

MARCH 13, 1967

An adjourned meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, Burnaby 2, B.C., on Monday, March 13, 1967, at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair;
Councillors Blair, Corsbie (7:35 p.m.),
Drummond, Herd, Hicks, Lorimer and
McLean

ABSENT: Councillor Dailly

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:
"That the Minutes of the meeting held February 27, 1967, be adopted as written and confirmed."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE submitted a report recommending that the Corporation contribute \$250.00 to the British Columbia Motels and Resorts Association (District "C") to assist it in producing a brochure entitled "Guide to Motels and Hotels".

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:
"That the recommendation of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR CORSBIE ARRIVED AT THE MEETING.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:
"That:

"BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION AND DEDICATION BY-LAW NO. 6, 1967" (B/L #5084),
"BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT FRONTAGE TAX BY-LAW NO. 1, 1967" (B/L #5079),
"BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION AND DEDICATION BY-LAW NO. 3, 1967" (B/L #5074),
"BURNABY EXPROPRIATION BY-LAW NO. 1, 1967" (B/L #5086),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 82, 1966" (B/L #5040),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 25, 1965" (B/L #4821),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 5, 1967" (B/L #5062),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 14, 1967" (B/L #5071) and
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 27, 1966" (B/L #4940),

be now reconsidered."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 82, 1966" (B/L #5040)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #128/66

FROM SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3)

Lot 1 Except Sketch 11608 and except South 100 feet, Block 4,
D.L. 2, Plan 4205

(Located at the South-West corner of Government Street and North Road)

Mar/13/1967

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 25, 1965" (B/L #4821)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #84/64

Lot 1 except Sketch 10240, Explanatory Plan 26490, Block 70,
D.L. 33, Plan 4055 AND

Pcl. "A", Sketch 10240, Explanatory Plan 26490, Block 70,
D.L. 33, Plan 4055

NOW: Lot 181, D.L. 33, Plan 30730

(Located on the North side of Grange Street about half way between
Chaffey Avenue and Willingdon Avenue)

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 5, 1967" (B/L #5062)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference No. 132/66

FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO MULTIPLE FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (RM3)

Lots 7 to 10 inclusive, R.S.D. 1, S.D. 11/13, Blocks 1/3,
D.L. 95N, Plan 1796

(Located on the North-East corner of Balmoral Street and Hall Avenue)

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 14, 1967" (B/L #5071)
provides for the following text amendments:

(1) RM4 Density Standards

(i) Height of Buildings (Section 204.3)

"The Height of a building shall not exceed 100 feet and
shall not be less than 4 storeys."

(ii) Floor Area Ratio (Section 204.7)

"The maximum floor area ratio shall be 1.20, except that:

(a) where the coverage of the lot is less than 30 percent,
and amount may be added equal to 0.02 for each 1 percent
or fraction thereof by which such coverage is reduced
below 30 percent;

(b) where the area of the lot exceeds 40,000 square feet, an
amount may be added equal to 0.001 multiplied by each
100 square feet of lot area in excess of 40,000 square
feet, but in no case shall this amount exceed 0.24."

(2) Caretaker Accommodation in Industrial Zones (also RZ #139/66)

The addition of a regulation to the "Uses Permitted" sections in the
M1 (Manufacturing), M2 (General Industrial) and M3 (Heavy Industrial)
Districts:

"Living accommodation for a caretaker or watchman, if
such living accommodation is considered essential to
the operation of the industry, subject to the following:

(a) to be located within a new principal building
housing a permitted industrial use, on a lot
with a minimum area of two acres;

(b) to be limited to the caretaker or watchman, and
not used for family accommodation;

Mar/13/1967

- (c) to form an integral part of the principal building and to be included in the building plans thereof;
- (d) to be fully separated from the industrial use by walls, partitions or a floor;
- (e) to be provided with an entrance separate from that of the industrial use;
- (f) to have a maximum floor area of 600 square feet."

