

January 30, 1973

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

PRESENT: Mayor R. W. Prittie, in the Chair;
Alderman T. W. Constable;
Alderman W. R. Clark;
Alderman J. D. Drummond; (7:55 p.m.)
Alderman H. M. Gordon;
Alderman D. A. Lawson;
Alderman G. H. F. McLean;
Alderman J. L. Mercier.

ABSENT: Alderman W. A. Blair.

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. A. L. Parr, Planning Director;
Mr. B. D. Leche, Municipal Clerk's Assistant;
Mr. R. F. Norcliffe, Municipal Clerk's Assistant.

(1) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M4)

Reference RZ #76/72

Lot 1, S.D. "A", Block 15, D.L. 98, Plan 4577

(5268 Beresford Street -- Located on the South side of Beresford Street, approximately 210 feet East of Royal Oak Avenue)

Mr. Hugh G. Ladner speaking on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Lewarne, who are the owners of the above noted property, and the applicants with respect to this rezoning application spoke in favour of the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Ladner noted that the Director of Planning, in his report to Council dated January 12, 1973, recommended that "this application for spot rezoning not be favourably considered".

He stated that if this application were being made as a "spot rezoning" he could not support it and would not ask Council to do so. However, the application is not being made on that basis - it is being made upon the basis that the zoning in this particular area is in need of review and the plan for the area in need of revision. This zoning application ought to only be considered in the context of the plan for the area and not with respect to this isolated parcel of land.

Mr. Ladner noted that there is support for this rezoning from the property owners in the immediate area as evidenced by the letters which he has filed with the Municipal Clerk.

Jan/30/1973
P.H.

The Director of Planning has reported that the proposed alignment of Antrim Avenue connecting with Irmin Street at MacPherson Avenue will, in conjunction with the Hydro right-of-way, become a logical land use boundary and provide a suitable termination to the industrial zone to the North and to the East.

Mr. Ladner submitted that Antrim Avenue is not the logical land use boundary because there is already industrial development to the West of it. The lot on the Southwest corner of Antrim Avenue and Beresford Street has established industrial development upon it with a new construction facility extension that was only completed about the end of 1971. There is also a millworking manufacturing plant on the lot on the Southwest corner of Antrim Avenue and Victory Street. There is, therefore, already well established industrial development of recent origin to the West of Antrim Avenue. Antrim Avenue cannot, therefore, be a logical land use boundary nor can it be an effective one. A land use boundary to the West of Antrim Avenue ought to be considered and he submitted that Royal Oak Avenue is the logical boundary on the West and Victory Street (or perhaps the lane to the South of it) is a logical boundary on the South.

Mr. Ladner suggested that Council may be well advised to reconsider the proposal suggesting Antrim Avenue be developed as a local traffic collector. To proceed with this would have the effect of introducing major traffic into the residential area East of MacPherson Avenue and adjacent to the complex developed by Action Line Housing which involves 20 units and now houses 96 children. It would also be adjacent to the lots recently sold to the Provincial Government for housing. Such a collector would detract from the housing amenities that are necessary for housing of all kinds - including subsidized housing. Council should consider simply extending Beresford Street to the East to where it may rejoin Rumble Street.

The Planning Director had also submitted that industrial zoning is incompatible with the proposed extension of MacPherson Park.

Mr. Ladner contended that there was nothing incompatible with the sort of industrial development that is being proposed by Mr. Lewarne. It is a clean, quiet industry that has been a credit to the community for many years. It is certainly cleaner and more attractive than the development in the immediate area now.

In any event, the extension of MacPherson Park is not feasible within the foreseeable future. There is new commercial development on Lot 12 on Irmin Street (the second lot East of Royal Oak Avenue). A new duplex was completed on Lots 7 and 8 on Irmin Street (the second and third lots East of Royal Oak Avenue) within the last three years; and there are two new duplex on Lots 1, 9, 8 and 7 in the 5200 Block on Sidley Street.

Mr. Ladner suggested that as an alternative to the extension of MacPherson Park, Council may consider the use of the Antrim Avenue road allowance and Lot 72. The area in which the subject lot is located is logical for industrial development, and only industrial development. All of the homes in this area are approximately 50 years old except for three homes on the Northeast corner of Royal Oak Avenue and Victory Street, and a home on Lot 13 on Victory Street. These are the only homes in the area of more recent origin.

Jan/30/1973
P.H.

-3-

Mr. Ladner also noted that the noise from the trains shunting daily and nightly on the Hydro right-of-way make their area unsuitable for residential use and symptomatic of this is the fact that the homes on Beresford Street, all of which are rental properties, are always difficult to rent. In retrospect Council may consider it to have been an error to have allowed apartments to locate immediately adjacent to the Hydro right-of-way in the Maywood area. It should also be noted that the Hydro right-of-way is a logical quarter for rapid transit and may experience very substantial development in the near future.

