

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

7 August 1970

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 45, 1970.

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

Gentlemen:

Your Manager reports as follows:

1. Re: Lane - Georgia-Frances,
East of Delta.

This was Problem Lane #11 in the report to Council on problem lanes. All the necessary acquisitions for the construction of this lane have been made except for the rear 10' of Lot 4, Block "H", D.L. 127W3/4, exc. W 80', Plan 1254.

Lot 4 is known as 5030 Frances Street and is owned by a Mrs. Semenoff. Mrs. Semenoff refuses to donate or sell the rear 10' of her property because of dissatisfaction over paving of the street. The fence and buildings were set back from the lane in contemplation of the future lane construction.

It is recommended that Council authorize expropriation proceedings for the South 10' of Lot 4, Block "H", D.L. 127W3/4, exc. W 80', Plan 1254.

2. Re: Bylaw No. 5739.

Bylaw No. 5739 amends Burnaby Trades License Bylaw 1950.

It defines "agricultural pesticide" and provides for an insurance policy for comprehensive general liability covering premises and operations liability, including completed operations liability, in limits of not less than:

Bodily Injury Liability	\$500,000	each occurrence
	500,000	aggregate products and/or completed operations
Property Damage Liability	\$500,000	each occurrence
	500,000	aggregate products and/or completed operations,

and approved by the Corporation, to be obtained and maintained at the Licensee's cost, as a condition of a License for Commercial Spraying.

It is noted that the Provincial authorities are thinking of something along this line but in amounts of \$100,000 and \$10,000 only.

3. Re: Disbursal of Surplus Local Improvement Monies.

Under Security Issue Bylaw No. 5535, Burnaby borrowed \$41,120 to finance the cost of local improvement works, authorized by Bylaw No. 5152 for \$19,680, to finance those in Bylaw No. 5340. The complete cost of the projects were \$33,573 and \$9,318, leaving a surplus of \$17,909.

It is recommended that a bylaw be passed to authorize the application of the surplus of \$17,909 to reduce the amount of borrowing required to finance the works authorized by Bylaw No. 5336. The Municipal Solicitor has prepared Bylaw No. 5755 for this purpose.

It is recommended that the bylaw be passed.

Continued - -

4. ✓ Re: 1969 Annual Report -
Burnaby Health Department.

Submitted herewith is the Burnaby Health Department Annual Report for 1969.

5. Re: 8800 and 8900 Blocks 15th Avenue
and 7600 Block Cariboo Road.

The above area is included in the following report on "pockets" or small unsewered areas within the Municipality where development has taken place.

Item No. 12 of the Municipal Manager's Report No. 39, 1970 deals with this same subject and the following information is repeated from that Item:

<u>No. of Area</u>	<u>Name of Area</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
1	Copley Pump Area	\$315,000
2	Aubrey Area	100,000
3	Claude Area	46,000
4	20th Street Area	35,000
5	Deer Lake Street Area	10,000
6	Copley Pump Extension	400,000
7	Central Valley Pump Area	900,000
8	Gamma Avenue Area	13,000
9	Broadway Street Area	30,000
10	Lougheed Area	35,000
11	15th Avenue/Cariboo Area	90,000 ✓
		1,974,000
	Reconstruct West Burnaby Sewer	250,000
	Total Estimated Cost	<u>\$2,224,000</u>

The areas are not numbered to show any priority. Nos. 1 and 3 are included in the 1970 Capital Improvement Program.

Omitting Nos. 1 and 3, a count of existing buildings has been made:

Area No. 2	-	47
4	-	26
5	-	7
6	-	47
7	-	58
8	-	14
9	-	16
10	-	26 12
11	-	42

Based on its general knowledge of areas, rather than an intensive field examination, the Health Department rates priorities as:

Area No. 1	(In 1970 program)
3	(In 1970 program)
6	(
7	Interchangeable priority)
10	
4	
8	

and further states that Areas No. 2, 5, 9, and 11 should be decided on other than any Health necessity.

Area No. 11 was re-examined after the claims of the delegation were heard and only one nuisance was found which is easily corrected.

It is now recommended that Areas No. 10, 4, and 8 be added to the 1970 program. This would complete the Health Department list with the exception of Areas No. 6 and 7 which cannot be considered at this time due to excessive cost.

Continued - -

6. Re: Damage Claim -
Einar Anderson, 7770 Sussex Street.

A fence, garage, and retaining wall were damaged in the process of paving the lane behind Mr. Anderson's property.

The work was done by J. Cewe Limited but on direction and supervision of Municipal employees. The damage was caused by pressure of the machine in use. It was not physically possible to recognize the potential problem which resulted.

Mr. Anderson is prepared to settle his claim for \$250.00.