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 27, 1966" (B/L #4940)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #70/65

FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5)
TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (RM3)

Lots 29 and 30, Block 48, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 1437

(Located on the East side of Willingdon Avenue commencing at a point approximately 350 feet South of Maywood Street and extending Southerly a distance of approximately 156 feet)

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That:

"BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION AND DEDICATION BY-LAW NO. 6, 1967" (B/L #5084),
"BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT FRONTAGE TAX BY-LAW NO. 1, 1967" (B/L #5079),
"BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION AND DEDICATION BY-LAW NO. 3, 1967" (B/L #5074),
"BURNABY EXPROPRIATION BY-LAW NO. 1, 1967" (B/L #5086),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 82, 1966" (B/L #5040),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 25, 1965" (B/L #4821),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 5, 1967" (B/L #5062),
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 14, 1967" (B/L #5071) and
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 27, 1966" (B/L #4940).

be now finally adopted, signed by the Reeve and Clerk and the Corporate Seal affixed thereto."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That plans and specifications of the work or undertaking pursuant to By-Law No. 5086 be filed with the Municipal Clerk pursuant to Section 483 of the Municipal Act."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MUNICIPAL CLERK stated that he had received a letter from Mr. G. B. Hobbs, Commercial Division, H. A. Roberts, Ltd., indicating the reaction of the proposed developer of Lot 60, D.L. 153, Plan 26311 (Reference RZ #145/66), Union of Oil Company of Canada Limited, to the prerequisites established by Council in connection with the application to rezone this property to General Commercial District (C3).

In his letter, Mr. Hobbs advised that Union Oil Company of Canada Limited is:

- (i) prepared to dedicate the South 20 feet of the subject property for lane purposes and construct it to a paved standard;

Mar/13/1967

- (ii) agreeable to the dedication of the North 16.5 feet of the Lot for road purposes for the eventual widening of Kingsway, but would appreciate clarification being received as to whether or not the Company could use this 16.5-foot strip, without involving the placing of a permanent fixture thereon, until the land is required for the widening mentioned;
- (iii) in no position to dispute the prerequisite concerning the provision of a sum to cover the cost of constructing that portion of Silver Avenue adjacent to Lot 60 to the standard required by the Corporation because this is already confirmed in an agreement between Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited and the Corporation.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That further consideration of the By-Law covering the above rezoning proposal be deferred until formal assurance is received that the prerequisites in question will be satisfied and, with respect to the point raised in the letter from Mr. Hobbs regarding the North 16.5 feet of the property, the Planning Department indicate whether, and by what means, this strip of property can be used by the owner of Lot 60 until required for the actual widening of Kingsway."

CARRIED

COUNCILLORS HERD
AND DRUMMOND -- AGAINST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That the Council now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW NO. 80, 1966" (B/L #5038)."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 80, 1966" (B/L #5038)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #112/66

FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C2)
TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (RM3)

Lot 1 Explanatory Plan 10989 Except Plan 15900 and Reference Plan 11756, R.S.D. "A" and "D", S.D. 1, Blocks 1 and 2, D.L. 207, Plans 4141 and 5923

(Located within the tract of land bounded by Barnet Road, Inlet Drive and the lane South of Pandora Street)

PLANNING DIRECTOR stated that, though the two prerequisites established by Council in connection with this rezoning proposal have not yet been satisfied, the Amendment By-Law could be given its Third Reading this evening. He added that the By-Law should not be finally adopted until these prerequisites are satisfied.

MUNICIPAL CLERK pointed out that the By-Law before Council provides for the rezoning of the property in question to Multiple Family Residential District Three (RM3) whereas it was the decision of Council the last time the matter was before it to rezone the property to RM2.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 80, 1966" be amended to provide that the rezoning of the property involved be to MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (RM2)."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That the Committee now rise and report the By-Law complete, as amended."

