

Re: 1975 Local Improvement Street Program

Following is a report from the Municipal Treasurer regarding the 1975 Local Improvement Street Program.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the Municipal Treasurer's recommendations be adopted.

* * * * *

22 January 1975

File: I52-2

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER
FROM: MUNICIPAL TREASURER
RE: 1975 LOCAL IMPROVEMENT STREET PROGRAM

In adopting the 1974 local improvement program on 4 March 1974, Council directed:

- (1) That the front foot rates currently in effect for local improvement projects not be applied to the 1975 and 1976 local improvement programs, and that a review be made at the appropriate time to reflect more closely the increase in the cost of constructing such projects.
- (2) The Manager was instructed to submit a report indicating all the ramifications of actual construction costs for local improvement projects being more closely related to the front foot rates that are set for local improvement works than at present, and include in his considerations such things as the costs of sidewalk crossings and the costs the Municipality must absorb as a result of the policy respecting charges against properties having a frontage in excess of 66 feet.

The rates applicable to the 1974 program were compiled as follows:

Owners' share

1. The costs of Portland cement concrete curbs, sidewalks or curbwalks plus not more than 14 feet of asphaltic paving at fixed rates per front foot, offset by local improvement rates which were currently in effect. No property was taxed on a frontage greater than 66 feet, and allowances in frontage were made for similar works constructed along a second boundary of a property when local improvement rates for this earlier work were currently in effect.

- 2 -

2. A charge separate and apart from the frontage tax was applied to properties requiring a vehicle crossing of curbing or curbswalks.

General mill rate share

1. Storm drainage facilities, retaining walls, the relocation of fire hydrants and power and telephone poles.
2. Costs of extending driveways and sidewalks on abutting properties to connect with public curb or curbswalk.
3. Costs of street widths greater than 28 feet.
4. Costs involved in street intersections.
5. Costs in excess of the fixed rates chargeable to owners.
6. Costs on frontages in excess of 66 feet.
7. Costs for frontage exempted because of allowances for works already being charged to a second boundary of a property.
8. The differences in frontage rates for allowances being made for previous works already being taxed.

Rationale for the Corporation accepting these items of cost has been:

1. Storm drainage facilities.

Originally, any storm drainage necessary to a street improvement project formed part of the local improvement although no portion of the cost was passed along to abutting owners. Not every project requires a storm drain. When they are necessary, their principal use is to drain roads. Nevertheless, the house drains of every abutting property are connected to them. Storm drains generally form a grid and drain areas larger than the street on which they are built. They benefit abutting properties but not all affected properties are subject to local improvement levies since some work of this nature has been necessary at the general expense of the Municipality. Therefore, rather than charge some properties for storm drainage and free others from this cost, Council determined that no one would pay special charges for storm drainage. Latterly, it has become possible to finance these works by means other than local improvement.

1.(a) Retaining walls.

In the past, it has not been possible to provide prospective home builders with design street levels and for a time the Municipality did not insist that finished roads be constructed by developers to ultimate widths. This lack of direction has made necessary extensive construction of retaining walls on some streets as part of a local improvement project. As all abutting owners, no matter where located in the Municipality, pay the same rate per front foot for works of the same description installed in the same year, it seemed unfair to apportion to all streets in one program the cost of constructing retaining walls on a minority of streets.

1.(b) Relocation of fire hydrants and power and telephone poles.

If pole lines and water lines are properly located in road allowances it should seldom be necessary to move fire hydrants or power and telephone poles. However, there are streets on which relocation work is necessary. Therefore, it seemed unfair to charge all abutting owners in all local improvement programs of the same class for this special work on a minority of streets.

2. Costs of extending driveways and sidewalks on abutting properties to connect with public curb or curbside.

For a number of years considerable friction had been generated when property owners found it necessary to connect driveways or sidewalks with the local improvement works, particularly when there was a difference in elevation between the local improvement works and the private properties. Latterly this cause for friction has been removed because the works undertaken during the past several years have included, as part of the contract, the cost of the asphalt and concrete work between lot lines and the street works. If the owner had a driveway, he was required to pay a separate charge for the crossing. The cost of the balance of the work has been borne by the Corporation.

3. Costs of street widths in excess of 28 feet.

Some years ago, a 28 foot street was selected by Council as the standard of width in residential neighbourhoods.

