

FEBRUARY 24, 1969

A regular meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B.C. on Monday, February 24, 1969 at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mayor R.W. Prittie in the Chair;
Aldermen Blair, Clark, Dailly,
Drummond, Herd, Ladner, Mercier
and McLean.

D E L E G A T I O N

Mr. Norman S. Jones, Architect, submitted a letter requesting an opportunity to appear before Council.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:
"That Mr. Jones be heard."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Jones then spoke and stated that he was appealing a decision of Council rendered on February 10, 1969 to not proceed with the rezoning of property at the North-East corner of Kingsway and Waltham Avenue to Multiple Family Residential District 3 (RM3).

Mr. Jones displayed a prospectus outlining the development proposed for the property.

He also offered the following in support of his appeal:

- (a) The Planning Department supported the rezoning proposal.
- (b) The property is included in an area designated by the Apartment Location Policy for immediate medium density apartment development.
- (c) The property, being partly zoned R5 and partly C4, could have a range of uses made of it which might be regarded as unsuitable.
- (d) Commercial development of the site would perpetuate the "ribbon" commercialization of Kingsway.
- (e) Such development would also generate considerable traffic volumes thus compounding such problems on Kingsway.
- (f) Development of the property for commercial purposes would result in a greater site coverage than if developed for apartment purposes. For example, the plan envisaged for the site will allow for 61.5% of it to be landscaped, and underground parking is to be provided.
- (g) A lane access will be provided to the site as a prerequisite to the rezoning being effected.

Feb/24/1969

At this juncture, the Planning Director stated that the School Board has no objection to an apartment being built on the subject property.

He also reviewed the reasons of his Department for supporting the rezoning proposal.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERCIER:
"That, after reviewing the rezoning proposal in question in the light of the presentation made this evening by Mr. Jones and the representations made earlier to Council at the Public Hearing on the matter, the decision rendered by Council on February 10, 1969 to not rezone the property to the RM3 category be reaffirmed."

CARRIED -

AGAINST - Aldermen Herd, Dailly
and Blair

TABLED MATTERS

The following matter was then lifted from the table:

Multiple Family Development in the Kingsway-Patterson-Olive area.

A report on this matter, which dealt with the concern of Trans Pacific Investments Limited relative to some of the land in the area, was submitted by the Planning Department.

The following is the substance of that report:

- (a) On November 13, 1968, the Council resolved to not proceed with the rezoning of Lot 7, 8 and 9 N $\frac{1}{2}$ on Patterson Avenue to RM 5 and allowed a permit to be issued to build a 3-storey frame apartment on the site under the RM 3 zoning category.
- (b) At the same meeting, the Planning Department was asked to consider ways and means of achieving higher density apartment developments in the area that was zoned RM3.
- (c) At the end of last year, Mr. & Mrs. Heisler approached the Planning Department and expressed concern over being omitted from a proposed apartment site. The Heisler's were advised of the desire of the Planning Department to achieve high density development but they were also told that, as the area was already zoned, the Municipality had no by-law control over the problems of locked-in lots. It was suggested to them that they might wish to approach Council, which they indicated they would do.
- (d) A few days later, the developer (Trans Pacific Investments Limited) approached the Department with a proposal to build a 3-storey frame apartment. The Company was informed of the Planning Department's past action with respect to property on Patterson Avenue and was told of the RM5 zoning category envisaged for the area. The Company was also advised of the Heisler's concern.

Feb/24/69

- (e) Around mid January, the developer approached the Planning Department once more and indicated he had purchased the Heisler property and would be submitting a proposal to develop a site which would include the Heisler property. The attention of the developer was drawn to the triangular-shaped lot to the south. The desire of the Planning Department to achieve "high-rise" apartment development on land in the area was repeated, although the Company was aware that the Department had had no success in obtaining RM5 zoning on the property on Patterson Avenue.
- (f) The Heisler's letter, which was dated January 7, 1969, was received in the Planning Department on January 20th accompanied by advice that it would be presented to Council on January 27th. The Department was requested to provide Council with a report on the matter. Though the Department did submit a report, it was not dealt with by Council because Mr. Heisler informed the Municipality that his property had been purchased.
- (g) On February 4, 1969, the developer's consolidation plans were presented, at which point they were held pending Council consideration of the January 27th report of the Planning Department. This report was considered on February 17th and tabled.
- (h) The Planning Department has examined the area in some detail during the past week and feels that, whatever decision Council makes with respect to the property of Trans Pacific Investments Limited, the Department would still recommend the rezoning of the area outlined on the attached sketch to RM5, consistent with the concept adopted in principle in the Apartment Location Study, and the preparation of a Community Plan to define actual sites.