It is recommended that the claim be settled by an ex gratia payment of \$250.00 subject to the necessary releases being obtained.

7. Re: Social Welfare Per Capita Costs.

On 13th July, 1970, your Municipal Manager reported to Council that on the basis of a revised per capita rate by the Provincial Government, and including a retroactive adjustment for the 1969-70 fiscal year, there would be a shortfall of \$71,685.60 in this Corporation's provision for Social Welfare per capita charges.

Mention was also made that the opinion was held that the new per capita charge of \$1.06 would not be sufficient according to the trend.

On 4th August, 1970, advice was received from the Government that from 1st July, 1970, the per capita charge is increased to \$1.15 per month. In dollars this is an increase per month of \$10,080.81 which is \$60,484.86 for the balance of the Corporation's financial year.

The budget picture now is:

Previous estimated shortfall	-	\$71,685.60
Add new requirement	-	60,484.86
Total estimated shortfall in 1970		<u>\$132,170.46</u>

The per capita increase is due to the large increase in social allowance cases and does not result from any change in the cost-sharing formula - 30%/20%.

8. Re: Inter-City Express (1955) Limited
7976 Winston Street.

This item is further to Report Item 15 of the Report of the Municipal Manager of 24 July, 1970, and is to provide the information desired by Council with respect to the Municipal Licenses held by the operators on this property.

The license department first became aware of the operation during the early stages of site development. A routine check with the Planning Department determined that work was proceeding under preliminary plan approval.

Direct contact was established on July 10, 1970, for the purpose of obtaining an application for license and to investigate complaints received by the Planning Department. An inspection was made and Messrs. Smith and Sutherland were interviewed.

The operation involves use of the premises by three companies - Inter-City Express (1955) Limited, operating twenty-two vehicles ranging from 2-3 ton vans to tractor-trailer flatdeck and tankers engaged in local deliveries; British Pacific Transport Limited operating seven tractor-

3. Re: Inter-City Express (1955) Limited
7976 Winston Street. (Cont'd)

trailer "line hauls" units engaged in charter trips throughout the Province; Overland Freight Lines Limited operating three tractor trailer units engaged in daily trips to Chilliwack. The latter two of the above are subsidiary companies to Inter-City Express.

Actual use of the premises involves a general office and dispatching service, parking and fueling of vehicles and on completion of a building, the service and repair of said vehicles. A limited amount of storage of goods will be undertaken from time to time when unforeseen circumstances make this necessary..

Of the 32 vehicles operated by the three companies, average overnight use would be approximately 20 units. The remainder are away on trips or, in the case of Inter-City Express, are leased to one company and parked on their premises. Traffic to and from the yard is minimal as the vehicles in the yard leave between 3:00 and 3:30 a.m. and normally return between 4:30 and 6:00 p.m. Leased vehicles return an average of once a day for fuel. Larger line vehicles are parked in the yard between trips only, with average trips being two to four days. With the possible exception of a loaded vehicle being parked overnight, the premises are not being used for storage or transfer of goods. The main operation consists of transport of goods and freight from the customer direct to the consignee.

In the opinion of the Chief License Inspector the use of this yard constitutes a cartage-express facility. For licensing and zoning enforcement purposes an operation carried on in this manner is classified separately from a trucking terminal. The important difference being, that a terminal operation involves the loading and unloading of the majority of all goods that are transported. This necessitates a much heavier flow of vehicles, both company owned and potentially, units from any other delivery or express company. Conversely, the express office does not handle freight at their place of business and the traffic is generally limited to their own units, normally leaving in the morning and returning on completion of their rounds.

As the Planning Director points out in his report, several other industries involving a similar heavy type truck usage are permitted in this zone. The wording of the by-law does not empower License to classify either by size of fleet or size of vehicles, rather by use of premises.

No license has yet been issued to Inter-City Express and the subsidiary companies but this will be done upon approval from Health, Building, and Fire Departments unless instructions are received to the contrary.

The question was raised about the relationship of Warner Loat Park to Industrial Zoning. Warner Loat Park is situated on the east side of Piper Avenue. It is bounded on the north and east by property Zoned M1. The railway track is on the south boundary of the park, ostensibly, but there is a small portion of the park south of the track. The property adjoining this small portion, to the south, is Zoned R5. The property immediately to the west, that is on the west side of Piper Avenue north of the tracks, is Zoned M2.

Council had previously agreed with the residents of the "Winston" area that when Winston is developed there be trees planted on the road allowance which in time would act as a visual screen. There is no buffer area as such except as is provided in the Zoning Bylaw. Since the set-back required is only a 20' landscaped area this could not be construed as a buffer zone.

