

RE: LOCAL IMPROVEMENT STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 1980
 (ITEM 7, REPORT NO. 39, 1980 MAY 26)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the recommendations contained in Item 7, Report No. 39, 1980 May 26, be adopted; and
2. THAT this initiative make provision for an alternate standard as described in the report.

REPORT

The attached report appeared on the Council agenda of 1980 May 26 and was withdrawn because a number of questions had not been addressed.

The report came forward as a result of a resolution of Council of 1979 September 04 which read:

"THAT Kensington Avenue be placed on the Local Improvement Program for 1980 in order that it may reflect a 36' pavement width".

The underlined words are significant and it is assumed that this standard will prevail even though the matter of the overpass of the Burlington Northern Railway is currently under review.

The report has been brought down to reflect the most cost effective standards of work and the guidelines for standards for street works approved by the C.I.P. Committee, and has not addressed itself to the interpretation of the standards considered by the Planning Department to be appropriate to the project. With today's high costs, local improvements receive critical attention by owners in residential areas and many of them fail. Kensington is in a particularly sensitive neighbourhood and the feeling is that some input as to the standard desired should be received from the benefiting owners.

The cost report shows a total cost of \$520,000. This would be increased to \$674,000 if separated sidewalks were substituted for curbswalks. Separate walks ordinarily cost more than curbswalks. However, much of the extra cost in this case is due to the fact that much of the fronting property on the east side of the street is in embankments requiring a cut and retaining walls, and attendant problems with connecting residential sidewalks and driveways. Nevertheless, if the extra cost is not a consideration there is no engineering reason why this work could not be done. The pattern of sidewalks in the neighbourhood is curbswalk. However, there are no curb returns on Kensington to complicate matters. There are, however, a number of trees and shrubs that would have to be removed.

Attached is a report from the Planning Director which recommends that streets such as Kensington (collectors) continue to conform with Municipal standards, and in this particular situation consideration should be given to placing separated walks on the west side of the street and curbswalks only on the east side (such a configuration exists on Sperling north of Halifax). This would add approximately \$62,000 to the cost.

In the matter of getting input from the property owners, there are two methods that may be used:

1. By questionnaire - this was tried a number of years ago with mixed results. It was not considered satisfactory.
2. The process currently used is to indicate on the information sheet going forward with the initiative that in the event the majority of the owners petition against a proposed work and indicate that the reason for the opposing petition is because they want some other type of work, and providing that the proposed alternate work is compatible with the design requirements of that particular location they may, on request to the Municipal Clerk, be supplied with a petition form drawn pursuant to Section 658 of the Municipal Act whereupon, on receipt of a sufficient petition, Council would consider whether or not to authorize the work.

This process has come into play on a number of occasions, mostly where curbs only were desired in place of curbwalks. The annual charge for curbs is slightly lower than for curbwalks. Usually, though, the request comes about because of topography. Another example is that in the program currently before the property owners, owners on Malvern between Imperial and Burriss have petitioned against the project because it called for a separated walk matching an existing separated walk on the west side of Malvern between Imperial and Morley. The balance of the project called for curbwalks.

In the case in point, this process could be varied by stipulating that if the owners desired separated sidewalks, their petition against the work would so stipulate and that on receipt of sufficient petitions against the work bearing such a notation, Council would re-initiate the works to call for separated walks. Council's policy is that projects for separated walks be charged at the same rate per foot as projects calling for curbwalks.

The Planner has suggested that a compromise of separated sidewalks on the west side and curbwalks on the east side might be acceptable in this instance. Council may wish to consider this alternative.

After viewing the properties concerned and the written material of the two departments, your Acting Municipal Manager has concluded that the project should be initiated for 11m pavement on Kensington, Union to Broadway; curbs both sides with 1.5m abutting sidewalk on east side, Union to Napier; 1.5m curbwalks both sides, Napier to Broadway, storm sewers and trees as required, and that the owners be given the opportunity to opt for separated sidewalks in the manner described in the report. The Municipal Engineer is of the opinion that there is no cost benefit to placing separated sidewalks on the west side of the street and curbwalks on the east side. This is a matter of "aesthetics and safety for pedestrians" and must be weighed on its merits.

* * * * *

cc: Director of Planning
Municipal Engineer

ITEM	18
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	44
COUNCIL MEETING	1980 06 23



INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

RECEIVED
1980 JUN 11

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

DEPARTMENT:

DATE: 80 06 11

FROM: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

DEPARTMENT:

MUNICIPAL MANAGER'S
OFFICE

OUR FILE # 08.640-
08.617/05.300

SUBJECT: PROVISION OF SIDEWALKS ALONG MAJOR COLLECTORS - KENSINGTON

YOUR FILE #

It is clear that, in developed areas, sidewalks should be provided on both sides of all streets except for minor residential streets, such as cul-de-sacs, which carry a very limited amount of traffic.

However, there is no universally accepted design standard for sidewalks. Curb walks - where the sidewalk is built adjacent and integrated with the curb line - are clearly cheaper to construct. On the other hand, separated sidewalks - where there is a span of boulevard between the curb and the sidewalk - are generally considered more desirable because:

1. There is greater separation between pedestrian and vehicular traffic with consequent improvements to pedestrian safety and the environment for the pedestrian.
2. The boulevard offers an opportunity for landscaping and tree planting which results in a streetscape that is more pleasant for pedestrians, adjacent residents and vehicular traffic.

Thus, on roads which carry a significant amount of pedestrian as well as vehicular traffic such as collector streets our policy is to provide separated sidewalks. Quite often the extra cost (relative to curbswalks) indicated for separated sidewalks results from the desire to maintain a constant roadway/sidewalk cross section regardless of terrain, utility lines, etc. However, the cost of separated sidewalks can be minimized by judicious and sensitive design allowing the footway to vary in vertical elevation to accommodate the existing terrain and in horizontal alignment to accommodate existing landscaping, utility lines, etc. This flexible approach to the design of separated sidewalks would not only tend to minimize their cost, but also to maximize the 'livability' of the street environment for all users.

Accordingly, we recommend that local improvements for streets such as Kensington continue to conform to Municipal Standards requiring separated sidewalks, but that a flexible approach be taken in the design. Thus, along the west side of Kensington, for example, the existing chip walk could be integrated into the design to provide for a separated sidewalk; whilst, in other areas, existing landscaping or other constraints may entail a curb sidewalk.


A. L. PARR
Director of Planning

PL:lf

ITEM	18
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	44
COUNCIL MEETING	1980 06 23

ITEM	7
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	39
COUNCIL MEETING	1980 05 26

RE: LOCAL IMPROVEMENT STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 1980 (cont'd)

The following is a report from the Municipal Treasurer re the above.

167

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT the recommendations of the Municipal Treasurer be adopted.

* * * * *

1980 May 21
File: 152-8

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

FROM: MUNICIPAL TREASURER

RE: LOCAL IMPROVEMENT STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 1980 (cont'd)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1980, By-law No. 7479, be amended to include the works shown in this report; and
2. THAT Council approve the cost report contained in this report; and
3. THAT the Municipal Clerk be instructed to initiate the program shown in this report.

REPORT

On 1979 September 04, in connection with a number of highway matters brought forward by the Transportation Committee, Council passed the following resolution:

"THAT Kensington Avenue be placed on the Local Improvement Program for 1980 in order that it may reflect a 36' pavement width."

The following information pursuant to Section 601 of the Municipal Act is required to be placed before Council before the initiatives for the work may proceed.

Location and type of work	11m pavement on Kensington, Union to Broadway, curbs both sides with 1.5m abutting sidewalk on east side, Union to Napier; 1.5m curbswalks both sides, Napier to Broadway, storm sewers and trees as required.
Length	1,665m
Taxable foot frontage	4,158.38'
Actual foot frontage	8,568.76'
Estimated cost	\$ 520,000.00
Owners' estimated cost:	
Projects with sidewalks	107,583.23
Projects with no sidewalks	6,879.02
Corporation's share	405,537.75
Frontage tax:	
Paving and curbswalks	3.73
Paving and curbing	3.27
Estimated lifetime of works	20 years
Number of years of levy	15 years

Analysis of Costs

Cost to owners of 8.5m pavement, curbing or curbswalks	\$ 114,462.25
Cost to Corporation for:	
Street width in excess of 8.5m and exempt frontages	312,107.75
Storm sewers	76,780.00
Trees	16,650.00
	<u>\$ 520,000.00</u>

ITEM	18
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	44
COUNCIL MEETING	1980 06 23

ITEM	7
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	39
COUNCIL MEETING	1980 05 26

In this connection it will be necessary to amend Burnaby Local Improvement Charges By-law 1980, By-law No. 7479, to provide the following in Schedule "A" thereof:

- 25. 11m pavement with 1.5 curbside on both sides of a designated length of a street, and curbing on both sides of the street with abutting 1.5m sidewalks on one side of the street in the remaining length of the street.

Annual charge per taxable front foot	Number of annual installments
\$ 3.27 curb side	15
3.73 walk side	15

It will be noted that while the work is described in metrics, the front-ages are still in imperial measurements. This is for the reason that our conversion to metric mapping is not yet complete.

For projects requiring long term financing, Council has directed that a statement showing the current debt picture of the Municipality, together with a projection to include the requirements of the new project, be brought down. The difficulty in providing this information is that it is a year or two before the impact of new borrowing affects the tax levy. The reason for this is that the money is borrowed six months to a year following the date of passage of the authority to borrow, and the first year's payment may only be a six months' interest charge, rather than a full year's principal and interest charge. Nevertheless, statements can be drawn to indicate what the effect of new borrowing would be if the current year's operations had to bear the full cost of the carrying charges of the debt to be created.

The following is such a statement as it affects the local improvement debt shown above:

Total general purposes debt to 1979 December 31 (Note 1)	\$37,347,840
Add: approved debt pending financing	2,606,575
1980 local improvement initiatives pending approval of property owners	3,912,000
Local improvement initiative per this report, inclusive of provision for discount on sale of bonds	525,000
Gross debt, if all initiatives are approved	\$44,391,415

	Corporation's Share	Owners' Share
Debt carrying charges:		
On debt as of 1979 December 31	\$4,805,386	\$1,014,781
On approved debt pending financing	281,977	-
On 1980 local improvement program above	365,668	224,119
On local improvement program per this report	61,150	17,247
	<u>\$5,514,181</u>	<u>\$1,256,147</u>

Note 1 Debt payable in U.S. dollars has been reflected on the basis that \$1 U.S. equals \$1 Canadian.

Debt payable in U.S. dollars is	\$10,238,383
The rate of exchange at 1980 May 09	\$1.1855
The Canadian dollar equivalent of U.S. dollar debt is	\$12,137,603

ITEM	18	ITEM	7
MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	44	MANAGER'S REPORT NO.	39
COUNCIL MEETING	1980 06 23	COUNCIL MEETING	1980 05 26

- 3 -

169

The above statement shows an increase in the Corporation's share of the annual carrying charges due to new local improvement projects of \$426,818. If 50% of the initiatives pass, the annual cost to the Corporation would be \$213,409, which represents .317 mills in taxation at 1980 rates.

B. D. Hays
MUNICIPAL TREASURER

BM:gw

cc: Municipal Solicitor
Municipal Clerk
Municipal Engineer