Trans Pacific Investments Limited also submitted a letter which indicated the following in regard to the matter covered by the report of the Planning Department:

- (1) The first discussions pertaining to the consolidation of the properties were held with Mr. Gordon Auld of the Planning Department either during the last week of December 1968 or the first week of January 1969.
- (2) The purpose of these discussions was to establish, prior to the purchase of the properties, the exact zoning status, the mechanics of consolidation and the extent of co-operation which could be expected from the Planning Department should the Company decide to proceed with the construction of the proposed project.
- (3) The Company was immediately told that the Planning Department had received an indication from the Heislars of their displeasure at their property being left in an isolated situation. Mr. Auld indicated that, should the Planning Department receive a letter confirming this indication from the Heislars, it would not be able to proceed with the processing of the plan of the Company.

Feb/24/1969

- (4) The Company was advised that its alternatives were to include the Heisler property or reduce the number of home sites in the proposed consolidation by one thereby increasing the vacant property adjacent to Heisler to that sufficient to allow for additional future development. It was added that the Planning Department favoured the Company purchasing the Heisler property.
- (5) During discussions regarding the present building status of the properties, it was brought to the Company's attention that the Municipality would like to see high-rise development in the area. The extent of the Company being advised of the imminence of such action was no more than a statement saying it was something the Municipality would like. The matter was concluded by Mr. Auld advising that any real danger of such an occurrence was nullified by the fact another developer had just received a permit to construct a 3-storey frame building immediately behind the site of Trans Pacific Investments Limited. Mr. Auld further assured the Company that, whether it proceeded with the purchase of the Heisler property or not, the Planning Department could not stop any development because that planned by Trans Pacific Investments Limited was in accordance with the current zoning status.
- (6) At no time did Mr. Auld or any other member of the Planning Department advise the Company, or its agents, of any intention of the Planning Department or Council to make immediate or future changes so as to bring the RM5 zoning into reality.
- (7) Subsequent discussions with the Planning Department, mostly in relation to the purchase of the Heisler property, likewise revealed no indications of the same intention. Consequently, it was decided to purchase the Heisler property and include it in the site the Company proposes to develop. A call was made to Mr. Auld only a few moments before finalizing the documents for the purchase of the Heisler property and he was specifically asked whether the Company could expect to receive the full co-operation of the Planning Department in its development proposal after acquiring the property from the Heislars. Mr. Auld offered his fullest assurance that there would be no problem.
- (8) The Company believes that, prior to its purchase of, and commitment to, the project, it gave the Planning Department more than sufficient time to advise of any zoning changes. The Company is extremely displeased to find that, besides not being warned of the intent of the zoning change, no notice was given that action would be taken by Council and that the Heisler's letter withdrawing their complaint was ignored by the report of the Planning Department submitted to the Manager. It was only by accident the Company discovered the impending action and was able to lodge its letter of complaint.
- (9) It is with great reluctance that the Company must express its displeasure but the properties involved have been purchased at considerable expense and, should they be rezoned to RM5, the Company would be unable to proceed to use the site. It would also

Feb/24/1969

be in considerable difficulty resulting from a situation where it would be unable to resell the property and recoup not only the land costs but architectural and legal fees.

- (10) Should the zoning of the property be left in limbo, then not only would the Company be unable to sell it but all the property owners in the entire area would be unable to sell their properties. In either circumstance, it would seem reasonable that the only course remaining is for the Municipality to purchase the properties owned by the Company immediately, plus expenses, and those of any other owner in the area.
- (11) Should the occasion be necessary, the Company would appreciate an opportunity to address Council.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CLARK:
"That the zoning of the property owned by Trans Pacific Investments Limited in the Kingsway-Patterson-Olive area not be altered."

