

13 Re: Sanitary Sewer Connection  
3149 Bainbridge Avenue  
(C.B. & O.T. Gingrich)

Appearing on the Agenda for the August 30, 1971 Council Meeting is a letter dated August 19, 1971, from Mr. & Mrs. Gingrich regarding their sanitary sewer connection and asking for a refund.

The Engineer has reviewed the matter, and we would like to deal first with the matter of why an R.C.M.P. officer arrived at the property with the summons for failure to connect to the sanitary sewer. The chronology of events is as follows. In accordance with direction of the Municipal Council, a letter was sent to the owner September 16, 1970, advising that sanitary sewer service was available to the property, and connection thereto was required in accordance with By-law 4247. After failure to comply with this notice, a registered letter was sent to the owner on November 12, 1970, advising that in accordance with By-law 4247 the property must be connected to sewer within 60 days of the date of the letter. Municipal Council, on February 1, 1971, reviewed a list of property owners who had failed to comply with notices and directed that summonses be issued to property owners who had failed to comply and had not supplied acceptable reasons therefor, and accordingly the R.C.M.P. delivered the summons to the property owner in May, 1971.

Dealing with the matter of the cost of \$650.00 to connect to the sewer, the Engineer advises that sanitary sewer was initially made available to this property from the rear (Hillview) in 1968 and when a new sanitary sewer was constructed on Bainbridge, as a result of subdivision in November, 1970, it opened up the possibility for the owner to obtain a second connection to Bainbridge, and as provided for in By-law 4247 the owner was charged the cost of the connection which was estimated at \$650.00. The first connection was installed free of charge in accordance with our policy. Second connections are installed at the cost and at the request of the owner based on the Engineering Department estimate of the cost of construction, and in this case the cost was more than average as the main line was in the 12 to 14 foot depth range on the far side (east) of Bainbridge and required the construction of a riser at the main and continued across the street at a depth of approximately 7 feet. It should be pointed out that should the sanitary sewer construction not have proceeded on Bainbridge in November 1970, as a result of subdivision, the property owner would have had no alternative but to run his connection from his house to the connection installed in 1968 at the Hillview side of his property to meet the requirements of the Pollution Committee and By-law 4247.

Dealing with the statement in the first paragraph that a Mr. Laughlin inquired at the Municipal Hall in approximately 1966 regarding the location of sanitary sewer, and was informed that both sanitary and storm sewer would be laid on Bainbridge Avenue; we would advise that we are quite sure that no one in the Engineering Department could have made such a commitment at that time, as it was not until 1968 that sanitary sewers were constructed on Hillview, which provided the initial service to this property, and there was no intention of constructing sanitary sewers on Bainbridge and no design or layout made for the area until the subdivision occurred on the east side of Bainbridge in 1970.

continued . . . .

13 Re: Sanitary Sewer Connection  
3149 Bainbridge Avenue  
(C.B. & O.T. Gingrich)

Dealing with the matter of a choice of installing the second connection, Mr. Gingrich basically answers his own question by stating in his third last paragraph that it would have cost him approximately \$2,000.00 to run the longer distance to the westerly limit of his property and overcome obstacles in the back yard, whereas by spending the \$650.00 for the extra second connection to Bainbridge Avenue, he was able to connect thereto at a cost of "less than \$300.00". The estimates he provides have not been verified by the Engineer.

In summary, the owner had two alternatives open for his connection: (1) Spend \$2,000.00 connecting to a "free connection" put in when no plans were available for an alternative route or (2) Spend \$650.00 for a connection to the property line plus \$300.00 approximately for connecting to the connection for a total of \$950.00. All cases of this type have been treated in the same fashion.

In the second last paragraph, it is stated that the driveway was damaged during construction and not repaired. An investigation on August 26 shows that the driveway was apparently damaged during storm sewer construction on the west side of Bainbridge Avenue and has not properly been repaired. We are taking immediate action to have this paved driveway repaired.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT no refund be made to Mr. & Mrs. Gingrich in accordance with our present policy; and  
THAT Mr. & Mrs. Gingrich be advised of the reasoning behind this recommendation and that their driveway will be repaired.