

JUNE 17, 1975

A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chamber, Municipal Hall,  
4949 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C. on Tuesday, June 17, 1975 at 7:30 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Alderman D. A. Lawson  
Alderman G. H. F. McLean

STAFF: Mr. M. J. Shelley, Municipal Manager  
Mr. A. L. Parr, Director of Planning  
Mr. J. Hudson, Municipal Clerk  
Mr. R. W. Watson, Deputy Municipal Clerk

The Public Hearing was held to receive representations in connection  
with the following proposed amendments to "Burnaby Zoning By-Law 1965":

(1) FROM COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)  
TO AMENDED COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #84A/69

Lot 85, D.L. 4, Plan 38877

(9501 Erickson Drive - Located in the Mid Portion of the Block Bounded  
by Bell Avenue, Cameron Street and Bartlett Court with Frontage on  
Lougheed Highway)

*This proposal is to amend the original adopted by-law to allow addi-  
tional space to be used for commercial facilities.*

There were no submissions received in regard to the above noted proposed  
rezoning.

(2) FROM SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M4) AND RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R5)  
TO MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (RM3)

Reference RZ #53/74

Lots 1S $\frac{1}{2}$  and 2, Blocks 42 & 43, D.L. 153, Plan 1566  
Lot 3, Blocks 42 & 43, D.L. 153, Plan 1566  
Lot 4, Block 42, D.L. 153, Plan 1566

(6450/72/78 Telford Avenue - Located on the South East Corner of  
Telford Avenue and Beresford Street)

*This proposal is for the rezoning of the above described properties  
to allow for the construction of a three-storey condominium apartment  
development.*

There were no submissions received in regard to the above noted proposed  
rezoning.

June 17/75

- 2 -

(3) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R4)  
TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD)

Reference RZ #2/75

Lot V, D.L. 92, Plan 13612

(6540 Oakland Street - Located at the Southeast Corner of Gilley Avenue and Oakland Street Right-of-way)

*This proposal is for the rezoning of the above described property in order to provide group housing designed primarily for the accommodation of families with children.*

1. Mr. James Duff, Chairman, Burnaby Residents Association, appeared before the Hearing to submit a petition of 330 names in regard to the proposed rezoning. The text of the petition was as follows:
  - a. The Comprehensive Development District (C.D.) is too comprehensive, permitting commercial, institutional and industrial uses, as well as residential.
  - b. The proposed group housing development is 250% higher density than the surrounding area, and this may be increased to 500% more if the full allowable site coverage was used.
  - c. The increased density will probably double the traffic flow, and the existing schools in the area would be unable to handle the increased student enrolment, placing a further burden on the present tax-payers to provide more educational facilities.
  - d. The planned 33' widening of Gilley Avenue incorporated in this proposed development is obviously the initial step in converting Gilley Avenue into a main North-South arterial road, hooking up with Oakland Street and eventually the East-West Dover-Grange arterial road.
  - e. If the above road plan was adopted, it would be detrimental and hazardous to the Applicant's intention - i.e. to provide high density group housing designed primarily for the accommodation of families with children.
  - f. The stated Applicant's intention does not indicate whether the proposed accommodation to be provided will be on a rental or sale basis.

Mr. Duff advised that the petition was a spontaneous product of the abutting owners and was endorsed by the Concerned Burnaby Residents Association. In addition to the objections raised by others Mr. Duff would call Council's attention to the roads and traffic problems aggravated by this proposal. Mr. Duff stated there were several unresolved traffic problems in the area, one of which was provision of the truck route which could best be resolved by the proposed Gilley ravine route. It was stated that the normal number of vehicles generated by the present zoning could be tolerated with some sacrifices, but to double or triple that amount, they should not be called upon to put up with. It was also stated a further traffic problem resulted from the

June 17/75

- 3 -

misalignment of Imperial Avenue by 20 feet at the intersection with Gilley. It was stated that six accidents a week are recorded at the Gilley-Imperial intersection. It was suggested that Council would be remiss if they compounded the already significant traffic problems in the area by altering the existing zoning.

2. Mr. Ian L. Beveridge, Vice-President, Community Builders Ltd. Mr. Beveridge advised that before proceeding with the project they had asked themselves two questions. What effect the project would have on the neighbours and what reaction would they have to it, and stated that they would not normally go ahead unless they had some positive answers to the questions. He suggested that it was a psychological fact that it was easier to drum up opposition to a project rather than support and suggested that this is partly due to the fact that the people who would eventually be residents of the project were not in attendance. With these problems in mind and due to the fact that the R-8 standards had not to this point been used in Burnaby, the concept was submitted twice to Council previously to try and ascertain that they were on the right track. As I understand it, this zoning allows more imaginative and effective use of the land, by utilizing the land required under the existing zoning, for roadways, as it would be wasted in a conventional subdivision. Also it lets an architect with imagination create a low density housing project which will blend with the existing single family dwellings and provide some interesting housing variety in the neighbourhood. If you look at the plot plan you will find that there are no units in the proposal as close to Gilley as there would be with conventional housing. The two closest being approximately 30 feet from the roadway. In this situation, it ended with an efficient ten-unit to the acre cluster type of development with large amounts of landscaping and open space. We have 79 privately owned two-storey townhouse units instead of approximately 58 rental duplexes under existing zoning.

In reviewing the school situation it was stated that after contacting school principals, it was indicated approximately 300 elementary school spaces were available and 350 secondary spaces. In our experience and others, this type of unit usually generates approximately .6 children per dwelling unit. It was stated that due to the CD zoning, no high density could result and the plan presented here tonight would be the plan eventually constructed.

3. Mr. Barry McLeod, Project Architect. Mr. McLeod advised that the project consisted of 79 units on 7.9 acres of which ten were two-bedroom units of 1,150 square feet, fifty-nine were three-bedroom units of 1,500 square feet, and ten were four-bedroom units with 1,800 square feet. All units being two storeys with a full basement, a double carport, a patio, a balcony and finished with cedar and brick. Mr. McLeod advised that there were 155 parking stalls for the complex or 1.96 per unit, substantially above the Municipal requirements. Mr. McLeod advised that they were lowering the general level of the project by approximately 4 feet to ensure that persons outside the project would not have their views totally blocked and the roof lines were kept to a minimum, with the heights of the individual units being 18 or 26 feet. It was stated that the selling range would be \$70,000.00 plus for the units. It was also stated that berming would be carried out to a height of 5 to 6 feet in some locations plus planting of trees. It was stated the recreation facilities included a tennis court and indoor swimming pool. Mr. McLeod then reviewed the several sketches indicating access and egress as well as plot plans involved, and showing a model of one of the clusters.

June 17/75

- 4 -

The Planner advised that the intent was that the street improvement required on Gilley was the responsibility of the developer.

Mr. Beveridge advised that the purpose of the project was to provide a different type of housing unit. It was recognized as being an above average level of unit. The costs per unit did not provide for a \$50,000.00 range but rather provided a unit cost in keeping with the existing residential neighbourhood.

4. Mr. John Sage, 6413 Burns Street, appeared before the Hearing and stated that in his opinion the library and recreation facilities available in the Municipality were already inadequate and specifically that the Library Board did not meet a minimum standard of 2 volumes per person. It was also noted that the Municipality had to rent ice from several private sources for recreation purposes. He stated that his experience in the North Vancouver area was that similar developments in the \$70,000.00 to \$80,000.00 range generated more than two children per unit. It was also stated that the Brantford School being the adjacent one to the facility did not have the capacity to carry the children that would apparently need to be accommodated.

5. Rosa Douglas, 6529 Gilley Avenue appeared before the Hearing and advised that she had been a resident of Gilley Avenue for the past 26 years and requested answers to two specific questions. Had the recommendations of the Planner been adopted and had the Advisory Planning Commission reviewed the project?

Mayor Constable advised that the purpose of the Hearing was to receive input into the proposal and that Council had not as yet adopted the project. It was also indicated that individual planning recommendations were not requested from the Commission and that their role in Burnaby was to review the overall planning.

6. Mr. Jim Marsh, 6191 Berwick Street, appeared before the Hearing and stated his concern for the sudden increase in children in the area. It was stated that the number of children in the neighbourhood now are approximately 3 per family and it was suggested that even at 1½ children per family in the proposed development as opposed to the .6 suggested, and considering that 50% of these children would be beyond Grade 7, that there would in fact be problems absorbing these numbers in the area. It was also stated that in considering the attempts by the Province to lower the pupil-teacher ratio, that there would be a double effect on the school system.

It was suggested that the 1.5 children per unit as opposed to the .6 of the developer was probably more accurate and under the circumstances it was suggested that the children presently attending school in overcrowded classrooms would find they may be required to attend schools at a further distance and walk more than the five or six blocks maximum that they already walked. In any event, the children's schooling in the area will in all probability suffer or be temporarily disrupted and further that it places an unnecessary tax burden on the residents of Burnaby to provide these additional classrooms.

June 17/75

- 5 -

It was also suggested that privately-owned condominium developments placed in the middle of a single-family dwelling area could create antagonisms that would lead to juvenile delinquency.

In closing, Mr. Marsh suggested that the community would be better served by the land being developed under the present R4 zoning.

7. Mr. L. Gregson, 6376 Burns Street, appeared before the Hearing and stated that he had been a resident at that address for the past 17 years and advised he was appearing as an individual citizen, however, also representing owners in the area.

He noted that the adjacent lands were basically a single-family and duplex area and most of the existing owners have lived there since the housing was new.

It was suggested that the services and facilities in the area were designed for the before noted zoning and that any change at this time would lead to overcrowding the school and road systems.

It was suggested that the ground stability of the land was in question relative to the project proposed.

Mr. Gregson then reviewed the report of the Planner under date of May 20, 1975 indicating the following:

- 4.1 A cul-de-sac was proposed for the end of Lakeview Street when in fact a portion of the property was still privately-owned.
- 4.7 It was stated that the Brantford School was operating to full capacity and it would be the one servicing the development.
- 5.1 The site area of 7.5 acres does not take into consideration access roads, emergency exists plus visitor parking. It was suggested that the figures quoted in Item 5.1 do not give a proper picture of the end result.

He noted a floor ratio of .36 was indicated. It was stated this figure did not include basements or covered carports and suggested the actual floor ratio was more in the order of .40. It was suggested that the floor area for the swimming pool and tennis courts were missed in the calculations.

In review, Mr. Gregson suggested that the proposed development was not compatible with the surrounding area as indicated under Comprehensive Development Zoning Item 7.002.

8. Gordon Heselton, 6405 Burns Street, appeared before the Hearing on behalf of the Concerned Burnaby Residents.

Mr. Heselton suggested that if Council was serious in providing additional accommodation in Burnaby that they develop the Stride Avenue Development site containing 97.5 acres and that it could contain 309 dwelling units at 4.1 units per acre or 501 cluster units at 5.4 units per acre.

It was suggested that if a housing shortage continues to exist the Council give the Stride Avenue Development their full support. It was stated that after contacting residents adjacent to the Stride Avenue Development that there would be no opposition to the plans as proposed last fall by the Burnaby Planning Department.

June 17/75

- 6 -

It was also suggested that this type of development not be enclosed by a fence or similar structure in order to create the largest expanse of open air possible.

9. Rosemary Bonsley, 6288 Service Street, appeared before the Hearing requesting what the development company would do if the project units did not sell at the \$70,000.00/\$80,000.00 cost referred to.

It was stated that the developer had been successful in previous projects to this point and suggested that although there might be a time lag in certain instances the project would eventually sell.

10. Mr. Mel Sharpe, 6349 Burns Street. On a question of Mr. Sharpe relating to a ravine in the Northeast corner of the property the developer's Architect stated that they are aware of the ravine in question and would be transferring materials from other areas of the site to the ravine.

The Planner advised that they expect and have requested the developer to provide information on the stability and suitability of the land for the proposed project.

Mr. Sharpe also advised that in his opinion the change in the number of units to be placed on the parcel from sixty to approximately eighty was a substantial increase in density.

11. Mr. Len W. Forsythe, 6465 Burns Street, appeared before Council requesting information on the question of enforcement of maintenance charges due by the individual owners. It was stated that under the Strata Titles Corporation, the Corporation Council had the right to foreclose on the individual not making payment and in that way performance was assured to the residents living adjacent to the project.

It was noted the development company would continue its maintenance of the landscaping for a one year period to ensure successful results from the plantings.

12. Mr. Dick Drinnan, 6377 Burns Street. On a question of Mr. Drinnan, the Architect advised that the full basements referred to would be located in such a manner that the floors on the first level were approximately flush with the ground or 6 inches above grade.

Mr. Drinnan indicated that he had seen previous projects where in fact the eventual location of the units were different than what was originally proposed.

It was stated that under the Comprehensive Development Zoning being considered the units could only be located where placed on the approved drawings.

13. Mr. Cecil Kaban, 6311 Lakeview Avenue. On a question of Mr. Kaban, it was stated that the developer would have to purchase property on the East side of Lakeview in order to complete the cul-de-sac proposed.

The Planner advised that the cul-de-sac development would be a two-phase development. Firstly, the one portion would be developed by the persons proceeding with the existing project and the second phase would be developed when the property to the East came up for consideration.

June 17/75

- 7 -

It was stated that a sufficient portion of the cul-de-sac would be developed at this time to provide access to the development.

14. Mr. Peter Madden, 6555 Stanley Street. On a question to the Architect, the Architect advised that he had been the developer of units at Cauffield Cove, Marine Drive, in West Vancouver and there had been approximately 7 units per acre or 12 to 13 units per net acre. Mr. Madden suggested that if the design layout of this facility was as good as the Cauffield Cove one that it would be an asset to the area.

15. Mr. Romeo Princic, 6241 Burns Street. On a question of Mr. Princic, it was stated that if the zoning did not go ahead that the area could be completely covered in duplexes under (R4) and that the limitations were 35 feet in height and 2½ storeys and the numbers estimated were between 54 and 58.

16. Mr. Harold Chursinoff, 6338 Gilley Avenue. Mr. Chursinoff advised that he had experience with duplexes and suggested that there would be no way anyone would construct duplexes at present day rentals and expect to get a return on their money.

Mr. Chursinoff also suggested that the children's playground at the outside corner of the property be moved into the middle due to the noise level that would be generated from such an area.

17. Mr. Gordon Miller, 6103 Service Street. On a question of Mr. Miller it was stated that the development would carry itself by way of paying for its own internal servicing. It was stated that any increased costs to the tax payer might relate to schools.

18. Carolyn Sharpe, 6349 Burns Street, appeared before Council and advised that she owned property immediately adjacent across the laneway involved and suggested that in the development, consideration be given to installation of speed bumps in the lane. It was indicated that people used the lane as it had a better grade than the steep grade on Lakeview Street. It was also suggested that when the development was completed that people would be inclined to go down Gilley and turn down the lane.

19. Mr. Raymond Gross, 6308 Lakeview Street. On a question of Mr. Gross relating to possible conversion of the project from an ownership to a rental concept, it was stated that there was no specific safeguard for stopping future conversion, however, the state of rentals at the present time meant that the units could not be disposed of on a rental basis and costs recovered.

Mr. Ian Beveridge of Community Builders Ltd., advised that one point had not been covered and that was that the developer had to, under the Municipality's regulations, contribute \$475.00 per unit for the development of local parks outside the boundary of the project.

No one else appeared in connection with this rezoning proposal.

June 17/75

- 8 -

(4) FROM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R5)  
TO SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M5)

Reference RZ #6/75

Lots 3 W1/2, 3 E1/2, 4, 9 W1/2, 9 E1/2, 10,  
Blk. 10, D.L. 69, Plan 1321

(4038, 4044, 4048 Myrtle Street, 4041, 4051, 4061 Regent Street -  
Located in the Mid Portion of the Block Bounded by McDonald and  
Gilmore Avenues with Frontages on Myrtle and Regent Streets)

*This proposal is for the rezoning of the above described properties  
for warehousing purposes on a rental or lease basis.*

The following letter was received by way of a submission on this re-  
zoning proposal:

"

June 17, 1975.

His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council,  
Corporation of the District of Burnaby,  
Municipal Hall,  
4949 Canada Way,  
Burnaby, B.C. V5G 1M2

Dear Sirs,

Re : Rezoning Reference No. 6/75: File RZ #6/75  
Lots 3 W $\frac{1}{2}$ , 3E $\frac{1}{2}$ , 4, 9W $\frac{1}{2}$ , 9E $\frac{1}{2}$ , 10,  
Block 10, DL 69, Plan 1321  
4038, 4044, 4048 Myrtle Street,  
4041, 4051, 4061 Regent Street,  
Located in the mid Portion of Block  
bounded by McDonald and Gilmore Avenues  
with frontages on Myrtle & Regent Streets

- I am acting on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. John T. Wilson of 4091  
Regent Street, Burnaby, whose property is immediately adjacent to the  
above lots, for which application has been made to rezone from Residential  
District to Special Industrial District.

In the event Municipal Council approves this rezoning application  
by the owner of all four of the lots to be zoned, there will be four lots  
left as Residential District, being Lots 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the same block  
as the lots on which application to rezone has been made.

My clients are not disputing the proposed rezoning, but feel that  
a pocket of Residential District zoned lots will be created if the pro-  
posed zoning application is approved and this could create a hardship to  
my clients, as residents.

My clients therefore request Municipal Council to approve zoning  
of lots directly abutting on the lots contained in the application to  
rezone from Residential District to Special Industrial District, being  
Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.



June 17/75

- 9 -

If this application to rezone all these lots is approved, it will make the entire block Special Industrial District and will not leave my clients' lot alone as Residential.

Yours truly,

'T. BRIAN PRENTICE' "

There were no further submissions received in regard to the above noted rezoning.

(5) FROM SMALL HOLDINGS DISTRICT (A2)  
TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R2)

Reference RZ #14/75

D.L. 131, Blk. 2, Pcl. "A", Expl. Pl. 11009 of 10, Plan 3049;  
Lot 23, D.L. 78, Plan 24759;  
D.L. 78/131, Blk. 2, S.D. 10, Pcl. "B", Sk. 12025, Plan 3049.

(2636 Ellerslie and 6946/54 Broadway - Located South of Broadway and East of Ellerslie Avenue)

*This proposal is for the rezoning of the above described properties in order to create a residential subdivision.*

There were no submissions received in regard to the above noted proposed rezoning.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LEWARNE:

"THAT this Public Hearing be now terminated."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting terminated at 9:30 P.M.

CONFIRMED:

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

  
MAYOR

  
DEPUTY MUNICIPAL CLERK

RWW/lc

