

REPORT NO. 36, 1967.

16 June 1967.

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

Gentlemen:

Your Manager reports as follows:

1. Re: Monday, July 3rd, 1967.

Inasmuch as this is Centennial Year, it was anticipated that the Senior Governments might have declared Monday, July 3rd, a Public Holiday. It is now clear that this is not going to occur.

Both the Federal Government and the Province of British Columbia are granting their employees a holiday.

The banks in the area will also be closed. Some major companies in the area will also be closed.

Information received indicates that 44 municipal corporations in B.C. have granted a staff holiday on July 3rd.

The following municipalities in this general area have approved a staff holiday:

Surrey
Delta
Richmond
Coquitlam
Port Moody.

The City of Vancouver has approved August 7th as a staff holiday. The City of New Westminster is granting August 9th for the annual employee picnic.

Burnaby Union agreements do not provide a holiday on July 3rd.

Submitted for the information of the Council.

2. Re: Lot "E", D. L. 160, Plan 13174 (Eacrett)
Lane Allowance east of and parallel to Gilley Avenue
between Neville and Clinton Streets.

This subject was referred by Council for the purpose "that the entire question of creating a road or lane system in the area for better circulation (should) be reviewed."

It is first necessary to examine the functions of lanes in residential areas:

- (a) they are established to provide servicing routes for municipal and other vehicles (e.g. utility services), secondary access to off-street parking on residential properties, and routes for utilities serving the parcels.
- (b) lanes are not generally required primarily for traffic circulation because many successful subdivisions have been created without lanes. The traffic circulation features provided by lanes are only the result of their creation for property servicing and secondary access.
- (c) a lane assumes the function of a street and ceases to function solely as a secondary access and servicing facility when vehicles use the lane to gain access from one residential street to another. Where the local street pattern established is well-defined and useable as the primary access route it should be used as such.

(.....2)

(Item 2 re Lane allowance east of and parallel to Gilley....continued)

Traffic Planning considerations in this area are based on the assumptions that:

- (i) each resident of the area is entitled to primary and secondary access to his property;
- (ii) the freedom from through traffic features provided by cul-de-sac street should be maintained;
- (iii) the street system is adequate and unnecessary "short-cutting" through lanes between residential streets, by residents and service vehicles, should be minimized to not create a nuisance and a hazard for those whose dwellings are located adjacent the secondary access facilities and for those seeking pedestrian access through the lane.

Planning has then reviewed the current and future access requirements for the Clinton Street residential area taking into account the functions of lanes, the proposed future development of major roads and, as a consequence, the need and possibility of preserving residential amenities in the area.

The re-examination considered the following road-lane plans:

- (1) Current road-lane pattern.
- (2) Lane extending between Portland and Neville Streets.
- (3) Lane connection only from Portland to the lane North of Portland and from Neville to the lane south of Neville.
- (4) Current lane pattern but Clinton extended through to Gilley.

The two-directional traffic flow pattern was analyzed separately for each case.

Sketches are attached for the cases examined.

It can be readily seen that Case (4), opening Clinton Street to Gilley Avenue and maintaining the current lane pattern offers the least circuitous travel routes. However, to achieve this pattern, the Corporation would need to acquire one lot with its improvements and a narrow portion of the adjacent lot. Further, in addition to the undesirability of adding another cross street connection to the proposed Gilley Avenue arterial, it would be necessary to make substantial road grade improvements on the Clinton approach to Gilley because there is a considerable difference in elevation between Gilley Avenue and Clinton Street, which would make the Clinton Street approach to Gilley a fairly steep upgrade.

Cases (2) and (3) have common travel patterns except for two movements. They also illustrate some movements common to the other schemes.

Case (3) would create a longer travel route than Case (2), for vehicles originating from the north side of Clinton Street and for vehicles returning to the neighbourhood destined for the south side of Clinton Street. This applies only to one directional movement and only for vehicles which would use the street for parking. The majority of residents who use their lane access and off-street facilities would not experience any access difficulties. Case (3) provides for a full cul-de-sac on Clinton Street with no lane connections from the cul-de-sac to lanes parallel to Clinton Street. This scheme provides the greatest protection from traffic abusing the lane facilities by "short-cutting", yet maintains primary access rights to individual properties from the street and secondary access to the same properties from the lane.

Implementation of Case (3) would involve the acquisition of lane allowance to Neville Street and closure to vehicular traffic the short lanes currently connecting with Clinton Street. We understand that the acquisition of lane allowance to Neville Street will preclude subdivision of Lot "E" fronting Neville Street (Mrs. Eacrett), thus the Corporation will likely be faced with either acquisition of a larger portion of property or paying compensation to the owner for precluding subdivision potential. The former, acquisition of property, would likely be advantageous for exchange purposes when widening of Gilley is initiated.

(....3)

(Item 2 re Lane allowance east of and parallel to Gilley....continued)

As mentioned above, the travel pattern for Case (2) has common features with Case (3). However, Case (2) involves only the acquisition of lane allowance to Neville Street and thus would provide a lane connection across the Clinton Street cul-de-sac between Neville and Portland Streets.

This scheme obviously perpetuates lane travel as part of the primary street access route, except that the majority of traffic movement would now be on the lane connecting Neville with Clinton instead of on the lane between Clinton and Portland as currently experienced and illustrated in Case (1).

There is yet another case which involves widening of the 10' lane connection to Gilley Avenue. This scheme would involve acquisition of 10' additional lane allowance from Lot 9, and re-opening the route to the traffic. Prime disadvantages of this scheme are that a secondary access facility will connect directly to a primary arterial, and the lane will continue to be used as a "short-cut" to Clinton. There are no advantages to this scheme other than providing a short-cut for residents on Clinton Street to the detriment of adjacent properties and the proposed arterial facility.

The travel pattern resulting from this scheme would be similar to that of Case (2) except that all traffic using the lane facility would enter the Gilley Avenue arterial directly from a secondary access rather than from a residential street as in Case (2).

The Planning Department believes the access and circulation problem in this area is in fact of little magnitude because currently there is adequate primary and secondary access and circulation possible although not as direct as the Clinton Street residents would like to see.

However, it is apparent that no action at this time would solve nothing, but it is difficult to find a logical basis on which to recommend the expenditure of funds on this problem.

In view of the points discussed in this Report, and based upon what are believed to be the true functions of streets and lanes and a desirable street and lane pattern for this well-established area, it is recommended that if action is approved by Council, Case (3) be implemented as the ultimate plan for the area.

3. Re: Extension to McGill Branch
of the Burnaby Public Library.

An advertised tender call for extension of the McGill Branch Library resulted in eight bids being received.

Tenders were opened by the Purchasing Agent in the presence of Mr. M. J. Jones; Mr. R. J. Constable; Mr. R. Robinson of the Library Board; Mr. Peter Smith (Architect for the Project); and representatives of the firms tendering.

Submitted herewith is a tabulation of the bids received.

The low bid was by Shopland Construction Co. Ltd. of \$47,054.00 including painting of the interior and exterior of the existing building. The Tax Sale Monies By-law for the Project was for \$57,000. so the bids received were all less than estimate with the exception of that of the high bidder.

It is understood a formal recommendation will be forthcoming from the Library Board supporting the low bid.

It is recommended the bid of Shopland Construction Co. Ltd. for \$47,054.00 be accepted, subject to concurrence by the Library Board.

(.....4)

4. Re: Willingdon Avenue Widening.

The Corporation obtained possession of the South half of Lot "A", Block 61, D. L. 123, Group 1, Plan 10789, save and except the east 52 feet thereof and save and except the west 7 feet thereof on June 15th. The property was formerly owned by Otto K. C. and Grete V. Kempf.

The estimated cost of demolishing the buildings is \$350.00.

It is recommended that the Land Agent be authorized to have the buildings situated on the property demolished. The work will be done with municipal forces.

5. Re: S.D. Ref. #52/67 - Lot "D" W^{1/2}, Block 15, D. L. 93, Plan 3633.

The subdivision of the above property creates an "L" shaped lot which does not meet the provisions of Section 712 requiring the frontage of a lot to be not less than 10% of its perimeter.

It is recommended that this requirement be waived under Section 712(2) of the Municipal Act.

6. Re: Tenders for One Triple Combination Pumper.

Council on 10 April 1967 authorized the invitation of tenders for one Triple Combination 1050 l G.P.M. Pumper, with equipment, for the Burnaby Fire Department and per specifications prepared by the Burnaby Fire Department.

Two tenders were received and opened by the Purchasing Agent in the presence of Fire Chief L. Auvache, Mr. R. J. Constable, and representatives of the firms tendering.

Submitted herewith is a tabulation of the bids received.

It is recommended that the low bid entered by Hub Fire Engine and Equipment Ltd. be accepted in the sum of \$36,645.79 including 5% Provincial Tax.

The estimated cost of this apparatus complete with equipment was \$32,000.00.

7. Re: Vancouver-Fraser Regional Parks District.

The Municipal Clerk referred the proposed Letters Patent to the Burnaby Parks and Recreation Commission for their attention.

The Secretary of the Commission advises "The Commission did not make any comments."

Respectfully submitted,



H. W. Balfour,
MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

HB:eb