

JANUARY 18, 1960.

An Adjourned Meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Committee Room, Municipal Hall, 4545 E. Grandview Douglas Highway, on Monday, January 18, 1960 at 7.30 p.m.

PRESENT: Reeve A. H. Emmott in the Chair; Councillors Brown, MacSorley, Prittie, Mather, Jamieson, Harper and Drummond.

President, Lozells and District Civic Betterment Association, wrote advising that he wished to submit to Council, a petition concerning the proposed Community Plan for the Government Road-South Burquitlam District of the Municipality.

Moved by Councillor Brown, seconded by Councillor Prittie "That the delegation be heard."

Carried Unanimously.

The President, Mr. P. McPhail, appeared and presented copies of the Petition referred to above, and advised that it was supported by over two hundred and sixty residents in the subject area. The Petitioners submitted that the land was in the confines of the area bounded by Lougheed Highway, Brighton Avenue, Government Street and Sperling Avenue, was characteristically residential, and that to ensure that it remained as such, they felt it necessary that an Official Community Plan be prepared for the area in question. They stressed that a mere statement of policy by Council with respect to future land use affords no intrinsic protection from industrial intrusion into the residential neighbourhood, with the result that this tends to depreciate adjoining property and also isolates part of the Lozells area. In conclusion, the petitioners requested that Council retain the residential area without any reduction, and set up an Official Community Plan (as provided under the Municipal Act) with acceptance of it being in accordance with the wishes of the residents involved.

Mr. ~~M. Peters~~ ^{L. Peters} also addressed Council on the subject matter and suggested that in addition to the area outlined in the Brief, the Lozells District also included that territory lying between the Lougheed Highway and Broadway, and the section between Brighton Avenue and North Road. He pointed out that in the future land use plan which Council intends to follow, certain of the future land use designations for the Lougheed Highway constitute nothing more than ribbon development. Mr. Peters concluded by strongly urging that the area in question be retained wholly for residential purposes.

Mr. S. Hughes also addressed Council advising that he, too, endorsed the submission by the Petitioners. He reminded Council that in 1957, the Planning Department had stated that further industrial encroachment into the Government Road area would make the situation for the residents untenable. He suggested that Council take steps to avoid the creation of a residential "pocket" by means of zoning the periphery of the area in question for industrial or commercial purposes. Mr. Hughes concluded his presentation by requesting that Council express its opinion with respect to the utilization of the Official Community Plan provisions of the Municipal Act.

Moved by Councillor Prittie, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That the petition be received and the delegation thanked for their respective presentations."

Carried Unanimously.

President, Fraser Valley Mosquito Control Board, wrote inquiring as to whether Council intends to continue its participation in the Mosquito Control Programme for the year 1960. The President also advised that a meeting of the Board is to be held on January 27th at 8 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, Haney.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Mather "That the letter be received and the Mosquito Control Board be advised that this Municipality intends to continue its participation in the Mosquito Control Programme."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Harper, seconded by Councillor MacSorley "That Councillor Mather be delegated to attend the meeting referred to in the letter."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Brown "That the Council do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to deal with:

- (a) Report of Traffic Safety Committee.
- (b) Report of Policy Committee.
- (c) Report No.2, 1960 - Municipal Manager."

Carried Unanimously.

(a) REPORT OF TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE:

1. Road Markings on Cumberland Street leading to George-Derby Health and Occupational Centre.

The Committee reported it had received a number of suggestions from the Hospital Superintendent at the above street and 16th Avenue. It advised that an inspection of this location was made which revealed that the centre line on Cumberland Street stops a few feet inside the Hospital Gate and that, in their opinion, since this

(Report of Traffic Safety Committeecontinued).

could easily lead motorists to believe they were on a "through" street, the centre line should not extend beyond 16th Avenue. They added that they felt possible a "turn" sign could be erected on Cumberland Street in advance of 16th Avenue to indicate a change of direction in the main route, but that otherwise, they did not feel other signing or lining necessary. The Committee recommended that the centre line of Cumberland Street between 16th and 17th Avenues be no longer painted.

