THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

JANUARY 9, 1970

MR. H. W. BALFOUR MUNICIPAL MANAGER

Dear Sir:

RE: VILLA MONTECITO (LAKEWOOD VILLAGE)
PHASE 1 - 153 UNITS

In response to a request from the developer of the above project to change 56 three-bedroom units in Phase 1 to two-bedroom units, this Department presented three possible alternatives to the Council in a report dated December 15, 1969.

These alternatives were as follows:

- (1) Require the developer to build to the plan which was presented to Council and the Public Hearing and which became a part of the bylaw. This approach would require that the developer alter those suites which are being readied for occupancy.
- (2) Accept the 16 three-bedroom suites which have been altered to two-bedroom and require the developer to build the remaining 40 of the suites to the plans originally approved by Council. This approach would require a Public Hearing and Bylaw Amendment for the 16 suites altered.
- (3) Accept the change of all 56 three-bedroom units to two-bedroom units as requested. This approach would require a Public Hearing and Bylaw Amendment for the whole Phase 1 of the project.

At their meeting of December 22, 1969, Council resolved to advance to a January 12 Public Hearing the matter of changing 16 three-bedroom units to two-bedroom units, and deferred until its January 12 meeting the question of the 40 remaining suites.

Following discussions with the developer, this Department would propose a fourth alternative for the consideration of Council.

In this alternative, the developer has agreed to leave unchanged the overall two and three-bedroom count in Phases 1, 2 and 3 by replacing the 56 three-bedroom units changed in Phase 1 with a similar number of redesigned three-bedroom units in Phases 2 and 3.

This alternative recognizes that the existing three-bedroom units have some design deficiencies, and in assuming that there will be a market for an improved three-bedroom apartment. retains the original suite-mix.

In agreeing to this alternative, the developer wishes to reserve his right to approach the Department at any time in the future if necessary to further discuss Phases 2 and 3.

I would suggest that this report be read at the January 12 Public Hearing, and if Council concurs with the fourth alternative, that this Hearing be taken to cover all 56 three-bedroom units in Phase 1.

It will then be necessary for the developer to present revised proposals for Phases 2 and 3, incorporating this change before Development Permits could be issued for these phases.

Respectfully submitted,

A. L. Parr,

HIPAN

Planning Director.

ALP/has

c.c. Municipal Clerk