

NOVEMBER 12, 1963

A Public Hearing to receive representations in connection with the proposed rezonings listed below was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, on Tuesday, November 12, 1963 at 7:15 p.m.

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair;
Councillors Blair, Cafferky,
Clark, Drummond, Kalyk, MacSorley
and Wells

ABSENT: Councillor Harper

(1) FROM LOCAL COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL TWO-FAMILY

Lot 1, S.D. 4/5, Block 2,
D. L. 206, Plan 19153.
(Located at the north-east
corner of Kensington Avenue
and Curtis Street)

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL TWO-FAMILY TO LOCAL COMMERCIAL

- (a) Lot 1, D. L. 149 NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Plan 3602
- (b) Lot 6, Block "D", D. L. 149 NW $\frac{1}{4}$,
Plan 10021

(The first lot is located at the south-east corner of Patterson Avenue and Imperial Street. The second lot fronts on Hurst Street approximately midway between Patterson Avenue and Willingdon Avenue)

Mr. E. C. McBratney, 6976 Patterson Avenue, appeared and advised that he was also representing Messrs. Howson and Burkinshaw, all of whom were opposed to the proposed rezoning. Mr. McBratney stated that his contingency were opposed because they felt the commercial intrusion into the residential neighbourhood would detrimentally affect existing development. He added that the applicant already has property in the immediate vicinity which it could use for the purposes indicated for the property under application.

Mr. F. Hill, 6909 Willingdon Avenue, appeared and stated that he was opposed to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. C. J. Hobbs, 7007 Patterson Avenue, appeared and indicated that he was opposed to the proposed rezoning for the same reasons mentioned by Mr. McBratney.

Mr. K. Durk, 7008 Patterson Avenue, also indicated that he was opposed to the rezoning proposal.

Mr. M. S. Fergusson, Director of Ocean View Burial Park Company, was present and explained to those in attendance that the Company was planning to improve the property under application but, before it could do so, it was necessary that the rezoning be effected. He pointed out that the existing development on the property is not only unattractive but is no longer adequate for the Company's needs. Mr. Fergusson displayed a sketch illustrating the development proposal of the Company and stressed that it would be quite compatible with the current residential development in the area.

Mr. G. R. Burnett, Manager of Ocean View Burial Park Company, also spoke and elaborated on the comments made by Mr. Fergusson. He also emphasized that the primary aim of the Company was to make the property involved more attractive by rehabilitating it. Mr. Burnett stated that he appreciated the concern of the residents in the area that rezoning might be construed as allowing commercial inroads to be made into the area.

Mr. Burnett also mentioned that it was proposed to merely clean up Lot 6 and use it for parking purposes whereas the other property was slated for development in a semi-commercial way.

Mr. W. G. Peterson, 6946 Patterson Avenue, also spoke and advised that he was opposed to the rezoning proposal.

In response to a query, Mr. McBratney indicated that he would be opposed to the development planned by the Company regardless of whether the land was rezoned or the development was allowed to proceed without rezoning.

The Hearing then adjourned.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:


REEVE


CLERK