

NOVEMBER 6, 1962

A Public Meeting and Public Hearing was held in Burnaby Central High School, 4433 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, on Tuesday, November 6, 1962 at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: His Worship Reeve Emmott in the Chair; Councillors Harper, MacSorley, Edwards, Kalyk, Clark, Hicks and Blair

ALSO PRESENT: Municipal Planner, Administrative Planner, Municipal Clerk.

His Worship the Reeve presented opening remarks including an explanation of the joint Public Hearing and Public Meeting and the reasons therefor.

The Reeve laid rules of conduct for the meeting and requested that any persons wishing to endorse the opinions of any particular speaker rise and associate themselves with that speaker in order that repetition of information would be avoided.

#### PUBLIC MEETING

Proposal to construct a 30 suite garden - type apartment on Lot "A", Block 1, D. L. 43, Plan 10061 (Located on the South-West corner of Lougheed Highway and Lozells Avenue.

His Worship called on the Director of Planning and the Director recapitulated the application and the report by his Department presented to the Municipal Council previously. A preliminary plan of the layout was presented. However, the Director advised that a more detailed plan which had been expected was not forthcoming and this day it had been learned that the firm originally interested in the development had withdrawn its interest.

Mr. Ramsay of Brighton Avenue asked whether Section 13 of the Town Planning By-Law under which this development was to receive approval interfered in any way with the Community Plan adopted within the Government Road area a couple of years ago.

His Worship the Reeve explained that there was no bearing on the Community Plan contained in this application as the density of dwellings in this instance was sufficiently low that rezoning the property was not necessary and the type of development could be dealt with by approval of the Council under Section 13 of the Town Planning By-Law.

Mr. Lovegrove - Kraft Crescent. Mr. Lovegrove submitted that it was his understanding there would be no access to the Lougheed Highway for this development and queried the traffic access into the proposed development. The Director of Planning advised that there would be no access to the Lougheed and that entrance to this site would be found via the street system. It was pointed out, however, that the density for this development was fifteen units per acre compared with apartment developments which allowed up to three times the density and that therefore there would not be an abnormal traffic situation occur.

*[Handwritten signature]*

Mr. Parsons - Kraft Place requested information on whether this development was to be of a low rental housing nature similar to those apartments being built in Vancouver immediately west of Boundary Road. The Director of Planning advised that to his knowledge this development would not be subsidized by any National Housing Act loans which generally was the source of financing where low rental housing was being constructed.

There were no further representations.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL TWO FAMILY TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE 1.

Lots 17, 18, 19, Block 37, D. L.'s  
151/3, Plan 2069  
(Located on the northerly side of  
Maywood Street between Willingdon  
Avenue and Cassie Avenue)

A letter was read from Mr. R. E. Free advising that he was agreeable to accepting rezoning of the above described property from Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family Type 1 on the conditions as recommended in a report of the Planner.

There were no further representations on this proposed rezoning.

(2) FROM LIGHT INDUSTRIAL TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE 1.

Lots 34, 35, 36 South 33 feet, 37  
Except North 33 feet, 38, 39, Blocks  
42/43, D. L. 151/3, Plan 1566  
(Located on both sides of Sussex Avenue  
between Beresford Street on the South  
side of the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority  
right-of-way and a point approximately  
165 feet southerly)

A letter was read from Mr. Joseph Loukes expressing agreement with the proposed rezoning but opposing the three provisions imposed through the reported recommendations covering this rezoning. These were:

- (1) Provision requiring dedication of 33 feet of Lot 36 for road purposes;
- (2) That sufficient funds be deposited to pay the cost of building the road mentioned in (1) above. It was the opinion the road construction was the responsibility of the Municipality;
- (3) Consolidation of the three lots into one parcel. Opposition was registered for the reason that the property may be sold more readily in separate lots and consolidation would be up to future purchasers of the property.

No further representations were made in connection with this proposed rezoning.

*JH*

(3) FROM LOCAL COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL TWO FAMILY.

