

DECEMBER 8, 1969

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B. C., on Monday, December 8, 1969, at 6:30 p.m. to receive representations in connection with the following proposed amendments to "Burnaby Zoning By-law 1965".

PRESENT:

Mayor R. W. Prittie in the Chair;
Aldermen Clark, Dailly, Herd,
Ladner (7:20 p.m.), and McLean;

ABSENT:

Aldermen Blair, Drummond and
Mercier;

HIS WORSHIP, THE MAYOR, first explained the procedure which Council was required to follow in connection with rezonings, and also its policy insofar as advising owners of property abutting the land under application. He also explained the purpose of a Public Hearing and suggested the desired method for the public to express its views in regard to the proposed amendments.

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

(a) Reference RZ #34/69

- (i) Lots 13/14/15, S.D. 18, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95N, Pl. 1880
- (ii) Lot 18, S.D. 17, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95N, Plan 1414

(7007 - 7025 - 7041 - 7057 Balmoral Street -- Located on the North side of Balmoral Street from a point 132 feet West of Salisbury Avenue Westerly a distance of 264 feet)

Mr. Parker MacCarthy, 7652 Clayton Court, first spoke and requested that Item (b) on the Agenda, Rezoning Reference No. 52/69, be dealt with at the same time as the properties under application were adjoining and both proposed for rezoning to the Multiple Family Residential District (RM3) category. He also indicated that he was the applicant and agent in both instances.

It was felt that each application should be dealt with separately, but the comments offered would also be considered when dealing with the application to follow.

With the permission of the Chair, Mr. MacCarthy then distributed material related to both applications. (SECRETARY'S NOTE: A copy of the information distributed is attached to and forms a part of these minutes.)

Mr. MacCarthy then advised that the two sites under application fell within the area designated by the Apartment Study for future apartment use, and in determining what is considered for future apartment use he submitted that economics should govern this factor. In support of this view he drew attention to the information presented, and noted that portions of the two blocks immediately South of those under application, categorized for immediate apartment development,

accommodated good standard single family dwellings, and it would likely be some time before apartment development could take place economically." Mr. MacCarthy then spoke of the assessed values of the subject properties, both land and improvements, and noted that the total represented approximately half of the value of those properties just referred to.

Mr. MacCarthy then expressed the opinion that because of the economic factors existing, the properties he represented were ready for immediate apartment development.

To a question put by a member of Council, Mr. MacCarthy advised that he was unable to say whether the apartments proposed for the two sites were designed for family accommodation.

(b) Reference RZ #52/69

- (i) Lots 6, 7, 8 and 9, R.S.D. "A", S.D. 19/20, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95N, Plan 1264
- (ii) Lots 10 and 11, Block "A", D.L. 95, Plan 1264
- (iii) Lot 17, S.D. 17, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95, Plan 1414
- (iv) Lots "A" and "D", R.S.D. 16/18, S.D. 18, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95N, Plan 12331
- (v) Lot "B", S.D. 16/18, Block 18, D.L. 95, Plan 12331
- (vi) Lot "C", S.D. 16/17, Block 18, D.L. 95, Plan 12331

(6950 - 7064 Elwell Street inclusive -- Located on the South side of Elwell Street from a point 132 feet West of Salisbury Avenue Westward a distance of approximately 462 feet)

It was noted that the views of the previous speaker, and those that may wish to speak to the application now under consideration, would apply equally to both Items (a) and (b) of the Agenda, Rezoning Applications No. 34/69 and 52/69.

Mr. P. F. Archer of 6975 Elwell Street, an abutting owner, expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning on the grounds that the apartment development would devalue his property. He also expressed the view that the present parking problem would be even greater, and that the proposed development would take away from the privacy that he presently enjoyed.

Mr. M. E. Horning, 7021 Elwell Street, also opposed the application and concurred in the remarks made by the previous speaker.

Mr. E. Rutka, 6995 Elwell Street, also expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. H. A. Carnes, 6940 Elwell Street, speaking for the five property owners located between the site on the South side of Elwell Street and Griffiths Avenue, expressed concern as to the future prospect of their homes, three of which were comparatively new, in the event the application was successful.

Mrs. M. Holm, 6965 Elwell Street, on being advised that Elwell Street represented the most Northerly limits of the area designated for immediate and future apartment development, expressed concern that those on the North side of the street would face onto apartments, and submitted that the demarcation line should be along the lane.

(c) Reference RZ #75/69

Lots 3 to 10 inclusive, Block 41, D.L. 30, Plan 3036

(7418, 7424, 7432 Nineteenth Avenue, 7365, 7385 Humphries Avenue and 7425, 7419, 7411 Eighteenth Avenue -- Located between Eighteenth and Nineteenth Avenues South-West from Humphries Avenue a distance of approximately 280 feet)

Mr. D. Maaren, 7457 - 19th Avenue, speaking on behalf of his father, advised that both were vehemently opposed to the proposed rezoning if it was not possible to improve the difficult parking situation already existing on the street. He indicated that if sufficient off-street parking were provided to cater for the proposed apartments then they would have no objection.

Mr. A. T. Moss, 7419 - 19th Avenue, then spoke and agreed with the views expressed by the previous speaker. He also indicated that if the properties on the North side of the street were not of sufficient size to accommodate apartment development then he would oppose the proposal for this additional reason.

He was advised that apartment sites could be assembled from the properties on the North side of 19th Avenue.

Mr. J. E. S. Thompson, 7412 - 19th Avenue, advised that whilst he was not opposed to the proposed rezoning, he was highly concerned about the parking situation and was against any further development that would add to the problem.

Relative to the concern expressed to the parking situation, the requirements of the By-law as pertaining to apartment development were explained. It was also pointed out that the real problem was in getting the tenants of apartments to use the parking provided.

Mr. A. E. Armstrong, 7386 Humphries Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning and concurred in the views expressed by Mr. Maaren and Mr. A. T. Moss.

Mr. G. H. Moss of 7429 - 19th Avenue, also indicated his opposition to the proposal if the parking problem was not satisfactorily resolved, and 19th Avenue at this point brought up to a standard that would safely carry the vehicle and pedestrian traffic using the street.

Mr. B. Miller on behalf of the developers, advised that off-street parking would be provided under the proposed building. He was also of the understanding that parking would not be charged for and taken care of through the rents.

The feasibility of making this factor a condition of rezoning was raised, but the Planning Director considered that this would have to be a matter for a separate agreement, and expressed the view that it would likely be difficult to enforce.

Dec/8/1969

Mr. G. M. Steinbeck, 7425 - 19th Avenue, then spoke and also expressed concern to the parking problem. He also indicated concern for the future of their properties on the street, and whether or not apartment development would be feasible.

The Planning Director advised that the Department had been encouraging people in the area bounded by 19th Street, Edmonds Street, Humphries Avenue, and Kingsway, to consolidate for apartment development.

Alderman Ladner arrived at 7:20 P.M.

In view of the interest expressed in the matter, His Worship, The Mayor, suggested to those who were concerned that an approach be made to the Planning Department where information may be obtained as to the proposed future use of the subject area.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4)

Reference RZ #77/69

Lots 2 and 3 except part on plan with By-law 30078, D.L. 94, Plan 440; - that portion 105 feet in depth North from a line parallel to and situate 125 feet North of Kingsway

(5633 - 5677 Kingsway -- Located on the North side of Kingsway midway between Elgin Avenue and Dufferin Avenue with a frontage on Kingsway of 262 feet)

Mr. L. T. Davies, 6590 Elgin Avenue, wished to know who had applied for the rezoning and for what purpose it had been requested.

The Planning Director advised that the application had been submitted by the owner, and would provide for an extension of the already existing commercial zoning of the site to bring it into line with the commercial use permitted on the adjoining Kingsway properties.

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO PARK AND PUBLIC USE DISTRICT (P3)

Reference RZ #79/69

Lot 50, D.L. 53, Plan 32413

(Vacant property located between Nineteenth and Eighteenth Streets North of 14th Avenue with an area of 2.63 acres)

Benjamin Moore & Co. Limited, abutting property owners, submitted a letter and indicated that no objections were offered to the proposed rezoning.

No one spoke to this application.

(4) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2)

Reference RZ #70/69

Lot "B", Block 2, D.L. 69, Plan 3691

(3785 Myrtle Street -- Located on the North side of Myrtle Street between Esmond and Smith Avenues, having an area of 2.2 acres)

Dec/8/1969

Mr. A. A. Metcalf, 3826 Myrtle Street, spoke at some length to the parking problems on the street, where residential and industrial development co-existed.

He also complained strongly about the standard to which the road was developed and particularly about the drainage ditches on the street.

He further expressed concern as to the requirements for the disposal of sewage and submitted that it was already a problem in the area.

Mr. Metcalf concluded by stating that the proposed development would compound greatly the problems the residents and users of the street and area were faced with, and out of sheer desperation opposed the application.

The Planning Director indicated that one of the prerequisites of rezoning was a submission, by the applicant, of suitable evidence that sewage can be handled on the site until sewer service is available.

Mr. J. Lahm, 3808 Myrtle Street, also expressed his opposition to the application and concurred in the views expressed by the previous speaker.

Mr. G. W. Jackson of Jackson Scaffolding Ltd., speaking on behalf of the application, submitted that the operation of their business on the property should not aggravate the problems referred to, as adequate space was available on the site for the required parking, and that they would do what was necessary to take care of the sewage disposal.

(5) FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C2) TO SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4)

Reference RZ #76/69

Parcel "B", Ref. Plan 15504, Block 38, D.L. 159, Plan 930

(5730 Marine Drive -- Located on the South side of Marine Drive from a point approximately 776 feet West of Byrne Road, Westward a distance of 201 feet with an area of .5 of an acre)

No one appeared on this rezoning application.

(6) FROM HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M3) TO PARK AND PUBLIC USE DISTRICT (P3)

Reference RZ #80/69

Lot 18, D.L. 155C, Plan 1138

(Located on the Southerly side of Meadow Avenue between 12th Avenue and 14th Avenue, with a frontage of 260 feet, an average depth of 818 feet and an area of 4.88 acres)

No one spoke to this application.

The Hearing adjourned at 7:42 P.M.

Confirmed:

Certified correct:

Robert W. Little
MAYOR
GM/hb

J. Thaw
CLERK

[illegible]

29/15 pm 10:50 by 521931x3

Spiraea alba

1947-1948

Kingsway

Middleburg

B. 9/17/02

417025

9211115

1872
1873
1874

St. Johns

	75,500	
	31,700	

*Subject Property in
Future Expansion Area*

75,500
31,700
107,200 a'

Baltimore

15,840		
43,560		

Immediate use 1984

15,840
43,560
102,760 a'

ARCOLA

43,560		

Kingsway

ASSESSED VALUES OF AREA DESIGNATED FOR INDUSTRIAL USE.

BLOCK C - Arcola - South Side

	<u>land</u>	<u>Impr.</u>
N $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 and 2	\$ 4270	\$ 7760
SE of 1 and 2		7165
3	4165	5240
4	4165	2427
5	4165	11,345
6)	5070	9965
7)		
8	4165	6830
9	4165	12,250
10	5970	9835

BLOCK D - Arcola - North Side

12	4410	12,625
13	4410	13,165
14	4410	6435
15	4410	12,960
16	4410	2460
17	4410	13,030
18	4410	12,015
19	4410	12,015
20	4410	7115
21)		
22)	3320	6325

BLOCK B - Balmoral - South Side

A	6005	15,005
1	4410	9360

\$ 92,440	\$195,253	\$ 594,5
-----------	-----------	----------

ASSESSED VALUES OF AREA COVERED BY SUBJECT APPLICATIONS.

BLOCK A - Balmoral North Side

13	\$ 6720	\$ 4800
14	6320	7185
15	6320	7830
18	6325	5440

BLOCK A - Elwell - South Side

6	4445	6850
7	4445	-
8	4445	2885
9	4445	-
10)		
11)	6370	6060
A	5380	5840
B	5380	6415
C	5380	7960
D	5380	7960
17	6455	5400

\$ 77,410	\$ 74,605	\$ 150,015
-----------	-----------	------------