


Mayor & Council

From: B YAWORSKI s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: April 2, 2026 9:12 PM
To: Mayor George Harvie; Alicia Guichon; Dylan Kruger; Jessie Dosanjh; Jennifer Johal; Daniel Boisvert; Rod Binder; Mayor & Council; Doreann Mayhew
Cc: Emma Adams
Subject: LU009863 - 4984 45 Avenue, Ladner

7 APR 26 9:11 AM

TYPE: REFERS TO # 8.1
DEPT: DEV
A.T.#: 150496
Comments:

 agenda
FILE # 6700-01

Warning: This email came from outside the City of Delta. If the sender is not known, please do not open links or attachments. Contact the Service Desk (3215) if unsure of this email.

Hello Mayor & Council: As residents of Ladner living about 3 blocks from this property where we regularly walk & drive by this address, we are expressing our dissatisfaction with various aspects of this proposal.

1. 9 units is too large for this site. A better compromise would be closer to 6.
 2. 9 parking spots are not sufficient for 9 units and 1 visitor parking spot is inadequate. This would only lead to spillover parking onto 45 Avenue.
 3. **LOCATION** is key for this project and any plan at this location must seriously & fully take into account that this project would be right across the street from the high school EQUINOX THEATRE - Ladner's main event centre for concerts, plays, musicals, and many other activities drawing large crowds that often must park on 45 Avenue - due to limited parking at the school.
- Also, this address is right across the street from the running track & soccer field - which also draws crowds needing parking.

The applicant needs to come up with a downsized "neighbourly-sensitive" version that adequately takes into consideration its nearby location to already established indoor and outdoor activities - all requiring safe, adequate parking to accommodate adult and even teen high school drivers, athletes and arts participants.

What is the applicant willing to revise and contribute to make this key location a non-congested, friendly, safe spot for the larger community to enjoy?

Best,
Bev Yaworski & Doug Reynolds
4687 Morgan Place,
Delta (Ladner) BC V4K 3R6

Date: 5th of April, 2026

From: Vilem Foit - 4937-44B Avenue Delta B.C. V4K 1H1G

To: Delta City Council

Re: File No LU009863

A genda
FILE # 16700-01

TYPE: REFERS TO #8.1
DEPT: DEV
A.T.#: 150506
Comments:

Ladies and Gentlemen!

This letter is sent to you for consideration in regards to the Application for rezoning and Development Variance permit submitted by Hardeep Bassi, Bassi Properties.

My objections against the approval of this application is as follows:

- 1) Number of Amendments requested in this application is beyond reasonable measure.
- 2) The Variances are against the interest of Ladner community. Out of many the occupancy density of proposed project is breaking all records, especially by reducing the minimum distance between buildings.
The number of parking spaces available to the future owners is marginal and number of visitor parking missing altogether is putting excessive stress on the street. We can hardly assume the number of vehicles per household is only one. Taking in account that the building lot width is only double/single lot, the parked vehicles will be parked in front of neighbors on both sides.
- 3) I believe that the city bylaws were made to protect and serve the up-keeping standards which were approved in order to make our city livable and not to be bent to suit individual interests.
- 4) I believe City Council are supposed to work for the interest of the population and will resist the pressure of wild development breaking existing orders.
- 5) I see a number of high density projects in the making in Ladner and in my opinion they are not the right size and aesthetic contribution to the proximity to the city historic center is at least problematic. Let's do not allow the situation to worsen!

I understand development is reality but keeping it in check is necessary. I ask you to consider my concerns. I am convinced that my opinion in this matter is shared by many of my fellow residents.