CARRIED

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND -- AGAINST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND -- AGAINST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That 'BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 80, 1966' be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND -- AGAINST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the Council now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on 'BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 44, 1966' (B/L#4972)."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 44, 1966" (B/L #4972)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #56/64

FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3) AND RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5)
TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FOUR (RM4)

- (a) Lot "E", Blocks 43/44, D.L. 30, Plan 7164
- (b) Pcl. "H", Expl. Pl. 7297, except Expl. Pl. 14259,
S.D. 11, Block 43, D.L. 30, Plan 3036
- (c) Lot 1, Block 44, D.L. 30, Plan 3036
- (d) Parcel "A", Reference Plan 4984, Block 44, D.L. 30, Plan 3036

(Located at the North-West corner of Kingsway and 19th Avenue)

MUNICIPAL CLERK advised that this Amendment By-Law was being placed before Council at the request of the applicant for the rezoning covered by the By-Law.

The Planning Director explained that his Department had recommended RM4 rezoning for the property, and Council had obviously concurred, but the applicant now desired RM3 zoning.

He pointed out that this request was precipitated because the original RM4 zoning category permitted a minimum height of three storeys for apartments but, with the passage this evening of "Burnaby Zoning By-Law 1965, Amendment By-Law No. 14, 1967", the density standards in RM4 zones now require that apartments in such zones be no less than four storeys.

The Planning Director stated that the applicant had a potential buyer for the property who was prepared to only build a three-storey apartment, which could not be done under the new RM4 zoning regulations.

He added that the three prerequisites established by Council in connection with this rezoning proposal had not yet been satisfied. He also drew attention to an appeal of the applicant to Council on November 21, 1966 concerning the prerequisite involving the deposit of monies to cover the cost of extending storm sewer facilities to serve the site, explaining in this regard that Council had reaffirmed this prerequisite that such facilities be provided by

extending the storm sewer North on Kingsway to serve the property.

The Planning Director concluded by advising that his Department preferred "high-rise" apartment development on the property in accordance with the RM4 regulations, or even RM5.

The Municipal Clerk pointed out that the applicant for the rezoning in question was present and desired an audience.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HERD:
"That the applicant be heard."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. H. J. Marshall, the applicant, appeared and advised that the Planning Director was correct in his statements but the problem was that the RM4 regulations are different now than they were when the application for rezoning was first made.

He stated that the potential purchaser of the property had just been informed this morning about the then proposed change in the RM4 Density Standards and, because they only wished to build a three-storey frame apartment on the property, they and he were both naturally desirous of changing the category to RM3 in view of the new regulations in the RM4 zones.

Mr. Marshall suggested that the area was not really suitable for "high-rise" apartment development because it was a well trafficked commercial area and the suites could only command so much rent because of the area.

When the Planning Director stated that the application at hand has been held in abeyance due to the lack of a development plan, Mr. Marshall advised that he was unable to present such a plan because he had been unable to obtain a purchaser for the property in the past.

The Planning Director also interjected that, in the initial report from his Department on the application, it was indicated that the proper use of the property was for either "high-rise" apartment development or commercial development, not medium density apartments.

Mr. Marshall continued and stated that, before 1959, he had tried to develop the land commercially as a satellite to the Dominion Store development on adjoining property, but had not been successful. He added that it was next felt that perhaps an automobile dealership arrangement could be located on the property but that too failed. Mr. Marshall indicated that, following this, he had approached the Planning Department to determine its views on the best use of the land involved.

Mr. Marshall pointed out that 113 suites could be accommodated in a "high-rise" apartment development on the property whereas only 60 could be provided in a three-storey structure. He added that, irrespective of the type of apartment development, he would receive the same price for the land and therefore it would be obviously more economical for a developer to build "high-rise" apartments.

Mr. Marshall indicated that the lending institutions had no available money for such apartments in this area, presumably because they feel this money can be used to build "high-rise" apartments elsewhere.

Mr. Marshall concluded by pointing out that, a few years ago, he had constructed a building on the property at a cost of \$15,000.00, some of which would be lost when apartments are built on the property.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR LORIMER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:
"That further consideration of "Burnaby Zoning By-Law 1965, Amendment By-Law No. 44, 1966" be deferred until the meeting to be held on March 28, 1967 to allow the Planning Department an opportunity to present a precis in connection with the rezoning proposal embodying all the pertinent factors relating to it."

