

August 20, 1974

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chamber, Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby 2, B. C. on Tuesday, August 20, 1974 at 7:30 p.m. to receive representations in connection with the following proposed amendments to Burnaby Zoning By-Law 1965:

PRESENT:

Mayor T. W. Constable, in the Chair
Alderman G. D. Ast
Alderman A. H. Emmott
Alderman B. M. Gunn
Alderman D. A. Lawson
Alderman G. H. F. McLean
Alderman J. L. Mercier
Alderman V. V. Stusiak
Alderman W. A. Lewarne

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. D. Stenson, Assistant Planning Director - Current
Mr. James Hudson, Municipal Clerk
Mr. E. A. J. Ward, Deputy Municipal Clerk

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

(CHANGE IN COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLANS)

Reference RZ #73/73

- (a) Lots 6 and 7, Block 26, D.L. 95, Plan 9019
- (b) Lots "A" and "B", Block 26, D.L. 95, Plan 9592

(7249, 7259, 7267 and 7271 Acorn Avenue -- Located on the Northwest corner of Acorn Avenue and Beresford Street)

This project, as proposed, is a 66-unit condominium apartment housed in a 12-storey tower on a 39,818 square foot site.

Mr. W. Ralph Brownlee, Architect, appeared and stated that the proposed change in the Comprehensive Development Plan involving the above described properties was in the number and size of the suites planned to be built in the 12-storey structure proposed to be constructed on the site.

(2) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5), SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4) AND DRIVE-IN RESTAURANT DISTRICT (C7) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #32/74

- (a) Lot 1, Blocks 17/50, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 799
(3705 Kingsway)
- (b) Lots 2 and 3, Blocks 17/50, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 799
(3735 Kingsway)
- (c) Lot "P", D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 19539
(3743 Kingsway)
- (d) Lot "Q", D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 19539
(3769 Kingsway)
- (e) Parcel "A", Explanatory Plan 7056 Except Part on By-Law 31505, S.D. 7, Blocks 17/50, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 799
(3777 Kingsway)
- (f) Lot 7 Except Parcel "A", Explanatory Plan 7056, and Except Part on Plan with By-Law 31505, Blocks 17/50, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 799
(3781 Kingsway)
- (g) Parcel "B", Reference Plan 5469, S.D. 8, Blocks 17/50, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 799
(3789 Kingsway)
- (h) Parcel "A", Reference Plan 5450, S.D. 8, Blocks 17/50, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 799
(3795 Kingsway)
- (i) Approximately the Easterly 1/3 of Lot "O", Block 15, D.L.'s 35/151, Plan 19539
(5450 Boundary Road)
- (j) Approximately the Easterly 1/2 of Lots 1 and 2, Block 16, D.L. 35, Plan 5289
(5610 and 5620 Boundary Road)
- (k) Approximately the Easterly 1/3 of Lots 2, 3 and 4, Block 15, D.L. 35, Plan 2453
(5530, 5540 and 5570 Boundary Road)

(Located on the Northeast corner of Kingsway and Boundary Road extending to the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority Right-of-Way)

This project, as proposed, is a terraced office building complex on a 6.77 acre site.

Mr. Gordon McFarlane of the B. C. Telephone Company spoke and stated that the purpose of the building is to serve as a headquarters office building for the Company and not a structure for housing telephone facilities.

Mr. McFarlane outlined the plan of the Company and commented that it was felt the structure would be an asset to both the community and the area involved.

Mr. Frank Musson, Architect for the project, then spoke and stated that there were three basic considerations which were given the matter, they being the requirements of the B. C. Telephone Company, the strategic location of the site, and the ambitions of the Municipality for the area and the site in particular.

Mr. Musson advised that it was planned to build a structure of some 600,000 square feet.

He also provided an explanation of the type of structure planned and displayed a model and a number of sketches illustrating details of the proposed building.

In response to a question, Mr. Musson stated that consideration was given the matter of providing terraced areas higher than that planned but this was discarded because it would add to the bulk of the structure and possibly detract from its appearance.

Mr. McFarlane, also in response to a question, advised that the B. C. Telephone Company had to recognize the fact the Imperial Oil Company owned adjacent land and wished to remain on its site and provide a gas bar.

Mr. McFarlane also, in response to a question, stated that the B. C. Telephone Company does not presently have flexible working hours for its employees but this could always change in the future. He added that the Company knows the route followed by all of the employees who would be housed in the proposed building when travelling to and from work.

When Mr. Musson was asked about the provisions which were being made in regard to fire protection in the building, he replied that there are 12 alternative methods of control that can be allowed under the National Building Code and, though the current plans make what is considered adequate provision, alterations could always be made at a later date if deemed necessary.

A written Brief was also presented to the Council explaining the proposed development in considerable detail.

Mr. J. Jankola, 4136 Bond Street, then spoke on behalf of the Central Park Ratepayers' and Citizens' Association and began to read a Brief relating to the rezoning of land, in general terms, in the Central Park area. He apologized for past statements made to Council when making representations about the rezoning proposals.

Mr. Jankola also commented that the development planned by the B. C. Telephone Company could be regarded as prestigious.

See Minutes of September 3, 1974 Council meeting for amendment.

Mr. Arthur Porter, who stated he resided on Thurston Street, then spoke and criticized the proposed development. He advised that he was opposed to the project because of its size, the traffic problems which would be created and inadequate parking facilities.

Mr. Porter also commented that he felt the same views were shared by some of his neighbours.

(3) FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C1) AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2) TO SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2)

Reference RZ #31/74

- (a) Block 24, D.L. 1, Plan 4231
(7351 North Road)
- (b) Lot 22 Except Part on Plan 24399, D.L. 1, Plan 3043
(7281 North Road)
- (c) Lot 3, D.L. 1, Plan 24399
(9424 Trans Canada Highway)
- (d) Lot 6 Part Southwest of Freeway, Block 23, D.L. 1, Plan 4231
(9412 Trans Canada Highway)
- (e) Lot 5 Part Southwest of Freeway, Block 23, D.L. 1, Plan 4231
(9388 Trans Canada Highway)
- (f) Part of Lot 2, D.L. 1, Plan 24399
(9354 Trans Canada Highway)
- (g) A Portion of Block 21 Except Part on Plan 24399, D.L. 13, Plan 3046
(9286 Trans Canada Highway)

(Located between the Freeway (Trans Canada Highway) and the Great Northern Railway Right-of-Way extending Westward from North Road and containing some 14.4 acres)

Mr. Robert M. Boyd, Assistant Manager for Properties, Burlington-Northern Railway Company, then spoke and stated, in strong terms, that the Company was opposed to the rezoning proposal. He added that the Company did not request the rezoning and, so far as he knew, the matter was initiated by the Municipality.

Mr. Boyd emphatically stated that the properties were intended to be held by the Burlington Northern Railway Company for railway purposes strictly. He pointed out that the railway business is increasing rapidly and there is a demand for land for railway operational use. As an example, Mr. Boyd pointed out that there is a need for another lead track from the Lake City area in Burnaby to Sapperton.

In response to a question, Mr. Boyd stated that the Burlington-Northern Railway Company has improvements in the City of New Westminster and the City of Vancouver but, so far as he knew, none in Burnaby.

Mr. Boyd also commented that the Trans Canada Highway lying to the North of the subject property acts as a natural barrier and effectively screens the railway operation from the residential area to the North. This was recognized when the Company disposed of its land North of the Trans Canada Highway earlier this year.

When an enquiry was made as to whether a transportation system was being considered between the Burlington-Northern Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway, Mr. Ford of Burlington-Northern replied that he had no knowledge of any study being made in regard to such a scheme.

When asked, Mr. Boyd stated that Burlington-Northern Railway had absolutely no opposition to the proposed change in a portion of the subject properties from NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C1) to some other category.

Mr. L. Love, 8720 Government Street, then spoke and stated that he was opposed to the rezoning proposal because he felt the land in question was a natural industrial site and that there was nothing wrong with its use for railway purposes.

(4) Reference RZ #36/74

FROM GASOLINE SERVICE STATION DISTRICT (C6) TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (R2)

The Northerly 60 feet of Lot 8, S.D. "B", Block 7, D.L. 125, Plan 22106

FROM GASOLINE SERVICE STATION DISTRICT (C6) TO GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2)

The remainder of Lot 8, S.D. "B", Block 7, D.L. 125, Plan 22106

(5258 Lougheed Highway -- Located on the Southeast corner of Lougheed Highway and Springer Avenue)

The applicant, Mr. A. R. Grimwood, submitted a letter asking that the proposal to rezone the above described property be withdrawn.

(5) FROM MANUFACTURING DISTRICT (M1) TO LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M5)

Reference RZ #41/74

Lot "A", S.D. 1, Block 3, D.L. 120, Plan 13545

(1680 Gilmore Avenue -- Located on the Southeast corner of Douglas Road and Gilmore Avenue)

No one appeared in connection with this rezoning proposal.

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

Reference RZ #20/74

Southern Portion of Lot 192, D.L. 95, Plan 37840

(7252 Kingsway -- Located South of Kingsway and North of the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority Right-of-Way, about 155 feet East of Acorn Avenue)

Mr. Z. Kiss, Architect for the project proposed on the above described property, spoke and advised that the development proposed will be the second tower for senior citizens directly behind the Public Library.

When an enquiry was made about the parking situation proposed for the development, Mr. Kiss replied that after it was realized the parking allotment for the first tower was inadequate, arrangements were made to provide more parking facilities for the second tower than are required under the Zoning By-Law.

Mr. D. Mercier then spoke and asked a number of questions concerning the adequacy of parking on the site and the relationship between senior citizens' projects and commercial developments.

Mr. D. Stenson of the Planning Department provided answers to the various questions posed by Mr. Mercier.

Mr. Mercier concluded by stating that he supported the rezoning proposal.

Mr. R. I. Rirtwell, Housing Department, Greater Vancouver Regional District, submitted a letter relating to the prerequisites/connection with the subject rezoning proposal.

It was understood by Council that the Planning Department would determine whether taxes would be paid on the subject site.

It was further understood that the Manager would indicate whether the Municipality has the power to require the provision of parking facilities different than that required by by-law.

The Planning Department was also asked to check the parking facilities at the New Vista development to determine whether they were adequate.

(7) FROM SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2) TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TWO (R2)

Reference RZ #33/74

(a) D.L. 100 Except 360' x 662', Plans 744 and 3065
(1861 North Road)

(b) Part 360' x 662', D.L. 100S $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 3065
(2021 North Road)

(Located on the West side of North Road approximately 792 feet North of Broadway)

9

John James Harrison

Mr. C. Dunning, Project Co-Ordinator for Community Builders Limited, the applicant, spoke and answered a number of questions posed by members of Council concerning the reason for the desired rezoning. In that regard, he stated that the Company proposes to develop approximately 18 acres of land in the area for single family purposes and requires the rezoning of the subject properties to achieve this end.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN EMMOTT, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MCLEAN:
"That the Hearing now adjourn."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Hearing adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Confirmed:


MAYOR

Certified Correct:


DEPUTY MUNICIPAL CLERK

EW/mc