

MAY 31, 1976

A regular meeting of the Municipal Council was held in the Council Chambers, Municipal Hall, 4949 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C. on Monday, May 17, 1976, commencing at 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Mayor T.W. Constable, in the Chair
Alderman G.D. Ast
Alderman D.P. Drummond
Alderman A.H. Emmott
Alderman B.M. Gunn
Alderman D.A. Lawson
Alderman G.H.F. McLean
Alderman F.G. Randall
Alderman V.V. Stusiak

STAFF:

Mr. M.J. Shelley, Municipal Manager
Mr. E.E. Olson, Municipal Engineer
Mr. A.L. Parr, Director of Planning
Mr. R.W. Watson, Deputy Municipal Clerk
Mr. J. Plesha, Administrative Assistant to Manager
Mr. B.D. Leche, Municipal Clerk's Assistant

M I N U T E S

The Minutes of the Special Meeting of Council held on May 19, 1976 and the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council held on May 25, 1976 came forward for adoption.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN AST:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

"THAT the Minutes of the Special Meeting of Council held on May 19, 1976 be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN AST:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

"THAT the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council held on May 25, 1976 be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D E L E G A T I O N S

The following wrote requesting an audience with Council:

- (a) Mr. Victor Lipp, President Burnaby Tennis Club
Re: Cover For, and Management of, Tennis Courts
at Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.
- (b) Mr. Ralph Wolloschuk, 5985 Sumas Street Re:
Questions and Comments on Municipal Hall/ Council
Activities.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN AST:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

"THAT the Delegations be heard."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (a) Mr. Victor Lipp, President, Burnaby Tennis Club, then addressed Council on The subject of a cover for, and management of, six tennis courts in the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex. The following is the text of Mr. Lipp's brief:

May 31, 1976

My name is Victor Lipp, I am President of the Burnaby Tennis Club and Chairman of our Winter Play Committee.

My purpose in being here this evening is to express the concern voiced by the public and members of our tennis club and the concern we as citizens of this municipality have regarding the decision made by our Parks and Recreation Commission at their May 19, 1976 meeting.

As you know, at that meeting they approved recommendations to have a private Enterprise group, headed by Mr. W. F. Holm, negotiate with the Parks and Recreation staff for the installation and management of an air supported structure over 6 courts at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.

In addition to this winter operation, the recommendations passed included the proposal that the same private enterprise group negotiate for control of the tennis activities during the summer months at this location, as well.

We, as members of the Municipal Tennis Club, and citizens of Burnaby, object very strongly to the idea of having an outside, private enterprise, profit-motivated, group establish their business on our municipal facilities.

To be given the control of this facility on a year-round basis, in addition, makes the entire idea completely untenable; especially when there is an alternative.

The Burnaby Tennis Club was established as a non-profit organization under the provincial Societies Act in 1968 for the purpose of developing and fostering the sport of tennis in this municipality.

During our nine years of operation we have grown in number to approximately 520 members, junior and senior, over 90% of whom are Burnaby residents.

In this relatively short period of time we have made many accomplishments, both on and off the courts for which we and the municipality can be justly proud.

Some of these include:

- Construction of an attractive and useful tennis clubhouse to serve as a focal point for organized tennis in Burnaby.
- Contributions toward plexigave surfacing of the 11 courts and nylon backdrops at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.
- Hosting of major Canadian Tennis Tournaments including the largest ever, THE CANADA GAMES.
- Providing organized tennis opportunities to our citizens - coaching, league play, tournaments, group lessons, ladder play and many special junior programmes.
- The winning of several B.C.L.T.A. Inter-Club League events.

The reason I mention these few details of the Burnaby Tennis Club is to ensure that these contributions are not forgotten in any future considerations being made and to underline our proven management capabilities.

When we were first made aware of the proposal by Mr. Holm to construct a 5 court winter facility at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex, we met with him to discuss details and possible collaboration.

On examination of his plans, we concluded that we could construct such a facility ourselves and offer more to the tennis players and to the municipality. Hence, we submitted a proposal to the Parks and Recreation Department to construct and manage a 6 court winter tennis facility at these courts ourselves.

The 6 court air supported structure we proposed would be the largest tennis facility of this type in the Lower Mainland area.

May 31, 1976

We acknowledge that the group headed by Mr. Holm submitted a very comprehensive proposal with many apparent advantages. I feel it was the well prepared nature of his submission with emphasis on:

- management
- low court charge rates
- High School and junior programmes
- availability to the general public
- monetary returns to the municipality

that swayed the decision to accept his proposal over ours.

I would like to make a point by point comparison of these considerations for your own evaluation now:

1. **MANAGEMENT:** - Mr. Holm proposes professional management and operational staffing. The professional involved is Mr. Rico Policarno, who also happens to be one of the principals. He has managed a similar facility in Calgary. We don't know if they are broadening the base of their operations or if they are abandoning Calgary.

The Burnaby Tennis Club has always and will continue to be managed by a membership-elected Executive and Directorate consisting of 15 Burnaby Tennis Club members.

Incidentally, we are proud to have Mayor Constable as our Honorary President.

Member court charges - Weekdays (per hour)		Sat./Sun./Holidays
	7 a.m. - 5 p.m. \$4.00	7 a.m. - 9 a.m. \$4.00
(non-members add \$2.00 to each rate)	5 p.m. - 10 p.m. 6.00	9 a.m. - 6 p.m. 6.00
	10 p.m. - 12 p.m. 4.00	6 p.m. - 12 p.m. 4.00

b. Burnaby Tennis Club winter rate proposal:

Initiation, (first year of membership only) \$175.00

Annual Dues - \$125.00

Hourly court charges: i. Members - NIL
ii. Non-members - Non Prime \$4.00
- Prime 6.00

Example: (1) A member plays 4 hours per week.

Comparative annual costs for: (a) 1 year and
(b) 2 years

	MR. HOLM'S CHARGE	B.T.C. CHARGE
(a) Singles, Prime Time	\$367.00	\$ 300.00
Doubles, " "	211.00	300.00
Singles, Non Prime Time	263.00	300.00
Doubles, " " "	159.00	300.00

Mr. Holm's rate average \$50.00 less in the first year.

(b) Singles, Prime Time	\$734.00	\$425.00
Doubles, " "	422.00	425.00
Singles, Non Prime Time	526.00	425.00
Doubles, " " "	318.00	425.00

Burnaby Tennis Club rates average \$75.00 less for the second year.

Example: (2) A non-member plays twice per week.

