

A G E N D A

For Regular Meeting of Red Deer City Council to be held in the
Council Chambers, City Hall, on Monday, April 29th, 1963 at 4.15 p.m.

1. Present:

Confirmation of minutes of Regular & Closed meeting of April 15th, 1963 and
minutes of Special Meeting of April 17th, 1963.

2. Unfinished Business:

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Rezoning Pt. of S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ 29-38-27-W4 - Red Deer Health Unit Report	1.
2. Re: Resolution - Milk Distributors - Purity Dairy	1-2.
3. R.C.M.P. March 1963 Report - Complaints.	3.
4. 40A Avenue Sanitary Sewer Report	3.
5. Sewage Grinders at P.T.S. & Deerhome	3-5.

3. Reports:

1. Tender - $1\frac{1}{2}$ Ton Truck	6.
2. Tender $3\frac{1}{2}$ Ton Pickups	6.
3. Court of Revision - 1963 Frontages	7.
4. Tenders - Tractor-Backhoe Loader	7.
5. Home Occupation Applications	8.
6. Finance Committee Recommendations	8.

4. Written Enquiries:

5. Correspondence:

1. R.D. Twilight Homes Foundation.	Letter of thanks re Grant	9.
2. Murphy, Armstrong & Beames	New Era Development vs City of Red Deer	9.
3. Jay's Taxi	2 Additional Parking Stalls	10.
4. R.D.D.P. Commission	Comments on Planning Act	10-11.
5. Recreation Board	Appointment of 2 new members	12.
6. R.D. Health Unit	Supplementary Budget for 1963/1964	12-14.
7. Haddin, Davis & Brown	1963 Utility Construction Tenders	14.
8. Mr. & Mrs. Giesbrecht	Application for rezoning Lots 39 & 40, Plan 6269 A.F. West Park	15.

6. Petitions or Delegations:

7. By-laws:

- No. 2011N. Zoning By-law amendment - 1st Reading.
No. 2147. Special Frontage Assessment - 2nd & 3rd Readings.

8. Monthly Reports & Minutes:

1. R.D.D.P. Commission Subdivision Committee minutes - April 3rd, 1963.
2. R.D.D.P. Commission Minutes - March 18th, 1963.
3. Social Service Dept. - Quarterly Report January-March 1963.
4. Red Deer Recreation Board Minutes - April 3rd, 1963.

9. Notices of Motion:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:No. 1.

No. 9 (Red Deer) Health Unit.

April 23, 1963.

Mr. R. Stollings,
City Clerk,
City Hall,
Red Deer, Alta.

Dear Sir,

Re: Rezoning Part of the S.W. Quarter,
Section 29-38-27 W4 to permit construction
of a Trailer Court thereon.

This is to advise that construction of a dry lot trailer coach park is prohibited by Public Health Regulation 17-7-1 viz. "Every trailer coach park shall be equipped so that there is provided on every trailer coach lot:

- (1) A water riser or outlet to which a connection can be made to a trailer coach water inlet, or inlets in accordance with the requirements of subsequent sections of this division.
- (2) A sewer riser or inlet to which a connection can be made from the combined liquid waste outlet or outlets of a trailer coach, in accordance with the requirements of subsequent sections of this division."

Also, proposed location would appear to be contrary to Regulation 17-4-1 which states "No trailer coach park shall be so located that the drainage of the trailer coach park will endanger any water supply. All trailer coach parks shall be well drained and shall be located in areas free from swamps or other pests likely to breed."

Furthermore, toilet, bathing and laundry facilities shall be provided in accordance with regulations. These facilities would require an approved source of hot and cold water and also a proper sewage disposal system.

I trust that this is the information City Council require for their next meeting on April 29, 1963.

Yours very truly,
H. Bownes,
Public Health Inspector.

NOTE:

The above is information requested by Council at meeting of April 15th, 1963.

City Clerk.

No. 2:

City Clerk,
City of Red Deer.

Public Utilities Board,
Edmonton

April 19, 1963.

Dear Sir,

Re, Resolution - Milk Distributors - Purity Dairy

The Board has now given consideration to the above resolution passed by the Council of the City of Red Deer.

A license was issued to Purity Dairy by this Board to distribute in the City of Red Deer after the Board was satisfied that its requirements had been met. These requirements included the approval of the health authority and the municipal authority.

The resolution of your Council requests the Board to cancel this license. You will appreciate that this could not be done without good and sufficient reasons. The Public Utilities Act requires the Board to have regard primarily to the interests of the public and to the continuity and quality of supply. The quality of supply has never been questioned and the Board doubts that it is in the public interest to have the number of distributors restricted to two. We have no evidence that would indicate that the continuity of supply is liable to be affected by reason of adding one additional distributor.

After considering the matter very carefully the Board has concluded that it has no good or sufficient reasons at this time to cancel the license of Purity Dairy.

Yours truly,
A. E. Fahlman,
Secretary.

NOTE:

At the regular meeting of Council on Monday, February 11th, 1963, the following resolution was passed.

"That the Council of the City of Red Deer request the By-laws Committee to prepare a by-law based on the request of the Milk Producers Association for presentation to Council."

On Monday, March 11th, 1963 on a recommendation of the By-laws Committee the following resolution was adopted.

"In the matter of the Public Utilities Board Act, and in the matter of Milk Distribution in the City of Red Deer.

WHEREAS this Council is sympathetic to this request for the following reasons:

1. The Red Deer Region produces more milk than it requires for its own needs.
2. One of the largest employers of labour in the City of Red Deer is a milk plant which processes locally produced milk.
3. The local distributors are being subjected to unfair competition by distributors selling milk in the City produced as far away as 200 miles.
4. The unfair competition consists in the giving away without charge of free milk which is contrary to the Public Utility Board regulations, and

WHEREAS this Council does not feel it is given sufficient power in Sections 362 & 364 of the City Act to adequately deal with this situation, and

WHEREAS the Public Utilities Board is given all necessary authority under Division 5, Sections 103-114 of the Public Utilities Board Act and in particular the power to license any distributor of milk and cream, to distribute milk or cream in a particular area,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Board of Public Utility Commissioners is hereby requested not to issue any further licenses to a distributor to distribute milk or cream in the City of Red Deer and is further requested to suspend or cancel any authorization already given pursuant to Section 104, Subsection 2, Clause (D) other than the authorizations of distributors with processing plants located in the City of Red Deer.

Your Commissioners feel that as the Board cannot find good and sufficient reason to justify the withdrawal of the license held by Purity, and further, they are satisfied with the quality of supply, which has also been confirmed by the Red Deer Health Unit and is continuously being checked by the Health Unit.

We therefore recommend that the By-laws Committee be asked to present their opinions on the enforceability of the proposed By-law referred to in the resolution dated March 11th, 1963.

COMMISSIONERS.

No.3:

The City Commissioner,
City of Red Deer.

R.C.M. Police,
City Detail,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 23, 1963.

Sir,

Re: R.C.M.P. Report - Month of March, 1963.

With reference to your correspondence of April 23rd, in the above connection, it is advised that all complaints made to this office whether in person or by telephone are recorded for the purpose of detailing members to take whatever action is indicated. These complaints consist of a variety of subjects, from missing children, missing property, assaults, stolen vehicles, to complaints of theft, false pretences, etc.

These are all legitimate complaints made by people who require police action to be taken to resolve their problems. I would very much doubt that there is any manner in which these can be lessened. I would rather believe that we can expect this number to continually increase as our population increases.

As a matter of interest as you will have no doubt noted from our monthly reports for 1962, that we handled over 3600 such complaints last year. This does not include our Traffic Tickets or investigations conducted for other Detachments of the Force or other outside Organizations.

Yours truly,
J. D. Kennedy, Sgt.
I/C Red Deer City Detail.

NOTE:

The above information was requested by Council at their meeting of April 15th, 1963.

COMMISSIONERS.

No.4:

To: City Council.

April 25th, 1963.

Included with the agenda is a report prepared by the Engineering Dept., in respect of 40A Avenue Sanitary Sewer.

City Clerk.

No.5:

To: City Commissioner.

From: City Engineer.

April 25th, 1963.

Re: Sewage Grinders at P.T.S. & Deerhome

Attached is the complete file on this matter including:

- (a) Recent letter from the Chief Engineer P.W.D.
- (b) Report from Building Inspector
- (c) Letter from the Provincial Sanitary Engineer.

On the basis of this information I would recommend that the appeal be allowed.

N. J. Deck.

City of Red Deer,
Office of City Engineer.

Government of the Province of Alberta
Department of Public Works.

Attention N.J. Deck, City Engineer.

Dear Sirs,

Re: Provincial Training School, Red Deer - Sewage Grinders

In reply to your letter of April 8, 1963 we can state as follows:

The present installed disposal units total two (2) for a total capacity of 8 to 10 H.P. The proposed new Services Building will replace these units with two (2) new units of a capacity of 3 and 2 H.P. One existing unit will be salvaged for use in a gaol camp at Nordegg while the other will be written-off. The revised capacity will be comparable to the existing capacity by virtue of the improved efficiency of modern-day units. In our estimation the load on the sewers will not be increased over the existing situation whether measured by percentage of total solids or by Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD).

We hope that this will provide you with sufficient information to support our appeal.

Incidentally, we note that the subject titles of both your letter and the copy of your directive refer to both Deerhome and P.T.S. We would like to emphasize that we plan no change in the present arrangements at Deerhome and our Appeal was made with respect to Provincial Training School only.

Yours very truly,
J. F. Hunt, P.Eng.,
Chief Engineer.

To: City Engineer.

From: Building Inspector.

April 24th, 1963.

Garbulators P.T.S. - Deerhome

An on site inspection of the above institutions on this date indicates that there was one domestic type garbulator in the Infirmary Building in the P.T.S., this building being erected in 1956 prior to the passing of the By-law..

At Deerhome in buildings erected prior to 1959, there were seven garbulators installed as follows:- Kitchen & Bakery 2, Dormitory 1 - 4 & 6 - one in each dormitory. In two buildings erected in 1960 the Administration Building and Dormitory #5 there is one garbulator in each. This was discussed with the Provincial Government Inspectors and the Construction Superintendent and they were asked not to install these garbulators. However, in consideration of the fact that they were not and are not now connected to the City sewerage system they did not comply with our request.

All the garbulators in question have a water demand of 6 g.p.m. and have 2" wastes.

Building Inspector.

Mr. N. J. Deck,
City Engineer,
City of Red Deer.

Government of the Province of Alberta
Department of Public Health.

February 5th, 1963.

Dear Mr. Deck,

Mr. J.F.Hunt, Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works has asked us to write you about the relaxation of your regulations prohibiting the use of heavy duty garbage disposal units in the case of the Provincial Training School.

We do not feel that we can advise you on the application of your City regulations, as these in turn relate to the operation of your sewage disposal system. The point at which we control the pollution of the rivers in Alberta is where the waste waters are released to the rivers, i.e. after the treatment facilities. Our general comments on this problem would be that your sewerage system by-law pertaining to the quality of waters released to your sewer system would be an appropriate method of control and that relaxation prohibiting the use of heavy duty garbage disposal units would not be detrimental to the control system that you have set up.

Yours very truly,
H. L. Hogge, P.Eng.,
Provincial Sanitary Engineer.

NOTE:

In view of information contained in letters noted, we concur with recommendation of the City Engineer.

COMMISSIONERS.

REPORTS:

6.

No.1.

April 16th, 1963.

To: The Council City of Red Deer.

Gentlemen,

In response to our tender for the supply of one only $1\frac{1}{2}$ ton truck complete with body, we received the following proposals.

Firm	Make	Model	Max.Net H.P.	Displacement in Cubic In.	Engine Model No.	Bid Price
Galon Motors	GMC	C95503	120	230	230	3498.28
Northwest Motors	Dodge	D400	140	225	6 Cyl	3875.00
Parkland Equipment	IHC	1500	144	264	B264	4095.00
Red Deer Motors	Chev.	C5503	147	292	292	3785.00
Rio Vista Garage	Ford	F500	132	262	H.D.6 Cyl	3860.90
Millar Motors	Fargo	D400	127	224.7	Slant Six	3619.50

"A heavy duty engine suitable for City driving" was requested in the specifications. The model 292 engine is available from Galon Motors as an option for \$90.00. We believe that the model 292 engine would be more suitable.

We would therefore recommend the purchase of the GMC truck from Galon Motors with the larger engine for the sum of \$3588.28.

Respectfully submitted.
A.S.Krause, Purchasing Agent.
D. W. MacGowm, P.W.Supt.

NOTE:

The low tender price of \$3498.28 calls for a $1\frac{1}{2}$ ton truck equipped with an engine indential to that supplied in $\frac{1}{2}$ ton trucks. We feel the heavier engine is required for the $1\frac{1}{2}$ ton truck, we recommend Council approval of acceptance of Galon Motor's tender at total price of \$3588.28.

COMMISSIONERS

No.2:

April 16th, 1963.

To: Council City of Red Deer.

Gentlemen,

In response to our tender for the supply of $3\frac{1}{2}$ ton pickups we received the following proposals.

Firm	Make	Model	Engine Displacement	Bid Price
Galon Motors	GMC	C91504	230	5724.33
Red Deer Motors	Chev.	C1504	230	5760.00
Northwest Motors	Dodge	D100	225	5994.00
Rio Vista Garage	Ford	F100	223	6018.65
Millar Motors	Fargo	D100	224.7	6110.40
McFarlane Goodacre	Mercury	100	223	6239.00
Parkland Equipment	IHC	1100	264	6960.00

We would recommend the purchase of the $3\frac{1}{2}$ ton pickups from Galon Motors for the sum of \$5724.33.

Respectfully submitted,
A. S. Krause, Purchasing Agent.
D. W. MacGowan, P.W.Supt.

NOTE:

Concur with recommendation of Purchasing Agent.

COMMISSIONERS

No. 3:

To: City Clerk.

From: City Assessor.

Re: Court of Revision - 1963 Frontages

The Council by resolution may act as the Court of Revision and in such case shall appoint not less than three nor more than five of its own members to form the Court.

It is suggested date of sitting be set for 2.00 p.m., Monday, June 3rd, 1963 in Council Chambers, City Hall, Red Deer.

C. E. Ross,
Assessor.

No. 4:

Mayor & Council,
City of Red Deer.

April 22nd, 1963.

Gentlemen,

In reply to our tender request for a tractor - backhoe loader, the following bids were received.

Pardee Equipment Co.	7,875.00
Pardee Equipment Co. (Alternate)	7,375.00
Parkland Equipment Co.	8,795.00
Equipment Sales	7,940.00
Ultra Sales & Service	6,935.10
Lindsay Equipment Co.	7,391.18

Only one of the above bids met the specification for digging alongside obstructions. This was the first bid listed as submitted by Pardee Equipment Co.

I would recommend we purchase this unit from Pardee Equipment Co., for the amount of \$7,875.00.

A. S. Krause,
Purchasing Agent.

To: City Commissioners.
From: Electric Light Supt.

Re: Specifications for trencher, E.L. & P. Dept.

We specified an offset feature on the backhoe so that we could trench parallel to obstructions. Reason for this is that in all the new subdivisions we have to trench within 2 feet of water shut-offs, and most of the time within 2 feet of an embankment. With the standard machine this results in constantly moving the machine and as much time is spent jockeying the machine into position as is spent actually trenching. With the offset backhoe the machine can keep right on trenching once it is set on the alignment.

If it was only a case of working up against a building periodically this feature would not be necessary as time lost in jockeying here would not be serious. However, there is a constant need for this offset in all our new work so the extra feature is more than warranted.

O.C. Mills,
E.L. & P. Supt.

NOTE:

As only the Pardee tender met specifications required, we recommend approval of acceptance of that tender at total price of \$7,875.00.

COMMISSIONERS.

No.5:

8.

April 24th, 1963.

To: City Commissioner.

From: Building Inspector.

Applications for Home Occupation

The following applications for Home Occupations meet with the requirements of Zoning By-law 2011 and are submitted for approval.

1. M. Vandenbrink	3981-35 Ave.	Landscaping	21.75
This application was formerly approved Mar.26/63 for 3406-44A Avenue.			
2. K. Bickerton	5844 W.P.Cresc.	Excavator	21.75
This application was formerly approved Mar.26/63 for 3706-46 Street.			
3. J.A.Nyman	305 Terrace Park	Woodworking Trophies	25.00
4. A. Vermeulen	3713-45 St.	Wake-Up Service	25.00
5. C. McGill	3413-44A Ave.	Accounting Business	25.00
6. O. Loberg	4452-33 St.	Distributorship Zip-Grip	
		Clothes Line	21.75
7. G. Schulz	4228-34 St.	Flooring Services	25.00

G. K. Jorgenson,
Building Inspector.

No.6:

To: City Council.

From: Finance Committee.

At the meeting of Finance Committee held April 24, 1963, the Committee considered a request submitted by the Chamber of Commerce)copies enclosed with agenda) re: 1963 Special Grant.

The Committee having considered the above, recommend that the City participate with the Chamber of Commerce on a cost sharing basis on \$500.00 Xmas Lighting, \$250.00 new signs, \$500.00 toward Tourist Booth and the City to assume cost of \$1000.00 for Industrial & City Brochures and Maps, the latter being a continuing matter. Total expenditure of \$2250.00.

A further recommendation of your Finance Committee is that authorization be given for calling of tenders for the installation of heaters in the Red Deer Arena.

Secretary.

CORRESPONDENCE:

9.

Letter No.1.

Red Deer Twilight Homes Foundation.

City of Red Deer,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 17th, 1963.

Dear Sirs,

We wish to express our sincere thanks for your kindness in making us a grant in lieu of taxes, which enables us to keep our operation costs down to the minimum, for the Senior Citizens concerned.

Yours very truly,
Red Deer Twilight Homes Foundation,
F.J.Setters,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Letter No.2:

Murphy, Armstrong, Beames & Chapman.

His Worship Mayor Newman,
City Hall,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 19th, 1963.

Dear Sir,

Re: New Era Development Ltd., vs. City of Red Deer

We refer to our telephone conversation respecting the Trial of the above action.

As we advised you, this action was set down for Trial immediately after the Examinations for Discovery were held, which Examinations had to be held before the action could be entered for Trial.

The first possible date for Trial was during the February sittings, and as you are probably aware, Kainz was in Europe during the February sittings and the Plaintiff obtained an adjournment on that ground. The next possible date was for the April sittings, now in session. This is a four day sittings and all or most of the List has been taken up by Criminal matters which have precedence, and little if any Civil matters will be reached. As a matter of fact, at least one Civil action which we are involved in has been on the last three Lists and still will not be heard. As a result, the City's action again had to be adjourned.

The next sittings is in June and it appears that our Counsel, Mr. McGillivray, and probably Mr. Moir, New Era's Counsel will not be available during that week. However, Mr. McGillivray is fully aware of how anxious the City is to have the matter determined as soon as possible and before the Summer vacation. He is accordingly using every endeavour to make arrangements with a Supreme Court Judge to hold a special sitting in Red Deer for the trial of this action before the Summer recess.

You may rest assured that your representatives will bring this matter to trial without delay and just as soon as it is possible to do so.

Yours faithfully,
J. W. Beames.

NOTE:

In our discussions with Mr. Beames and Mr. Richards, we are satisfied that everything possible is being done to bring this case to trial as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONERS

Letter No.3:

The Mayor & Police Committee,
City Hall,
Red Deer, Alta.

5020-49 Street,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 18th, 1963.

Dear Sirs,

Re: Jay's Taxi

Our firm presently operates four vehicles from our taxi stand located at 5020-49th Street, Red Deer, Alberta. The fourth car is normally parked at the rear of the Arlington Hotel and therefore parking is not a problem. We already have a parking stall rented from the City of Red Deer in front of the Windsor Hotel.

We request that the City allow our firm two additional parking stalls in front of our place of business for which we are prepared to pay the monthly rent of \$10.00 per stall.

We would appreciate receiving a reply at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,
Frank Jay,
Jay's Taxi.

NOTE:

Section 719 (1) of By-law 2121 Traffic By-law statws:-

"When a property marked taxicab stand or an open taxicab rank has been established by authority of City Council pursuant to this By-law, then no person shall park a vehicle that is not a taxicab in such stand."

Present Council policy permits one curb stand per company in front of their office, the Commissioners are authorized to set the rental rates, at the present time they are set at \$10.00 per month.

Recommendation:

That in view of our present parking requirements for new businesses, and the parking situation in the downtown areas,

We recommend that taxi companies be required to provide off-street parking for all vehicles in excess of the one stall they lease in front of their respective offices.

Commissioners.

Letter No.4:

City Commissioner,
City of Red Deer.

Red Deer District Planning Commission.

April 19th, 1963.

Dear Sir,

Re: Enquiry - Alderman Power.

Mayor Roper's comments on Planning Act

I have read the comments of Mayor Roper as reported in the Edmonton Journal, Friday, March 29th, 1963, and have compared his comments with the Act as assented to on March 29th, 1963 (the same day).

According to the Act, there is no change in the present requirement, to set up an Appeal Board to deal with appeals in respect of a Zoning By-law's provisions. The Powers of the Appeal Board are relatively unchanged with the exception that they will now deal with "similar uses" whereas previously these have been dealt with by Council.

The rights to delegate discretionary authority to a Technical Planning Committee also remains virtually unchanged.

In view of the fact, I contacted the City Planner in Edmonton to inquire what was the basis of Mayor Roper's comments and was informed that Mr. Hooke, in the House, had made a proposal that there should be an appeal from the decisions of Appeal Boards back to the Council. This came to the attention of Mayor Roper who was strongly opposed to this arrangement and consequently, the suggested change of Mr. Hooke was never incorporated in the Bill.

It is one of the peculiar things about this Act that the Minister presenting the Bill (Bill No.57), proposed himself, a number of changes in the Bill, which he was presenting, which changes had not been the result of any consultation or study. Some of these changes were adopted and have created very peculiar situations.

There was a clause in the old Act and in the new Bill which stated that a Zoning By-law should not establish a zone in which "only parks, playgrounds, schools, public recreation grounds, or public buildings are permitted unless at the time the zone is established, the lands in the zone are owned by the municipality or by a public authority."

This was a very reasonable provision to insure that through zoning, a man's land could not be rendered valueless because it could only be used for public purposes. However, for some reason unknown to anybody, Mr. Hooke, recommended that the word 'only' should be removed which means that it is not possible any longer, in a by-law, to have a general residential zone in which parks are allowed; there can be no general zone in which public buildings are allowed unless the land in the zone is owned by the public authority.

Generally speaking, this will not present a problem to the City of Red Deer because its by-law has been set up with separate zones for parks and schools and public buildings, but I understand that in all the other cities where general zones have been established in which parks, playgrounds are a permitted use, will require their by-laws to be amended. It will involve a lot of administrative time and work and will achieve no purpose whatsoever.

Another interesting point was that Mr. Hooke strongly applauded a member of the House that asked the innocent question as to whether there was any need to control the size of rooms in buildings, and this clause was deleted. This will not present any problems because normally this is controlled by the Building Code and the Central Mortgage and Housing Company. The suggestion in the House, however, was that to control the size of rooms at all was over-stepping the mark by bureaucracy. The fact that it is incorporated in every Building Code in the country and in the Health Regulations is incidental.

We shall need a little time to examine carefully the new Act before we can make a constructive report, but I believe it will be necessary to review our entire by-law and to revise it where it is inconsistent with the new Act.

Yours truly,
 Denis Cole,
 Director.

NOTE:

The main item reported in Edmonton Journal noted, was Mayor Roper's opposition to the suggestion that New Planning Act provide that an appeal to Council could be made from a decision by the Zoning Appeal Board. Present provisions of Zoning By-law provides decision of Zoning Appeal Board is final.

It will be noted in above report that the proposed amendment to the Planning Act was not incorporated in the new Act which has now become law.

We concur with Planning Director's suggestion that new Act be studied by him and full report be submitted. Should this report indicate any of the amendments incorporated in the new Planning Act are undesirable from City's point of view, recommendation could be made to next Union of Alberta Municipalities meeting that that Organization make recommendation to Provincial Authorities for amendments believed necessary to make the Act satisfactory to cities and municipalities concerned.

We have asked that copies of the new Planning Act be forwarded to us as soon as they are available.

COMMISSIONERS

Letter No.5:

3422-39 Street,
Red Deer, Alta.

April 23, 1963.

The Mayor & Council,
City of Red Deer.

Dear Sirs,

At their April meeting, the members of the Recreation Board studied the matter of the appointment of two new members to the Board to replace the positions held by two retiring members, Mr. Merv Hewson, and Mr. Harry Genser.

On behalf of the Board, therefore, I submit the following names for your approval:

Mr. Allan Baker, 5342-42A Avenue.
Mr. Henry Flock, 3916-38 Avenue.

We would be very pleased to hear of your action on this matter.

Yours truly,
H. Kuharchuk,
Secretary, Recreation Board.

NOTE:

Recommend approval of the above appointment.

COMMISSIONER.

Letter No.6:

No. 9 Red Deer Health Unit.

City of Red Deer,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 10, 1963.

Gentlemen,

Re " No.9 Red Deer Health Unit Budget
" April 1, 1963 to March 31, 1964.

A regular meeting of the No.9 Red Deer Health Unit Board was held on April 5, 1963, at which time it was approved that a supplementary Dental Auxiliary program be instituted for the benefit of the contributing bodies which form the No.9 Red Deer Health Unit.

The additional requisition requested will be based on a 12¢ per capita contribution from local contributing authorities and a 9½¢ per capita grant from the Provincial Government.

The supplementary Dental Auxiliary Budget and population figures are attached for your information.

We hope that this additional preventative Dental program will meet with your approval and support.

Yours very truly,
M. F. Mackenzie,
Secretary-Treasurer.

No.9 Red Deer Health Unit
Supplementary Dental Auxiliary Budget
For the period April 1, 1963 to March 31, 1964

13.

<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Salaries:	
Dental Auxiliary - to be appointed - 5-2-1	\$ 3,480.00
Dental Auxiliary - to be appointed - 5-2-1	<u>3,480.00</u>
	\$ <u>6,960.00</u>
(2) Travelling Expenses:	
Subsistence	\$ 200.00
Unit car expense	1,000.00
Unit car insurance	100.00
New car purchase - other than replacements	<u>2,700.00</u>
	\$ <u>4,000.00</u>
(3) Equipment:	
New equipment	\$ 2,027.76
Equipment depreciation	<u>100.00</u>
	\$ <u>2,127.76</u>
(4) Supplies and Misc. Expenses:	
Laundry and uniforms	\$ 100.00
Dental supplies	<u>500.00</u>
	\$ <u>600.00</u>
Net total supplementary budget	\$ <u>13,687.76</u>
Population 63,664	
Departmental grant for - Dental services - 91%	\$ 6,048.08
Mandatory contribution from local municipality - Dental services	<u>2,419.23</u>
	\$ <u>8,467.31</u>

No.9 Red Deer Health Unit
Population figures for 1963/64 Budget

M.D. #55	13,477
I.D. #65	5,532
I.D. #58	474
County #14	8,725
Red Deer	21,107
Rocky Mt. House	2,573
Lacombe	3,029
Sylvan Lake	1,436
Innisfail	2,270
Blackfalds	477
Mirror	577
Alix	649
Bentley	588
Eckville	586
Clive	248
Penhold	331
Bowden	551
Elnora	210
Delburne	463
Caroline	321
Gull Lake	<u>40</u>
Total	<u>63,664</u>

Finance Committee at meeting of April 24th, 1963 considered the above mentioned correspondence and recommend as follows:

That the City pay the extra demand from the Health Unit and the money be taken out of the Unspecified Reserves for Contingencies, subject to a member of the Health Unit giving a full explanation of what benefits we will derive from these extra services.

Secretary.

NOTE:

A representative from the Health Unit will appear before Council at 7.00 p.m. on Monday, April 29th, 1963.

COMMISSIONER.

Letter No.7:

Haddin, Davis & Brown Co. Ltd.,
Calgary, Alberta.

Mr. F. A. Amy,
City Commission,
Red Deer, Alta.

April 25, 1963.

Dear Sir,

1963 Utility Construction Tenders

We have checked the Tenders as received at 5.00 p.m., on April 23, 1963, for the Construction of Utilities for 1963 in the City of Red Deer. They are as follows:

Borger Construction Ltd., 2004-14A Street S.E., Calgary	436,908.50
G.C. McLeod & Co. Ltd., 9735-63 Avenue, Edmonton	472,657.50
Cunningham & Shannon Ltd., Box 2079, Taber Alberta	480,949.03
N.S. Pawliuk & Son Contracting Ltd., 4825-118 Ave., Edmonton	509,211.60
Burns & Dutton Construction (1962) Ltd., Box 220, Station A, Calgary	529,665.10
Poole Construction Co. Ltd., 2402-2A Street S.E., Calgary	534,012.80
Patrick Construction Co. Ltd., 322-42 Street, Saskatoon, Sask.	565,214.70

All Tenders were complete except Burns & Dutton Construction (1962) Ltd. did not include a list of subcontractors and suppliers.

All Tenders included have a provisional cost sum of \$15,000.00 which could be used for additional or unforeseen work.

All bidders, with the exception of Cunningham & Shannon Ltd., have completed works of this type for the City of Red Deer in the past five years. We see no reason to question the ability of any of these to complete the works included in the Tender.

We have not worked with Cunningham & Shannon Ltd., and are not, therefore, able to comment on their proposal. Further investigation was not carried out because their Tender is approximately \$44,000.00 higher than the low bidder and because we feel the second low bidder G.C. McLeod & Co. Ltd., would complete the work, if required.

Borger Construction Ltd., is a large well known company which contracts to complete large amounts of works of the type and nature included in the Tender. We have previously work with these people under the name of Borger Bros., and believe that they are capable of meeting the requirements of the proposed Contract. We would therefore recommend that the Contract be awarded to them.

We will not proceed further with the Contract Documents until we have received your comments. I trust you will find this in order.

Yours truly,
R. H. Vickerman, P. Eng.

Letter No.8:

To The City Council
of Red Deer.

5438-37 Street,
Red Deer, Alta.

April 11th, 1963.

Dear Sir,

Re: No. of Lots, Block (39) (40) Plan 6269 A.F.

I am writing to you as we have a sale for our property. If they can have a small grocery store in this corner. This is our chance if the City will approve of it. We have a good location for this purpose. A small store they need here that can be opened after 6. We would like this property rezoned if this is approved, please let us hear from you.

Sincerely,
Mr. & Mrs. Giesbrecht.

Red Deer District Planning Commission.

City Clerk,
City of Red Deer.

April 26th, 1963.

Dear Sir,

Re: Application for Re-zoning of Lots 39 & 40, Plan 6269 A.F.
West Park

This is an application for permission to erect a corner store grocery on a 50 foot lot opposite the entrance to the West Park School and on the intersection of 37th Street and 55th Avenue.

As Council is no doubt aware, a fairly large site was made available on 57th Avenue only six or seven hundred feet away from the site in question, for the purpose of a shopping centre. There have been, on a number of occasions, properties vacant in this shopping site which the applicants could rent if they believe there is sufficient business to warrant a second grocery store in West Park.

The applicant makes reference to the need for a store which is open after 6 o'clock, and to the best of my knowledge, the present Early Closing By-law would not prohibit a small grocery store in the Shopping Centre from being open after 6 o'clock.

It is not our responsibility to decide whether there are enough stores or not, but rather to decide on the appropriate location for stores, and I submit that the location proposed by the owner is not desirable and that any new grocery should be located in the existing Shopping Centre.

Yours truly,
Denis Cole,
Director.

To: City Commissioners

From: Zoning Officer.

April 25th, 1963.