CARRIED

AGAINST - Alderman Blair and Dailly

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:
"That Council agree to consider the rezoning of those areas outlined in black on the sketch accompanying the report submitted this evening by the Planning Department to Multiple Family Residential District 5 (RM5), with it being understood that the Planning Department will prepare a Community Plan to define the actual sites to be developed to this RM5 zoning standard, following which the rezoning proposals be advanced to a Public Hearing."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

His Worship, Mayor Prittie, stated that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 100 of the Municipal Act, he was returning for reconsideration a resolution Council passed on February 17th to not authorize the attendance of the Recreation Director at a Community Education Clinic.

He stated that his reason for this action was because of the policy of Council agreeing with the conclusions of the Park and Recreation Commission in regard to matters such as the one at hand.

He pointed out that, though the powers which Council has delegated to the Commission may undergo revision as a result of Council studying the matter, it was fitting at this time to not oppose an action approved by the Commission.

He also mentioned that, notwithstanding this relationship with the Commission, it was still necessary for Council to authorize staff from the Parks and Recreation Department to attend conferences.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That the Recreation Director, Mr. G. Squire, be authorized to attend the Community Education Clinic which is being held in Flint, Michigan, U.S.A. between March 12th and 14th, 1969; and further, it be recommended to the Commission that the report the Recreation Director submits to the Commission as a result of his attending the Clinic be made available to Council."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Feb/24/1969

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CLARK:
"That the Council now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

REPORTS

His Worship, Mayor Prittie submitted a report recommending that Alderman W. R. Clark be appointed as Acting Mayor for the months of March and April, 1969.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That the recommendation of the Mayor be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

His Worship, Mayor Prittie submitted a report relative to the next Canada Summer Games, advising as follows:

- (a) He joined Mayor Evers of New Westminster in meetings in Ottawa on February 6th and 7th to obtain information about the possibility of holding the next Canada Summer Games after 1969 in Burnaby and in New Westminster.
- (b) The meeting was with the Honorable John Monroe, Minister of National Health and Welfare, and Mr. T. Bedeckl, Assistant Director of the Fitness and Amateur Sports Directorate. Messrs. Douglas Hogarth Ray Perrault, MPs, were also present.
- (c) The next Canada Summer Games will be held in 1973 after the one this year.
- (d) The next Canada Winter Games will take place in 1971. This fact is important in determining the site of the Summer Games because it is unlikely both the Winter Games and Summer Games will be located in the same part of Canada.
- (e) The site of the 1971 Winter Games has not yet been decided. When that decision has been made, the Canadian Amateur Sports Federation (which recommends sites for the Minister's decision) will entertain applications for the 1973 Summer Games.
- (f) The Minister and members of the Fitness and Sports Council will be meeting in Vancouver sometime this March. At that time, the Minister and Council will be taken on a tour of Burnaby and New Westminster to see the facilities and potential for staging the Summer Games here.
- (g) The Federal Government is prepared to underwrite, with an approved ceiling, all operating costs of the Games.
- (h) The Federal Government will consider sharing with the Provincial and Municipal Governments the capital costs of required facilities, subject to satisfactory negotiations being concluded.
- (i) Representing the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate is responsible for initiating negotiations concerning financial arrangements between the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Games Society.

Feb/24/1969

In addition, the Directorate approves all methods of budgetary control regarding the expenditure of Federal Government funds approved to support these Games.

- (j) In the case of the host Province, it should be encouraged to assist the Municipal Government and the Games Society in the provision of facilities for the Games.
- (k) The impression was gained that the Federal share of capital costs might be measured in hundreds of thousands of dollars but not in millions.
- (l) A further report will be submitted when new information on the subject is received.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:
"That the report of His Worship, Mayor Prittie be received."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Alderman Blair submitted a report outlining the activities of the Durnaby General Hospital Board.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:
"That the report from Alderman Blair be received."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MUNICIPAL MANAGER submitted Report No. 13, 1969 on the matters listed below as Items (1) to (11), either providing the information shown or recommending the courses of action indicated for the reasons given:

- (1) Easement - Portion of Lot 1, D.L.s 57/58, Plan 23988

It was being recommended that Council authorize the:

- (a) Acquisition of an easement 15 feet wide, for sanitary sewer purposes, over the above described property for a consideration of \$1.00.
- (b) Execution of the documents attending the transaction.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:
"That the recommendations of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (2) Easement - Portion of Lot H, Blocks 3/4, D.L. 158
Plan 22253

It was being recommended that Council authorize the:

- (a) Acquisition of an easement 5 feet wide, for storm sewer purposes, over the above described property for a consideration of \$242.00.
- (b) Execution of the documents attending the transaction.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Feb/24/1969

(3) Heritage Park

In August 1968, the Parks and Recreation Commission recommended that a Committee be established comprising members of Council, members of the Commission and members of the Burnaby Historical Society to examine the question of establishing a 'Heritage Park' where various historical items, such as the inter-urban tram, could be located.

On August 27, 1968, the Commission advised that Messrs. A. H. Pride and R. Hull had been appointed by the Commission.

On February 10, 1969, the Burnaby Historical Society indicated that it selected Mr. Frank Street, 6176 Walker Avenue, Burnaby 1, B.C. and Mr. John Thompson, Ste. 109, 1130 East Broadway, Vancouver, B.C. as its delegates.

It would now appear that Council should designate its members to the Committee, with one of them being charged with the responsibility of Pro-tem Chairman.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:
"That His Worship, Mayor Prittie and Alderman J. D. Drummond be appointed as Council Representatives on the special Committee mentioned in the report of the Manager, on the understanding that His Worship will be the Pro-tem Chairman for the purpose of calling the Committee together."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(4) Demolition of Buildings at 3818, 3824/28, 3896 and 3918
Hastings Street Plus 3915 Pender Street.
HASTINGS STREET REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. 1

It was being recommended that the lowest tender, which was submitted by Construction Cartage Company Limited, amounted to \$2,650.00, for the demolition of the buildings on the above properties, be accepted.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ALDERMAN DRUMMOND LEFT THE MEETING

(5) Easement - Springdale Court Subdivision

It was being recommended that the ancillary rights over the lot shaded on the attached sketch be retained and the same type of rights over the other lots be released because a subdivision of the area has eliminated the need to have easements over all the properties concerned.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ALDERMAN DRUMMOND RETURNED TO THE MEETING

(6) Land Sale - Portions of Lots "D" and 22, Block 5, D.L. 207

An application has been received to subdivide the property lying to the east of the captioned land. This proposed subdivision will extend Trudy Court westward to a cul-de-sac and will require a triangular shaped portion of the Municipal property, as shown on an attached sketch.

Feb/24/1969

It was being recommended that this triangular shaped portion of property be placed in a sale position, subject to:

- (a) All the parcels involved being consolidated and becoming part of the proposed subdivision of the privately owned property to the east.
- (b) A minimum price of thirty-five cents per square foot being established for the land to be sold (this will yield approximately \$15,250.00 per acre).
- (c) The purchaser paying all the necessary legal and survey costs.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN CLARK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:
"That the report of the Manager be tabled for one week and, because it is felt the land to be sold can possibly fetch a higher price than that indicated, a report be submitted then on the question of the market value of the property involved plus details as to the size of the property."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(7) Dragline Rental to Matsqui

On February 11, 1969, at the request of Acting Mayor Dailly, Burnaby assigned a dragline and one man to the Municipality of Matsqui. Matsqui recognized an obligation to reimburse Burnaby through the issuance of a purchase order, which read "Provide emergency service for flood control - to include dragline shovel, operator and attachments as required - at cost. Fuel, oil and lube to be supplied by Matsqui."

Costs to February 16, 1969 amount to \$731.46, including the cost of moving the dragline and pads to Matsqui by low-bed truck.

It was being recommended that the action taken to assign the dragline and one man to Matsqui, as detailed above, be ratified by Council.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted, and arrangements be made to collect the sum mentioned in his report from the Municipality of Matsqui."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(9) Estimates

It was being recommended that Council approve the Special Estimates of Work totalling \$54,500.00 in an attached report from the Municipal Engineer.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(10) Fire Department

A report of the Fire Chief covering the activities of his Department during the month of January 1969 was being submitted.

Feb/24/1969

(11) R. C. M. P.

A report of the R. C.M.P. covering policing activities in the Municipality during January 1969 was being submitted.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN:
"That the above two reports be received."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR PRITTIE DECLARED A RECESS AT 8:50 P.M.

THE COMMITTEE RECONVENED AT 9:00 P.M.

(8) In-law Suites

Reports from the Chief Building Inspector and the Planning Director in connection with the captioned subject were being submitted herewith.

The following is the substance of those reports:

Chief Building Inspector

- (a) My views on the feasibility of introducing some form of special permit control system to authorize and recognize special housing accommodation for in-laws have not changed substantially in the past ten years.
- (b) In 1959, I advanced a proposal to recognize, under a special permit, accommodation for aged parents, in particular, that required housing within the domicile of a son or daughter yet in quarters separate to that of the younger family. That proposal received favourable consideration and encouragement by the Manager and, in fact, reached draft by-law form.
- (c) In 1961, the Council decided not to advance the proposal following the advice from the Municipal Solicitor that the regulations being proposed were beyond the power of Council. The Council also believed then that the need for such a by-law change was not real.
- (d) I was convinced in 1959 that the need for housing accommodation by certain families for aged parents was very real and urgent. I am convinced that the same sort of need continues today for a good many families and I have no reason to doubt that Mr. Ritchie is an example of such a family with this particular sort of need.

Planning Director

- (a) The questions of "Special Permits" and "Conditional Uses" was the subject of a number of reports submitted by the Planning Department to Council in 1964 and in 1965.
- (b) Following discussions with the Municipal Solicitor, it was determined that the Municipal Act did not provide the discretionary authority required to permit these administrative devices to be included in the by-law. This made necessary the spelling out in detail of the various zoning requirements and standards.

- (c) It is apparent that any change in the regulations governing additional suites in two family dwellings will need to be made by amending the text of the zoning By-law.
- (d) Under the present By-law, two boarders or lodgers may be accommodated in each dwelling unit in addition to the occupying family. This means that each of the units within a duplex or semi-detached two family dwelling may provide accommodation for two additional persons. These persons, who could be "in-laws", may occupy a separate bedroom, sitting room or living room within a dwelling unit. They may also be provided with separate bathroom facilities but kitchen and cooking facilities must be shared with the other occupants of the unit.
- (e) If separate kitchen facilities are installed and a self-contained unit provided, then this would constitute a second dwelling unit. A system that permitted only "in-laws" or "persons in dire need of housing accommodation" to occupy the second units in two family dwellings would be very difficult, if not impossible, to administer. The probable result would be to "open the door" to the development of additional units in all two family dwellings.
- (f) Under these circumstances, a two family dwelling would be transformed into a fourplex that could be occupied by four families. Development densities would double from ten units per acre for two family units in R4 zones and 12 units per acre in R5 zones to 20 and 24 units per acre respectively. These would be similar to the densities attained in the RM1 category.
- (g) Under the present By-law, a fourplex is considered as an apartment and is permitted in the RM1, RM2 and RM3 districts.
- (h) Because of the extensive areas zoned for two family development, any reduction in standards to permit additional units in two family dwellings would have a considerable impact. Large increases in densities could be expected to occur within many of the two family zoned areas.
- (i) Any pronounced increase in density, particularly if it involved new development, would almost certainly detract from the apartment market potential. Of even greater significance would be the added load placed upon Municipal services and utilities originally designed for lower density residential development. Considerable increases in traffic volumes would be generated on residential streets. Additional school enrollments would also result and this would place a strain on school facilities.
- (j) In addition to the regulations which permit the development of new two family units on 7200 square foot lots in R5 zones and 8600 square foot lots in R4 zones, a recent amendment to the By-law makes provision for the conversion of single family houses to two family use. This regulation applies to single family houses in R5 zones which existed before the effective date of the By-law, subject to a minimum lot area of 5400 square feet and a minimum lot width of 45 feet.

Feb/24/1969

- (k) The adoption of this amendment provided a potential of more than 3000 single family dwellings in R5 zones which could be converted for two family development. This represents approximately one-third of the total number of single family dwellings constructed prior to 1966 in the whole of Burnaby. The full development of this potential could accommodate 8000 additional families or 28000 persons, including 5000 elementary school pupils.
- (l) The present regulations governing two family development in Burnaby compare favourably with those in other Lower Mainland Municipalities.
- (m) It was being recommended that there be no change that would reduce the existing standards or increase development densities in two family zoned areas.

The following points were made in Council during consideration of the foregoing matter:

- (1) Perhaps a system of the type desired could be introduced by way of an amendment to the R3, R4 and R5 zones, with Council retaining control on the question of exercising discretion in granting the permits. One way of policing the granting of such permits would be to make it necessary for the recipient of the permit to renew it within a reasonable time so that Council would be aware whether the "in-law" suite was still being used for that purpose.
- (2) An indication should be provided as to whether it is at all possible for Council, either through a By-law amendment or an amendment to the Municipal Act, to achieve the end desired.
- (3) The Council should have the benefit of the Municipal Solicitor's latest opinion on the subject at hand.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:
"That the matter of in-law suites be referred back to the Planning Department for review in light of the points made this evening."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN:
"That the Committee now rise and report."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN:
"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ALDERMAN DRUMMOND LEFT THE MEETING

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That leave be given to introduce "BURNABY RATIFICATION BY-LAW 1968"
#5462 and that it now be read a First Time."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That the By-law be now read a Second Time."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That the Council do now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to
consider and report on the By-law."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That the Committee do now rise and report the By-law complete."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

ALDERMAN DRUMMOND RETURNED TO THE MEETING.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:
"That "BURNABY RATIFICATION BY-LAW 1968" be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That leave be given to introduce "BURNABY STREET AND TRAFFIC BY-LAW
1961, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 1, 1969" #3495 and that it now be read
a First Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That the By-law be now read a Second Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That the Council do now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to
consider and report on the By-law."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Feb/24/1969

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That the Committee do now rise and report the By-law complete."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:
"That "BURNABY STREET AND TRAFFIC BY-LAW 1961, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 1, 1969" be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:
"That the Council do now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on:

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 81, 1968" #5454
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 73, 1967" #5256."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 81, 1968 provides for the following rezoning:

REFERENCE REZONING #52/65

FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (R2) TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (RM5)

West 186.7 feet of Lot 9, Blocks 1, 4 and 6, D.L. 125, Plan 3520

(5050 Halifax Street - Located on the South side of Halifax Street, from a point approximately 304 feet West of Springer Avenue Westward a distance of 186.7 feet)

Deputy Municipal Clerk stated that the Planning Department had reported that the prerequisites established by Council in connection with this rezoning proposal have been satisfied.

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 73, 1967 provides for the following rezoning:

REFERENCE REZONING #105/67

FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FOUR (R4) TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (RM3)

Lots 10 and 11, except S. 15 feet and except N. 20 feet, Block "P", D.L. 127 W3/4, Plan 1254

(5488 - 5492 Hastings Street - Located at the South-West corner of Hastings Street and Howard Avenue)

Deputy Municipal Clerk stated that the Planning Department had reported that the prerequisites established by Council in connection with this rezoning proposal have been satisfied.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:
"That the Committee do now rise and report the By-laws complete."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:
"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:
"That

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 81, 1968"
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 73, 1967"
be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:
"That:

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 3, 1968" #5291
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 10, 1969" #5482
be now reconsidered."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 3, 1968 provides
for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #17/68

FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FOUR (R4) TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICT THREE (RM3)

Lots 2 and 3 except S. 15 feet, Block "P", D.L. 127 W3/4, Plan 1254

(5220 and 5232 Hastings Street - Located on the South side of
Hastings Street from a point 83 feet E. of Springer Avenue
Eastward a distance of 186 feet)

Deputy Municipal Clerk stated that the Planning Department had
reported that the prerequisites established by Council in connection
with this rezoning proposal have been satisfied.

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 3, 1968 provides
for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #104/68

FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C1) TO PARKING DISTRICT (P8)

Lot 4, Block 4, D.L. 68, Plan 980

(3430 Boundary Road - Located on the East side of Boundary Road
from a point 87 feet. South of Laurel Street Southward a distance
of 43 feet)

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

"That "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 3, 1968"
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 10, 1969"
be now finally adopted, signed by the Mayor and Clerk and the Corporate
Seal affixed thereto."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Feb/24/1969

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:

"That "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 44, 1968"
#5377 be now reconsidered."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Planning Director stated that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had received the request of Council for cedar shakes instead of duroid as a covering on the face of the buildings to be constructed on the properties covered by this By-law.

He added that it appeared as if the CMHC would accede to the request of Council for the use of the shakes.

The Planning Director also mentioned that he would discuss the traffic situation in the lane serving the property with residents in the area to determine if some mutually acceptable arrangement could be implemented.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:

"That "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 44. 1968"
be now finally adopted, signed by the Mayor and Clerk and the
Corporate Seal affixed thereto."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY