

July 23, 1970.

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 4545 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B. C. on Tuesday, July 28, 1970, at 7:30 p.m. to receive representations in connection with the following proposed amendments to "Burnaby Zoning By-Law 1965."

PRESENT: Acting Mayor, Alderman Drummond in the Chair;
Aldermen Clark, Dailly, Herd, Ladner and
McLean;

ABSENT: Mayor Prittie,
Aldermen Blair and Mercier;

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.

PROPOSED REZONINGS

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #26/70

- (a) Lots 22 to 36 inclusive, Block 59, D.L. 2135, Plan 1289
- (b) Lots 3 to 17 inclusive, Block 64, D.L. 2135, Plan 1239

(Vacant property -- Located on both sides of Stratford Avenue North from Pandora Street to within 66 feet of Dundas Street)

No one appeared relative to this proposed zoning.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) AND MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ONE (RM1) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #8/70

- (a) Lot 75, D.L. 30, Plan 29773
- (b) Lots 14, 15 and 16, Block 13, D.L. 30, Plan 3031
- (c) Sketch 10972, Block 17, D.L. 30, Plan 3526
- (d) Lot "A" part of Sketch 11602, D.L. 30, Plan 4000

(7549 - 93, 7535, 7521, 7511, 7510 - 90 and 7504 - 48 Vista Crescent; Located on both sides of Vista Crescent East of Mary Avenue and the New Vista property East of and abutting onto Vista Crescent)

Mrs. R. E. Pratt, 7511 Vista Crescent, one of the subject properties, submitted a letter indicating that she did not wish to sell her property. She also advised that provided she was allowed to continue living in her home for the rest of her natural life, she would not object to the proposed rezoning. Mrs. Pratt further stipulated that on her demise, the estate would give option of purchase to the New Vista Society but that it should also be open to other bids, otherwise she could not agree to the rezoning of the property as proposed.

Mr. L. Haave, representing the Architects of the proposed development, then spoke in favour of the rezoning proposal. He described the project, indicating that the four towers proposed would provide 654 suites and accommodate 750 people. It was advised that the present and economic use of the property, and factors relative to the repair and replacement of existing old buildings, had prompted the redevelopment of the 4.2 acre site.

P.H.
July 28, 1970.

- 2 -

Mr. Haave also advised that it was hoped that the remainder of the New Vista holdings would be developed in time with buildings that would compliment that proposed under the present application.

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #16/70

Lots 1 and 2 except part on Plan with By-Law 30073, Block 2 East part, D.L.'s 151/3, Plan 5457

(4361 Kingsway - Located on the North side of Kingsway from a point approximately 270 feet East of Chaffey Avenue, Eastward a distance of 223 feet, and extending through from Kingsway to Grange Street)

S. & R. Construction (Parkview Developments Limited), the applicants, submitted a letter relative to the prerequisites established by Council to the rezoning proposal, namely:

- (a) the submission of a suitable subdivision plan
- (b) the deposit of sufficient funds to cover the cost of widening and reconstruction of Grange Street between Chaffey Avenue and the east boundary of the site
- (c) the granting of the necessary easement to install storm sewer facilities
- (d) the deposit of sufficient funds to cover the cost of providing storm drainage facilities through the site
- (e) the submission of a detailed and suitable plan of development.

The letter indicated that the applicant agreed to prerequisites (a), (c), (d), and (e), but that item (b) could not be accepted and the following reasons were detailed:

- (1) such a condition has not be imposed on any of the developments that have been permitted on Grange Street in the block between Chaffey Avenue and Willingdon Avenue i.e. Old Orchard Shopping Centre, Willingdon Hospital and the apartment buildings.
- (2) 240 feet of the total of 510 feet of roadway fronts property we have no interest in or rights to and since it appears this property is not developed to its fullest potential it is likely that in the reasonably near future further development and/or change of use will be desired. Thus, we should not be required to improve the roadway adjacent to this property for the benefit of the present owners or occupiers.
- (3) Our development, contrary to the North American Life Insurance project, in the block west of Chaffey Avenue, does not itself require the street facilities contemplated by prerequisite (b).
- (4) We understand that the prime reason for this condition is to provide the funds to complete a portion of a service road that will eventually serve the whole of the town centre of Burnaby. It is our opinion since the portion concerned herewith is only a small segment of a much larger road requirement and the plans for the larger road programme are not finalized, we should not be required to participate until the whole programme is known.

