

Re: KASK BROTHERS READY MIXED CONCRETE LTD.
PROPOSED CONVEYOR SYSTEM

ITEM	22
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	7
COUNCIL MEETING	Jan. 31/77

On December 6, 1976, Council under delegations heard from Mr. Arnold F.C. Hean on behalf of his client, Kask Brothers Ready Mixed Concrete Ltd. Council on this occasion also considered a report (Item 20, Report No. 80 dated December 13, 1976) and adopted the following two recommendations:

- "1. The recommendations made by the Planning Director be tabled, and
2. The Planning Director be asked to undertake a review of the future use and zoning if the Kask Bros. property."

Council then passed the following motion:

"THAT the subject matter be referred to the Municipal Manager for discussion in reference to the ramifications of the proposal with the principals of Kask Bros. Ready Mix Ltd. with same to be brought back as soon as possible."

Council on December 20, 1976 during inquiries directed that the Parks and Recreation Commission be supplied with all reports and information available on the proposed conveyor system of Kask Bros. Ready Mixed Concrete Ltd. and that the Commission be requested to review this material and submit a report on same to Council.

Although on December 13, 1976, the Municipal Council directed that this subject matter be referred to the Municipal Manager for discussion with the principals of Kask Bros. Ready Mixed Concrete Ltd., on December 20, the Council directed that the Parks and Recreation Commission be asked to review this material and report on it. Because of the work load in the Municipal Manager's office recently plus the fact that the Director of Planning's report was received in the Manager's office on January 17, 1977 plus the fact that the Parks and Recreation Commission's report was received in the Manager's office on January 27, 1977 and finally because of the direction of Council to bring a report back as soon as possible, the Municipal Manager has not had the opportunity to meet with the principals of Kask Bros. Ready Mixed Concrete Ltd. If this meeting is still required by the Municipal Council in light of the information that is attached, then the material should be referred back to the Municipal Manager. This does not however seem necessary under the circumstances.

Attached for the information of Council is a report from the Director of Planning dated January 12, 1977, which is an information report, but in which he advises that his department's position is still the same; i.e. that the request to construct an underground conveyor through the Municipal park land be denied.

Also attached is a copy of the report dated January 27, 1977 from the Parks and Recreation Administrator which basically recommends that the Municipal Council approve of the request to construct an underground conveyor system subject to an appropriate fee being negotiated by the Land Agent and the restoration by the applicant of any disturbed areas. The report goes on to recommend that consideration be given to making the installation contingent upon the acceptance of an appropriate zoning designation that would allow the Corporation more control should the company wish to change its operation at some future date.

The Municipal Manager has reviewed both of these reports and is of the opinion that this matter should be considered in the following stages:

1. Whether or not to permit the conveyor.

2. If the decision is to permit the conveyor, then the area involved must be rezoned, and hence must go to a public hearing.
3. If the matter of the rezoning to permit the conveyor is approved at the public hearing and subsequently enacted by Council, then consideration should be given to the rezoning of the Kask Bros. site to a CD type of zoning in order to ensure future compatability with the adjacent park areas.

This is a rather complex problem, and it is recommended that the next step to be taken is to refer the matter of the rezoning to a public hearing prior to Council making a final decision. If it does not survive the public hearing, there is probably little need to address ourselves to the question of a CD zoning for the Kask Bros. Site just now.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT a further report be prepared leading to the preparation of a rezoning by-law for the rezoning of the appropriate park land from Park and Public Use District (P3) to Comprehensive Development District (CD); and
2. THAT the subject rezoning be advanced to a Public Hearing on April 19, 1977.

* * * *

ITEM	22
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	7
COUNCIL MEETING	Jan. 31/77

Planning Department
January 12, 1977

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER
FROM: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING
RE: KASK BROS. READY MIXED CONCRETE LIMITED-BARNET HIGHWAY FACILITY

A. BACKGROUND

At its meeting of December 13, 1976, the Municipal Council gave consideration to Item 20, Manager's Report No. 80, concerned with a proposed conveyer system associated with the Kask Bros. Ready Mixed Concrete facility. Council at that time adopted the following:

1. That the recommendations made by the Director of Planning be tabled.
2. That the subject matter be referred to the Municipal Manager for discussion in reference to the ramifications of the proposal with the principals of Kask Bros. Ready Mix Ltd.
3. That the Planning Director be asked to undertake a review of the future use and zoning of the Kask Bros. property.