Respectfully
Vilem Foit
Ladner resident

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

ACKNOWLEDGED

DATE: 2026 APR 26 1:11 PM

Mayor & Council

From: Nicolas Pimentel **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**
Sent: April 8, 2026 9:12 PM
To: Mayor & Council
Cc: **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**
Subject: Re: Comments on File No. LUU009863
Attachments: Comments on File No. LU009863 (Bylaw No. 8561).pdf

9 APR 26 01:46 AM

Warning: This email came from outside the City of Delta links or attachments. Contact the Service Desk (3215)

TYPE: REFERS TO #8.1
DEPT: DEV
A.T.#: 150 514
Comments: Regular Agenda
Apr. 13/26

Good evening,

Please find attached comments on the above noted proposed development from the following owners and residents:

1. Nicolas Pimentel and Samantha Ahuja (4966 45 Avenue);
2. Bob Aulik (4960 45 Avenue);
3. Sandra Swanigan (4956 45 Avenue);
4. Ken and Denise Buckoll (4968 45 Avenue);
5. Daniel Baxter (4977 44B Avenue);
6. Kelli Wils (5030 45 Avenue)
7. Peter and Helen Luong (5006 45 Avenue);
8. Sheila Aviles (5042 45 Avenue);
9. David Xie (5072 45 Avenue);
10. Avtar Atwal (5016 45 Avenue); and
11. Rhonda Duke (5018 45 Avenue).

A genda
FILE # 6700-01

Please ensure that the attached correspondence forms part of the Agenda package for the hearing on April 13, 2026.

As the attached comments are coming from 11 separate property owners, please ensure that the City Clerk counts this letter as 11 separate letters in City Council's Agenda package.

Please confirm receipt of this email and the attached comments by written reply before noon, April 9, 2026.

Nicolas.

April 8, 2026

Mayor and Council
City of Delta
4500 Clarence Taylor Crescent
Delta, BC V4K 3E2

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

**Re: File No. LU009863 (Bylaw No. 8561)
Proposed Development of 4984 45 Avenue**

We are the owners and residents of 4966, 4960, 4956, 4948, 5006, 5018, 5030, 5042, 5072, 5160 45 Avenue, and 4977 44B Avenue), which are many of the properties adjoining or surrounding the proposed development of 4984 45 Avenue. We are writing to provide our comments on the above noted proposed development application.

We understand that in October 2024, Delta updated its Official Community Plan ("OCP") in order to meet provincially mandated housing targets and to provide more housing opportunities in Delta. We are not opposed to densification where reasonable and appropriate, but we believe that the proposed development will have a significant impact on surrounding property owners and on the already congested traffic, walkability, safety, and parking situation on 45 Avenue.

We hope that City Council will carefully consider the below comments and either reject the development application or require significant revision before proceeding further. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss the below with City Council following its initial review, or to present our comments and submissions at a public hearing.

- The proposed development is inconsistent with OCP Policy 2.1.16, the requested parking variances defeat the purpose of Zoning Bylaw 7600, 2027 and would create traffic and pedestrian safety issues, and insufficient notice for review was provided to neighbourhood property owners.**

According to the OCP, the land use designation of "mixed residential" allows for multiple, less intrusive development opportunities, such as houseplexes or accessory dwelling units. OCP Policy 2.1.16 provides guidelines and provides:

"Support a range of sensitive residential infill in low density neighborhoods by protecting or enhancing existing vegetation wherever possible, promoting safety through Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, using human-scaled architectural features, and orienting windows, decks and balconies to maximize privacy.

(emphasis ours)

It is the undersigned's strong opinion that the development at 4984 45 Avenue, as currently proposed, is insensitive, intrusive, and in the variances sought, disrespects neighbouring properties' privacy, endangers pedestrian and driver safety and is, as a whole, not in the spirit of section 2.1.16 of the OCP. We ask that City Council very closely review of the application for this highly-densified development, on a street with no other townhouses and directly across from a school, theatre, sports fields and a community park, to ensure that the privacy and enjoyment rights of surrounding property owners are not ignored, that safety is considered, and that the negative impacts on the neighborhood do not outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

The OCP designates the south side of 45 Avenue as "mixed residential". We note that while there are townhouse complexes on the north-east side of 45 Avenue, these townhouse complexes have common features, including placement on cross-streets and proximity to other existing townhouse complexes. There are no current townhouse complexes on the south-side of 45 Avenue, and there will be no further townhouse complexes surrounding the proposed development for the foreseeable future.

The density and three-story height of the nine townhouse units proposed for 4984 45 Avenue is entirely inconsistent with the existing single-family character of the neighborhood. All of the surrounding properties are detached homes, many on already sub-divided lots. The proposed development represents a significant change in scale.

We have been informed that 4994 45 Avenue (on the east side of the proposed development) is a designated heritage property, and as such that there will be no heavily densified development of that property. It is our understanding that the owner of the property will also be submitting comments opposing the proposed development. 5006 45 Avenue has also been recently subdivided, with two new single-family homes being constructed.

On the west side of 4984 45 Avenue are two properties that were subdivided from one original property. The closest adjoining property (4966 45 Avenue) is a 4-year-old house and one of the residents is a 10-month-old child. The owner of 4960 45 Avenue built a brand-new house in 2025. To the west of the 2025 new build are two homes on a subdivided lot (4956 and 4648 45 Avenue) built in 2009.

The above is provided to demonstrate that both near-recent and recent permitting appears to reflect a plan that is consistent with and sensitive to the neighbourhood's character by creating density via the sub-division of lots rebuilt with single-family housing, with or without carriage houses. This townhouse development will quite literally be "on an island", which is not the norm for townhouse developments in neighborhoods of this character.

We would encourage City Council to reject the proposed development completely, and require a re-design that provides for a fourplex, duplexes, carriage houses, or units with garden suites, with sufficient on-lot parking and access for vehicles. This will be consistent with the character of surrounding properties while still achieving significant densification and additional housing units in Delta.

2. Sufficient notice for review and access to information was not provided to adjacent property owners; the hearing should be postponed.

The City plans to have the “First, Second and Third Hearings” on April 13, 2026. The residents of 45 Avenue only received notice, via mail, on April 2, 2026. Beyond the inclusion of the phrase “Permit to construct 9 three-storey townhouse units” and references to the Zoning Bylaws and the variances sought, there were no architectural plans or other details provided. The letter instructs that the only time and way to review development-related materials “such as the proposed bylaw, detailed maps and other information” is in person at City Hall from Thursday April 2 to April 13, 2026. There was no information online available regarding the layout and design of the proposed development.

City Hall was closed for the observation of Easter on Friday, April 3 and Monday, April 6, 2026, leaving only 2 business days for residents who received notice letters to gain access to the materials and get questions answered prior to the deadline to submit comments by noon on Thursday, April 9, 2026. (The development architectural plans are not available online.) While our City Hall was closed for 4 days so staff and Council could enjoy their Easter weekend, the undersigned and others spent their meeting, reviewing bylaws and the OCP, speaking to neighbours, taking photos, drafting this letter and rearranging work schedules so that we can get to City Hall on the 2 business days provided.

To date, of the 11 property owners and residents who are submitting the within comments on the proposal, only the owners of 4966 45 Avenue (Nicolas Pimentel) and 4956 45 Avenue (Sandra Swanigan) have had the opportunity to review the plans.

The short notice time meant that to get this correspondence to City Council on time, we had to divide outreach and research and work on one common letter. Many of the undersigned are still relying on the information, drawings and descriptions from the memory of those who have seen the plans. We request that the City Clerk to count this letter as eleven letters in City Council's Agenda package.

We further request, that this hearing be postponed and that a reasonable period of no less than 10 business days as of April 7 be provided for resident review.

3. To comply with the spirit of the OCP, the proposed townhouse development requires significant redesign and/or reduction of number of proposed units

The proposed development attempts to place too much density on a parcel that cannot accommodate it without significant negative effects on adjacent homes and the neighborhood in general. In its current form, the development application fails to take into consideration the privacy concerns of adjoining properties whatsoever. The requested Zoning Bylaw variances, discussed further below, will have further negative impacts, including a strain on traffic and road infrastructure, pedestrian and traffic safety, and neighbours' ingress and egress to their own homes.

