

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

19 May, 1967.

REPORT NO. 30, 1967.

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

Gentlemen:

Your Manager reports as follows:

1. Re: Sewer Extension - Subdivision Reference #41/67
Grassmere and Pioneer

A sewer extension to the border of a large subdivision of 34 lots is required.

The estimated cost of the extension is \$2,730.00.

It is recommended that Council authorize this extension at an estimated cost of \$2,730.00, chargeable to the Sewer Utility Capital Funds available.

2. Re: Extension to the McGill Branch of the Library

Council gave tentative approval to this project at an estimated cost of \$55,000.00. Funds were to be provided by means of a Tax Sale Monies By-law.

The By-law was deferred pending acceptance of the architect's plan by the Burnaby Public Library Board, and an estimate based upon these plans.

A letter has now been received from the Library Board advising that its Planning Committee has given its final approval to Mr. Smith's plans for the extension of the McGill Branch. The estimated cost, including architect's fees, has been increased to \$57,000.00 in order to provide an allowance for fixtures and exterior work.

A By-law to provide \$57,000.00 has now been prepared.

It is recommended that the plans and specifications be accepted and the By-law passed.

3. Re: Town Planning Institute of Canada

The Planning Director requests permission to attend the annual conference of the above mentioned organization to be held in Montreal, Quebec, June 21st to June 25th.

Mr. Parr is the President of the Planning Institute of B.C. for the year 1967.

It is recommended that permission be granted.

4. Re: Complaint of Mrs. H. Tokaryk, 1514 S. Springer Avenue

Council is in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Tokaryk objecting to various sewer service costs pursuant to a subdivision.

The Municipal Engineer reports as follows:

"When application was processed by the Engineering Department, two alternatives were considered for sanitary sewer as follows:

(a) Charge of \$600. to be held in trust until such time as a sewer was laid adjacent to the new lot (as is the policy for subdivisions in unsewered areas).

(b) Require that the new lot be connected to the existing trunk sewer which we estimate would cost approximately \$1,400.

.... Cont. Page 2.

(Item No. 4 - Re: Complaint of Mrs. H. Tokaryk, 1514 S. Springer Avenue cont.)

It was felt that, as the cost to connect to the sewer was excessive, the first alternative should apply.

Mrs. Tokaryk's next complaint is that the Municipality would not allow a subdivision to her to create four lots facing Howard Avenue as the sewer was at an inadequate elevation on Howard Avenue. (Ref. No. 64/65). The suggested method by us at that time to sewer these four lots was to construct a sewer on an easement from the back of the four lots, west to the Springer Avenue trunk, which we estimated would cost \$3,670.

Subsequently, her Agent, Toppings & Folino, submitted engineering drawings of an extension to the sewer on Howard Avenue, along with a firm commitment by the builders to accept all responsibility for designing and building all four houses to specifically suit this sewer. This proposal was accepted by us and the subdivision proceeded.

Mrs. Tokaryk indicates that Norburn Construction was allowed to do work that she could not obtain approval for. We would point out that approval was given only for this after considerable surveying and engineering was completed and proven satisfactory.

The request that the charge of \$600, be cancelled is not recommended unless Mrs. Tokaryk is prepared to have a sewer constructed to serve the new lot at an estimated cost of \$1,400."

5. Re: Tenders for Supply and Delivery of Gasoline, Diesel Fuel and Automotive Oils

Nine bids were received on a tender call for the Supply and Delivery of Gasoline, Diesel Fuel and Automotive Oils.

Tenders were opened by the Purchasing Agent in the presence of Mr. R.J. Constable and representatives of the firms tendering.

The Specifications called for bids on the supply and delivery of:

150,000 Imperial Gallons	-	Regular Grade Gasoline
40,000 " "	-	#1 Diesel Fuel
2,300 " "	-	Engine Oil
800 " "	-	Industrial Oil

The contract would commence June 1st, 1967, and the Specifications offered the bidders the opportunity of bidding on a one or two year contract.

A tabulation of the tenders received is submitted herewith.

The low tenders are:

Regular Gasoline	- Shell Canada Ltd.	- \$.2882 per gal.
Diesel Fuel	- Texaco Canada Ltd.	- .1607 " "
S.A.E. 20 Oil (Delo)	- Texaco Canada Ltd.	- .95 " "
(Super)	- Home Oil Distributors	- 1.1235 " "
Industrial Oil	- Home Oil Distributors	- .8295 " "

The existing contract prices and suppliers are:

Gasoline	- Shell Canada Ltd.	- \$.2912 per gal.
Diesel Fuel	- Texaco Canada Ltd.	- .1572 " "
S.A.E. 20 Oil (Delo)	- Home Oil Distributors	- .9135 " "
(Super)	- Home Oil Distributors	- 1.1235 " "
Industrial Oil	- Home Oil Distributors	- .8295 " "

.... Cont. Page 3.

(Item No. 5 - Re: Tenders for Supply and Delivery of Gasoline, Diesel Fuel and Automotive Oils cont.)

In the 1966-67 contract all quoted prices were based on the Prevailing Posted Consumer Tank Truck price and costs could vary accordingly. Actually, gasoline increased by 1¢ per gallon but all other prices remained constant.

The tenders submitted by Shell Canada Ltd., Home Oil Distributors Ltd. and Texaco Canada Ltd. are firm for the two-year period, 1st June, 1967 to 31st May, 1969.

The low tender is acceptable in all cases except that there is an advantage to be gained by having Oil supplied by one contractor.

It is recommended that two-year contracts be awarded as follows:

Regular Gasoline	- low bid, Shell Canada Limited
	@ .2882 per gallon
Diesel Fuel	- low bid, Texaco Canada Limited
	@ .1607 per gallon
Automotive Oils	- Delo - second low bid - Home Oil Distributors Ltd.
	@ .966 per gallon
	- Super - low bid - Home Oil Distributors Ltd.
	@ 1.1235 per gallon
Industrial Oil	- low bid, Home Oil Distributors Ltd.
	@ .8295 per gallon.

6. Re: Probation Service Offices

In December 1966 the Council approved the relocation of the Probation Service offices from the Justice Building to the South Burnaby Credit Union building.

An agreement between the Corporation and the Credit Union has been negotiated covering the portion of the building being used. The terms of the agreement is for one year from December 1st, 1966 and the Corporation has the option to extend the agreement on a month to month basis for a period of six months. The rent is \$141.00 per month which includes heat, electric power and water.

It is recommended that the Reeve and Clerk be authorized to sign the agreement.

7. Re: Proposed Lane Acquisition - Nelson Auto Court,
Block 26, S. 145.66', Ref. Pl. 6730, D.L. 151/3, Plan 733

Mr. Levine of Hean, Wylie and Dixon appeared before Council on 15th May, 1967 on behalf of his clients, Mercer Construction Ltd.

Council had previously authorized negotiations for a north-south lane allowance through the above-described property.

The subject was tabled for one week pending examination by Planning of an alternate proposal of an easement to Dunblane as a substitute for the N/S Lane.

Planning now reports:

"On May 15th, Council received a submission from Hean, Wylie and Dixon on behalf of Mercer Construction regarding an alternate proposal to the lane acquisition which is proposed. You will recall that we initiated this matter with our letter of November 28th in which we sought Council direction. On December 5th Council authorized negotiation for a 20' wide north-south lane and also a 33' x 33' portion of the property for the completion of the Dunblane Avenue-Grimmer Street rights-of-way. Negotiation followed Council's authorization.

The proposal of an easement rather than a dedicated lane has been reviewed by the Department and cannot be recommended as:

(Item No. 7 - Re: Proposed Lane Acquisition - Nelson Auto Court
Block 26, S. 145.66', Ref. Pl. 6730, D.L. 151/3, Plan 783 cont.)

1. The easement would not provide public and unrestricted access.
2. The Corporation does not build lanes on privately owned land.
3. The precedent established by accepting an easement in lieu of a dedicated lane would be damaging and we would undoubtedly be inundated by similar requests on subsequent rezoning and subdivision applications.

We would therefore recommend that Council not accept an easement as proposed and that Council decide whether they wish to continue with acquisition of a dedicated lane allowance or rescind their previous instruction to the Land Agent to negotiate for such an allowance. In either case, dedication of property for the completion of Dunblane Avenue is required."

8. Re: Marine Drive from Boundary to Joffre

In October, 1966 your Municipal Manager recommended an expenditure of \$12,000. to provide a slow lane westbound on Marine Drive between Joffre and Boundary.

Council deferred action until Planning had an opportunity to report on questions associated with the proposed Boundary Road Diversion.

Planning now reports as follows:

"Reference your memo dated April 25, 1967 on the subject matter. In order to present the Planning Department's views on the subject items we believe it necessary initially to review briefly the subject of the Boundary Road connection with the proposed Marine Drive route, captioned above as Boundary Road Diversion.

As early as 1959 a Joint Committee comprised of Vancouver and Burnaby Engineering and Planning Department staff was established to study mutual problems associated with road connections across Boundary Road.

This committee studied several alternative alignments and land use patterns for the Boundary Road - relocated Marine Drive area. The committee concluded that a diversion of Boundary Road eastward through a ravine on the southerly extremity of the south slope area appeared desirable.

Upon further examination of the diversion alternative, specifically with regard to its effect on Burnaby, (considering grade, access and the route's effect on possible land development, servicing and jurisdictional alterations necessitated by the diversion) the Burnaby Planning Department concluded that the diversion alternative was not as practicable as the existing alignment of Boundary Road to Scott Street, the latter becoming part of the new Marine Drive alignment.

The Planning Department would thus reaffirm its earlier views that there is no need to divert Boundary Road from its current alignment, and we have so advised our Vancouver counterparts who have reflected the route in their development plan for the south-east sector of the city.

With regard to the west bound "slow" lane on Marine Drive from Joffre to Boundary Road we would advise that under the proposed scheme of connecting Boundary Road with the new Marine Drive; the current Marine Drive would remain as a residential collector route with anticipated lower traffic volumes. However it will continue to function as a minor arterial until such time as the new Marine Drive along the "flats" can be completed.

(Item No. 3 - Re: Marine Drive from Boundary to Joffre cont.)

We thus believe very minimal improvements, to provide the westbound "slow" lane on Marine Drive, are justified for consideration at this time. Further, in light of recent correspondence from Vancouver Engineering on the intersection improvements they are prepared to make on Marine Drive at Boundary Road, we would anticipate that Burnaby Engineering will coordinate with Vancouver Engineering, their design of improvements to the Marine Drive-Boundary Road intersection and the westbound "slow" lane west of the deep ravine west of Joffre. Coordination of design will enable optimum use of an existing road allowance and may possibly reduce improvement costs on both sides of Boundary Road."

In view of the Planner's report and the intention of Vancouver to improve Marine Drive at the Boundary intersection within Vancouver it is recommended that Burnaby proceed with the installation of a westbound slow lane east of Boundary Road. The estimated cost was \$12,000.00.

9. Re: Rezoning Application Ref. #44/67
Lots "A" & "B" of Lot 14, D.L. 83, Plan 12867

On 20th March, 1967 Council dealt with the Planning Department report recommending against the rezoning of this property on Gilpin Street to permit the construction of a Day Care Centre.

Council decided to proceed with the rezoning and following the Public Hearing gave two readings to the Amending By-law. The By-law was left in the Committee stage to permit the Planning Department to examine the situation further to determine whether any conditions should be attached before finally passing the Amending By-law.

Planning is still not in favour of the rezoning but if it is to proceed it should be on condition that the two lots be consolidated.

While reviewing the development proposal another matter of concern has arisen. The problem is not necessarily unique to this application but rather it is the first time it has arisen. This particular proposal is for a dwelling with the lower floor being used as a day care centre. While the P1 zoning category does permit a dwelling or dwelling unit for a minister, caretaker or watchman, it was assumed in the normal case that this would be a minor or accessory use. In this case, the dwelling and the day care centre each occupy a floor and we have therefore what amounts to two principal uses.

This aspect is going to be examined in more detail by Planning but as the proposal is to erect a day care centre and P1 zoning allows such a use, rezoning as proposed would allow the principal use although the detail development plans might have to be altered.

Respectfully submitted,



H. W. Balfour,
MUNICIPAL MANAGER

HWB:at