

November 20, 1973

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B. C. on Tuesday, November 20, 1973, at 7:30 p.m. to receive representations in connection with the following rezoning proposals:

PRESENT: Mayor T. W. Constable, in the Chair;
Alderman E. L. Burnham
Alderman M. M. Gordon
Alderman B. M. Gunn
Alderman D. A. Lawson
Alderman W. A. Lewarne
Alderman G. H. F. McLean
Alderman J. L. Mercier
Alderman V. V. Stusiak

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. A. L. Parr, Planning Director
Mr. M. J. Shelley, Municipal Manager
Mr. R. F. Norcliffe, Municipal Clerk's Assistant

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

Reference RZ #67/72

- (a) Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9, Block 14, D.L. 69, Plan 1558
2710, 2720, 2730 and 2740 Boundary Road; 3731 Regent Street
- (b) Lots "A" and "B", S.D. 11/12, Block 15, D.L. 69, Plan 21765
3719 and 3729 Grandview Highway
- (c) Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10, Block 15, D.L. 69, Plan 1321
2810, 2820, 2830, 2840 Boundary Road; 3722, 3726, 3732 and 3738
Regent Street; 3745 and 3737 Grandview Highway
- (d) Lots 11 and 12, Block 16, D.L. 69, Plan 1321
3753 and 3761 Grandview Highway

(Located in the area bounded by Boundary Road, Grandview Highway and Highway 401)

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LEWARNE:

"That this item be tabled and brought forward as the last item on the Agenda."

Mayor Constable decided to proceed as the Agenda indicated.

Mr. W. A. Street, 853 Richards Street, Vancouver, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Street requested that the matter under consideration be tabled until the next Public Hearing. Mr. Street advised that definitive plans were not yet available as it had been only three weeks since Council resolved to advance the application to a Public Hearing.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LEWARNE:

"That the Public Hearing with regard to Rezoning Reference #67/72 be adjourned to December 18, 1973."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mayor Constable pointed out to the Public Hearing that further notices would be mailed to the affected owners advising them of the date and time of the next Public Hearing.

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FOUR (R4) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #54/73

- (a) Lots 11 and 12, Blocks 9/10, D.L. 80N $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 1831
- (b) Lot 13 Except Explanatory Plan 14745, Blocks 9/10, D.L. 80N $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 1831

(5849 and 5825 Kincaid Street; 4868 Canada Way -- Located in the area bounded by Canada Way, Sunset Street, Godwin Avenue and Kincaid Street)

Mr. L. Doyle of Hamilton, Doyle and Associates, Architects, representing the developer addressed the Public Hearing. Mr. Doyle advised that the proposed development was a senior citizens' project and consisted of two three-storey buildings with a total of 160 units. These would be divided into studio, and one-bedroom units. Mr. Doyle added that there would be many amenities in the project available for the senior citizens and a large amount of open space would be included. Many of the major trees would be preserved and walkways and landscaped areas would be added features of the development. In addition, Mr. Doyle advised that the undeveloped streets at the rear of the proposed project would be developed and the costs borne by the developer.

In response to questions from members of Council, Mr. Doyle advised that full municipal taxes would be paid and 51 parking spaces would be available. This was twice the minimum required by C.M.H.C.

Mrs. F. Tesar, 4892 Canada Way, expressed concern with regard to the extension of Godwin Avenue to Canada Way. Mrs. Tesar claimed that it would be a hazard to cross Canada Way at this point and in addition she could not see where the Municipality would gain anything from this road extension insofar as taxes were concerned.

Mr. A. L. Parr, Planning Director, advised that insofar as this development was concerned the proposal was only to extend Godwin Avenue as far as Kincaid Street. Mrs. Tesar advised that she was not opposed to the senior citizens' development as such but was opposed to the road extension.

Mr. E. Wilhelm addressed the Public Hearing and advised that he was representing the owners of the property located at the Southwest corner of Sprott Street and Godwin Avenue. Mr. Wilhelm was concerned as to how this property would be affected by the extension of Godwin Avenue.

Mr. A. L. Parr reiterated the facts that Godwin Avenue at this stage would only be extended to Kincaid Street and the costs would be fully borne by the developer.

Mr. Wilhelm expressed support for the proposed rezoning.

Mr. D. J. King, 5976 Sprott Street, enquired as to the plans for Sunset Street from Godwin Avenue to Canada Way.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that it was proposed to construct this portion of Sunset Street as a cul-de-sac to a standard of 36-foot pavement with curbs and gutters both sides. The developer would be responsible for the dedication of the necessary road rights-of-way along Sunset Street.

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

Reference RZ #42/73

- (a) Lots 7 and 8, Block 23/24, D.L. 32, Plan 1444
- (b) Parcel "F", Explanatory Plan 9114, Block 24, D.L. 32, Plan 812
- (c) Parcel "G", Reference Plan 14141, Block 32, D.L. 152, Plan 783

(5034 and 5046 Newton Street; 5019 Kingsway -- Located on the Northwest corner of Kingsway and Marlborough Avenue)

Mr. E. Maifriedi, a representative of John H. Hansen, Architects, representing the developer addressed the Public Hearing. Mr. Maifriedi advised that ^{the} proposal was for a mixture of commercial outlets and office development located at the Northwest corner of Kingsway and Marlborough Avenue. The development would consist of a four-storey tower of approximately 50,000 square feet with underground parking of approximately 65,00 square feet which would provide 177 parking stalls. In addition, a 35-foot landscaped setback from Newton Street would be observed and this would provide a buffer zone facing the apartment areas across the street.

In response to questions from members of Council, Mr. Maifriedi advised that vehicles would enter in and out from Marlborough Avenue with pedestrian access off Kingsway.

Mr. D. Crombie, 5065 Irving Street, expressed concern as to the traffic that would be generated by this development particularly traffic that would use Irving Street as a route to and from the development.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that it was proposed that Marlborough Avenue North of Irving Street and South of Newton Street be closed to public traffic. Mr. Parr advised that the problem was access to the Simpsons-Sears Complex. It has even been considered that Newton Street West of Marlborough Avenue be cul-de-saced however this would be dependent on an alternate route through Simpsons-Sears. It was hoped eventually to route Simpsons-Sears traffic South off Kingsway on Marlborough Avenue and then West on Bennett Street. Mr. Crombie advised the Hearing that he was in favour of the proposed development if the traffic could be controlled in the residential area.

Mr. C. Cullen, 5062 Irving Street, advised that he was speaking for himself and his grandmother who was the owner of 5057 Kingsway. Mr. Cullen was enquiring how much land would be required from his and his grandmother's property in order to widen and improve Marlborough Avenue.

Mr. Parr advised that the property necessary for the widening of Marlborough Avenue would be the responsibility of the developer and no land would be ^{needed} from adjacent owners. Mr. Cullen advised that he was in favour of the rezoning.

Mr. P. H. Lundholm, 5055 Irving Street, was concerned if the closure of Marlborough Avenue would affect his property.

Mr. Parr explained that the proposed closures and the cul-de-sacs were not necessarily dependent upon this development but would have to be taken into consideration when looking at traffic patterns throughout the whole area including the Simpsons-Sears Complex. However, Mr. Parr assured Mr. Lundholm that the widening of Marlborough Avenue would only go Northwards as far as Irving Street and therefore his property would not be affected.

Mr. Lundholm indicated support for the proposed rezoning.

(4) FROM GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2) AND TOURIST COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C5) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #31/73

- (a) Lot "A" Except East 569.25 feet, Block 11, D.L. 70, Plan 9892
- (b) Lot 10W $\frac{1}{2}$ Except Part on Plan 26625, D.L. 70, Plan 3216
- (c) Lot 10E $\frac{1}{2}$ of the West half of D.L. 70E, Plan 3216

(3100 Sumner Avenue; 4331 and 4431 Dominion Street -- Located South of Highway 401 East of Sumner Avenue and North of Norfolk Street)

The Burnaby Chamber of Commerce submitted the following Brief:

For many years Burnaby was the centre of the older type motels along Kingsway and our other major highways. Because of a change in the preference of service for other types of accommodation and the fact that most of these older units are situated on land that is ready for redevelopment, we have suffered a decrease in tourist accommodation over the past five or six years.

