastern portion of the lot, to the south of an existing statutory right-of-way for a storm sewer line. The lot is bounded by conservation area to the west and north, and by lots zoned M-2 (General Industrial) to the east and the south. 261A Street is to the south.

Project Description:

The proposed development involves replacing the existing retaining wall (maximum height of 2.7 m) with a proposed retaining wall (maximum height of 4.4 m). The existing statutory right-of-way for a storm sewer line to the north of the existing retaining wall would be replaced by a new statutory right-of-way for a storm sewer line relocated to the north of the proposed retaining wall.

The proposed retaining wall would help create a safe, level surface in the northeastern portion of the lot for essential site operations. Information regarding the proposed retaining wall can be found on the BOV Application Form (Attachment A), the Proposed Site Plan (Attachment G), and the Proposed Lot Grading Plan (Attachment H).

While there is some discrepancy between the BOV Application Form (Attachment A) and the Proposed Lot Grading Plan (Attachment H), staff have clarified with the applicant that the proposed building height would have a maximum height of approximately 4.4 m. Proposed top-of-wall and bottom-of-wall elevations are indicated on the Proposed Lot Grading Plan. Although the Proposed Lot Grading Plan indicates a maximum retaining wall height of 4.15 m, the applicant is requesting a maximum retaining wall height of 4.4 m to ensure that they will be able to match the height of a retaining wall under construction along the western lot line of the property to the east.

Proposed Variance:

The Board of Variance application requests the variance summarized in the table below. Information regarding the applicant’s claimed undue hardship in terms of complying with the relevant Zoning Bylaw requirement can be found on the BOV Application Form (Attachment A).

Maximum Retaining Wall Height Variance	
<p>Variance</p> <p>Zoning Bylaw No. 7600-2019, Part 4, Section 403.89 (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To increase the maximum retaining wall height from 1.2 m to 4.4 m. 	<p>Staff Comment</p> <p>The following rationale for the variance is relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Challenging Topography and Operational Potential</u> There is challenging topography, namely steep slopes, in the northeastern portion of the lot, which requires a retaining wall. If the applicant were to construct a series of terraced retaining walls with a maximum height of 1.2 m to comply with the relevant Zoning Bylaw requirement, this would reduce the useable portion of the lot and its operational potential. ▪ <u>Economic Hardship</u> The property owner has secured a \$2 million provincial grant through the Manufacturing Jobs Fund to support a planned expansion. The investment reflects the Province’s recognition of the property owner’s potential to drive economic growth and create skilled jobs in the City of Maple Ridge. As a grant condition, the property owner needs to have a Building Permit issued by April 30. Approval of the maximum retaining wall height variance is necessary before a Building Permit can be issued. Approval of the maximum retaining wall height variance is time-sensitive and failure to obtain the variance would increase costs and jeopardize a government-backed economic development project.

CONCLUSION:

It is recommended that the Board of Variance application be considered in relation to the requirements of Section 542 of the *Local Government Act*.

“Daniel Rajasooriar”

Prepared by: Daniel Rajasooriar, Planner 2

Attachments:

- (A) BOV Application Form
- (B) Location Map
- (C) Aerial Photo Map
- (D) OCP and Zoning Map
- (E) Title Search
- (F) BC Company Search
- (G) Proposed Site Plan
- (H) Proposed Lot Grading Plan
- (I) Existing Topographic Site Plan