	ITEM	10		<b>#####################################</b>
	MANAC	GER'S REPORT	NO.	82
		IL MEETING		
1.45	a - With the plant have		See Section 1.	it's the start of

10. Re: Comparison of Proposed Regional and Burnaby Noise Bylaws (Item 19, Report 73, November 15, 1971)

The Municipal Technical Sub-Committee was asked on November 15 to summarize in tabular or chart form the differences between the two draft bylaws.

The attached report is an interim one. It is the Committee's intention to enlarge on this report, if necessary, when the Committee submits its revised Bylaw draft about January 17, 1972.

**RECOMMENDATION:** 

THAT the report be received; and THAT a copy of this report be forwarded to the G.V.R.D. as well as to all those making submissions in connection with the Noise Bylaw.

25

SUEJECT	REGIONAL	BURNABY	COMMENTS	
Zoning	Quiet	Multiple Family Residential Districts, Public & Institutional Districts, Residential Districts	Either zoning could be used. of December 9, 1971, it was would be no conflict in rela	
	Activity	Industrial, Commercial, Agricultural, Comprehensive Development Districts	tion with the broader defini the Regional By-Law	
Day Time	7:00 a.m 10:00 p.m.	7:00 a.m 10:00 p.m.	Same	
Permitted Noise Lev	els in Quiet and Activity Zones			
<u>Quiet Zone</u> Continuous Noise	65 dbA day time 55 dbA night time	55 dbA day time 45 dbA night time	We consider the Regional By- zones. We are assessing the quiet areas and will be repo	
Non-continuous	No specification .	80 dbA day time 75 dbA night time	by-law presentation.	
Activity Zone				
Continucus Noise	70 dbA day time 65 dbA night time	65 dbA day time 55 dbA night time	It is our opinion that the d gional proposal are too high	
Non-continuous	80 dbA day time	80 dbA day time 75 dbA night time	essing the noise from specia continuous process industrie further when the by-law is p	
	In 10 years dbA ratings to decrease 10 dbA	In 5 years dbA ratings to decrease 5dbA in commercial and industrial districts		

Acres 6

in Adapt State

26

N

## ed. In our last report as indicated that there elating our categoriza-inition as proposed in By-Law too high in quiet the existing levels in our eporting at the time of e db ratings in the Re igh but we are still ass-cial operations namely ries. We will be reporting s presented. ITEM .10 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 82 COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 20/71

VEHICLE	REGIONAL	. BURNABY	COMMENTS
<u>Cver 6,000 lbs</u> .			
30 m.p.h. or less Over 30 m.p.h.	85 dbA 92 dbA	85 dbA 92 dbA	The noise levels for vehicles are the same. report of December 9, 1971, the difference i distance 15 feet versus 50 feet for Regional
Under 6,000 lbs. 30 m.p.h. or less Over 30 m.p.h.	80 dbA 85 dbA	80 dbA 85 dbA	This committee does not agree in the carryin in accordance with S.A.E. Standards as it is would be impossible to carry out except in a S.A.E. should, we feel, be confined to Provi stations.
Recreational vehicles	82 dbA	Must meet noise levels set for the district in which they are operated	Recreational vehicles are generally banned i Provincial licencing laws.
Non-licenced vehicles used in industry, agriculture, etc.	94 dba	Is covered under permit for construction or demolition or by levels set for particular district	
Power lawn mowers and power gardening tools	84 dbA (day time)	87 dda	
Pure Tones	Where there is audible pure tone in any quiet or activity zone, the permitted noise level shall be reduced by 5 dbA	Has no such requirement	We are considering the advisability of incor section into the by-law.
			ITEM

## PERMITTED NOISE LEVELS FROM VEHICLES

\*\*

27

ITEM 10 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 82 COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 20/71

e. However, in our e in measurement of wal was pointed out. ring out measurements is impractical and a few locations. evincial Inspection

in Burnaby through

orporating a pure tone