

## THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

20 November, 1964.

REPORT NO. 74, 1964

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

Gentlemen:

Your Manager reports as follows:

1. Re: Street Lights & Boulevard Development on Boundary, north of Hastings  
Complaint of L. E. Jones

Mr. L. E. Jones, 324 North Boundary Road has written to Council complaining of a lack of street lighting and the condition of the boulevard on Boundary Road, north of Hastings.

The present situation in this section of Boundary Road is:

Hastings	- One M.V. at S.E. corner
Albert	- None
Pandora	- One light, S.E. corner, Burnaby service
Triumph	- One light, S.E. corner, Burnaby service
Dundas	- None
Oxford	- None
Cambridge	- One light, S.E. corner, Burnaby service
Eton	- None
McGill	- One light, S.E. corner, Vancouver service
Trinity	- One light, S.E. corner, Vancouver service
Yale	- One light on Boulevard, Vancouver service
Edinburgh	- One light, S.E. corner, Burnaby service.

There is no access to B.C. Hydro service readily available at Albert, Dundas, Oxford and Eton without requiring a number of cedar poles to reach each intersection. According to B.C. Hydro the cost of providing this service will be excessive under the terms of contract with B.C. Hydro for this type of lighting service.

It is now apparent that the local improvement proposed on Boundary Road south of Hastings has been successful. This improvement, if undertaken by Council, will in due course involve the lighting of the area. It is reasonable and appropriate, then, to consider whether the "ornamental-type" lighting should be extended on the Burnaby side of Boundary Road north of Hastings. This would have to be worked in with any plans Vancouver may have for lighting and an estimate of cost could then be prepared, and if approved, co-ordinated with the installation of lighting south of Hastings on Boundary. Tenth Avenue was treated in this way in co-operation with New Westminster.

Being a boundary road the matters of boulevard development and maintenance is also a joint responsibility. Vancouver is preparing a proposed formula for the section improved and to be improved, for Burnaby's consideration. It is not likely any formula will be considered for other sections until improvement to final standard is completed.

2. Re: Complaint of Ronald and Eileen Waslen  
of 5375 Gilpin Street re Sanitary Conditions

Council received a letter at its meeting held 9th November, 1964 from Mr. & Mrs. Waslen alleging an unsanitary condition in the 5200 to 5500 Block section of Gilpin and asking for the installation of sanitary sewers.

(..... Cont. Page 2.)

Page 2.  
REPORT NO. 74, 1964  
MUNICIPAL MANAGER  
20 November, 1964.

(Item 2 ..... Re: Complaint of Mr. & Mrs. Waslen .. cont.)

This section of Gilpin Street is in Sanitary Sewer Project known as Gilpin Grandview Area 10/11 and on the schedule of sewer construction as adopted by Council is scheduled for construction commencing June, 1965.

The Health Department reports:

- "1. The Complainants recently found it necessary to repair their house sewer which drains into their septic tank. The house sewer line collapsed with a resultant nuisance.
2. The area in question has been surveyed to determine the extent of sewage pollution. The number of dwellings involved from the 5200 block Gilpin to the 5500 block Gilpin number twenty. Three minor septic tank nuisances were observed. The standard of septic tank construction is generally an accepted one."

The complainants were genuinely concerned as they were not aware of Burnaby's methods of sewage control, nor of Burnaby's progressive sewer program. Their property was one of the three minor sewage nuisances observed and they have been advised of the method of abatement.

3. Re: Request of Sign-O-Lite Plastics Ltd.  
for review of Sign Regulation By-law

The above by-law was passed by the Council on the 4th of December, 1960, in order to regulate signs within an area of the Corporation adjacent to the Burnaby Throughway.

It has been in effect since that time and signs erected within the designated area over the last four years have complied with the by-law.

The purpose of a sign by-law is as follows:

1. To protect signs and lights erected for the direction of traffic from the effects of conflicting business and advertising signs.
2. To prevent the confusion which may arise from the undue conflict of business advertising and other signs one with another.
3. To protect the appearance of the various districts of the Municipality and its public works and places from the effect of signs which may be inappropriate as to size, design or location.
4. To protect the public from the dangers of signs of inferior construction and from the public nuisance or hazard arising out of improperly sited signs.

In addition to the above, a sign by-law related to the Freeway has a special task of ensuring that the multitude of Freeway users be they residents, prospective investors, tourists, developers or industrialists, are presented with an impression of order, protection, fair regulation and stability, upon their travels through or within the Municipality.

The most desirable form of signing to achieve the aims listed above, and at the same time to provide adequate and attractive advertising for small or large businesses is the illuminated wall or fascia sign which has the added advantages of being related architecturally to the building upon which they are located, providing for continuity of adjacent buildings, avoiding never-ending competition caused by the obliteration of one projecting sign by another, and preserving

(..... Cont. Page 3.)

Page 3.  
 REPORT NO. 74,1964  
 MUNICIPAL MANAGER  
 20 November, 1964

(Item 3 ....Re: Request of Sign-O-Lite Plastics Ltd.... Cont.)

the public road allowance for traffic signs, street names, directional signs and public use. For this reason, By-law 4173 permits wall or fascia signs to a maximum of 20% of the surface on which they are fixed. In other words, 1/5 of a building frontage can be devoted to signing which cannot be said to be restrictive.

In addition, the by-law permits directional signs, sale or rental signs, freestanding signs and a number of other lesser signs for residential zones.

In my opinion, the by-law permits adequate advertising for a business; and yet retains the degree of control necessary to prevent confusion and encourage orderliness.

In view of the above and the fact that businesses have developed in accordance with this by-law for the last four years, it is recommended that the Freeway Sign By-law be not amended.

4. Re: Appeal of W. A. Ferguson,  
 7540 Aubrey Street,  
 Lot "N" except Expl. Plan 26234, D.L. 138, Pl. 12221

With reference to a letter from Mr. W. A. Ferguson who has appealed the decision of the Building Department regarding a setback on the above mentioned property of which he is the registered owner, the Department reports as follows:

- "(1) A building permit was issued to W.A. Ferguson for a dwelling to be situated on the above mentioned property. The plot plan indicated a front yard setback of "40 ft. or the average of the block, whichever is greater."

Section 9 (m) of the Town Planning By-law #1991 states in part:-

"..... The minimum depth of each front yard and each rear yard shall be forty (40%) per centum of the minimum lot frontage prescribed by the "Burnaby Subdivision Control By-law 1955" for the district in which the site or lot is located, provided however, that where the sites or lots on one side of any street between two intersecting streets are occupied by buildings to the extent of fifty (50%) per centum or more of the total frontage, the required front yard may be reduced to the average depth of existing yards or twenty (20) feet whichever is greater."

This lot is located within a Small Holdings Zone where the minimum setback is prescribed as 30 ft.

- (2) Of the 13 parcels in this block, all are occupied by houses. However, because of the large size of the lots (118' x 560'), subdivision is a continuing process.
- (3) Mr. Ferguson elected to set his house 40 ft. from the street and built the forms to this dimension. The forms were inspected by the Building Inspector on the 10th November, 1964 and it was noted that these forms were 9 ft. in front of the house on the west side and 5 ft. in front of the house on the east. From a quick survey of the entire block, the Building Inspector judged that the forms were possibly ahead of the average of the block and therefore did not pass them for placing of concrete.

(..... Cont. Page 4)

Page 4.  
REPORT NO. 74, 1964  
MUNICIPAL MANAGER  
20 November, 1964.

(Item 4... Re: Appeal of W. A. Ferguson ..... Cont.)

- (4) Aside from the fact that this siting could quite conceivably result in complaints from the immediate neighbours, for loss of view, the Inspector was also mindful of a lawsuit against the Corporation now pending, in which circumstances are similar to those at hand.
- (5) The owner has made a survey of setbacks in the entire block and has noted that the average is 42 ft. On November 13th, Mr. Ferguson made representation to this Department and he was told that the average would have to upheld in accordance with the Town Planning By-law.
- (6) Mr. Ferguson is correct in his assertion that two homes, built in 1964 and 1961, have setbacks of 35ft. and 30 ft. respectively. These two buildings are adjoining and are situated at the opposite end of the block (the block is approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile long) where other dwellings in the immediate area are observing much the same setback.

5. Re: Street Lights

Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Engineer's report covering suggested street light installations.

It is recommended that the installations be approved.

6. Re: Estimates

Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Engineer's report covering Special Estimates of Work in the total amount of \$282,280.

It is recommended that the estimates be approved as submitted.

7. Re: Expenditures

Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Treasurer's report covering Expenditures for the four week period ended 1 November, 1964, in the total amount of \$1,915,598.

It is recommended that the expenditures be approved as submitted.

Respectfully submitted



H. W. Balfour  
MUNICIPAL MANAGER

HWB:gr

Page 1 - Supplementary  
 REPORT NO. 74, 1964  
 MUNICIPAL MANAGER  
 23 November, 1964

9. Re: Application for Welfare Institutions Licence

On October 19th, 1964, Council approved in principle an application for a Welfare Institutions Licence, received from Mr. E. Frank, 7341 Ridge Drive, to operate a kindergarten at 3821 Piper Avenue for 28 children. Final approval was subject to the building being constructed to municipal standards. The limit of 28 children was on the assumption that the property might be subdivided.

Mr. Frank now advises that it is not the intention to subdivide the property and requests a licence for 32 children.

The Director of Planning recommends that the application be approved for 32 children subject to the original conditions, with the understanding that the limit be reduced to 28 children in the event the property is subdivided in the future.

9. Re: Sperling-Halifax Sanitary Sewer Project 16/17

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

- (a) Owner - Julia Demchuk, 2120 Sperling Avenue, Burnaby, B. C.  
 Property - Easterly 5' of Parcel "A" (Expl. Plan 10006) of Lots 8 & 9, Block 6, and of Lots 1 & 2, Block 7, D.L. 131, Group 1, Plan 5464, N.W.D.  
 Location of easement - 2120 Sperling Avenue, Burnaby, B. C.  
 Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of easement area.
- (b) Owner - Thomas Alexander and Norma Winifred Klopp, 6784 Hycrest Drive, Burnaby,  
 Property - North 10' of Lot 11, D.L. 131, Group 1, Plan 23101, N.W.D.  
 Location of Easement - 6784 Hycrest Drive, Burnaby,  
 Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of easement area.

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

10. Re: South Slope Sanitary Sewer Project - Phase 4.

An easement is required in connection with the above sewer project as follows:

- Owner - Otto Halinen and Jenny Halinen, 6416 Beresford Street, Burnaby,  
 Property - South 10' of Part of Lot 2, Lot 4 of Lot 11, of Lot "C", D.L. 96, Group 1, Plan 3458, N.W.D.  
 Location of easement - 6416 Beresford Street, Burnaby,  
 Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of easement area.

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

11. Re: Request of William & White Machine Shop Ltd.,  
 6280 McKay Avenue, Burnaby.

The above mentioned company advises it has acquired Lots 23 and 24, Block 15, D.L. 153, Group 1, Plan 1109 adjoining the present location, for the purpose of expanding the machine shop and requests permission to use the properties for machine shop purposes.

(..... Cont. Page 2.)

Page 2 - Supplementary  
REPORT NO. 74, 1964  
MUNICIPAL MANAGER  
23 November, 1964

(Item No. 11 .. Re:Request of William & White Machine Shop Ltd....Cont.)


The Director of Planning advises there is no objection to the establishment of the requested use of the property.

It is recommended that the request be approved in principle pursuant to Section 11(E) of the Town Planning By-law and that final approval be considered after submission of a suitable plan of development.

12. Re: Second Special 1964 Local Improvement Program

Submitted herewith is the Municipal Clerk's "Certificate of Sufficiency" covering additional local improvement works for the 1964 program.

Respectfully submitted,

  
H. W. Balfour  
MUNICIPAL MANAGER

HWB:gr