Moved by Councillor Prittie, seconded by Councillor Mather "That the recommendation of the Committee be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

2. Proposed Sidewalk installation adjacent to Pacific Coast Packers property.

The Committee reported that it was of the opinion any sidewalk crossing properly used presents no hazard for people on the sidewalk, and that one on the east side would not be used by children travelling to a school on the west side. They added that no assurance could be given that a future sidewalk on the east side of McPherson Avenue would not be crossed by as many or more sidewalk crossings than will be required by Pacific Coast Packers Limited. The Committee advised that a student movement survey indicates that 180 children travel south on McPherson Avenue to the School, with 134 entering McPherson Avenue from the east and 46 from the west. The Committee also reported that at the present time, perpendicular parking of employees' vehicles takes place in front of the Plant and this indiscriminate parking would not be possible after a sidewalk has been installed. The Committee advised that the concern of the Company regarding this work is that it would be better for them, and safer for the children (because of the several sidewalk crossings required) if the sidewalk were installed on the east side rather than the west. The Committee advised that, in view of the reasons presented above, it could not concur with the Company and therefore felt they must support the proposal for the construction of a sidewalk at the original location.

Moved by Councillor Prittie, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That the report of the Traffic Safety Committee be received."

Carried Unanimously.

(B) REPORT OF POLICY COMMITTEE:

Your Committee met on Monday, January 11, 1960, and would recommend:

- (a) That an annual water charge of \$25.00 apply to all one family dwellings, a store or office with or without living quarters, a unit of not more than three stores or offices, or both, without living quarters; subject to the installation of a meter under the Waterworks Regulation By-law.
- (b) That an annual water charge of \$41.00 apply to all two-family dwellings, a unit of not more than three stores or offices or both, including living quarters for one family; subject to the installation of a Water meter under the Waterworks Regulation By-law.
- (c) That an additional annual water charge of \$10.00 for a swimming pool installation not subject to the installation of a water meter under the Waterworks Regulation By-law be made.
- (d) That the following monthly rates for industrial, commercial and residential meters apply:

For the first 10,000 cu. ft. used -	.25¢ per 100 cu. ft. per month
For the next 20,000 cu. ft. used -	.20¢ per 100 cu. ft. per month
For the next 50,000 cu. ft. used -	15.6¢ per 100 cu. ft. per month
For the next 420,000 cu. ft. used -	13.75¢ per 100 cu. ft. per month
For the next 1,500,000 cu. ft. used -	.10¢ per 100 cu. ft. per month
For all consumption in excess of 2,000,000 cu. ft. used -	8.75¢ per 100 cu. ft. per month.
- (e) That a minimum monthly charge of \$1.65 plus meter rent, apply to those metered properties on monthly rates.
- (f) That the following quarterly rates for industrial, commercial and residential meters apply:

For the first 30,000 cu. ft. used -	25¢ per 100 cu. ft. per quarter
For the next 60,000 cu. ft. used -	20¢ per 100 cu. ft. per quarter
For the next 150,000 cu. ft. used -	15.6¢ per 100 cu. ft. per quarter
- (g) That a minimum quarterly charge of \$4.95, plus meter rent, apply to those metered properties on quarterly rates.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Prittie "That the recommendations of the Policy Committee be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

A suggestion was offered to Council that there might be some merit in the adoption of a plan which would provide for the ready deployment of staff at the Centennial Staff to handle extraordinary situations at all times, such as the presence of large crowds. The proponent of this suggestion advised that he had received a complaint that on Sunday, January 17th, there was insufficient parking facilities to accommodate the host of visitors to the site and that as a consequence there was some confusion and inconvenience. He also advised that he felt with such a large crowd, the concession should have been open to serve the Public. He added that it had come to his attention that there was a coating of ice on the upper floor near the telescope and that this could have led to serious injury and possibly, the Municipality being faced with a legal action had someone slipped on the ice.

Moved by Councillor MacSorley, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That the Council representative to the Parks and Recreation Commission take the matter as recited above, under advisement with the Commission to determine whether some plan can be evolved which would achieve the end suggested above."

Carried Unanimously.

It was reported to Council that the snow which lay on Chaffey Avenue was ploughed to the side and into the ambulance driveway of the Kirkpatrick Rest Home. The feeling was expressed that care should be taken when clearing the roads of snow, that emergency driveways are not blocked. The Council directed that all such entrances and exits in the Municipality be given this treatment in the event that more snow ploughing becomes necessary.

(C) MUNICIPAL MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 2, 1960.

(1)

The Manager submitted Special Estimates of the Municipal Engineer in the total amount of \$7,360.00, recommending that they be approved.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Mather "That the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

(2) Easement over westerly five feet of Lot 19N½, Expt. Pl. 13189, S.D. 6, Blocks 1 and 2, D.L. 207.