P.H.
July 26, 1970.

- (5) We intend at the time of development and construction of the apartment portion of the concept to landscape and install driveways to and at the Grange Street frontage. It is our objective to create an attractive and pleasing appearance to the residential aspect of the project. This can be done without the extensive improvement that has been proposed for Grange Street.

The letter concluded by requesting Council to eliminate prerequisite (b), as it would be considered an undue financial burden, and that the developers were prepared to participate on a front-foot basis in any Local Improvement Programme proposed for Grange Street.

Mr. R. J. McKay, a Director of Parkview Development Ltd., then spoke in support of the rezoning. He first described the site and the development proposed for the property.

Initially, he advised, it was proposed to develop three speciality restaurants on the south portion of the site fronting onto Kingsway, that would provide a choice of dining in one location. Parking would be provided under a pedestrian oriented plaza that would integrate the total development of the southerly half of the site that was to include an office building, considered as Phase 3 of the total development.

Phase 2 would see the construction of a high-rise apartment building, accommodating 205 suites. This residential use would front onto Grange Street.

Mr. McKay then advised that the final phase calls for the development of an office building adjacent to the three restaurants and taking access from Kingsway. It was also noted that additional parking would also be provided at this stage.

Mr. McKay then reiterated the views of the developers, as expressed in their letter, respecting the prerequisite to rezoning established by Council relative to the cost of widening and reconstructing Grange Street between Chaffey Avenue and the east boundary of their property.

As to a timetable of development, Mr. McKay anticipated that a start would be made on Phase 1, the three restaurants and plaza, within the next six months. With Phase 2 in approximately 1 years time, with Phase 3 following after further studies. To a question raised respecting the concept of development, Mr. McKay submitted that the plan was desirable and would likely remain unchanged.

Mr. J. Bjornson, owner of the apartment block at 4111 Grange Street, advised that whilst he basically favoured the proposed project, he expressed concern that it might break down the residential character of the street. He requested that the restaurants envisaged for the site be serviced from Kingsway and not from Grange Street through the area proposed for apartment use. Mr. Bjornson submitted that a parking problem already existed in the immediate area and felt that the situation would be further aggravated by the development, and in this respect asked what parking was to be provided for the high-rise apartment.

Relative to the timetable of development, Mr. Bjornson felt that it would be undesirable to retain the present motel use of the site in conjunction with the restaurant operation proposed.

P.H.
July 23, 1970.

- 4 -

Mr. Bjornson was advised that one of the prerequisites of rezoning was removal of all existing buildings from the site within six months of rezoning.

Mr. McKay again spoke and gave assurance that the motel would be demolished as required, and that the developers also wished to retain the residential character of Grange Street. He further advised that 125% parking would be provided for the apartment high-rise building.

(4) FROM MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ONE (RM1) TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5)

Reference RZ #34/70

Lot "D", S.D. 1, Block 10, D.L. 116S $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 21877

(820 Esmond Avenue -- Located on the East side of Esmond Avenue from a point 76 feet South of Union Street Southward a distance of 45 feet)

No one appeared relative to this proposed rezoning.

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

(a) Reference RZ #32/70

Lot 61, Block 17, D.L. 68, Plan 11700

(3790 Forest Street -- Located on the South side of Forest Street from a point 58 feet West of Smith Avenue Westward a distance of 49.5 feet)

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

(b) Reference RZ #33/70

Lot "D", S.D. 32, Blocks 15, 18, 1 and 2 part, D.L.'s 68/39W, Plan 18026

(3814 Forest Street -- Located on the South side of Forest Street from a point 66.5 feet East of Smith Avenue Eastward a distance of 49.5 feet)

No one appeared in connection with this proposed rezoning.