Lot 63, R.S.D. "A/C", S.D. 8/10,  
Block 1, D. L. 745 $\frac{1}{2}$ , Plan 21308  
(Located on the southerly side of  
Grandview-Douglas Highway approxi-  
mately 280 feet northwest of Laurel  
Street)

No correspondence was received and no representations were made for or against this proposed rezoning.

(4) FROM LOCAL COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE II

- (a) Lot 1 except Sketch 12927, Block 2,  
D. L. 216, Plan 11055.
- (b) Lot 35, Block 2, D. L. 216, Plan 11555.  
(These lots are located on the north side of  
Pandora Street from Barnet Road West a  
distance of approximately 256 feet)

FROM COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE II

Lots 6 to 11 inclusive, S.D. "A" & "D",  
Block 1, D. L. 207, Plan 13300  
(Located on the south side of Pandora  
Street from Barnet Road West a distance  
of approximately 366 feet)

Mr. King, 7150 Inlet Drive, requested clarification of the Type II Multiple Family zoning. The Director of Planning explained that this was a medium density zoning and permitted one suite for each 1,100 square feet of land and that off-street parking must be provided on the basis of three vehicle parking spaces for each four dwelling units.

Mr. Chadwick, agent for Mr. H. Lobb, owner of Lot 1 Except Sketch 12927, Block 2, D. L. 216, submitted that the owner had made surveys of commercial use in the area indicating that there was sufficient commercially zoned land to take care of commercial needs. No sale of the property had been found for commercial purposes and application had been made for rezoning of the land for Multiple Family purposes.

Mr. Taylor, 7130 Inlet Drive, requested information on what effects the proposed rezoning would have on taxes on the seven lots on the northwest side of Inlet Drive.

His Worship the Reeve explained that this was a matter of the assessment and that it was not possible to give information on what the effect of an apartment development would have on the properties in question.

There were no other representations for or against this rezoning.

(5) FROM LIGHT INDUSTRIAL TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY

TYPE 11.

- (a) Lot "A", Block 18, D.L. 97, Plan 7406  
(b) Block 13 North 210 feet, D.L. 97, Plan 824

FROM LIGHT INDUSTRIAL TO RESIDENTIAL TWO FAMILY

All that area generally bounded on the West by Merritt Avenue; on the North by the lane South of Kingsway, on the East by Randolph Avenue and on the South by the right-of-way of the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority, save and except Lots 8 to 11, Block 13A, D. L. 97, Plan 2802.

Correspondence was received from the following concerning this proposed rezoning:


- (a) Letter from Mrs. Jessie A. Devlin opposing the rezoning on the grounds that the area contains several industrial and commercial firms and the area immediately across the railway track also contained industrial plants, all of which made the area non-conducive to residential use.
- (b) Mrs. Eileen Pope Hicks expressing opposition to the proposed rezoning on the grounds that the area is already built up with too many industries within and bordering the district to make it a desirable residential area.
- (c) Mr. and Mrs. O. A. Pickard opposing the proposed rezoning on the grounds that the property had been purchased for Light Industry and it was felt there should be no change particularly since one side of the property faces the railway and the other a sheet metal shop with a busy thoroughfare and lane front and rear.

The Director of Planning referred to a map of the area covered by the recommended rezonings and outlined the existing zone pattern within the area.

The Planning Director submitted that his Department was opposed to the rezoning of the Kelly property (Lot "A" and Block 13) in isolation pointing out that the inter-mixing of apartment use and surrounding industrial use would only give rise to nuisances and complaints. It was considered by the Department, however, that if the larger area represented by the second rezoning from Industrial to Residential Two Family were considered in conjunction with the apartment rezoning, there was some merit in the proposal and on this basis the Council approved the proposal for further consideration.

Reference was made by the Planner to previous considerations given to rezoning of land in the general area between Kingsway and the B. C. Hydro rail lines, and in the earlier stages of consideration the Council had dropped the area between MacPherson Avenue and Burnaby South High School.