28 foot streets mostly are of benefit to abutting owners only. Streets of widths in excess of 28 feet generally benefit all or a part of the community at large as well as abutting owners. On some streets, because of wider road widths, owners must put up with the inconvenience of noise and traffic. As a consequence, Council determined that the costs of constructing a 28 foot street would be charged to all abutting owners, and that the difference in cost of constructing a wider road and a 28 foot road would be passed on to the community at large.

Commerce and industry receive some special benefit from wider road widths. A special rate can be established for works on such streets but the rate must apply to all properties, not just those used commercially or industrially. In Burnaby, residentially, commercially and/or industrially used properties are often in close mix. Rather than charge residential properties at commercial/industrial rates, Council has applied a common rate to all classes of property.

4. Costs involved in street intersections.

At one time, it was a requirement of the Municipal Act that the Municipality absorb the cost of works at street intersections. With the enactment of Section 594 in 1968, this no longer is necessary. Presumably in previous years it was considered that as works at street intersections abut none of the affected properties, none of them should bear any part of the cost of work at these locations. Of course, a road, watermain, or whatever, has no value at all if it is not connected to the rest of the system. Nevertheless, this is as good a measure as any to apportion costs between a municipality and affected owners. The calculated cost at street intersections of paving and curbing or paving and curbsides is 10% and sidewalks by themselves 5%.

5. Costs in excess of fixed rates chargeable to owners.

Pursuant to Section 594 of the Municipal Act, Council must establish rates per taxable front foot chargeable to abutting owners or, conversely, establish a proportion of the cost of each class of works that will be chargeable to owners. The difference between the rates established and the actual cost must be borne by the general mill rate.

Long before Section 594 was enacted, by judicious interpretation of the several sections of the Municipal Act, Council employed fixed rates for each class of street works and maintained them at a level that was most attractive to benefiting owners. They did so to meet certain objectives - pave every gravel street in Burnaby - improve the drainage system - and to give owners what they wanted - dust-free streets in some cases, and completed street improvements in others.

ITEM 6

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5

COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

- 4 -

To a considerable degree, the first three of these objectives have been met by means other than local improvements. Some years ago it became possible to pave all gravel roads in Burnaby by use of moneys that otherwise would have been spent on maintenance of roads. It became possible, too, to finance storm drainage works separate and apart from local improvements.

6.& 7. Costs on frontages in excess of 66 feet - allowances for works already being charged to a second boundary of a property.

Originally the 66' maximum rule came about to give relief to owners of corner lots and to owners of V.L.A. properties. The owners of V.L.A. properties were given relief until their properties were sold. When sold, the properties generally were subdivided and the new owners each paid a tax based on the actual frontages of the newly created properties.

Burnaby has many streets on which most of the properties are flankage and on which residences face some other street. To encourage owners to accept local improvement programs on such streets - especially the conversion of gravel roads to asphalt - some way had to be found to reduce the costs to such properties. The Act makes provision for a reduction in cost where a work affects two sides of a property, or where a work affects a property on which a previous work to another boundary of the property is a charge to that property. There is no provision at all to reduce cost to a corner lot where the work affects one side of a property only which is not affected by some previous work.

Therefore, Council established a maximum frontage measurement of 66 feet applicable to all properties affected by local improvement street improvement programs. This rule must apply to all properties. It cannot be applied to corner properties only.

This, of course, gives an advantage to owners of properties of wide frontages, particularly apartment sites and commercial-industrial sites. However, this is not as bad as it seems, because the owners of such properties pay through the general mill rate a much larger proportion of the Corporation's share of the cost of local improvements than do owners of residential properties.

It is no longer true that corner lots bring a better price at the market place than do other lots. Ill-conceived local improvement taxes can be an unbearable burden to the owners of such properties. In the past, in some cities excessive local improvement charges on corner lots caused corner lots in otherwise fully developed neighbourhoods to remain vacant for many years. However, with the prevailing scarcity of land in most cities, the size of local improvement levies should have less effect than it once did on the saleability of such properties. Nevertheless, due to the large number of corner lots involved, it was considered that some reduction should be made in the amount of local improvement charges affecting them, and the retention of a fixed frontage factor is one way of doing so.

Another way was to set minimum-maximum frontage for all properties. If this had been done, each and every property would have been charged an identical amount and corner lots would have been absolved from charges for subsequent works on a second frontage. However, owners of 33 foot lots would have paid the same as owners of 66 foot lots whereas in the application of the 66 foot maximum rule, each and every property was charged in accordance with its frontage up to the maximum. This likely would have been a cause for complaint.

The matter of assessing corner lots for local improvements has been taken up with the Department of Municipal Affairs and it is quite possible that a change in legislation may be made in time for our 1976 program.

8. The difference in frontage rates for allowances being made for previous works already being taxed.

This is fast dying out. In the early years, twenty foot strip pavements were local improvements repayable in ten years, and sidewalks constructed by themselves repayable in fifteen years. Subsequently, it became possible to complete the improvements to finished standards on such streets. It seemed unfair to charge owners on such streets a higher combined rate for two sets of works than owners on streets on which a finished street came under a single local improvement. Therefore, when a second work is done, the rates for the second work are reduced to make allowance for the first, so that the combined rate is roughly equal to the rate chargeable for a single complete work.

However, there are very few of these works on which the levies are still in force. It has been the practice that unless the levy for the work is in force at the time a new work is initiated, no allowance is made in the rates for the new work.

1974 PROGRAM

The rates established for the 1974 program were:

	<u>Annual rate per year for 15 years</u>
28' pavement with curbwalks	\$1.10
28' pavement with curbs only	.95
4' sidewalks	.62

These rates were calculated by the use of the above formula applied to 1973 program experience. They were calculated at 75% of the actual rate, it being the intention that 100% be applied in future programs. However, by the time the initiation formalities were completed and tenders called, construction prices had risen as follows:

	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Revision</u>
28' pavement with 5' curbwalk both sides	\$ 530,650	\$ 937,000
28' pavement with curbs both sides with 4 1/2' walk on south side	35,000	57,600
28' pavement with curbs both sides	118,000	207,000
28' pavement with 5' curbwalk on north side, curb on south side	137,425	267,700
36' pavement with curbs on both sides	28,000	35,500
36' pavement with sidewalks both sides	12,000	27,000
	<u>\$ 861,075</u>	<u>\$1,531,800</u>

This list includes 17 works from the previous program, construction on which had been delayed for one reason or another.

Originally, it had been estimated that the Corporation's share of the cost would be \$514,213 or 59.7%. As it turns out, this share will be approximately \$1,151,816 or 75.2%.

There were no 4' sidewalks in the program. The proper rates should have been:

	<u>@ 75%</u>	<u>@ 100%</u>
28' pavement with curbwalks	\$2.43	\$3.24
28' pavement with curbs only	2.13	2.84

ITEM 6

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5

COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

- 6 -

The cost to an owner of a 66 foot frontage property would have been:

	Actually in effect	Should have been	Or at 100% rate
28' pavement with curbwalks	\$72.60	\$160.38	\$213.84
28' pavement with curbs only	62.70	140.58	187.44

Inflation continues to be with us. Indications are that the rates shown above will increase by at least 10% in 1975. In view of the uncertain economic conditions that prevail, local improvements at any price may not be acceptable to owners in 1975. Certainly they will not, if priced too high. What is too high? The present costs are too high for some of the property owners - particularly those on fixed incomes. What the upper limit for the majority of owners may be remains to be seen.

Now that the objectives of paving all roads in Burnaby and finding a means of financing other than by local improvement for the construction of storm sewers has been found, local street improvements are mostly of benefit to abutting owners. Nevertheless, they have some benefit to the entire community, in that with the advent of finished streets, property owners tend to take better care of their properties, thereby upgrading entire neighbourhoods. Improved streets are, of course, part and parcel of the overall development of a municipality.

Perhaps the time has come to look at other ways of dividing local improvement costs between owners and the municipality. The present system, if it is followed to the letter, tends to be inflexible. Perhaps a better method may be to establish fixed rates per front foot by arbitrarily sharing costs. Such a system could be:

1. In the summer of each year, establish the program for the year following. An early start will enable the initiative procedures to take place and a tender call to be made early in the following year. The cost structure of the program should have an allowance for inflation built into it.
2. Set the standard for cost sharing at a 28' street, paving, curbing, curbwalks or separated sidewalks as the case may be, with the portion of costs in excess of 28' in street widths being borne by the Corporation.
3. Set the cost sharing between owners and the Corporation at a percentage of the average gross cost of a 28' street, paving, curbing, curbwalks or separated sidewalks as the case may be. E.g. 40%-60%; 50%-50%; 60%-40%.
4. So that corner lots will not be harshly dealt with, the present maximum frontage rule (66') should be maintained.
5. Procure assessment rolls for the work.
6. Divide the taxable assessment for each class of work into the estimated cost of the work to establish the cash cost of the work to each owner. In this way, there will be no costs for excess frontage which would be chargeable to the Corporation.
7. Incorporate these rates in the charges by-law.
8. Proceed with the initiatives.

The following is the effect of several examples of cost sharing applied to the 1974 program:

	Actual 1974	40%-60%	50%-50%	60%-40%
Owners	\$ 379,984	\$ 607,859	\$ 759,823	\$ 911,788
Corporation	1,139,663	911,788	759,824	607,859
Corporation re 36' streets	12,153	12,153	12,153	12,153
	<u>\$1,531,800</u>	<u>\$1,531,800</u>	<u>\$1,531,800</u>	<u>\$1,531,800</u>

Annual rates would have been:

28' pavement with curbwalks	\$ 3.24	\$ 1.94	\$ 2.42	\$ 2.90
28' pavement with curbs only	2.84	1.60	2.00	2.40

Annual charges to the owner of a 66 foot lot would have been:

28' pavement with curbwalks	\$ 213.84	\$ 128.04	\$ 159.72	\$ 191.40
28' pavement with curbs only	187.44	105.60	130.00	158.40

A system such as this is quite flexible. Rates can be adjusted quite readily year by year, without a great deal of clerical work taking place.

Standards of work

From time to time, members of Council comment on the lack of choice being given to property owners. For example, do owners on a particular street need or want sidewalks?

For some time, for economic reasons, curbwalks have been installed as a matter of course. The cost of constructing a curbwalk is about \$3.00 per foot greater than building a curb by itself. To come along later and construct a separated sidewalk would cost, at today's prices, \$15.00 per foot. From an economic point of view, a curbwalk is of best value. Curbs or curbwalks generally encourage owners to extend and maintain their landscaping to the curbs or curbwalks. Strangely enough, in areas where sidewalks are separated from curbs, owners often do not develop and maintain the boulevards that are created. This suggests that in areas in which separated sidewalks are built, the Municipality should complete the boulevards to finished standards and maintain them. As the law presently stands, if the Municipality constructs a boulevard, it must maintain it during its lifetime. That is, if it forms part of a local improvement.

Despite their higher costs, separated sidewalks have their place in the street patterns of the community for the following reasons:

1. Separation of pedestrian from passing vehicular traffic; removing the pedestrian from danger, splashing and intense noise.
2. Preservation of existing trees.
3. Aesthetically, treed boulevards are selected to give an increased residential environment.
4. In difficult topographic conditions, separation of the sidewalk to another level avoids the construction of retaining walls.
5. Permits pole mounted utilities to be located in the boulevard rather than in the sidewalk.
6. Avoids the roller coaster treatment associated with curbwalks crossed by driveways.
7. Provides an area beside the road for snow clearance if needed.
8. Allows for unforeseen road widening without destroying existing sidewalk.

A more extensive report on the matter of standards of street works is being developed and will be before Council at an early date.

The prime difficulty is to find out from the owners the combinations of works they desire. It is not possible to give them a choice on the initiative notices.

In the 1975 program, there is one street (Sardis) on which a separated sidewalk is proposed. It is the subject of two initiative notices, one for pavement and curbing - the other for a four foot sidewalk. The installation of the sidewalk is contingent upon whether or not the initiative passes and whether or not the initiative for the roadwork passes as well. It is proposed that the sidewalk not be built unless the roadway is built as well.

We cannot give an owner a choice in street widths, these being established by the traffic patterns of the neighbourhood. We can enquire if he wants curbing only, curbwalks on one or both sides, and whether he wants a sidewalk separated by a boulevard on one or both sides of the street or, conversely, whether he wants paving and a curbwalk or paving and a separated sidewalk, if traffic conditions

show that a sidewalk is essential. The topography of the street will dictate the kinds of works that may be given.

About the only way an expression of opinion can be obtained from property owners is by questionnaire to be filled out by the owners prior to initiative notices being sent out. In other words, each owner would be contacted twice.

A questionnaire could include the following information:

Questionnaire

"The Corporation is planning to initiate, as a local improvement, 28 feet in width of pavement together with curbing on both sides of _____ from _____ to _____.

However, before doing so, it would appreciate an expression of opinion from abutting owners on the combination of works desired by the majority of owners, before the legal process of initiating the works takes place.

The annual charge against your property for this work for each of fifteen years is estimated at \$ _____.

In the event that a curbsidewalk is included in the work on your side of the street, your estimated annual charge will be \$ _____.

In the event that a sidewalk separated from the curb by a boulevard on your side of the street is included in the work, your estimated annual charge will be \$ _____.

THE ESTIMATES USED ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE. THE CORPORATION WILL BE BOUND ONLY BY THE RATES WHICH WILL BE SHOWN ON THE NOTICE IN LEGAL FORM CONCERNING THE ACTUAL WORKS TO BE INITIATED ON CONCLUSION OF THIS SURVEY.

Target date for construction of the works, if approved by abutting owners, is the year 1976.

Please fill out the attached postcard and mail it on or before _____.

Reply card

Name _____

Address of property abutting the work _____.

I desire do not desire a local improvement pavement 28' wide with curbing to be constructed on the street abutting my property.

I desire a curbside to be constructed on my side of the street as an addition to the above works.

I desire a sidewalk separated from the curbing to be constructed on my side of the street as an addition to the above works.

THIS IS AN EXPRESSION OF OPINION ONLY AND IN NO WAY BINDS ME TO ACCEPT THESE WORKS. I understand that at a later date I will have the opportunity of petitioning against these works should I so desire, when the formal initiative notice relative to the actual works chosen showing the actual costs involved, is distributed by mail.

In order to avoid confusion, the questionnaire card would contain only the alternatives that are physically possible on the street concerned or, stated in another way, the combination of works plus alternatives that the Municipal staff recommend. Whether or not owners wish trees to be included as part of the work, could form part of the questionnaire should Council so decide.

Trees

Council has enquired whether or not it would be possible to include trees in local improvement street improvement programs. Yes, they may be included, but they must be maintained by the Municipality during their lifetime. On the other hand, if they are put in out of general revenue, the owners may be taxed annually for their maintenance.

- 9 -

Before undertaking such a program, there are a number of problems to be resolved, e.g.:

- the siting of trees to minimize damage to sidewalks, curbs and underground installations
- the selection of suitable trees
- the availability of suitable trees
- the determination of an annual cost of maintenance

There is a wealth of information available from other cities. We have a new member on staff who has had considerable experience in this field. In any event, a little more time is needed to prepare suitable recommendations. Therefore, it is recommended that tree planting not be part of the local improvement program currently under consideration and that a report be brought down for consideration with the 1976 program which is expected to be before Council in May 1975.

Prepayment of rates

By law, each and every initiative notice of a local improvement must show the sum by which an owner may commute the local improvement charges, i.e. prepay all installments by a deposit of cash. Burnaby's notice includes the following phrase:

"Your charges may be paid in full on receipt of first tax bill following construction of the work by paying the sum of \$ _____."

Only 20 or so taxpayers make prepayments of this nature each year. The Municipality would be in pocket if a large number were to do so. Yet this is not likely, for in this day of mobility of families, homes seldom remain under one ownership for long periods of time. Unless they do, prepayment has no advantage.

Commutation has been unattractive for another reason. The commutation rates used in the charges by-law are low. They were set at 4 1/2% at a time when the interest rate payable on borrowings was 6% and at a time when the prepayments made were received too late to reduce the amount of money to be borrowed. Instead, the moneys paid have been used to reduce the sums required to meet annual payments of principal and interest.

Customarily, a sum equal to 80% of the estimated cost of local improvements is borrowed at one time and the difference between this sum and actual construction costs at another time. With the time lag involved in securing financing through the Municipal Finance Authority, it is possible to apply sums received through commutation of rates to reduce the final sum to be borrowed.

The interest rate used in the calculation of the frontage taxes contained in this report is 10 1/2%. Perhaps this should be used in calculating the sum to be prepaid on the commutations of the rates in the first year. Since payments received in commutations during the second and successive years of the levies must be applied to the reduction of principal and interest charges and since the Municipality will not likely be able to reinvest the money pending use over the balance of the years of levy at a high rate of interest, probably a 6% rate should be used.

Lanes

New lanes are constructed by the Municipality on petition, conditional that abutting owners pay for the cost of asphalt and minor grade preparations as a local improvement, with charges payable over five years. The Corporation pays for the roadbed construction. Existing lanes are paved on petition, conditional

ITEM 6
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5
 COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

- 10 -

that the owners pay for the asphalt and minor grade preparations as a local improvement.

There are very few lanes in the Municipality still in gravel condition.

The current annual charge for this work is 25.7¢ per front foot. The actual cost of the work is 50.36¢ per front foot. It is recommended that the rate for future works be set at 50.36¢.

PROPOSED 1975 PROGRAM

The attached cost report has been compiled using the rules set forth on page 6 with the Corporation paying 50% of the cost of all works except those relating to 36 foot wide streets and separated sidewalks. In the case of the former, the difference between the costs of constructing a 36' street and a 28' street has been charged to the Corporation. In the case of the latter, the sample was too small to apply the formula. The annual charge per foot was \$3.40. This has been reduced to \$1.78. The cost of constructing 28 feet of pavement with two separated walks, under optimum construction conditions, is 48% greater than constructing a 28 foot pavement with five foot curbswalks both sides. Therefore the \$1.78 rate was calculated by multiplying the \$2.68 rate for 28 feet of pavement plus curbswalks by 148% and subtracting the \$2.19 rate for 28 feet of pavement plus curbs only. In this particular case, it adds \$1,789 to the Corporation's share of the cost.

Proposed 1975 frontage tax rates

The following are the rates that should be included in the Corporation's Local Improvement Charges By-law, By-law No. 6432:

28' pavement with 5' curbswalks on both sides of the street	\$ 2.68
28' pavement with 5' curbswalks on one side of the street and curbs and gutters only on the other side	2.68 & 2.19
28' pavement with 5' curbswalk on one side of the street only	2.68 & 1.36
28' pavement with curbs and gutters on both sides of the street	2.19
4' sidewalks, built in conjunction with, and at the same time as, a local improvement paving and curbing project	1.78
36' pavement with 5' curbswalks on both sides of the street	2.68
36' pavement with curbs and gutters on both sides of the street	2.19
36' pavement with curbswalks on both sides of the street with allowance for local improvement sidewalk already in place	2.68 & 2.19
14' or less pavement on lanes	0.5036

The annual charges to owners of 66 foot lots as compared with the 1974 program will be:

	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>
28' or 36' of pavement together with 5' curbswalks	\$ 72.60	\$ 176.88
28' or 36' of pavement together with curbs and gutters	62.70	144.54
4' sidewalk	40.92	117.48
14' or less of lane pavement	16.96	33.24

ITEM 6

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5

COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

- 11 -

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the owners' share of the cost of works be set at a fixed percentage of the cost of providing 28' of pavement, curbs, curbwalks or sidewalks separated from curbs, in whatever combinations as may be appropriate to circumstances; and
2. THAT the percentage rate for 1975 be set at 50%; and
3. THAT the rates payable by owners on streets in excess of 28' be the same as for streets of 28' in width; and
4. THAT the frontage maximum for 1975 be set at 66 feet; and
5. THAT the frontage rates to be fixed be adjusted so that the entire owners' share of the cost will be borne by abutting owners, with the exception for 1975 of the four foot sidewalk project in which case the sharing will be as shown on the cost report; and
6. THAT consideration be given to a questionnaire being sent out in connection with 1976 programs during June, 1975 to determine the wishes of owners with respect to the types of works to be constructed; and
7. THAT commutation rates be set at 10 1/2% on commutations made in the first year of levy and at 6% for the payments made during the second and subsequent years' levies; and
8. THAT Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1974, By-law No. 6432, be amended to incorporate therein the frontage tax rates shown on page 10 of this report, and that all other rates shown therein be repealed; and
9. THAT a report on the planting of trees as part of a local improvement project be brought down as soon as possible; and
10. THAT the work program for 1975 outlined in the attached cost report be adopted; and
11. THAT the Municipal Clerk be instructed to initiate the works.

Barbara Mulvey
MUNICIPAL TREASURER

BM:gw
Attach.

cc: Municipal Clerk
Municipal Solicitor
Director of Planning
Planner II (CRL)
Municipal Engineer
Assessor

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY
LOCAL IMPROVEMENT COST REPORT PER SECTION 601, MUNICIPAL ACT

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Location of work</u>	<u>Length in feet</u>	<u>Taxable Foot Frontage</u>	<u>Actual Foot Frontage</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u> \$	<u>Owners' Estimated Cost</u> \$	<u>Frontage Tax</u> \$
	<u>28' pavement with 5' curbswalks on both sides</u>						
74-023	Halley Avenue from Burke Street to Sardis Street	1,050	1,214.64	1,870.31	52,500	24,074	2.68
74-024	Bond Street from Halley Avenue to Patterson Avenue	1,100	1,006.00	1,966.97	55,000	19,939	2.68
74-025	Brantford Avenue from Imperial Street to Oakland Street	2,640	4,106.37	5,093.23	132,000	81,388	2.68
74-026	19th Avenue from 2nd Street to Newcombe Street	1,400	1,869.15	2,373.06	70,000	37,047	2.68
74-027	18th Avenue from 1st Street to Newcombe Street	750	1,212.88	1,352.88	37,500	24,039	2.68
74-028	McKay Avenue from Rumble Street to Boxer Street	1,680	1,771.36	2,756.95	84,000	35,108	2.68
74-029	Irmin Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	940.00	1,091.55	32,500	18,631	2.68
74-030	Watling Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	940.00	1,090.62	32,500	18,631	2.68
74-031	Southwood Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	830.55	1,074.40	32,500	16,462	2.68
74-032	Clinton Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	908.60	1,065.45	32,500	18,008	2.68
74-033	Portland Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	904.20	1,066.77	32,500	17,921	2.68
74-034	Peter Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	912.96	1,088.96	32,500	18,095	2.68
74-035	Victory Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	930.77	1,088.77	32,500	18,448	2.68
74-036	Arbor Street from Boundary Road to Joffre Avenue	650	940.00	1,089.55	32,500	18,631	2.68
74-037	Highlawn Drive from Midlawn Drive to Beta Avenue	850	1,230.82	1,625.54	42,500	24,395	2.68
74-038	William Street from Willingdon Avenue to Alpha Drive	500	697.63	876.13	25,000	13,827	2.68
		15,170	20,415.93	26,571.14	758,500	404,644	

ITEM 6
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5
 COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT COST REPORT PER SECTION 601, MUNICIPAL ACT

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Location of work</u>	<u>Length in feet</u>	<u>Taxable Foot Frontage</u>	<u>Actual Foot Frontage</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u> \$	<u>Owners' Estimated Cost</u> \$	<u>Frontage Tax</u> \$
	<u>28' pavement with 5' curbs on north side only</u>						
74-039	12th Avenue from 1st Street to Cumberland Street		NS 1,551.80 SS 2,131.02	2,053.77 2,131.02		30,757 21,374	2.68 1.36
		2,250	3,682.82	4,184.79	99,000	52,131	
	<u>28' pavement with 5' curbs on one side and curb on other side</u>						
74-040	Joffre Avenue from Hurst Street to Rumble Street - curbs on west side	1,900	CW-WS 462.00 C-ES 66.00	1,450.76 1,881.65	89,300	9,157 1,067	2.68 2.19
74-041	Southwood Street from McKay Avenue to Patterson Avenue - curbs on north side	830	CW-NS 565.50 C-SS 570.35	824.80 789.55	39,010	11,208 9,217	2.68 2.19
74-043	Mandy Avenue from Imperial Street to Hurst Street - curbs on west side	600	CW-WS 306.49 C-ES	483.45 589.45	28,200	6,075	2.68 2.19
		3,330	CW 1,333.99 C 636.35	2,759.01 3,260.65	156,510	26,440 10,284	
	<u>28' pavement with curbs both sides</u>		1,970.34	6,019.66		36,724	
74-022	Chaffey Avenue from Burke Street to Sardis Street	1,000	1,645.82	1,834.58	44,000	26,596	2.19
74-044	Joffre Avenue from Southwood Street to lane north of Marine Drive	1,900	2,985.50	3,298.64	83,600	48,246	2.19

ITEM 6
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5
COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT COST REPORT PER SECTION 601, MUNICIPAL ACT

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Location of work</u>	<u>Length in feet</u>	<u>Taxable Foot Frontage</u>	<u>Actual Foot Frontage</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u> \$	<u>Owners' Estimated Cost</u> \$	<u>Frontage Tax</u> \$
	<u>28' pavement with curbs both sides (Cont'd)</u>						
74-045	Clinton Street from Joffre Avenue east to E.P.L. Lot K, Block 2, D.L. 175, Plan 14480	450	624.00	837.85	19,800	10,084	2.19
74-063	Dundas Street from Boundary Road to Gilmore Avenue	<u>2,200</u>	<u>3,121.13</u>	<u>3,866.19</u>	<u>96,800</u>	<u>50,437</u>	2.19
		5,550	8,376.45	9,837.26	244,200	135,363	
	<u>4' sidewalk</u>						
74-046	Sardis Street from Barker Avenue to Halley Avenue - sidewalk on south side	500 SS	149.00	475.51	7,500	1,961	1.78
	<u>36' pavement with curbs both sides</u>						
74-058	Chaffey Avenue from Sardis Street to Grange Street	640	830.39	1,194.15	38,560	13,419	2.19
74-060	Sardis Street from Barker Avenue to Halley Avenue	500	445.00	950.81	27,000	7,191	2.19
74-061	Joffre Avenue from Rumble Street to Southwood Street	330	413.00	592.62	17,820	6,674	2.19
74-071	Maywood Street from Cassie Avenue east to E.P.L. Lot B, Block 41, D.L. 153, Plan 30149	800	327.00	1,251.49	43,200	5,284	2.19
74-062	Joffre Avenue from lane north of Marine Drive to Marine Drive	<u>200</u>	<u>198.00</u>	<u>382.01</u>	<u>10,800</u>	<u>3,200</u>	2.19
		2,470	2,213.39	4,371.08	137,380	35,768	

ITEM 6
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5
COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY
LOCAL IMPROVEMENT COST REPORT PER SECTION 601, MUNICIPAL ACT

Project No.	Location of work	Length in feet	Taxable Foot Frontage	Actual Foot Frontage	Estimated Cost	Owners' Estimated Cost	Frontage Tax
	<u>36' pavement with 5' curbs on both sides</u>				\$	\$	\$
74-053	Halley Avenue from Sardis Street to Grange Street	420	357.00	754.87	25,200	7,076	2.68
74-054	Morley Avenue from Canada Way to W.P.L. Lot 176, D.L. 86, Plan 25478	600	862.76	1,065.30	36,000	17,100	2.68
74-055	18th Avenue from 1st Street to 2nd Street	600	750.11	1,025.96	36,000	14,867	2.68
74-056	Sperling Avenue from Kingsway to Arcola Street	300	114.50	487.23	18,000	2,269	2.68
74-057	Buller Avenue from Irmin Street to Beresford Street	900	747.26	1,250.23	54,000	14,811	2.68
		<u>2,820</u>	<u>2,831.63</u>	<u>4,583.59</u>	<u>169,200</u>	<u>56,123</u>	
	<u>36' pavement with 5' curbs on both sides with allowance to south side for works being replaced</u>						
74-059	12th Avenue from 1st Street to 2nd Street		NS 454.08	549.78		9,000	2.68
			SS 550.00	550.00		8,888	2.19
		<u>600</u>	<u>1,004.08</u>	<u>1,099.78</u>	<u>36,000</u>	<u>17,888</u>	
	Total Cost	<u>32,690</u>	<u>40,643.64</u>	<u>57,142.81</u>	<u>1,608,290</u>	<u>740,602</u>	

Estimated lifetime of the works: 20 years
 Number of years of levy: 15 years

ITEM 6
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 5
 COUNCIL MEETING Jan. 27/75

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY
LOCAL IMPROVEMENT COST REPORT PER SECTION 601, MUNICIPAL ACT

RECONCILIATION

Owners' share	\$ 740,601
Portion re 4' sidewalk taken over by Corporation	1,789
Cemetery and school shares taken over by Corporation	<u>29,341</u>
	771,731
Corporation's matching share	771,731
Corporation's share re street widths in excess of 28 feet	64,700
Round offs	<u>128</u>
	<u>\$1,608,290</u>