	MR. HOLM'S CHARGE	B.T.C. CHARGE
Singles Prime Time	\$ 208.00	\$156.00
Doubles " "	104.00	78.00
Singles Non Prime Time	156.00	104.00
Doubles " " "	78.00	52.00

Burnaby Tennis Club rates average \$39.00 less for non-members.

May 31, 1976

Comparison of these examples shows the Burnaby Tennis Club rates to be less after the first year for members and lower in all cases for non-members.

Another important fact to consider when making these direct comparisons is that bookings in our proposal are for $1\frac{1}{4}$ hours versus 1 hour bookings for Mr. Holm's proposal.

4. AVAILABILITY OF COURTS TO NON-MEMBERS: - Mr. Holm proposes that all unused court time would be open for general public use, to be pre-booked on the day of use, at a court fee to be set at \$2.00 per court hour higher than the "Regular" rates.

We all assume he refers to members rates, not regular rates as charged by other winter tennis clubs.

The Burnaby Tennis Club proposes similar unused court times for general public use at an hourly rate averaging \$5.00 per hour (\$6.00 prime, \$4.00 non-prime time).

In comparing the hours available to non-members in both proposals, let's make the following assumptions; both would operate 15 hours per day, both would involve 6 covered courts, (Mr. Holm's still refers to a 5 court cover in various parts of the administrator's report), and let's also assume that members would play an average of 3 hours per week.

Total hours available to non-members is therefore the total number of player court hours available per week, minus the number of members multiplied by the average number of times each member would play per week.

- (a) Mr. Holm's proposal:

$$\begin{array}{l} 6 \text{ courts} \times 4 \frac{\text{players}}{\text{court}} \times 15 \frac{\text{hours}}{\text{day}} \times 7 \frac{\text{days}}{\text{week}} - 650 \text{ members} \\ \times 3 \frac{\text{court hours}}{\text{week}} \\ \hline = 520 \text{ player court hours available for} \\ \text{non-members} \end{array}$$

- (b) Burnaby Tennis Club proposal:

$$\begin{array}{l} 6 \text{ courts} \times 4 \frac{\text{players}}{\text{court}} \times 15 \frac{\text{hours}}{\text{day}} \times 7 \frac{\text{days}}{\text{week}} - 400 \text{ members} \\ \times 3 \frac{\text{court hours}}{\text{week}} \\ \hline = 1320 \text{ court hours available for} \\ \text{non-members} \end{array}$$

You will note that the difference in these two figures, 750 player court hours more in the Burnaby Tennis Club proposal, is accounted for by the difference in club memberships. The Burnaby Tennis Club proposes a core membership of 400. Mr. Holm speaks of 500 senior members and 150 junior members - and suggests no upper limit on memberships. Certainly, as membership in Mr. Holm's plan grows, non-members would be excluded to a greater and greater extent.

5. MONETARY RETURNS TO THE MUNICIPALITY: - We have no idea what amount of money Mr. Holm proposed to return to the municipality for the use of this facility as a base for his business. However, since the Burnaby Tennis Club is a non-profit organization, the fact that we could return more in terms of money, improvements to the facility and availability of tennis at low rates is self-evident.

These five points of comparison:

- MANAGEMENT
- COURT CHARGE RATES
- JUNIOR AND SCHOOL PROGRAMMES
- AVAILABILITY TO NON-MEMBERS
- AND - RETURNS TO THE MUNICIPALITY

Upon close examination, in all cases, show the Burnaby Tennis Club proposal to be better than that of Mr. Holm.

May 31, 1976

There are many other details contained in both proposals. We stressed our willingness to discuss all aspects of ours with the Parks and Recreation Department in order to come to full agreement. That offer still stands.

The Burnaby Tennis Club is not a closed group unto itself! We are a part of a much larger tennis fraternity, The British Columbia and Canadian Lawn Tennis Associations.

Our membership is open to all Burnaby residents and for the mere concession of 6 of the 58 municipal tennis courts return many advantages in terms of taxes on our building, additional business for Burnaby merchants, a certain municipal pride in the achievements of the club, and facilities, and an all important social and competitive environment to foster the sport of tennis in Burnaby.

It is apparent from statements in the Administrator's report to the Parks Commission that there were points in our proposal that were not fully understood.

I would like to make specific reference to these so that they may be corrected.

- (1) The second to last paragraph on the second page of the Administrator's report #9, Commission Meeting May 12, 1976 implied that the Burnaby Tennis Club expected to have exclusive use of this facility.

We stated emphatically in our brief and I will so state again "That we do not propose that this be an exclusive facility". As a matter of fact, to meet the terms for a provincial Community and Recreational Fund Grant we must allow public access.

- (2) In the second paragraph of the third page of the same report, it was stated that, "It would appear to be too late for the club to purchase and erect an air supported structure, because the awarding of a grant would not be made until sometime in August".

With everything else in readiness, as we have, and the relatively short erection time required, we projected completion of this facility by November, 1976.

Ironically the application deadline grant is to-morrow and only a miracle would allow us to meet that. However, we are still interested and could meet the next deadline which is October 1, 1976. This would allow us to proceed with winter operations starting in 1977.

At this point I would like to summarize some of the considerations favoring the Burnaby Tennis Club's proposal to construct and manage winter tennis facilities at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.

- We will assume all costs and responsibilities for this project.
- This will not be an exclusive facility.
- We have an established clubhouse facility to serve as the base for our operations.
- We have proven management capabilities.
- We are a registered non-profit organization.
- We have a public access clause in our constitution.
- We have a dissolution clause in our constitution which states that if the Burnaby Tennis Club is ever dissolved, the remaining assets will revert to the municipality or to another similar non-profit organization.
- We propose full professional management.
- We offer the greatest return to the municipality.

May 31, 1976

- We offer the lowest rates for members and non-members.
- We offer the most time available to non-members.
- We offer junior, high school, family and coaching programmes.
- Finally, we offer to manage the entire tennis facility at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex winter and summer, and if given the use of all 11 courts, we'll expand our regular summer membership to over 1,000 Burnaby residents.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this concludes my presentation. Hopefully you will find in it grounds to refer this matter back to the Parks and Recreation Commission for further study.

As citizens, we remain strongly opposed to private enterprise operating on municipal facilities at our expense!

As members of the Burnaby Tennis Club, we know there is a better way.

I will remain to answer any questions.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:

"THAT Item 8, Municipal Manager's Report No. 37, 1976, be brought forward for consideration at this time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The following is the substance of that report:

"On May 12, 1976, the Parks and Recreation Commission heard four delegations on the subject of indoor tennis facilities. These delegations were:

- (a) Burnaby Tennis Club, Spokesman - Mr. V. Lipp
- (b) W.F. Holm Group, Spokesman - Mr. W.R. Holm
- (c) E.R. Salmon Group, Spokesman - Mr. E.R. Salmon
- (d) Judd Anderson Group, Spokesman - Mr. Bob Patteson

On that date, the Commission also considered a staff report on the subject. The Commission tabled this report for one week and directed staff to inquire into the possibility of an alternate location for the bubble facility.

A report containing the requested information was presented by staff to the Commission on May 19.

The Commission then approved the following recommendations as contained in Item 1 of the Administrator's Report No. 10, dated May 12, 1976:

1. THAT the Commission approve the concept of using an air support structure for 6 courts at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex for winter use.
2. THAT the Commission adopt the principle of charging a fee for court use at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex based on the provision of booking privileges, scheduling and the services of a tennis professional.
3. THAT the Commission direct staff to negotiate with the W.F. Holm Group for an agreement for the provision, installation and management of an air-supported structure over 6 tennis courts at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.
4. THAT the Commission direct staff to negotiate with the W.F. Holm Group in consultation with the Burnaby Tennis Club for the control of the tennis activity during the summer months at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.'

May 31, 1976

Parks and Recreation staff are now implementing these recommendations and a further report is being prepared for the Commission meeting of June 2, 1976. This report will contain the terms of agreement between the Corporation and the W.F. Holm Group for providing and operating an air-supported structure over 6 tennis courts at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex.

This report is submitted for the information of Council."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the report of the Municipal Manager be received for information purposes."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN AST:

"THAT this Council go on record as being strongly opposed to any group other than the Parks and Recreation Commission installing a bubble over any Municipal tennis courts."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT further consideration of this matter be tabled and that the submission of the Burnaby Tennis Club be referred back to the Parks and Recreation Commission to allow that body an opportunity to study the whole situation, including the question of a bubble, and to make appropriate recommendations to Council following that study."

FOR: Mayor Constable, Aldermen Lawson.
McLean and Stusiak

OPPOSED: Aldermen Ast, Drummond, Emmott,
Gunn, and Randall.

MOTION DEFEATED

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT this matter be referred to Council sitting as a Committee of the Whole to meet with the Parks and Recreation Commission to study the whole question including the installation of a bubble over Municipal tennis courts in the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex."

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Alderman Randall

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT the submission of the Burnaby Tennis Club dated May 28, 1976 be referred to the Parks and Recreation Commission for information purposes."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(b) Mr. Ralph Wolloschuk then addressed Council on the following questions of concern to him. Mr. Wolloschuk noted that he was appearing as a private citizen who had lived in the Municipality since 1957.

- (a) Mr. Wolloschuk noted that in accordance with the Burnaby Procedures Bylaw Council meetings are scheduled to be concluded at 10:30 P.M. Mr. Wolloschuk was of the opinion that as this hour approaches on a Monday evening, Council is inclined not to give individual items on the agenda the consideration they deserve. Mr. Wolloschuk was also concerned that Council was not adhering to its own Procedures Bylaw.
- (b) Mr. Wolloschuk requested confirmation from His Worship, Mayor Constable, that no funds were being expended in contravention of the direction given by the electorate at the last municipal election.

May 31, 1976

- (c) Mr. Wolloschuk also objected to the procedure whereby a citizen wishing to appear as a delegate to Council must make his wishes known to the Municipal Clerk by 12:00 noon on the Thursday prior to the Council meeting at which the citizen wishes to appear. Mr. Wolloschuk also noted that Minutes of Council meetings were not available to the public until such time as they had been adopted by Council which did not happen for at least a week until the next meeting of Council. Mr. Wolloschuk was of the opinion that this effectively blocked public discussion of Council business until it was an accomplished fact.
- (d) Mr. Wolloschuk stated that he could recall no discussions whether Council should, or should not, have spent the monies involved in the Municipal Hall renovations.
- (e) Mr. Wolloschuk also suggested that the advertising of Public Hearings concerning rezoning applications was not given sufficient publicity.
- (f) Mr. Wolloschuk also complained that the Municipality had not provided proper top-soil for the boulevard in front of his property following a Local Improvement Project. Mr. Wolloschuk noted that other people had been supplied with top-soil and was of the opinion that there should be a standard policy in this respect.
- (g) Mr. Wolloschuk noted that at the Council meeting of May 25, 1976, a motion had been made to table further discussion of the proposed neighbourhood pub in the Parkcrest Shopping Centre. This motion had been duly seconded. His Worship, The Mayor, had then called the question on the main motion without a vote being taken on the tabling motion. Mr. Wolloschuk was of the opinion that the vote on the main motion was, therefore, invalid and the question should be returned to Council for further consideration.

His Worship, Mayor Constable, suggested to Mr. Wolloschuk that he was completely wrong. Alderman Randall had made a motion to table but there was no seconded to the tabling motion.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:

"THAT the submission of Mr. Wolloschuk be referred to the Municipal Manager for reply."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B Y L A W S

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN AST:

"THAT Item 1, Municipal Manager's Report No. 37, 1976, be brought forward for consideration at this time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The following is the recommendation contained in that report:

"THAT a Bylaw be brought down to permit the expenditure of monies from the Local Improvement Fund to temporarily finance the following works."

<u>Bylaw No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Loan Authorization Bylaw</u>
6671	28' pavement with curbs on both sides	\$ 28,600
6674	28' pavement with curbs on both sides	44,000
6675	28' pavement with curbs and gutters on both sides	68,200
6704	Ornamental street lighting	740,600
6729	28' pavement with 5' curb sidewalks on both sides	140,000
6864	28' pavement with curb on one side only	27,140
6865	28' pavement with curbs on both sides	397,500

May 31, 1976

<u>Bylaw No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Loan Authorization Bylaw</u>
6860	28' pavement with curb on one side and 5' curb sidewalk on other side	\$ 62,540
6867	28' pavement with 5' curb sidewalks on both sides	346,080
6868	36' pavement with curbs on both sides	196,115
6869	36' pavement with 5' curb sidewalks on both sides	91,120
6870	36' pavement with curb on one side and 5' curb sidewalk on other side	81,920
6871	46' pavement with 6' curb sidewalks on both sides	91,750
6872	4' separated sidewalks	91,449
		<u>\$2,407,014</u>

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

"THAT the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN AST:

"THAT Item 2, Municipal Manager's Report No. 37, 1976, be brought forward for consideration at this time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The following is the recommendation contained in that report:

"THAT a tax sale moneys Bylaw be brought down to appropriate \$855,126.32 from the Tax Sale Fune Reserve to reimburse general revenue funds for the moneys expended on the land acquisition and development costs as noted below:"

Land Assembly and Development Costs

Acquisition

<u>Address</u>	<u>Legal Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
7631 Aubrey St.	Lot H, Ex.Pl. 28069, D.L. 138, Plan 12221	\$ 3,419.91
4553/61/65/73/83 Canada Way	Lots 15, 17, 18 & 20, Block 7, D.L. 70, Plan 1775, and Lot 35, D.L. 70, Plan 41988	360,778.59
6361 Hardwick St.	Lot 13, Block 6, D.L. 76, Plan 1885	24,093.69
7818/28 Burris St.	Lots 389 & 390, D.L. 87, Grp. 1, Plan 48101	75,027.91
6609 Willingdon Ave.	Lot 11, Block 48, D.L. 151, Grp. 1, Plan 1437	60,201.83
4857 Rowan Ave.	Lot "C", Blocks 4 & 5, D.L. 79, Grp. 1, Plan 15589	174,935.29
4754 Eton St.	Lots 20 & 21, Block 9 of Block "E", D.L. 188, Grp. 1, Plan 1165	59,136.52
7291/95 Cariboo Rd.	Rear portion of Parcel "D", Ex.Pl. 9242, Except Ex.Pl. 10852, & Parcel 1, Ex.Pl. 10852, & all of Block 37, D.L. 13, Plan 3046	\$ 14.00
6084 Kathleen Ave.	Lot 31, Block 11, D.L. 151/153, Plan 1191	30,000.00
Stanley/Braemar	Lots 340 to 357 inclusive, D.L. 86, Grp. 1, Plan 49263	163.50
		<u>787,771.24</u>

May 31, 1976

Development

Burris St. subdivision reference #25/74 - to provide services and underground wiring	28,898.49
Fitzgerald & Atlee - to provide underground services	7,836.00
Lane south of Myrtle and west of Gilmore - to relocate B.C. Telephone plant	3,154.00
Schou St. subdivision reference #32/74 - Municipal share	12,560.00
Stride Ave. dump rehabilitation	1,543.94
20th St. & 14th Ave. - to install sanitary sewer and storm sewer connections	2,137.17
East of Cariboo from Wilberforce south approximately 100' - to construct lane	961.44
Easement south of Grimmer between Dunblane & Marlborough - to provide services.	262.43
Laurel St. from Smith Ave. east to and including cul-de-sac - to install pavement with curbswalks	2,892.30
D.L. 86, Stage II B - to construct 5' walkway including ornamental street lighting between Lambeth Dr. & Buckingham Dr.	3,882.26
D.L. 86, Stage III B - to install private crossings of sidewalks and to service subdivision	3,074.85
D.L. 86, Stage IV - engineering services for design of utilities	679.71
D.L. 86, Stage IV A - install services .	40,999.38
Lot 192 - behind 7252 Kingsway - to install water, sewer and gas services	17,489.36
Keswick School site - costs originally charged to reserve subsequently financed by a separate by-law	(58,985.50)
Cul-de-sac south of Lister and west of Inman - to provide services	(30.75)
	<u>67,355.08</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$ 855,126.32</u>

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

"THAT the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT:

'Burnaby Tax Sale Lands Reserve Fund Expenditure Bylaw No. 1, 1976' - #6873

'Burnaby Local Improvement Temporary Financing Bylaw 1976' - #6874

be now introduced and that Council resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the Bylaws."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Council reconvened.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

May 31, 1976

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT:

'Burnaby Tax Sale Lands Reserve Fund Expenditure Bylaw No. 1, 1976' - #6873

'Burnaby Local Improvement Temporary Financing Bylaw 1976' - #6874

be now read three times."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT Council do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on:

'Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 60, 1975'." - #6797

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The foregoing Bylaw provides for the following proposed rezoning.

Rezoning Reference #54/75.

- (a) Lot 185, D.L. 85, Plan 46306
- (b) Portion of Parcel "A", Reference Plan 9998, Block 4, D.L. 85, Plan 3322. (To become Lot 228, D.L. 85, Unregistered Plan)

5380 and 5460 Sperling Avenue.

From Residential District (R1) to Comprehensive Development District (CD).

The Director of Planning, by memorandum dated May 27, 1976, advised that the prerequisites previously established by Council in connection with this rezoning proposal are nearing completion.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT the Committee now rise and report the Bylaw complete."

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Aldermen Lawson,
McLean and Randall

The Council reconvened.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Aldermen Lawson,
McLean and Randall

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT:

'Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 60, 1975' - #6797

May 31, 1976

be now read a third time."

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Aldermen Lawson,
McLean and Randall

C O R R E S P O N D E N C E A N D P E T I T I O N S

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT all of the following listed items of correspondence be received and those items of the Municipal Manager's Report No. 37, 1976 which pertain thereto be brought forward for consideration at this time."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(a) Block Bros. Realty Ltd. Re: 5092 Canada Way Proposed Zoning

A letter under date of May 20, 1976, was received from Mr. James Cowe, Block Bros. Realty Ltd. in which it was suggested that the zoning of the area in which the subject property is located as proposed by the Director of Planning is utterly impossible for at least ten to twelve years as no developer could possibly pay the price that would be needed for the land. Most of these lots have houses which would sell for \$65,000.00 at today's prices. Any developer could only afford to pay approximately \$32,000.00 for these properties.

Mr. Cowe stated that, as it stands, his clients would be paying taxes on a piece of property for possibly the next twenty years and it was his opinion that his clients deserve the right to sell their R4 Section for a single family home to be built.

Item 12, Municipal Manager's Report No. 37, 1976, pertaining to this subject was brought forward for consideration at this time. The following are the recommendations of that report:

1. That Council reconfirm the adopted area plan objectives as outlined in the Director of Planning's report;
2. That Council not give favourable consideration to the request as outlined in the correspondence from Mr. Cowe;
3. That Mr. Cowe be sent a copy of this report.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

"THAT the recommendations of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EMMOTT:

"THAT the Municipal Manager advise the necessary departments to bring forward a plan of acquisition costs and the necessary steps to create an acquisition program for this development similar to the Cariboo Development Plan."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(b) Mrs. Eileen Dailly, Member of the Legislative Assembly,
Burnaby North, Re: Remand Centre at Willingdon School for Girls.

A letter under date of May 19, 1976 was received advising that Mrs. Dailly, while accepting the fact that a remand centre is needed, had some concerns with the decision of the Government to use the former Willingdon School for Girls as a remand centre. Mrs. Dailly enclosed some of her comments with reference to this matter as recorded in Hansard and the Attorney General's comments. Mrs. Dailly considered this excerpt from Hansard may also clarify some of the Government's policy on this matter.

May 31, 1976

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT a copy of Mrs. Dailly's correspondence be forwarded to the Burnaby Justice Council and the Youth Advisory Committee."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(c) Lower Mainland Municipal Association Meeting Re: Meeting June 17, 1976

A letter under date of May 20, 1976 was received advising that the next meeting of the Lower Mainland Municipal Association would be held in Port Moody on Thursday, June 17, 1976. Attached were copies of resolutions from member municipalities for endorsement to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities.

(d) Union of British Columbia Municipalities Re: Official Notice of the 73rd Annual Convention, Vancouver, B.C. September 15, 16 and 17, 1976

Official Notice of the 83rd Annual Convention of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities to be held in Vancouver, B.C. on September 15, 16 and 17, 1976 was received.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT any member of Council wishing to attend the 73rd Annual Convention of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities on September 15, 16 and 17, 1976 be authorized to do so and that this authorization apply to the Municipal Manager and the Municipal Clerk."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(e) Mrs. Joanne Jahner, 5163 Sussex Avenue

(f) Mrs. J. Van Alstine

(g) Mr. K. Van Dyk, 4864 Bond Street

(h) Mr. Hai Chew Chiang, 4750 Grassmere Street

(i) Mrs. Joan Hardy, 4564 Burke Street

Letters were received from the above noted persons objecting to the proposed Nelson Avenue/Wayburne Drive extension.

(j) Mr. E. Willy Lang, 635 Clyde Avenue, West Vancouver, B.C.
Re: Construction of a Penthouse on apartment at 6710 Sussex Avenue

A letter under date of May 21, 1976 was received advising that Mr. Lang had recently been refused a Building Permit to construct a penthouse on an apartment at 6710 Sussex Avenue. An appeal to the Board of Variance in this regard had also been denied. Mr. Lang was concerned that such decisions did nothing to alleviate the desperate rental accommodation situation in the Municipality.

(k) Messrs. W. Dodds and K. Brown Re: Neighbourhood Pub in Parkcrest Shopping Centre

A letter under date of May 26, 1976 was received advising that the services of a reputable sound consulting firm will be retained in order to ensure that noise levels associated with the neighbourhood pub at the Parkcrest Shopping Centre will be contained within the building.

(l) Union of British Columbia Municipalities Re: Human Resources Monthly Per Capita Charges

A letter under date of May 20, 1976 was received enclosing a letter from Mayor M.S. Evers, President of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities to the Minister of Human Resources concerning the additional monthly per capita charges for Social Welfare which will be effective April 1, 1976. Mayor Evers urged all members affected by these added costs to review the letters content and to express their individual concerns to the Minister as

May 31, 1976

soon as possible so that the Minister may be fully aware of the impact of the changes.

(m) Minister of Human Resources Re: Per Capita Municipal
Share of Social Assistance Costs for 1976/77

A letter under date of May 21, 1976, was received concerning the per capita municipal share of social assistance costs for 1976/77. The following is the text of the Minister's letter:

"There appears to be some confusion regarding the per capita municipal share of social assistance costs for 1976/77. This letter is to explain the various points that appear to have led to this misunderstanding. If further information is required, I would be pleased to receive your inquiries.

Municipalities pay 10 per cent of the social assistance portion of the Department of Human Resources budget. This 10 per cent, for the sake of equity, is charged monthly on a per capita basis. It should be understood that because the percentage is fixed, but budgets vary annually, the per capita amount will also vary and, of course, is subject to increases.

This year's social assistance budget is up considerably due to inflation and several proposed, but quite necessary increases in benefits. Last year the \$1.30 per capita per month which had been estimated at the beginning of 1975/76, was found to be insufficient. In fact, for the latter part of the year, the Department of Human Resources was absorbing the additional costs normally charged to the Municipalities. This amount could, as in the past, properly have been charged to this year's per capita levy against municipalities. However, realizing the very difficult financial position of municipalities, it was agreed by the Department to absorb this amount -- approximately \$1.5 million. The new figure estimated in this fiscal year for the per capita levy is \$1.55.

In addition, most municipal jurisdictions in the Province have annually paid 60¢ per capita in lieu of administration costs for social service delivery. This year, instead of a separate billing system, we decided that we would add 5¢ per month and eliminate one administrative procedure.

There are eight of the larger municipalities in British Columbia that continue to totally administer social services. This has resulted in a very inequitable situation, in that these municipalities are paying as much as \$5.00 per capita annually as opposed to the 60¢ (5¢ per month) charged the remaining municipal jurisdictions in the Province.

Therefore, immediately following the adoption of the Department of Human Resources estimates by the Legislature, we will commence negotiations for the take-over of administration so that these remaining eight municipalities will also be charged only 5¢ per month per capita for administrative costs.

We look forward to the early conclusion of these negotiations without disruption of existing staff.

The costs to the Department of Human Resources for the \$1.5 million forgiveness, and our decision to assume administrative costs for the eight remaining municipalities, amounts to a sizeable expenditure from our budget. I believe these decisions demonstrate our desire to assume greater responsibility from the municipalities for the provision of social assistance. Given the inflationary pressure on the per capita rates and our Provincial financial constraints, we trust that our approach will meet with everyone's approval."

(n) Mayor T.W. Constable Re: Effect of Provincial Grants on
Municipal Budgets

Mayor T.W. Constable submitted a copy of a letter which he had written to the Premier of British Columbia, at Council's direction, expressing Council's concern with the fact that the Provincial Government's unconditional local grants and school grants have not kept pace with the inflation and the demand for increased services.

May 31, 1976

MOVED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:

"THAT a copy of Mayor T.W. Constable's letter to the Premier of British Columbia be forwarded to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(o) City Clerk, City of Vancouver Re: Still Creek

A letter under date of May 25, 1976 was received advising of the action taken by the Vancouver City Council with regard to Still Creek. The Vancouver City Council on May 18, 1976 had approved the following recommendations of the Standing Committee on Planning and Development:

- "(a) That the Greater Vancouver Sewer and Drainage District be requested to maintain an ongoing monitoring program on Still Creek in order to detect any significant changes in water quality;
- (b) That no further enclosures of Still Creek be permitted south of Grandview Highway;
- (c) That north of Grandview Highway, east of Cornett Road Still Creek be kept open where it is adjacent to a road or public access;
- (d) That north of Grandview Highway between Rupert Street and Cornett Road, where Still Creek flows through private properties, the owners be encouraged to keep the Creek open; if this is not possible, the Creek may be culverted and completely enclosed at the option of the owner;
- (e) That the City Engineer and the Greater Vancouver Sewer and Drainage District report back on the area north of Grandview Highway west of Rupert Street;
- (f) That the owners of the properties between Rupert Street and Cornett Road north of Grandview Highway be requested to co-operate in providing an easement for a finished right-of-way suitable for a bicycle trail."

(p) Eastburn Resident Planning Committee Re: Tree Planting Ceremony

A letter under date of May 26, 1976 was received inviting His Worship, The Mayor and members of Council to attend a tree planting ceremony in Eastburn Park on June 8, 1976, at 2:30 P.M.

T A B L E D M A T T E R S

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the Report of the Self Serve Service Station Committee be now lifted from the table."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The following are the recommendations contained in the Report of Self-Serve Service Station Committee as amended by Council at the Council Meeting of May 25, 1976:

- (a) That Council take no action at this time to limit the number of self serve service stations;
- (b) That the Director of Planning bring down a report to suggest a zoning category for self serve gas bars and split service gas and service outlets;
- (c) That the Director of Planning advise what changes have to be made to the existing zoning categories;
- (c) (1) That the Director of Planning submit a report suggesting possible uses for presently closed vacant service station sites;

May 31, 1976

- (d) That the Director of Planning advise Council what text amendments would be required and the timing required for public hearings;
- (e) That the Director of Planning keep Council informed of all applications to convert to or create self-serve service stations;
- (f) That the subject of self-serve gas stations should be reviewed by Council in April, 1977, or before if deemed necessary;
- (g) That a copy of this report be sent to all interested parties.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the recommendations of the Self-Serve Service Station Committee be adopted."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN AST:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT Recommendation (a) in the Report of the Self-Serve Service Station Committee be deleted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A vote was then taken on the original motion as moved by Alderman Stusiak and seconded by Alderman McLean "That the recommendations of the Self-Serve Service Station Committee be adopted as amended and same was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN AST:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT the Provincial Government be requested to take appropriate action to prohibit oil companies involved in the refining of petroleum products from marketing gasoline at the retail level."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN EMMOTT:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:

"THAT the foregoing motion be amended to read as follows:

'Because of the concern of this Council with the present marketing situation of gasoline, the Provincial Government be requested to consider the feasibility and practicability of prohibiting oil companies involved in the refining of petroleum products from marketing gasoline at the retail level'."

FOR: Mayor Constable, Aldermen Emmott,
Lawson, McLean, Randall and Stusiak
OPPOSED: Aldermen Ast, Drummond, Gunn

MOTION CARRIED.

A vote was then taken on the original motion as amended and CARRIED, Opposed Alderman Drummond.

I N Q U I R I E S

Alderman Stusiak

Alderman Stusiak stated that he would be introducing a Notice of Motion that Council petition the Provincial Government to amend the Municipal Act to provide for future School Board Budgets to be subject to review by Municipal Council.

Alderman Randall

Alderman Randall inquired as to the status of the report on smoking in retail outlets.
The Municipal Manager advised that he anticipated this report would be available on June 7, 1976.

May 31, 1976

Alderman Gunn

Alderman Gunn inquired as to why the final printing of the Annual Budget could not contain a summary of the action taken by Council with reference to the Budget.

It was agreed that such a summary be included in the final printing of future budgets.

Alderman Gunn inquired as to the current status of the bulldozing taking place in Confederation Park.

The Director of Planning advised that this matter was being investigated jointly by the Engineering and Planning Departments and that a report would be forthcoming in the near future.

Alderman Gunn inquired as to when the progress report on the Chevron Canada Ltd. expansion would be available.

The Director of Planning advised that a report on the Shell Oil expansion program would be available on June 17, 1976. The progress report on the Chevron expansion had been delayed somewhat by some debate on the landscaping proposal but this should be cleared in the immediate future and the progress report would follow.

Alderman Gunn was of the opinion that the Tax Notice currently in use was not satisfactory. Alderman Gunn recalled that this question had been referred to the Municipal Manager and he was interested in the Manager's findings in this respect. Aldermen Randall noted that the question of the Tax Bills had originally been raised by him. Alderman Randall stated that he had discussed this matter with the Manager and it had been indicated that there were one or two areas where changes would be made which would show the percentages in the Municipal and the School Board Increase.

Alderman Lawson

Alderman Lawson inquired if the Manager's Committee on the subject of motor vehicles and parks and trails had had the opportunity to see the changes that Surrey had made in their Municipal Bylaw. This information had been handed to Alderman Lawson this evening.

The Municipal Manager replied that he had not seen the material at this time.

Alderman Emmott

Alderman Emmott, in connection with Tax Bills, inquired if it would be possible to specify the cost of a Local Improvement.

The Municipal Manager replied that it may be possible to include this information in an insert which would accompany the Tax Bill.

Alderman Randall

Alderman Randall inquired as to the present status of the situation with regard to Noble Towing Ltd.

The Municipal Manager advised that he had received no written confirmation from Noble Towing Ltd. but it was the Manager's understanding that Noble's solicitor was favourable inclined to the Municipality's proposal and would be making a recommendation to the Company in the near future.

R E P O R T S

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

"THAT Council do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Municipal Manager presented Report No. 37, 1976 on the matters listed following as Items (1) to (14) either providing the information shown or recommending the courses of action indicated for the reasons given:

(1) Local Improvement Fund

This item was dealt with previously in the Meeting as Item 3(b) under Bylaws.

May 31, 1976

- (2) Tax Sale Monies Bulaw to Repay General Revenue Funds for Acquisition and Development of Land

This item was dealt with previously in the meeting as Item 3(a) under Bylaws.

- (3) Animal Control - Domestic Animals Protection Act

It was recommended that an application under Section 2(a) be made to the Minister of Agriculture requesting that the provisions of Section 8 of the Domestic Animals Protection Act be declared applicable in the Municipality of Burnaby.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

"THAT the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (4) 1975 Annual Report / Burnaby Detachment, Royal Canadian Mounted Police

The Municipal Manager submitted the 1975 Annual Report of the Burnaby Detachment Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In connection with this report the Municipal Manager had the following comments:

There are two statements in the report which require some clarification. The first appears in the last paragraph on page two in which reference is made to "an increase of only four police personnel being provided in 1976". When the annual report was being prepared, it was not possible to accurately project the number of civilian employees that would be provided for in the 1976 annual budget. The budget has now been approved by Council, and in addition to four policemen, the R.C.M.P. will be filling the following positions with civilian personnel this year:

<u>Number of</u> <u>Openings</u>	<u>Positions</u>
6	Telephone Complaint Takers
3	Counter Complaint Takers
1	Radio Operator
1	Parking Patrolman
1	File Room Clerk
<u>12</u>	

A further clarification concerns the fourth entry on page 23 which shows the total number of regular members to be as follows:

<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>
193	190

The 190 figure does not include 6 members of the "E" Squad who were transferred to the lower mainland district in April, 1975. This squad, which is funded by the Provincial Government, is primarily concerned with surveillance and the gathering of intelligence on a wide variety of matters throughout the Province, but particularly in the Greater Vancouver area. In order to establish a more realistic comparative relationship between the two figures, it would be appropriate to reduce the total in 1974 by 6 as follows:

<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>
187	190

This is for the information of Council.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the 1975 Annual Report of the Burnaby Detachment, Royal Canadian Mounted Police be received for information purposes."

615 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

May 31, 1976

- (5) Letter from the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Which Appeared on the Agenda for May 17, 1976 Meeting of Council Proposed Improvements to Bus Service in Burnaby

It was recommended:

1. That the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority be thanked for their mutually cooperative approach to reviewing transit serving Burnaby;
2. That Council concur with the service changes proposed by the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority;
3. That the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority be requested to consider the reallocation of the 16th Avenue loop to the vicinity of the Edmonds loop;
4. That British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority provide Burnaby with new schedules and bus route numbers as soon as these are available so that Burnaby citizens may be kept fully informed of improvements in bus services in Burnaby;
5. That British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority be sent a copy of this report.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN AST:

"THAT the recommendations of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:

"THAT Recommendation No. 3, aforementioned, of the Municipal Manager be amended to read as follows:

- "3. 'That this Council strongly recommend to the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority that the 16th Avenue Loop be re-located to the vicinity of the Edmonds Loop'."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A vote was then taken on the original motion as moved by Alderman McLean and Seconded by Alderman Ast "That the recommendations of the Municipal Manager be adopted", as amended, and same was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (6) Restrictive Covenant for Subdivision Reference #27/76

It was recommended that Council authorize the preparation and execution a covenant pursuant to Section 24A of the Land Registry Act which states that any dwelling located on Lot 306, D.L. 207, Plan (unregistered) N.W.D. will not be constructed closer than 7.7 feet from the westerly property line of Lot 305, D.L. 207, Plan (unregistered).

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

"THAT the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (7) Engineer's Special Estimate

It was recommended that the Special Estimate of the Municipal Engineer in the total amount of \$22,000.00 as more particularly detailed in the report received be approved.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

May 31, 1976

- (8) Letter Dated May 27, 1976 From the Burnaby Tennis Club
Covered Courts for Winter Play at the Burnaby Lake Sports Complex

This item was dealt with previously in the meeting as Item 2(a) under Delegations.

- (9) Information on Retirement of Mr. James Ellis

It was recommended that a letter of appreciation from Council be presented to Mr. James Ellis for his many years of loyal and dedicated service to the Municipality.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN AST:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN DRUMMOND:

"THAT the recommendation of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- (10) Letter from the Minister of Human Resources Per Capita Costs

This item was dealt with previously in the meeting as Item 4(m) under Correspondence and Petitions.

- (11) Letter from The Honourable Hugh A. Curtis, Which Appeared
on the Agenda for the May 25, 1976 Meeting of Council
Federal Provincial Municipal Incentive Grant Program

In a release dated May 14, 1976, Mr. Hugh A. Curtis the Minister of the Department of Housing announced that the Province has reached a satisfactory agreement with the Federal Government with regard to their Municipal Incentive Grants and that an additional \$500 grant has been approved by the Province.

The Federal/Provincial agreement covers three financial assistance programs:

- a) Assisted Home Ownership Program
 - i) \$750 provincial subsidy to qualifying buyers
 - ii) federal interest-reduction loan to qualifying buyers
 - iii) \$750 federal subsidy to qualifying buyers
- b) Assisted Rental Program
 - i) \$600 grant to builders (provincial)
 - ii) \$1,200 interest-free loan to builders (provincial)
 - iii) \$1,200 interest-free loan to builders (C.M.H.C.)
- c) Municipal Incentive Grant Program - for construction of medium-density, modest-size, affordable housing units.
 - i) \$500 provincial grant per housing unit for designated municipalities.
 - ii) \$1,000 federal grant per housing unit for designated municipalities.

The Information Circular outlines the terms of the Municipal Incentive Grant Program including the following:

- a) The applicable grant depends on the project density:
 - i) \$1,500 grant from CMHC and the Province
 - 10-45 units per net acre is required for lands that have been serviced for at least five years.
 - 10-30 units per net acre.
 - ii) \$500 grant from the Province only
 - 31-60 units per acre in core areas of larger urban centres.
- b) Eligible units must have a building permit dated between November 1, 1975 and December 31, 1978.

May 31, 1976

- c) The value of units will vary according to their type and size (i.e. Bachelor, 1-Bedroom, 3-Bedroom, etc.). For the Vancouver area the value ceiling is generally \$47,000. This value must include the total unit cost including building, land, legal closing costs, real estate fees, etc. Consequently the actual cost to the prospective eligible owner will be less than \$47,000 after the ownership grants are deducted.

From discussion with Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation (CMHC) the most appropriate manner of determining the unit value is to request a complete estimated unit valuation from the builder at the time of the release of the Preliminary Plan Approval/Building Permit with a further confirmation or clarification of this valuation at the time of the release of the occupancy permit. The builder's unit valuation would be evaluated and either confirmed or rejected by the CMHC staff as part of their application processing procedure.

- d) The maximum floor areas outlined in the program are virtually equal to the minimum Burnaby floor areas, and it appears, at this time, that there should be no operational problems in this regard. The CMHC maximum floor areas for apartments are generally computed according to inside wall surface dimensions and do not include unit stairwells down from the main living area, laundry areas, bulk storage areas, and utility/service areas.
- e) The first initial application for individual projects will be made by the Municipality to the Province at the time of the Preliminary Plan Approval/Building Permit which will enable the Province to budget for the eligible grants. After the occupancy permit has been released a formal full application would be submitted to CMHC for approval and the release of the grant funds.
- f) This Municipality will be designated by the Department of Housing as eligible for the grants after the appropriate resolution is passed by Council. Clarification was requested of the processing authorities whether the municipality was to be limited in the manner in which funds received from the Municipal Incentive Grant Program were to be utilized. It was explained that the resolution constitutes the general intent of the municipality to use the grant funds "to encourage and facilitate the production of housing". Therefore, the funds could be utilized for, among others, the provision of services and roads, land banking, parks acquisition, or any other purpose which can be reasoned to assist in the general opening up or creation of suitable residential communities and developments. Therefore, for the required resolution, it is advised that the wording suggested by the Department of Housing be utilized.

In addition, at the May 25, 1976 Council meeting a question was raised as to the relationship of the Municipal Incentive Grant Program to the adopted GVRD Livable Region Program. It appears that there is a conflict between the population goals of the Livable Region Program which encourages the increase in future population in central urban areas such as Vancouver, Burnaby, and New Westminster rather than in less developed ex-urban areas such as Surrey or Delta; and the probable development pattern promoted by the Municipal Grant Incentive Program which due to unit value and density limitations would encourage the construction of new residential developments in the outlying suburban areas where land values are less. It is our understanding that the City of Vancouver may be requesting some relaxation of the density limits so that the higher city land values can be sufficiently counteracted to allow for developments under the AHOP program to be developed economically within the city. The GVRD planning staff have been contacted. They have expressed their concern as to the effect of the program on the distribution of new residential development in the GVRD which is at variance with the Livable Region Program.

May 31, 1976

However, it is noted that the program was originally initiated by the Federal government. The program criteria have been established on a broad national basis and consequently, specific regional variances and situations have not been given particular attention. It would appear, at this point in time, that the density criteria are firmly established with no indication of any adjustments to the program in the near future.

In summary, the Planning Department in cooperation with other municipal departments will set up operational procedures to ensure that the necessary application is made for any eligible housing developments in Burnaby in order to obtain the funds made available by the Federal/Provincial program.

If it is the intention of specific developers to obtain the benefits of the AHOP program, it appears that, with careful consideration and design and discussion of a given project with the regulating CMHC staff, the standards of the AHOP program and of the Burnaby development requirements can be made to coincide. A review of rezoning proposals currently under consideration indicate that the following projects are intended to qualify within the established AHOP criteria.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Type of Project</u>	<u>Approximate Number Of Eligible Units</u>
Burnaby 200	Cluster	600
RZ #31/75	Townhouse	44
RZ #30/74	Townhouse	31
RZ #50/75	Cluster	58

The preceding information is subject to changing market conditions at the time of the construction of the projects, and approval by CMHC of a detailed application which requires an accurate detailed account of the construction and land costs, and other related costs.

It was recommended:

1. That Council agree to use the funds obtained from the Municipal Incentive Grant Program to encourage and facilitate the production of housing in Burnaby;
2. That the Minister of the Department of Housing be informed of the passage of this resolution.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT the recommendations of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(12) Letter dated May 20, 1976 from Block Bros. Ltd.
Lot 1, S.D. "A", Block 12, D.L. 85, Plan 7571
5092 Canada Way (Graham)

This item was dealt with previously in the meeting as Item 4(a) under Correspondence and Petitions.

(13) Royal Canadian Mounted Police Monthly Report

The Municipal Manager presented the Monthly Report of the Burnaby Detachment Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for the month of April 1976. In this connection the Municipal Manager submitted the following comments:

"With reference to the information on overtime as noted in the last paragraph of the report, it should be mentioned that the 3,139.5 figure is the time and one-half computation, i.e. actual hours overtime worked reverts to 2,092 hours.

If we take the Detachment's actual strength at month end which was:

May 31, 1976

187
x8 hrs. per day
= 1,496 hrs. per day for the Detachment
x22 working days in April (excluding 2 days off per week)
= 32,912 total hours.

Percentage of overtime worked of total hours by Detachment (rounded off to nearest "0"):

$\frac{2,090}{32,910} \times 100 = 6.4\%$

PLEASE NOTE: Of the 2,092 hours referred to, 1,088 hrs. are compensating hours for working statutory holidays in April, which leaves us with 1,004 overtime hours worked. This, then, puts the percentage at approximately 3.3%.

This is for the information of Council."

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the Monthly Report of the Burnaby Detachment, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for the month of April, 1976 be received for information purposes."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(14) Proposed Road Closure and Sale of Municipal Land
Subdivision Reference #52/76

It was recommended:

1. That Council authorize the introduction of a road closing bylaw for the lane right-of-way as shown on the subdivision plans subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) payment of \$4,042.50 or \$1.75 per square foot to Burnaby for the closed right-of-way;
 - (b) consolidation with the adjacent Lots 1, 2, and 3;
 - (c) provision of an easement in favour of Burnaby for storm and sanitary sewers over the closed right-of-way;
 - (d) submission of the requisite bylaw plans and subdivision plans by the developer;
2. That Council authorize the sale of that 27 foot parcel of Municipal land as shown on the subdivision plans subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) payment of \$10,867.00 or \$3.50 per square foot to Burnaby;
 - (b) consolidation with Lot 3;
 - (c) submission of the requisite subdivision plan by the developer.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN RANDALL:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

"THAT the recommendations of the Municipal Manager be adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

MOVED BY ALDERMAN GUNN:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN AST:

"THAT this Council go on record with the Greater Vancouver Regional District that it wishes to be an objector to the Pollution Control Permits for Shell Oil Limited, Imperial Oil Limited and Gulf Oil Canada Limited."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN LAWSON:

SECONDED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:

May 31, 1976

"THAT an invitation be extended to the Lower Mainland Municipal Association to hold a meeting in Burnaby. The invitation is to be issued at the first meeting of the Association subsequent to the Association's meeting on June 17, 1976."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the Committee now rise and report."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Council reconvened.

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT the report of the Committee be now adopted."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED BY ALDERMAN STUSIAK:
SECONDED BY ALDERMAN McLEAN:

"THAT Council do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole 'In Camera'."

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY