THE CORFORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNARY

8 December 1967.

REPORT NO. 79, 1957.

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

Gentlemen: 💈

Your Manager reports as follows:

 Re: Acquisition of Easement - Portion of Lot 220 of S.D. of Lot "A" and 1, Block 1, S.D.2, D.L.44/78/131/6, Plan 6333.

An easement is required, in order to finalize a subdivision, over a portion of Lot 220 of a subdivision of Lot "A" and 1, Block 1, S. D. 2, D. L. 44/78/131/136, Plan 6938, from Violet Kneale, Stenographer, 6726 East Broadway, Eurnaby 2, D. C. The easement is required for sanitary sever purposes and there is no consideration payable by the Corporation. The property, on which the casement is situated, is located at 6726 East Broadway.

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

 Re: Acquisition of Easement - Portion of Lot 209 of a subdivision of Lot 635¹/₂, D.L.132, Plan 1493.

An easement is required, in order to finalize a subdivision, over a portion of Lot 209 of a subdivision of Lot $63S_2^L$, D. L. 132, Plan 1493, from Harold Gengnes and Ethel Mary Gangnes, Carpenter and Housewife, The easement is required for sonitary sever purposes and there is no consideration payable by the Corporation. The property, on which the easement is situated, is located at 6715 Kitchener Street.

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

3. Ro: S.D. Reference #269/67.

Section 712(a) of the Municipal Act provides that any lot created by a subdivision shall not have a frontage of less than 10% of its perimeter.

Section 712(b) enables Council to waive the provisions of Section 712(a).

It is recommended that the requirements of Section 712(a) be usived for the lot created by the above mentioned subdivision. A sketch is attached hereto.

4. Re: Subdivision Reference No. 231/67 - Sanitary Sever Extension.

S. D. Reference #231/67 is for a 26-lot subdivision at Greenwood Street and Lougheed Highway:

To service this subdivision it is necessary to extend the sever service approximately 700 feet on Greenwood east to the Greater Vancouver Severage and Drainage District trunk sever at an estimated cost of \$7,300.00.

It is recommended this extension be approved.

(.....2)

Page ? HOTOKT EO. 79, 1907 HUNIGIPAL MAELOSK 8 December 1967.

5. Re: / cquisition of Frances and Georgin Street lane.

Negotiations have been concluded for the acquisition for lane purposes of:

(a) South ten fat of the west 80 feat of Lot 4, Block "H", of the West 3/4 of D. L. 127, Group 1, Plan 1254, owned by Salvatore De Fazio, 5020 Frances Street.

The consideration is \$1.00.

It is recommended that the acquisition be approved.

6. Re: Lot Sizes in Two-Family Zones.

ΰ.

Ċ.

ĉ,

His Worship, Reeve Emmott, suggested at the meeting of Council on 2nd October 1967 that the requirements of the Zoning By-low pertaining to lot sizes in Two-family zones should be reviewed.

Council concurred and referred the subject to the Folicy/Planning Committee.

A report has been prepared by the Director of Planning and is submitted harewith for consideration.

7. Ro: 60 and Up Health Clinic.

Submitted herewith is a report from the Medical Health Officer on this subject.

Provision has been made in the 1968 Provisional Budget for the necessary funds, subject to Council approval.

8. <u>Pe: Medical Services Association.</u>

The Corporation provides the services of the above mentioned Association to the employees. The costs are shared on a 50/50 basis and the present/races are as follows:

Single Employee - \$4.94 less 10% - \$4.44 Employee with Dependents -\$14.82 less 10% -\$13.34

The 10% bonus reduction, which has been in effect since April 1st, 1966, will be rescinded on January 1st 1968 and commencing on that date the rates will be as follows:

Single Employee - \$4.94 Employee with Dependents - \$14.82.

It is recommended that the Reneval Rider to the agreement for the year 1967 be executed.

 Re: Estimate of cost of widening Imperial Street - Royal Oak to Kingsyay.

This portion of Imperial Street is approximately 2,000 feet in length.

At Council's request, the following estimates are provided:

Widening Acquisition - \$ 65,000. Road construction - 88,000.

579

. . REPORT BALLY, ST W. MMAGIENU EN LORD, 8 Feeember 1967.

10. Re: Sidevolk - Sparling Avenue, from Municipal Jee Rick to Broadway.

There is one uncompleted item from the letter of 25th Saptumber, 1967 from Mrs. S. Fisher of 1266 Sherlock Avenue to Council. This item is a sidewalk on Sporling Avenue between the Eunicipal Ice Rink and Broadway.

The present situation is:

From Broadway to Lougheed - no sideuall and incomplete roadway.

From Lougheed to Greenwood - no sidewalk but curb-to-curb roadway.

From Greenwood to Rink - a gravel welk on the east side of Sperling.

The Municipal Engineer advises that the existing gravel walk from the Rink to Greenwood is still in quite good condition. He suggests that an adequate sidewalk from Broadway to the Rink would best be provided by:

(a) Brush clearing along the existing gravel walk.
(b) Adding a 4 1/2" sidewalk to the back of the existing curb between Greenwood and Loughced,

(c) Constructing a gravel walk between Loughced and Broadway.

All this on the cest side of Sperling to provide a continuous walking sufface from Broadway to the Rink. The estimated cost is \$2,5%C.00.

11. Re: Goodvin Join son (1960) Ltd. - Rezoning Reference #29/57.

The problems regarding the Goodwin Johnson operation at the foot of Penzance Drive have been the subject of much correspondence and ecveral discussions. The activity being parried on at the site has been and still is without benefit of proper services or building permits, and is unlicenced, being contrary to the Zoning By-law.

Council decided to allow the use by amending the Zoning By-law, providing Goodwin-Johnson met a number of conditions. These conditions have not been met and the Zoning amendment has not been passed.

The operation is active and is being carried on contrary to this Corporation's by-laws. There have been only token attempts on the applicant's part to meet Council's conditions and the persistence of the operation directly flouts the decisions of Council.

It is recommended that since discussions and correspondence have failed to produce the desired effect, legal action be commenced egainst Goodwin Johnson (1960) Ltd.

12. Re: Petition urging Brush Renoval in Edmonds-Stride Area.

A petition has been received containing 43 signatures asking:

"that all the bush be removed from Edmonds to Stride Avenue School to avoid children being molested by nude characters recently seen in the area going to and from school. Let's take action something happens." before

The Engineering Department contacted Mrs. Anne Reimer, sponsor of the petition, and it was ascertained that it is 19th Street just south of Edmonds that Mrs. Reimar is most concerned with. This is a wooded ravine on municipal property.

Instructions were issued to have the brush cleared adjecent to the road allowance on both sides of 19th St. in the area completed about.

Pege 4 REPORT 30, 79,1967 NURICIPAL PARAGER 8 December 1967,

13. Re: Estimates.

Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Engineer's report covering Estimates of Work in the total amount of \$212,446,40.

It is recommended the estimates be approved, as sulmitted.

- 14. <u>Re: Expenditures.</u> Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Treasurer's report covering Expenditures for the period ended 26 November 1967 in the total amount of \$2,015,516. It is recommended the expenditures be approved as submitted.
- 15. <u>Re: Allowances.</u> Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Treasurer's report covering applications received under Section 411 of the Municipal Act in the amount of \$15.00. It is recommended that the allowances as applied for be granted.
- <u>Re: Street Lights.</u> Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Engineer's report covering the installation of a street light on the south side of Clinton between Buller and Plum Avenue.

It is recommended the installation be approved.

- Submitted herewith for your information is the Chief Building Inspector's report covering the operations of his Department for the period November 6 to December 1, 1957.
- Submitted herewith for your information is the report of the Social Service Administrator showing comparisons of caseloads and ciebursaments for select months in 1967 as compared to these same months in 1966.

Respectfully submitted,

H. V. Balfour, MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

HB:eb

Ray 1-02, 400 out 100 PANAGEN'S RUELET 100 79,1967, 11 December 1967.

Re: Acquisition of Easement - Portion of Subdivision of the South 200¹ Lot 10, and part of Lot 9, D.L. 83, Plan 1267.

An essement is required, in order to finalize a subdivision, over a portion of a subdivision of the South 200 feet of Lot 10 and part Of Lot 9, D. L. 83, Plan 1267, from George Cleridge and Helen J. Petschl, both of 5541 Gilpin Street, and Bridget Lodrus, 5595 Gilpin Street. The essement is required for drainage vorks and there is no consideration payable by the Corporation. The property, on which the essement is located, is situated cast of 5541 Gilpin Street.

It is recommended that authority be granted to acquire the above easement and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to execute the necessary casement documents.

20. Re: Marlborough Junior Secondary School Site.

Council recently passed the inclborough Road Closing By-Law No. 4, 1967, for the purpose of closing certain streets and lanes for consolidation with the above mentioned school site.

During the necessary searches it has been determined that Parcels "A" and "B", as shown on the attached sketch have never been dedicated for the Marlborough Avenue right.of-way which means they are not covered by the road closing by-law. It will be necessary to convey them to the School Board to complete the consolidation of the site.

It is recommended that the said Parcels "A" and "B" be conveyed to the Furnaby School Board for the consideration of \$1.00 and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

21. Re: Policing the District of Burnaby.

Division Headquarters, "E" Division, Victoria, of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have forwarded the Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Corporation of the District of Burnaby, covering the period 1 April 1967 to 31 March 1968.

. The Agreement has been checked and found to be in order.

Advice has also been received that consideration is being given to extending the period of Municipal Contracts to cover two or three fiscal years.

The present Agreement provides for 148 members of the Force for the Burnaby Detachment, R. C. M. P.

It is recommended that the Reeve and Municipal Clerk be authorized . to execute this Agreement on behalf of the Corporation.

22. Re: Proposed 15th Avenue Industrial Estate.

The Corporation requires the following easements in connection with the above mentioned Industrial Estate to contain storm and sanitary sever and a water main:

- (a) A 0.153 ac. portion of Lot 39, D. L. 53, Group 1,
- granted by the B.C. Hydro Authority. See sketch attached.
 (b) A 0.459 portion of Lot 52, D. L. 53, Group 1, granted by Dominion Construction Co. Ltd. See attached sketch.

There is no consideration.

It is recommended that the easements be acquired and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

(....2)

Po. 1 2 - 2019-001 - 00 REFORT NO. 70, 1967, Funicipal Honages 11 December 1967.

23. Re: Acquisition of Mascrents-Stenley Street Sever Project.

Essements are required in connection with the above sanitary sever project as follows:

- (a) Owner J. K. Frommarlid, 4004 Bayridge Drive, West Vancouver. Property-Portion of Lot 3, Block. "A", D. J. 87, Plca 1494. Location of property-5920-22 Grandview Highway. Consideration - \$1.00 and restoration of the casement area.
- (b) Gamer: and M. H. Stone, 7729 Hazelmare Street, Burnaby 1. Property - Fortion of Lot 2 of Lot "D" of

Block 3, D. L. 87, Fign 17670. Location of property - 7729 Kazelmere Street. Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the easement area.

(c) Owner - Norman and Hyacinth Graham, 2230 E. Grandvieu-Douglas Highway.

Property - Portion of Lot 3, Block 2, D. L. 87, Plan 1454. Location of property - 6230 E. Grandview-Douglas Highway. Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the casement area.

- (d) Owner Arthur A. and Margaret G. B. Todd, 7818 Stanley Street, Eurnaby 1.
 - Property Portion of Lot 1 of Parcel "C" and Parcel "F" Block 3, D. L. 87, Group 1, Plan 20357. Location of property - 7818 Stanley Street, Burnaby 1, B. C. Consideration - \$1.00 plus restoration of the ecsement area.

It is recommended that authority be granted to acquire the above easements and that the Reave and Clerk be authorized to execute the necessary easement documents.

24. Re: (a) Lot 20, D. L. 83 (5926 Gilpin Street - Innes)
 (b) Lot "B", D. L. 83 (5988 Gilpin Street-Bisaillon)
 and letter of 27 November 1967 from Mrs. Oxendale to Council.

The letter from Mrs. Margaret Oxendale of Block Bros. Realty Ltd. to Council was tabled for a report.

The letter from Mrs. Oxendale refers to the two properties and to the actions of your limitipal Manager with respect to the Innes property.

To deal first with this question: your Municipal Manager recalls having been visited by the Innes. The subject dld not appear to indicate the proparation of an office record of the visit so none was made. It is certainly recalled that the question of the value of the Innes property was raised and though it cannot be recalled there might wall have been some commitment to communicate with the Innes' though this is not practice once negotiations have been started by the Land Department. The Land Department recall that they were required to review and explain their position with respect to their recommended Land Value but certainly there was no communication with the Innes' as a result of their visit. There has been no contact between the Innes' and the Manager's Office since December 1965. Had the Manager been reminded of any commitment at an cerlier date the purported omission would have been

A sketch is submitted showing the two properties in question. It should be noted that the sketch shows a projected new road pattern. This is actually a preliminary sketch showing the possible location of new roads without benefit of survey for location, or design as to right-of-way requirements. It is sufficient hower, to indicate that these two properties would be affected by the proposed roads.

(.....3)

() |-

Pege 3 - Supplet whey REDat 00, 70, 1967 Emicipal Echagos 11 December 1967.

(Item 24....re D.L.83 property...continued)

The detailed offect cannot be determined except by survey and final design of the major road between Gilpin and Gilley.

The Innes property was the first to be Asubject of but no application was made at that time in 1966. The outers ware advised of the involvement of the roads and the lunes' offered their entire property to the Municipality. On 24 October 1966 a report was made to Council giving the asking price and the Lond Agent's evaluation. Council directed the Lond Agent to negotiate the acquisition at a reasonable market value.

To this date negotiations on this basis have not been concluded.

There are several points which must be considered with respect to the Innes property.

- The property is unsubdividible to the Subdivision Guide Plan, even disregarding any major road complications, without the co-operation of the owner of the property to the east (Lot "B"),
- (2) In her original letter to the Planner in 1966 Mrs. Innes stated that subdivision according to plan would be impossible due to the "exaggerated opinion of value" by the owner of Lot "B".
- (3) Mrs. Innes third to persuade Planning to grant a subdivision of 3 - 56 foot loss facing Gilpin. This was not possible because of two things the frontage requirements of the by-law and the major road complication.

(4) It is costly to service.

(5) The lower lots are not the best of land, being somewhat low.

The Long Agent, in calculating the market value of the Innes property (Let 20) assumed a six-lot subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Guide Plan (without the major road complication). A report was submitted to Council and negotiations authorized to purchase at a fair market value. The Land Agent reports that he opened negotiations at \$12,500, and subsequently went to \$13,500. Since there was no indication that anything less than the asking price of \$25,000. would be acceptable, no further move was made by the Land Agent. The last contact with the Innes' was in June, 1967.

The Land Agent does not assume any sentimental value in his calculations.

On 16 October 1967 Mrs. Oxendale for Block Bros. Realty put in an application to subdivide both Lot 20 and Lot "B". It is possible to consider a subdivision of these two parcels together. The impact of the proposed new road remains however as a complication.

The Planner recommends that the Council authorize negotiations for the purchase of Lot "B" because of the proposed new road.

Block Bros. were advised on 13 November 1967 that Council had authorized purchase of Lot 20 and on 21st November 1967 they were advised that a recommendation would be going to Council to purchase Lot "B".

Mr. Grist was asked to again review his calculations re the Innes property (Lot 20) and he advices that he considers the possible purchase price as reported to Council in 1956 is still valid. He has no authority to purchase Lot "B" and has made no calculations as to market value.

584

Foga 6 - Guigeleant (17 REPORT 10, 79, 1967, Municipal Monager 11 December 1967.

(Item 24...re D.L.83 proparty...continued)

As a further matter of interest, the owner of Lot "B" has submitted a claim against the Municipality for about \$3,000. for traspass and damage to property in the construction of the walkway south of Gilpin recently constructed by Municipal forces. The traspass was removed but the claim has not been sattled.

25. Ro: Miscellaneous Drainage Easement.

The Corporation requires an casement over a portion of property as shown on the attached sketch. The casement is required to contain a storm drain.

The consideration is \$1.00.

It is recommended that the easement be acquired and that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

Respectfully submitted,

V. Balfour, н. MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

585

HB:eb