

APRIL 2, 1963

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, on Tuesday, April 2, 1963 at 7:30 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Councillor Harper.

The Hearing was held for the purpose of receiving representations in connection with the following proposed rezonings:

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

- (a) Lot 53 except East 10 feet and except
Sketches 6509 and 8213, D.L. 33, Plan
944.
(Located at the north-east corner of
Grange Street and Pioneer Avenue)

Mr. N. Jordan, 5887 Pioneer Avenue, appeared and advised that he had no objection to the proposed rezoning unless "High-rise" apartments were to be built.

- (b) Lots 9 to 11 inclusive, Blocks 55/58,
D.L. 33, Plan 1825.
(Located at the north-west corner of
Grange Street and Sussex Avenue)

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

- (c) Lot 6, Block 68, D.L. 33, Plan 8118.
(Located at the north-west corner of
Grange Street and Willingdon Avenue)

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

- (d) Lot "D", Block 39, D.L.s 151/3, Plan 23107.
(Located at the north-east corner of
Maywood Street and McKay Avenue)

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

- (e) Lots 1 to 4 inclusive, S.D. "B", Blocks
47 & 49, D.L.s 151/3, Plan 1936.
(Located on the west side of McKay Avenue
south of the lane south of Maywood Street)

M. and J. A. Jenkins and M. S. & M. Wawryk submitted a letter objecting to the rezoning proposal because it is felt the rezoning would tend to depreciate surrounding properties.

They added that should the question of rezoning both sides of McKay Avenue between Maywood Street and Imperial Street be considered, they would be more favourable to a change in the zoning.

Mrs. D. P. Franks, 6667 McKay Avenue, appeared and advised that she concurred with the view expressed in the letter from the Jenkins' and Wawryk's.

Mr. J. Bell, 6619 McKay Avenue, owner of two of the parcels under application, appeared and stated that he felt rezoning to Multiple Family Type 1 use would enhance other such developments in the immediate area. He also pointed out that, due to this other Multiple Family development, his property is more suitable for this type of use.

- (f) The south 180 feet of Lots 3 and 4, Block 46, D.L.s 151/3, Plan 7157.
(Located on the north side of Imperial Street approximately midway between Dow Avenue and the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority right-of-way at Jubilee Avenue)

Mr. Plumley, representing the owners of the abutting Lots 2 and 5 (Messrs. Lecomte and Darke), appeared and indicated that these owners were not opposed to Multiple Family development of the area in which the subject properties lie but they were opposed to the "spot" rezoning of these two properties. He suggested that Council should consider the rezoning of the entire block, adding that other owners in this block support this view.

Mr. Armstrong of the Planning Department explained the prerequisites in connection with the use of property for apartment purposes, stressing that such land must have certain minimum dimensions before it can be so utilized.

- (g) The north 40 feet of Lots 1 to 12 inclusive, Block "G", D.L. 127 West 3/4, Plan
(Located on the south side of Hastings Street between Delta Avenue and Springer Avenue)

Mrs. H. Urquhart submitted a letter advising that she supported the rezoning proposal as she felt the property in question was suitable for development with "High-rise" apartments.

The Deputy Clerk advised that, upon receipt of this letter from Mrs. Urquhart, his office had replied and pointed out that the rezoning at hand was not to permit the construction of "High-rise" apartments and that instead, the rezoning would only allow for the establishment of apartments in accordance with the regulations set out under the Residential Multiple-Family Type 1 zone.

- (h) Lots 11 to 13 inclusive, Block 24, D.L. 186, Plan 1124.
(Located at the north-west corner of Cambridge Street and Esmond Avenue)

Planning Director submitted a report on this rezoning proposal plus the following one advising that because his Department had made negative recommendations in respect of both items, no mention was made as to the density of apartment development that should be allowed. He indicated that, in view of the decision made by Council

regarding both items, he was recommending that Multiple Family Type I zoning be applied to the property currently under consideration since this density restricts the building height to approximately that of surrounding dwellings and it is in keeping with two other "lot" zones which were created by Council in this area.

With respect to the other proposed rezoning, he advised that his Department was recommending Multiple Family Type II zoning because it is compatible with the type of zone across the lane from the subject property and also with the development on the west side of 14th Avenue in the same block.

Mr. Robinson, 3757 Cambridge, appeared and stated that he held no objection to the proposed rezoning provided a good standard of apartment development took place on the subject properties.

Mr. D. L. Rinder, 3780 Eton Street, appeared and expressed his opposition to the proposed rezoning because he felt his property would be adversely affected by it. He added that the current application was a case of "spot" rezoning and that he concurred with the views of the Planning Department on the application. Mr. Rinder also suggested that property in the Boundary - Dundas area seemed more suitable for apartment purposes than that presently under consideration.

Mr. A. E. McCarvill, 3790 Eton Street, appeared and advised that he concurred with the views expressed by Mr. Rinder, adding that other owners in the area agreed with him as well. Mr. McCarvill also stated that both the dwelling on, and grounds of, one of the lots under application were in a deplorable condition. He suggested that steps be taken by the Municipality to compel the owner of this parcel to tidy his premises.

The applicant, agent for the owner of one of the properties under application, appeared and stated that he was in agreement with the view that this property was in poor condition but it did lend itself to apartment use. He added that a plan of development could be prepared, if Council and the abutting owners so desired.

Mr. R. MacKenzie, 3786 Cambridge Street, appeared and advised that he was in support of the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Jensen, 3804 Eton Street, appeared and indicated that he was opposed to the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Armstrong of the Planning Department stated that before the site under application could be used for apartment purposes, it would be necessary that the lots be consolidated in order to meet site size requirements of the Town Planning By-law.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL TWO-FAMILY TO RESIDENTIAL
MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE II.

Lot 5 East 22 feet and Lot 6, Block 19,
D.L. 29, Plan 3035.
(Located on the south side of 14th Avenue
approximately 316 feet east of Kingsway)

Mr. C. M. Richards submitted a letter advising that he supported the rezoning proposal. He also elaborated on his reasons for this support.

Mr. D. Kemp and Margaret S. Gibson, part owners of the 44 foot lot immediately abutting the west side of the properties under application, submitted a letter expressing opposition to the rezoning proposal

because their property would be seriously depreciated due to it being "hemmed in" between the parking lot of the Burnaby Hotel and the apartments that would be built on the property under application. They added that an attempt was made to have the applicant incorporate their property with those under application but they met with no success in this regard.

The applicant, Mr. O. Kenzie, appeared and denied the validity of the statement made by Mr. Kemp and Mrs. Gibson in their letter concerning his role in connection with the matter at hand. He also stated that the Burnaby Hotel encroaches on residentially zoned property and a public lane is being used by the Hotel interests as a part of their parking lot. He added that this client did not create the "44 foot lot" situation and that therefore they should not be penalized for it.

Mr. Armstrong explained the regulations in respect of using residential property abutting commercial premises for parking purposes, pointing out that this use is one that is permitted with the express approval of Council under Section 13 of the Town Planning By-law.

Mr. H. Tosseng, 7453 - 14th Avenue, appeared and expressed approval of the rezoning proposal.

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE 1
TO RESIDENTIAL TWO-FAMILY

Lot 19, Block 18, D.L. 68, Plan 1009.
(Located on the north side of Spruce Street,
99 feet east of Smith Avenue).

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.


(4) FROM LIGHT INDUSTRIAL TO COMMERCIAL

Lots 8E $\frac{1}{2}$ and 8W $\frac{1}{2}$, Block 3, D.L. 206,
Plan 1071.
(Located on the south side of Hastings
Street, approximately 216 feet west of
Grove Avenue)

Mr. E. M. Anderson, owner of one of the parcels under application, appeared and expressed approval of the rezoning proposal.

The Hearing then adjourned.

confirmed:


REEVE

Certified Correct:


DEPUTY CLERK