RE: LETTER FROM MRS. SHANTI DEO WHICH APPEARED ON THE AGENDA FOR THE 1980
JUNE 02 MEETING OF COUNCIL (ITEM 4h)
(a) DEVELOPMENT OF A PROPERTY AT 4858 BUXTON STREET
(b) SPEED BUMPS
(c) DAMAGE TO FENCING

The following report from the Chief Building Inspector and the attached report from the Municipal Engineer contain information on matters that were the subject of a letter from Mrs. Shanti Deo which Council received on June 02.

## RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT a copy of this report be sent to Mrs. Shanti Deo, 4861 Sardis Street, Burnaby, B.C. V5H $1 \mathrm{L4}$.

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

1980 JUNE 02

FROM: CHIEF BUILDING INSPECTOR
RE: SECTION 4858 BUXTON ST. LOT 20, BLOCK 13, DISTRICT LOT 32, PLAN 1667

## RECOMMENDATION:

That this report be received by Council for information and that a copy be forwarded to (Mrs.) Shanti Deo of 4861 Sardis St. Burnaby, B.C.

## REPORT:

Building permit B-48226 was issued 1980 March 11 for the construction on the subject property of a two storey single family dwelling consisting of an unfinished basement with a double garage, a large ( $2338 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) first floor containing a living/dining area, kitchen, family room, laundry, two bedrooms and two sets of plumbing; and a second floor (1267 sq. ft.) with four bedrooms with three sets of plumbing. The height of the building is approximately $27 \frac{1}{2}$ feet from grade to ridge which is below the present acceptable maximum of 32.12 feet and well below the acceptable maximum at the time of application which was 34.45 ft . The lot coverage of approximately $28 \%$ is well below the maximum allowable of 40\%.

In all respects the proposed dwelling meets the requirements of the Burnaby Zoning Bylaw and on this basis the application was approved and the building permit issued. There is no provision in municipal legislation for the protection of vistas from adjacent properties.
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## RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the above report be sent to Mrs. Shanty Neo of 4861 Sardis Street, Burnaby, B.C., V5H lL.

## REPORT

In responding to the submission from Mrs. Shanti Dea dated 1980 May 23 we will be commenting on Items 2 and 3 only:
2. In regard to the placement of speed bumps in Municipal lanes, the Municipal Council established a policy some years ago whereby residents adjacent any lane could have speed bumps installed by the Municipality if they were prepared to pay for the costs of the installation. Mrs. Dea contacted our Department and was advised of the procedure to obtain speed bumps.
3. The fence referred to in the submission consists of 4 " $x 4 "$ wooden posts with connecting $2 " \mathrm{x} 4$ " stringers top and bottom. At one time the fence area was covered with chicken wire, however there now only remains a few rusted strands. The majority of the fence adjacent the rear and side lanes is fully open between the $4^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime}$ posts. The section of the fence framing at the lane junction is broken down and could have been struck by vehicles.

As noted on the attached sketch the lane allowance is only 16 feet, four feet less than the normal lane. Should the owner rebuild the fence it would be advisable to truncate the corner to avoid future damage from turning vehicles.

To answer the question related to liability for damage to the fence we would say this is a matter between the owner and the persons damaging the fence. The Municipality can only accept responsibility when such damage is caused by a Municipal vehicle.
$\mathrm{HB} / \mathrm{Ch}$


Att.
c.c. ( ) Traffic Supervisor