In recent approval of the residential subdivision north of Winston all lots were backed onto Winston and their depth is 165' compared with the normal 120' lot depth. The additional depth is of little use if all the trees and growth are removed from it. If this is done then the objective of the deep lot depth is negated. The owners could provide their own screen within this extra depth.

8. Re: Inter-City Express (1955) Limited
7976 Winston Street. (Cont'd)

It does appear though, that the complete responsibility for any form of screen between the residential and industrial uses is being passed back to the Corporation. Planning is therefore taking another look at the entire situation to see what recommendations are in order to prevent future conflict of interest. See separate report of the Planning Director attached herewith.

9. Re: Stanley - Allman Lane.

In order to provide exits for this lane to Allman Street and 6th Street it is recommended:

"That authority be granted to expropriate the rear 10' of:

- a) 7393 Stanley Street - Lot 3, Blocks 1 and 2, D.L. 87,
Expl. Plan 14265, Plan 4459. (F.A. and R.M. Armstrong)
b) 6230 Canada Way - Lot 3, Block 2, D.L. 87, Plan 1494."

Negotiations to acquire these two widening strips have been unsuccessful.

10. Re: Lot 39 Except Parcel "A", Explanatory Plan 16076,
D.L. 86, Plan 1203 (Lesosky).

Council tabled this subject to permit a meeting between Planning and Mr. Anderson representing Mr. Lesosky.

The earliest Planning has been able to arrange this meeting to discuss the detailed servicing estimates is Monday, 10th August, 1970. The results of the meeting therefore will not be ready in report form for the Council Meeting on 10th August, 1970, but will be submitted to Council on 24th August, 1970.

It is recommended that the subject be retabled until 24th August, 1970.

11. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 20/70.

MESSAGE

To: Mr. Balfour

Date: 10 August 1970
Time: 4:05

Mr. Pearce called re Rezoning Ref. 20/70 on tonight's Agenda. He would like to know if it can be deleted from the Ccl. Mtg. as they want to adjust the whole matter, and also, due to certain difficulties they can't have a representative at the meeting. He is at 946-4445 (Delta Challenger Newspaper), and would like to be notified as soon as possible.

L. 29, Plan 4215 (7542 Kingsway)
L. 4900 (Vacant)
L. 168, Plan 3035 (7558 Kingsway).

RS to RM3 and C2.

The Planning Department to work with an more in keeping with the points within the framework of the RML Study.

representing the applicant and Mr. Paget above application. However no word that his client was unwilling to

representative of the applicant it is of 27th July, 1970, be now reconsidered.

12. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 16/70.

Rezoning Reference No. 16/70 applies to:

Lots 1 and 2, except part on plan with bylaw 30078,
Block 2, East Part, D.L.'s 151/153, Plan 5457.

8. Re: Inter-City Express (1955) Limited
7976 Winston Street. (Cont'd)

It does appear though, that the complete responsibility for any form of screen between the residential and industrial uses is being passed back to the Corporation. Planning is therefore taking another look at the entire situation to see what recommendations are in order to prevent future conflict of interest. See separate report of the Planning Director attached herewith.

9. Re: Stanley - Allman Lane.

In order to provide exits for this lane to Allman Street and 6th Street it is recommended:

"That authority be granted to expropriate the rear 10' of:

- a) 7393 Stanley Street - Lot 3, Blocks 1 and 2, D.L. 87,
Expl. Plan 14265, Plan 4459. (F.A. and R.M. Armstrong)
b) 6230 Canada Way - Lot 3, Block 2, D.L. 87, Plan 1494."

Negotiations to acquire these two widening strips have been unsuccessful,

10. Re: Lot 39 Except Parcel "A", Explanatory Plan 16376,
D.L. 26, Plan 1203 (Lesosky).

Council tabled this subject to permit a meeting between Planning and Mr. Anderson representing Mr. Lesosky.

The earliest Planning has been able to arrange this meeting to discuss the detailed servicing estimates is Monday, 10th August, 1970. The results of the meeting therefore will not be ready in report form for the Council Meeting on 10th August, 1970, but will be submitted to Council on 24th August, 1970.

It is recommended that the subject be retabled until 24th August, 1970.

11. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 20/70.

This rezoning applies to:

- a) Block 27, Expl. Plan 19908, D.L. 29, Plan 4215 (7542 Kingsway)
b) Lot 1, Block 26, D.L. 29, Plan 4900 (Vacant)
c) Block 26, D.L. 29, Sk. Plan 7368, Plan 3035 (7558 Kingsway).

The requested rezoning is from C4 and R5 to RM3 and C2.

Council on July 27, 1970 instructed the Planning Department to work with the developer in the creation of a plan more in keeping with the points listed in the Department's report and within the framework of the RM1 designation provided in the Apartment Study.

On July 31, 1970, Mr. L. M. Pearce representing the applicant and Mr. Paget of this Department met to discuss the above application. However no progress was made as Mr. Pearce stated that his client was unwilling to accept anything but RM3 zoning.

In view of the above decision by the representative of the applicant it is recommended that the Planning report of 27th July, 1970, be now reconsidered and that the application be not approved.

12. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 16/70.

Rezoning Reference No. 16/70 applies to:

Lots 1 and 2, except part on plan with Bylaw 30078,
Block 2, East Part, D.L.'s 151/153, Plan 5457.

12. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 16/70. (Cont'd)

The address of the property is 4361 Kingsway, and the application is to rezone from C3 and R5 to CD comprehensive development.

Council has usually established a prerequisite with respect to property where existing buildings are to be removed to require that all existing improvements be removed within six months of the rezoning being effected.

Due to an oversight this prerequisite was not included in the list of those recommended to Council in the Planning report of 27th June, 1970, dealing with the subject application.

It is now recommended that the following additional prerequisite be set:

"A submission of an undertaking that all existing structures will be removed within six months of the rezoning being effected."

The applicant indicated at the Public Hearing that he intended to demolish all existing buildings on the site.

*adopted
10/8/70*

13. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 35/70.

Rezoning Reference No. 35/70 applies to:

- a) Lot 2, except Expl. Plan 8663, Block 5, D.L. 34, Plan 1355
- b) Lot 1, Block 5, D.L. 34, Plan 1355
- c) Lots 2 and 3, Sk. 8663, Block 5, D.L. 34, Plan 1355.

The address of the above properties is 5603, 5622, and 5636 Inman Street, and the rezoning requested is from R5 to R43 Multiple Family.

In the Planning report to Council of 27th July, 1970, Planning advised that further services may be required as prerequisites to this rezoning depending upon the outcome of the Engineering Department's review which was then in progress.

Engineering has now completed its review and has determined that storm sewer service is not available.

It is, therefore, recommended that the following be set as a prerequisite to this rezoning:

"The deposit of monies to cover the cost of providing storm sewers to serve this site."

*adopted
10/8/70*

14. Re: Home-Owner Grant Claims.

The following information is supplied to Council in view of the recent publicity given to non-payment by the Government of claims submitted to the Government for Home-owner Grants allowed.

Based on the following assumptions:

- a) a period of 20 days after submission of claims before payment can be expected is reasonable, according to previous experience;
- b) an interest rate of 7.3% for short-term money.

The delay in 1970 in payment of Burnaby's Home-owner Grant claims resulted in a calculated loss in interest earnings of \$4,283.29.

Payment was received on 4th August, 1970, of all claims submitted to and including 13th July, 1970. The amount of the payment was \$1,843,150.11. The 13th July, 1970, claim would not normally be expected until 10th August, 1970.

There are now two outstanding claims dated 20th and 28th July, 1970, totalling \$1,676,301.40.

Rec'd

15. Re: Subdivision Reference No. 137/68 -
Heathdale Drive.

The initial subdivision of property creating Heathdale, west of Howard, created only a 30' road allowance and an easement for sewers was retained over Lot 372 on the south side of the allowance. Lot 372 was a large unsubdivided parcel, approximately 400' x 90'.

Lot 372 was subsequently subdivided into 5 lots and the south half of the road allowance dedicated. In error, the easement referred to above was transferred to all five lots whereas it actually is required only from 2 lots, No. 392 and 393, being the lots on which the remnant of the easement is now located.

It is recommended that Council grant authority to have the charge against lots No. 378, 379 and 380 released.

16. Re: Mobile Home Parks.

When Council adopted a recommendation of the Advisory Planning Commission that Mobile Home Parks be not permitted in Burnaby it added a rider that it wished to be informed of any actual proposal received by the Planner. The thought was that possibly a proposal could be received which could be considered as an interim use of land.

The Planning Department has recently received a letter from Gordon & Gordon Realty Limited on the subject of mobile home parks together with a brochure containing statistical material and illustrative examples of mobile home developments.

Although no definite schemes or proposals were advanced, an area of at least twenty acres has been suggested for the establishment of a mobile home park site. This would presumably be Corporation-owned land.

The duration of the lease which is specified (not less than 30 years) would not be in keeping with the directive of the Council that mobile home park developments be considered only on an interim land use basis.

This has been pointed out in our reply to Gordon & Gordon Realty Limited. Further information has also been requested.

Council direction is requested before proceeding further on this matter.

17. Re: Contract with Ridgeway Pacific Construction Limited
for a Field House - Kensington Park.

On recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Commission, Council awarded a contract to Ridgeway Construction Limited. Item No. 9 of the Municipal Manager's Report No. 41, 1970, refers.

The bid contract price was amended by removing the "mechanical" bid and replacing it with a Prime Cost Sum. The "mechanical" was to be re-tendered. The Prime Cost Sum actually included in the adjusted base price was \$20,000.

Four contractors bid when the mechanical was re-tendered and the lowest tender received was from D. & R. Plumbing and Heating Limited for \$23,444.00.

This bid is \$2,506 less than the original price for mechanical but is also \$3,444 more than the Prime Cost Sum in the Ridgeway Construction Contract. The contract with Ridgeway Construction Limited should be revised to reflect the new price for mechanical of \$23,444.00.

It is recommended that Council approve that the Contract be so amended, subject to ratification of this recommendation by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

13. Re: Drive-In Restaurants.

By Item No. 9 of the Municipal Manager's Report No. 43, 1970, the Planner's Report on Service Commercial Districts (C4) was submitted to Council.

Mention was made that a complementary report on Drive-In Restaurants would be forthcoming.

Submitted herewith is the Report on Drive-In Restaurants referred to.

19. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 58/68 (a)
Lot 13, D.L. 2, Plan 35814
9920 Lougheed Highway
From A2 Small Holdings to C4 Commercial.

At their July 13, 1970 meeting, the Municipal Council decided to proceed with this Bylaw and requested the Planning Department to report on the prerequisites to this rezoning.

It is therefore recommended that the following be set as prerequisites to this rezoning:

1. The submission of a suitable plan of development which places particular emphasis on properly screening the subject property from adjacent apartment developments proposed to the south and west, and which resolves problems of access and on-site stacking of cars.
2. The submission of an agreement that all landscaping shall be carried out as part of the first stage of development.
3. The submission of a notice of agreement to the future closure of Rochester Street.
4. The submission of an undertaking to remove all existing improvements within six months of the rezoning being effected.
5. The deposit of sufficient monies to cover the cost of the following servicing requirements:
 - (a) storm and sanitary sewers
 - (b) the enclosure of the watercourse on the property.

20. Re: Sale of Lots 212 and 213, D.L. 86, Plan 36959.

Lots 212 and 213, D.L. 86, were bid on by Doctor Chan. The bids were:

Lot 212 - \$13,550
Lot 213 - 15,550

These were the only bids received on these two lots and they were awarded by Council to Edward Chan.

Dr. Chan has now applied to Council to be allowed to withdraw his bid for Lot 213 and use the bid deposit made as part of the first instalment on Lot 212. His letter follows:

"I placed bids on two lots, lot 212 and lot 213, D.L. 86, Plan 36959, in the amount of \$13,555.00 and \$15,555.00 respectively, which were both accepted.

Unfortunately I only anticipated being successful on one lot. The rules are set out by the land department are quite specific and state a separate deposit is required for each lot. I am not in the land speculation business and wanted to purchase a lot for my personal use. I would like to appeal to council to allow me to withdraw my bid on

20. Re: Sale of Lots 212 and 213, D.L. 86, Plan 36959. (Cont'd)

"lot 213 and use the deposits of the bid in the amount of \$777.50 to aid in the installment payment of lot 212.

Your consideration in this matter is very much appreciated."

Your Municipal Manager knows of no precedent for such action. The problem would not be too complicated if it were not that the property was sold on the bid system. This naturally resulted in some of the lots being sold above the average successful bids and some at less than the average successful bids.

To accede to Dr. Chan's request would mean that this lot which presumably had been sold would have to be placed on the sale list at a fixed price - presumably the \$14,300 established for other unsold lots. There would then be nothing to prevent Dr. Chan, or someone on his behalf, coming in and buying this self-same lot at a total saving of \$1,250.00

It is recommended that the request be denied and if Dr. Chan does not want to proceed with the purchase of Lot 213 he would forfeit his deposit of \$777.50.

Moved 2 hrs. after meeting down payment.

Need adoption

21. Re: Land Sales by Advertisement.

There is a protest to Council over the award of bids on lots in D.L. 86, and the procedures followed.

For years it was the custom to include a reserve price in the advertisements of property offered for sale. One Council disagreed with this practice and directed that it be discontinued.

Property is now advertised for sale by bid without specific mention of a reserve price. The advertisements however clearly state that any or all bids may be rejected.

When bids are reported to Council a recommendation is made to Council of a minimum acceptable price, which is in essence the reserve price. The recommendation to Council respecting the actual bids reflects this minimum acceptable price.

These procedures were followed in the case of the 38 lots in D.L. 86 offered for sale by tender.