The Manager reported that an easement is required from the owners of the above Lot 19N½, J. A. and H. A. Wilson, over the westerly five feet of it in order that a subdivision of this property can be finalized. He advised that the easement was for the purpose of providing one of the lots to be created by the subdivision with sewer service and that no consideration was payable by the Corporation. The Manager recommended that Council authorize the acquisition of this easement.

Moved by Councillor MacSorley, seconded by Councillor Brown "That the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

(3) Investments.

The Manager advised that the Treasurer had found it necessary to make the following transfer of investments:

1. Tax Sale Trust to Local Improvement Fund at market value - \$180,800.50	- \$185,000.00
2. Local Improvement Fund to Rotary Reserve at market value - \$180,887.45	- 185,000.00

The Manager recommended that the actions of the Treasurer in making these transfers be approved.

Moved by Councillor Brown, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

(4). Possible Replot of Portion of D.L. 4.

The Manager submitted a letter which he had received from the Municipal Planner pertaining to a subdivision situation existing in D.L. 4. In his letter, the Planner advised that the area in question is bounded generally by North Road, Cameron Street, Bell Avenue and Loughheed Highway - Government Street, and encompasses an area of approximately 80 acres in size. The Planning Director further advised that his Department has given consideration to the general land use pattern in this vicinity and it is felt that it should form part of the residential neighbourhood bounded by Loughheed Highway, North Road, Stoney Creek and Broadway. He added that an elementary school site would be required within the tract presently under consideration and that it was felt this site should be supplemented by an additional area to form a park-school site; which proposal has been approved in principle by both the School Board and the Parks Commission. The Planning Director further advised that in certain ways the subject area is right for development inasmuch as it offers a considerable acreage of good building land and is in close proximity to the Stoney Creek Trunk Sewer. He added that development has generally leap-frogged the area because of the haphazard subdivision tangle, lack of sewer service and the fact that owners of land on the

MUNICIPAL MANAGER'S REPORT NO.2, 1960 (continued)

(Item 4...re Possible Replot - D.L.4...continued)

Lougheed and North Road have probably been attracted more by the profit possibilities of using land for non-residential purposes. The Planning Director pointed out that the imposition on the Lougheed Highway, diagonally across the then semi-rural subdivision pattern - with no attempt to reconcile the pattern of land ownership to the new allowance - is the root of the present difficulty in the area in question. He reported that under these conditions an acceptable plan of subdivision cannot be expected to result from the co-ordination of individual subdivision attempts, and that therefore, if development is to proceed, the following three general alternatives are available:

- (a) the out-right acquisition of land by the Corporation and the re-subdivision of it - using National Housing Act assistance;
- (b) the replotting of the subject tract under Sections 830 and 863 of the Municipal Act, as was done in the Forest Glen District;
- (c) the acquisition and resubdivision by a private developer - as was done in Sullivan Heights to the North.

The Planning Director advised that over the past year, his Department has been working with a Mr. Kennedy in his endeavours to acquire the tract under consideration, with the result that a satisfactory lay-out has been devised for the area in question. He added that it was understood that 32 of the 38 owners involved have signed options to sell, and that of these six who have thus far not consented to grant options, three of them are located at the south-east corner of the tract and own properties which are felt to be essential in the provision of an entrance road from Government Street. The Planning Director pointed out that there is little motivation for the developer to acquire this property since no building lots would be created or made available by this proposed road link. The Planning Director added that the remaining parcels on which options have not been obtained are located so as to frustrate the accomplishment of the over-all plan; the reason for not granting options is not one of unwillingness to sell but rather - that the demanded prices are impossible to meet. The Planning Director advised that the request of Mr. Kennedy is that the Corporation consider the implementation of a replotting scheme so that the property owners who do not wish to sell can be offered alternate land (under his control) in such locations and in such shape that the residential subdivision may be proceeded with. The Director of Planning advised that in the opinion of his Department, the Corporation would be justified in this participation:

- (1) since development cannot proceed on most of the parcels by individual owners;
- (2) since this should offer the most economical opportunity to the Corporation to secure an acceptable development;
- (3) because of the vastly more simplified administration, design and negotiation problem presented under present circumstances as contrasted with an all out replotting;
- (4) because of the need to acquire the school-park site;
- (5) because of the better standard of services which would result from an over-all development by one developer as contrasted to the level of services resulting from a series of individual subdivisions.

