

OCTOBER 1, 1962

An Adjourned meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, on Monday, October 1, 1962 at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair;
Councillors Blair, Clark,
Edwards, Harper, Hicks, Kalyk,
and MacSorley

ABSENT: Councillor Prittie

Reeve Emmott presented Miss F. Macdonald with a "Meritorious Achievement" award in recognition of her long and outstanding service as both a Royal Nurse and as a Supervisor of the Victorian Order of Nurses in Burnaby. He added that Miss Macdonald had held this latter position for the past twenty-three years.

Reeve Emmott proclaimed the period between October 7, 1962 and October 13, 1962 as "Fire Prevention Week".

Mr. John Davies, Proprietor of the Central Park Pharmacy, wrote expressing gratitude to the members of the Burnaby Fire Department who successfully contained a fire which occurred in the premises of Aluminum Installation Specialists Limited on September 17, 1962 and, in so doing, completely prevented any damage occurring to his business premises which are located in the same building as the Company.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CLARK:

"That the letter be received and a commendation be extended to those men involved in the subject fire for the manner in which they handled the situation."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CLARK:

"That the Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Reeve Emmott submitted a report recommending that, in the absence of Councillor R. W. Prittie, the Reeve be appointed as the alternate Council representative to the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board of B. C. for the balance of this year.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendation of the Reeve
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MUNICIPAL MANAGER -- REPORT NO. 52, 1962.

- (1) Easements - (a) That portion of Lot 4 shown outlined in Red on a right-of-way plan, S.D. "B", Block 47, D. L.'s 15173, Plan 12308 (Testar).
- (b) The west 10 feet of Lot 18, Block 1, D. L. 149 N $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Plan 1373 (Baker).
- (c) The south 15 feet of Lot 4, Block 2, D.L. 149, Plan 1351 (Watts).
- (d) The north 10 feet of Lot "B", Block "D", D. L. 150 S $\frac{1}{2}$ of N $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Plan 8581 Except the easterly 85 feet thereof (Lutz).
- (e) The south 10 feet of Lot 13, S.D. 2, Block "A", D. L. 149 SE $\frac{1}{4}$, Plan 16262 (Mace and Berry).

The Manager submitted a report recommending that Council authorize the acquisition of easements over the above described properties for the following considerations adding that these easements are required in connection with Phase 3 of the South Slope Sewer project:

- (a) Testar - \$200.00 plus restoration of the easement area
- (b) Baker - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area and a sewer connection.
- (c) Watts - \$50.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
- (d) Lutz - \$152.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
- (e) Mace and Berry - \$30.00 plus restoration of the easement area, including the fences and the clothes line pole.

The Manager also recommended that Council authorize the execution of the documents required in connection with these acquisitions.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the recommendations of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(2) Easement - Portion of Lot "L", D.L.'s 69/70, Plan 24284 (Freeway Developments Ltd.).

The Manager recommended that Council authorize the acquisition of an easement for drainage purposes over that portion of the above described Lot "L" shown on a sketch prepared by David H. Burnett and Associates dated August 30, 1962. He added that there is no consideration payable by the Corporation for this easement since it is being required on subdivision.

He also recommended that Council authorize the execution of the necessary documents.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the recommendations of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(3) Easement - Portion of B. C. Hydro and Power Authority Right-of-Way between McKay Avenue and Silver Avenue.

The Manager recommended that Council authorize the acquisition of an easement over the above described portion of the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority right-of-way to contain a drainage ditch. He advised that the consideration for this easement is \$10.00.

He also recommended that Council authorize the execution of the necessary documents.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendations of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(4) Assessment Error.

The Manager submitted a report prepared by the Municipal Treasurer showing an error discovered in the current Assessment Roll, as follows:

<u>Assessment Roll Number -</u>	6009846
<u>Property Description -</u>	Lot 3, Block 37, S.D. 8, D. L. 159, Plan 5804
<u>Name of Taxpayer -</u>	J. W. & H.B. Edwards, Elrose, Saskatchewan
<u>Incorrect Assessment -</u>	Land - \$3,195.00 Impts.- \$2,540.00
<u>Correct Assessment -</u>	Land - \$2,195.00 Impts.- \$2,540.00
<u>Taxes Imposed Including Penalties-</u>	\$248.63
<u>Correct Taxes -</u>	\$204.78
<u>Overcharge -</u>	\$ 43.85 - Paid

He advised that the owner of the subject property received a notice indicating the incorrect assessment but he made no appeal to the Court of Revision and, therefore, the assessment and tax bill, though legal, are at the same time unjust.

He recommended that Council make application for an Order-in-Council to abate the excess taxes charged.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK:

"That the recommendation of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(5) Financing of Local Improvement Works.

The Manager submitted a report advising that the construction of 97 streets, which were authorized under sixteen separate Local Improvement By-laws, is expected to be completed by December 31, 1962. He provided Council with copies of the Schedules listing the works mentioned.

The Manager pointed out that market conditions are such that it is deemed advisable to proceed with the issue of debentures prior to the completion of the works, an act that is permitted under Section 604 of the Municipal Act.

He provided details of the proposed debenture issue, as follows:

Amount Required -	\$965,330.00
<u>LESS: Return from Senior Governments under Winter Works Incentive Programme -</u>	<u>13,549.00</u>
	\$951,781.00

<u>PLUS: Provision for discount on debentures, expenses of the sale and temporary financing of the works pending sale of the debentures -</u>	<u>48,219.00</u>
	\$1,000,000.00

The Manager recommended that a Debenture By-law be passed to authorize the issuance and sale of debentures totalling \$1,000,000.00 bearing a coupon of 5 3/4% and dated November 15, 1962, maturing serially over the period between 1963 and 1977 inclusive.

He added that the forthcoming session of Parliament may have an effect on the market, in which case the decision to sell debentures at this time might have to be reversed. Notwithstanding, he recommended that the necessary legal formalities be carried out on the assumption that a market can be found for the debentures in mid November.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendations of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6) Debentures - Places of Payment.

The Manager reported that debentures and coupons of this Municipality are redeemable at par as they become due at The Royal Bank of Canada in Burnaby and in nine cities across Canada. He advised that the cost to this Municipality for this service is 1/4 of 1% of the face value of coupons and 1/8 of 1% on the face value of debentures presented in the banking areas of Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal. He added that the cost is increased by 1/20th of 1% on the face value of coupons and 1/10th of 1% on the face value of debentures presented in the other cities in Canada as well as all other places in Canada in which debentures or coupons might be cashed.

He pointed out that most provincial governments in Canada make their debentures payable at par in one or two of the major cities in each province, while the Government of Canada makes its debentures payable throughout the Dominion.

He advised that there is a considerable number of Burnaby debentures in the hands of residents of cities other than the ten mentioned and, if the Bank agreed to permit payment at par of our coupons and debentures at any branch of the Bank in Canada, the holders of the debentures would be relieved of the extra charges while, at the same time, the Municipality would pay no more than it does at present.

The Manager reported that the Royal Bank has expressed willingness to permit par privileges wherever they have a branch in Canada on all future issues of debentures.

Under the circumstances, the Manager recommended that debentures currently being approved by Council, and all future debentures, be endorsed to provide payment at any branch of the Royal Bank of Canada in Canada insofar as where payment is concerned.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the recommendation of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(7) Estimates.

The Manager submitted a report of the Municipal Engineer covering Special Estimates of Work in the total amount of \$6,900.00 recommending that they be approved.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the recommendation of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(8) Junk Yard Application - Lot 16, Block 29, D. L. 124, Plan 3343 (2222 Alpha Avenue).

The Manager reported that an application has been received from Mr. and Mrs. Sigurdson for permission to operate a junk collection business on the above described property. He added that it is proposed to erect an eight foot board fence around the property.

The Manager advised that the proposed use has been reviewed and the following observations have been made:

- (a) The properties to the south on Dawson Street are occupied by a new and used construction equipment sales yard and, beyond this, on the peat lands, lies the Atlas Iron and Metal Works Scrap Yard. The existence of these rather unsightly operations is recognized but it must be recommended that this type of use be confined and not be allowed to spread to the better building land to the north.
- (b) A high quality commercial - industrial complex is developing around the Loughheed - Willingdon intersection. Establishment of ~~the use~~ ^{under application} would have a blighting effect on existing development and would forestall the "filling in" by industrial and commercial developers of a sizeable surrounding tract.
- (c) Dawson Street should ultimately function as an industrial collector street and this, coupled with the proximity of location to the Loughheed Highway, Willingdon Avenue, and the Freeway, should attract to the property a much higher quality of industrial development - possibly a distribution type industry.
- (d) ^{The subject} type of land use, which generally involves only negligible amounts of building, should be confined to marginal peat lands which are adequate for the junk yard type use but not suitable for extensive building without considerable site preparation.

The Manager recommended that the proposed use be denied since the land is capable of a higher use. He added that the amenities of the industrial area should be protected by confining this type of operation to the "bottom" lands rather than the firmer ground on the Slope.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CLARK:

"That this matter be tabled for a period
of one week."

CARRIED
COUNCILLOR HICKS -
AGAINST

(9) Lot 9 E $\frac{1}{2}$, Block 7, D. L. 70 W $\frac{1}{2}$ of E $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 1397 (Genest).

The Manager reported that on January 30, 1962, the Council authorized the acquisition of the above described property, and other lands in the vicinity of Willingdon Avenue and Grandview-Douglas Highway, for a land reclamation project in order to take advantage of land fill which was being made

available from the Freeway construction.

He advised that the owner of the subject parcel, Mr. J. A. Genest, has withdrawn his offer to convey the subject lot for \$500.00 and negotiations for the acquisition of this property have thus far proven unsuccessful.

The Manager recommended that expropriation proceedings be instituted to acquire the lot in question.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the recommendation of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED
COUNCILLOR KALYK -
AGAINST

(10) Janzen Land Exchange and Sewering in D. L. 86 Area.

(a) Janzen Land Exchange

The Manager reported that the tentative subdivision plan for the property owned by Dr. Janzen in D. L. 86 indicated two 90 foot lots, / and that this arrangement was used in calculating the terms of the exchange.

He pointed out that the basis of the exchange was:

Net value of existing property -	\$ 35,470.00
Net value of 5 lots being offered under subdivision -	<u>31,125.00</u>
Difference payable to Dr. Janzen by the Corporation -	<u>\$ 4,345.00</u>

The Manager reported that the actual subdivision plan produced 80 foot lots and that it is therefore necessary to make an adjustment in the exchange. In this regard, the Manager advised that discussions were held with Dr. Janzen, who has agreed to accept an additional 80 foot lot (Lot 15), with the result that the transaction will now be as follows:

Net value of existing property -	\$ 35,470.00
Net value of 6 lots being offered under subdivision -	<u>35,625.00</u>
Difference payable to the Corporation by Dr. Janzen -	<u>\$ 155.00</u>

The Manager recommended that this alteration in the exchange be approved.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the recommendation of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(b) Sewering in D. L. 86 Area.

The Manager advised that progress on the Sperling Avenue portion of the sewer system has occasioned a further investigation as to the desirability of installing dry sanitary sewers in conjunction with the servicing now being undertaken in the D. L. 86 area.

He pointed out that a saving of \$4,000.00 for an expenditure at this time of \$10,200.00 can be achieved and, of possible equal importance, are the facts that:

- (a) It would eliminate the necessity to repair a newly constructed street within a relatively short period after initial construction;
- (b) The sanitary sewer could be placed in the same trench as the storm sewers, thus eliminating a problem of attempting to locate street space for the sanitary sewer.

He added that the estimated cost includes connections to the lots on the "high" side.

The Manager further advised that the Greater Vancouver Sewer Board trunk will end approximately 2,700 feet from the subdivision and it is not proposed to extend this trunk to the subdivision. He also mentioned that the sewerage of D. L. 86 has not been considered a responsibility of the Utility since the subdivision now falls within the same policy as a private subdivision and therefore, it would be logical for the Utility to consider any saving it may be able to achieve.

The Manager recommended that the Sewer Utility proceed with the construction of the subject dry sewer.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK:

"That the recommendation of the Manager
be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The following reports of the Planning Department dealing with applications to rezone were then lifted from the table:

- (1) Application to rezone Lot 12, Block 33, D. L. 30, Plan 3036 - From Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family.

The Department reported that the subject property is located on the north side of 18th Avenue approximately 264 feet east of Mary Avenue and that it has an area of approximately 7,450 square feet.

They further advised that this property is presently occupied by a small frame dwelling in fair condition while other lots in this block are similarly developed, the houses varying in age but generally well kept. The Department pointed out that the lot in question lies within the interior of a uniformly developed area bounded by Kingsway, the Edmonds Street

commercial zone, Edmonds Street School, and Grandview-Douglas Highway; development in this area being predominantly residential single family in character. The Department reported that the application could not be favourably considered since it would be a "spot" rezoning. They added that the possibility of creating a larger zone has been examined but cannot be recommended.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not favourably considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted,"

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(2) Application to rezone Lot 2, D. L. 30, Plan 22919 -
From Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple
Family.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located on the west side of Grandview-Douglas Highway approximately 162 feet north of Edmonds Street and that it has an area of approximately 0.677 acres.

They advised that the applicant desires to erect a garden type apartment on the property.

The Department also reported that the front portion of the property is occupied by a small old house while the rear is vacant. It added that land to the south fronts on Edmonds Street and is part of a commercial zone and property to the north is zoned for residential use, although only half of it has been subdivided. The Department also advised that, with the exception of properties on Edmonds Street and six privately developed lots, the westerly half of the super block bounded by Edmonds Street, Mary Avenue, Rosewood Street, and Grandview-Douglas Highway is occupied by the senior citizens development.

The Planning Department pointed out that in considering any proposed change in land use in the easterly end of the block, the possible effects on the existing land use and subdivision pattern must also be considered. In this regard, the Department pointed out that if the subject property was rezoned, the owners of acreage to the north could reasonably expect the same consideration and this would allow multiple family development to abut new single family homes on Ramsay Avenue, possibly destroying the amenities which they currently enjoy. In addition, apartment development of these large tracts could preclude the continuation of the street pattern which has been started and should be completed.

The Department concluded by advising that it felt the land is appropriately zoned and is capable of normal residential subdivision.

The Planning Department recommended that the application not be favourably considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (3) Application to rezone Lots 3 and 4, S.D. 11/13, Blocks
1 and 3, D. L. 95N - From Residential Two Family to
Residential Multiple Family Type I.

The Planning Department reported that these two lots are located at the south-west corner of Walker Avenue and Elwell Street and they have a combined area of approximately 26,800 square feet.

The Department advised that Lot 4, which is located on the corner, is occupied by two small three room dwellings while Lot 3, the most westerly, is occupied by a large frame dwelling in fair condition. They added that the two other lots in the block are also occupied by older type homes in fair condition while development on the west side of Hall Avenue consists of the Middlegate Apartments and the Shopping Centre. The Department also pointed out that land to the north and south of the subject property is zoned and developed with single and two family dwellings while property on the east side of Walker Avenue and also the east side of Linden Avenue south from Elwell Street to the commercial zone on Edmonds Street is zoned for Multiple Family Type III.

The Planning Department advised that it felt the two subject parcels and the two other lots lying to the west could ultimately be suitable for Multiple Family use and that additional property to the south might also be so used if not required for commercial purposes since the total area along Arcola Street, Balmoral Street, and the south side of Elwell Street between Hall Avenue and Walker Avenue is convenient to good shopping and public transportation, it is occupied by older homes, and it has most of the essential ground services.

The Department pointed out that, at the present time, the enclave described is not served by storm sewer facilities, with the result that it is unable to recommend a change in the land use pattern which could precipitate an expensive drainage problem for the Corporation.

The Planning Department recommended that the subject two lots, and the enclave described be not rezoned, adding that when a storm drainage system is provided in the area, the land use pattern can be reconsidered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (4) Application to rezone Lot "A", Block 18 and also a 210 foot portion of Block 13, Both of D. L. 97 - From Light Industrial to Residential Multiple Family Type II.

The Planning Department reported that the above described properties are located on the east side of Buller Avenue approximately 98 feet north of Beresford Street and that the combined area is approximately 3.248 acres.

The Department advised that the applicant has submitted a preliminary perspective drawing and a brief resume of the proposed development, which indicates that two "E" shaped three storey buildings containing a total of 128 suites are planned.

The Planning Department advised that the properties are occupied by older type frame dwellings and assorted outbuildings, with the majority of surrounding land being residentially developed. They added that the broad swath of land in which the subject property lies (Kingsway Commercial strip, Burnaby South High School, Kingsway - Central Park Line, Royal Oak Avenue) was the subject of considerable discussion in 1959 since it was a part of the area recommended for rezoning in the "Kingsway - Central Park Line" study. The Department pointed out that this area was withdrawn by Council from the overall zoning recommendations and thus remains industrially zoned although the predominant land use is residential. It was added by the Department that when reporting on other rezoning applications in the same swath, it has recommended rezoning to residential but Council has not accepted this approach.

The Department advised that it is still of the opinion that the best land use in this general area is residential and that it was becoming increasingly concerned over the gradual disintegration of the area into an industrial slum. The Department stressed that it must strongly recommend against the creation of a high density residential "island" in the centre of an industrial zone unless Council wishes to consider the rezoning of a much larger area to residential.

The Department advised that, aside from the general zoning pattern, there are several problems which are of concern when considering the application, the first being the adequacy of the school to which children would be required to attend (Windsor School), the second is the problem of an adequate street and lane pattern.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not favourably considered but if a broader zoning change to Residential, as indicated above, could be accomplished to encompass a large portion of the area between Royal Oak Avenue and Burnaby South High School and between Kingsway and the Central Park Line, the current proposal could be viewed in an entirely different light. In this regard, the Department advised that if Council desires to consider a widespread rezoning, a definite recommendation would be forwarded by the Department.

Mr. W. A. Street of Street, Wollen and Promislow, Barristers and Solicitors, submitted a letter requesting the opportunity to appear before Council in connection with the subject rezoning.

Mr. Street appeared and advised that he was representing the

applicant but, since he had just recently been engaged and therefore had not had the opportunity to examine the proposal, he was requesting that the application be tabled for a period of one week or, alternatively, that it be advanced to a Public Hearing.

He did, however, express certain remarks relative to the gist of the recommendations submitted by the Planning Department in regard to the "area" rezoning proposal.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the subject application be tabled
for a period of one week."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (5) Application to rezone Lot "A" except west 99 feet, S.D. 15/18, Block 7, D. L. 171, Plan 8798 - From Residential Two Family to Commercial.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located on the west side of 12th Avenue approximately 613 feet north of Marine Drive and that it has an area of some 8,300 square feet.

The Department pointed out that the applicant wishes to use this property for the sorting and storage of scavenged scrap metal and the like.

The Planning Department advised that the lot in question is occupied by an old dwelling, sheds, numerous piles of junk, and several old cars while land on both sides of 12th Avenue to the south is residentially developed, with three of the houses being of fairly recent construction and the remainder being fairly well kept. They added that 12th Avenue, which terminates at the Stride Avenue Gravel Pit just north of the subject property, is the only developed street in the vicinity and the bulk of surrounding land is Municipally owned although, as yet, it is undeveloped.

The Department pointed out that the property in question lies in a large residential two family zone which extends from 18th Avenue to 20th Avenue and between Marine Drive and 20th Street and, although there is only limited development in this large tract, it is felt the current zoning is appropriate. The Department also noted that a residential subdivision is being initiated on the east side of 10th Avenue.

The Planning Department also pointed out that, knowing the intended use of the property, it would be necessary for the applicant to obtain special permission from Council under Section 13 of the Town Planning By-law to use the property for the storage of junk, a use which could not be recommended by the Department.

The Planning Department recommended that the application for "spot" rezoning be not favourably considered and that the legality of the current non-conforming use be investigated with a view to forcing its discontinuation.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE REEVE DECLARED A RECESS AT 8:45 P.M.

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED AT 8:55 P.M.

- (6) Application to rezone Lot 2, Block 18, D. L. 155A, Plan 1425 - From Residential Two Family Type III to Commercial.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located on the south side of Marine Drive approximately 205 feet west of Willard Avenue and that it has an area of some 0.49 acres.

The Department mentioned that the applicant is also the owner of adjoining property to the west on Marine Drive and the parcel directly south which extends to Meadow Avenue and that it is the intention of the owner to erect a building on the subject lot for the retailing and storage of vegetables grown on his adjacent property.

The Planning Department advised that the two lots owned by the applicant (Lots 1 and 2) are occupied by two dwellings and assorted sheds and greenhouses, and the land lies in the 200 foot wide residential buffer strip on the south side of Marine Drive. It added that to the south of this buffer strip, land is zoned Heavy Industrial and, with only two exceptions, the buffer strip is continuous between Boundary Road and 14th Avenue.

The Department advised that in reporting on similar applications in the past, it has strongly recommended that the 200 foot zone be maintained as a buffer between the industrial land to the south and residential property to the north.

The Department also mentioned that it is understood the warehouse and retail building proposed by the applicant would not be constructed before the next year or so, with the purpose of the building being to provide a seasonal roadside outlet for produce and for storage.

The Department reported that it is not prepared to recommend the "spot" rezoning of the subject Lot 2, which actually would have the effect of reducing the strength of the aforementioned buffer strip but, refusal of the application does not preclude the erection of a building since the applicant can build the warehouse on adjoining property which is industrially zoned. The Department pointed out that since the retail outlet is a seasonal roadside development, it is felt this might be considered by the Zoning Board of Appeal. In this regard, the Department offered the opinion that if such use was allowed by the Board, a small fruit stand would not offend the local amenities and would not destroy the effect or intent of the buffer strip.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not favourably considered and that the applicant consider discussing the matter of erecting a small retail stand with the Zoning Board of Appeal.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(8) Application to rezone Lots 34, 35 and 36, Blocks 42/43, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 1566 - From Light Industrial to Residential Multiple Family.

The Planning Department reported that the above three lots are located on the west side of Sussex Avenue immediately south of the Kingsway - Central Park Line right-of-way and they have a combined area of approximately 26,300 square feet.

The Department advised that the three lots, which are occupied by an old house and a storage shed, fall within the 200 foot wide Light Industrial strip on the south side of the aforementioned Kingsway - Central Park Line. It pointed out that this zone was retained by Council in 1959 when extensive rezonings were recommended in this area but, subsequently, the zone was diminished with the rezoning during the past year of properties on either side of Dow Avenue adjacent the railway tracks.

The Department pointed out that the Multiple Family zone on both sides of Dow Avenue is now fairly well developed and the apartment zone on either side of Sussex Avenue, which extends to within 200 feet of the tracks, is gradually infilling, therefore, the extension of the Multiple Family zone to the tracks would be logical and compatible with the zoning changes which have taken place on Dow Avenue.

The Department advised that it was concerned, when considering the application, with the three residentially developed Light Industrially zoned lots on the east side of Sussex Avenue and also the problem of traffic circulation in this area south of the tracks between Dow Avenue and Telford Avenue. The Department pointed out that although use of the subject land for apartment purposes would be logical (considering development to the south) industrial use of that property on the east side of Sussex Avenue would be grossly incompatible. They advised that these three lots on the east side of Sussex Avenue should also be rezoned if the ones on the west side are.

The Planning Department also reported that, in reviewing the street pattern in this area, it felt Beresford Street south of the tracks should be constructed between Dow Avenue and Telford Avenue. They pointed out that with the exception of the portion west of Sussex Avenue for 133 feet adjacent the subject land, the road allowance exists and will shortly be constructed.

The Department recommended that the north 33 feet of Lot 36 be acquired for road purposes before rezoning is finally considered and also that the portion of Beresford Street between Sussex Avenue and the lane east of Sussex Avenue adjacent the subject property be constructed or a deposit made to cover the cost of building it.

The Planning Department recommended that Lots 34, 35, 36 South 33 feet, 37 except North 33 feet, 38 and 39, Blocks 42/43, D. L.'s 151/3 be rezoned from Light Industrial to Residential Multiple Family Type I, with final rezoning to await the following:

- (a) The dedication of the north 33 feet of Lot 36 for road purposes.

- (b) The deposit of a sufficient sum of money to cover the construction of Beresford Street from the lane west of Sussex Avenue to Sussex Avenue for the purpose of providing secondary access.
- (c) The consolidation of the two 33 foot lots with the adjacent 66 foot lots.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK:

"That the rezoning proposal be referred back to the Planning Department to obtain the consent of the owners on the east side of Sussex Avenue to the proposal advanced."

IN FAVOUR - COUNCILLORS
EDWARDS, KALYK & CLARK

AGAINST - REEVE EMMOTT,
COUNCILLORS BLAIR,
HARPER, HICKS AND
MacSORLEY

MOTION LOST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED
COUNCILLORS CLARK,
EDWARDS & KALYK -AGAINST

- (9) Application to rezone Lot 28, Blocks 55/58, D. L. 33, Plan 1825 - From Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family Type 1.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located on the west side of Booth Avenue 122 feet north of Grange Street and that it has an area of approximately 7,750 square feet.

The Department advised that the subject property is occupied by an old frame dwelling in poor condition and that land to the north on both sides of Booth Avenue is also residentially developed, the quality of housing improving as one approaches the north. It added that land to the south, which fronts on Grange Street, was recently rezoned for Multiple Family purposes and when reporting on this application, the Department informed Council that the Kingsway Commercial zone should ultimately be extended north to Grange Street as the need for land arises, land assembly takes place, etc. The Department pointed out that, in conjunction with this extended commercial zone, it is felt a strip of Multiple Family development should be created on the north side of Grange Street since it would be mutually advantageous to both the commercial and residential interests in this area.

The Department pointed out that the property under application

does not fall in the Grange Street frontage and, if rezoned, it would constitute an intrusion into the residential area and defeat the underlying principle of a buffer or transition strip. It was added that the property in question is not served by a sanitary sewer.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not favourably considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS:

"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (10) Application to rezone Block 21 Sketch 12444 Except Reference Plan 14898, D. L. 35, Plan 799 - From Residential Two-Family to Residential Multiple Family Type I.

The Planning Department reported that this property is situated on the west side of Smith Avenue approximately 245 feet north of Thurston Street and that it has an area of 0.875 acres.

The Department advised that the front portion of the property is occupied by a well kept residence while the rear portion is not utilized at this time. It added that the property is located on the east side of the super block bounded by Boundary Road, Burke Street, Smith Avenue, and Thurston Street and that the root problem confronting this super block is the haphazard pattern of boundary lines. It added that the pattern of ownership, while satisfactory so long as the residents desire a semi-rural setting is not easy to reconcile to an acceptable residential subdivision and this problem is aggravated because there is no apparent agreement between neighbours on the question of when to exploit their properties.

The Planning Department pointed out that, notwithstanding these long standing problems, satisfactory development of the block appears more imminent now than before. The Department advised that a residential subdivision plan has been evolved and a subdivision application is currently being considered involving two key properties on Burke Street through which road access to the block must be obtained. The Department also reported that it is currently examining a development proposal in the west half of the block where the proponent is prepared to provide storm and sanitary sewer services through the entire block.

The Department mentioned that the suggestion for rezoning of the block to Multiple Family use has been made several times recently by the present applicant and other parties. It stressed that any inference that such rezoning would remove the subdivision problems is a hazardous oversimplification since serious utility servicing problems would arise, there is a lack of an internal street and the depth and shape of the existing parcels would create a labyrinth of buildings, and critical delivery, servicing, and fire access problems could be expected. The Department advised that the effect on the surrounding neighbourhood if Multiple Family zoning was

proceeded with would be the overtaking of available and projected park and school facilities, a shortage that would be extremely expensive to correct and could not be justified.

The Department pointed out that its comments in respect of a "block wide" rezoning might not possibly apply if the subject parcel was rezoned but, apart from the usually accepted concern over "spot" rezoning, use of the parcel in question for apartment purposes would frustrate the further subdivision and development of the block, a situation which would likely be compounded by other owners who could expect to seek the same opportunity.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not approved.

Mrs. B. Bradley, the applicant, submitted a letter advising that her application was a little premature, although it was her desire to bring the development problem involving the super block before Council on behalf of all the owners concerned.

Her letter also contained certain remarks regarding the development of the subject super block and concluded by advising that, in light of these remarks and due to recent proposals for development of the super block, a reapplication for rezoning would be submitted later.

Mrs. Bradley and three other owners in the subject super block were present and Mrs. Bradley explained the situation in respect of the development problems confronting the area in question.

She also suggested that the sewer and drainage problem in this area could be overcome by extending an easement a short distance and by extending the sanitary sewer from the apartment now under construction in this area.

She also presented a letter sent to her by the Sewers Engineer of this Corporation dated March 1, 1962 relating the situation regarding the sewer situation in her area.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CLARK:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (11) Application to rezone Lot 63, R.S.D. "A"/"C", S.D. 8/10, Block 1, D. L. 74S $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 21308 - From Local Commercial to Residential.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located on the south side of Grandview-Douglas Highway approximately 280 feet north-west of Laurel Street and that it has an area of approximately 5,400 square feet.

The Department advised that this lot is vacant and is one of five which forms a small Local Commercial zone on the south side of Grandview-Douglas Highway west of Royal Oak Avenue.

It added that the subject property is the westerly limit of this zone, the adjacent lot is residentially developed as are all other lots to the west, except the one on the corner of Grandview-Douglas Highway and Westminster Avenue. The Department further reported that land to the north and south is both zoned and used residentially, the houses to the south being of better quality, while two adjacent properties to the east, which are also zoned as Local Commercial, are vacant and the two lots at the east end of the block are occupied by small stores.

The Planning Department pointed out that this Commercial zone has existed for some time but has experienced only limited development. It also pointed out that the five lots mentioned, together with four on the east side of Royal Oak Avenue north of Laurel Street and two bounded by Grandview-Douglas Highway, Schou Street, and Royal Oak Avenue form the only commercial zone on the Highway between Willingdon Avenue and Sperling Avenue. The Department suggested that while this general area will ultimately require increased commercial facilities, it is felt these facilities could be better located to a position where intensive development would not precipitate traffic problems. The Department advised that it is currently conducting a study of existing commercial facilities in the Municipality and, once the inventory is complete, it may be that the subject zone should be considerably reduced and a new one created in a better location.

The Planning Department recommended that the rezoning of the subject lot from Local Commercial to Residential Two Family be advanced for further consideration.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(12) Application to rezone Lots 1 to 5 inclusive, Block 3,
D. L. 119 E $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 2855 - From Residential Two Family
to Commercial.

The Planning Department reported that these lots are located at the south-east corner of Buchanan Street and Rosser Avenue and they have a combined area of approximately 40,200 square feet.

The Department advised that the westerly four of the five lots are vacant, with the fifth being occupied by an old frame dwelling and further, an open watercourse traverses these properties. It added that all other occupied properties in the immediate vicinity are similarly developed, with the dwellings varying in age and condition. The Planning Department pointed out that the subject five lots lie in a small pocket bounded by Halifax Street, Willingdon Avenue, the commercial zone fronting on the Lougheed Highway, and Rosser Avenue, with land in this area being zoned Residential Two Family.

The Department pointed out that when reporting on several rezoning applications in this area in recent years, it has indicated that the optimum use of land in this enclave should be commercial and it has been suggested that this enclave is

strategically located, with the result that its commercial use could have resounding effects on the street system and amenity of the surrounding area. The Department pointed out that it has recommended in the past that rezoning should not take place until land is assembled, suitable plans of development are submitted, and an adequate street system exists. It mentioned that the subject properties cover approximately one-quarter of a block and, if properly designed and sited, a commercial development could be constructed which should not frustrate the overall development of the aforementioned enclave. The Department added that further zoning changes in this area should not be considered until assembly takes place and suitable development plans are submitted.

The Planning Department recommended that the rezoning of the subject five lots be not advanced at this time but ^{that} the applicant be informed that favourable consideration would be given the rezoning if:

- (a) The five lots in question were consolidated into one parcel.
- (b) A firm undertaking was given that the adjacent lane would be constructed to Municipal standards.
- (c) A firm undertaking was given that the watercourse traversing the property would be enclosed to Municipal standards.
- (d) A suitable plan of development was submitted, including setbacks, off-street parking facilities, etc.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS,
 SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS:

"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (13) Application to rezone Lots 4 and 5 Central 33 feet, Sketch 2905 and also Lots 4 and 5 East 33 feet, Block 13, D. L.'s 115/186, Plan 1236 - From Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family.

The Planning Department reported that the above property is located on the south side of Pender Street approximately 180 feet west of Gilmore Avenue and that it has a combined area of approximately 8,050 square feet.

The Department advised that the land is presently occupied by an old frame dwelling in fair condition while other properties in the block on both sides of Pender Street are similarly developed, the homes being roughly of the same age but the condition of them varying from one lot to the other. It added that the properties lie within a large Residential Two Family zone which is interrupted only in the two blocks west of MacDonald Avenue where land on the south side of Pender Street is zoned for Multiple Family purposes and, although the zones have existed for some time, higher density development has not taken place, the only apartment building being one on the north side of Pender Street between MacDonald Avenue and Ingleton Avenue.

The Department reported that it was unable to recommend the

"spot" rezoning of the subject site to Multiple Family use in this homogeneously developed residential area. It added that since there is zoned land available in the two blocks to the west (where lot sizes are more suitable) it is felt these blocks should be occupied before any further apartment zoning is considered in the area.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not favourably considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (14) Application to rezone Lots "B" and "C", S.D. 1/2, Block 9, D. L. 186, Plan 18407 - From Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family Type I.

The Planning Department reported that these lots are located on the south-east corner of Boundary Road and Dundas Street and they have a combined area of approximately 12,200 square feet.

The Department advised that the northernmost lot is occupied by an older type dwelling, recently repaired, while the southernmost lot is vacant. It added that adjacent property on the east is occupied by a new dwelling and both properties to the south are occupied by well kept dwellings as are most of the other residences in this area.

The Department pointed out that property on the north-east corner of Boundary Road and Dundas Street is occupied by a new apartment block, the site having been rezoned in 1960.

The Department advised that it is felt now, as it was in 1960, that those properties fronting Boundary Road south to Hastings Street possess some of the amenities and facilities desirable for higher density residential use but, as adjacent and surrounding lots are occupied with dwellings in good condition whose present amenity and value would be depreciated by apartments, rezoning of the "strip" would be premature.

The Planning Department reported that it was unable to recommend the "spot" rezoning of the subject property nor the creation of a larger zone extending south along Boundary Road.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (15) Application to rezone Lots 11 and 12, Block 24, D. L. 186, Plan 1124 - From Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family Type I.

The Planning Department reported that these lots are located

at the north-west corner of Cambridge Street and Esmond Avenue and they have a combined area of approximately 12,200 square feet.

The Department advised that the subject lots are presently occupied by an old two-storey dwelling in fair condition, although the grounds are poorly maintained. It added that adjacent and surrounding development is similar, the houses varying in age and condition but generally well kept.

The Department pointed out that virtually all lots in this area are residentially developed and therefore consideration of the application would in fact be a "spot" rezoning.

The Planning Department recommended that the application be not favourably considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the recommendation of the Planning
Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(18) Application to rezone Lot 1 Except Sketch 12927, Block 2, D. L. 216, Plan 11055 - From Local Commercial to Residential Multiple Family.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located at the north-west corner of Pandora Street and Barnet Road and it has an area of approximately 0.39 acres.

The Department advised that this lot is vacant and, on the west side of the unopened lane allowance, another vacant parcel, also zoned Local Commercial, exists. It added that beyond this to the north and west are seven residentially developed lots which front on Inlet Drive and Ridge Drive while immediately to the north of the subject property is a service station with frontages on both Ridge Drive and Barnet Road. The Department also pointed out that the north-west and north-east corners of the Barnet - Pandora intersection are commercially developed and a large block of land south of Pandora Street between Barnet Road and Inlet Drive is zoned for Commercial purposes and is occupied by a variety of commercial enterprises.

The Department expressed the opinion that, at the present time, the local shopping needs appear to be adequately served by the Westridge Shopping Centre and also the Sperling - Hastings commercial complex and, though there may ultimately be a need for a larger commercial area, the subject lot is insufficient in size for this purpose nor are the nine single lots on the south side of Pandora Street.

The Department opinionated that the subject property plus the vacant lot to the west (Lot 35, Block 2, D. L. 216, Plan 11555) could be used for Multiple Family purposes without affecting the amenities of the surrounding area and further, since adequate commercial facilities are available and apartment use of this land plus that on the south side of Pandora Street could provide a suitable transition between the residential land to the north and the commercial land to the south, it is felt consideration should also be given the

rezoning of properties on both sides of Pandora Street.

The Planning Department recommended that the rezoning of the subject Lot 1 Except Sketch 12927 and also the Lot 35 mentioned from Local Commercial to Residential Multiple Family Type II be advanced for further consideration, with final approval to await a satisfactory resolution of the lane allowance between the two properties.

The Department further recommended that the rezoning of Lots 6 to 11 inclusive, S.D. "A" and "D", Block 1, D. L. 207, Plan 13300 (south side of Pandora Street) from Commercial to Residential Multiple Family Type II be also advanced for further consideration, with final approval to be conditional upon the construction of the lane at the rear of the properties and the consolidation of the six lots into one parcel later to be subdivided into sites of suitable size.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY:

"That the first recommendation of the
Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the second recommendation of the
Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(19) Application to rezone Lot "A", Block 1, D. L. 43, Plan 10061 - From Residential Single Family to Residential Multiple Family.

The Planning Department reported that this property is located at the south-west corner of Loughheed Highway and Lozells Avenue and it has an area of approximately 1.99 acres although the westerly 65 feet is restricted by a Sewer Board easement.

The Department pointed out that the applicants desire to erect a 30 suite garden type apartment, with suitable landscaping of the natural watercourse which travels along the western boundary of the property.

The Department advised that when first reporting to Council on the Government Road - South Burquitlam area rezonings, it recommended that residential zoning be considered for the Loughheed Highway frontage between Bainbridge Avenue and Lozells Avenue, with the possibility of low density Multiple Family development being suggested as a reasonable land use refinement. The Department added that in the report submitted in November 1959, the Loughheed Highway frontage was recommended for Industrial zoning but it was ultimately determined that the land use on the south side of the Highway between Bainbridge and Lozells Avenue should be residential. The Department advised that it was suggested then that some segments of this strip might be suitable for very low density Multiple Family accommodation which, if properly designed, could be quite

compatible with surrounding residential development and could provide a suitable transition between the Single Family area and the Highway.

The Department reported that it is felt the subject property could be developed with such an accommodation (approximately 15 suites per acre) without affecting the residential amenities or the development of adjacent properties since the site is topographically and physically separated from the residential area of which it is a part. It stressed that this Multiple Family accommodation is acceptable only so long as the density remains as proposed, which is approximately 2,900 square feet of site area per suite because, if the density were increased, the development would lose its residential character and could become incompatible with surrounding Single Family development of recent construction. It added that access should not be permitted from the Loughheed Highway but rather from the local streets to the south.

The Department advised that it favoured the use of the property in question for a type of low density development but it is concerned that rezoning for even Residential Multiple Family Type III (1,800 square feet of site area per suite) is not adequate protection from the overuse of the site.

The Department suggested that if Council is favourably disposed the property not be rezoned but instead the "bungalow court" provision under Section 13 of the Town Planning By-law be used. The Department pointed out that, under this Section, a Public Hearing is not necessary but, notwithstanding, it suggested the residents of the area be given an opportunity to express an opinion on the development proposed.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MacSORLEY,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KALYK:

"That the suggestion of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Council directed that all residents in the "Willows" Subdivision be notified of the subject development proposal, as well as those who would normally receive notice.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the Committee now rise and report."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HARPER:

"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That leave be given to introduce
"BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DEBENTURE
BY-LAW NO. 2, 1962"
"BURNABY ROAD CLOSING BY-LAW NO. 3, 1962"

and that they be read a First Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the By-laws be now read a Second
Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the Council resolve into Committee
of the Whole to consider the By-Laws."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the Committee rise and report
the By-laws complete."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the report of the Committee be
now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EDWARDS,
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That "BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DEBENTURE
BY-LAW NO. 2, 1962"
"BURNABY ROAD CLOSING BY-LAW NO. 3, 1962"
be now read a Third Time."


CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting then adjourned.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:


REEVE


CLERK