The Land Agent calculated a minimum price of \$150 per foot for these lots. This cannot be construed as applying only to the actual frontage of the individual lots because some of them are irregular in shape. Possibly the most attractive lot offered had a narrow frontage but a beautiful width of back-yard. The reserve price of \$12,000 was then calculated on the basis of the average lot size, 80' at \$150 per foot, taking into consideration the standard and cost of servicing, and a reasonable return on the land.

There is no actual prohibition against it but as a matter of personal policy staff invariably refuse to make any suggestion to prospective bidders as to what bid they should make. Information is available with respect to previous sales in the area but the bidder should decide for himself what a particular lot is worth to him.

Of the lots which were subsequently put on sale over the counter at \$14,300 per lot, five have since been sold.

The Land Department was directed to comment on the claim that the lot in question has a lesser value than the others. The Land Department states that the lot is not of a lesser value. The frontage is less than some others but the rear lot line is longer. The area of the lot is 13,400 sq. ft. compared with 14,200 sq. ft. for the lot 258, which sold for \$13,132.00.

Rec'd 10/18/70

no change in policy

22. Re: Reports under Section 601
of the Municipal Act.

Revised

Submitted herewith is the Report of the Municipal Treasurer pursuant to Section 601 of the Municipal Act, relative to certain lane paving projects which required re-initiation for various reasons, and to the initiation of three new projects.

23. Re: Edmonds - Kingsway Area "O"
Community Plan Area #6.

Refer to A.D.C.

Submitted herewith for the consideration of Council is the Planner's Report dated 10th August, 1970, relative to the Edmonds - Kingsway Community Plan.

24. Re: Burnaby Association For Retarded Children -
Appeal for a Site.

The above Association submitted a Brief to Council on 27th July, 1970, asking for a site on which the Association could erect a hostel and a workshop for the purposes of the Association.

Council referred the matter to the Municipal Manager for consultation with the Association to discuss the availability of land for the purpose.

This meeting has been held. The site originally selected by the Association is not serviced, even by a road, and cannot therefore be recommended.

Approve the use of the site.

It was suggested to the Association that it consider a row of lots facing on the unconstructed Banff Avenue. There are many advantages to this site, including the fact that the Association will be the heir to the Auto Court property immediately across Banff Avenue. The only drawback to the site is that it would require rezoning.

By letter dated 5th August, 1970, the Association endorses the Banff Avenue site.

The Association is desirous of either an outright gift of the property or lease at a nominal rate.

The property now under consideration is Lots 48B to 52B inclusive, S.D. 19, Blk. 6, D.L. 74S $\frac{1}{2}$, Plan 13520. The area is just under one acre but if the need is there it should be possible to add $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Banff allowance to the site and when the Association becomes the owner of the Auto Court, Banff can be cancelled completely and a composite site made.

25. Re: Proposed Road Exchange Bylaw -
Covering part of D.L.'s 6 and 10.

This Bylaw would affect Part of D.L.'s 6 and 10, Group 1, Plan 31569, and a Portion of Lot 69, Plan 31569 of D.L.'s 4 and 6, Group 1, N.W.D. The road allowance to be corrected is Eastlake Drive, north of the Lougheed Highway.

Eastlake Drive ^{is} in the development of the East Lake City area currently being considered by Council. It is necessary to amend the detailed alignment of the road intersection shown on the attached plan by exchanging the portion of dedicated road coloured green, for a newly dedicated portion coloured red.

concern 10/8/70

It is recommended that Council proceed with the preparation of a Road Exchange Bylaw to accomplish this change, with all costs to be the responsibility of the developers.

Sketches are attached.

26. Re: James Cowan Theatre Renovations.

Tenders were called for the subject work up to 3:00 p.m. local time, Wednesday, 5th August, 1970.

Three bids were received and opened by the Purchasing Agent in the presence of Mr. N. Shearing (Underwood, McKinley, Cameron, Wilson, Smith - Architects), P. Stockstad, R. J. Constable, and representatives of the firms bidding.

Submitted herewith is a tabulation of the bids received.

These tenders were considered by the Parks and Recreation Commission at its meeting held 5th August, 1970, and the Commission accepted the low bid of Kirkham Bros. Construction Company Limited subject to negotiation with the bidder on various deletions so that the total cost of the project including the consultants fee would not exceed the provision for this project of \$49,800.00.

Negotiations with the low bidder have now been concluded and the revised price is as follows:

Basic Tender		\$48,469.00
Amendments:		
1. Delete carpet from lobby area	\$1,115.00	
2. Delete planter from entrance	410.00	
3. Delete outside covered walk	760.00	
4. Delete seamless treatment from walls	250.00	
5. Delete mirrors and re-use existing ones	60.00	
6. Change fir frame work to kiln dried hemlock frame work in restrooms and ticket booth	200.00	
7. Change 5/8" T & G flooring to 1/2" T & G flooring in Balcony and Projection Booth area	60.00	
8. Delete plywood wall finish in storage area	78.00	
9. Delete 1 W.C. and 2 Urinals but complete rough in work in restrooms	230.00	
10. Delete 1 metal W.C. Partition	85.00	
11. Change two metal screen partitions to plywood screen partitions in restroom entrance area	100.00	3,348.00
Revised Price with Kirkham Bros. Construction Co. Ltd.		<u>\$45,121.00</u>

The Consultants fee @ 10% will be \$4,512, making a total cost of the project of \$49,633.00.

The Parks and Recreation Commission recommends acceptance of the low bid by Kirkham Bros. Construction Company Limited as revised to the price of \$45,121.00.

*adopted
p 8/70*

27. Re: Rezoning Reference No. 63/69.

The above rezoning is an application for the rezoning of D.L. 158E1/2, Block 13, Lots 1 and 2 W1/2, Plan 1908, from C2 Commercial to CD Comprehensive Development.

The address of the property is 7224 Royal Oak Avenue.

Submitted herewith is the Planner's Report on the proposed rezoning.

20. Re: North End of Willingdon Avenue
(Chevron Canada Limited).

The Council received a letter from the Burnaby Pollution Removal Association on 13th July, 1970, requesting that the action taken some months ago to close the North end of Willingdon Avenue be reviewed.

Actually, the decision of Council was taken on 2nd October, 1967, when Council agreed to grant Chevron Canada Limited permission pursuant to Sections 513 (i)(b) and 462 of the Municipal Act to construct:

- a) a gate across Willingdon Avenue at a point 105' south of the South-West corner of Lot 1, Block "A", D.L. 188, Plan 4169;
- b) a fence between the aforementioned South-West corner of Lot 1 and along the Easterly boundary of Willingdon Avenue to the gate mentioned;

all as more particularly shown on a plan accompanying a letter of September 21st from the Company, subject to the Company saving the Corporation harmless from any damages or claims that may arise as a result of the installations and their presence.

The gate and fence were subsequently installed and are still in position, and the Agreement was executed.

The letter of request from the Company stated:

"We are making the request because at present we require four access gates from Willingdon Avenue in order to conduct our business. They do not, however, afford us the measure of safety and security we would like to have. This is exemplified in the last few years by increasing traffic inadvertently entering the refinery area. We are interested in correcting the condition by eliminating the existing four gates and installing one. This would not only reduce the possibility of people becoming involved in accidents within the plant area but would also prevent the likelihood of accidents at the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the foot of Willingdon Avenue."

When the request for reconsideration was received by Council, the Company wrote as follows:

"Dear Sirs:

With reference to your letter of July 15, 1970, the gate on Willingdon Avenue has performed a service to the public from our experience over the last two years. It has eliminated numerous accidental collisions of the public's automobiles with gates we had beside Willingdon Avenue. These were not serious accidents but had that potential. The single gate also redirects "lost" motorists more safely by having them turn around before they enter our property which in the past resulted in several accidents by the public in our plant. The gate has provided better security to the Company, which is also a service to the public.

As you know, Willingdon Avenue always has terminated to the motoring public about one block north of our gate. Foot traffic does have access to the waterfront by a path along the east side of our fence, or a more travelled pathway on the east side of the big gully in Confederation Park, a distance of only several hundred feet east of Willingdon Avenue. In addition, there are other foot paths through Confederation Park that terminate at the waterfront.

We have not made use of the portion of Willingdon Avenue north of the gate. We are cognizant of, and we believe we are living up to the agreement we made on October 17, 1967."

Mr. Bremner, Vice-President and Refinery Manager for Standard Oil of B.C. Limited advised your Municipal Manager that the gate is open during working hours and locked at night.

Continued - -

*Re: a minor
ask Bremner
if they can improve
the E. side
from the
waterfront
standard.*

28. Re: North End of Willingdon Avenue
(Chevron Canada Limited). (Cont'd)

The letter to Council from the Burnaby Pollution Removal Association implied that the Company had erected the gate without permission, which is not correct. The Association also understands that Burnaby owns Willingdon Avenue which is also incorrect as it is a dedicated street but the Municipality does have control over it.

29. Re: Estimates.

advised 10/8/70
Submitted herewith for your approval is the Municipal Engineer's report covering Special Estimates of Work in the total amount of \$19,843.36.

It is recommended that the estimates be approved as submitted.

30. Re: Social Service.

Submitted herewith for your information is a report prepared by the Social Service Administrator indicating Social Allowance Disbursements and Caseloads for select months in 1970 as compared to those same months in 1969.

Respectfully submitted,


H. W. Balfour,
MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

LD:ep

Attach.

31. Re: Sale of Municipal Lots - D.L. 86

Those lots in D.L. 86 not awarded by Council on tender bid were ordered by Council to be placed on sale at a price of \$14,300. for each lot.

The Land Agent reports that since then the following seven lots have been sold:

- (1) Lot 215, D.L. 86, Plan 36959 (with easement)
- (2) Lot 216, D.L. 86, Plan 36959 (with easement)
- (3) Lot 219, D.L. 86, Plan 36959 (with easement)
- (4) Lot 222, D.L. 86, Plan 36959
- (5) Lot 233, D.L. 86, Plan 36959
- (6) Lot 211, D.L. 86, Plan 36959
- (7) Lot 220, D.L. 86, Plan 36959

Adm. 10/18/70
It is recommended that Council grant authority to execute the necessary documents, together with the sewer easements on Lots 215, 216 and 219, as noted.

32. Re: Report under Section 601 of the Municipal Act.

Submitted herewith, pursuant to Section 601 of the Municipal Act, is the Treasurer's Report as required, relating to sundry lane paving, as noted:

- (a) Location of Work: Rumble Street - Neville Street "T" lane from Buller Avenue to East property line of Lot 6, S.D. 2, Block 36, D.L. 159, Plan 13416
 - Length of Work: 520 feet
 - Estimated Cost of Work: \$1,040.00
 - Actual Frontage: 655.73 feet
 - Taxable Frontage: 609.96 feet
 - Owner's Share of Cost: \$609.96
- (b) Location of Work: Lane East of and parallel to Douglas Road, from Laurel Street to Fulwell Street
 - Length of Work: 300 feet
 - Estimated Cost of Work: \$600.00
 - Actual Frontage: 523.00 feet
 - Taxable Frontage: 330.00 feet
 - Owners' Share of Cost: \$330.00

Rec'd 10/18/70
Continued --

32. Re: Report under Section 601 of the Municipal Act (Continued)

(c) Location of Work:	Elwell - Rosewood Street lane between Mary Avenue and Canada Way.
Length of Work:	1,400 feet
Estimated Cost of Work:	\$2,800.00
Actual Frontage:	2,252.13 feet
Taxable Frontage:	1,448.15 feet
Owners' Share of Cost:	\$1,448.15

33. Re: German Measles Immunization Program

Your Municipal Manager was directed to obtain information regarding the public discussions of a German Measles Immunization Program and the possibility of such a program in Burnaby.

The following information has been obtained from Dr. Bonham, M.H.O. for Vancouver, who discussed the matter with Dr. Sunderland before Dr. Sunderland left on annual holidays:

- (1) The Provincial Government is buying vaccine costing \$88,000. or an estimated 77,190 doses.
- (2) Burnaby will receive vaccine to the ratio the Burnaby school population in Grades 1-7 bears to the Provincial school population in these same grades.
- (3) These figures are: Burnaby - 17,964
Province - 321,472
- (4) Burnaby's percentage is 5.6%
Therefore, Burnaby would receive 5.6% of 77,190 = 4,322 doses for 17,964 children.
- (5) The Kinsmen Rehabilitation Foundation will be raising funds. This could be a \$100,000 fund - but there is only \$5,000 now.
- (6) The \$100,000 does not include any Municipal contribution.
- (7) It will be distributed within the Province on the same basis as the Government's \$88,000.
- (8) It is now proposed that the program cover ages 1-12. It is estimated that Burnaby has about 25,000 in these ages.
- (9) Using an acceptance rate of 85%, this means about 21,250 doses would be needed.
- (10) Of these 21,250 doses, Burnaby could expect 4,322 from the Government leaving 17,000 to be found.
- (11) The cost of vaccine reduces by volume purchases so for circulation purposes \$1 would be satisfactory.
- (12) Therefore, to carry out this complete immunization program for ages 1-12 would require another \$18,000 approximately.

Continued --

33. Re: German Measles Immunization Program (Continued)

- (13) This \$18,000 could be reduced by any contribution from the Kinsmen Fund.
- (14) The immediate problem is the guarantee of funds to pay for the vaccine when it is delivered - if ordered.
- (15) This could be achieved by an "advance" from the Municipality to the amount of \$18,000, subject to adjustment from any contributions received.
- (16) The immunization program is planned to commence 14th September, 1970 in most municipalities entering the program.

Respectfully submitted,



H. W. Balfour
MUNICIPAL MANAGER

HB:mc

