

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

Re: 1976 LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Following is a report from the Capital Improvement Committee regarding the 1976 Local Improvement Program.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the Committee's recommendations be adopted.

* * * * *

10 December 1975

File: I52-8

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

FROM: MUNICIPAL TREASURER

RE: 1976 LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

1. Results of Questionnaire

On 22 August 1975, Council directed that questionnaires be sent to owners affected by the proposed 1976 local improvement program. The questionnaires were to be sent to owners on streets on which it was possible to offer, in addition to pavement, a choice of curbs or curbwalks, curbs or curbs and separated sidewalks, or curbs and a sidewalk on one side of the street only. Owners on streets for which the works are governed by topography and safety factors would have no option and would not receive questionnaires.

Of the thirty-six streets included in the attached program, options were made available to owners on sixteen streets, one of which (Dundas) had several options. Attached is a table showing the response. The rates of response ranged from 42% to 88% - very high indeed.

It will be observed that except for Whitsell Avenue and Union Street, the owners clearly indicate that they object to local improvements at current costs. On eleven streets where curbwalks were offered as an alternative to curbs only, the indications are that 59% of the respondents favoured curbwalks, and on those streets where separate walks were offered as an

ITEM	9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	81
COUNCIL MEETING	Dec. 15/75

- 2 -

alternative, the indications are that only 33% were in favour of separate walks.

Generally, the response to the questionnaire was negative and appears to be related entirely to cost.

It will be the recommendation of this report that no further questionnaires of this nature go forward; that works be initiated on the joint recommendation of the Engineering and Planning Departments; and that if owners on a street petition against a work because they wish a work different from the one proposed, that in such instances Council accept a petition signed by a sufficient number of owners for the alternate work, provided that the alternate work meets with Engineering and Planning approval.

2. Frontage Tax Rules

Currently, with one exception mentioned later in this report, the cost of constructing local improvement street, lane and ornamental lighting works is allocated 50% to abutting owners and 50% to the Corporation. The rate per taxable front foot is determined by dividing the costs of all works of like description to be initiated at one time by the total of the taxable frontages of all such works and incorporating this rate in the Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law. This means that due to the maximum frontage rules (described in this report), on some streets the owners pay more than 50% of the cost of constructing those streets, and on other streets the owners pay less than 50%. This means also that if some of the initiatives fail, the proportions of cost sharing alter. The final program approved may show the owners paying more or less than 50% of the gross cost.

In 1958, at the onset of the local improvement program in Burnaby, Council was faced with two problems requiring resolution before programs could proceed. There were a number of large-size undeveloped properties in Burnaby, some of which were being held by veterans under V.L.A. regulations. To tax such properties on full frontages might have caused some of such owners to press for subdivision and sale of their properties. This was not considered to be in the public interest at that time. Also, there were a large number of streets on which the majority of lots flanked. Owners of these lots would not be interested in street improvements if they were faced with taxes on full frontage as well as on full flankage. As the local improvement method was the only instrument available at the time to finance the reconstruction and paving to interim standard of the street system of the community, some method had to be found to encourage the use of this instrument. Also, there was the fact that taxing two frontages of a corner property placed an onerous load of taxation on the owner of such a property, with the consequence that in cities where this system prevailed, corner lots tended to remain vacant.

As a consequence, Council adopted the following frontage rules as quoted from Section 4(1) of Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1975, By-law No. 6629:

"(a) Where the number of feet of a parcel of land which abuts on any of the said works is more than 66 feet, the taxable foot frontage shall be 66 feet.

(b) Notwithstanding anything in this by-law contained

(1) where a parcel of land is situated at the junction or intersection of streets and the work is provided on or along more than one side of the parcel, the taxable foot frontage shall be not more than 66 feet;

- 3 -

- (ii) where a parcel of land is situated at the junction or intersection of streets and the work is provided on or along a second side of the parcel, where a similar work is already provided on or along one side, the taxable foot frontage shall be not more than 66 feet less the taxable foot frontage already charged against the parcel for the similar work;
- (iii) where the front and rear boundaries of a parcel of land each abut on a highway, other than a lane, and the work is provided on or along both such boundaries, the taxable foot frontage shall be not more than 66 feet;
- (iv) where the frontage of a parcel of land abutting the works is less than five feet, the taxable frontage shall be established at five feet."

