

Thursday, August 11, 1965

Public Hearing - "Burnaby Town Planning By-law 1948,
Amendment By-law No.3, 1955".

A Public Hearing was held into the proposed amendments to By-law 1991 as contained in "Burnaby Town Planning By-law 1948, Amendment By-law No.3, 1955" pursuant to Section 11 of the Town Planning Act on August 11, 1965 at 7.30 p.m. at the Municipal Hall, 193 Kingsway, South Burnaby.

Present: Reeve MacSorley in Chair; Crs. W.P. Philips, Charlton, Drummond, Hean, Hughes, F. Philips and Morrison.

The proposed amendments were considered as follows:

Paragraph 39 - "Schedule 3 is amended by adding the following thereto as clause (qq):

(QQ) Lots 15-19 inclusive, Block "G", D.L.34."

J. Sager and others submitted a Petition signed by 331 persons protesting the establishment of a commercial zone in the Central Park Garden Village area on the above described property. Mr. Sager appeared and spoke with reference to the Petition and expressing the opinion of the residents that a shopping center at the southwest corner of the subdivision would not effectively serve the area. It was also pointed out that the property owners in the Subdivision had purchased their land on the understanding that the commercial area would be located in the centre of the subdivision. Mr. Sager advised that the residents were willing to await the installation of sewers to rectify the drainage condition which would arise from the existence of a commercial area in the original location and requested that the proposed zone be not proceeded with.

Mr. John Boulton of the firm, Boulton, Sweet and Company presented a series of letters indicating 68 persons in favour of the proposed rezoning and 59 persons against. Mr. Boulton advised that the original commercial area planned for the centre of the subdivision had been turned down by the Sanitary Department. Mr. Boulton advised further that it was agreed amongst the merchants interested in the commercial development that the new location was a better area from an economical and marketability point of view. Mr. Boulton suggested that their firm was willing to hold the original area for commercial area pending the installation of sewers.

Mr. Milledge, resident property owner at 4070 Patterson Avenue, spoke in protest to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Browne, resident property owner in the 3900 Block Patterson Avenue objected to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Donnelly submitted that the area was already being served by the Kingsway Commercial zone and suggested that in view of the differences of opinion with regard to the proposed rezoning and the fact that the original area was set aside in the Subdivision area was considered unsuitable by the merchants, that neighbor area be established at this time.

Mr. Gilbert and Mr. McRae both spoke in protest to the proposed rezoning.

Paragraph 43 - Schedule 7 is amended by adding the following thereto as clause (q) "(q) The easterly 125 feet of Block 124, District Lot 86."

A.P.W. Watkinson and others submitted a petition in protest of the proposed rezoning of this property situated on Douglas-Grandview Highway and Burris Street. Mr. Watkinson spoke representing the objecting residents and expressed the opinion of the residents that should a commercial zone be established on the subject property there would be little to prevent it from spreading along the Highway and along Burris Street.

Mr. Thompson resident property owner of the 2700 Block Douglas Road suggested that the area was adequately served at the present time.

Mr. Watkinson gave some statistics with regard to the traffic flows on the subject Highway and pointed out that the creation of a gasoline service station on the subject property would increase the hazard due to its location at the base of a hill.

Mr. Braidwood spoke on behalf of the applicant, Mr. W.S. Turner, pointing out an examination of the Petition had revealed the names of the persons who had signed it were residents some distance away and that the Petition was not proper in other ways. Mr. Braidwood pointed out that the surrounding area was not primarily residential in that extensive greenhouses were existing across the street and to the rear of the property and further that a Saddle

Club and Riding ring and motel were located to the west along the Highway. With regard to the traffic hazard it was suggested that there had been no objection raised from traffic officials of the Municipality. Mr. Braidwood gave comparative assessments showing non-depreciation of values owing to surrounding commercial development.

Mr. Falston spoke in rebuttal to Mr. Braidwood's remarks and again expressed the fear of commercial spread in the area.

Mr. D. Reid spoke and disagreed with the remarks re the mixed commercial development and suggested that the residents did not agree that the present agricultural green house development were detrimental to the area.

Paragraph 45 - Schedule 7 is further amended by adding the following thereto as clause (s)

(s) All that portion of Lot 1, Block 4, D.L. 91 South part, Plan 4210 having a frontage of 180 feet on Grandview Douglas Highway and 110 feet on Elwell Street.

A Petition was received from Cornelius Hiebert expressing favour to the proposal to rezone this property to gasoline service station zone.

Mr. Porteous, resident property owner of the 2400 block Douglas road suggested that the area between Formby and Emond Street along Douglas Road should be rezoned commercial. Mr. Porteous opposed the application to rezone the subject property until a later date.

Mr. Brandon, resident property owner of the 2400 block, supported the suggestions advanced by Mr. Porteous.

Paragraph 34 (section 13) dealing with the establishment of a landscaped buffer zone where Heavy Industrial zones meet residential zones.

Mr. Olsen spoke on behalf of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association objecting to the proposed buffer zone and requested that the proposed amendment be withheld pending consideration by the Association.

Mr. Hughes objected to the foreseeable relinquishment of any of his land for buffer zone. A Correction of this impression was given by the Clerk who advised that the proposed buffer zone would not affect the residential properties but rather would be provided out of the Heavy Industrial zoned area.

No representations were made to any other of the proposed amendments within the by-law.

The Hearing Then adjourned.

Confirmed:

Charles Brown
Clerk.

Reeve.