

FEBRUARY 2, 1970

An adjourned meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B. C. on Monday, February 2, 1970 at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor R. W. Prittie in the Chair;  
Aldermen Blair, Clark, Dailly,  
Drummond, Ladner, Mercier, Herd  
and McLean;

MOVED BY ALDERMAN CLARK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:

"That the Item on Page 29 of the Minutes of the January 19, 1970 meeting pertaining to a request of His Worship, Mayor Prittie, involving his attending the opening of the British Columbia Legislature, be amended by deleting the resolution shown and adding the following:

HIS WORSHIP also requested that he be authorized to undertake any business of the Corporation deemed necessary which will involve travel beyond the municipality and that he be entitled to receive the normal expense allowances for such trips.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN CLARK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:

"That His Worship, Mayor Prittie, be authorized to undertake any business of the Corporation that is deemed necessary and which will involve travel beyond the municipality, including the attending of the opening of the British Columbia Legislature this month, and he be entitled to the normal allowances, including the per diem rate, for such trips."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:

"That the Minutes of the meeting held on January 26, 1970 be adopted as written and confirmed."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \*

#### DELEGATIONS

- (a) Brentwood Dodge Ltd., Carter Pontiac and Butterworth Moving and Storage, submitted a letter requesting an audience with Council relative to the parking regulation under Section 13(5) of Burnaby Street and Traffic By-law 1961.

- (b) Mr. W. H. L. Rogers submitted a letter requesting an opportunity to address Council on the matter of using his property for apartment purposes.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:  
"That the two delegations be heard."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(a) Mr. L. Bonar of Brentwood Dodge Ltd. appeared on behalf of the Company and the other two mentioned in his letter to request that the parking regulation under Section 13 (5) of the Street and Traffic By-law not apply to vehicles associated with the operations of the three companies.

He and a colleague provided the following reasons in support of the request:

- (a) Some of their customers wished to obtain their vehicles in the early morning before business starts and, to accommodate these people, their vehicles have been parked on Alpha Avenue.
- (b) Though Brentwood Dodge Ltd. has off-street parking facilities, the vehicles there are guarded at night by two dogs. The Company found that the use of watchdogs was the most effective deterrent against theft which was occurring frequently. These dogs are within a fenced compound.
- (c) Moving traffic on Alpha Avenue between 1:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. is virtually non-existent so the presence of parked vehicles on the side of the road causes no problems.
- (d) Lately, some of the vehicles which were parked on Alpha Avenue have been towed away. When the vehicles were missing, it was suspected that they had been stolen. The R.C.M.P. was contacted and it was then that they were aware the vehicles had been towed away because they were violating the aforementioned parking regulation.
- (e) All vehicles which have been parked on Alpha Avenue are within 200 yards of the property of the Companies.

*Upon being asked, the Municipal Engineer stated that the R.C.M.P. had been asked to enforce the subject parking regulation after complaints were received about vehicles being parked on Alpha Avenue from residents in the area.*

*During consideration of the request from Mr. Bonar, a suggestion was made in Council that perhaps the Companies concerned could make an arrangement to use the Brentwood Shopping Centre property for the parking of vehicles that are to be obtained at the times the businesses of the three Companies are closed.*

Feb/2/1970

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:

"That the submission from the three Companies represented by Mr. Bonar be referred to the Traffic Safety Committee for consideration and recommendation."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(b) Mr. W. H. Rogers then appeared in connection with his problem concerning the use of his property for apartment purposes.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:

"That Item 6 of Report No. 7, 1970 of the Municipal Manager, which deals, in part, with the subject of Mr. Rogers' presentation, be brought forward for consideration at this time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6) Undevelopable apartment sites under Zoning By-law

The Planning Department has reported as follows on the abovesubject:

- (a) The Zoning By-law text amendments recommended in the Apartment Study 1969 report became effective on January 1, 1970 after Council approved them.
- (b) Included in these amendments, which introduced higher standards as a means of improving the quality of development in apartment areas, was a substantial increase in the minimum lot area and width requirements in the RM3 Districts.
- (c) As a result of these changes, a number of properties zoned RM3 could no longer experience apartment development.
- (d) This is the situation involving Mr. and Mrs. Rogers.
- (e) The Council, as a result of receiving the complaint from the Rogers, directed the Planning Department to indicate possible means of resolving the problem involving all the lots which were affected by the aforementioned text amendments.
- (f) One possibility which was examined was the granting of relaxations by the Board of Variance. However, the Municipal Solicitor subsequently expressed his opinion that the Municipal Act does not provide the Board of Variance with the necessary power for the granting of such relaxations.
- (g) It was then decided to examine all of the affected properties (32 in number) in detail with the object of determining their development possibilities on an individual basis, and to make recommendations aimed at alleviating the problems.

This has been done and the results are set out in an attached report.

- (h) 14 of the properties located within apartment zones created in 1956 had, due to their size and location, no potential for apartment development even under the standards which existed prior to the recent text amendments. In these instances, the attached report contains suggestions as to alternative possibilities for development.
- (i) In the case of eight other properties, their inclusion in future development schemes for other apartment categories (RM4, RM5) has been proposed.
- (j) Council approval of the proposals covering the twenty-two properties mentioned under Points (h) and (i) will provide the Planning Department with a guide to the future development of each of the affected parcels.
- (k) In addition, there are ten properties which had an apartment development potential under the 1965 regulations. This was removed by the recent text amendments.

In these cases, the accompanying report proposes that apartment development be permitted under the 1965 standards.

In order to accomplish this, it was being recommended that the effective date of the Amendment By-law dealing with the changes in the text be extended to January 1, 1972 for the ten properties in order to allow time for development to take place under the former RM3 standards.

The accompanying report to which reference is made above contained the following particulars as they concern the ten properties mentioned under Point (k) above, one of which is owned by Mr. and Mrs. Rogers:

- (1) Lot 8, Except Plan 22210, Block "G", D.L. 127W3/4, Plan 1254

This Lot had a full potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

The owner of Lot 10 of the same Block has applied for preliminary plan approval for an additional twelve suites in the apartment on the property.

Lot 8 is situated in an area designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

*It was being recommended that the owner of the Lot 8 in question be allowed to develop it to the 1965 RM3 standards.*

- (2) Lot 33, Block 42, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 1566

This lot had a potential for RM3 (two-storey) development under the 1965 By-law.

Consolidation of the lot with adjacent properties is unlikely in the near future.

The lot is situated in an area that has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

*It was being recommended that the owner of the property be allowed to develop it to the 1965 RM3 standards.*

- (3) Lots 6, 19, and 21, all of Block 29, D.L. 152, Plan 1292  
Lots 3, 8 and 9, Sketch 9886, and Lot 31, all of Block  
30, D.L. 152, Plan 1520  
Lots 15 and 16, Block 31, D.L. 152, Plan 1209

The six lots described above in Blocks 29 and 30 had a potential for two-storey RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

They are designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

The sites are relatively small, and to develop according to 1965 standards would be consistent with the scale of the neighbourhood.

*It was being recommended that the owners of these six properties be allowed to develop them to the 1965 RM3 standards.*

Lots 15 and 16, as described above, had a potential for RM3 (two-storey) development, if consolidated first.

They are under one ownership.

They are situated in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

*It was being recommended the the two lots be consolidated and allowed to develop according to the 1965 By-law.*

Mr. Rogers then spoke and first stated that allowing him until January 1, 1972 to develop his property under the 1965 RM3 regulations was certainly better than the situation which exists at this time. He added that his preference would be that the date be extended until some time in 1974 when he expects to be in a position where he will no longer require his dwelling to the same extent as he does now because his family will be "off his hands".

Mr. Rogers also remarked that he has had to appeal his property assessment every year because of the situation whereby his land is zoned RM3 and yet he cannot use it for that purpose. He indicated that, last year, the assessment of his property was reduced by \$4,000.00 as a result of his appeal.

*The Planning Director stated that the Municipal Assessor was submitting a report to the Court of Revision this year in regard to the matter at hand after Council renders a decision in connection with the situation covered in the report of the Planning Department now under consideration.*

Feb/2/1970

MOVED BY ALDERMAN CLARK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

"That the development, for RM3 purposes, of the properties described above in the report of the Planning Department be allowed under the regulations which were in effect when Burnaby Zoning By-law 1965 was enacted, until January 1, 1972."

\* \* \* \*

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:

"That all of the below listed Original Communications be received."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Manager, I.C.I. Department, Macaulay, Nicolls, Maitland & Co. Ltd. submitted a letter expressing appreciation to Mr. Lyall Armstrong of the Planning Department for attending the January Staff Luncheon Meeting of the Company and providing information pertaining to the land development situation, as it concerns the Planning Department, in Burnaby.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

"That a copy of the letter from the Company be forwarded to the Planning Department for the attention of Mr. Armstrong."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Secretary, B.P.O. Elks, South Burnaby Lodge No. 438, wrote to request permission to hold a Tag Day in the municipality on Saturday, May 23, 1970.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CLARK:

"That permission be granted to South Burnaby Lodge No. 438 to conduct its campaign on the date indicated."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman, Moccasin Miles, Resources for Native Progress Association, submitted a letter requesting permission to use certain streets in the municipality when conducting its programme: "Moccasin Miles" from the Vancouver City Hall to Hope Village Park between April 3rd and 5, 1970.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"That permission be granted to the Association to conduct the activity mentioned at the time indicated and along the route outlined in its letter, subject to:

(a) the approval of the R.C.M.P.

