

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

11 September 1964.

REPORT NO. 58,1964.

His Worship, the Reeve,
and Members of the Council.

Gentlemen:

Your Manager reports as follows:

1. Re: Municipal Hall Alterations
- Agreement - P. F. Smith, Architect.

Submitted herewith is a form of Agreement between the Corporation and Mr. Peter F. Smith for Architectural Services in connection with the alterations to the Municipal Hall.

It is recommended that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to sign this Agreement.

2. Re: Acquisition of Easement - Easterly 7½ ft. of Lot 176 and westerly 8 feet
of Lot 181 of S.D. of Lot 85 E½ and W½, Lot "B"
Expl. Plan 14971, Blocks 96 and 97, and remainder
of Block 96, DL 129, Plan 1492.

An easement is required for drainage purposes, in order to finalize a subdivision, over the easterly 7½ feet of Lot 176 from Carl Otto Olson, 6224 Kitchener Street, and over the westerly 8 feet of Lot 181 from Everett Gurth Atkinson, 6255 Winch Street, both lots being a subdivision of Lot 85 E½ and W½, Lot "B", Expl. Plan 14971, Blocks 96 and 97, and remainder of Block 96, D. L. 129, Plan 1492. The easement is located at 6255 Winch and 6224 Kitchener. There is no consideration payable by the Corporation.

It is recommended that authority be granted to acquire the above easements and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to execute the documents on behalf of the Corporation.

3. Re: Land Acquisition for Construction of Five foot curb sidewalks
and Widening of Still Creek Avenue from North lane to Noel Drive.

In compliance with Council direction of August 24th for a report on the subject, the following pertinent points are submitted for consideration.

In January 1962, the Property owners of Larkin Crescent requested the completion of their street to finished standard on the condition that Still Creek Avenue be so improved. Municipal files verify that the acquisition of additional right-of-way in exchange for road construction costs was agreed to. The street was included in the 1962 initiative programme along with Larkin Crescent. However, it was removed as a result of a subdivision application on the parcel from which acquisition was required. However, as the subdivision failed to materialize, the street was included in the 1963-64 programme to honor the Municipal commitment to the Larkin Crescent owners who have already received their improvements.

(.....2)

(Item 3....re Land Acquisition - Still Creek Avenue...continued)

The objection to proceeding with acquisition on the grounds that the Municipality is subsidizing a potential subdivision is essentially a valid one in that servicing costs will be lower to the subdivider. However, we are not relieving the lots created by subdivision from local improvement charges and the major part of the cost of construction will be so recovered if subdivision should occur (and it likely will) in the period up to seven years of the fifteen repayment years.

Supposedly, if subdivision does not occur and if the street allowance had been of adequate width without acquisition, the parcel would yield \$58.74 annually to retire the \$2,800.00 road construction costs involved. Relieving the owner of this relatively insignificant charge as a condition of dedication seems well justified when evaluating the benefit in providing sidewalks to the school site. Sidewalks, as you are aware, may not be included in subdivision servicing costs and should we cancel the authorized work the Corporation would be faced with the problem again in the future under bleak circumstances for a successful Local Improvement initiative.

With the improvements including sidewalks to North Road forthcoming in the near future, the demand for continuity of the facility is further justification for proceeding with the acquisition and work.

The points in favour of acquisition are summarized as follows:

- (a) the moral obligation to the Larkin Crescent owners to proceed with the work to provide continuity of their street standard to North Road.
- (b) provision of sidewalk continuity to the school site in conjunction with such forthcoming improvements to North Road.
- (c) the minimal loss of return of local improvement assessments (\$58.74 annually up to the time of subdivision of the subject parcel).
- (d) the benefit of lower maintenance costs on the subject street.
- (e) the doubtful circumstances that will prevail should we wait for subdivision to provide the required street width for the work for the successful re-initiation of sidewalks.

The Municipal Engineer recommends that the Corporation proceed with the project and your Municipal Manager concurs.

4, Re: Local Improvement - Sperling Avenue,
Lougheed to Greenwood St.

Council, on 3 August approved as a local improvement, the construction of 44 feet of asphaltic pavement with concrete curbs on both sides of Greenwood between Sperling and the present interim pavement on Greenwood.

In conjunction with this work, it would be desirable to rebuild Sperling Avenue between Lougheed and Greenwood. It will be recalled that during construction of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' plant, earth pressures caused Sperling Avenue at this point to be forced out of line. At the time, the F.V.M.P.A. agreed to pay the Corporation \$900. assessed damages. Rather than renew the street to its 20 foot standard, it would be better to widen it to 44 feet complete with curbs. The cost would approximate:

Drainage	-	\$14,500.
Roadwork	-	<u>12,500.</u>
		<u>\$27,000.</u>

(.....3)

(Item 4...re Local Improvement....Sperling Avenue....continued)

The abutting properties are:

East side - FVMFA	-	-	92.5'
Stub end Mill Street	-		66'
FVMFA	-	-	235.16'
Imperial Oil			
Service Stn.-	-		327.36'

If this project is approved as a local improvement, FVMFA would be liable for 66' of taxable frontage on the first mentioned property and exempt on the second, because it is taxable for work on Greenwood - another butting street. Their commitment of \$900. for the restoration of the street would be ample to commute the rates.

The Imperial Oil property would be liable for 66 feet of taxable frontage.

Whilst the frontages abutting the work are lengthy, the actual frontages taxable bear some relationship to the degree of benefit enjoyed by the abutting properties - bearing in mind that Sperling is a heavily travelled street.

The lifetime of the work is estimated at 15 years.

The levies would be for a period of 15 years.

The frontage tax would be 75¢ per front foot.

This report will satisfy the requirements of Section 601 of the Municipal Act in the event the project is approved as a local improvement.

The two companies referred to have indicated that they are prepared to entertain this project.

It is recommended that this project be approved by Council for immediate initiation so that if successful, Sperling and Greenwood can be constructed at the same time.

5. Re: Petition for Sidewalk on Norland Street from Douglas eastward.

Council correspondence for its meeting held 8th September 1964 contained a petition submitted by Mr. H. R. Lijst and several others for "a sidewalk on Norland Street (off Douglas Road) or reduce speed to 15 miles per hour."

Norland Street in this area has a right-of-way of 46 feet in width and traverses largely a peat bog area. The existing roadway is narrow and difficult to maintain because of the peat conditions and the heavy traffic it receives from the trucking industries located in the area. Improvement of the street has been contemplated but always deferred for sewer board installations and Burnaby's water main installations.

Norland is approximately 3000 feet long; Laurel 800 feet; and Ardingley 1200 feet; making a total of about 1 mile.

The standard of improvement as seen at this time is suggested to be a 20 foot interim paving on a soil cement base following peat treatment for sub-base stability. A coarse estimate of costs of the section from Douglas Road to Laurel Street would be \$180,000., not including land acquisition required.

(.....4)

(Item 5 re Petition for Sidewalk on Norland Street.continued)

A 10 ft. widening strip from each side is the recommended manner of widening. On Laurel and Ardingley ground conditions are normal requiring no special treatment or land acquisition. A 20 foot interim standard pavement on these streets would cost approximately \$30,000.00.

This standard, of course, would not provide sidewalks but would provide wide shoulders for walking which is a condition still existing on the majority of Burnaby streets. Sidewalks should not, in any event, be considered without acquisition of the full road allowance.

The end cost of this mile of road would then be about \$210,000. exclusive of acquisition costs.

Consideration of the improvement of this road can best be provided by its inclusion in the next Local Improvement program.

6. Re: Estimates.

Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Engineer's report covering Special Estimates of Work in the total amount of \$13,795.00.

It is recommended the estimates be approved as submitted.

Respectfully submitted,



H. W. Balfour,
MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

H³eb

Page 1 -Supplementary
REPORT NO. 58, 1964.
MUNICIPAL MANAGER
14 September 1964.

- 7, Re: Acquisition of Easements - Lots 49,50,51 to 56, of S.D. of Lots 1,2,3, 12 and 13,
(Plan 1355) and Lot "A" (Plan 11209) all of
Blocks 17 and 18, D.L.34.

Easements are required as follows in connection with the above subdivision:

- Lot 49 - - Joseph Carmen Politano and Margaret Mary Politano,
(northerly 15') 3963 Price Street, Burnaby 1, B. C.
Lot 50 - - Reginald D. Keen and Gladyce E. Keen,
(northerly 15') 3949 Price Street, Burnaby 1, B. C.
Lots 51 to 56 - Glenwood Developments Ltd. - 2168 Kingsway St., Vancouver.
(easterly 15 feet of Lots 51 and to 55 and southerly 8' x 100' ptn. Lot 456).

The easements are required for drainage purposes and there is no consideration payable by the Corporation. The easements are located approximately 40 feet west of Inman Avenue and Gilpin Street.

It is recommended that authority be granted to acquire the above easements and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to execute the documents on behalf of the Corporation.

8. Re: Acquisition of Easements -
Parkcrest Sewer Extension Project #15.

Easements are required in connection with the above project as follows:

- (a) Owner - Earl Leonard and Barbara June TUCKER, 3321 E. 3rd Avenue, Vancouver, B. C.
Property - Easterly 5' of E $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 29, D. L. 129, Group 1, Plan 2639,
except the N. 164' thereof.

Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
Location of easement - 6051 Aubrey Street.

- (b) Owner - Michil Delaere, 1560 Fell Avenue, Burnaby 2, B. C.
Property - Easterly five feet S $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 99, D. L. 129, Group 1, Plan 1492, N.W.D.
Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
Location of easement - 1560 Fell Avenue, Burnaby 2, B. C.

It is recommended that authority be granted to acquire the above easements and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to execute the documents on behalf of the Corporation.

9. Re: Acquisition of Easement -
South Slope Sewer Project #4.

Easement is required in connection with the above project as follows:

- (a) Owner - Floyd Beardsell and Evelyn Gertrude Beardsell, 21298 Volker St., Haney, BC
Property - Portion of Pcl."D" (Ref. Plan 2807) of Lot 2, Blks. 40 to 43, DL 159,
Group 1, Plan 2014, N.W.D.
Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
Location of easement - 5953 Marine Drive, Burnaby, B. C.

It is recommended authority be granted to acquire the above easement and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to sign the easement documents on behalf of the Corporation.

(.....2)

10. Re: Acquisition of Easements - Sperling-Halifax Sewer Project 16/17.

Easements are required in connection with the above sewer project, as follows:

- (a) Owner - Eva Pausche, 3509 Pandora Street, Vancouver, B. C.
Property - South ten feet of W $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot "B" of Lot 19, Blk.8, D.L.136, Group 1,
Plan 9951,N.W.D.
Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
Location of easement - 7010 Halifax Street.
- (b) Owner - Victor W. and Shirley Arychuk, 273 W. Osborne, North Vancouver, B. C.
Property - South 10 feet of E $\frac{1}{2}$ Lot 19, Block 8, D. L. 136, Grp.1,Plan 9951,NWD.
Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area.
Location of easement - 7020 Halifax Street.

It is recommended authority be granted to acquire the above easements and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to execute the documents on behalf of the Corporation.

11. Re: Hastings Street Widening - Springer to Holdom Avenue.

The Department of Highways is currently reconstructing the subject section of Hastings Street to an interim standard within the existing right-of-way width.

To take advantage of the present disrupted condition of the street, Norburn Electric has been retained to instal the necessary underground conduits and seven street lights to serve this section of Hastings Street.

12. Re: Application for Licence - Forsyth Construction Co. Ltd.

The above mentioned Company has applied for a licence to operate a construction business and equipment sales and rental yard at 4032 S. E. Marine Drive. The letter of application states the business will be of a very similar nature to business carried on by Murphy Excavating Co. Ltd., the property will be well maintained and in no way will be a junk yard.

The Director of Planning reports as follows:

"The Municipal Clerk has forwarded a request for permission to carry on a construction business plus the sales and rental of equipment from the above described property located on the south side of Marine Drive just west of Patterson Avenue. Council recently asked that all applications involving outside storage be referred to Council and thus our report.

The subject property was originally occupied by Murphy Excavating but has subsequently been used as an auction yard for construction equipment. Equipment has been stored in a fenced yard within the Industrially zoned portion of the property south of the 200 foot residential strip. The use proposed in the present letter is described as being similar to that which is being carried on. Section 13 approval is not required for this use within the Industrial zone.

In reporting on recent land use proposals on the south side of Marine Drive, we have noted the present development along both sides of Marine Drive is largely Residential in character and that with the ultimate relocation of Marine Drive to the south, the street could become an attractive residential street. When this happens, Highway oriented uses such as the one proposed will be poorly located. Our observations also apply in this case but as the use already exists

(.....3)

Page 3 - Supplementary
Report No. 58,1964.
MUNICIPAL MANAGER
14 September 1964.

(Item 2... re Forsyth Construction Co.....continued)

one cannot make strong objection, IT is most important, however, that parking and storage of equipment and vehicles be confined to the Industrially zoned portion of the property and that the north 200 feet of the property be maintained in an acceptable manner, compatible with adjacent Residential development."

Respectfully submitted,



H. W. Balfour,
MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

H3:eb