After reassessing the land use picture within the Central Park Line area, and studying the changes which have taken place since 1958 when the area was last studied it was concluded that no harm would be occasioned future industrial development by the removal of the area now recommended for change. The following facts underlie this conclusion:

- 
- (1) In the area from Patterson Avenue to Edmonds between Kingsway and the Central Park Line and excluding Simpsons-Sears, the Ford Plant and Kelly Douglas (also excluding industrial land south of the Central Park Line) there existed a total of 190 acres. Of this, only 30 acres was in use commercially or industrially or about 16%. The removal of 24 acres contained in the land under the proposal would not significantly change the Municipality's industrial future.
  - (2) Apart from the area between the two Rail lines at the eastern end, there are only two or three sites of approximately one acre which are vacant or are occupied by only a few houses. There is very little unoccupied land in the area which could be taken up by small Industrialists.
  - (3) The remainder of the area is totally developed with housing. Based on 1959 figures the cost of establishing an Industrial site in the area would run generally about \$55,000.00 per acre. It is the opinion of the Assessment Department that these figures have not significantly altered in the past four years. This cost of \$55,000.00 per acre compares with Industrial land costs in the vicinity of from \$15,000.00 to \$18,000.00 and asking prices of up to \$22,000.00 per acre to the south of the subject area. It is impossible to see any trend towards assembly of Industrial sites out of densely housed land.
  - (4) There will remain a demand for small parcels for small businesses. However, small business has not moved into the area significantly during the past three and one-half years, there having been about sixteen businesses established on the periphery taking up approximately 3.1 acres. One exception to this was the Home Bakeries. Within the industrial area between Nelson Avenue and Burnaby South High School there is a total of about 90 acres. At this rate the property owners in the area will wait many years before the sale of their land can be realized for industrial purposes.

The Planner advised having sought the opinion of private development concerns to determine their interest in the area and other agencies regarding the feasibility of larger Industries being established. The opinions expressed have all indicated that it would be uneconomic to establish in the area and the Department has reaffirmed its previous opinion that the Kingsway - Central Park Line Area is vastly over-supplied with industrially zoned land and that development within the area for industrial purposes will not take place for many years.

It was the conclusion of the Department that the change of zoning presently before the Hearing was fully justified in view of these factors and in view of the terms of reference spelled out by the Municipal Act regarding zoning matters as follows:

"Section 702(2). In making regulations under this section the Council shall have due regard to the following considerations:

- 
- (a) The promotion of health, safety, convenience and welfare of the public.
  - (b) The prevention of the overcrowding of land and the preservation of the amenities peculiar to any zone.
  - (c) The securing of adequate light, air and access.
  - (d) The value of the land and the nature of its present and prospective use and occupancy.
  - (e) The character of each zone, the character of the buildings already erected and the peculiar suitability of the zone for particular uses.
  - (f) The conservation of property values.

The Director of Planning continued and gave reasons for selecting the particular boundary for zoning change. It was felt that the boundaries did not constitute an ideal residential neighbourhood. Some non-residential development was contained in the area which detracted from its residential character. However, it was felt that attention should be given to re-orienting the street system to improve the residential character and this could be accomplished by eliminating three street ends onto Kingsway. This would have the effect of eliminating through traffic in the area and would improve the residential character of the area. Reference was made to the provisions of the National Housing Act insofar as the clearing of some conditions from obsolescent areas. However, these conditions must be critical before participation under the National Housing Act can be expected. It was hoped that the National Housing Act provisions would be extended in the future to prevent slum conditions from developing. It was further submitted that these conditions were not serious at present but would develop in time. It was further suggested that planned tree planting, etc., could take place in the area which would be conducive to a residential atmosphere. Such plantings could take place on the west side of Merritt Avenue and on the east side of Brantford Avenue to create a buffer between the residential and industrial areas. Shirley Street on the west side would be used as secondary access to the industries to the south, thus relieving Merritt Avenue from carrying industrial traffic. It was noted that industries at the foot of Curragh Avenue had been excluded from the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Savage, 7276 Curragh Avenue, expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning. Mr. Savage suggested that the zoning map presented to the Hearing was not complete in that other businesses were contained in the area which were not shown.