(b) the Provincial Department of Highways having no objection to the use of the arterial highways in Burnaby which are involved."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman, The Consulate Club, wrote to request permission to hold a Car Rally on various streets in the municipality on Sunday, February 15, 1970.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN CLARK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

"That permission be granted to the Club to conduct its Rally at the time mentioned and along the route outlined in its submission, subject to:

- (a) The approval of the R.C.M.P.
- (b) The Provincial Department of Highways having no objection to the use of the arterial highways in Burnaby which are involved."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman, Burnaby-New Westminster Summer Games Committee, submitted a letter:

- (a) Outlining the programme planned by the Canada Games Committee in preparing a submission in support of hosting the Canada Summer Games.
- (b) Requesting that both the Municipality of Burnaby and the City of New Westminster each contribute \$1,000.00 to cover the interim operating expenses of the Committee.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CLARK:

"That authority be granted to contribute \$1,000.00 to the Burnaby-New Westminster Canada Games Committee for the purpose outlined in the letter from the Chairman of the Committee."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"That the previous motion be amended by adding the following:

"and it be recommended to the Committee that the Mayors of the two municipalities involved be appointed as interim trustees of the funds which the Committee will collect because the practice of appointing trustees, such as indicated, is a common one and is regarded as being business-like when dealing with the raising of funds like that planned by the Committee."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A vote was then taken on the original motion, as amended, and it was Carried Unanimously.

Secretary, Public Utilities Commission, submitted a letter:

- (a) Indicating that the Commission has been made aware of a resolution of Council regarding a proposed increase in rates for electricity.

Feb/2/1970

- (b) pointing out that the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority is a crown corporation whose electric operations are not subject to the regulatory authority under the Public Utilities Act.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:

"That a letter be sent to the Honourable W. A. C. Bennett, as Premier and Minister of Finance, urging that the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority be summoned to appear before the Public Utilities Commission, at a Public Hearing, to justify the proposed increase in electricity rates; and further, the three members of the Legislative Assembly representing Burnaby, the Union of B. C. Municipalities and the City of Vancouver be notified of this request of Mr. Bennett."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairman, Fraser Valley Mosquito Control Board, wrote to:

- (a) Explain why he felt there was justification in the Board authorizing him to attend Conferences in Portland and Hawaii.
- (b) Advise that, because the Council of Burnaby was opposed to any delegate from the Board attending the Conference in Hawaii, he has cancelled his reservations for both Conferences.

ALDERMAN DAILLY LEFT THE MEETING.

Mr. H. Airth of the B.C. Vocational School Student Council forwarded a submission requesting the assistance of Council in endeavors to have the Provincial Government not levy a fee for parking on the grounds of the B. C. Vocational School and the B. C. Institute of Technology.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:

"That the B. C. Vocational School Student Council be advised that the Municipal Council does not regard the subject of the presentation to be a matter of concern to the municipality and therefore the Municipal Council will not participate in the cause because the dispute between the Provincial Government and the B. C. Vocational School Student Council is a matter for resolution between themselves."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMEN DRUMMOND AND  
McLEAN

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



TABLED ITEM

The following matter was then lifted from the table:

Proposed lane in Block 101, D.L. 132, Plan 1493 (McLean)  
SUBDIVISION REFERENCE #129/68

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:

"That Item (2) of the Municipal Manager's Report No. 7, 1970, which deals with the subject of the Tabled item, be brought forward for consideration at this time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ALDERMAN DAILLY RETURNED TO THE MEETING.

(2)

Policy- Lanes in Subdivisions

The Approving Officer has submitted the following report in connection with the matter at hand:

- (a) The following suggestion, which was made at the Council meeting on January 19, 1970, is contrary to the established policy that was instituted by Council on September 14, 1964:

"That, where an owner is subdividing his property and is required by the Approving Officer to provide a lane at the rear of the property and along one or more sides and is required to pay for the paving of such lanes, he should be exempted from paying for the cost of paving more than one of the lanes."

- (b) Wherever a required service benefits the property being subdivided, the application of the aforementioned 1964 policy is considered justified.
- (c) In the case of Mr. McLean's subdivision, the lane pattern has been established for many years and the ultimate completion of the lane to the pattern intended will definitely benefit Mr. McLean's entire property.
- (d) As reported earlier, the value of the five feet required from Mr. McLean's property for lane purposes plus the estimated construction cost of \$1,200.00 is less than if Mr. McLean had been required to dedicate ten feet for lane and pay half the construction costs.
- (e) Flanking lanes are not uncommon in Burnaby and have been required in numerous subdivisions in recent years. In each case, the developer was required to provide all such lane allowances and construct them, where feasible, or deposit an amount in trust for future construction. Although the policy in effect at the time the 15-foot allowance was dedicated for lane purposes from the land lying immediately East of Mr. McLean's property did not require a deposit for future lane construction, it is felt that the amount of \$1,200.00 plus the value of the land involved is not an unfair requirement.

Feb/2/1970

- (f) The matter of attempting to have the cost of flanking lanes shared by several owners has been reviewed and the conclusion reached that there is no practicable way of achieving this. Any cost sharing would therefore need to be borne by the Corporation. The taxpayers of the municipality should not, through general revenue, pay for services that directly benefit one particular subdivision on which the developer stands to realize a fair profit.
- (g) It was therefore being recommended that the existing policy be confirmed and that the payment of \$1,200.00 for the construction of the lane involved in Mr. McLean's subdivision remain a requirement for final approval.

*During consideration of the foregoing, the following suggestions were made in Council:*

- (1) *Perhaps the policy followed in Local Improvements whereby no one is required to pay for more than 66 feet of any work which is undertaken by the municipality should be applied in the case of paying for the cost of lanes created by subdivisions.*
- (2) *The flanking lane in question may not be necessary because those abutting it do not require the lane for access to their properties.*
- (3) *Perhaps all that is required is an easement instead of a dedicated lane allowance.*
- (4) *The reference in the report from the Planning Department to the "fair profit" aspect should be deleted.*
- (5) *Because Mr. McLean is dedicating only one quarter of the total lane allowance involved, he should only be charged one quarter of the cost of paving the lane.*
- (6) *Perhaps the existing policy should be maintained, except in cases where three lots or less are to be created and a lane flanking the property is dedicated.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:

"That Mr. McLean dedicate the land required by the Approving Officer for the flanking lane and the matter of requiring him to pay for the cost of paving that lane, or depositing a sum for its paving in the near future, be waived."

IN FAVOUR -- ALDERMEN MERCIER  
AND HERD

AGAINST -- ALDERMEN BLAIR, CLARK,  
DAILLY, DRUMMOND,  
LADNER AND McLEAN:

MOTION LOST

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CLARK:

"That the subject matter of the report from the Planning Department be tabled for one week in order to allow Alderman Ladner an opportunity to prepare a report on a proposal that the existing policy in respect of lanes in subdivisions be maintained, except in cases where three lots or less are to be created and a lane flanking the property is dedicated."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

His Worship, Mayor Prittie and Alderman Herd each presented a submission pertaining to the proposed Burnaby General Hospital Extension and related matters.

The material submitted by His Worship consisted of financial statements from the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District in which an indication was provided as to the amount and way funds have been dis<sup>Regional</sup>ursed for hospital construction since the passage of the Hospital Referendum By-law in 1967.

The submission from Alderman Herd contained a chronological indication of the progress which has been made between October, 1967 and January, 1970 regarding the matter of constructing the Burnaby General Hospital Extension. Included with the material was a copy of a letter from the B. C. Hospital Insurance Service to the Administrator of the Burnaby General Hospital relating to the preparation of sketch plans for the project in question.

*During consideration of the foregoing material, Alderman Clark stated that the Medical Health Officer for the municipality had indicated that the kitchen at the Burnaby General Hospital was in a deplorable condition; in fact, if it was in any other building where the public attended, the premises would be closed.*

*Alderman Clark stated that the Burnaby General Hospital Extension, which is the subject under consideration, will include the provision of new kitchen facilities.*

*He also remarked that, as he has suggested on three occasions previously, Council should ask the B. C. Hospital Insurance Service to expedite its approval of the extension plans for the Burnaby General Hospital. He added that a copy of the report from the Medical Health Officer concerning the kitchen facilities at the Hospital should be forwarded to illustrate the seriousness in having the Extension, including the ancillary facilities, constructed.*

*His Worship, Mayor Prittie, mentioned that a Special Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District was hoping to meet with the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance soon to discuss the Burnaby General Hospital Extension and associated matters.*

*Alderman Herd commented that the Planning Committee of the Burnaby General Hospital Board was meeting this Friday at 11:30 a.m. to deal with the Hospital Extension matter.*

*Alderman Mercier suggested that, in the future, the projects specified in any By-law presented to the Electorate by the Regional District should not be altered in any way unless the Electorate subsequently so approved. He explained that some of the items which were referred to in the Hospital Referendum By-law in 1967 have been substantially altered.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN CLARK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:

"That the B. C. Hospital Insurance Service be requested to approve as quickly as possible the plans for the Burnaby General Hospital Extension."

IN FAVOUR -- ALDERMEN CLARK AND  
DRUMMOND;

AGAINST -- ALDERMEN BLAIR, DAILLY,  
HERD, LADNER, MERCIER  
AND MCLEAN;

MOTION LOST

HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR PRITTIE DECLARED A RECESS AT 9:20 P.M.

THE COMMITTEE RECONVENED AT 9:35 P.M.

An enquiry was made as to when a Motion advanced by Alderman Mercier on January 26, 1970 relating to Municipal responsibility for hospital services was to be considered by Council.

It was pointed out that Item 10 of Report No. 7, 1970 of the Municipal Manager, which was due for consideration later this evening, dealt with the subject of Alderman Mercier's proposal.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:  
"That the Motion proposed by Alderman Mercier on January 26, 1970 relating to Municipal responsibility for hospital services, plus Item 10 of Report No. 7, 1970 of the Municipal Manager, be tabled until the February 9th meeting."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:  
"WHEREAS the existing C4 Service Commercial District in "Burnaby Zoning By-law 1965" is too general in scope in that a large number of uses is permitted in the said zone;

AND WHEREAS observations by the public have indicated some confusion and concern over possible changes in use subsequent to C4 zoning being introduced, i.e. a building housing a bank could be vacated and replaced by a funeral parlour or a taxi office;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manager and Planner be instructed to review the uses permitted in a C4 Service Commercial Zone and report to the Council on the advisability of introducing further commercial categories into the Zoning By-law which would result in more compatible types of businesses being grouped together, rather than sustain the more general grouping within the existing Service Commercial Zone."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

\* \* \*

R E P O R T S

HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR PRITTIE, submitted a report:

- (a) pointing out that Mr. D. Copan, Mr. J. E. B. Holdom and Mrs. C. Wells have completed their terms of Office on the Family Division Committee (formerly the Family Court Committee).
- (b) recommending that the following be appointed to the Committee in place of those three just mentioned:
  - (i) Mr. R. Gary Begin,  
9625 Sullivan Street,  
Burnaby 3, B. C.

(ii) Mr. W. A. Lewarne,  
4835 Irmin Street,  
Burnaby 1, B. C.

(iii) Mrs. C. N. (Clara) O'Neill,  
8449 - 16th Avenue,  
Burnaby 3, B. C.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:  
"That the recommendation of the Mayor be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \*

GRANTS COMMITTEE submitted a report:

- (a) pointing out that the Council, on April 28, 1969, passed a resolution recommending to the 1970 Council that a grant be made to the Association for Retarded Children to assist in underwriting the cost of a banquet to be held in conjunction with their annual meeting, up to a maximum of \$1,000.00.
- (b) advising that Mr. R. Scott of the Conference Committee of the Association for Retarded Children of B. C. has indicated that no more than 200 persons are expected to attend the banquet this year, which is on May 15th, and the cost should not exceed \$900.00.
- (c) recommending that a grant not to exceed \$900.00 be made to the Burnaby Association for Retarded Children to assist in defraying the cost of the banquet that is to be held on May 15, 1970 at the time of the Annual Provincial Convention of the Association for Retarded Children of B. C.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:  
"That the recommendation of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \*

MUNICIPAL MANAGER submitted Report No. 7, 1970 on the matters listed below as Items (1) to (10), either providing the information shown or recommending the courses of action indicated for the reasons given:

(1) 9137 Mona Avenue

It was being recommended that the Land Agent be authorized to have the building on the above property, which is owned by the Corporation, demolished.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:  
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(2) Policy - Lanes in Subdivisions

(This item was dealt with previously in the meeting).

(3) Taxi Licenses

- (a) Burnaby has 53 licenced taxi cabs, which are allocated as follows:

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Bonny's Taxi Co. (including Owner-Drivers) | - 28 |
| Capitol Hill Taxi Ltd.,                    | - 14 |
| Courtesy Cabs Ltd.,                        | - 10 |
| Legion Taxi,                               | - 1  |

53

- (b) The Municipal licence fee is \$40.00 per taxi cab per year.
- (c) Licences are issued in the name of the registered owner of the vehicle.
- (d) Under the By-law, licences are required to maintain an office.
- (e) Taxi cab licences are treated in a manner similar to other trades licences; i.e., an applicant, once having met all requirements for licencing, is automatically eligible for renewal of that licence upon payment of the proper fee. Refusal or revocation of that right requires a Council decision.
- (f) Taxi cabs are considered to be a part of the public transportation system.
- (g) To the extent that a cab may operate outside the boundaries of the municipality licencing them, they come under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.
- (h) As a part of the Public Transportation complex, the interests of the public should be paramount in the minds of the licencing authority.
- (i) Taxi cabs should be clean and well kept, mechanically correct, driven by capable and trustworthy chauffeurs, and convenient to the public. Such convenience requires either a grouping of owner-operators or a company. Only in this way can advertising, a dispatching centre, and radio control of the fleet, become economical.

- (j) Reputable companies are usually progressive and seek franchises and industrial contracts to assure themselves of regular customers.
- (k) Acceptance into such a company entitles a newcomer to participate in all of the above.
- (l) Taxi cab licences have had a value on the market many times in excess of the municipal licence fee. This fact has caused some concern in the minds of various licensing authorities, and a great deal of thought has been given to ways and means of eliminating the practice. One method is to remove all limits on the number of taxi cab licences. One important drawback to this is that it would encourage people to enter the taxi industry without proper resources and background. Another problem is that the available legitimate revenues would be spread so thinly that clandestine and illegal practices would develop. In addition, the mechanical condition of the cars could deteriorate and the public would suffer.
- (m) No Company can afford to enter the taxi cab business, and establish an organization to become successful, if there is any hint that their licences would not be renewed, unless they have done something to deserve refusal or revocation. This is recognized by the Municipal Act which practically assures renewal, except for some cause.
- (n) In dealing with the cases of owner-operators, they are usually connected with some company. While it might well be possible to cancel a licence if the taxi cabs changed hands and there was a new registered owner, the Company would quickly transfer all licences into its name for self-protection.
- (o) So far as can be determined, no satisfactory method which:
  - (i) recognizes the legitimate interests of the taxi cab industry,
  - (ii) recognizes the interests of the public,
  - (iii) would eliminate the sale of taxi cabs for high prices,has yet been devised.

Only a publicly -owned and operated taxi cab system could ensure this.
- (p) At the present time, Burnaby has one taxi cab for every 2,250 people. The Burnaby Taxi Owners' Association would like to see this ratio maintained.
- (q) The Licence Department has applications on hand for five more taxi cab licences.
- (r) The Chief Licence Inspector has recommended a ratio of 1:2000. This would permit seven new licences to be issued.
- (s) It was being recommended that Council establish a ratio of taxi cab licences in Burnaby at 1 for each 2000 of the municipality's population.

Feb/2/1970

MOVED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:  
"That a Special Committee of two be appointed to investigate the subject of the foregoing report from the Manager and, in conjunction therewith, confer with the Municipal Manager and other officials of the Corporation involved, with it being understood that the Special Committee will examine the Brief submitted by the Burnaby Taxi Owners' Association."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR PRITTIE, appointed Aldermen Mercier and Clark as the Special Committee referred to in the previous resolution.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:  
"That the meeting extend beyond the hour of 10:00 p.m."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMEN CLARK AND  
DRUMMOND

(4) Littering and Indiscriminate Dumping

The following answers were being supplied to questions raised in Council a short time ago relating to the above subject:

- (a) Sections 3 and 4 of the Health By-law prohibit people from depositing, or permitting to be deposited, on any street and other areas various forms of refuse.
- (b) Problems of enforcing the By-law are related to the severe coverage it provides. Though Court action is sometimes taken, the usual practice is for the Public Health Inspectors to have the offence remedied.
- (c) The By-law provides for a penalty not to exceed \$100.00, with or without costs, or thirty days in jail.
- (d) There is no other penalty provision in the By-law.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:  
"That the report from the Manager be referred to the Air Pollution Control Committee for consideration with a view to recommending some course of action designed to instill, in the minds of the public, the undesirability of littering and indiscriminate dumping."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(5) Community Plans

The Planning Department has submitted a report dealing with the above subject.



MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:

"That the report of the Planning Department be referred to the Advisory Planning Commission, along with a report Council received on January 19, 1970 relating to Area "L" (Kingsway - Patterson), for consideration and comment.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6) Undevelopable Apartment Sites under Zoning By-law

The remainder of the report from the Planning Department concerning the captioned matter, part of which was considered earlier in the meeting when Mr. Rogers appeared, indicated the following:

(a) Lots 13 and 14, Block 29, D.L. 152, Plan 1292

These lots are regarded as being important to the neighbourhood.

Ideally, development of the site should take a form which would act as a "closure" for Block 29 and take advantage of the setting which faces Lobley Park.

Town-House development would satisfy these environmental requirements.

The site, as it is, would yield:

- for R6 development - 8 units
- for RM3 development - 21 units

An alternative would entail the cul-de-sacing of Dunblane Avenue, the substitution of a twenty-foot lane for Grimmer Street and the relocation of a water main.

*The following alternative recommendations were being made:*

- (i) That the properties be allowed to develop, under the RM3 section of the By-law, to the 1965 standards.*
- (ii) That they be rezoned for R6 development.*
- (iii) That the site be increased in size by incorporating a portion of Grimmer Street, as more particularly shown on an accompanying plan.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:

"That the Parks and Recreation Commission offer its opinion on the matter of apartments being built on the above property in such close proximity to the Southern side of Lobley Park, which lies to the North of the subject site."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN BLAIR

- (b) Lot "G", Block 38, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 14505  
Lot 7 N32 feet, Block 38, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 2068  
Lot 15, Block 38, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 25303  
Parcel "A", Ref. Plan 4398, S.D. 4, Block 38, D.L.'s  
151/3, Plan 2068  
Lot "B", Block 38, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 8356

The above described lots "G", 15, and "B" had a potential for two-storey RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

The other two properties had no such potential.

All the lots are situated in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

The Lots "A" and "B" in question could be consolidated to form a RM3 (two-storey) site.

Those two lots plus Lot 15 could be consolidated to form a three-storey RM3 site.

Lot "G" could be allowed to develop according to the 1965 standards.

Lot 7N 32 feet could be used for parking, or designed open space. This would perpetuate awkward siting and small-scale development in the area.

The area is related quite closely to Community Plan Area 2 which makes RM4 development feasible in the neighbourhood.

Consolidation of the properties would provide an RM4 site, 48% of which is presently developed with apartments.

*It was being recommended that all the lots await consolidation, as shown on the accompanying plan, and then be redeveloped for RM4 purposes.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:  
"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (c) Lots 16, 28N $\frac{1}{2}$  and 28S $\frac{1}{2}$ , 29, Remainder of 31 and 32,  
all of Block 7, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 1895

Lot 29 had a potential for RM3 (two-storey) development under the 1965 By-law.

Lots 16 and 32 were doubtful RM3 lots under the 1965 By-law.

The other three properties had no potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

All of the properties are in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for high density apartment development.

They are also covered by Community Plan Area 1 in which each will form part of an RM5 site.

*It was being recommended that the lots await consolidation and then be redeveloped as RM5 sites.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:  
"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(e) Lot "F" N $\frac{1}{2}$ , Block 31, D.L. 152, Plan 10076

This Lot had no potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

It is situated in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

*It was being recommended that the Lot either be rezoned for a "neighbourhood store" type of development or remain as it is.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:  
"That the matter of dealing with the subject Lot "F" N $\frac{1}{2}$  be tabled to allow the owner of the property to offer his opinion on the situation portrayed in the report of the Planning Department, as it affects the Lot; and further, the owner of the Lots 13 and 14 covered under Point (a) above be given the same opportunity to comment on the proposal advanced in the Planning Department's report involving his lot,"

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMAN CLARK

(e) Lot 26, Block 1, D.L. 30, Plan 3036  
Lot "D", S.D. 34 and 36, Block 1, D.L. 30, Plan 7416  
Lot 81, Block 2, D.L. 30, Plan 30406

Lot 26 had no potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

It is situated in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

The lot is owned by the municipality and is intended to be used for parking or designed open space.

*It was being recommended that no change be made in the situation involving the subject Lot 26.*

Lot "D" had no potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

Most of the Lot will be required for future road purposes.

Feb/2/1970

*It was being recommended that there be no change in the situation involving this Lot.*

Lot 81 can form a site with Lots 23 and 24 to the South.

It is situated in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

*It was being recommended that the subject Lot 81 be left for future consolidation with the Lots 23 and 24 mentioned.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:  
"That the recommendations of the Planning Department covering the above three lots be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (f) Lot 61, Block 17, D.L. 68, Plan 11700  
Lot "D", S.D. 32, Blocks 15, 18 and 1/2, D.L.'s 68/39W,  
Plan 18026

Both of these properties had no potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

They are presently used for residential purposes and are located outside the areas considered suitable for future apartment use.

*It was being recommended that they be rezoned to a residential category.*

- (g) Lot "B", Block 10, D.L.'s 116/186, Plan 21877

This Lot had no potential for RM3 development under the 1965 By-law.

It is located outside an area suitable for future apartment development.

*It was being recommended that this property be rezoned to a residential category.*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:  
"That action on the proposals to rezone the above described three properties to a residential use be deferred until the owners of the properties concerned have had an opportunity to offer their opinions on the rezoning proposal."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (g) Lot 17E $\frac{1}{2}$  and 17W $\frac{1}{2}$ , Block 3, D.L.'s 116/186, Plan 1236

These Lots had no potential, individually or in consolidated form, under the 1965 By-law.

Feb/2/1970

They are "locked-in" by new apartment development on either side.

They are in an area which has been designated, as a first priority, for medium density apartment development.

They are also located immediately North of Community Plan Area 3.

They could become either a tot-lot or be used for parking for adjacent apartments.

It was being recommended that there be no change in the situation involving the two lots.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:  
"That the recommendation of the Planning Department be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(7) Miscellaneous Local Improvements

The Municipal Treasurer has submitted a cost report, pursuant to Section 601 of the Municipal Act, for a variety of Local Improvement works on portions of Cameron Street, Halifax Street, Broadway, Bainbridge Avenue, and Cliff Avenue.

The total cost of the works is \$404,300.00.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR:  
"That the report of the Manager, including the accompanying one from the Treasurer, be received and the programme outlined in the Cost Report be initiated pursuant to the Local Improvement provisions in the Municipal Act."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(8) Miscellaneous Local Improvements in

The report of the Treasurer mentioned/ the previous item includes a category of work which is not covered by Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1968, Amendment By-law 1968.

Before this Project can be initiated, it will be necessary to amend the aforementioned by-law to provide for the type of work, which is widening to 46 feet and five foot curb sidewalks.

It was being recommended that the Amendment By-law required be passed.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:  
"That the report of the Manager be received and the By-law covered by the recommendation be prepared for the consideration of Council."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(9) Lane Paving

The recent decision of Council to change the policy respecting "tie-ins" in conjunction with lane paving requires an amendment to By-law No. 5546 to delete the words "and including asphaltic tie-ins with existing driveways and garage approaches where necessary but, in any event, not further than the boundaries of the lane allowances".

The Solicitor is preparparing this amendment to the By-law mentioned.

With regard to the question of property owners applying for tie-ins, it was being recommended that these owners be given the option of paying for such work at their request at the rate of \$2.25 per square yard of asphalt in the first tax levy, or at the rate of 51.4¢ per square yard payable over five years.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MERCIER:  
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED

AGAINST -- ALDERMEN CLARK  
AND HERD

(10) Private Hospital Services

(This item was dealt with previously in the meeting).

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:  
"That the Committee now rise and report."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:  
"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \*

B Y - L A W S

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:  
"That the Council do now resolve into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on:

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 79, 1965" #5628  
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 59, 1968" #5415  
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 35, 1968" #5368  
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 64, 1968" #5420  
"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 82, 1969" #5631"

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 79, 1969 provides for the following proposed rezoning:

Reference RZ #75/69

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

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)

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 59, 1968 provides for the following proposed rezoning:

Reference RZ #88/68

FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ONE (R1) TO PARKING DISTRICT (P8)

Lots 3, 4 and 5 except Explanatory Plan 14411, Block 2, D.L. 59, Plan 3798

(2961, 2987, 3011 Bainbridge Avenue -- Located on the West side of Bainbridge Avenue from a point 161 feet South of Lougheed Highway, Southward a distance of 315 feet)

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 35, 1968 provides for the following proposed rezoning:

Reference RZ #42/68

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

- (i) Lot 4, S.D. 18, Blocks 1 & 3, D.L. 95N, Plan 1880
- (ii) Lot 5, S.D. 18, Blocks 1 & 3, D.L. 95, Plan 1880
- (iii) Lot 6, S.D. 17, Blocks 1 & 3, D.L. 95, Plan 1414

(7026 - 7058 Arcola Street -- Located on the South side of Arcola Street from a point 132 feet West of Salisbury Avenue, Westward a distance of 198 feet)

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 64, 1968 provides for the following proposed rezoning:

Reference RZ #86/68

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

Lot 6, Blocks 1 and 3, S.D. 18, D.L. 95, Plan 1880

(7008 Arcola Street -- Located on the South side of Arcola Street from a point 330 feet West of Salisbury Avenue Westward a distance of 66 feet)

BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 82, 1969 provides for the following proposed rezoning:

Reference RZ #70/69

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

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)

Municipal Clerk stated that the Planning Department had reported as follows in connection with the above five amendments to the Zoning By-law:

(a) Reference RZ #75/69

The prerequisites in connection with this rezoning proposal are nearing completion. The By-law can therefore be given third reading at this time, with final adoption to follow the complete satisfaction of the prerequisites.

(b) Reference RZ #88/68

This By-law can be given third reading now, with Final Adoption to follow the production of a new legal description and title number for the properties concerned.

(c) Reference RZ #42/68

All the prerequisites associated with this rezoning proposal have been satisfied so the By-law can be advanced for further readings.

(d) Reference RZ #86/68

All the prerequisites associated with this rezoning proposal have been satisfied so the By-law can be advanced for further readings.

(e) Reference RZ #70/69

The prerequisites connected with this rezoning proposal have been partially fulfilled. The applicant has requested that Council give the By-law third reading at this time in order to accommodate financial circumstances which are dependent upon the advancement of the By-law to this stage.

The By-law will be returned to Council for final adoption after all the prerequisites have been completely satisfied.



MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN HERD, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DAILLY:

"That:

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 79, 1969"

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 59, 1968"

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 35, 1968"

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 64, 1968"

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 82, 1969"

be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

"That:

"BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT CONSTRUCTION BY-LAWS NOS. 1 TO #5645 to  
12, 1970" 5655 & 5658

"BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION BY-LAW NO. 1, 1970" #5656

"BURNABY EXPROPRIATION BY-LAW NO. 1, 1970" #5644

be now reconsidered."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN BLAIR, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LADNER:

"That:

"BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT CONSTRUCTION BY-LAWS NOS. 1 TO  
12, 1970"

"BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION BY-LAW NO. 1, 1970"

"BURNABY EXPROPRIATION BY-LAW NO. 1, 1970"

be now finally adopted, signed by the Mayor and Clerk and the  
Corporate Seal affixed thereto."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \*

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LADNER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HERD:

"That plans and specifications of the work or undertaking  
pursuant to By-law No. 5644 be filed with the Municipal Clerk  
pursuant to Section 483 of the Municipal Act."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY