

APRIL 21, 1970

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B. C. on Tuesday, April 21, 1970, at 7:30 p.m. to receive representations in connection with the following proposed amendments to Burnaby Zoning By-law 1965.

PRESENT: Alderman Mercier in the Chair;
Aldermen Blair, Clark, Dailly and
Drummond;

ABSENT: His Worship, Mayor Prittie;
Aldermen Herd, Ladner and McLean;

The Chairman first indicated the purpose of the Public Hearing, and explained the desired manner for the public to express its views in regard to the proposed amendments.

A. PROPOSED REZONINGS

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (R2) TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (R3)

Reference RZ #2/70

The South portion of Lot 1, Except Plan 12728, Block 2E½,
D.L. 162, Plan 5176

(5133 South-East Marine Drive - Located on the North side of Marine Drive from a point approximately 160 feet West of Royal Oak Avenue Westerly a distance of 153 feet and to a depth of approximately 107 feet)

Mr. C. Spady, 5133 S. E. Marine Drive, the applicant, spoke in favour of the rezoning. He advised that his property had a frontage of 153 feet, and under existing zoning could be subdivided into only two lots as the minimum lot width for the zoning category was sixty feet. He submitted that it was unreasonable to require him to divide the property into two parcels as the property could be subdivided into three fifty-one foot lots which would be adequate to accommodate single family homes, and that there existed many other fifty-foot lots in the district.

Mr. Spady also expressed the view that the standard for the area was too high, and did not recognize the housing situation and the current cost of acquiring homes and their upkeep. He pointed out too, that the R3 zoning requested would permit the subdivision of the subject property into three fifty-one foot parcels.

April/21/1970

Mrs. T. Murray, 5158 Marine Drive, advised that both her husband and herself supported the rezoning.

Mr. E. Bodner, 5142 Marine Drive, submitted a letter wherein he indicated support for the proposed rezoning.

(2) FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C2) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #63/69

Lots 1 and 2 W $\frac{1}{2}$, Block 13, D.L. 158 E $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 1908

(7724 Royal Oak Avenue and 5216 Neville Street -- Located at the South-East corner of Royal Oak Avenue and Neville Street)

It was noted that the application had been brought to a Public Hearing on October 28, 1969, but that suitable development plans, a necessary requirement for Comprehensive Development zoning, had not been available at that time.

In a memorandum from the Planning Department, there was reference to its written reports submitted to Council during the month of March on the proposed rezoning, with advice that they had re-examined plans submitted earlier, in the light of changes as indicated in a written submission by the applicant dated March 20, 1970.

The Planning Department indicated that the only physical change in the proposed development is the reduction in the floor area, from 8,000 to 7,860 square feet, of Multiple Family development. It was further noted that this reduction is a result of increasing the deck area on the top floor which also reduced the proposed two-bedroom suites to one-bedroom suites. It was then noted that the plans were otherwise the same as submitted earlier and therefore the basic noncompliances with the By-law requirements remain the same as noted in their earlier reports.

The letter then dealt with the aspect of floor area ratios, and indicated that the proposed development would be approximately 2,360 square feet over the maximum allowed.

Relative to the plans as submitted, the Planning Department reported that they did not comply with the requirements as noted under Section 700.3, (the regulations pertaining to the development plan for Comprehensive Development zoning) in that:

- (a) There are no dimensions indicated on the plans other than the site size.
- (b) There is no indication of finish materials.
- (c) There is no indication of existing or finished grades or their relationships to adjoining properties.
- (d) There are no suite layouts indicated.
- (e) There are no landscaping details indicated.

The Planning Department concluded its submission by reiterating its earlier conclusion that the submitted plans do not comply with the basic requirements of a CD scheme and that the rezoning application should not be approved.

Mr. H. Krahn then spoke, and advised that he was one of the developers, and expressed surprise at the comments of the Planning Department and that he had been given to understand that detailed plans had been submitted with a request that they be copied to members of Council.

He further indicated that artists' renditions of the structure proposed for the site were being brought to the Chamber for display, and apologized for their tardiness.

It was agreed, therefore, to defer the application to after the final item on the Agenda, to allow time for the renditions referred to, to be set up for examination and comment.

(3) FROM SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #84/69

Lots 75, 76 and 77, D.L. 4, Plan 35319

(9353, 9381, 9411 Lougheed Highway -- Located on the North side of Lougheed Highway approximately midway between Bell Avenue and Austin Road to an average depth of approximately 770 feet and having an area of approximately 7.5 acres)

No one appeared relative to this proposed rezoning.

B. PROPOSED ZONING

(4) It was advised that the following zoning applications are introduced to extend the municipal zoning regulations over parcels of land which were formerly within New Westminster but now lie within the Municipality of Burnaby as a result of a recent relocation of the boundary between the two municipalities.

Reference RZ #7/70

(a) TO COMMUNITY INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT (P5)

Lot "E" of Parcel 1, Ref. Plan 15888, D.L. 1, Plan 1702

(Located on the North side of Holmes Street, West of Craig Street and being the Easterly corner of the St. Michaels School property)

No one appeared relative to this application.

(b) TO SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2)

Those portions of Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block 13, D.L. 1,
Plan 2342 lying South of the old municipal boundary

(Vacant -- Located on the East side of Craig Street
and North of the lane parallel to Holmes Street)

No one was present for this zoning application.

(c) TO SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2)

Lot "E", Except Pcl. 1, Ref. Plan 15888, D.L. 1,
Plan 1702

(Vacant -- Located on the North-West corner of Holmes
Street and Craig Street)

Mr. M. Hennessy, Director of Wakefield Realty Ltd., owners of
the subject property, advised that they had purchased it from
the City of New Westminster as a residential building lot, and
would oppose the proposed zoning; should it restrict in any
way the development of the site for residential use.

Mr. Hennessy further indicated that he had received no notification
of the boundary change, but on enquiry it was found that the
property had only recently changed ownership and that advice
of boundary change would have been sent to the previous owner.

The Chairman considered it likely that the zoning in this instance
should have been to a Residential category, and requested that
the Planning Department re-examine this matter in the light of
the comments made by Mr. Hennessy.

* * * *

Item (2), Reference RZ #63/69 was then re-introduced.

Mr. Krahn again spoke for the application, and referred to the
artist's rendition of the proposed development, and indicated
that the design reflected the requirement for additional open
space and that this had been achieved by reducing suites from
two to one bedroom.

As to the understanding that a suitable development plan had
been submitted, the representative of the Planning Department
advised that the most recent set had been received on April
16th, and it was on those that the Planning Department report
had been based.

It was suggested to Mr. Krahn, that the developers meet with the
Planning Department on the subject of development plans, with
the view of resolving points raised by the Department in their
submission to the Public Hearing.

April/21/1970

A copy of the report of the Planning Department referred to was handed to Mr. Krahn.

The Hearing adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified correct:


MAYOR


CLERK

GM/hb