

TO: CITY MANAGER **DATE:** 2001 06 04
FROM: DIRECTOR ENGINEERING **FILE:** 70-01-01
**SUBJECT: CORRESPONDENCE FROM MR. DICKINSON-STARKEY OF
4673 PENDER STREET**
PURPOSE: To respond to concerns regarding local improvements cost sharing.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. **THAT** a copy of this report be sent to Mr. Dickinson-Starkey of 4673 Pender Street, Burnaby, B.C.

R E P O R T

1.0 INTRODUCTION

At its meeting of 2001 June 04 Council received correspondence from Mr. Dickinson-Starkey of 4673 Pender Street. Mr. Dickinson-Starkey was concerned about the scarcity of local improvements (LIP) in the north Burnaby area and more specifically the cost-sharing formula utilised by the City for the LIP program. This report responds to those concerns.

2.0 BACKGROUND TO LIP

The Local Government Act prescribes that Council may, by bylaw, direct certain types of work be undertaken as local improvements. In Burnaby, however, local improvements have been limited to:

- Roadworks (pavements and sidewalks) including lanes
- Street lighting
- Traffic calming measures

The LIP program responds largely to property owner requests for improvements, but may also include projects initiated by the City where there are concerns for traffic and pedestrian safety or maintenance considerations. City initiated projects are generally collector streets compiled from Council requests and staff recommendations. Collector streets are an important component of the Transportation Network and since no other source of funding is available for widening and upgrading, the LIP program has been invaluable in bringing them up to urban standard with curbs and gutter, boulevard trees, sidewalks and streetlights.

Streets that are candidates for upgrading typically have aging interim strip pavements, gravel road shoulders, ditches and culverts for storm drainage. A LIP project would typically provide proper storm drainage facilities, eliminate gravel shoulders and ditches, and rehabilitate the asphalt pavement.

Under the Local Government Act, local improvements may be undertaken on the initiative of Council or by petition from abutting owners. The essential difference between the "Initiative" and "Petition" method is that the former is regarded as a Council endeavour that seeks the approval of property owners; whereas, the "Petition" method places the onus on citizens to obtain the requisite approvals from within the neighbouring community. Council have previously endorsed the "Petition" method for local improvements in Burnaby as it stimulates public participation in the approval process and is likely to more accurately reflect the wishes of the community.

The cost impact of a LIP program is broken into two components:

- Property Owner Share
- City Share

For roadworks, abutting property owners are charged 50% of the cost of constructing a standard 8.5m (28-foot) local residential street. The City pays the remaining 50% plus the costs of storm sewers and any construction greater than the basic 8.5m width. On average, the City's share represents 65 - 75% of the overall construction cost depending on the mix of streets within the program.

3.0 DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

The LIP process is an integral component of the City's infrastructure renewal and upgrading program. Procedures have been refined, within constraints of the Local Government Act, to encourage citizen participation and increase the program's effectiveness in meeting community needs. Perusal of LIP construction history in Burnaby since the early 1960's suggest that most finished streets in established residential areas were upgraded through the LIP process and cost shared with abutting owners. The City is a significant contributor to the LIP both in terms of co-sharing capital costs and, in most cases "carrying" the residents' share (majority of property owners prefer annual charges rather than a lump sum payment).

Mr. Dickinson-Starkey's suggestion that the City alters the cost sharing formula, with presumably some unstated reduction in the current 50% apportioned to abutting owners (with a corresponding increase in the City's share), would disadvantage property owners who have paid or are continuing to pay for local improvements on their street.

Local improvements are funded through the capital budget and are prioritized with other capital improvement projects. Budget constraints have, unfortunately, necessitated a suspension of LIPs over the past year. There are currently twenty-one request on file, not including Mr. Dickinson-Starkey's, for road improvements. As property owners request are dealt with on a "first come, first served" basis, the likelihood of improvements in the 4600 block Pender Street without undue delay is very much dependent on the adoption of the next year's capital program.

Staff have been in touch with Mr. Dickinson-Starkey and have discussed the contents of this report with him.



W.C. Sinclair, P. Eng.
DIRECTOR ENGINEERING

AAS:

cc: Director Planning & Building

