## THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

February 28, 1964.

HIS WORSHIP THE REEVE AND MEMDERS OF THE COUNCIL.

Gentlemen:

ł

ţ

## REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Your Committee met on Monday, February 24th, 1964 and would recommend as follows:

## (1) Local Improvement Ornamental Street Lighting Programme

This Programme includes five areas in different parts of the Municipality where ornamental street lighting was initiated under provisions of the Local (mprovement divisions of the Municipal Act and the Certificate of Sufficiency presented indicated that four out of the five areas registered insufficient objection (3 by owners signature and assessment and 1 by assessment only) to the installation of ornamental street lighting as proposed. No petition was received from one area.

Certain objections arose from the residents of the Government Park area included in the Willows area which was one of the districts where an insufficient petition was presented and the Government Park residents argued that their segment of the Willows area should be separated since the physical conditions within the area were different. The residents suggested that the density of lighting was the real objection and asked that the Council consider a lesser density than that proposed by the Local improvement Programme.

A petition was also received from the Deer Lake Place requesting that the ornamental standards be installed on alternate sides of the street rather than one side.

In view of these representations, the Council referred the entire proposed programme to the Policy Committee. Your Committee has considered the various matters raised by the residents and is of the opinion that the suggestion of the people in the Government Park area that the lighting density should be lessened is one which strikes at the policy aspect of ornamental lighting rather severely. A standard has been set through the installation of other ornamental street lighting systems whereby the lighting standards are set at a distance of 120 feet apart and this in effect has become a component of the Council's policy in regard to these lighting programmes. The suggested lessening of density by spreading the standards to a greater separation means, in effect, that the existing 120 foot standard becomes ineffective in that future areas could conceivably ask that special treatment in this respect be also afforded their areas.

The residents of the Government Park area have mentioned the multiplicity of poles and wires already existing in their area and have suggested that this is another reason for lessening density. In considering this aspect, your Committee would submit that the B. C. Hydro and Power Authority do not favour the removal of poles to rear property lines through the medium of aerial easements because of maintenance difficulties to the constructed pole lines. This can cause a nuisance to residents who have landscaped rear yards and experience has shown that serious difficulties occur in this respect. Another feature of the project in this area is found in the fact that there are several residents of Colleen Street who would be affected and who have not expressed opposition to the lighting programme.

With respect to the suggested installation of standards on alternate sides of the street, your Committee would submit that such installation would result in considerably more cost in that the lead wires to the standards would, of necessity, have to be installed on both sides of the street. There are instances also where it is definitely advantageous to instal the standards on one side only. One example can be found where there is a sharp cross fall in the terrain and in such areas the installation of lights on the side of the street adjacent the lower elevation is more acceptable than an installation on the side adjacent higher elevation. The former creates less light reflection directly into the dwellings on the lower side of the street.

Your Committee would recommend that the current Local Improvement projects be proceeded with with the understanding that consideration be given to the location of poles within the Government Park area on that side of the street where poles presently do not exist.

## (2) <u>3800 and 3900 Blocks East Hastings Street</u>

Your Committee has considered again the general question of acquiring properties in the 3800 and 3900 Dlocks East Hastings Street for the widening of the highway. A question has arisen as to the plans of the Corporation with respect to the remaining lands not required for the 20-foot widening strip. In order to crystalize the future actions of the Council in this respect, it is necessary that the Council formally define the purposes for which this land would be utilized by the Municipality.

Your Committee would therefore recommend that this Corporation proceed with the acquisition of properties in the 3800 and 3900 Blocks East Hastings Street for road widening, and redevelopment purposes pursuant to Section 465 of the Municipal Act.

JHS:mw