B. THE EASTERN BURRARD INLET DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

The Eastern Burrard Inlet Development Concept adopted by Council on October 22, 1973 was formulated on the following three primary study objectives:

1. To provide for continuous pedestrian foreshore access.

2. To ensure that the expenditure of currently available funds best preserves certain strategic holdings and provides for the immediate establishment of a recreational core from which programmed expansions can occur.
3. To ensure that adjacent land uses are compatible with the foreshore and marine park concepts.

With respect to the Kask Bros. Ready Mix plant at 7500 Barnet Highway consideration was given at the time of the concept preparation to the possible public acquisition of the site. However, it was felt that available funds would be better applied to more strategic foreshore properties. In addition, as was outlined in the 1973 concept report, the Kask operation in its existing state and location was not considered to be a major detraction to the proposed marine park system. Consequently, no recommendation was ever advanced for the acquisition of the Kask property. Rather, it was recommended and adopted by Council that any proposed change in the type or intensity of its land use be reviewed with reference to the objectives of the 1973 concept report.

The recent submission by Kask Bros. Ltd. requesting permission to construct an underground aggregate conveyer through Municipal parklands has resulted in Council directing staff to obtain additional information relative to the Kask Bros. operations as a basis for the review of the Kask property at 7500 Barnet Highway. This information is as follows:

I. EXISTING OPERATIONS

1. What is the source of the aggregate material?

Materials are brought in from Sechelt by barge by Rivtow Straits Ltd. and deposited at former Kapoor property for sorting and storage.

2. What is the volume and frequency of the delivery of the aggregate materials?

On average, one barge containing approximately 5,000 tons of aggregate material per week.

3. What volume of aggregate material is brought in from the former Kapoor site each day?

Four trucks each with a capacity of 12 cubic yards on average undertake approximately 15 trips per day, giving a total volume of 720 cubic yards. The maximum number of truckloads undertaken by any one vehicle is about 30 trips.

4. On average, how much material is stockpiled at the former Kapoor property at any one time?

Approximately 2 barge loads or 10,000 tons.

5. On average what is the total volume of the various materials stockpiled at the Kask Bros. property at 7500 Barnet Highway?

Three barge loads or approximately 15,000 tons. This also represents the maximum present storage capacity of the Kask property.
6. What percentage of the various materials are used in the ready mix operation as opposed to aggregate sales?

Approximately 95%.
7. What is the existing capacity of the ready mix plant?

Kask Bros. have indicated that the capacity of their plant is sufficient to supply any project within their market area.
8. What is the average ready mix output from the plant?

Under normal circumstances approximately 500 cubic yards per day. However, on occasion, output has been as high as 1,000 cubic yards per day.
9. How many ready mix trucks does Kask Bros. operate?

Twenty-five trucks of various sizes.
10. On average how many round trips per day does each ready mix truck make?

Approximately four per day.
11. How many people are employed with Kask Bros. Ready Mixed Concrete Limited?

Approximately 50 people.
12. What is the predominant market area for the ready mix operation?

The majority of the business is conducted within a ten mile radius of the plant. However, Kask Bros. has a concrete supply contract with the City of Vancouver which extends their market for this aspect west to the University Endowment Lands.
13. What would be the alternate source of raw material assuming that the conveyer proposal were not approved?

To be trucked in from Lafarge facilities either in North Vancouver or Leeder Avenue in Coquitlam.

II. CONVEYER PROPOSAL

182

1. What is the size and capacity of the proposed aggregate conveyer?

A 30" wide belt conveyer which runs between 250 and 300 feet per minute with a capacity of 500 tons per hour. It was explained that this capacity is required to unload a 5000 ton barge in 8-10 hours.

2. What is the projected cost of the conveyer installation?

In the order of \$500,000.

3. What would be the approximate additional cost of trucking in aggregate as opposed to receiving materials from a conveyer system.

Approximately \$1.00 per ton (assuming retail purchase of materials). This equates to a cost increase of approximately \$1.50 per cubic yard of finished concrete.

4. Have detailed engineering drawings been prepared and related to specific site conditions?

Only preliminary conceptual drawings have been prepared.

5. In the event the conveyer were installed, would Kask Bros. Ltd. wholesale or retail aggregate materials from the Barnet plant?

No.

6. Are there any plans to increase production and/or add additional hoppers following the installation of the proposed conveyer system should this be approved?

Not at the present time. However, Kask Bros. indicated that the growth and development of the business would directly relate to future demand for the products and services of the business which could increase over time.

C. PRESENT AND FUTURE USE AND ZONING OF PROPERTY

In the considerations surrounding the Kask Bros. proposals, there has never been a disagreement by this department that the services provided by a ready mix operation are both appropriate and of value within an urban area such as Burnaby. What has been of issue in this particular instance is the scale, location and method of raw material input. In the development concept, the continued use of this operation at an appropriate scale has been recognized and incorporated within the plans for the area.

Following a review of the Kask Bros. facility relative to the development concept objectives, Planning Department staff are still in agreement with the opinion stated in the 1973 concept report that the existing use and zoning is appropriate given its established presence, setting, and general level of intensity and the park acquisition and development priorities for the area. However, should Kask Bros. Ready Mixed Concrete Ltd. at some-time in the future voluntarily relocate from their property, the Planning Department considers at this point that the most appropriate action would then be to rezone the property to an industrial category providing a range of uses considered more compatible with the adjacent park area (e.g. M5 zoning). Alternately, should the company at some future date wish to substantially expand or change its operations, then the Municipality should apply appropriate zoning control (i.e. CD zoning) to ensure compatibility with the adjacent park areas.

While the particular existing use associated with the Kask operation is considered suitable for the site, Planning Department opposition to the various conveyer proposals submitted by Kask Bros. has been consistently based upon the following:

1. the direct conflict of the siting of the floating conveyer works with the proposed foreshore development;
2. the required rezoning of parkland to accommodate the industrial installations;
3. a potential intensification of industrial activity at the site resulting from the conveyer installation that could well lead to a corresponding intensification of its general incompatibility with the adjacent park areas.

While the current proposal to move the conveyer to the west has somewhat alleviated the first concern, this department still has objections to Item 2, and following a meeting with Kask Bros. representatives on January 7, 1977 also has strong reservations with respect to Item 3. With respect to Item 3, it is difficult to establish a finite level at which point incompatibility would significantly detract from the adjacent Marine Park System. Relative to this, the Kask Bros. representatives have indicated that they have no immediate plans to expand their operations as a result of the proposed conveyer system. Kask Bros. cannot guarantee this beyond the foreseeable future as the growth and development of their business would directly relate to a future demand for their products and services. It is this expansion potential and intensification of related activities together with the stated objection to Item 2 above, that is the basis for this department's position that the request to construct an underground conveyer through Municipal parkland be denied.

This report item is submitted for the information of Council.


A. L. Parr
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

JSB:BL/dm
cc Parks and Recreation Administrator

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER
FROM: PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATOR
RE: KASK BROS. READY-MIX CONCRETE LIMITED -
BARNET HIGHWAY FACILITY

JANUARY 27, 1977

At its meeting of January 26, 1977, the Parks and Recreation Commission was advised that the Municipal Council, on December 20, 1976, had directed the Municipal Manager to report further on the subject of an underground conveyor from the Transmountain waterlot through portions of the Phillips Avenue right-of-way to their property at 7500 Barnet Highway. He was also directed to obtain input from the Parks and Recreation Commission.

A copy of a report prepared by the Director of Planning dated January 12, 1977, was submitted to the Commission. The Parks and Recreation staff have reviewed this matter and reached the conclusion that the existing concrete operation and the installation of an underground conveyor belt along the Phillips Avenue alignment will not be detrimental to the use of the foreshore park once it is developed. The proposal that it is incompatible is generally based upon the existence of noise, visual and dust pollution. It is argued that these factors will reduce the enjoyment of the park by park users.

Whilst it is impossible to refute this argument categorically and say that it will not reduce the enjoyment of park users, in the staff's opinion, the effects will be such that it will be of no consequence to park users and, therefore, it will not detract in any appreciable way from their enjoyment of the foreshore park. The area of park immediately fronting the Ready-Mix Concrete plant is devoted to trail use - hiking trails, pedestrian walks and bicycle paths.

cont'd.....