While we would admit freely that the tourist industry within Greater Vancouver benefits Burnaby, we benefit much more when the facilities are within Burnaby. There is, first of all, the tax revenues to the Corporation and, of course, more payroll because people tend to live as close as possible to their place of employment.

There is also the fact the spinoff from the tourist facilities that adds to the revenues of our other businesses, such as service stations, retail stores, restaurants, etc.

With the outstanding growth of the business community within Burnaby we need a greater number of hotel rooms within Burnaby for business reasons. Most of our businesses have visitors throughout the year and most of these businesses like good accommodation available close to their plants rather than having to locate their visitors in the downtown Vancouver area.

-4-

Our experience has been that our two major hotels are usually so booked that it is difficult to reserve accommodation on short notice.

We are aware that there are proposals for the building of other accommodation in Burnaby, but to the best of our knowledge none are yet at the stage where we may expect them to be built in the near future.

Burnaby also has a need for more of the services provided by hotels. Diningrooms, lounges, meeting facilities. Even now the Chamber finds it difficult to schedule the many meetings that we must hold to the hotels prior commitments.

We believe that the Sheraton-Villa Inn is admirably situated to fulfill its need within our community and we are advised that the additions to the hotel will be built as soon as the necessary approvals are obtained.

We would urge that Council agree with this proposal as we are certain that the proposed addition to the Sheraton-Villa will be of great benefit to Burnaby and its resident.

Mr. J. Dye, Manager of the Sheraton-Villa Hotel then addressed the Public Hearing.

Reasons for the Addition

- (a) The area surrounding the Sheraton-Villa is rapidly developing as a prime office location for previously based Vancouver firms because of its easy access and its geographical location in relationship to Greater Vancouver.
- (b) Many of the firms located in the Highfield Park development are located there because of its proximity to the facilities offered by the Sheraton-Villa.
- (c) The facilities offered by the Sheraton-Villa Inn have long been overtaxed due to the demands of these and other developments in the immediate area, particularly the demand for guest rooms.
- (d) Many of the service and businessmen visiting the area, are being turned away daily, due to the lack of guest rooms.
- (e) The residents of the Municipality of Burnaby need a first class facility that they can both be proud of. Existing facilities have, in the past served the function, but can no longer do so, unless this proposed addition is approved.

What Benefits Will the Development Have for Burnaby and Its Residents

- (a) Burnaby and its residents will have a first class facility under one roof.
- (b) Jobs will increase to 300 and annual payroll will increase to over 2,000,000.
- (c) Taxes are now \$70,000.00 and we anticipate they will increase to \$150,000.00.
- (d) Visitors dollars are pollution free. The tourist business has been said by men of Council to be clean business that takes little of our resources and adds very greatly to our payroll and taxes.
- (e) There is a great need for complete, well-rounded, first class facility in our community. Visitors dollars spent outside the Hotel in the adjacent service stations, stores, etc. will increase to over 13,000,000.

What Part Does Sheraton Play in the Proposed Development

- (a) The Sheraton franchise for B.C. is 97% B. C. owned by Wosk's Limited. Wosk's Limited is 100% B. C. owned and operated.
- (b) A Sheraton worldwide advertising campaign exposes Burnaby to millions of people. Daily, this type of exposure on an individual basis is estimated to cost \$250,000.00.

- (c) The Sheraton Corporation is worldwide and renowned for maintaining strict building and service requirements, thereby, ensuring a first class facility to the residents of Burnaby and its visitors.

We are prepared to comply with all prerequisites 1-4 by the Planning Department, however, we cannot secure a permanent lease from the Department of Highways for the remainder of Lot 10E½. We do agree, as I am sure you do, with the policies, as we feel it is not in the best interest of any level of government to grant permanent leases. We have a five-year lease, which is renewable. Should this lease be relinquished, we will, produce in writing an agreement, that we will provide, within reasonable time, alternative parking within the standards as set by the Planning Department, as we feel it is not only in the best interest of Burnaby, but more important in the best interest of our guests to provide adequate parking.