Upon being asked to point out the other businesses Mr. Savage, upon approaching the map, apologized advising that he was unable to see the full detail of the map from where he was sitting although his own property used industrially was not shown as such. Mr. Savage also suggested that the lots on Merritt Avenue would preclude any widening and that the tree plantings referred to could not be undertaken. The same situation applied on Randolph Avenue.

The Planner submitted that both Randolph and Merritt Avenues were 66 foot street allowances and that there was sufficient boulevard space for tree planting. Mr. Savage advised his business was contained in his garage and the Planner submitted

*JS*

that their survey of the area was undertaken from exterior viewing only and that there was a possibility some industries might have been missed at the time the zoning pattern map had been prepared.

Mr. Don Jamieson, representative of the Burnaby Chamber of Commerce, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning. Several points would be made, some of which were contained in a Brief prepared by the Chamber of Commerce for presentation to the Council. It was agreed that an application to rezone one portion of land within this area was illogical - that any application to rezone should be considered on the basis of the large area. It was the feeling of the Chamber of Commerce, however, that the rezoning of the whole area would have a harmful effect on the industrial climate of the area. Some industry has come in in recent years and the proposal to rezone does not give a chance for the area to develop properly as an industrial complex. It was suggested that industry begets industry. Mr. Jamieson noted that industry was slow coming into the area but that eventually it would come. Reference was made to the report of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board and the statistics regarding industrial growth rate which was to be expected in the Lower Mainland area and it was suggested this report proffered the argument that industrially zoned areas should be maintained. It was considered the cost rate of \$55,000.00 per acre which had been quoted was not considered out of line. Some good homes were located in this area but some were not good and there was a possibility these latter properties would attract purchases by industrial concerns.

The imposition of a major apartment block in the area would also impose more school burdens south of Kingsway and other services required by such developments. An alternative to schools in the immediate area would be the construction of a costly overpass or some other expensive means of permitting students to cross Kingsway. It was emphasized that the area under consideration was 28 acres and it was requested that consideration be given to the preservation of the industrial zoning in this area and that it not be allowed to go to residential zoning. Finally, Mr. Jamieson submitted that the Chamber of Commerce was opposed to the rezoning of both areas or separate rezonings.

Councillor Edwards questioned the spokesman on whether or not the Brief he had presented was submitted with the approval of the membership of the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Macdonald, Executive Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, advised that the Brief had been approved by the Executive Council of 19 members. Other members have been contacted and in all cases endorsement of the Brief had been given. However, the general membership had not ruled on the submission of the Brief.

Mrs. Weston, 6849 Russell Avenue, asked if there was any reason why the Kelly property could not be spot zoned.

His Worship the Reeve referred to the report of the Director of Planning wherein it was pointed out that to comply with the spot zoning proposal would be to run contrary to good planning principles. Mrs. Weston submitted that she had owned a business for many years in the area and that now it was proposed to block off certain street ends which would

JH

detract from the business usefulness of the area.

The Director of Planning replied to remarks of Mrs. Weston that "the Planner was going to block off street ends" and submitted that the entire matter was a Council responsibility. Recommendations of the Director of Planning did not bind the Council in any way.

It was pointed out that if the general area is rezoned, businesses legally established within the area may continue to operate. Such businesses may not rebuild without permission of the Town Planning Board of Appeal.

Mrs. Weston expressed the opinion that industry and residential development should be made to be compatible that there was a need for both types of development.

Mr. Insley, Solicitor, appeared as agent for Mr. and Mrs. Walter Carlson, 5061 Beresford Street and expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning. It was submitted that this was a logical industrial area with Highway and trackage available. Reference was made to the terms of reference in Section 702 of the Municipal Act and it was suggested that the rezoning of the property would not be in keeping with these terms of reference in that the area was particularly suited to industrial use.