The Director of Planning has recommended that "quasi-residential uses for institutional uses could be located in this area". In the letter to the applicant to which he refers, he suggests that it might be used as a church complex.

Mr. Ladner suggested that this area is already well served with churches. There are a number in the immediate neighbourhood. He further suggested that Council would be hard pressed to propose an acceptable type of development for this area of a residential or institutional category. Hopefully the day is behind us when Council would place any form of subsidized housing or such things as halfway houses or rest homes in an area as unsuitable as this. He submitted that it is completely unsuitable for these purposes. Its only logical use is as industrial.

In conclusion, Mr. Ladner submitted that this area is suitable only "for the accommodation of light industrial activities under conditions that are designed to minimize conflict with existing residential uses in areas of mixed development". He noted that these words are the preamble to the permitted uses of the M4 zoning district in the Burnaby Zoning By-Law and are most applicable here.

Letters were received from the following residents of the area expressing themselves in favour of the proposed rezoning:

- (a) P. I. Williams, 7008 Royal Oak Avenue
- (b) Mr. and Mrs. W. Ostrihoff, #6 - 1065 Bute Street, Vancouver (5312 Beresford Street)
- (c) K. E. Jeffrey, 7026 Royal Oak Avenue
- (d) D. Murfitt, 7058 Royal Oak Avenue
- (e) Aurora Holdings Ltd., 7042 Royal Oak Avenue
- (f) W. Kellett, 5388 Beresford Street
- (g) Mr. C. C. Berney, 5900 34B Avenue, Delta (5362 Beresford Street)

Letters opposing the proposed rezoning were received from the following residents of the area:

- (a) A. C. Franklin, 7076 Royal Oak Avenue
- (b) W. T. Kellett Jr., 45766 Yale Road West, Chilliwack (5338 Beresford Street)

A petition signed by 21 other residents of the area was received expressing opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Mrs. Howard Jones, 5287 Victory Street petitioned against the proposed rezoning for the following reasons:

Jan/30/1973
P.H.

-4-

- (1) She was against the spot zoning in this area. She felt that if there is to be rezoning the whole area should be considered.
- (2) The zoning is not designed to benefit the individual or to protect personal interest but must take into account the well being of the entire community.
- (3) The entire community has contributed to the development of the MacPherson Park and its recreational facilities which adjoin the school. Also adjoining the Park are facilities for curling and skating. For the community to get maximum use for this Park and its facilities, she suggested that this area be rezoned to high-rise apartments to house people who in turn could make use of the Park and its facilities.

Mr. J. Motiuk of 6767 Strathmore Avenue also stated his opposition to the rezoning proposal on the grounds that this constituted a spot rezoning. He fully supported the remarks of the previous speaker.

Mr. R. Miller, 5792 Beresford Street spoke in favour of the rezoning proposal. He stated that the heavy, noisy train traffic made the area unsuitable for R5 zoning. It was his opinion that the proposed development would be much more compatible with the surrounding area.

ALDERMAN DRUMMOND JOINED THE MEETING AT 7:55 P.M.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ONE (R1) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #60/72

Block 84 Except Explanatory Plan 33894, D.L. 40, Plan 29647

(8335 Winston Street -- Located on Winston Street 714.12 feet West of Brighton Avenue)

Mr. Brian Calder speaking on behalf of Beedie Construction Co. Ltd. stated that their reason for requesting this rezoning is that they did not believe this land could be properly developed as residential as it abuts an operation zoned M2 Heavy Industrial which, by the nature of its business, is noisy and unsightly. He did not believe that residential is a suitable use for this land or that people would wish to reside next to this operation.

In August, 1972, the Company wrote to the Planning Department and requested that the consideration be given to the rezoning of this property. In September, the Planning Department advised that Council had considered their request and approved in principle the concept of rezoning the site to Comprehensive Development District (CD) on the basis that the site will be developed under regulations that are proposed for the M5 zoning district.

The Council also stipulated that the plan of development for the property must reflect the following:

Jan/30/1973
P.H.

-5-

- (a) The preservation of existing growth in the West and Northwest portions of the property.
- (b) The provisions of an 80-foot to 100-foot buffer zone suitably planted along the Westerly side of the site.
- (c) Recognition of the residences to the North in the planting and the landscaping of the area.
- (d) Suitable architectural treatment of buildings which might be employed to enhance the view of the existing industrial uses of the area.

He stated that many discussions had been held with the Planning Department in the interim period and that the Company has agreed to do a number of things to ensure that the intent of Council and the planners is carried out and fully realized in the final product of the building.

