

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

24 December, 1965.

CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS  
OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Gentlemen:                    Re: Temporary Water Mains in Burnaby

This Report is submitted with reference to Item #13 of the Municipal Manager's Report No. 72, 1965, which dealt with a request by Byrneroad Peat Farm for a water service to the Peat Farm at 8995 Royal Oak Avenue. The Report Item is reproduced below:

"Council requested a report from the Municipal Engineer pursuant to a request received from the above mentioned organization for a water service to the Peat Farm at 8995 Royal Oak Avenue.

Herewith is the report as requested:

'Mr. W. G. Head has made application for a water service to the Byrneroad Peat Farm, 9051 Royal Oak Avenue. There appears to be two points raised in Mr. Head's letter of 20th September, 1965.

1. Application for Water Service.
2. Lack of Water Supply to Mr. Chang Bo Hoy's property.

To answer the first part, we refer to the Water Works Regulation By-law which sets out a charge for each size of service applied for and there is no exception to these charges.

In Mr. Head's case, he may be referring to the cost involved in extension of the service from the point where we would provide the connection, and his property. The closest water main to the Byrneroad Peat Farm is at Royal Oak and Byrne Road which would require an extension of 500 to 600 ft. of service pipe.

This brings us to the second point regarding water supply to Mr. Chang Bo Hoy's property at 9051 Royal Oak Avenue. A water service application was received 2 July, 1953, and installed to the property line on Byrne Road, a distance of approximately 30 ft. The application has the remarks on it that 'it is to be understood that this application for Water Supply is to service the above lot only and not to service other properties or subdivision of this property'; also, that 'connection of water supply is from Byrne Road to temporary 3/4" main being laid on Royal Oak by owner'. This service was metered 21 May, 1965, and because of a complaint about water supply, the service was renewed 1 June, 1965.

It is true that Mr. Hoy is not receiving adequate water supply and Mr. Head is restricted to tapping to this supply. To receive water, Mr. Head would have to run a temporary 3/4" main similar to Mr. Hoy's from a connection at Byrne Road at a cost of \$80,00 for the connection plus the cost from Byrne Road to the terminus. We are not suggesting that such 'temporary mains' should be constructed now or ever.'

Council referred the subject to Policy Committee and the Policy Committee deferred action to await an up-dated report on the entire subject of Temporary Water Mains in Burnaby. This up-dated report is submitted herewith. In summary, the picture is:

.... Page 2.

	<u>Length</u>	<u>Replacement Cost</u>
Temporary Mains	29,956'	\$ 300,130.
Private Mains	6,081'	72,720.
Wells	<u>1,379'</u>	<u>10,790.</u>
	<u>37,416'</u>	<u>\$ 383,640.</u>

The above estimate includes the replacement of all presently classified Temporary Mains as well as private long water services, and some scattered wells except those on the Southwest face of Burnaby Mountain numbered 126 to 130 inclusive in the Report. Items 126 to 130 inclusive have not been estimated because of the magnitude of the problem of servicing this area and the uncertain development pattern.

The particular item concerning Mr. Head and Mr. Chang Bo Hoy is numbered 9 in the Report. The present 3/4" line is classified as a private one because it traverses private property on its way to serve Mr. Chang Bo. Hoy. The means of replacing this 3/4" line would be through the provision of a new 10" water main on Royal Oak Avenue from Byrne Road northward, a distance of 692', at an estimated cost of \$15,900.

Burnaby's present policy respecting watermain extensions is to require the developer or person involved to pay for such extension up to a maximum size main of 6". It is difficult to suggest a change in this policy, inasmuch as most of the mains would be beneficial to the properties concerned, although perhaps not outright essential. There is always the matter of subdividers being relieved of legitimate subdivision servicing costs through the replacement of these temporary mains.

In some areas, such as the Cariboo Area, there is still an uncertain road and development pattern, which makes it undesirable to go to any expense to replace temporary or private lines with permanent mains which might prove to be in the wrong place later on.

One possible step which could be taken is to make some distinction between the extension of water mains fronting property which is very likely to remain in large parcels and in either commercial or industrial use, and the extension of water mains fronting property which has a likely subdivision potential.

Respectfully submitted,



H. W. Baird  
MUNICIPAL MANAGER

HWB:gr  
Attach.