

JULY 4, 1966

An adjourned meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4545 East Grandview-Douglas Highway, Burnaby 2, B.C., on Monday, July 4, 1966, at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Reeve Emmott in the Chair;  
Councillors Crosbie, Drummond,  
Herd, Hicks and McLean,  
Councillor Dailly (6:35 p.m.),  
Councillor Cafferky (6:35 p.m.)  
and Councillor Blair (6:38 p.m.)

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. H. W. Balfour, Municipal Manager  
Mr. M. J. Jones, Chief Building Inspector  
Mr. E. A. Fountain, Assistant Manager  
Mr. J. L. Martin, Assistant Chief Building Inspector  
Mr. H. G. Taylor, Senior Plumbing Inspector  
Mr. W. L. Stirling, Municipal Solicitor  
Mr. C. W. Warner  
Mr. Fisher (Counsel for Mr. Warner)  
Messrs. Twining and J. Simpson, Union Representatives  
Mr. J. H. Shaw, Municipal Clerk

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HERD:

"That the Council resolve into an "In Camera" session for the purpose of continuing the Hearing into the allegations made by Mr. Warner, Plumbing Inspector in the Building Department."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

After opening remarks by His Worship, the Reeve, the Manager submitted that new information had been brought in at the last session of the Hearing which had not been submitted before and that investigations into this new material had been made.

(1) Re: The Edmonds Rollerway

Reference was made earlier to the dangerous situation which prevailed at the Rollerway which, but for Mr. Warner, may have developed into a catastrophe on New Year's Eve. The Manager read from a hand-written report (on file) on the circumstances surrounding the inspections of the furnace chamber at the Edmonds Rollerway which had given rise to the comments by Mr. Warner.

COUNCILLORS DAILLY AND CAFFERKY ARRIVED AT 6:35 P.M.

(2) Re: The Allegations that there was a similarity in preparation of plans for buildings erected at Everett Court to those drawn by Mr. Martin, Assistant Chief Building Inspector for Dr. McLean on Buckingham Avenue.

The Manager read a letter from Mr. Kidd, developer of the buildings on Everett Court advising that the design work had been done by different designers, none of whom were Mr. Martin, Assistant Chief Building Inspector.

COUNCILLOR BLAIR ARRIVED AT 6:38 P.M.

July/4/1966

- (3) Re: The employment of different plumbing regulations within the Department including the 1926 Plumbing By-Law (#542) and the new Plumbing Code recently introduced by other communities in the metropolitan area including the City of Vancouver

It was submitted that while the 1926 By-law was being enforced, it was outdated in some respects and inspections were being conducted on the basis of new concepts which had been introduced into the plumbing trade. An example of this was the use of plastic pipes, currently used for plumbing work. In response to a query made as to whether or not this Corporation was inspecting where no authority was contained with the 1926 By-Law, the Chief Building Inspector advised that such inspections were, in fact, taking place. Part 7 of the National Building Code covered these new concepts in some instances. A new Plumbing Code was under preparation as a result of meetings held over a period of time at which representatives of the plumbing trade, the master plumbers and a representative of this Corporation had taken part.

His Worship, the Reeve, questioned whether or not an attempt was being made to make regulations uniform within the metropolitan area and the Chief Building Inspector submitted that the purpose of the Committee mentioned earlier was to draft such a uniform code.

His Worship, the Reeve, questioned whether there were other municipalities in this area where plumbing by-laws were as outdated as that used in Burnaby. The Chief Building Inspector replied that New Westminster had not adopted the new Plumbing Code as yet. Up to three years ago there were many areas which were operating under old by-laws.

- (4) The Manager submitted that if Mr. Warner or his Solicitor could give explicit addresses concerning misplaced files in the Department, a closer check could be made.

- (5) Re: Charge of connection fees and the specific charge that one Inspector was charging such fees amounting to \$3.00 per inspection while others were not.

Considerable discussion ensued on the type of connections and plumbing work for which fees were chargeable. Specifically, it was submitted by the Chief Building Inspector that it had previously not been the practice to charge the \$3.00 fee referred to since the work in question was considered to be a portion of other sewer connection work for which another permit was taken out and it was not considered that additional fees were chargeable under the regulations for the connection work referred to by Mr. Warner.

- (6) Regarding the allegation that no action was taken about B/F cards for illegal fixtures

Illegal fixtures or plumbing installations are followed up and action taken where the Department has proper authority under By-Law. In case of old buildings and old installations, enforcement of up-to-date plumbing installation is questionable legally, and in many cases out of proportion to the value of the buildings. Procedure for guidance of all Inspectors is laid down by the Department for the handling of these cases.

- (7) Regarding the Inspectors becoming Instructors

The Manager submitted that this point appears to relate to competency of various people engaged in contracting and is involved in licensing procedures. Authority of the Corporation under the Municipal Act is very narrow.

Control of unskilled tradesmen at present comes down to rigorous application of the By-law regulations which may be burdensome to Inspectors but is the only legal means available.

The Manager then read from Item 8 of his Report No. 39, 1966, addressed to the Council, re the proposed Plumbing By-Law which dealt with the uniform regulations to be adopted by the Provincial Government, covering the competency of plumbing workmen under the Tradesman's Qualification Act.

The Manager concluded by advising that he would deal with the matter arising out of the Warner incident and subsequent Hearing at the next meeting of the Council and would make a recommendation to the Council, following which the Council can take whatever action is deemed necessary.

His Worship, the Reeve, suggested that the Council may wish some form of a summation from the Municipal Solicitor for the benefit of the Council and the Manager on procedures to be followed from here on.

The Solicitor submitted that, in his opinion, the Council should hear Mr. Fisher further; however, since Mr. Jones had been subjected to cross-examination by the Council on points he has made, it may be that the Council may wish to cross-examine Mr. Fisher on the points he has made.

Mr. Fisher was then asked to speak and submitted firstly that he was not armed with the historical background of many of the points raised.

With regard to the Rollerway incident, Mr. Fisher noted that the Manager's remarks indicated there was something inflammatory about this situation and it was submitted by Mr. Fisher that there was nothing inflammatory about the remarks made in regard to the circumstances surrounding the inspections at the Edmonds Rollerway.

Mr. Fisher submitted that Mr. Warner was in a difficult position in that he had informed on certain members of the Department in which he was working, as a result of his employment in that Department over the past eighteen months. These were matters which were of concern to Mr. Warner, however, and no personal motives were held by Mr. Warner with regard to any of the other people involved.

Mr. Fisher submitted that he could not appreciate some of the remarks of the Manager and the Chief Building Inspector and referred to the matter of the \$3.00 sewer connection. Mr. Fisher referred to Page 12 of By-Law No. 542, Item 9, which detailed the fees for sewer connection work, submitting that these fees had been doubled in 1949 from their original \$1.50 fee to \$3.00. Mr. Fisher submitted that Mr. A. Brown, Plumbing Inspector in the Department, had been charging this inspection fee and it was now common practice in the Department that this fee be charged in the same manner as had been practised by Mr. Brown. The fee was collected where a house-drain connection was made or where there was any change in alteration to the plumbing within the house.

A discussion then ensued on the various types of plumbing alterations and connections covered by permit and fee in the Department in the interests of clarifying the point that the \$3.00 fee should or should not be charged or when such fee should be charged.

It was submitted that there had been a change in 1949 and that in the case where house-drains were being connected, the fee was as described; however, the Department was not in the position to charge a fee for lowering of house connections until the new by-law has been adopted. Mr. Warner submitted that in connection with the charges being made by Inspector Brown, there had been a meeting with Mr. Jones and a ruling made that the fee was to be charged in accordance with the pending new By-law.

Councillor Cafferky directed the question to the Chief Building Inspector as to whether Mr. Brown was charging this fee and the Chief Building Inspector advised that he was not prepared to say at this time whether or not he was charging this fee.

The Chief Building Inspector referred to Section 9 of By-Law No. 542 which originally did provide for \$1.50 permit fee and this By-Law had been amended in 1955 to double the fee to \$3.00. Further discussion ensued on the various types of connections and it was repeated that the part of the plumbing which extended into the house from a sewer connection was covered by another permit and this was the reason the \$3.00 fee had not been charged.

Councillor Cafferky questioned whether any other member of the staff could advise whether or not Mr. Brown was charging the \$3.00 fee.

Mr. Taylor, Senior Plumbing Inspector, advised that only the inspection fee was charged by Mr. Brown, and this would cover a situation where fixtures were added to the plumbing.

In response to the direct query as to whether or not Mr. Brown had been collecting the \$3.00 fee, Mr. Taylor advised that he could not answer for sure.

The question was asked of Mr. Martin and in reply he advised that he knew nothing about fees collectible by Mr. Brown.

There was still some uncertainty about what type of connection the fee covered and it was suggested this should be checked out.

His Worship, the Reeve, submitted that there were three types of connections, according to his understanding:

- (i) a connection to a sanitary or combination sewer of a line which was previously connected to a septic tank;
- (ii) an owner would add further plumbing units within his household which would establish a connection;
- (iii) an inspection had been made of a plumbing installation or connection and fault had been found and an inspector would be required to go back for re-inspection of the connection or other plumbing work.

It was submitted again that where a connection was made to a cast-iron pipe leading from a building a distance of 30 inches, and the pipe was dropped to the other sewer line constructed of material other than cast-iron pipe, a connection fee of \$3.00 was made and was being charged by Mr. Brown.

It was suggested that the trouble in understanding the type of connection may be due to the fact that in past years, sewer connections were not prevalent; however, now that sewers have become common in the municipality, it was necessary to meet the regulations for sewer connection and to drop the drains as suggested previously and this is where the \$3.00 connection fee was made.

Mr. Fisher proceeded with regard to the property on Patrick Street which had been commented on by the Chief Building Inspector. It was submitted that in this instance, second-hand cast-iron pipe had been installed and the By-Law provided that such pipe must be tested, and pipe in this instance was not tested and, furthermore, the pipe had been laid a depth less than eighteen inches, contrary to the By-Law.

The Chief Building Inspector repeated that, because the By-Law was silent in regard to the use of cast-iron pipe, no insistence was made that such pipe should be laid at the eighteen-inch depth.

In answer to the query as to whether or not the pipe used on the Patrick Street job had been tested, the Chief Building Inspector advised that notice had gone to the trade that tests of second-hand cast-iron pipe should be made before installation.

Mr. Fisher read from the By-Law which referred to any type of material which could be used for sewer-line connections and that, in his opinion, the fact that cast-iron pipe being used was irrelevant insofar as the depth was concerned since the By-Law seemed to allow the use of any material.

The Chief Building Inspector submitted that cast-iron pipe, by custom, had always been considered more suitable for sewer connection and sewer-line work and it had always been the policy of the Department that the depth of the pipe need not necessarily be eighteen inches.

Mr. Fisher referred to an earlier comment by the Chief Building Inspector where he agreed that eighteen inch depth was a desirable depth and the Chief Building Inspector agreed that this was a desirable depth.

Mr. Fisher referred to the comments re mileage rates and suggested that rates submitted previously were perhaps given in error. Reference was made to a rate of \$82.50 for an Electrical inspection whereas, in fact, it appeared that there were four inspectors on the \$77.00 rate whereas one was on the \$72.50 rate. Now, however, there were six inspectors on the \$72.50 rate although the areas of inspection had been reduced in size.

Mr. Fisher referred to the "hours of work" comment and submitted that these hours had changed and that the staff were in fact starting work at 9:30 a.m. and finishing at 4:30 p.m. at the suggestion of Mr. Warner.

The Chief Building Inspector confirmed that, because of the workload and in order to get more inspections made, these hours had been laid down.

Mr. Fisher submitted that for clarification, Mr. Warner had not returned to the Hoglund house but that Mr. Martin, Assistant Chief Building Inspector, had visited Mr. Hoglund the last time.

Mr. Fisher submitted with regard to the Edmonds Rollerway that at the time of the collapse of the roof, Mr. Warner had attended the Rollerdrone and the cement blocks which were to be used in connection with the building structure around the furnace chamber were still piled in the building after the collapse of the building.

The Chief Building Inspector advised having checked the records and that there was indication that the work was put in order. Mr. Martin submitted that the boiler-room was enclosed in four-inch lamination type construction and not cement-block construction.

Mr. Fisher submitted that, at the collapse of the building, Mr. Warner and Mr. Reid visited the building and viewed the circumstances there.

With regard to the homes on Everett Court, Mr. Fisher explained that he did not say that Mr. Martin had prepared the plans but he did say that there was a similarity in these plans to other plans which Mr. Martin had prepared for Dr. McLean. He did submit that such practices would place Mr. Martin, the Building Department and, in fact, the Council in a bad light.

The Reeve questioned Mr. Martin directly as to whether or not he had anything to do with designing the homes on Everett Court and Mr. Martin replied that he had only done design work for his friend, Dr. McLean, on Buckingham Avenue.

In commenting on the B/F cards for illegal suites, Mr. Fisher submitted that many man-hours were spent in administration of these cards and there appeared to be no forcible steps taken to correct illegal plumbing practices discovered in buildings.

Reference was made to the fact that in the City of Vancouver, certification of plumbers did take place and the regulations there did provide that plumbing work would be done only by such certified plumbers and this cut down a good deal of the illegal work. Upon being questioned by Mr. Jones, Mr. Fisher admitted that the City of Vancouver had been in the practice of using certified plumbers and granting licences to such plumbers over a period of 20 years.

July/4/1966

Mr. Fisher referred to the apologies to the young lady who was present at the time of Mr. Warner's outburst in the Department and he was informed that Mr. Warner had, in fact, apologized to the young lady; however, in view of Mr. Jones' remarks that no apology had been forthcoming, Mr. Warner had contacted the young lady and had apologized for not making an apology earlier and had apologized to her for the incident. When Mr. Warner first spoke to the young lady, she could not remember whether or not an apology had been made.

Mr. Fisher summed up by submitting that his client had brought forward some items about the administration of the Building Department and it was considered these were germane. Mr. Fisher further submitted that Mr. Warner had laid his head on the block insofar as his job with the Corporation was concerned. It would take a large man to forgive Mr. Warner for some of the claims he has made. Mr. Warner wants to remain in the employ of the Corporation. Mr. Fisher stated that he did not say that all should be running smoothly in the Department. It was realized that there were no instances where an administration ran perfectly. He wanted it clearly understood that there was no vendetta against the Manager, the Chief Building Inspector or Mr. Martin. Mr. Warner was disturbed with some of the things going on in the Department administratively and no matter what the recommendation may be or action taken by the Council, it was submitted that the air had been cleared.

His Worship, the Reeve, advised that the Manager would be bringing the matter before the Council at a later date.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:  
"That the Committee do now rise and report."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:  
"That the report of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Council then recessed at 7:50 p.m. to reconvene in the Council Chamber.

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED AT 7:55 P.M.

COUNCILLORS CAFFERKY AND McLEAN WERE ABSENT.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY:

"That the Minutes of the meeting held May 24, 1966, be adopted as written and confirmed."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLORS CAFFERKY AND McLEAN ARRIVED AT THE MEETING.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That leave be given to introduce:

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 52, 1966",

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 46, 1966", and

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 47, 1966",

and that they be now read a First Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That the By-Laws be now read a Second Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That the Council now resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the By-Laws."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 52, 1966" provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #53/66

FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3) TO SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4)

(a) Lot 16, Block 3, D.L. 119E½, Plan 2055

(b) Lot 17 except West 33 feet, Block 3, D.L. 119E½, Plan 2055

(Located on the North side of Lougheed Highway from a point approximately 99 feet East of Rosser Avenue Eastward a distance of 99 feet).

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 46, 1966" provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #23/65

FROM MANUFACTURING DISTRICT (M1) TO SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C4)

(a) Lot "C" except Sketch 12576, S.D. "B", Block 1, D.L. 119W½, Plan 3363

(b) Lot "C", Sketch 12576 except Plan 21113, S.D. "B", Block 1, D.L. 119W½, Plan 3363

(c) The Westerly 200 feet of Block 2 except part on Plan 21113, D.L. 119W½, Plan 206

(d) Lot "B", Block 2, D.L. 119W½, Plan 11285

(e) Lot "C" except part on Plan 21113, Block 2, D.L. 119W½, Plan 11285

(The foregoing parcels lie within that area bounded by Halifax Street and Douglas Road on the North, Madison Avenue on the East, Lougheed Highway on the South, and the W.P.L.'s of the Lot "C" described under (a) and (b) above).

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 47, 1966" provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #76/66

FROM MANUFACTURING DISTRICT (M1) TO GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2)

The Northerly five acres of Parcel 1, Explanatory Plan 10599 except Plan 26541, Block 2, D.L. 73, Plan 4326

(Located on the West side of Westminster Avenue immediately South of the Freeway).

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:  
"That the Committee now rise and report the By-Laws complete."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:  
"That the report of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:  
"That "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 52, 1966", "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 46, 1966" and "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 47, 1966 be now read a Third Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:  
"That leave be given to introduce "BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 48, 1966" and that it be now read a First Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:  
"That the By-Law be now read a Second Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:  
"That the Council now resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the By-Law."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY ZONING BY-LAW 1965, AMENDMENT BY-LAW NO. 48, 1966" provides for the following rezoning:

Reference RZ #47/66

FROM GENERAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (M2) TO RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT FIVE (R5)



Reference RZ #47/66 (Cont'd):

- (a) (i) Lots 1 to 98 inclusive, Block 3, D.L. 77, Plan 3051
- (ii) Lots "E" and "F", Block 3, D.L. 77, Plan 13680
- (iii) Lots "C" and "D", Block 3, D.L. 77, Plan 13359
- (iv) Lots 8 and 9, S.D. "E", Block 1, D.L. 75, Plan 4147

(These parcels lie within that area bounded by Darnley Street on the North, Auckland Avenue on the East, Laurel Street on the South and the W.P.L. of the above described Lots 8 and 9 on the West).

- (b) (i) Lots 17 to 19 inclusive, S.D. "A", Block 1, D.L. 75, Plan 4147
- (ii) Lots 1 to 4 inclusive, S.D. "E", Block 1, D.L. 75, Plan 4147

(These parcels lie within that area bounded by the Freeway on the West, the N.P.L. of the above described Lot 17 and Darnley Street on the North; the E.P.L. of the Lots 1 to 4 described above on the East, and Laurel Street on the South).

It was mentioned to Council that there had been representations made in opposition to the above rezoning proposal.

It was also indicated that the Planning Director had had some second thoughts in regard to the matter as a result of these representations and his re-examination of the proposal.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:

"That the Planning Department submit a further report on the proposed rezoning described above so that Council can be aware of the position of that Department on the matter."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HERD:

"That the Committee now rise and report progress."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That the report of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

"BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT CONSTRUCTION BY-LAW NO. 2, 1966" was withdrawn.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That leave be given to introduce "BURNABY PLUMBING BY-LAW, 1966" and that it be now read a First Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That the By-Law be now read a Second Time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That the Council now resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the By-Law."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item #8 of Report No. 39, 1966 of the Municipal Manager, which is attached to and forms part of these Minutes, was brought forward.

The Chief Building Inspector was present and stated that the Provincial Government was proposing to introduce legislation within the next few months to regulate the work being done by the Plumbing trade.

He suggested that it might be helpful to Council if it was aware of the intentions of the Provincial Government in this regard.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That "BURNABY PLUMBING BY-LAW 1966" be tabled to allow the Chief Building Inspector the opportunity of ascertaining the situation in respect of the intentions of the Provincial Government in regard to the proposed uniform Plumbing Code Regulations,"

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That the Committee now rise and report progress."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That the report of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That "BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION AND DEDICATION BY-LAW NO. 15, 1966", "BURNABY HIGHWAY EXPROPRIATION BY-LAW NO. 2, 1966" and "BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT FRONTAGE TAX BY-LAW 1966, AMENDMENT BY-LAW 1966" be now reconsidered."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That "BURNABY ROAD ACQUISITION AND DEDICATION BY-LAW NO. 15, 1966", "BURNABY HIGHWAY EXPROPRIATION BY-LAW NO. 2, 1966" and "BURNABY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT FRONTAGE TAX BY-LAW 1966, AMENDMENT BY-LAW 1966" be now finally adopted, signed by the Reeve and Clerk and the Corporate Seal affixed thereto."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MAJOR ROAD PROPOSAL AROUND DEER LAKE

His Worship, Reeve Emmott, explained that, contrary to what he had stated last week concerning the disposition by Council of the question involving a major road proposal around Deer Lake that only a member of Council who voted then on the prevailing side could return the matter for reconsideration, it had been discovered that "Burnaby Procedural By-Law 1944" permitted any member of Council the opportunity of returning a matter for reconsideration at the next meeting.

He pointed out that the legislation he had used as the basis for his decision last week was Roberts Rules of Order and that they did not apply because the By-law mentioned above covered a situation such as is before Council at the moment.

July/4/1966

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSDIE:

"That the following motion which was negated by a tie vote at the Council meeting of June 27, 1966, be reconsidered:

"That the proposed major road leading from the Sperling Interchange off Highway 401, follow a planned alignment around the East side of Deer Lake to a contact point with Gilley Avenue or Lakeview Avenue."

CARRIED

IN FAVOUR: REEVE EMMOTT  
COUNCILLORS DAILLY, HICKS,  
CORSBIE AND BLAIR

AGAINST: COUNCILLORS CAFFERKY,  
DRUMMOND, HERD AND McLEAN

It was mentioned that Mr. Arnold F. C. Hean had written in connection with the subject matter.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That Mr. Hean's letter be read and he be allowed to address Council, if he so desires."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That the Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Hean then read his letter in which he expressed his views with respect to the proposal to establish a major North-South road around the East side of Deer Lake.

Mr. Hean also stated that he felt a carefully prepared approach to the Provincial Government by Council in regard to the Municipality using a portion of the Oakalla Prison Farm for a major road might cause the Government to reconsider its avowed position on the matter.

Each member of Council expressed his opinion with respect to the question of a major road proposal around Deer Lake and the following pertinent comments were made:

- (i) The creation of a major road around the West side of Deer Lake would result in the Municipal Hall and Centennial Project complex being severed by the road.
- (ii) The Municipality will require a major North-South road in the general area because of the future development of sports facilities in the central part of the municipality.

Councillor Cafferky, in his submission, suggested that a major road could be developed around the West side of Deer Lake following an alignment shown on a sketch he displayed.

He also mentioned that the Planning Department had been instructed on October 12, 1965, to bring forward a recommendation on what was required to make a definite decision concerning the need for a major North-South road in the Deer Lake area. He added that further enquiries were made in Council on December 13, 1965, as to the status of the major road proposal involving land around Deer Lake.

It was submitted that the following aspects relating to the need for the road should be taken into account:

July/4/1966

- (a) The possibility of an interchange with the Freeway being provided at Nursery Street;
- (b) The completion of the Stormont Interchange of the Freeway, with related connections to Edmonds Street;
- (c) An origin-destination study of traffic using the Sperling Interchange.

He also stated that a delegation which attended upon the Attorney-General for the Province some time ago were informed that a portion of Oakalla could be used if certain security features were given attention by the Municipality.

Councillor Cafferky also read a telegram from the Attorney-General to Mr. Ralph Brine in which it was indicated that the Government might reconsider its position.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That the matter of the Municipality establishing a major road around Deer Lake be tabled for two weeks in order to allow Council an opportunity to make further enquiries of the Attorney-General for the Province of British Columbia in regard to the use of a portion of the Oakalla Prison Farm property for the major road proposal in question."

IN FAVOUR: COUNCILLORS CAFFERKY, McLEAN,  
HERD AND DRUMMOND

AGAINST: REEVE EMMOTT  
COUNCILLORS BLAIR, CORSBIE,  
DAILLY AND HICKS

MOTION LOST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:

"That the subject major road proposal be tabled for a period of 30 days and the Planning Department submit a report then on the road proposal outlined by Councillor Cafferky."

IN FAVOUR: COUNCILLORS HERD, CAFFERKY,  
DRUMMOND, McLEAN AND BLAIR

AGAINST: REEVE EMMOTT  
COUNCILLORS HICKS, DAILLY  
AND CORSBIE

CARRIED

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HERD:

"That subdivision approvals be withheld on all land affected by any of the route proposals for the subject major road which are presently before Council until the report from the Planning Department is submitted, except on that property involving the Southern leg of the route proposals where they have been abandoned."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE REEVE DECLARED A RECESS AT 9:30 P.M.

THE COMMITTEE RECONVENED AT 9:40 P.M.

COUNCILLOR DAILLY WAS ABSENT.

July/4/1966

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:  
"That the Committee now rise and report."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL RECONVENED.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:  
"That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED

REEVE EMMOTT & COUNCILLOR HICKS AGAINST

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:  
"That the Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR DAILLY RETURNED TO THE MEETING.

REEVE EMMOTT LEFT THE MEETING.

COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY ASSUMED THE CHAIR.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That the decision rendered by Council on June 13, 1966 in respect of a  
lane allowance at the rear of 7960 Curragh Avenue be reconsidered."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That the recommendation contained in a report of the Municipal Manager  
under Item 24 of Report No. 34, 1966, be adopted and, in the event  
Mr. D. L. Shears makes application to the Registrar of Land Titles for  
cancellation of the lane allowance, the Corporation support him in his  
application to obtain the total width of the lane allowance abutting his  
property, provided the Municipality retains an easement over the allowance  
to protect its services therein, the reason for this support being that it  
is felt the lane allowance is topographically suited for consolidation with  
the property owned by Mr. Shears."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

REEVE EMMOTT RETURNED TO THE MEETING AND RESUMED THE CHAIR.

MUNICIPAL MANAGER -- REPORT NO. 39, 1966

Report No. 39, 1966 of the Municipal Manager, attached to and forming a  
part of these Minutes, was dealt with as follows:

- (1) "BURNABY TRADES LICENCE BY-LAW 1950, AMENDMENT BY-LAW 1966"

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:  
"That the report of the Manager be received."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (2) Lot 38, Block 17, D.L. 122, Plan 1308  
WILLINGDON AVENUE WIDENING

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:  
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

July/4/1966

(3) Local Improvement - Silver Avenue from Imperial Street to Maywood Street

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HERD:

"That the report of the Manager plus the Certificate of Sufficiency of the Municipal Clerk, be received and a By-Law be prepared to authorize the work described on the Certificate."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(4) Easements - Portions of Lots 100, 143, 147 and 148 (SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY WATER SUPPLY)

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:

"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(5) Land Acquisitions for widening of Douglas Road

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DAILLY:

"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6) Annual Report - Health Department

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That the report be received."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR BLAIR LEFT THE MEETING.

(7) "Rubberized" Paving of Track at Burnaby South High School

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That authority be granted to instal "rubberized asphalt" on the pole vault and broad jump pit areas, plus the high jump area located at the East end of the infield, on the track at Burnaby South High School at an estimated cost of \$2,400.00, subject to the approval of the Burnaby School Board, with the sum required being appropriated from the Contingency Account in the Municipal Budget with a view to there being a possible adjustment when the current budget is recast later this year and, further: that the "rubberized" track be maintained by the Parks and Recreation Commission."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(8) Proposed Plumbing By-Law

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:

"That this report be received."

(9) Lot 25, Blocks 1 and 3, D.L. 43, Plan 3227 (BINGHAM PUMP COMPANY LIMITED) (Reference RZ #61/66)

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:

"That the decision rendered by Council on May 24, 1966, with respect to the application to rezone the above described property from M1 Industrial to M2 Industrial, be rescinded."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

It was mentioned that the General Manager of the Bingham Pump Company Limited was in attendance and desired an audience with Council.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That the delegation from Bingham Pump Company Limited be heard."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The General Manager of the Company spoke and advised that his Company has a large order which it can only accommodate if expanded facilities are provided.