The Municipal Manager advised that he had reviewed the above matter with the Municipal Planner together with the prospective developer and, as a result, felt there was no reason why the subdivision of this particular area should not be encouraged, and because of the complications mentioned by the Planning Director, the only practical way of achieving the desired results would seem to be Municipal participation in a replotting scheme in conjunction with the developer. The Manager recommended that the Council approve in principle the matter of the Municipality participating, in conjunction with the developer in a replotting scheme for the area bounded generally by North Road on the east, Cameron Street on the North; Bell Avenue on the west and Lougheed Highway- Government Street on the south.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Prittie: "That approval in principle be given the matter of the Municipality participating in the replot described above."

Carried Unanimously.

(5) Portion of Lot 1, Block 2 - D.L.175N½ of SW¼ of SW¼, Plan 9315.

The Manager reported that Mr. K. Papke has submitted an application to subdivide property described as Lot 2, Sketch 7800, D.L.175N½ of SW¼ of SW¼, Plan 3668, and that approval (in accordance with Planning Department Plan 110-59) has been given, subject to the owner acquiring a thirty foot strip of Corporation-owned property abutting the west side of his land. The Manager recommended that the Corporation list this 30 feet of property for sale at a price of Three Thousand dollars, subject to this strip being consolidated with the land abutting on the east.

Moved by Councillor MacSorley, seconded by Councillor Prittie "That the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

(MUNICIPAL MANAGER REPORT NO.2, 1960....continued)

(6). Re Investments.

The Municipal Manager reported that the Municipal Treasurer has made the following investments:

\$200,000.00 - C.N.R. - 5½% - 15 December 1964 @ \$97.95	-	\$195,900.00
	Accrued Interest	1024.66
Yield 5.97%		<u>\$196,924.66</u>

The Municipal Manager recommended that the actions of the Treasurer be confirmed.

Moved by Councillor Mather, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Prittie, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That the Committee now rise and report."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Brown, seconded by Councillor Mather "That the report of the Committee be now adopted."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Prittie, seconded by Councillor Brown "That the Council now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider "Burnaby Town Planning By-law 1948, Amendment By-law No.1,1960".

Carried Unanimously.

The Municipal Clerk advised that he had received letters from the following in connection with this By-law:

1. D. R. and L. Barlow, and I.L. and H. A. Mosure.
2. advising that they objected to the rezoning of Lots 1 and 2, Block 39, D.L.151/3, Plan 2884 from Residential Two Family to Residential Multiple Family Type 1 on the grounds that this particular corner - (Maywood Street and McKay Avenue) constitutes a traffic hazard due to the angled direction of the streets and because the area of the lots under application are too small to permit of an apartment development.
2. E.H. Jeeves advising that he supported the rezoning of his property at 5858 Olive Avenue for Light Industry.

A discussion then ensued as to the rezoning of the lots on the east side of Olive Avenue and, in particular, the three most southerly of these lots (6 to 8). The argument presented was that the lots which lie directly to the south of the three lots (5) remains Light Industrial and as this lot is flanked on the south by a lane, it therefore seemed more reasonable that the Light Industrial "line" should be relocated from its present position to this lane. The Planning Director agreed that this was the most logical line of demarcation but because there is a possibility this lot may be developed in conjunction with other property to the east, (since all parcels concerned are owned by the same Company) expansion of this industrial enterprise to Lot 5 might not be offensive if adequate development controls are exercised. He mentioned that a meeting had been arranged with officials of the Company in question to discuss the nature and extent of their future development plans and suggested that as this meeting was to be held this week (Wednesday), it might be advisable if Council left the By-law in abeyance until information is received concerning development plans of the Company in question.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Harper "That the Committee rise and report progress."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Mather "That "Burnaby Road Dedication By-law No.1,1960" be now reconsidered."

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Councillor Jamieson, seconded by Councillor Mather "That "Burnaby Road Dedication By-law No.1,1960" be now finally adopted and signed by the Reeve and Clerk, and that the Corporate Seal be affixed thereto."

Carried Unanimously.

The Municipal Clerk brought forward a report dated October 26th, 1959 of the Special Transportation Committee dealing with Transportation requirements for the Municipality

advising that it had been referred to the 1960 Council for further consideration.

Moved by Councillor Prittie, seconded by Councillor Jamieson "That this report be referred to the Public Utilities Committee for study."


Carried Unanimously.

The Reeve advised that the Province Reporter, Mr. J. H. Guilfoyle, was being transferred from his present position as a reporter for Burnaby, to the Head Office in Vancouver.

Moved by Councillor MacSorley, seconded by Councillor Brown "That a Vote of Thanks be extended to Mr. Guilfoyle for the competent manner in which he reported newsworthy matters emanating from the Municipality."

Carried Unanimously.

The meeting then adjourned.


REEVE


CLERK