(c) Reference RZ #31/70

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

(6709 Royal Oak Avenue -- Located on the West side of Royal Oak Avenue, midway between Grimmer Street and Imperial Street)

Mr. A. McLean, 6709 Royal Oak Avenue, owner of the subject property, spoke and indicated his agreement with the proposed rezoning.

(6) FROM MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT THREE (RM3) TO
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT SIX (RS)

Reference RZ #30/70

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

(6567 Marlborough Avenue and 6560 Dunblane Avenue -- Located on the South side of Grimmer Street between Dunblane Avenue and Marlborough Avenue)

Miss D. E. Maybee, of 6567 Marlborough Avenue, submitted a letter opposing proposed rezoning for the following reasons:

- (1) that the rezoning of the property from RM3 to the RS category would greatly decrease its value, and that no individual or family should be required to absorb the total devaluation for the enhancement of such an extensive neighbourhood.
- (2) As the development in the area is almost exclusively within the RM3 zoning, closing up the block with RM3 development would not cause deterioration.
- (3) Due to their location the subject properties are valuable and would be wasted for development under the RS zoning category. It is understood that town-house development is more suitable for unimproved acreage in a less congested area.
- (4) That 6567 Marlborough Avenue, Lot 13, has been owned by the family since 1924, and that since 1952 Miss Maybee has sustained the home and supported her parents, who eventually became infirm. That in lieu of other investments, or annuities, her further needs would be protected by the value of the property, and would request that Lots 13 and 14 remain in the RM3 zoning category.
- (5) That if the site does not retain its RM3 zoning, it will in all probability continue to be used for single family use, and Miss Maybee claims that she would be ill advised to sell the property at a greatly reduced price.

The submission concluded by directing a question to the Planning Director: "Under these circumstances, and the present zoning, is it permissible for the owner to construct a single family dwelling, or, repair and reconstruct the present dwelling?"

Mr. J. A. Shier, 6580 Marlborough Avenue, then spoke and also expressed opposition to the proposed change for basically the same reasons as indicated in the previous submission.

Mr. Shier also offered an alternative solution to the locked-in apartment lot problem and suggested that the Zoning By-laws be relaxed and RM3 development be allowed under 1965 standards.

(Secretary's Note: A copy of the submission made by Mr. J.S. Shier is attached to, and forms part of these Minutes.)

Mr. M. Partriquin, 6560 Dunblane Avenue, one of the subject properties, also expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning for the same reasons as previously presented.

(7) FROM ADMINISTRATION AND ASSEMBLY DISTRICT (P2) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #25/70

Lots 29 and 30, Blocks 1/3, D.L. 95N, Plan 550

(7272 Kingsway -- Located at the South-West corner of Kingsway and Edmonds Street)

No appeared in connection with this rezoning proposal.

B. TEXT AMENDMENT

The following text amendments concerning "Taxi Offices" are proposed:

- (a) The deletion of the presently used term "taxi offices" from the Zoning By-Law, where it is included as a permitted use in the C3 (General Commercial) and C4 (Service Commercial) Districts.
- (b) The addition of the following definitions to the Zoning By-Law:
 - (i) "Taxi Dispatch Office" means an office from which taxis are dispatched by radio to pick up fares and where related office functions may be carried on, but excluding the servicing and outside parking or storage of taxis on the lot.
 - (ii) "Taxi Service Centre" means an establishment from which taxis may be dispatched to pick up fares and where the servicing and outside parking or storage of taxis may be carried on in addition to related office functions.
- (c) The addition of "taxi dispatch offices" as a permitted use in the C2 (Community Commercial), C3 (General Commercial) and C4 (Service Commercial) Districts.
- (d) The addition of "Taxi service centres" as a permitted use in the C4 (Service Commercial) District.

Letters opposing the proposed Text Amendment were received from the following, and particular objection was indicated by all to the operation of a "Taxi Dispatch Office" at 4388 Imperial Street:

J. Vaton, 6882 Sussex Avenue
Mr. & Mrs. Foxton, 6889 Sussex Avenue
Mrs. Ethel Ross, 6908 Sussex Avenue.

The Hearing adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:

ACTING


MAYOR


CLERK

GM/fl