

JANUARY 8, 1963

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, on Tuesday, January 8, 1963 at 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair,  
Councillors: Cafferky, Clark, Drummond,  
Kalyk, MacSorley and Wells.

ABSENT: Councillors Blair and Harper.

The Hearing was held for the purpose of receiving representations in connection with the following proposed rezonings:

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL TWO FAMILY TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE I

- (a) Lot 1, Block 47, D.L.s 151/3, Plan 11295.  
(Located at the south-east corner of Maywood Street and Willingdon Avenue).

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

- (b), Lot 2, Block 9, D.L.s 151/3, Plan 2702  
(Located on the west side of Wilson Avenue approximately 225 feet south of Kingsway)

Mrs. E. Alston, owner of property at 5967 Wilson Avenue, appeared and stated that she did not necessarily oppose the proposed rezoning but she was interested in the effect it might have on her property taxes.

Reeve Emmott explained the relationship between zoning and assessments, pointing out that any rezoning would likely have an effect on the land assessment of the property affected but it would in no way influence the assessment on improvements. He hastened to add that assessments are based on the value of property and this, in turn, is influenced by the use of the land. He also mentioned that assessments are used as the bases for property taxes.

- (c) Block 54 except Plan 9220 and except the west 10 feet, D.L. 33, Plan 944  
(Located at the north-west corner of Grange Street and Elsom Avenue).

Mrs. R. M. Swanson, 5855 Elsom Avenue, appeared and made the same inquiry as Mrs. Alston. She also requested some details as to the development proposed, principally the height of the building to be constructed and the set-backs which were to be observed.

The Planning Director, in conjunction with the applicant (Mr. E Dohman), answered the questions raised by Mrs. Swanson.

Mr. W. J. Robison, 4596 Grange Street, also appeared and requested clarification of the remarks expressed by the Planning Director in his report to Council on the subject application, particularly the comment that all land lying between Kingsway and Grange Street as far east as Sussex Avenue should ultimately be considered for commercial use.

Mr. Robison inquired as to the effect the subject rezoning would have on property lying on the south side of Grange Street where he is located.

The Planning Director elaborated on the matter to which Mr. Robison had made reference, stressing that commercialization of that property between Grange Street and Kingsway was a prognostication, and that this was in no way a part of the rezoning proposal at hand.

Mr. E. Dohman, the applicant, submitted a letter advising that he agreed to both dedicate the easterly 33 feet on the property in question for road purposes and to construct it to Municipal standards, as requested by Council.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL TWO-FAMILY AND COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY TYPE III.

Lots 2 to 5 Inclusive and also Lots 7 and 8, Block 2, D.L. 205, Plan 3328.

(Lot 2 to 5 Inclusive, as aforesaid, are located on the south side of Hastings Street between a point approximately 133 feet east of Holdom Avenue and a point approximately 660 feet east of Holdom Avenue)

(Lots 7 and 8, as aforesaid, are located at the south-west corner of Hastings Street and Fell Avenue and extend westward a distance of approximately 262 feet from Fell Avenue)

Mr. S. Gluska, owner of property at 5931 - 33 Hastings Street appeared and stated that he favoured the rezoning proposal.

Mr. J. Bull, a representative of Westcott Construction Limited, also appeared and stated that the development proposed has been scrutinized by the Planning Department and certain minor alterations have been made which were mutually acceptable to the developer and the Corporation. He emphasized that the development was to be a family-type project, with 100% parking plus other desirable features being provided.

Mr. J. Q. Wood, owner of the property lying between the ones under consideration, submitted a letter advising that he had noted the developer had agreed to donate the south 33 feet of the property under application for future road purposes and that he therefore felt a similar 33 foot portion of his property would likely be expropriated. Being of this mind, Mr. Wood requested that consideration be given to the following points:

(a) The area that would be required by the Corporation for road purposes would be approximately 5,500 square feet, a considerable part of his holdings.

(b) This portion of his property is used as a site for trailers during the entire year, and it is the stable part of his operation because it is not subject to seasonal demands.

(c) The annual revenue from this portion of his property represents the difference between a reasonable return on his investment and an uneconomical operation.

(d) The loss of this revenue would mean a considerable hardship and a loss in capital value.


Mr. Wood concluded by suggesting that, because of the matters mentioned above, the cost of expropriating might be quite high.

He suggested that an alternate solution would be to use the land on the south side of the proposed Frances Street projection since it is Municipal property.

The Hearing then adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:

  
REEVE

  
CLERK