It was indicated that it was imperative the rezoning at hand be approved in order that these expanded facilities could be constructed.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That the application to rezone Lot 25, Blocks 1 and 3, D.L. 43, Plan 3227, from M1 Industrial to M2 Industrial, be approved for further consideration and advanced to a Public Hearing as soon as possible."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(10) Easement - Portion of Lot 81, S.D. 18/19, Blocks 1/5, D.L. 159, Plan 1219 (TAYLOR)

(11) Miscellaneous Easements for Sewer Projects

(12) Miscellaneous Land Acquisitions for the widening of Douglas Road

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR HERD, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HICKS:  
"That the recommendations of the Manager covering the above three items, be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

REPORT OF THE PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

A report of the Publicity Committee, a copy of which is attached to and forms a part of these Minutes, was dealt with as follows:

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:  
"That the recommendation of the Committee be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A letter was submitted from the Chairman of the Burnaby Committee, Dominion Youth Travel Programme, requesting that Council help defray expenses which will be incurred when a contingency of some students and escorts from Carlton, Quebec, visit Burnaby on August 8, 1966.

The letter explained in detail the object in the Committee seeking the assistance desired.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BLAIR:  
"That Council authorize a grant of between \$250.00 and \$300.00 to help defray the expenses referred to in the letter from the Burnaby Committee of the Dominion Youth Travel Programme."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

THE COUNCIL THEN RESOLVED ITSELF INTO THE POLICY/PLANNING COMMITTEE.

SEWER UTILITY OPERATIONS

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:  
"That this item be tabled until the next Policy/Planning Committee meeting."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

JUVENILE CELLS IN THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING

The members of the Family Court Committee were present and the Chairman, Mr. D. Copan, addressed Council on the matter of concern to the Committee.

In this regard, Mr. Copan contended that the housing of juveniles and adult offenders in close proximity to each other in the Public Safety Building would not be conducive to effective rehabilitative efforts for juveniles.

He also indicated that the Committee is appreciative of the fact any internal structural changes in the Public Safety Building to accommodate the desire of the Committee, and the provision of separate detention facilities for juveniles, would increase costs. He suggested that, even though such increased costs might not be justified at present, Council should examine the long-range aspects and plan accordingly.

It was also mentioned that one of the members of the Family Court Committee, Mr. G. A. Whiten, was competent in the field of juvenile rehabilitation and could offer his opinion on the matter.

Mr. Copan concluded by requesting that serious consideration be given the question of separating facilities for juveniles involved in Family Court matters from adult offenders in the Public Safety Building.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE:  
"That the request of the Family Court Committee be referred to the Public Safety Building Committee and the Family Court Committee be invited to make a submission to the other Committee when the question posed by the Family Court Committee is to be deliberated."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CORSBIE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR McLEAN:  
"That the items "Development Permits", "Regional Parks Plan for the Lower Mainland", "Fraternalities, Sororities and Students' Residences", be tabled until the next meeting of the Policy/Planning Committee."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLOR McLEAN LEFT THE MEETING.

A report of the Municipal Manager, dealing with the proposed development of the 15th Avenue Industrial Area, a copy of which is attached to and forms part of these Minutes, was next considered.

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR HERD:  
"That the recommendation of the Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DRUMMOND, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CAFFERKY:  
"That the rezoning of the property described in the report of the Manager lying between 15th Street and 16th Street for Manufacturing District (M1) use, be approved for further consideration and advanced to a Public Hearing to be held on Monday, July 13, 1966, commencing at 7:00 p.m., on the understanding that Dominion Construction Company Limited will endeavour to resolve the problem outlined in the report concerning an isolated lot that lies within the area proposed to be rezoned."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



July/4/1966

It was understood that the proposed rezoning of Lot 25, Blocks 1 and 3, D.L.43, Plan 3227 (Bingham Pump Company Limited - Reference RZ #61/66), which was dealt with earlier in the evening, would be advanced to the same Public Hearing.

COUNCILLOR McLEAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING.