

PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 17, 1959

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair; Councillors Mather, Frittie, MacSorley, Brown, Jamieson and McLean
Messrs. Blakeley, Roberts, Armstrong and Shaw.

His Worship the Reeve presented a few opening remarks explaining the requirements of the Municipality with regard to the Public Hearing into amendments to the Town Planning By-Law. A review of the action of the Council in ordering the planning survey of the Kingsway - Central Park area was given and it was pointed out public meetings had been held to acquaint the people with the proposal following which a modification of the original plan had been adopted by the Council for presentation to a Public Hearing. Public Hearing notices had been mailed to all property owners within the area on the basis of the modified proposal. The Reeve explained the purposes of a Public Hearing and outlined the procedures to be followed in passage of the Town Planning By-Law.

The Reeve then called for representations to be made.

Mrs. D. Short, 5922 Olive Avenue.

Mrs. Short referred to reports of the Director of Planning wherein it was suggested that the rezoning proposals were made due to the possible occurrence of blight within the areas. Mrs. Short asked if the term "blight" referred to the normal age factor of buildings in the area and made reference to the areas in Vancouver presently being rehabilitated where it was suggested that the normal effluence of time had brought about the so-called blight situation and that the subject areas of Burnaby were presently going through the same process. Mrs. Short submitted that in part the lack of industrial growth in the area was attributable to the lack of co-operation by Municipal officials in locating industries. It was also pointed out that the loss of revenue would accrue to the Municipality due to the change in assessment which would result on a long term basis with the retention of the area for residential purposes.

Mr. Thompson

Mr. Thompson spoke against the proposed rezoning and submitted that light industrial plants already established in the area could not be forced to cease their operations and that therefore the current effect on residential development would still continue.

Mr. Rowse, 6279 Silver Avenue.

Mr. Rowse spoke against the rezoning to Residential, his chief reason being that the area adjacent was developed industrially. Mr. Rowse also complained of the dust nuisance in the area and charged that the people in the area did not have proper representation from the Reeve and Council.

Mr. Falo, 7438 Griffiths Avenue.

Mr. Falo requested that a buffer zone be established on the west side of Griffiths Avenue to protect the proposed residential zoning on the east side of Griffiths. Mr. Falo spoke in favour of the proposed rezoning for the Griffiths Avenue area to Residential.

Mr. Arthur Cross, 6931 Byrne Road.

Mr. Cross spoke against the proposed rezoning, and suggested not enough consideration had been given to the individual property owner. A complaint was made against the actions of the Council in creating a jog in humble Street at 19th Street due to the failure of the Corporation to negotiate for property at this point owned by him some years ago. It was also submitted

that since the construction of Humble Street, the property upon which he now resides was left with a cut some six feet in depth above the level of the road. Mr. Cross also submitted that two properties owned jointly by himself and his wife were within the proposed rezoning area whereas the third was not and it was felt such a split was not in his best interests.

Mr. B. Dunnell, 7370 Griffiths Avenue.

Mr. Dunnell spoke against the proposed rezoning unless the buffer is established on the west side of Griffiths Avenue, His remarks supported those of Mr. Palo.

Mrs. Wagner, 1699 Edmonds Street.

Mrs. Wagner spoke against the proposed rezoning on the grounds that her large property (71 feet x 214 feet) on Edmonds Street backed up to old sheds and other commercial buildings situated along the B.C. Electric Spur Line tracks and as such was not good residential property.

Mr. Whittaker, 6066 Wilson Avenue.

Mr. Whittaker spoke against the proposed rezoning on the grounds that the properties on Wilson Avenue were hemmed between Commercial and Industrial development and as such was not good residential property.

Mr. Phillips, 6690 Royal Oak Avenue.

Mr. Phillips spoke for five properties on the east side of Royal Oak Avenue in the 6600 Block, pointing out that their properties would back up to a Light Industrial zone to the east and a Commercial zone on the west of Royal Oak and that, therefore, their properties were mal-located residential properties.

Mr. Alsen, 5967 Wilson Avenue.

Mr. Alsen spoke against the proposed rezoning on the grounds that the properties in this block on Wilson were sandwiched between Commercial and Industrial plants.

Florence and John Hayne, 7042 Royal Oak Avenue.

Submitted that real estate firms were not interested in the sale of this property for industrial purposes.

Mr. Mosslander, 6076 Wilson Avenue.

Requested information about modifications to the original plan as represented by the maps distributed for the public meetings and referred specifically to the exclusion of the egg plant south of the tracks at Wilson Avenue and the jam factory. Mr. Mosslander spoke generally against the proposed rezoning.

Ron Bushel, 7008 and 7026 Beresford Street.

Mr. Bushel spoke against the proposed rezoning. It was submitted that his home was 35 years old and was difficult to sell for residential purposes. Difficulty was also encountered in selling the property for industrial purposes. Mr. Bushel complained against a development by the Municipality opposite his property consisting of a ramp for unloading purposes along the B.C. Electric Spur Line track.

Burnaby Board of Trade represented by Mr. Victor Wiebe, President.

Mr. Wiebe presented a brief opposing the rezoning from Light Industrial to Residential giving some statistical information on the availability of lands for the different use categories within the Municipality. It was submitted land set aside for Light industrial purposes, including the area

in question, amounted to only 3.65 percent of the total land in the Municipality. The disputed area consisting of 193 acres would diminish the total available light industrial land by 23 percent. The Board drew attention to an industrial subdivision being developed by the City of Vancouver across Boundary Road at considerable cost to the City. It was also submitted the location of the disputed land was unique in that it was a logical site for industrial enterprises forming a natural compliment to existing retail and commercial establishments and being served by the B.C. Electric right-of-way and the Provincial Highway where opportunities for rail spur facilities and road transport were good.

The Board submitted further that soil bearing characteristics of the area made it ideal for foundations for industrial development and it was pointed out that the rezoning resulting in barring of industry from the area will significantly harm Burnaby's long term tax revenue situation, deprive Burnaby citizens of potential jobs and result in higher tax burden to the residential taxpayer. Upon being questioned by the keeve it was submitted that the Board of Trade brief had been endorsed by the executive of 15 members of the Board. It was also submitted that the executive had full power to present this document.

Mr. L. Karr, 6992 Falm Avenue.

Mr. Karr advised he was also representing property owner at 6976 Falm Avenue and asked for information on the effect on existing industries, pointing out that the industry in which he was interested was long established. Mr. Karr spoke against the rezoning generally. The keeve explained to the spokesman the situation regarding existing businesses which would become non-conforming with the rezoning and also explained the avenues open through the Town Planning Board of Appeal where the non-conforming industry may find it necessary to expand or become destroyed by fire.

Mr. C. Mennear, 7058 Beresford Street.

Mr. Mennear opposed the proposed rezoning and complained of flooding on his property which he attributed to the existence of the municipal loading ramp on Beresford Street alongside the B.C. Electric Spur Line Track.

Mr. Goskey, Kathleen Avenue.

Mr. Goskey submitted that the existence of a machine shop and egg candling plant next to his property rendered his property a poor location for residential purposes.

Mr. Milne, 5056 Imperial Street.

Mr. Milne registered an objection against the proposed rezoning.

Donald and Gertrude Brown, 5908 Olive Avenue.

The spokesman requested information on why lots 5 and 10 of Blocks 8 and 9, D.L. 151 had been excluded from the proposed rezoning.

Louis and Dagny Snedker, 6776 Royal Oak Avenue (Corner Imperial Street)

Registered opposition to the proposed rezoning pointing out that a service station was situated immediately across from their property, also Imperial was a heavily travelled street and these features made it undesirable residential property.

Mr. Montgomery, 7271 Acorn Street.

Opposed the rezoning and requested information on what the future of the industrial concern on the large property at the foot of Acorn Street would be.

Mr. Franklin, 7076 Royal Oak Avenue.

Spoke on behalf of himself and the owner of adjoining property, protesting the rezoning as proposed.

Mr. Baker, 7462 Griffiths Avenue.

Spoke in favour of the rezoning and supported the submission by other residents of this block on Griffiths Avenue presented at the Hearing. It was his contention that the opposite side of Griffiths should also be zoned for residential purposes.

Mr. Tom Goode.

Mr. Goode spoke suggesting that the majority of comment had shown a negative opinion to the proposed rezoning, pointing out that it was a matter for the consideration of all the municipality and that in general the advantages would accrue to the general benefit of the municipality. Mr. Goode spoke in favour of the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Brodie, 7144 Royal Oak Avenue.

Spoke in favour of the rezoning.

Mr. Collard, resident of Falm Avenue.

Spoke in favour of the rezoning.

Resident at 5892 Olive Avenue.

Spoke in favour of the proposed rezoning and suggested that properties adjacent to the B.C. Electric Central Park right-of-way should remain residential and have permission for further industrial development should not be granted.

Mrs. Munnik, owner of property at 6072 McKay Avenue & 6091 Silver Avenue.

Mrs. Munnik opposed the rezoning on the grounds that her property was situated opposite the Ford Plant and as such was not desirable residential property. Furthermore, no lane allowance existed between McKay and Silver Avenues which again made it undesirable residential property.

Mr. Wood, 6138 Cassie Avenue.

Advised he had circulated a petition previously and that 80 percent of the residents along Cassie and adjoining area were in favour of the proposed rezoning. It was submitted that the properties are currently developed for residential purposes and that the zoning should be changed to conform.

Resident at 6121 McKay Avenue.

Spoke in favour of the rezoning.

Mr. Carlings, 6291 Silver Avenue.

Mr. Carlings protested the proposed rezoning.

Mr. William Fenty, 4675 Imperial Street.

Mr. Fenty objected to the proposed rezoning of the 200 foot strip between the B.C. Electric right-of-way and Imperial Street.

Mr. Hutter, 6550 Lily Avenue.

Mr. Hutter expressed opposition to the zoning as proposed on the grounds that not enough attention had been given to zoning of the properties on the perimeter of the area.

Mr. Wilson (no address given)

Mr. Wilson asked if the Council was setting a precedent by rezoning properties for residential purposes where commercial development was existent at one end and industrial at the other.

Mr. W. R. Beamish, Solicitor.

Mr. Beamish submitted that it seemed the preponderance of people expressing themselves in regard to the proposed rezoning was against the proposal and the opinion was expressed that the Public Hearing need not have been held. Mr. Beamish then spoke on behalf of the following:

(1) Mr. Clark, owner and operator of Burnaby Junk Company situated on two lots at the northwest corner of the B.C. Electric right-of-way and Falm Avenue. The owner had invested in property on trackage and a siding had been constructed along the property to serve the plant. Opposition to the rezoning was presented on the grounds that such proposal would be detrimental to the property and business.

(2) Mr. Beamish advised he was representing property owners in the area bounded by the B.C. Electric track, Willingdon, Imperial and Hoyal Oak. It was submitted the owners were definitely opposed to rezoning the area for residential purposes. Property owners regard their holdings as an investment due to industrial character as well as a home location. A petition was presented representing 19 out of 21 owners in the area who had signed indicating opposition.

(3) Mr. Beamish advised he was representing property owners on McKay and Silver Avenues and had presented a petition representing 36 properties on these streets. Mr. Beamish referred to a prior petition submitted which indicated favour to the proposed rezoning and advised that this petition represented 25 properties signed by 30 persons, one tenant and that seven owners had acquired land in the areas since the original rezoning became effective.

(4) Mr. Beamish advised he was representing the Fresh-Fak Company who were opposed to the rezoning. The Fresh-Fak plant was situated on McKay Avenue, its tax, water rates and trades licence fees to the Municipality amount to \$3,843.00. Payroll is in the neighbourhood of \$90,000.00. Sale value of the property as an industrial concern approximately \$28,000.00. The Company desire to expand and erect a One Hundred Thousand Dollar plant at 6205 Willingdon Avenue. While the new site is not affected by the rezoning the present site is and the possibility of sale of the latter site is made difficult by virtue of the proposed zoning plan. A request was made that the Company be withdrawn from the proposed rezoning for residential purposes.

Mr. Beamish advised he had read the reports of the Planner dated March 25th and October 16th and that it appeared the recommendations were more concerned with the alleged depreciation of residential land rather than the encouragement of industrial development. The speaker advised he could not envision the area being developed into a first-class residential district and submitted that it should be allowed to develop in a normal manner, otherwise, it will become a slum. It was also suggested that the industrial features of the area were enhanced by the advantage of highway and trackage facilities. The Council was urged to go slowly on the proposal.

Mr. Wills spoke on behalf of the owners of Lot "H", Block 12, D.L. 151/3

Mr. Wills submitted that the owners had spent considerable time and money on preliminary development plans and that if the zoning is adopted as presently proposed the investment would decrease by 25%. It was submitted that approximately \$750,000.00 would be spent on the property and that tax revenues would increase and surrounding areas would also increase in value, if the industrial zoning were retained and their development permitted to proceed. Mr. W. submitted further that it would be next to impossible to dispose of the property under residential zoning. It was stressed that the property was situated between established commercial and industrial areas.

Mr. Feldstein spoke representing owners of a large tract of land situated north of Watling Street and east of Royal Oak Avenue. It was submitted that the owners were not as directly affected as other persons within the rezoning areas but nevertheless a severe effect would be imposed. Mr. Feldstein advised that the owners had searched through the Property Manager for an extended time but were unable to locate Municipal property and had purchased this land privately. Plans were current for a factory to be erected on the property representing an investment of some \$250,000.00 which would employ 30 to 35 people and involve a \$100,000.00 payroll. It was submitted the site would be useless for this purpose under the proposed rezoning. The residential zoning would also be of such nature that disposition of the property would be made difficult. It was suggested the Council consider that if rezoning was deemed desirable that consideration be given to the position of the owners in having to purchase another site. It was requested that as an alternative the land be rezoned for Multiple Family use since it was considered this type of zoning would permit the land to be used beneficially.

Mr. Bartram, 4635 Imperial Street.

Mr. Bartram spoke in favour of the proposed rezoning and requested information on the possibility of street access to the property presently comprising a long narrow shape. The spokesman was advised that the subdivision approval process was available to him which would answer the query with regard to road access.

Mr. LeComte, 4645 Imperial Street.

Mr. LeComte expressed opposition to the rezoning.

Mr. Drew

Mr. Drew spoke representing owners at 4916, 4950 and 4984 Imperial Street opposing the proposed rezoning and, at the same time, expressing dissatisfaction with the present zoning.

Mr. Beamish spoke further and submitted that no consideration was being given to the small industrialist whereas it appeared full consideration was given to the large commercial and industrial plants within the area.

His Worship the Reeve called for further representations and there being none the Hearing adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

R E E V E



C L E R K