

OCTOBER 22, 1963

A Public Hearing was held into proposed amendments to the Burnaby Town Planning By-law 1948, at the Burnaby Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, on Tuesday evening, October 22nd, 1963 at 7:30 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Councillors Harper, Kalyk and
Cafferky.

His Worship the Reeve explained for the benefit of those of the public who were present the procedures in handling zoning applications at Public Hearings and the subsequent actions in dealing with the appropriate amending by-laws.

The following proposed rezonings were then dealt with:

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TO COMMERCIAL

- (a) Lots 1 to 3 inclusive, Blocks 38/39, D. L. 159, Plan 9355.
- (b) Lots 4 to 7 inclusive, Block 39, D. L. 159, Plan 10608.
- (c) That portion of Block 39 except Plans 9355 and 10608, D. L. 159, Plan 930, lying between the Westerly boundary of Lot 1, Blocks 38/39, D. L. 159, Plan 9355, and the Easterly boundary of Block 38 except Sketch 6927, except Plan 9355, and except Reference Plan 15504, D. L. 159, Plan 930 and North from the westerly projection of the South boundary of the aforescribed Lot 1.

(These properties are located on the South side of Marine Drive from Byrne Road West a distance of approximately 476 feet)

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TO HEAVY INDUSTRIAL

The Northerly portion of Block 39 except Plans 9355 and 10608 and except that part described under Item 1(c) above, D. L. 159, Plan 930, comprising an area of approximately .7 acres.

(This property is located immediately South of those lots described under Item 1 above)

Mr. M. Aaron, 6370 Stride Avenue, spoke as General Manager for the Binns Equipment operation south of Marine Drive advising that Mr. Binns was out of town at the present time and he was acting on behalf of the Company. The Company has been contemplating more buildings on the property for the purpose of a new industrial development

involving the manufacturing of new equipment. It was submitted that the industry will grow to a major industry in the area. The land owned by the Company comprised two and three-quarter acres and was of mixed zoning and if the subject zoning is not granted the use of the property would be split to the detriment of the Company.

Mr. Merritt, 5930 S.E. Marine Drive, spoke as a property owner directly north of the zoning mentioned by Mr. Aaron on behalf of Mr. Binns. By the subject rezoning his property would be rezoned from Residential to Commercial and by his calculations the taxes would increase by \$60.00 for a 66 foot frontage. Mr. Merritt opposed the proposed rezoning of his land to Commercial but was not opposed to the rezoning of the land for industrial purposes to the south.

Mr. Boxer, owner of one of the subject lots at the corner of Byrne Road and Marine Drive, opposed the rezoning of his property from Residential to Commercial on the grounds that the taxes would increase. Mr. Boxer did not express opposition to the Heavy Industrial zoning to the south.

Mr. R. Merritt, 5926 S.E. Marine Drive, echoed the submission of his brother on adjoining property and opposed the rezoning of his property. He was not opposed to the Heavy Industrial zoning to the south.

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TO MANUFACTURING 1

Lot 1 except North 150 feet, Block 1, D. L. 40,
Plan 40, Plan 3043.

(This property is located at the South-west corner
of Government Street and Brighton Avenue commencing
at a point 150 feet South of Government Street)

Mr. W. Wells, 8350 Government Road, expressed opposition to this proposed rezoning on the grounds that the dedication of the south 66 feet of the property to be rezoned for road purposes would be detrimental to his property.

Columbia Trailer Company wrote advising that their firm would be willing to comply with the stipulations laid down by the Council as related in the report of the Planner dated September 20th, 1963.

There were no further representations.

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

(a) Lot 1 except North 20 feet and except South 15 feet,
Block "P", D. L. 127W 3/4, Plan 1254.

(Located at the South-east corner of Hastings Street
and Springer Avenue)

(b) Lot 3, Blocks 55/53, D. L. 33, Plan 1325.

(Located on the West side of Sussex Avenue
approximately 176 feet North of Grange Street)

Mr. J. Holdom, 5232 East Hastings Street, spoke as a part owner of the subject property and supported the rezoning.

Mr. R. Birch, representing Mrs. Wilse, property owner to the south, submitted that he was not necessarily opposed to the rezoning but that difficulties would be caused to Mrs. Wilse by the opening of the lane allowance in that her residence encroaches on the said allowance.

Mr. Holdom submitted that the encroachment was some distance east of the property line of the land under rezoning and that this rezoning would not affect the portion of lane to which Mr. Birch referred.

There were no further representations.

(5) FROM RESIDENTIAL TWO-FAMILY TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE II

The Northerly parts of Lots 5 and 6, Block 46, D. L.'s 151/3, Plan 7157.

(These parcels are located on the South side of the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority right-of-way immediately adjacent a portion of the Easterly limit of a site occupied by the Maywood School)

There were no representations for or against this rezoning.

(6) FROM LOCAL COMMERCIAL TO COMMERCIAL

Lot 1, S.D. 4/5, Block 2, D. L. 206, Plan 19158

(Located at the North-east corner of Kensington Avenue and Curtis Street)

Mr. R. E. Erhart, 4245 East Pender Street, spoke as representative of the Faith Lutheran Church on the corner of Kensington and Curtis, objecting to the proposed rezoning on the grounds that the development would not improve and may deteriorate land in the future.

Mr. P. Murphy, 6503 Dunnedin Street, read a petition signed by 38 property owners in the general vicinity, protesting the proposed rezoning for Commercial purposes for the erection of a service station on the grounds that the development would reduce property values in the vicinity.

Mr. Murphy advised further that the property under application faced his home and had been an eyesore for approximately four years. The property had been used as a dumping ground. Several applications had been made for residential zoning which was favoured in the area and it was hoped the Council would agree to such rezoning. Small children reside in the area and the service station development would create a hazard to their safety. Mr. Murphy submitted that there were eight service stations within less than a mile from the subject site and that the area otherwise was adequately served with shopping facilities.

Mr. Murphy also read a letter from T. F. Annan opposing the rezoning on the grounds that the area was adequately served commercially at the present time and the proposed development would depreciate residential properties in the area.

Mr. Dainbridge, agent for an investment company, 935 East Broadway, opposed the rezoning on the grounds that the proposed development would be detrimental to three properties which their Company was in the process of developing at the present time which were in the immediate area of the proposed development.

Mr. McMillan, 6295 Napier Street, spoke as a property owner and owner-operator of a service station in the general area, submitting that the development of a service station would be detrimental to the area which was already adequately served with service stations and would also depreciate residential properties in the area.

Mr. McMillan also spoke as a representative of the Automotive Retailers Association and gave statistics on the number of service stations existing in the Municipality at the present time, indicating that Burnaby was well served generally speaking.

Mr. McCrachen representing Gamma Finance Company - the applicants for the rezoning - submitted that the property had been held by the Company since 1957 and that considerable expense had been incurred over the years and that their Company would suffer a great loss if the property was not rezoned, more than some of the other people within the area. Funds had been spent on arrangements for the commercial development which, it was submitted, would be compatible to surrounding residences. Mr. McCrachen submitted that he also was an owner of a service station in the general area and that he was not concerned with the number of stations, being a believer in free trade. It was admitted that the property was an eyesore and money had been spent slashing the brush and generally tidying up the property but further improvements were needed. It was proposed that the development would be suitably landscaped.

Mr. West, 6533 Dunnedin Street, spoke as a resident immediately across from the subject property submitting that there were good homes in the area which would be depreciated by the proposed development.

Mr. N. H. Thompson, 6565 Curtis Street, spoke opposing the rezoning on the grounds that the proposed development would not be in the best interests of the school children from adjacent schools.

Mr. Cook, 6605 Napier Street, opposed the rezoning on the grounds that the service station would be detrimental to the safety of the children in the area. Mr. Cook favoured rezoning of the property for Residential purposes.

Mr. R. Brown, 6540 Dunnedin Street, opposed the rezoning and favoured Residential zoning for the property. Mr. Brown submitted that this area was relatively close to the Simon Fraser University which would generate other development in the surrounding areas and that it was felt this proposed Commercial block would be detrimental to the area generally and to the whole of the Municipality in the future.

Mr. McNeil, 6534 Curtis Street, agreed with the other speakers and opposed the proposed rezoning.

Mrs. L. Perry, 6563 Dunnedin Street, opposed the rezoning and concurred with the other expressions made concerning residential development.

Mrs. Cavers, 6551 Curtis Street, opposed the rezoning and favoured Residential zoning of the property.

Mr. D. Bennett, 6575 Curtis Street, opposed the proposed rezoning and favoured Residential zoning.

Property owner at 6558 Dunnedin, opposed the rezoning and favoured Residential zoning.

Mr. Mudry, 6566 Dunnedin, opposed the rezoning and favoured Residential zoning for the property.

Mr. DeFazio, 6543 Dunnedin, opposed the Commercial zoning and favoured Residential zoning.

The Clerk brought forward two telegrams; one received from the Automotive Retailers Association of Burnaby, strongly opposing any additional service station outlets in Burnaby at this time until population warrants same.

Secondly, Fred Crowhurst, Shell Service, submitted a protest telegram of any rezoning of the area at Kensington and Curtis on the grounds that the general area was already served by nine service stations.

A plan of the proposed development was also laid before the Hearing as submitted by the Gamma Finance Company.


The proposed amendment to Sections 9C and 9D of Burnaby Town Planning By-law 1948 to require that all categories of Multiple Family zones provide on-site parking facilities on the basis of one parking space for each dwelling unit was presented to the Hearing by His Worship the Reeve.

There were no representations for or against this proposed amendment.

The Hearing adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:


REEVE


CLERK