It was agreed that it would be ridiculous to rezone the Kelly property alone. However, the larger area for rezoning does not meet the test of good area zoning. It was submitted that this was an incursion upon the light industrial zoning of Burnaby in that it would create a residential island in an industrial area, of 1/25th of a square mile in extent. The boundaries of the area would not create a compatible situation particularly in the southern extremities where, because of the exempted inroad of industry along Curragh Avenue, residences would exist within 200 feet of these industries and approximately 100 feet from trackage.

In regard to the earlier comment that there has been no great demand, it was submitted that there would not be demand so long as proposals such as this came forward. Industry is afraid to establish in an area under unstable circumstances. Two points were stressed:

- (1) Island area zoning is not warranted and not in the best interests of the surrounding owners.
- (2) One owner should not be permitted to upset the status quo of a larger area.

The opinion was expressed that there had not been one good reason for the proposed rezoning and the Council should proceed very slowly with any change. The spokesman agreed with the previous decision of the Council to leave the whole area zoned industrially.

Mr. Jennelle, Merritt Avenue, submitted that he was not speaking in opposition to the rezoning. However, if a larger area were zoned Merritt Avenue would become half residential and half industrial and there was fear expressed of the effect which might occur to the residential values along Merritt Avenue under such circumstances. It was



JS

further suggested that Multiple Family zoning might be more beneficial than the proposal to rezone to the Two Family category.

Mr. Nelson, 7111 Buller Avenue, spoke in favour of the zoning. The proposed development would be advantageous to the Municipality in the way of taxes and employment. Business will emanate from the inhabitants of the apartment. The apartment area is surrounded by good homes and it was agreed that if the surrounding area were left industrial, slum conditions would creep in.

Mr. Hall, 7011 Randolph Avenue, suggested that if there was slum conditions there had been laxity in enforcing the building regulations in the past. His Worship the Reeve explained that the present Council could not be blamed for any building regulations which may have been adopted or enforced in the past and its responsibilities could only be accepted during its current term of office.

Mrs. Ashworth, 5757 Willingdon Avenue, opposed the proposed rezoning and requested information on the fine line between Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial zoning.

His Worship the Reeve explained the differences and Mrs. Ashworth requested advice on what would happen to the values if the land reverted to Residential from Light Industrial and it was submitted that values were reflected through the Assessment Department which, in turn, found its information basically from sales of property through records of the Land Registry Office. Mrs. Ashworth was the owner of property on Buller Avenue.

Mr. William Street, agent for Westcott Construction Limited, and Mr. Kelly, owner of the property under consideration for apartment zoning, spoke in favour of both applications.

With regard to the proposal for rezoning the larger area, Mr. Street advised he was authorised to speak for residents in the area who are in favour of the proposed rezoning, and for Mr. Kelly. Mr. Street presented a petition signed by 83 citizens who live in the larger area, who are owners of residences in the area, and some who own residences but who do not live in the area. Two-thirds of the petitioners reside in the area. It was submitted there were others who were generally in agreement but who did not want to sign the petition until after the Public Hearing. The petition represented 75% in total of the property owners. There were a number of absentee owners who were not contacted.

Mr. Street referred to the Planner's report quoting from the paragraph which read: "and we are increasingly concerned over the gradual disintegration of the area into an industrial slum". Mr. Street suggested that this was an understatement pointing out that there were a hundred residences developed in the area and approximately six industrially developed properties. Mr. Street requested that the Council rezone the land as proposed to bring the area into line with the residential development that has prevailed for many years. It was pointed out that existing industry would not be put out of business in that the

businesses would become non-conforming for the lifetime of the Industrial building.

It had been suggested by some of the owners in the area that their land had been purchased with the hope of selling at some future time as industrial land. The Director of Planning has shown the facts of the matter. An example of the fallacy of this view can be found in the case of Mr. Kelly who has had his property on the market for twenty years and has not received one firm offer for his land for industrial purposes.

Mr. Street advised that the B. C. Hydro had examined the area from the point of view of providing trackage and that it was considered land in the area was too costly. Reference was made to the possibility of purchasing service land in other parts of the Municipality for \$20,000.00 per acre as opposed to \$40,000.00 or \$50,000.00 in the subject area and the former area supplied a hard pan base, on trackage.

It was also submitted that the supply of industrial land in Burnaby as compared to other communities in the metropolitan area was as follows:

(a) Burnaby -	25%
(b) Vancouver -	11.4%
(c) Richmond -	10%

There are 374 acres of land cut into small parcels in this general area and there has been very little industrial development.

Mr. Street expressed surprise at the Brief of the Chamber of Commerce, suggesting that it would be thought that the Chamber of Commerce would be interested in any development in the area that would give business to the community, and particularly the commercial strip along Kingsway. It was submitted that the property had no real economic future as an industrial area and, in its present zoning, will only create a blight that will affect values in the general area. The erection of the apartments would bring employment to the area and in addition dedication of land for street purposes would help to complete the street system.

Mr. Street asked the question "who are the people that are going to be harmed if the land is rezoned?" The man who has developed his land industrially and who hopes that he will expand. It was pointed out there were only six in this category and that such owners would suffer no hardship if they do not try to expand. It was suggested that someone has got to be hurt sometime and it was further suggested that the six industrial properties should not be allowed to blight the one hundred home owners in the area.

Upon being queried Mr. Street advised that the cost of the apartment development will be in excess of One Million Dollars.

Mr. R. M. Rintoul, 6992 Russell Avenue. Mr. Rintoul submitted that there were four types of people interested in this proposal. Firstly, there was the Municipality as represented by the Director of Planning which had presented a picture of the benefits which would accrue to the owners

*JH*

In the area. Secondly, there are those who want to make money out of the proposed rezoning. Thirdly, there are those who want to make money out of the existing industrial character of the area and fourthly, there are those who are neutral and who did not buy property in the area for the purpose of making money. The spokesman submitted that he was in the neutral class and planned to remain in the area and that there were many people residing in the area who liked it as a residential community, being in the same position as he. Mr. Rintoul deplored the possibility of the area going into the same sort of slum conditions as existed in Vancouver on West 7th, 8th and 9th Avenues, amongst others. It was suggested that if the land was not rezoned a slum would certainly arise and would subsequently have to be cleaned up.

Mr. W. R. Beamish, Solicitor, presented a petition opposing the rezoning, a copy of which is attached to and forms a part of these Minutes. Mr. Beamish advised that this petition had been signed by 72 persons representing 50 out of 119 properties. The petition had also been signed by 27 abutting owners. Signatures of representatives of 27 firms were also included.

The spokesman advised that he had been instructed by 17 owners who had signed the petition presented by Mr. Street that they wished to withdraw their names from that petition claiming misrepresentation at the time they were asked to sign.

Mr. Beamish submitted that there were 197 acres of land zoned Light Industrially in Burnaby and that this was less than one-third of a square mile and was a very small proportion of a Municipality of 40 square miles.

It was submitted that this was the third time in three years that the people of the Kingsway - Central Park Line had been called upon to defend their position in regard to the zoning of their property and it was suggested this was an expensive imposition upon the people in the area and that before the Council comes back again it should take a good long look at the prevailing position.

His Worship the Reeve advised the meeting that the area under consideration had never before been before a Public Hearing.

Mr. Neem, agent for Egglers Truck and Diesel Service Limited, 7011 Merritt Avenue, expressed concern that the proposal would constitute a "thin edge of the wedge" and there was fear that the zoning would spread to other areas. It was pointed out that his client's business was commenced as a backyard industry and had grown over a period of two years from a one principal - two employee industry to a position where the Company now consists of two principals and ten employees. It was suggested that if the proposed rezoning was passed the firm would be inclined to take a serious look at its future in this area. If the zoning was expanded their firm would be directly affected.

Mr. Neem associated himself with the remarks of Mr. Insley and Mr. Beamish and expressed opposition on behalf of his client to the proposed rezoning.

*JP*

Mr. Scott, 7209 Curragh Avenue. Mr. Scott submitted that he operates a business from his basement. If his property was rezoned to Residential his values would decrease considerably with a floor wax business on one side, and an Iron works business on the other.

This property was located on the corner of Arbroath Street and Curragh Avenue and the Planner pointed out that a band of residential land had been left along Arbroath Street on the South side to protect the proposed residential neighbourhood on the North side.

Mr. R. Raymer, 6100 Block Kingsway. Mr. Raymer expressed favour to the proposed rezoning submitting that business was suffering along Kingsway in the general area from a vacuum of residential development. A large school and other vacant land existed on the North side of Kingsway in the general area and it was submitted that the influx of population which would follow the apartment development would benefit the Kingsway - Commercial area.

In attempting to find purchasers of land along Curragh Avenue, experience had shown that purchasers were willing to pay the price of the land only, and not the price of the building, in dealing for industrial sites.

His Worship the Reeve asked for a show of hands amongst those present as an indication of the number who were opposed and those who were in favour of the proposed rezoning. The show of hands indicated that approximately two-thirds of those present were opposed and about one-third in favour.

Mr. Street submitted that this was not necessarily a true indication as it had been the experience that those in favour are inclined to stay home whereas those who were opposed come out in force to Hearings on matters of this kind.

Mrs. Morgan, property owner at Beresford and Randolph, asked Mr. Street how the proposed rezoning would benefit her property.

Mr. D. E. Tilton, owner of property next door to Mr. Scott, who spoke earlier, suggested that industry will grow slowly in the area, but will eventually provide considerable employment. It was suggested that generally not enough attention was given to the encouragement of secondary industry.

Mrs. Zuckov, 5700 Block Beresford Street. Mrs. Zuckov advised that she lived on the south side of the tracks and that there were, in the general vicinity, many industries including a sawmill, a body shop, etc., which created considerable noise and that if it was the proposal to rezone land on the north side of the Railway right-of-way to "Residential" the noise nuisance should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Devlin, 5943 Beresford, also spoke on the industries operating in the area and the effect on the residential area, particularly those south of the railway.

An owner at 5792 Beresford Street advised that while he was resident outside the area he felt that information on the proposal should have been forwarded to him as an affected owner.

His Worship the Reeve explained that the Council was going beyond its legal responsibility in giving personal notification but that there were limitations and that it was the policy to notify owners within the area and those immediately adjacent.

Mr. Chase, 5959 Beresford Street, submitted that it was his opinion when property was purchased by an individual for a certain purpose there should be an opportunity to use the property for that purpose. Many people bought property in the area with a view to an investment for the benefit of their children. Mr. Chase was critical of the constant fear of rezoning.

Mr. Terry-Berry, 6063 Buller Avenue, asked if there had been an occasion previously where rezoning of an area of land of this size from Light Industrial to Residential had ever been accomplished.

His Worship the Reeve referred to rezonings of similar lands in the Kingsway - Central Park area to the west of the area under consideration.

Mr. Danin of B. C. Iron Works, 7183 Curragh Avenue, submitted that his firm had been established six years ago and that since that time his firm had erected a shop 40 feet by 60 feet and he had built a good quality home which was the pride of the neighbourhood.

Upon a remark having been made that Mr. Kelly wanted to have property in the area rezoned, Mr. Street, Solicitor, rose to correct the impression that Mr. Kelly was not directly concerned with the development but his client, Westcott Construction Limited, were making the application for the rezoning and were interested in development of the apartment project.

The Hearing adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:

REEVE



CLERK

7  
AK

PETITION

To the Municipal Council of the Corporation  
of the District of Burnaby

- WHEREAS the Council is in receipt of a report from the Planning Department recommending the rezoning of certain lands lying South of Kingsway and North of Jutland Street, between Merritt and Randolph Avenues from Light Industrial to Residential Two Family and Residential Multiple Family Type II.
- AND WHEREAS this area has for fourteen years been zoned as Light Industrial.
- AND WHEREAS it was considered by the Municipal Council and the Town Planning Commission of 1948 that, because of existing trackage, such zoning was appropriate to meet the need for a proper balance of the Municipality's economy although it was not anticipated that a change in actual use would occur within any particular time.
- AND WHEREAS fourteen years is a relatively short time in the life of any community to expect a complete changeover in the land use of a particular developed section.
- AND WHEREAS these bodies realized that there was a need for light industrial zones for a proper balance of the Municipal economy and it appeared to them to be eminently suitable for such zoning as it was already served by trackage on one side and Kingsway on the other.
- AND WHEREAS mere zoning does not create but only permits a desirable type of development, the realization of which must be obtained by positive action to that end, any alleged slowness of a conversion of actual use can be attributable to a lack of a co-ordinated sales effort rather than a lack of desire of industry to use the area for light industrial purposes.
- AND WHEREAS many large industries, which now form the basis of our industrial system, started out as "backyard shop" enterprises and needed only time to develop to the status of a stable and valuable industrial concern.
- AND WHEREAS the present zoning has not lessened the values of the existing properties but rather increased them and rezoning would destroy these values and also the present potential of the future values of our properties.
- AND WHEREAS the rezoning proposals of the Planning Department indicate more concern for the vanishing residences in the area than for the encouragement of industrial development.
- AND WHEREAS In the democratic process of development of a community, land is settled upon, usually in small parcels before there is sufficient population in the general area to make a location there attractive to industry.

- AND WHEREAS industry and commerce are not deterred by the existence of small parcels of land and the need for assembling them when the economic climate is right, and when, in their wisdom, they decide upon a particular location.
- AND WHEREAS small secondary industries are necessary to the economy of any community.
- AND WHEREAS authoritative statistics establish that in addition to the employees of any industry, 1200 other people are needed to service every 1000 of such employees.
- AND WHEREAS if land is rezoned from light industrial to residential, it will result, in many instances, in a very well defined depreciation of areas presently built up as residential as well as those areas built up for industry.
- AND WHEREAS rezoning will have the effect of rendering all existing industry non-conforming with all the attendant consequences, such as the preclusion of expansion, or the rebuilding after a fire or the resumption of business after a period of cessation and would place industry in a position where it would have to leave the Municipality.
- AND WHEREAS upon rezoning, an individual residential property owner would suffer a loss of property value since in any event he would remain next door to an industry and would yet be required to be residentially zoned and this could lead in certain sections of the general area to a steady deterioration in the value of private residential property resulting in reduced tax benefits to the Municipality.
- AND WHEREAS since rezoning would be reducing the only major area which can benefit the home owner from a taxation standpoint, it is most inappropriate to take from industrial rolls, land which, because of services to it and the general locale, is most suitable to industrial use.
- AND WHEREAS we are owners of certain properties in or abutting on the affected area.
- AND WHEREAS we have either purchased the property well knowing its present zoning or have assented to its zoning in 1948 and some of us have continued to reside here and have accepted the character of its zoning and have lived there under somewhat less than ideal residential conditions, regarding our property more in the nature of any investment which would be realized in the future, rather than as a homesite.
- AND WHEREAS we have no knowledge that where any area had been zoned industrial or commercial, it had ever been rezoned back to a more curtailed use such as residential.
- AND WHEREAS we feel that stability of zoning is essential in a democratic community, to allow private enterprise to depend upon such stability in order to carry out plans which must of necessity in very many cases be of a long range nature.

JP

AND WHEREAS we have counted on the good faith of the Municipalityh  
not to disrupt the situation under which we have  
invested our money in our properties.

NOW THEREFORE, WE, the undersigned, owner-electors of this Municipality  
and residents of or abutting on the area affected  
hereby petition the Council of the Corporation of the  
District of Burnaby to refuse to adopt the recom-  
mendation of the Planning Department.

DATED at Burnaby, this 6th day of November, A.D. 1962.