As suggested by Council, we have tried to purchase Parcel "D". We have made a cash offer for more than ^{able} twice the appraised value and it has been refused. To me this price would have an unmeasurable inflationary affect on other proposed developments in our community.

The Sheraton-Villa has served Burnaby and its residents well over the past 10 years, but can no longer do so unless additional guest rooms are provided. The residents and the business community of Burnaby need more first class hotel rooms now, rooms that will be complimented by the facilities that already exist at the Sheraton-Villa Inn. The residents of the business community need a major hotel now, one that we can all be proud of. We are prepared, with your approval, to offer this facility now.

Alderman V. V. Stusiak suggested that the developer submit a written commitment, concerning alternative parking arrangements, in the event that the leased parking area is cancelled by either or both of the parties to the lease agreement.

Mr. B. Wosk, representing the Sheraton-Villa Inn, advised that he would be prepared to submit such a commitment which would be binding on him and his successors.

Mr. M. J. Shelley, Municipal Manager, suggested that the Sheraton-Villa Inn provide suitable undertakings together with appropriate surety acceptable to the Municipal Solicitor and a suitable design provision for requisite number of parking spaces in the event the Department of Highways cancels the lease resulting in the deletion of the parking spaces provided on the leased portion.

Mr. J. Dye, advised that his Company would prefer not to construct a rooftop restaurant on the proposed tower or to construct an office building over the proposed parking structure on the property South of Dominion Street.

Mr. A. L. Parr submitted that the construction of parking facilities only on the property South of Dominion Street would be an underuse of the property.

A discussion ensued concerning the number of parking spaces required under the present plan and the number of spaces required if the rooftop restaurant and the office building were eliminated.

Alderman W. A. Lewarne expressed concern as to how a 19-storey building could be justified in the proposed location.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that the Provincial Government/^{Building} in the area was 4-5 stories in height, it was proposed to build a similar tower across the Freeway, and the building appeared to be compatible with the surrounding uses.

Mr. B. Wosk advised the Public Hearing that if the rezoning was approved construction would likely start in February or March, 1974.

Mr. Kassen, representing the owners of Lot "D", which was situated South of Dominion Street, across the street from the proposed rezoning addressed the Public Hearing. He advised that he was in favour of the rezoning proposal but enquired if this proposal would affect the property he represented.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that Lot "D" would not be affected by the rezoning proposal.

(5) CHANGE IN DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Reference RZ #46B/68

Lot 90, D.L. 4, Plan 37535

(9230 Lougheed Highway)

Mr. A. W. Laughlin, President, Laughlin Developments Ltd., 830 York Street, New Westminster, addressed the Public Hearing. Mr. Laughlin advised that this was the final phase of the development. This final phase would still consist of 120 suites however, parking would be increased from 1.2 spaces per unit to 1.5 spaces per unit. A further adjustment would be to increase the distance of the building away from the Lougheed Highway to 90 feet. Six units along the Southern portion of the building would be provided on a fourth level. Mr. Laughlin submitted that the development was close to shopping centres, schools, and the 401 Freeway. The development was an asset for Burnaby and there was a large demand for this type of accommodation.

Alderman W. A. Lewarne advised that he was under the impression that a building over 3 storeys in height must be constructed with concrete.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that this was not the case where the first storey was classified as a basement.

Mr. I. Switzer, representing Irving Ventures Limited, advised that he was the owner of the property immediately East of the development in question. Mr. Switzer enquired if this change in development plan would affect his property.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that Mr. Switzer's property would not be affected by this change.

Mr. Switzer advised that he was in favour of the change in development plan.

Alderman B. M. Gunn enquired if the development conformed with the guidelines for condominium development.

Mr. A. L. Parr advised that the plan did conform to the guidelines.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:


MAYOR


MUNICIPAL CLERK'S ASSISTANT

RFN/mc