They are:

- (1) Everything possible has been done to create suitable buffer between the M2 Heavy Industrial use on the Easterly boundary and the proposed residential subdivision on the Westerly boundary.
- (2) Total berming and landscaping of the North boundary and the West boundary so that the visibility of the building will be minimized to any adjoining residential properties, has been proposed.
- (3) An 80-foot landscape sideyard on the Western boundary has been provided.
- (4) Substantial berming and planting on the Southeast corner will be done so that car parking will not be visible from any of the adjoining residences.
- (5) Vehicular traffic flows have been concentrated to the South and East corner of the property so that no noise or interference will be created to any residences.
- (6) The front of the building facing Winston Street has received suitable architectural treatments so that it will be considered an asset to the area.
- (7) The Western face of the building has also received special treatment and it will provide very aesthetically acceptable atmosphere, particularly when one considers that there will be an 80-foot landscaped sideyard between the Western building line and the property line followed by suitable planting.

Mr. Calder also noted that discussions had been held with the gentleman who is developing the residential subdivision to the West of the under consideration and he has stated that he is in agreement with the proposed development.

In conclusion, Mr. Calder noted that Beedie Construction Ltd. are general contractors having had their offices in Burnaby for the past 24 years. The Company is very willing and able to carry out and complete the facility as outlined above and respectfully requested that Council rezone this property to M5 industrial district.

Jan/30/1973
P.H.

-6-

In reply to a question from Alderman Constable as to what type of operation was proposed for the warehouse, Mr. Calder advised that they were looking for a light and clean business which would be a daytime operation and which would not generate a great volume of vehicular traffic.

Alderman Lawson enquired as to the height of the proposed berms. Mr. Calder stated that the design of the berms and the accompanying planning could be designed to meet any requirements of the surrounding properties but that it was anticipated the whole building would be very well screened.

Alderman Mercier enquired if there would be any encroachments into the required sideyard. Mr. Calder replied that the Planning Department had allowed a small encroachment into the 80-foot sideyard requirement to permit additional parking spaces over and above that required by the Burnaby Zoning By-Law.

Mr. W. Sager, 7789 Kentwood Street spoke in favour of the proposed rezoning. He stated that he owned the land immediately to the West of the property under consideration on which he was planning to build a residential subdivision.

Mr. A. Burgoyne, 7924 Burnlake Drive spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning. He was concerned with the further encroachment of industry onto the North side of Winston Street. He noted that the area South of Winston Street was already zoned industrial and was of the opinion that future development should be confined to this area. He was of the opinion that the existing houses North of Winston would suffer devaluation if this development is allowed to proceed.

Mr. R. A. Parmiter, 3880 Winlake Crescent also spoke in opposition to the rezoning proposal. He expressed doubt that an entirely daytime operation could be found to occupy the proposed warehouse. He was of the opinion that the area should remain zoned R1.

Mrs. Irene Timmerman, 8326 Government Street stated that she was the owner of the property immediately to the North of the property under consideration. She supported the previous speakers and was opposed to the rezoning.

Mr. D. Ward, 3626 Dalebright Drive was also opposed to the rezoning. He was convinced that a development of this type would only add to the already noisy conditions existing in the neighbourhood.

Mrs. R. A. Parmiter, 3880 Winlake Crescent was also opposed to the rezoning proposal. She was concerned with the increase in traffic which would be generated by such a development.

Mr. T. G. Shaw, 8316 Government Street spoke in opposition to the rezoning. He expressed doubt that berms could be constructed which would satisfactorily obscure the new development in the space available.

Jan/30/1973
P.H.

-7-

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5) TO COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL
INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT (P5)

Reference RZ #79/72

Lots 1 and 2, D.L. 68, Plan 3431

(4022 and 4046 Canada Way -- Located on the Southeast corner
of Curle Avenue and Canada Way)

Mr. Bill Marshall representing the developer stated that the proposed development would take the form of a two-storey building designed to accommodate 110 people in the age group of 65 to 90. He further stated that the project was designed for a profit making operation.

Mr. Joe Jerwa, 4072 Canada Way submitted a letter expressing opposition to this rezoning proposal. He wished to protest for properties adjacent to the subject site. When he signed an exclusive listing agreement with B. Fisher Realty and rezoning rights it was with an understanding that all four acres had to be rezoned before any development could proceed. Now rezoning has been applied for on subject properties only. He was concerned for resale value of his properties with so many institutional and commercial developments in his immediate area.

In response to a query received, the Director of Planning advised that one of the prerequisites established by Council to this rezoning required the dedication of the necessary road allowance at the South end of the site and the deposit of sufficient monies to cover the cost of constructing this road and the services. He noted that the purpose of the road would be to connect Kalyk Avenue with Curle Avenue.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Confirmed:

Certified Correct:

Robert W. Little
MAYOR

J. S. ...
DEPUTY CLERK

BL/mc