The development application proposes nine, three-story townhouse units in three separate buildings. If City Council does not reject the development proposal outright and/or require gentler densification options (fourplex, duplexes, carriage houses etc.), then we feel a more appropriate development would be six townhouse units placed as discussed below.

There are currently two proposed buildings (with three and two units respectively) on the east side of the property, with a laneway providing access to these buildings and a proposed third building (with four units) on the west side of the property alongside the property line with 4966 45 Avenue. The third building is entirely problematic and should be removed. As referenced above, six townhomes, running parallel and in the same position as the currently proposed three-unit and two-unit buildings would allow for sufficient parking on the lot and easier access and egress for the development's residents and neighbours. It would also be a positive step towards ensuring that neighbour's privacy and enjoyment rights are sufficient protected.

The third proposed building contains four units and runs along the entire backside of 4984 45 Avenue and is extremely close to southeast corner of the backyard 4966 45 Avenue. Should this building be retained in its current design, the two units on the west side of the building will have clear and unobstructed views from both the second and third stories directly into the backyards. We enclose a photograph taken from the southeast corner of 4966 45 Avenue showing the impact on privacy. The three-story height of the proposed building (placed directly on the corner of the adjoining property) will also obstruct views and block sunshine and light, causing significant shadowing impacts.



With respect to the two proposed buildings on the east side of the property, we would encourage the City to closely consider the differences between this proposed development and a recent rezoning application approved on the north-east side of 45 Avenue (<https://www.delta-optimist.com/local-news/the-latest-on-deltas-new-housing-development-scene-9817533>) That approved development was already surrounded by both low-rise apartments, townhouses, single-detached residential lots and infill single-detached residential lots. (This is a crucial distinction between the approved development and the one proposed for 4984 45 Avenue, which is a lot surrounded entirely by infill single-detached residential lots and a heritage house.) In specific recognition of privacy concerns from neighbours, City Council mandated landscaping within the side yard setback areas and a

fence to protect the privacy of properties to the east. Most significantly, City Council required the removal any third-floor windows on either the east or west elevations to minimize overlook onto adjacent properties.

Additionally, as concerning as the height and placement is the architectural design of the proposed buildings. The design depicts large second and third story windows on these buildings; in particular the second story windows appear to be almost “floor-to-ceiling”. While this would not necessarily be a concern if the development was more consistent with the character of the neighborhood and adjoining properties, the height and orientation of the proposed townhouses would provide direct, unlimited views into adjacent backyards.

The planned large, second and third-floor windows directly face the backyards of adjoining property owners. This will have a significant impact on the privacy of adjoining property owners, compounded by the fact that there will likely be at least 30 to 40 individuals living in these units. We attach a photograph demonstrating the sight lines that will be available from the property into 4966 45 Avenue.



The window design and placement for all the proposed townhouse buildings need to be reconsidered. In our opinion, all and any second and third-floor windows that provide direct views into adjoining properties should be removed or must be significantly smaller, placed above eye-view lines and be non-transparent. This would address the privacy concerns outlined above.

The proposed landscaping and fencing in the development application for 4984 45 Avenue do not afford appropriate privacy protections for surrounding properties. It appears that all current trees and vegetation (which currently provide some measure of privacy) will be cut down, and we do not have any clarity on how much privacy protection the new proposed

vegetation will afford in relation to the current vegetation. Furthermore, a 6-foot fence alongside the property line with 4966 45 Avenue is clearly insufficient to provide privacy protection where a three-story townhouse complex with large windows is being developed directly next door.

We would ask that City Council consider requiring landscape buffers or hedging along the entirety of the property line with 4966 45 Avenue of sufficient height, such that views from the buildings into backyards will be at least partially obscured. Alternatively, City Council could require that mature trees or landscaping be left in place, or that combinations of mature trees be planted to minimize sightlines directly into backyards. The landscaping should be sensitive, however, to shading out sun in neighbouring yards.

We note that our proposals above are entirely consistent with and respect the spirit of section 2.1.16 of the OCP, re-stated here:

Support a range of sensitive residential infill in low density neighborhoods by protecting or enhancing existing vegetation wherever possible, promoting safety through Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, using human-scaled architectural features, and orienting windows, decks and balconies to maximize privacy.

4. The Proposed Zoning Bylaw parking variances defeat the purpose of the bylaw, are unreasonable and unsafe, and should be rejected

The proposed units are all three or four-bedroom units, easily bringing, as mentioned, 30 to 40 new residents on that lot alone. The townhomes are to be served by a single laneway running along the west landline; this laneway provides road access to all nine townhomes. There is no driveway parking. We note that the Applicant seeks a variance of sections 8.4.2 of the Zoning Bylaw to reduce minimum parking spaces from 14 to 9, and minimum required visitor parking spaces from 1 to 0. The purpose of this section of the Zoning Bylaw is to ensure sufficient parking spaces on a specific lot. *Note: We are unclear what math underpins the "minimum 14 spaces"; based on section 8.4.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, there should be at least two parking spaces per dwelling unit for a total of 18 parking spaces.*

We further note that, with respect to the recent townhouse proposal at 4501 Arthur Drive (LU009952), the proposed vehicle parking requirements are for two parking spots per townhouse unit, and two visitor spots for every six units. This reflects a realistic parking space proposal, unlike this application for 4984 45 Avenue.

The parking variances sought are highly problematic. It is reasonable to expect that the residents of these units will own multiple vehicles and entertain visitors and, therefore, the south side of 45 Avenue will be utilized for daily residential and visitor parking.

Parking on this part of 45 Avenue is already regularly congested and oversubscribed due to Delta Secondary School, Genesis Theatre, special events at Memorial Park, and regular weekday and weekend activity at the sports fields and park facilities. These facilities are all located directly across the street from the proposed development. The south side of 45 Avenue is regularly interrupted by single home driveways and currently provides very limited

parking opportunities; parents picking up children and special event goers consistently use private driveways as “turn-arounds” and park in ways encroach on those driveways.

When the south side of 45 Avenue is heavily parked, it greatly impacts the visibility of oncoming traffic, making the already difficult task of backing out from the existing homes onto a busy, 50km per hour street even more so. Often family members or hosts have to stand in the street and wave the departing party out of the driveway while “stopping” traffic, should it approach. Not a safe practice but is often the only way to depart the driveways. Should such heavy and opportunistic parking be a daily event, an accident is all but assured to occur.

In regard to overall pedestrian safety, it should be noted the south side of 45 Avenue has no sidewalk that connects to a marked pedestrian crossing. We understand there is an expectation that the developer put a sidewalk in front of the property but because the lot is deep, not wide, this will leave that sidewalk disconnected from any cross street with a marked pedestrian crossing.

Currently, with the majority of south side residents parking in garages and driveways, pedestrians safely walk the south side of 45 Avenue on the marked shoulder/undeveloped City-owned setback. When the south side is regularly fully parked, pedestrians exiting the development and neighbouring properties to the east will be forced to “jaywalk” to the sidewalk on the north side. We regularly witness this illegal, but convenient and understandable, crossing habit every time there is event parking congestion, and it is highly concerning.

The only other option for pedestrians, once the development is established and all parking on the shoulder is occupied, is to walk approximately 100 metres to the east on actual sidewalk to where that sidewalk ends at the t-intersection with Garry Street. Again, there is no marked pedestrian aid to cross 45 Avenue, and this crossing lies within, what is anecdotally observed, a largely ignored school speed zone and where there is regular exceedance of the 50km non-school hours speed limit.

The combination of parking on both sides of the street, the lack of pedestrian options to cross the street, and the 50km speed limit outside of school hours is dangerous. While on paper the City has designated the south side of 45 Avenue for high density, the street itself is nowhere near ready for such impacts.

This plan does not provide for realistic or adequate parking, and the proposed variance defeats the intent of the Zoning Bylaw. The requested variance should not be granted.

5. Proposed Zoning Bylaw setback and building spacing variances requested are negatively impactful on neighbours and should be rejected

The Applicant seeks to vary section 7.3.3(b) of the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the minimum required width of the landscaped strip to 0 meters along the west lot line (adjoining 4966 45 Avenue) to facilitate garbage staging. As the photo below shows, this would place garbage and recyclables for 9 townhomes directly against the east property line of 4966 45 Avenue, and directly across from the main entrance to the home. Occupants and visitors would need to walk directly past this garbage area to enter the home. This is completely inappropriate and unacceptable.

The installment of this garbage staging area directly against the property line also effectively removes any additional protections for 4966 45 Avenue along the first 13 metres of the property, as would be provided for by the mandated landscaping requirements. This defeats the entire purpose of section 7.3.3(b), which is to provide screening through landscaping. This variance should not be permitted, and the garbage staging area must be relocated.

Likewise, the reduction of landscaped strips on all landlines will bring the 3-storey buildings nearer to the neighbours' properties. The closer proximity will cause even further overlook and exacerbate shadowing effects. The requested reduction in spaces between buildings will affect sunlight corridors in the adjacent yards.

According to the City of Delta, a bylaw variance can only be granted if it does not:

- (a) result in inappropriate development of the site;
- (b) adversely affect the natural environment;
- (c) substantially affect the use and enjoyment of adjacent land;
- (d) vary permitted uses and densities; and
- (e) defeat the intent of the Zoning Bylaw.

The very nature of variances the Applicant is testament that the Applicant is seeking to place too much density on a parcel unsuitable for their planned design. We believe that to grant permission for the parking, setback and spacing variances requested would contravene all items, (a) through (e), of City policy listed above. We are strongly opposed to the granting of the requested variances.

Conclusion

We request that City Council reject this development application or require a complete redesign of the project. A revised plan should include fewer units, reduced height, proper setbacks, landscape screening protections, smaller windows, realistic parking, and a design that reflects Delta's OCP policies. The current proposal does not adequately reflect neighbourhood character, liveability, or responsible planning.

By including our names and addresses below, we respectfully ask Delta Mayor and Council to reject the development application as submitted:

Nicolas Pimentel and Samantha Ahuja
Owners of 4966 45 Avenue

Bob Aulik
Owner of 4960 45 Avenue

Sandra Swanigan
Owner of 4956 45 Avenue

Ken and Denise Buckoll

Owners of 4968 45 Avenue

Daniel Baxter

Owner of 4977 44B Avenue

Kelli Wils

Owner of 5030 45 Avenue

Peter and Helen Luong

Owners of 5006 45 Avenue

Sheila Aviles

Owner of 5042 45 Avenue

David Xie

Owner of 5072 45 Avenue

Avtar Atwal

Owner of 5160 45 Avenue

Rhonda Duke

Owner of 5018 45 Avenue

Mayor & Council

9 APR 26 1:45 PM

From: Linda Erickson s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: April 9, 2026 11:48 AM
To: Mayor & Council; Mayor George Harvie; Rod Binder; Alicia Guichon; Daniel Boisvert; Dylan Kruger; Jennifer Johal; Jessie Dosanjh
Subject: LU009863

Warning: This email came from outside the City of Delta. If the sender is not known, please do not open links or attachments. Contact the Service Desk (3215) if unsure of this email.

Good morning,

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the number and extent of the variances that the applicant, Hardeep Bassi, is requesting for the property at 4984 45 Avenue. I would hope that you see that if this many changes to the bylaw are being needed then the project and design do not fit with the property and the bylaws as they are, then you must vote in opposition to this proposal.

Respectfully

Linda Erickson
7875 119A Street
Delta V4C 6N7

 agenda
FILE # 6700-01

TYPE: REFERS TO # 8.1
DEPT: DEV
A.T.#: 150530
Comments: Regular Agenda
Apr. 13/26