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR McLEAN -- AGAINST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the Committee now rise and report progress on the By-Law."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That the Council now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 83, 1966" (B/L #5041)."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 83, 1966" (B/L #5041)
provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #107/66

(a) Lot 1 South 100 feet, Block 4, D.L. 2, Plan 4286

(b) Lot "A", Block 3, D.L. 2, Plan 7780

FROM SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2) TO SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4)

(Located on the West side of North Road approximately 177 feet South of Government Street)

MUNICIPAL CLERK advised that the Planning Department had reported all of the prerequisites in connection with this rezoning proposal had been satisfied except for the filing of the plan.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR LORIMER:

"That the Committee now rise and report the By-Law complete."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR LORIMER:

"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 83, 1966" be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A request of the South Burnaby Credit Union for an extension of the condition regarding the demolition of the residence on Lots 12 and 13, S.D. 31/33, Blocks 1 and 3, D.L. 95N, Plan 1915, was lifted from the table.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND:

"That the condition recited above be extended for a further year to end December 30, 1967."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR BLAIR suggested that consideration should be given the matter of the Corporation purchasing the George Derby Hospital for all types of hospital use, including chronic care.

He pointed out that there are presently 211 beds in that hospital and that, if purchased by the Municipality, there would need to be some changes made to allow the use of the hospital for females.

Mar/13/1967

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the Municipal Manager consider the feasibility and desirability of the proposal outlined above while preparing the Brief in support of purchasing private hospital facilities to accommodate extended and chronic care cases, and his Brief be submitted to the Hospital Development Committee before it is presented to Council."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR HERD suggested that a request should be made of the Attorney-General to provide a progress report on the question of the Provincial Government relocating the Oakalla Prison to an area beyond the boundaries of Burnaby.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSDIE:

"That the Attorney-General for the Province be respectfully requested to indicate the current plan of his Department in respect of the question of relocating the Oakalla Prison to an area beyond the boundaries of Burnaby."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That the Council now resolve itself into the Policy/Planning Committee."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The question of the 60-foot Residential Zoning Strip on Lougheed Highway was then considered.

It was mentioned that Mr. W. R. Walling, 2190 Douglas Road, had written to request an audience with Council on this matter.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND:

"That Mr. Walling be heard."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Walling appeared and advised that he had had five abortive sales for the property over the past few years, which had been caused by the peculiar zoning on the property. He explained that all but the North 60 feet of his land is zoned Industrial and potential purchasers have been reluctant to consummate the purchase because of this dual zoning.

He suggested that the area was appropriate for Industrial use as witness the fact most of the property is zoned to permit such use, but the dual zoning mentioned makes it exceedingly difficult to develop the property for Industrial purposes.

Mr. Walling explained that there were four parcels involved in the triangular area bounded by Lougheed Highway, Douglas Road and Springer Avenue, and all have the same problem as him - some more than others.

He pointed out that, upon enquiring of the Planning Department, it was ascertained that if an Industrial use was to be made of the property, a 6-foot high tight board fence or concrete wall would need to be built along the front of the property facing Lougheed Highway. He suggested that if all four parcels had to erect such a fence or wall, 795 feet of frontage would have this fence/wall on it.

Mr. Walling pointed out that the Planning Director apparently felt the 60-foot Residential Strip was not necessary and was therefore recommending that it be reduced to 30 feet. Mr. Walling suggested that perhaps it should be reduced even further to 20 feet.

The Planning Director stated that the 30-foot suggestion was arbitrary but, because the Zoning By-Law requires a set-back of 20 feet in Manufacturing zones and since there should be an additional set-back along the Lougheed Highway to preserve its major traffic function and to protect the amenities of

adjacent residential development, it was decided that 30 feet was an appropriate distance for the residential strip.

The report of the Planning Department on the question of the 60-foot Residential Strip was then read.

The Planning Director remarked that it was certainly not desirable to allow residential development next to manufacturing use but this would not be possible in any event in the subject area because of the shallowness in depth of the residential strip and the fact that residential use of property cannot be made in conjunction with manufacturing use.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That a reduction in the width of the 60-foot Residential Strip on the South side of Loughheed Highway between Douglas Road and Springer Avenue to 20 feet be approved for further consideration."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That a Public Hearing be held on the foregoing proposal."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

It was understood that the Department of Highways would be notified of this proposed amendment to the Zoning By-Law because of its involvement with the Loughheed Highway.

HIS WORSHIP, REEVE EMMOTT, DECLARED A RECESS AT 9:25 P.M.

THE COMMITTEE RECONVENED AT 9:45 P.M.

The matter of Retail Tire Sales operations was then considered.

A report of the Manager on this matter, a copy of which is attached to and forms a part of these Minutes, was read.

The view was expressed that, because the Retail Tire Sales development at 5501 Hastings Street is the one which gave rise to the question of clarifying the regulations in the Zoning By-Law respecting the retail sale of tires, this activity at 5501 Hastings Street should be kept under observation to determine whether it is causing a nuisance to the neighbourhood.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the matter of examining the regulations in the C2 zone in respect of retail tire sales be tabled until ample time has elapsed after the development at 5501 Hastings Street has been kept under surveillance for the purpose of noting whether complaints are received in regard to the operation of the business, with it being understood that any such complaints will be reported to Council immediately and further, that should any other applications be received to establish a retail tire sales operation in a Community Commercial (C2) District, this too be reported to Council."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR BLAIR LEFT THE MEETING.

The question of introducing regulations which will allow apartments over Commercial premises was next considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR LORIMER:

"That the recommendation contained in the report of the Planning Department dated February 24, 1967, in respect of the subject matter be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mar/13/1967

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That, since the foregoing matter arose from the consideration which was being given a rezoning proposal involving property described as Lot 19, S.D. 12, Block 1, D.L. 120, Plan 9413 (located on the West side of Madison Avenue between William Street and Charles Street) - Reference RZ #93/66, the owner of that property be notified of the action taken by Council regarding apartments over Commercial premises and it be suggested to him that, if he is desirous of building apartments over the stores on the property, he make application to do so on the basis of the Comprehensive Development (CD) zoning category."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The matter of the powers of the Zoning Board of Appeal was next considered.

The Planning Director stated that he had posed five questions to the Municipal Manager concerning the subject but had not yet obtained answers to them.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That the matter of the powers of the Zoning Board of Appeal be tabled until a report is received from the Manager on the subject."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The question of uses in Institutional (PI) Districts was next considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That this item be tabled for two more weeks."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The matter of the Corporation establishing the position of Industrial Co-ordinator was then considered.

His Worship, Reeve Emmott, described a proposal involving the re-allocation of office space on the Second Floor of the Municipal Hall which he felt should be done if an Industrial Co-ordinator is engaged by Council.

His proposal was as follows:

"Because the proximity of the Industrial Co-ordinator to the office of the Reeve is of paramount importance, the two offices should be side by side.

Now that the Personnel Department is being moved to the basement floor, the Purchasing Agent can move to the present Personnel Department space. The present Purchasing Agent's space can be divided between the Legal Department and the rest of it, along with a part of the Committee Room, could be used to accommodate the office of the Reeve and the one for the Industrial Co-ordinator. One secretary could be engaged to serve both officials.

Either the Council Chambers could be used more frequently by Committees, Commissions, etc., or the area on the fourth floor that is occupied by the Centennial Co-ordinator could be converted for use by such Committees, Commissions, etc.

After the Reeve vacates his office, the Municipal Manager could move into it and the Assistant Manager could move into the Manager's present office."

- 11 -

Mar/13/1967

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That, before rendering a decision on the proposal outlined above by His Worship, Reeve Emmott, a report be submitted by the Municipal Manager covering all facets of the matter."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY