

APRIL 25, 1967

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, Burnaby 2, B.C., on Tuesday, April 25, 1967, at 7:30 p.m., to receive representations in connection with the following proposed amendments to "Burnaby Zoning By-Law 1965":

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair;
 Councillors Dailly, Herd, Hicks
 and Lorimer

ABSENT: Councillors Blair, Corsbie,
 Drummond and McLean

HIS WORSHIP, REEVE EMMOTT, outlined the procedure which Council follows in connection with rezonings, including the purpose of a Public Hearing. In addition, he suggested the desired method for the public to express its views in regard to the proposed amendments. He emphasized that the object of a Public Hearing was for the members of Council to listen to opinions given and not to make decisions.

A. PROPOSED REZONINGS

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ONE (R1) TO GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2)

Reference RZ #31/67

- (a) Lot 14, D.L. 10, Plan 26451
(b) Lot "F", Explanatory Plan 13626, Blocks "E" & "A", D.L. 10, Plan 3321

(Located in the area bounded by Government Street, Brighton Avenue, Lougheed Highway and the Westerly limit of Gagliardi Way, this limit being approximately 1,350 feet East of Brighton Avenue)

Mrs. I. D. Raymer, 8434 Government Street, wrote indicating her opposition to the rezoning and expressing the opinion that the area would be better developed residentially. She cited, in support of her opinion, the nuisance already being experienced by the residents of the area by the noise emanating from the Columbia Trailer development.

Mr. L. Ramsey, 3567 Brighton Avenue, spoke and expressed his opposition to the rezoning. He also indicated his concurrence with the views expressed in Mrs. Raymer's letter. He urged that Council take the wishes of the residents of the area into account when dealing with the application.

As a result of a question from Mr. Ramsey, the Planning Director outlined the uses permitted under the M2 zoning category. He also provided some comparisons with the type of uses permitted under Heavy Industrial Districts (M3).

Mr. Ramsey then made reference to the Community Plan proposals for the Government Road - South Burquitlam District of the municipality that were adopted by Council in 1959. When he suggested this Plan indicated that land West from Keswick Avenue was shown as residential, the Planning Director advised that the Community Plan provided for the future use of the subject property as Manufacturing.

Mr. I. Raymer, 8434 Government Street, then spoke and expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning. He suggested that what had been acceptable in 1959 under the Community Plan was, due to changing conditions and circumstances, perhaps not appropriate now. He added that the residential character of the area should be taken into consideration by Council.

Mr. Raymer also stated that, as Gagliardi Way is destined to travel through the area, industrial development adjacent to it would present an undesirable impression to visitors and others using this Highway.

He further remarked that industrial development in the area should be confined to land South of the railway.

Mr. Raymer suggested too that a buffer be provided between the creek traversing the property in question and Brighton Avenue in order to minimize the incompatibility of the industrial and residential development.

Mr. J. J. Phiopen, 6750 Cariboo Road, enquired as to when his property would be rezoned. He indicated that he was not opposed to the rezoning proposal at hand if his property was to be likewise rezoned.

Mr. Phippen was advised that, while the situation mentioned by him could be appreciated, any rezoning of his property was not contingent upon the proposal now under consideration.

Mr. C. S. Bourne, 3527 Brighton Avenue, next spoke and expressed concurrence with those who were opposed to the rezoning.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (R2) TO GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2)

Reference RZ #54/67

The South 40 feet of the North 60 feet of all property lying on the South side of Lougheed Highway between Springer Avenue and the intersection of Douglas Road and Lougheed Highway.

Mr. W. B. Walling, 2190 Douglas Road, appeared and stated he was speaking on behalf of all the property owners whose land was involved in the proposed rezoning in support of the proposal. He outlined some of the difficulties that the property owners had experienced as a consequence of the dual zoning of their properties.

Mr. Walling reiterated some of the points which he had made in an earlier submission to Council when the rezoning proposal was initially considered.

Mr. Walling also suggested that, while the owners regarded the proposal at hand to be superior to that which currently exists, it was considered that it would be even better if the 20-foot strip that would remain was rezoned in the same fashion unless it was only intended to serve as a setback, and there would be no problems with the Department of Highways when the owners endeavoured to gain access from the Lougheed Highway for industrial developments.

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (R2) TO INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT (P1)

(a) Reference RZ #13/67

Lot 91, D.L. 83, Plan 28684

(Located at the South-West corner of Chapple Crescent and Gilpin Street)

No one appeared in connection with this proposal.

(b) Reference RZ #44/67

Lots "A" and "B", Block 14, D.L. 83, Plan 18867

(Located on the North side of Gilpin Street from a point approximately 44.5 feet East of Mahon Avenue Eastward a distance of 114 feet)

The owner of the property, Mr. S. Christie, and five others, submitted a petition opposing the rezoning proposal. They expressed their concurrence with the Planning Department's recommendation that the "spot" rezoning of the properties should not be favourably considered.

Mr. B. Marr, Architect, spoke on behalf of his client, Mr. N.P.S. Schiml, who, he explained, held an interim agreement to purchase the property, subject to it being rezoned to the Institutional District (PI) category.

He expressed consternation that the owner of the property was opposing the rezoning proposal, especially when he (the owner) had entertained the agreement mentioned.

Mr. Marr advised that it was proposed to build a Day Care Centre, which would be very similar to a school.

He indicated that the structure envisaged would, in appearance, be similar to that of a house and be quite compatible with the type and class of homes in the surrounding area.

Mr. Marr also submitted that the Day Care Centre was similar in nature to a kindergarten. In support of his contention that such development was quite compatible with residential land use, he pointed out that Council had rezoned other property in the municipality to Institutional when it was located in close proximity to residential development.

Mr. Marr also presented a letter from Mrs. B. W. Raine, 5758 Gilpin Street, in which she expressed support for the rezoning proposal.

(4) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (RM3)

(a) Reference RZ #1/67

Lots 3 to 10 inclusive, Block 26, D.L. 32, Plan 7911

(Located at the North-West corner of Royal Oak Avenue and Irving Street)

The applicant, Gilley Real Estate Limited, submitted a letter advising that their clients were prepared to satisfy the prerequisites that Council established in connection with the rezoning proposal.

(b) Reference RZ #9/67

Lots 30 and 31, Block 49, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 1936

(Located at the North-East corner of Imperial Street and Silver Avenue)

The applicant, Mack Realty Company Limited, wrote and indicated that the prerequisites Council established for the rezoning would be satisfied.

(c) Reference RZ #12/67

Lots 1 and 2, R.S.D. 2, S.D. 11/13, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95N, Plan 1796

(Located at the South-East corner of Balmoral Street and Hall Avenue)

The applicant, Gateway Realty Limited, wrote and advised that the prerequisites to the rezoning would be satisfied.

(d) Reference RZ #26/67

Lots 2 to 7 inclusive, Block 26, D.L. 32, Plan 7911

(Located on the North side of Irving Street from a point 150 feet West of Royal Oak Avenue Westward a distance of 300 feet)

Mr. C. H. Morgan, 5055 Irving Street, spoke and stated that, though he was not really opposed to the rezoning, he was concerned about the possible adverse effect the rezoning might have on his property. In elaboration, he explained that, if his property was to be rezoned in a like manner, and he was, in addition

Apr/25/1967

to being required to dedicate land (12 feet) for the widening of Newton Street, also asked to dedicate approximately 18 feet off the West side of his property for the widening of Marlborough Avenue, this would leave him with a site that might not be sufficient in size for apartment development.

The Planning Director was requested to furnish Council with a report on the point mentioned by Mr. Morgan.

(e) Reference RZ #27/67

Lots 1 to 4 inclusive, S.D. 35, Block 49, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 4513

(These lots extend between the North side of Imperial Street and the South side of Maywood Street approximately midway between Silver Avenue and the intersection of Maywood Street and Imperial Street)

The applicant, Canada Trust, wrote indicating acceptance of the prerequisites established by Council in connection with the rezoning.

Mr. T. E. Gatland, 4376 Maywood Street, appeared and advised he was the owner of the Lot 5 that was to be consolidated with the subject properties. He enquired as to whether his property would be rezoned back to Single Family from the Multiple Family zoning category which he now enjoyed if the prerequisites were not satisfied within the time prescribed by Council.

Mr. Gatland was assured that this would not be the case and that, in any event, any rezoning could only be made by Council fully complying with all the provisions contained in the Municipal Act governing rezoning.

(f) Reference RZ #35/67

(i) Lots "D" except E. 105 feet; "D" $E\frac{1}{2}$ of E. 105 feet;
"DW $\frac{1}{2}$ " of E. 105 feet, all of Block 48, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 8659

(ii) Lots 23 and 24 except East 10 feet, Block 48, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 1437
(Located at the North-East corner of Imperial Street and Willingdon Avenue)

MacCarthy Agencies Limited, the applicant, submitted a letter advising that the intending developer was prepared to satisfy the prerequisites to the rezoning.

(g) Reference RZ #38/67

Lots 10 and 11, R.S.D. 2, S.D. 11/13, Blocks 1 and 3, D.L. 95, Plan 1796

(Located on the North side of Arcola Street from a point 132 feet West of Walker Avenue Westward a distance of 132 feet)

Mr. E. F. Schmidt, 7277 Arcola Street, spoke and stated that he was in favour of the proposed rezoning, providing he or other adjacent owners were not charged for the servicing prerequisites connected with the rezoning proposal under consideration.

He was informed that these conditions only affected the owner of the property covered by the application. He was also advised that Council could not impose charges of the kind in question without the assent of the persons involved.

Miss F. N. Cochrane, 7235 Arcola Street, spoke and expressed her concurrence with the views held by Mr. Schmidt.

(5) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R5) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3)

Reference #51/67

(a) Parcel "A" Explanatory Plan 5733, S.D. 27, Block 6, D.L. 153,
Plan 1768

(b) Lot 28, Block 6, D.L. 153, Plan 1768

(Located at the North-West corner of Hazel Street and Sussex Avenue)

The applicant, Beedie Construction Company Limited, wrote seeking further information regarding the prerequisites to the rezoning, particularly in respect of the costs involved.

Mrs. R. K. Conway, 4653 Hazel Street, spoke and indicated that she favoured the rezoning, providing sufficient off-street parking was provided. She advised that parking on Hazel Street was creating a serious problem and consideration should be given this matter before Council approved the application.

The Planning Director pointed out that the plans for the proposed development provide for off-street parking facilities.

Mrs. R. MacPhaden, 4611 Hazel Street, enquired as to the intended use of the property.

On being advised that it was proposed to construct an office building on the site, she asked what other uses were allowed under the zoning regulations.

The Planning Director then recited the uses permitted under General Commercial District (C3).

Mrs. MacPhaden expressed the opinion that, whilst it would be very desirable to have an office building of the type indicated, she did not want to see a service station or any other automotive development located on the site.

(6) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) AND COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C2) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3)

Reference RZ #50/67

(a) Lot 1 Sk. 6692, Block 24, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2001

(b) Lot 1 except Pcl. "A", Expl. Plan 6692, Block 24,
D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2001

(c) Lot 2 S.33 feet, Blk. 24, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2001

(d) Lot 2 except S. 33 feet, Blk. 24, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2001

(e) Lots 3 to 6 incl., Block 24, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2001

(f) Lots 28 and 29, Blk. 24, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2001

(g) Lots 30 to 32 incl., Blk. 24, D.L. 152, Plan 2001

(h) Lot 1 except Filing 65298, Blk. 25, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2000

(i) Lot 2 except Pcl. "C" Explanatory Plan 9064, Blk. 25, D.L. 152, Plan 2000

(j) Lot "C" Expl. Plan 9064, S.D. 2 and 3, Blk. 25, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2000

(k) Lot "A", Blk. 25, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 6387

(Located within the area between the West side of Nelson Avenue and the East side of Fern Avenue from a point approximately 200 feet South of the junction of Nelson Avenue and Fern Avenue Southward along the West side of Nelson Avenue a distance of 537 feet, and from a point approximately 245 feet South of the same junction along the East side of Fern Avenue Southward a distance of 332 feet)

Mrs. M. K. MacFarlane, 6507 Lilly Avenue, spoke and expressed approval of the proposed rezoning.

(7) FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C1) TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5)

Reference RZ #40/67

Lot 1, Block 2, D.L. 130, Plan 11990

(Located at the South-East corner of Broadway and Holdom Avenue)

Mr. E. Kravitz, the applicant, urged that Council approve the rezoning because the development proposal for the site was the best possible land use.

(8) FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C1) TO GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2)

Reference RZ #3/67

Lot "C", S.D. 2B and 3, Block 1, D.L. 77, Plan 13194

(Located on the South side of Lougheed Highway from a point approximately 150 feet West of Sperling Avenue Westward a distance of 511 feet)

Mr. J. Condon, 6861 Hastings Street, spoke and expressed his approval of the proposed rezoning.

(9) FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C1) TO INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT (P1)

Reference RZ #8/67

Lots 5 and 6, Block 4, D.L. 68, N.W. part, Plan 980

(Located at the South-East corner of Laurel Street and Boundary Road)

The applicant, the Reverend J. O. Carson, wrote and indicated that they were prepared to comply with the prerequisite to the rezoning, but would delay action on the matter until after the Public Hearing.

(10) FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C2) TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (RM2)

(a) Reference RZ #152/66

Lots 3 and 4 except Plan 15900 AND Lot 5, all of S.D. "A" and "D", Block 1, D.L. 207, Plan 13300

(Located at the South-East corner of Pandora Street and Inlet Drive)

R. E. Elliott Construction Limited, the applicant, wrote and advised that they were prepared to satisfy the prerequisites to the rezoning.

Mr. J. Wyman, 7169 Maureen Crescent, representing the Lochdale Ratepayers' Association, spoke and made reference to previous objections that had been registered when a similar rezoning proposal was being considered for the Crescent Auto Court property.

He asked:

- (a) are plans for the proposed development to be submitted for Council's approval as a condition of the rezoning?
- (b) how many suites are intended to be built?
- (c) are the three lots to be developed in conjunction with the apartment proposal for the Crescent Auto Court site?
- (d) are all the objections raised by the Lochdale Ratepayers' Association last year in connection with the "Crescent Auto Court" rezoning proposal being borne in mind by Council?

The Planning Director advised that the developer was not being required to produce development plans for approval by Council.

He also mentioned that the next rezoning proposal on the Agenda involved property adjacent to the Crescent Auto Court site, and the prerequisite to that rezoning was that the land be consolidated with the Crescent Auto Court property.

The developer stated that it was planned to erect 20 apartment suites on the property.

His Worship pointed out that this Hearing was not the last place people could make representations in regard to rezoning proposals. He explained that Council still has to consider By-Laws covering the rezonings and can, at that time, entertain further submissions.

Mr. A. Goy of the Lochdale Ratepayers' Association, spoke and enquired as to whether an architect had been employed to prepare plans of the proposed development.

The Planning Director advised that the developer had retained the same Architect that had been employed for the Crescent Auto Court site.

The developer stated that apartment proposal for this property would be very similar in appearance to that being built on the Crescent Auto Court property.

He added that a development plan had been submitted to the Municipality already.

(b) Reference RZ #24/67

That portion of Lot 5 except Plan 15900, S.D. 1, Blocks 1 and 2, D.L. 207, Plan 4032, lying East of Inlet Drive

(Located on the East side of Inlet Drive immediately North-East of the lane North-East of the intersection of Hastings Street and Cliff Avenue)

Mr. A. Goy again spoke and stated that virtually the same points of concern mentioned in connection with the previous item applied to this one.

Mr. Goy then made reference to the future development of Hastings Street into a four-lane highway as an entrance to the Simon Fraser University. The specific suggestion from Mr. Goy was that, because this road will be one of the access routes to Simon Fraser University, arrangements should be made to provide boulevard treatment for the centre of the road.

It was appreciated that the subject property does not abut any portion of the proposed road. However, since this property is to be developed in conjunction with the Crescent Auto Court land and this site touches a part of Hastings Street, the view was expressed that perhaps the developer should be required to dedicate a portion of this site for the eventual widening of Hastings Street if this extra width is deemed necessary to accommodate the boulevard treatment mentioned earlier.

The Planning Director was asked to offer his views on the aforementioned proposal and whether the future creation of the connecting road mentioned should be borne in mind when considering all the ramifications relating to the development of apartments on the Crescent Auto Court side and the adjoining subject Lot 5.

Mr. Wyman again spoke and once more made reference to the past opposition to the rezoning of the Crescent Auto Court site. He reviewed the points made at that time and suggested that the same conditions which were imposed then be attached to the proposal at hand, especially the one involving the submission of suitable development.

He also stated that the Lochdale Ratepayers' Association would be opposed to the intrusion of apartment development into residential areas.

(11) FROM SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4) TO SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (S4)

Reference RZ #15/67 -- Lot "A", Block 18, D.L. 943, Plan 22437
(Located on the South side of Grimmer Street from a point 226 feet West of Kingsway Westward a distance of 133 feet)

No one appeared in connection with this rezoning proposal.

(12) FROM SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4) AND RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5)
TO INSTITUTIONAL (P1)

Reference RZ #32/67

Lot 7, D.L. 34, Plan 849

(Located on the North side of Kingsway from a point 124.6 feet West of Patterson Avenue Westward a distance of 124 feet)

Mr. D. C. Hoskins, 5607 Patterson Avenue, spoke and advised that he had no objection to the rezoning proposal but wished to know the extent of the conversions and additions that were to be made to the existing structure.

The Planning Director displayed a plan which indicated that the additions were not were not extensive in nature.

It was pointed out too that the building was intended to be used as a church, which would include normal ancillary uses.

(13) FROM MANUFACTURING DISTRICT (M1) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3)

Reference RZ #47/67

(a) Lots 1 and 2, S.D. "A", Block 11, D.L's 151/3, Plan 5989

(b) Lot 4, Block 11, D.L's 151/3, Plan 1191

(c) Lot "A" except South 200 feet, Block 12, D.L's 151/3, Plan 3384

(d) Lot "D", except N. 16.5 feet and except South 200 feet, Block 12, D.L. 153, Plan 3384

(e) Lot "C", except South 200 feet, Block 12, D.L. 153, Plan 3384

(Located on the South side of Kingsway between Willingdon and Kathleen Avenue)

Dominion Stores Limited, the owner, submitted a letter in support of the rezoning proposal.

Mr. T. Nield, 5925 Kathleen Avenue, spoke and enquired as to the future use that was intended for the six remaining lots at the South-Westerly corner of Kingsway and Kathleen Avenue.

The Planning Director advised that he considered the best use for this property was high density commercial development such as is allowed under the General Commercial District (C3) zoning category.

The Planning Director also outlined the uses permitted under Manufacturing District (M1).

(14) FROM SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2) TO GASOLINE SERVICE STATION DISTRICT (C6)

Reference RZ #36/67

Lot 24, D.L. 78, Plan 26566

(Located at the North-East corner of Sperling Avenue and Lougheed Highway)

Mr. F. G. Moore of Standard Oil Company, owner of the subject property, spoke and advised that the purpose of the rezoning was to merely make the use currently being conducted on the property conforming.

D. PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT

It is proposed that the term "Grain Elevators" be deleted from Section 403.1(13) and replaced by the words "Cargo Handling and Wharf Facilities".

Mr. J. Haig de B. Farris, representing Goodwin-Johnson, Ltd., spoke and expressed his support of the proposed amendment.

The Hearing adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Confirmed:

[Signature]
R E E V E

Certified correct:

[Signature]
C L E A R K