In order to give relief to corner lots it was necessary to set a maximum frontage rate. 66 feet was chosen because it represented two 33 foot lots, a commonly used residential site. This has had three disadvantages. It lessened the charge on choice residential properties of large size, and commercial and industrial properties. To some extent the smaller frontage tax was offset by the portion of the general mill rate required to pay the Corporation's share of the cost, which until recently was about 65%; the portion of the mill rate applicable bears more heavily on expensive homes, commercial and industrial properties, than it does on the average residence. As noted earlier in this report, it complicates the rate setting process. Finally, it makes inequitable the apportionment of costs between owners when subdivision occurs.

In explanation of this latter point - Section 424 of the Municipal Act requires that the frontage tax on a parcel must be divided between the newly created parcels proportionate to their frontages. For example, if a parcel with 500 feet of frontage is subdivided into ten parcels, the \$176.88 annual charge must be reapportioned \$17.68 to each newly created parcel, notwithstanding the fact that all other 50 foot parcels on the street are taxed \$134.00 per annum for the same works.

This situation has been drawn to the attention of the Department of Municipal Affairs on a number of occasions over the years. Finally, the Spring session of the Legislature repealed Section 415(3)(c), (d) and (e) of the Municipal Act, after which Sections (i), (ii) and (iii) of By-law No. 6629 cited above are patterned, and enacted a new Section 415(3)(c) as follows:

"the assessment of corner parcels of land, parcels of abnormal or irregular shape or situation, and rights-of-way of railways and utilities may be varied in the manner and to the extent provided in the by-law to the end that they may be dealt with in a fair and equitable manner as compared with other parcels."

Except for corner lots, the problems of 1958 with respect to local improvements are no longer with us. Subdivisions are occurring with regularity. Small parcels are being consolidated to create larger ones. All streets in Burnaby have been paved, either to finished interim or finished standards. By the enactment of Section 415(3)(c) we now have the means of giving relief to corner lots without giving unnecessary relief to parcels other than corner lots.

It is proposed that Section 4 of Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1975, By-law No. 6629, be repealed and the following be enacted in its place:

- "(i) where a parcel of land is situated at the junction or intersection of highways and the work or service is provided on or along more than one side of the parcel, the taxable foot-frontage shall be the actual foot-frontage of the shortest of the two frontages plus 25% of the actual frontage of the longer of the two frontages;
- (ii) where a parcel of land is situated at the junction or intersection of highways and the work is provided on or along the longer of the two frontages of the parcel, the taxable foot-frontage shall be the actual foot-frontage of the shortest of the two frontages;
- (iii) where a similar work or service payable by special charges has previously been provided on or along one side of a parcel, the taxable foot-frontage shall be 25% of the actual frontage of the longer of the two frontages;
- (iv) where the frontage of a parcel of land abutting the works is less than five feet, the taxable frontage shall be established at five feet."

In other words, all regularly shaped lots would be taxed on actual frontage, irregularly shaped lots taxed on the frontage determined by the Assessor pursuant to Section 415(5) of the Municipal Act, and corner lots on their shortest frontage for the first work to affect them and on 25% of the longest frontage on the second work to affect them.

3. Proposed 1976 Program

The program considered by Council on 22 August 1975 totalled \$2,221,775. \$1,093,000 in works were included in the questionnaire. \$919,000 in works were in disfavour. To bring the 1976 program up to the amount originally approved by Council, the Planning and Engineering Departments have added \$818,667 of further works, bringing the new total to \$2,121,442. The program is attached for consideration of Council.

It will be noted that there are eighteen sections of 4' separated sidewalks proposed for six streets in the program and that it is proposed that they be initiated separately from the initiatives for the paving and curb works. The consequence will be that some owners will favour sidewalks by themselves or paving by itself, or will favour both together or reject both, in which instances the Corporation should be prepared to construct the work or works on which insufficient or no petitions are received against proceeding with the work.

4. Frontage Taxes

Council's policy for the 1975 program was that the Corporation would bear approximately 50% of the gross cost of constructing 28 feet of paving plus curbing, or 28 feet of paving plus 5 foot curbswalks or 4 foot separated walks, together with the portions of the costs of constructing streets of widths greater than 28 feet which exceed that of the cost of constructing a 28 foot street.

It is recommended that this policy be applied to the 1976 program. After applying this policy, the cost of the 1976 program may be analysed as follows:

Corporation's 50% share	\$ 1,001,588.50
Corporation's assumption of costs of street widths greater than 28'	<u>118,265.00</u>
	1,119,853.50
Owners' share of the cost	<u>1,001,588.50</u>
	<u>\$ 2,121,442.00</u>

Construction costs per linear foot are estimated at:

	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
28' pavement and curbing both sides of a street	\$44.00	\$50.00
28' pavement and 5' curbwalks both sides of a street	50.00	56.00
28' pavement only	37.00	42.00
4' separated sidewalk	15.00	17.74

Frontage tax rates calculated @ 10 1/2% per annum annually for each of fifteen years would be:

28' pavement and curbing both sides of a street	2.19	2.26
28' pavement and 5' curbwalks both sides of a street	2.68	2.53
28' pavement only	1.36	1.90
4' separated walks	1.78	1.41

The differences between 1975 and 1976 rates may be accounted for:

In 1975 the rates were determined by dividing the taxable frontage into the owner's share of the cost. Particularly in the case of the 28' pavement only and the single 4' separated walk, the total taxable frontages in 1975 were small, with a large portion of the actual frontage being exempt because of the prevailing frontage tax rules. Consequently, the rate and charge per property had to be large to defray 50% of the construction cost of the works. And, of course, the construction costs for 1976 are estimated to increase.

The effect on property owners for 28' pavements and 5' curbwalks may be shown as follows:

<u>Lot size</u>	<u>1975 program Annual charge</u>	<u>1976 program Annual charge</u>
33'	\$ 88.44	\$ 83.49
50'	134.00	126.50
66'	176.88	166.98
75'	176.88	189.75
100'	176.88	253.00
200'	176.88	506.00
300'	176.88	759.00

The effect on corner lots will be:

(a) On a lot size 50' X 120' where the work proceeds on the short side in one year and on the other side in another year:

	<u>1975 method</u>	<u>1976 method</u>
Annual charge for first work	\$134.00	\$126.50
Annual charge for second work	<u>42.88</u>	<u>79.50</u>
Annual charge in year both take effect	<u>\$176.88</u>	<u>\$206.00</u>

ITEM	9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	81
COUNCIL MEETING	Dec. 15/75

- 6 -

- (b) On a lot size 50' X 120' where the work proceeds on the long side in one year and on the other side in another year:

	<u>1975 method</u>	<u>1976 method</u>
Annual charge for first work	\$176.88	\$126.50
Annual charge for second work	nil	<u>79.50</u>
Annual charge in year both take effect	<u>\$176.88</u>	<u>\$206.00</u>

- (c) Suppose the work was done on the short side in some previous year on this 50' X 120' lot, then the costs would be:

Annual charge per 1975 method for first work	\$134.00
Annual charge per 1976 method for second work	<u>79.50</u>
Annual charge in year both take effect	<u>\$213.50</u>

- (d) Suppose the work was done on the long side in some previous year on this 50' X 120' lot, then the costs would be:

Annual charge per 1975 method for first work	\$176.88
Annual charge per 1976 method for second work	<u>79.50</u>
Annual charge in year both take effect	<u>\$256.38</u>

The extra costs involved when some previous work is in place and a second work is constructed to be paid for by 1976 rates is something that is difficult to avoid and happens because of the advent of a completely new system of charging for the works.

5. Petitions

Your Committee considered the desirability or otherwise of accepting petitions for local improvement works.

A petition pursuant to Section 591 of the Municipal Act, to be valid must be signed by two-thirds of the parcels liable to be specially charged and the signatories must be the owners of parcels having a value of at least one-half of the total assessed value of all parcels affected by the works. The petition must bear a description of all of the parcels affected, contain a general description of the work, the annual charge per taxable front foot or proportion of the cost of the work which will be the owner's portion as established by by-law, and the number of years for which annual charges will be imposed.

This was not always the case. A formal petition is now a most time consuming and cumbersome method of undertaking local improvements. An interested citizen must approach the Engineering Department. The Engineering Department must provide all of the information necessary for the petition before the signatures may be obtained. They would come in in dribs and drabs and be most difficult to control and to fit into the tendering process. And, furthermore, few formal petitions are likely to proceed.

Under the initiative method, the same amount of information is necessary but requires a petition against the work of a majority of owners owning at least one-half of the property value to defeat it. This method has long been used by the Corporation because of its economy of motion. A large number of projects can be assembled and processed at one time, allowing for positive tendering of the works to take place.

However, there is a middle ground. Up until now, the Engineering Department has accepted requests from as few as one owner as an indication that a local improvement is wanted, and caused to be instituted initiative procedures.

- 7 -

It is recommended that, in future, petitions outlining the work that is desired, omitting reference to frontages and costs, be handed to interested parties. On receipt of a petition containing the signatures of owners of at least ten of the affected properties or owners of at least 51% of the affected properties (whichever is the lesser), a formal initiative notice would go forward in the year following, provided the petition is received by 30 June. Other than making sure that the signatories are indeed registered owners, it shouldn't be necessary to insist that all signatures of multiple ownership properties appear on the petition.

The balance of each year's program would be made up of works considered to be in the public interest, as recommended by the Engineering and Planning Departments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the above report on the results of the questionnaire be received; and
2. THAT the questionnaire be dropped from the local improvement process; and
3. THAT the proposed program of works, attached, be approved for initiation; and
4. THAT the system of frontage tax rules outlined on pages 4, 5 and 6 hereof be adopted; and
5. THAT the Corporation continue to bear approximately 50% of the gross cost of constructing sidewalks, curbing and pavement to widths of 28 feet plus that portion of the cost of constructing streets of widths greater than 28' attributable to the excess street widths; and
6. THAT future programs be comprised of works recommended by the Planning and Engineering Departments as being in the public interest plus works for which a petition signed by the owners of at least ten affected parcels or 51% of the number of parcels, whichever is the lesser, received by 30 June each year; and
7. THAT the 1977 program be submitted to Council by 1 September 1976; and
8. THAT Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1975, By-law No. 6629, be repealed and the following be enacted to indicate:
 - (i) where a parcel of land is situated at the junction or intersection of highways and the work or service is provided on or along more than one side of the parcel, the taxable foot-frontage shall be the actual foot-frontage of the shortest of the two frontages plus 25% of the actual frontage of the longer of the two frontages;
 - (ii) where a parcel of land is situated at the junction or intersection of highways and the work is provided on or along the longer of the two frontages of the parcel, the taxable foot-frontage shall be the actual foot-frontage of the shortest of the two frontages;
 - (iii) where a similar work or service payable by special charges has previously been provided on or along one side of a parcel, the taxable foot-frontage shall be 25% of the actual frontage of the longer of the two frontages;
 - (iv) where the frontage of a parcel of land abutting the works is less than five feet, the taxable frontage shall be established at five feet.";

ITEM	9.
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	81
COUNCIL MEETING	Dec. 15/75

and rates as follows:

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1) 28' pavement and curb one side: | |
| pavement side | \$ 1.90 |
| curb side | 2.26 |
| 2) 28' pavement and curbs both sides | 2.26 |
| 3) 28' pavement and curb one side and
5' curbside other side: | |
| curb side | 2.26 |
| 5' curbside side | 2.53 |
| 4) 28' pavement and 5' curbsides both sides | 2.53 |
| 5) 36' pavement and curbs both sides | 2.26 |
| 6) 36' pavement and 5' curbsides both sides | 2.53 |
| 7) 28' pavement, curb one side, 4.5'
abutting walk other side: | |
| curb side | 2.26 |
| 5' curbside side | 2.53 |
| 8) 36' pavement, curb one side,
5' curbside other side: | |
| curb side | 2.26 |
| 5' curbside side | 2.53 |
| 9) 46' pavement, 6' curbsides both sides: | |
| curb side | 2.26 |
| 6' curbside side | 2.53 |
| 10) 4' separated sidewalks | 1.41 |

and,

9. THAT, in the event owners petition against a work and indicate that the reason for the petition is because they want some other work, the petitioners be supplied with a petition drawn pursuant to Section 591 of the Municipal Act, conditional that the alternate work be approved by the Planning and Engineering Departments, and that on prompt receipt of a sufficient petition the works proceed.

Bart McCafferty
Bart McCafferty,
CHAIRMAN, C.I.P. COMMITTEE

representing: Municipal Manager
Municipal Treasurer
Municipal Engineer
Parks & Recreation Administrator
Director of Planning

BM:gw
Attach.

cc. C.I.P. Committee

District of Burnaby

Original 1976 Program Approved by Council for Questionnaire Proceedings

	<u>Street</u>	<u>Pavement Width</u>	<u>Primary Initiation</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	<u>Variations to be Offered in the Questionnaire</u>
1.	Dent - Kitchener to Graveley	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 32,500	Curbwalks B/S
2.	Whitsell - William to Graveley	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 64,000	Curbwalks B/S
3.	Rosser - William to Graveley	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 64,000	Curbwalks B/S
4.	Kitchener - Madison to Willingdon	28'	Curbs B/S and Curbwalk N/Side only from Lane E. Madison to Willingdon	\$ 65,500	None
5.	Grant - Madison to Carleton	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 44,000	Curbwalks B/S
6.	Charles - Madison to Carleton	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 32,500	Curbwalks B/S
7.	Linwood - Boundary to Smith	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 42,500	Curbwalks B/S
8.	Halley - Moscrop to Spruce	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 67,500	Curbwalks B/S
9.	Darwin - Moscrop to Pine	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 52,500	Curbwalks B/S
10.	Pine - Darwin to Huxley	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 15,000	Curbwalks B/S
11.	Barker - Moscrop to Spruce	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 67,500	Curbwalks B/S
12.	Spruce - Halley to Huxley	28'	Curbs N/S and Curbwalk S/S	\$ 37,100	None
13.	Spruce - McDonald to Carleton	28'	Curbs N/S and Curbwalk S/S	\$ 33,920	None
14.	Spruce - Halley to Carleton	28'	Curbs N/S and Abutting Walk S/S	\$ 90,100	None

134

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75
ITEM 27
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 53
COUNCIL MEETING Aug. 18/75

District of Burnaby

Original 1976 Program Approved by Council for Questionnaire Proceedings (cont'd)

	<u>Street</u>	<u>Pavement Width</u>	<u>Primary Initiation</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	<u>Variations to be Offered in the Questionnaire</u>
15.	Fir - Huxley to Darwin	28'	Curbwalks B/S	\$ 15,000	None
16.	Fir - Halley to Carleton	28'	Curbwalks B/S	\$ 32,500	None
17.	Forest - Smith to McDonald	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 85,000	Curbwalks B/S
	Spruce - Royal Oak to Canada Way	28'	Curbwalks B/S	\$140,000	None
19.	Atlee - Spruce to Monarch	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 55,000	Curbwalks B/S
20.	William - Carleton to Madison	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 37,500	4' Separate walk S/Side only
21.	Kitchener - Carleton to Madison	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 3,750	No variations
22.	Madison - Albert to Cambridge	28'	Curbs B/S and 4' Separate Walks B/S Dundas to Pandora B/S Pandora to Albert	\$101,100	None
23.	Pandora - Boundary to Willingdon	28'	Curbs B/S	\$240,000	4' Separate Walks S/S Carleton to Willingdon N/S Madison E. 132' N/S Gilmore to Carleton
24.	Union - Boundary to Gilmore	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 82,500	4' Separate Walks S/S Boundary to Esmond S/S Ingleton to Gilmore
25.	Wakefield - Smith W. to cul-de-sac	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 30,000	No variations

ITEM 9
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
 COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75
 ITEM 27
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 53
 COUNCIL MEETING Aug. 18/75

District of Burnaby

Original 1976 Program Approved by Council for Questionnaire Proceedings (cont'd)

<u>Street</u>	<u>Pavement Width</u>	<u>Primary Initiation</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	<u>Variations to be Offered in the Questionnaire</u>
26. Carleton - Albert to Triumph	28'	Curbs B/S and 4' separate walks W/S Pandora to Triumph E/S Pandora to Albert	\$ 42,235	None
27. Carleton - Dundas to McGill	28'	Curbs B/S and 4' separate walks W/S Dundas to Oxford W/S Oxford to Lane N. W/S Eton to Lane S. Eton W/S McGill to Lane S. McGill E/S McGill to Eton	\$ 84,470	None
28. Dundas - Carleton to Willingdon	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 98,500	4' Separate Walks S/S Madison to Rosser B/S Rosser to Willingdon <u>or</u> For S/S Madison to Willingdon offer alternative of curbswalk
29. Sutcliff - Duthie E. to cul-de-sac	28'	Curbs B/S	\$ 32,500	No variations
30. Dundas - Gilmore to Carleton	28'	Curbs N/S	\$ 31,250	No variations
31. Carleton - Triumph to Dundas	28'	Curbs E/S	\$ 16,250	No variations
32. Graveley - Willingdon to Carleton	36'	Curbs B/S and 4' separate walks N/S	\$137,900	None
33. Laurel - Boundary to Smith	36'	Curbswalks B/S	\$ 57,800	None

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

ITEM 27
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 53
COUNCIL MEETING Aug. 18/75

District of Burnaby

Original 1976 Program Approved by Council for Questionnaire Proceedings (cont'd)

<u>Street</u>	<u>Pavement Width</u>	<u>Primary Initiation</u>	<u>Cost Estimate</u>	<u>Variations to be Offered in the Questionnaire</u>
Madison - Hastings to Albert	46'	Curbs E/S with 5½' abutting walks B/S	\$ 23,500	None
Brantford - Imperial to Strawson	28'	Curbs B/S	\$170,000	Curbwalks B/S
Huxley - Moscrop to Spruce	36'	Curbwalks W/S curbs E/S	\$ 86,400	None
TOTAL			\$ 2,221,775	

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

ITEM 27
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 53
COUNCIL MEETING Aug. 18/75

This street was added to the 1976 program at direction of Council on 12 May, 1975, and because of recent petitions to Council may not require a questionnaire.

District of Burnaby

1976 L. I. P. QUESTIONNAIRE

PROJECT	PROJECT #	# OF NOTICES SENT	NOTICES RETURNED		FOR L.I.P.		AGAINST L.I.P.		FOR C/W		AGAINST C/W		# OF OPTIONS	FOR SEPARATE WALK		AGAINST SEPARATE WALK		REMARKS		REMARKS	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	COST OBJ.	28' WIDTH OBJECTION		
Dent Avenue	10001	24	13	75	5	27	13	73	4	30	1	20						0	1		
Whitsell Avenue	10002	44	30	68	19	60	12	40	13	72	5	28						0	3		
Rosser Avenue	10003	38	24	63	9	37	15	63	5	55	4	45						2	0		
Grant Street	10005	33	22	65	7	31	15	69	5	71	1	29						2	0		
Charles Street	10006	21	16	76	4	25	12	75	1	25	2	75						0	0		
Linwood Street	10007	31	22	71	9	40	13	60	2	22	7	78						1	0		
Halley Avenue	10008	34	23	67	8	34	15	64	3	37	5	63						4	0		
Darwin Avenue	10009	29	23	79	7	30	16	70	4	57	3	43						2	0		
Pine Street	10010	8	4	50	1	25	3	75	0	0	1	100						1	0		
Barker Avenue	10011	35	25	71	9	36	16	64	6	66	3	34						3	2		
Forest Street	10017	59	52	88	18	29	34	71	11	61	7	39						3	0		
Atlee Avenue	10019	31	13	42	5	26	8	74	4	80	1	20	SENT	RECEIVED				1	0		
William Street	10020	22	14	63	4	35	10	65	--	--	--	--	10	7	1	14	6	86	1	0	
Pandora Street	10023	164	89	54	26	29	63	71	--	--	--	--	53	26	12	42	16	58	7	1	
Union Street	10024	88	39	44	21	53	18	57	--	--	--	--	33	17	5	29	12	71	0	1	
Dundas	10023	94	40	42	14	35	26	65	0	0	2	100	12	2	0	2	100	0	1		
Dundas	10028	94	40	42	14	35	26	65	1	9	10	91	30	13	0	0	10	100			} 2 options

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

Percent of those returned.

21 October 1975

District of Burnaby

1976 LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

REVISED BILLS

28 FOOT PAVEMENT CURB ONE SIDE

<u>Project</u>	<u>Limits</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Approx. Length</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Dundas	Gilmore - Carleton	Curb N/S	590'	\$27,140.
Carleton	Triumph - Dundas	Curb E/S	270'	12,420.

28 FOOT PAVEMENT CURBS BOTH SIDES

Madison	Albert - Cambridge		1590'	79,500.
Carleton	Albert - Triumph		600'	30,000.
Kitchener	Carleton - Madison		720'	36,000.
Wakefield	Smith West to Cul-de-sac		610'	30,500.
Union	Boundary - Gilmore		2130'	106,500.
Sutcliff	Duthie East to Cul-de-sac		650'	32,500.
Maitland	Nelson - Sussex		800'	40,000.
Burns	Griffiths - Sperling		810'	40,500.
Mary	Vista - Elwell		800'	40,000.
Gilpin Court	Gilpin South to Cul-de-sac		280'	14,000.
Irmin	Boundary - Joffre		570'	28,500.
Carleton	Dundas - McGill		1250'	62,500.

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

District of Burnaby

28 FOOT PAVEMENT CURB ONE SIDE AND 5 FOOT CURBWALK OTHER SIDE

<u>Project</u>	<u>Limits</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Approx. Length</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Kitchener	Madison - Willingdon	Curbs both sides and curbwalk N/S only lane E. of Madison to Willingdon	1260'	\$66,780.
Spruce	Halley - Huxley	Curb N/S, Curbwalk S/S	590'	31,270.
Spruce	McDonald - Carleton	Curb N/S, Curbwalk S/S	590'	31,270.

28 FOOT PAVEMENT, 5 FOOT CURBWALKS BOTH SIDES

Whitsell	William - Graveley		1260'	70,560.
Fir	Huxley - Darwin		260'	14,560.
Fir	Halley - Carleton		600'	33,600.
Spruce	Royal Oak - Canada Way		2700'	151,200.
Venables	Madison - Willingdon		1250'	70,000.
Brantford	Imperial - Strawson		3400'	190,400.
7th Street	Graham - 16th Avenue		240'	13,440.
Pandora	Holdom - Fell		1260'	70,560.
Beta	Westlawn to Lane South Northlawn		730'	40,880.

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

District of Burnaby

36 FOOT PAVEMENT CURBS BOTH SIDES

<u>Project</u>	<u>Limits</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Approx. Length</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Mary	Edmonds - Vista		230'	\$14,030.
McKay	Imperial - Maywood		575'	35,075.
Gilmore	Oxford - Edinburgh		1910'	116,510.
Ellesmere	Hastings - Capitol		500'	30,500.
Graveley	Willingdon - Carleton		2210'	134,810.

36 FOOT PAVEMENT, 5 FOOT CURB WALKS BOTH SIDES

McGill	Boundary - Esmond		500'	34,000.
Laurel	Boundary - Smith		840'	57,120.

28 FOOT PAVEMENT, CURB ONE SIDE, 4.5 ABUTTING WALK OTHER SIDE

Spruce	Halley - Barker	Curb north side, 4.5 foot abutting walk south side	260'	13,260.
--------	-----------------	---	------	---------

36 FOOT PAVEMENT, CURB ONE SIDE, 5 FOOT CURB WALK OTHER SIDE

Huxley	Moscrop - Spruce		1280'	81,920.
--------	------------------	--	-------	---------

46 FOOT PAVEMENT, CURBS BOTH SIDES, 5.5 FOOT ABUTTING WALKS BOTH SIDES

Madison	Hastings - Albert		250'	21,500.
McPherson	North P/L Lot "J", Block 27, D.L. 97, to the southerly Beresford Street		820'	70,250.

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

District of Burnaby

4 FOOT SEPARATED SIDEWALKS

<u>Project</u>	<u>Limits</u>	<u>Work</u>	<u>Approx. Length</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Graveley	Willingdon - Carleton	Walk North Side Only	1940'	\$35,895.
Mary	Vista - Elwell	Walks Both Sides	1340'	23,262.
Mary	South P/L Lot C - Vista	Walk West Side Only	115'	1,997.
Madison	Dundas - Pandora	Walk East Side Only	540'	9,115.
Madison	Pandora - Albert	Walks Both Sides	540'	9,115.
Carleton	Pandora - Triumph	Walk West Side Only	270'	5,247.
Carleton	Pandora - Albert	Walk East Side Only	270'	5,247.
Gilmore	Oxford - Lane North Oxford	Walk East Side Only	150'	2,445.
Gilmore	Lane North Cambridge - Eton	Walk East Side Only	150'	2,445.
Gilmore	Lane North Eton - Yale	Walk East Side Only	690'	11,245.
Gilmore	Oxford Lane North Cambridge	Walk West Side Only	410'	6,682.
Gilmore	Eton Lane North Eton	Walk West Side Only	140'	2,281.
Gilmore	Trinity - Yale	Walk West Side Only	270'	4,400.
McKay	Imperial - Maywood	Walk East Side Only	550'	9,856.
Carleton	Dundas - Lane North of Oxford	Walk West Side Only	410'	7,968.
Carleton	Eton - Lane South Eton	Walk West Side Only	150'	2,915.
Carleton	McGill - Lane South McGill	Walk West Side Only	140'	2,720.
Carleton	McGill - Eton	Walk East Side Only	260'	5,052.
			PROGRAM TOTAL	\$2,121,442.

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

ITEM	9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	81
COUNCIL MEETING	Dec. 15/75

Re: ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE 1976 STREET LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Following is a report from the Municipal Engineer on proposals for the design of certain streets that are included in the 1976 Street Local Improvement Program.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the Corporation enter into an Engineering Agreement with McElhanney Surveying & Engineering Ltd. for the design of various additional projects in the 1976 L.I.P. Street Program as outlined in the Engineer's letters dated November 13 and 21, 1975, with the understanding that the fee for these services are to be in accordance with Section IV, Scale 1 (payroll cost plus 125%), of the "Outline of Services and Scale of Minimum Fees to be Charged for General Engineering Projects" published by the Association of Professional Engineers of B.C. dated September 5, 1975 to an upset of \$10,650 plus disbursements.

* * * * *

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

3 DECEMBER, 1975

FROM: MUNICIPAL ENGINEER

RE: ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR 1976 STREET LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Subsequent to the C.I.P. Committee's finalization of the 1976 L.I.P. for streets, it was found that a number of the projects have not been designed because they were late additions to the program.

I have, therefore, by way of my letters and terms of reference dated November 13 & 21, 1975 (see attachments "A" and "B") invited proposals from four reputable consulting firms.

All of the consultants contacted have submitted proposals based on the Corporation's terms of reference and standards. Therefore, on the basis that each consultant has proposed to complete the work in accordance with our standards and deadline the one remaining aspect of comparison is the cost of the work to the Corporation. In this respect the firm of McElhanney Surveying & Engineering Ltd. has proposed to complete the requisite work for a fee of \$10,650. exclusive of disbursements. This is approximately 2% of the estimated cost of the listed projects. By comparison the other three firms have proposed the following fees:

Web Engineering Ltd.	\$ 11,950.
Vector Engineering Services Ltd.	\$ 17,950.
Hunter, Laird Engineering Ltd.	\$ 21,500.

Each of these proposed fees also excludes disbursements.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Corporation enter into an Engineering Agreement for the design of various additional projects for the 1976 L.I.P. program as outlined in the Engineer's letters dated November 13 & 21, 1975 with McElhanney Surveying & Engineering Ltd. The fee for these services are to be in accordance with Section IV, Scale 1 (payroll cost plus 125%), of the "Outline of Services and Scale of Minimum Fees to be Charged for General Engineering Projects" published by the Association of Professional Engineers of B.C. dated September 5, 1975 to an upset of \$10,650. plus disbursements.

mw
MNW:wjh
Atch.

E.E. Olson
MUNICIPAL ENGINEER

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

ATTACHMENT "A"

The Office of the Engineer

13 November, 1975

McElhamney Surveying & Engineering Ltd.
7832 - 120th Street
Surrey, B.C.

Dear Sirs:

Re: Engineering Services for 1976 Street
Local Improvement Program

Our original 1976 Street Local Improvement Program has been reduced by reason of property owners defeating certain projects. In order to maintain a reasonable sized program we are proposing to add the streets shown on the attached list.

We invite you to submit proposals for your engineering services for field survey, drafting, design and quantity take-off for the projects listed.


The work shall be performed in accordance with our current standards and as detailed on the attached specification sheets.

The deadline for completion of these designs shall be February 29, 1976. We anticipate that consultants for this work will be appointed by the end of November.

Please submit your proposals by not later than November 26, 1975.

Yours truly,

E. E. Olson, P. Eng.
MUNICIPAL ENGINEER



by: V. N. Wiebe, P. Eng.
DESIGN ENGINEER

VNW:wjh

Atch.
cc: () Design Engineer

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

ADDITIONS TO 1976 STREET L.I.P.

* Brantford	Oakland to Strawson	28 feet	Curbwalks B/S.
** Spruce	Halley to Barker	28 feet	Curbs N/S. 4½' abutting walks S/S.
7th Street	Graham to 16th Street	28 feet	Curbwalks B/S.
Pandora	Holdom to Fell	28 feet	Curbwalks B/S.
Maitland	Nelson to Sussex	28 feet	Curbs B/S.
McGill	Boundary to Esmond	36 feet	Curbwalks B/S.
Gilmore	Oxford to Edinburgh	36 feet	Curbs B/S. 4' separated walk on E/S between Oxford and Lane N. Oxford. Lane N. Cambridge and Eton, and Lane N. Eton and Yale. 4' separated walk on W/S between Oxford and Lane N. Cambridge, Eton and Lane N. Eton and Trinity and Yale.
Ellesmere Ave.	Hastings to Capitol Drive	36 feet	Curbs B/S.
Beta	Westlawn to Lane S. of Northlawn	28 feet	Curbwalks B/S.
Venables	Madison to Willingdon	28 feet	Curbwalks B/S.
Gilpin Court	Gilpin St. to deadend south	28 feet	Curbs B/S.

* This section added to Design No. 730050 - 8.

** This section added to Design No. 730049 - 9.

ITEM 9
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 81
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 15/75

ATTACHMENT "B"

The Office of the Engineer

21 November, 1975

McElhanney Surveying & Engineering Ltd.
7832 - 120th Street
Surrey, B.C.

Dear Sirs:

Re: Engineering Services for 1976
Street Local Improvement Program

Further to my letter of November 13, 1975 please be advised that two (2) projects, as listed below, have been added to the program.

1. Burns - Griffiths to Sparling - 28 feet - Curbs B/S.
2. McPherson - R.P.L. Lot "J", Blk. 27, D.L. 97 to - 46 feet - Curbs & 5 1/2 ft. abutting walks southerly portion of Baresford St. B/S.

Please include these two projects in your proposal. Because of the last minute notification regarding these additions I have extended the deadline to December 1, 1975.

Yours truly,
E. E. Olson, P. Eng.
MUNICIPAL ENGINEER


by: V. N. Wiebe, P. Eng.
DESIGN ENGINEER

VNW:wlh
cc: () Design Engineer