Re: Rezoning Application Mr. & Mrs. Giesbrecht

This is an application to change the zoning of Lots 39 & 40, Block 9, Plan 6269 A.F. (5438-37 Street) from R.2 B (General Residential) to C.4 (Local Commercial).

The site is 50 feet x 125 feet situated on the N.E. corner of the intersection of 37 Street and 55 Avenue approximately two blocks East of the West Park Shopping Centre a C.3 (Neighbourhood Commercial) District.

The creation of a Local Commercial site in such close proximity to a Neighbourhood Commercial site would appear to be unnecessary and not in the best interests of the overall development of the district.

We therefore would not recommend that approval be given to the proposed change in zoning.

G.K.Jorgenson, Zoning Officer.

Note:

We recommend this application for rezoning of this property be not approved.

COMMISSIONERS

Robinson, Holmes, Crowe, Paisley & Power.

The Commissioners,
City of Red Deer,.

April 11, 1963.

Dear Sirs,

Re: Proposed Developments of Lots 1-6 and 34-40, Block 26, Plan K.

We act for Hicke Real Estate Ltd., who hold options on Lots 1 to 6 inclusive in Block 26, Plan (K). We understand the City owns Lots 34-40 inclusive in the same Block.

Under separate cover we are delivering to you three sets of drawings of proposed plans to develop the aforesaid property. You will observe this commercial development will contain parking accommodation for 200 cars. It will have 28,000 square feet of rentable ground floor space, 20,000 square feet of rentable second floor space and 20,000 square feet of rentable third floor space. In addition, there will be a full basement throughout. The cost of this development is expected to exceed one million dollars.

Our client appreciates that its proposal will require Council's approval:

1. To re-locate a portion of the present lane at the west end of Block 26 over Lot 4 on which our client holds an option.
2. To re-zone all those lots to the south of the present lane from "transitional" to "commercial";
3. To sell to our client Lots 34 to 40.

When the technical planning committee refers this proposal to Council, would you please advise the writer? He would like to attend with the architect when the Aldermen consider this development. We are hopeful you will give the matter your early attention.

Yours very truly,
ROBINSON, HOLMES, CROWE, PAISLEY & POWER.
per J.K.HOLMES.

Robinson, Holmes, Crowe, Paisley & Power.

F. A. Amy, Esq.,
City Hall,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 23, 1963

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed Development of Lots 1-6 and 34-40, Block 26, Plan (K)

Further to the writer's recent interview with the Technical Planning Committee, we have checked with our client concerning the matters discussed.

Our client favours meeting any increased parking requirements by adding extra floors to the proposed parkade.

With regard to the proposed service station, it is our client's plan to have the same located entirely within the parkade (including pumps). This will probably require a change in the present zoning regulations.

If possible, we would prefer that this matter receive the consideration of the City Council at the first opportunity. If you will be kind enough to advise us of the date and time, we will be in attendance to discuss the matter further with the Council.

Yours very truly,
ROBINSON, HOLMES, CROWE, PAISLEY & POWER.
Per J. K. HOLMES.

April 29th, 1963.

The City Commissioners,
City of Red Deer,
4819 Ross Street,
RED DEER, Alberta.

Dear Sirs:

Re: Proposal for development
49th Avenue between 48th & 49th Streets

During the last ten days I have given this proposal a great deal of thought, and have endeavoured to re-examine critically my first re-action that it should be a pre-requisite to the sale of the City parking lot (175 feet by 125 feet East of Hudsons Bay) that a parking lot of equal value be provided in the same block.

The proposal is a very attractive one. It will involve at least 68,000 square feet on the ground and upper floors (which is one-third larger than the Hudsons Bay Building) plus a basement and a parkade to provide over 200 stalls (174 would be the By-law requirement).

The appraised value of the City site is in excess of \$220,000 which the City would receive and at the same time no demands would be placed on the City by a contribution to the fund. That is, the City might have been obliged to spend substantial City revenues immediately if the developer had chosen to contribute to the fund rather than provide for his own parking needs.

In view of the fact that this City owned site is probably the most valuable site in the City, without exception, there is little doubt that the City should be able to acquire a larger site for the sale price received at any other location.

My main concern is that the City should not surrender for cash or for buildings the economic possibility of erecting a large parkade in this general area. It may well be that when the other buildings of the Civic Centre are erected it will be desirable to retain one or two floors for Civic employees. It may also be desirable, eventually, to provide some cheap employee parking on a rental basis in this area. The secret of downtown re-development is equally divided between growing demand and adequate parking - both customer and employee.

.../2

It is necessary, therefore, to re-examine the whole parking scheme together with the City's role in encouraging re-development in the Central part of the City.

About 1955, I recommended to the City that it should endeavour to accumulate and assemble several large sites at strategic locations so that when land became prohibitive in price, there would be suitable locations for erecting structures.

Secondly, I pointed out that the proper location for parking lots in a City of our size was in the most valuable locations. Customers want to park as close to the big traffic generators as they can. It took 18 months to persuade Council that they should pay \$40,000 for the 75 feet occupied by the old Knox Church so that this lot could be combined with 50 feet already owned by the City and thereby provide a further 40 stalls in the vicinity of Eaton's and the Post Office .

Within a year of its purchase by the City, the Hudson's Bay Company approached the City with a view of buying this 125 feet, together with adjacent lands for their new store. The City agreed only if the Bay would acquire 175 feet on the opposite side of 49th Avenue and would exchange it for the 125 feet they needed from the City. This was done.

175 feet is adequate but still rather small for our efficient parkade, 250 feet (as at the Post Office) is a more desirable size.

The question now arises, if the applicant/developer erects 68,000 square feet on ground, first and second floors, plus a basement and also provides a parkade to accommodate 200 or more stalls, do we need a City parking lot in addition in this block? In this connection we must note that the Hudson Bay Company and Eaton's operate a parking lot in the adjacent block to the West and nearby is the 100 stall City parking lot behind the Post Office.

Nevertheless, I am still strongly of the view that the City should not sell this site unless a site of equal value and at least equal size is provided in this same block and having a frontage to 49th Street. My reasons are as follows:-

- (1) The City has a moral obligation to provide not only parking where it is now required but to acquire lands for future parking needs in so far as the funds will permit. It is not sufficient to have large sums in the parking fund, it is better and more appropriate to boast of the extensive parking facilities in the areas where they are most needed. I believe the City will be justifiably criticized if it

...../3

starts selling large parking sites if it does not immediately replace them, even if the purchaser is erecting parking facilities.

- (2) It must not be overlooked that the 60 stall parking lot of the City East of Hudson's Bay has a potential of 300 stalls (if a Parkade is erected) for use by developers in the area. A promotion scheme for developing a major portion of the balance of this block is now on hand and both Architects and Engineers have been engaged and a substantial firm of developers is involved. If they erect a comparable development at the other end of the block and choose to pay into the fund rather than provide the parking, there is no doubt that we shall have to have land in the vicinity to provide for the immediate parking needs of this one development and also provide for further development on 48th Street in the future.
- (3) In connection with the general parking demand in the area, we should not lose sight of the fact that the overall plans for the Civic Centre do not envisage parking being provided on the site except for a few employees involved in using their cars for duty. The City, regardless of other fund contributors has a heavy responsibility to see that adequate parking is available nearby for customers and employees and that these demands do not encroach on the parking provided in part by others.
- (4) Many cities are now spending astronomical sums to organize and re-develop their downtown areas. The tremendous growth of our City can bring about a great deal of re-development without City cost if the City will act wisely in its land policies. The City owns certain strategically located lands (the most valuable in the City) and can use these not just for parking or for sale but rather to promote further development. If this land is sold and the money reserved in a fund until needed, it will not be serving a useful function. If on the other hand it is immediately re-invested in lands in the vicinity, the first thing is that the money goes back into circulation and can be used for further development on spending in the City. Secondly, more old houses can be cleared so as to open up the area and give it a more commercial appearance. Thirdly, the extra parking will encourage further development. If it can ultimately be shown that the parking is not required in this location (when all around has been fully developed) then and only then should the City relinquish its land holding in the block.

To sum up, I hope sirs, that you appreciate that I regard it as my responsibility not to enthuse but rather to be coldly analytical and critical of all developments, however desirable they may appear, so that

April 29/63

Council can make its decisions knowing both the advantages and disadvantages of every proposal. In the circumstances, I hereby confirm that I strongly support the proposal, subject to the applicant or the City being able to re-invest the whole appraised value of the site in acquiring a similar or larger area in the same block and having a minimum of 100 feet frontage to 49th Street and I would recommend the following resolution to Council:-

"Be it resolved that the City approve in principle the sale of the City owned parking lot for its value as appraised, subject to the purchaser entering into an agreement to erect on this and adjacent land a building having not less than 68,000 square feet on the ground and upper floors and facilities for a minimum of 174 stalls."

This sale, however, to be subject to:-

- (a) The Hudson Bay Company approving the arrangement (in view of the City agreement with this Company regarding the use of the said site) and
- (b) The City being able to acquire adequate lands in the vicinity and suitably located to replace the land to be sold.

It would be recommended that the City be given a period of six weeks at least within which to find out whether they can obtain such lands. It would be further recommended that the applicants should leave with the City a deposit which would be returned if the City decided not to sell because of either (a) or (b) above, but would be forfeited to the City if after six weeks the City had obtained options on alternate lands and the applicant would not then proceed with the scheme, but would be applied to the purchase price in the event that both the City and the purchaser were ready to complete the transaction.

It is particularly important, I believe, to obtain further information on the second development proposed for this block as I believe much of the land is now held under option by the promoters. In my opinion this reason alone would justify holding off on irrevocable decisions at this time.

Submitted for consideration.

Yours truly,

DC:ts

Denis Cole,
Director

The development envisaged would result in between 250-275 car parking spaces being provided in our own main commercial area in conjunction with a large commercial building. The overall cost to be in vicinity of one million dollars. The total building including the parking structure would be tax producing property when constructed.

The proposal would require closing of existing lane to 49th Avenue - this would be replaced by an "L" lane opening on 48th Street on property provided by developer.

The developer would purchase the City owned parking lot at actual value. The area of building proposed would require provision of some 175 parking stalls, and the additional roughly 100 parking stalls contemplated would be some 40 more stalls than are presently provided on the existing City parking lot.

In effect the developer is proposing to construct a parkade for roughly 250-275 cars, as a commercial venture and requests the City sell him the present City parking lot for this purpose.

There is an agreement between the City and Hudson Bay Co., that parking spaces presently on the City owned parking lot will be maintained as parking spaces, within below ground, ground level, or above ground level, for period of 25 years. Any agreement, therefore, with this developer would be subject to agreement being reached with Hudson Bay Co., in respect of this parking agreement.

Your Commissioners feel the overall proposal has considerable merit, and providing satisfactory arrangements can be made to assure the public parking spaces will be continued in the proposed structure for the life of the whole building, and providing the money derived from the sale of our land is placed in the Off-Street Parking Fund.

Your Commissioners recommend approval in principle of this development, subject to plans being acceptable and complying with our Building By-law and agreement re the relocation of the lane with 5 ft. set back and other details to be prepared between the City Solicitor and the applicant in an agreement form, final details to be approved later by Council.

With respect to the service station, our Zoning By-law prohibits construction of same in this area and we do not recommend any change.

COMMISSIONERS

April 29th, 1963.

R.E.Stollings,
City Clerk,
City of Red Deer.

Re: Your Memo dated April 19th, 1963
Sale of Power to Deerhome Institute and Hudson Bay Co.

In compliance with City Council's request, attached is an analysis indicating the profits derived from the sale of power to the above mentioned consumers for the year 1962.

You will appreciate that the proration of expenses is not precise but only representative with view to the rather arbitrary bases available.

It is interesting to note, however, that the profits earned from these two consumers are comparable percentage-wise to the profit earned by the electric light and power utility during 1962.

Respectfully submitted,
O.C.Mills - Electrical Superintendent
J.H.Pallo - Asst. City Treasurer.

THE CITY OF RED DEER

Revenue Derived in 1962 from Two Power Consumers and
Revenue Consequently Used for Capital Expenditures and
Relief of Taxation.

<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Deerhome</u>	<u>Hudson Bay</u>
Kilowatt hours sold	<u>3,201,600</u>	<u>1,311,600</u>
Sales	\$ 51,480.00	\$ 21,383.50
Discount	<u>nil</u>	<u>nil</u>
Net Sales	\$ <u>51,480.00</u>	\$ <u>21,383.50</u>
<u>Expenditures</u>		
Electrical Energy Purchases	\$ 30,269.78	\$ 12,400.62
Billing, Servicing and Other Costs	57.74	57.74
Cost of money	288.00	144.00
Return on Investment	<u>288.00</u>	<u>144.00</u>
Total Expenditures	\$ <u>30,903.52</u>	\$ <u>12,746.36</u>
Contribution to Capital Expenditures and Relief of Taxation	\$ <u>20,576.48</u>	<u>8,637.14</u>
Percentage of Profit to Sales	40%	40%

NOTE:

The above information was requested by Council April 15th, 1963.

City Clerk.

REQUEST AND BRIEF RE THE MEMORIAL CENTRE
=====

THE RECREATION BOARD requests Red Deer City Council to place the recreation facility of the Memorial Centre under the jurisdiction of the Recreation Board, in accordance with By-Law number 2104, section 3 (a) to (f), and section 5 (a) to (g) dealing specifically with oversight and use of recreational city-owned facilities.

The Recreation Board and Recreation Department administering the City's recreation program, and co-operating with the community recreational groups, can best evaluate, co-ordinate and develop the use of the Memorial Centre with the total Red Deer recreation program.

Attached is a breakdown of the Memorial Centre rentals for 1962, and January and February of 1963. It clearly indicates that the Centre is primarily used for recreation.

It is disturbing to see that it is not used more, and everything possible should be done to encourage more use of this dual-function recreational facility.

MEMORIAL CENTRE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Memorial Centre was subscribed to by the citizens of Red Deer and the surrounding area to be a recreation building. It has been administered since its inception by a Joint Committee, comprised of representatives of the City and Red Deer School Division (not to be confused with the Red Deer City School Board). Operating expenses have been born completely by the Red Deer School Division, until the Centre reverted solely to City ownership and management in 1960.

Over the years the School Division spent a great deal of money on the Memorial Centre. The east wall of the auditorium was partly sound-proofed; the whole building was completely re-wired (the original wiring having been condemned by the Provincial authorities some years after completion); one of the best theatre-lighting systems of the so-equipped community auditoriums in Alberta was installed, with dimmer and control panel and spotlight overhead box; speaker system; extension on the north to provide two drama workshops and meeting rooms; extensive roofing repairs; re-carpeting and installation of drapes and extensive stage-drape trackage; rebuilding of front of stage and installation of stage set door; etc. Besides, the Electricity and Metal Departments, under Mr. Chris Flanagan's instigation, made many additional, portable stage lighting spot stands, which have been invaluable and are now part of the Memorial Centre equipment.

Until 1960 the Memorial Centre gym was used almost full time by the R.D. School Division (which included then the Composite).

The auditorium especially was used extensively by city groups, preference being given them, as long as booking was made in advance sufficient for postponement of school gym use, with the noise factor involved.

REQUEST BY THE RECREATION COMMISSION IN 1959 RE MEMORIAL CENTRE

At the time of the City taking over the management of the Memorial Centre from the Red Deer School Division, no discussion of its future administration took place with either the Recreation Department personnel or the Recreation Commission, operating at that time under By-law 1609 with section (a) stating:

"The Commission shall have the supervision and control with respect to all questions affecting the development, maintenance, extension and use of all recreational grounds owned or controlled by the City, including buildings and equipment, therefore, and concerning all sporting and recreational activities and the Commission shall be responsible to the City Council therefore:"

And Section (f) stating "The Commission shall co-operate with public and private agencies and any or all civic, social and religious organizations so that the most beneficial and effective use may be made of all recreational grounds and facilities:"

As soon as the Commission became aware of the disregard of the By-Law strong, unanimously approved, protest was made in writing to the Mayor and the City Council. No Reply verbally or in writing, was ever received. A second protest later, was also ignored.

REASONS FOR REITERATION REQUEST 1963

In view of the continuing need to correlate and co-operate with all recreational facilities and programs in the city; the fact that most of the use of the Memorial Centre is recreational and the disturbing situation of a great deal less than maximum use of the Centre, the present petition by the Recreation Board is being made.

We appreciate the good job of administration that has been done by the Red Deer Fairgrounds Commission, especially in view of their lack of information and liaison with the recreation program. They have made some much needed improvements, which have added considerably to the appearance and functional use of the Centre.

Without detracting from our compliment of the improvements, the urgency of the need of these would have obtained much the same consideration and program if the Memorial Centre had been placed under the management of the Recreation Commission.

The cost of beam installation and a deficit on operation (\$3022.67 for 1961, \$3085.03 for 1962.) had to be faced quite apart from which Department or Commission was responsible for operation. It is possible the Memorial Centre income can never meet operating costs.

A move to raise rentals could easily defeat the purpose and result in less use and therefore lower rental income.

There have been several complaints that the increased rates are now forcing withdrawal of groups formerly using the Memorial Centre. The Junior Chamber of Commerce found it impossible to sponsor the Political forum March 27th in the Centre, and rented the East View School. Their bill would have been \$90.00 for rent otherwise.

Parkland Players, although admitting counter-attractions due to the Golden Year Celebrations, have entered a complaint of the impossibility of doing drama productions under the present Memorial Centre revised rental schedule, especially for practise rental.

THE MEMORIAL CENTRE IS NOT OPERATING AT ANYWHERE NEAR CAPACITY USE. Greater use will not appreciably increase operating costs which are basic.

It may be possible with increased use to increase income sufficiently to lessen the deficit. But at least a valuable facility should be given more, if not full use, with gain to the whole community. Increased use of the building can only come about when it can be correlated with the programs operating in other recreational facilities and the schools, by the people involved in the programs.

Commercial, religious and political rental should be encouraged to full possibility.

It is most unfortunate the City itself did not procure furnishings of tables, chairs, piano, etc. when they were sold at extremely low prices by the Red Door School Division.

It would seem a real hazard to rental that there is not a piano in the gymnasium nor sufficient chairs to seat anything but a very small number of people, and that tables for displays, etc. are not available. Rental of chairs must be a prohibitive factor to many possible renters. And a piano (safely housed in protective locked casing) would surely permit many activities now not possible without piano accompaniment.

SEVERAL MOST NECESSARY THINGS ARE NEEDED IMMEDIATELY in the auditorium:

1. Blackout curtains, so that afternoon film showings can be held. (Present curtains could still be used, with dark lining, inserted between curtain and lining, and this would be much more visually acceptable than the black drapes often taken to Centre by travelling film projectionists.

2. Replacement (or request for return if borrowers are known) of the jellatin frames or shutters) is a must, as coloured lighting is impossible without them. They are inexpensive little frames of metal that go over the front of the spot lights.

3. Also there is no intercom 'phone between lighting box and the ceiling spot box. This means that all communication of lighting requirements from the stage to the lighting switch area has to be relayed to the ceiling box by running up and down the LADDER. This is physically exhausting and insufficient.

A telephone system had to be borrowed by the Golden Year Concert Committee, for instance, for a relatively simple lighting need.

4. It would seem advisable to replace all missing stage lighting globes. If necessary a small stage-lighting fee could be charged to groups using stage (not overhead) lighting to cover replacement.

But it is not a feasible situation for a group to rent the stage and find that hard-to-acquire globes are missing.

All this points to management by people knowledgeable of RECREATION programs and functions. This is learned the hard way by any management board, but is easier if involved in the programs.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR EXTENDED USES OF THE MEMORIAL CENTRE

It must be realized that these are long-term aims, and will not materialize immediately.

DRAMA

In 1945 the Recreation Commission began to consider the need for a Recreation Centre. In 1948 findings of a two-year thorough community survey indicated the total community needs, and the urgency of a multi-purpose, physical-program, creative-art, cultural-development recreation building, which would accomodate an indoor swimming pool, a gymnasium, permanent space for art, music drama, craft and creative groups, with the necessary storage space adjunctive to some of these.

So in the first plans for the Recreation Centre space for drama with workshop and storage space was included. Upon revision of the plan the cost eliminating some features the Recreation Centre Committee decided all drama would have to function in the Memorial Centre, though workshop and storage were very inadequate.

(Cothurn Players had rental of the added space, with use of it for other groups actually staging a play and for numerous local, provincial final and Church group festivals.) The three-wing total Recreation Centre plan does not include any space for drama activities, nor a stage.

As the Recreation Department or community groups extend drama to youth work, correlation of the Memorial Centre with use of school gym auditoriums for practise, and actual set and prop work will be needed.

MUSIC

The Memorial Centre stage is a most versatile rental area. The present rental schedule indicates an unawareness of its possibilities.

It will undoubtedly take time to develop use of it, but it would lend itself to encouraging the musical life of Red Deer, which is minimal for a city this size.

The beautiful Baldwin grand piano has deteriorated from lack of use. Almost every visiting pianist who uses it complains that it is an "unused" piano and begs for it to be played frequently so that it would be kept "live".

Ways should be sought for it to be used for advanced piano student practise. And it could be used often to accompany instrumental and voice practises.

At present there is only 1 instrumental trio in the City. A new member is hoping to promote a Chamber Group, or a small symphony. The stage is most suitable for such groups.

With the dearth of musical talent in the city, the stage with piano might be provided free of charge to instrumental music teachers to help develop musicians. Rent would eventually be gained from groups playing together. (Music teachers are not highly paid, and the expenses of coming into the city have proven prohibitive in the past)

YOUTH FOLK OR SQUARE DANCING

Although such groups will use school space, the gym is most suitable for the competitions and get togethers. As yet this recreation is not organized in the community.

THE RECREATION DEPARTMENT PROGRAM

NON-PHYSICAL -- The non-physical program being developed by the Recreation Department under the direction of Mr. W. Kendal, is still much in the formative stage. It is hard therefore to define actual program use of the Memorial Centre. But an extended program of the Arts, crafts, quick crafts, hobbies, is underway for both adults and youth, with alignment of volunteer leaders, for whom an intensive training course has already been given. The Recreation Centre basement is almost to capacity use now.

PHYSICAL -- In this sphere most activities are carried on by associations and groups, co-operating and correlating with the Recreation Department with jurisdiction over the Memorial Centre it is hoped greater activity would take place there and new skills developed.

OTHER USE OF THE GYM SPACE

It is possible full use of school gyms and the YMCA extension could eventually lessen usefulness of the Memorial Centre gym as such. In this case the space could be converted to multiple use, as the Allied Arts Centre in Calgary.

BREAKDOWN OF MEMORIAL CENTRE RENTALS 1962 AND JAN. FEB. 1963

GYM		1962	1963 Jan. & Feb.	Auditorium 1962	1963 Jan. & Feb.
Air Cadets	Hours	43	16	6	
Optomist Band		6	2	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Square Dance Club		19 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Basketball		12	2		
Handball Club		7 $\frac{1}{2}$	2		
The Y		93			
Boy Scouts		-	2	2	
Track & Field		-	8	2	
City Rec. Dept.		15		1 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Local Concert Groups		2		18 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
Overture Concerts		2		9	2
Other Community Groups		3			
Central Alberta Teens		27 $\frac{1}{2}$	14		
Midtown		12			
Martin School of Dancing		-	-	50	
Local drama groups		-	-	64	
Out of town drama		-	-	3	4
Separate School		24			
Composite, extra curricula		43	6	46*	2
Religious		50 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	15	3
Political		2		18	4 County of Lacombe
General meetings		4 $\frac{1}{2}$		17	
Commercial, Inc. RCMP					
Outdoor life films		-	-	74 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$ (10 pd. & not used)

Note (* Composite R. D. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ & teachers)

REQUEST AND BRIEF RE MEMORIAL CENTRE

Besides this the Composite High School uses the gym 4 to 5 hours a school day, with agreement that heat offsets rental.

UNUSED DAYS IN CENTRE

1962 -- The gym 202 days; the auditorium 223 days.

There are some functions that make it impossible to rent both facilities at the same time.

The Sundays when neither facility used were 38.

Christmas holiday 9 days, and summer vacation from July 1st to September 3rd were 58 days.

Even with these considerations there is still a lot of unused time outside of daytime use. (the Composite School)

Submitted by the Recreation Board from

Resolution passed at the meeting of April
3, 1963.

Mrs. J. J. Stewart, President

H. Kuharchuk, Secretary.

Robinson, Holmes, Crowe, Paisley & Power.

The Commissioners,
City of Red Deer,.

April 11, 1963.

Dear Sirs,

Re: Proposed Developments of Lots 1-6 and 34-40, Block 26, Plan K.

We act for Hicke Real Estate Ltd., who hold options on Lots 1 to 6 inclusive in Block 26, Plan (K). We understand the City owns Lots 34-40 inclusive in the same Block.

Under separate cover we are delivering to you three sets of drawings of proposed plans to develop the aforesaid property. You will observe this commercial development will contain parking accommodation for 200 cars. It will have 28,000 square feet of rentable ground floor space, 20,000 square feet of rentable second floor space and 20,000 square feet of rentable third floor space. In addition, there will be a full basement throughout. The cost of this development is expected to exceed one million dollars.

Our client appreciates that its proposal will require Council's approval:

1. To re-locate a portion of the present lane at the west end of Block 26 over Lot 4 on which our client holds an option.
2. To re-zone all those lots to the south of the present lane from "transitional" to "commercial";
3. To sell to our client Lots 34 to 40.

When the technical planning committee refers this proposal to Council, would you please advise the writer? He would like to attend with the architect when the Aldermen consider this development. We are hopeful you will give the matter your early attention.

Yours very truly,
ROBINSON, HOLMES, CROWE, PAISLEY & POWER.
per J.K.HOLMES.

Robinson, Holmes, Crowe, Paisley & Power.

F. A. Amy, Esq.,
City Hall,
Red Deer, Alberta.

April 23, 1963

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed Development of Lots 1-6 and 34-40, Block 26, Plan (K)

Further to the writer's recent interview with the Technical Planning Committee, we have checked with our client concerning the matters discussed.

Our client favours meeting any increased parking requirements by adding extra floors to the proposed parkade.

With regard to the proposed service station, it is our client's plan to have the same located entirely within the parkade (including pumps). This will probably require a change in the present zoning regulations.

If possible, we would prefer that this matter receive the consideration of the City Council at the first opportunity. If you will be kind enough to advise us of the date and time, we will be in attendance to discuss the matter further with the Council.

Yours very truly,
ROBINSON, HOLMES, CROWE, PAISLEY & POWER.
Per J. K. HOLMES.

April 29th, 1963.

The City Commissioners,
City of Red Deer,
4819 Ross Street,
RED DEER, Alberta.

Dear Sirs:

Re: Proposal for development
49th Avenue between 48th & 49th Streets

During the last ten days I have given this proposal a great deal of thought, and have endeavoured to re-examine critically my first re-action that it should be a pre-requisite to the sale of the City parking lot (175 feet by 125 feet East of Hudsons Bay) that a parking lot of equal value be provided in the same block.

The proposal is a very attractive one. It will involve at least 68,000 square feet on the ground and upper floors (which is one-third larger than the Hudsons Bay Building) plus a basement and a parkade to provide over 200 stalls (174 would be the By-law requirement).

The appraised value of the City site is in excess of \$220,000 which the City would receive and at the same time no demands would be placed on the City by a contribution to the fund. That is, the City might have been obliged to spend substantial City revenues immediately if the developer had chosen to contribute to the fund rather than provide for his own parking needs.

In view of the fact that this City owned site is probably the most valuable site in the City, without exception, there is little doubt that the City should be able to acquire a larger site for the sale price received at any other location.

My main concern is that the City should not surrender for cash or for buildings the economic possibility of erecting a large parkade in this general area. It may well be that when the other buildings of the Civic Centre are erected it will be desirable to retain one or two floors for Civic employees. It may also be desirable, eventually, to provide some cheap employee parking on a rental basis in this area. The secret of downtown re-development is equally divided between growing demand and adequate parking - both customer and employee.

.../2

It is necessary, therefore, to re-examine the whole parking scheme together with the City's role in encouraging re-development in the Central part of the City.

About 1955, I recommended to the City that it should endeavour to accumulate and assemble several large sites at strategic locations so that when land became prohibitive in price, there would be suitable locations for erecting structures.

Secondly, I pointed out that the proper location for parking lots in a City of our size was in the most valuable locations. Customers want to park as close to the big traffic generators as they can. It took 18 months to persuade Council that they should pay \$40,000 for the 75 feet occupied by the old Knox Church so that this lot could be combined with 50 feet already owned by the City and thereby provide a further 40 stalls in the vicinity of Eaton's and the Post Office .

Within a year of its purchase by the City, the Hudson's Bay Company approached the City with a view of buying this 125 feet, together with adjacent lands for their new store. The City agreed only if the Bay would acquire 175 feet on the opposite side of 49th Avenue and would exchange it for the 125 feet they needed from the City. This was done.

175 feet is adequate but still rather small for our efficient parkade, 250 feet (as at the Post Office) is a more desirable size.

The question now arises, if the applicant/developer erects 68,000 square feet on ground, first and second floors, plus a basement and also provides a parkade to accommodate 200 or more stalls, do we need a City parking lot in addition in this block? In this connection we must note that the Hudson Bay Company and Eaton's operate a parking lot in the adjacent block to the West and nearby is the 100 stall City parking lot behind the Post Office.

Nevertheless, I am still strongly of the view that the City should not sell this site unless a site of equal value and at least equal size is provided in this same block and having a frontage to 49th Street. My reasons are as follows:-

- (1) The City has a moral obligation to provide not only parking where it is now required but to acquire lands for future parking needs in so far as the funds will permit. It is not sufficient to have large sums in the parking fund, it is better and more appropriate to boast of the extensive parking facilities in the areas where they are most needed. I believe the City will be justifiably criticized if it

...../3

starts selling large parking sites if it does not immediately replace them, even if the purchaser is erecting parking facilities.

- (2) It must not be overlooked that the 60 stall parking lot of the City East of Hudson's Bay has a potential of 300 stalls (if a Parkade is erected) for use by developers in the area. A promotion scheme for developing a major portion of the balance of this block is now on hand and both Architects and Engineers have been engaged and a substantial firm of developers is involved. If they erect a comparable development at the other end of the block and choose to pay into the fund rather than provide the parking, there is no doubt that we shall have to have land in the vicinity to provide for the immediate parking needs of this one development and also provide for further development on 48th Street in the future.
- (3) In connection with the general parking demand in the area, we should not lose sight of the fact that the overall plans for the Civic Centre do not envisage parking being provided on the site except for a few employees involved in using their cars for duty. The City, regardless of other fund contributors has a heavy responsibility to see that adequate parking is available nearby for customers and employees and that these demands do not encroach on the parking provided in part by others.
- (4) Many cities are now spending astronomical sums to organize and re-develop their downtown areas. The tremendous growth of our City can bring about a great deal of re-development without City cost if the City will act wisely in its land policies. The City owns certain strategically located lands (the most valuable in the City) and can use these not just for parking or for sale but rather to promote further development. If this land is sold and the money reserved in a fund until needed, it will not be serving a useful function. If on the other hand it is immediately re-invested in lands in the vicinity, the first thing is that the money goes back into circulation and can be used for further development on spending in the City. Secondly, more old houses can be cleared so as to open up the area and give it a more commercial appearance. Thirdly, the extra parking will encourage further development. If it can ultimately be shown that the parking is not required in this location (when all around has been fully developed) then and only then should the City relinquish its land holding in the block.

To sum up, I hope sirs, that you appreciate that I regard it as my responsibility not to enthuse but rather to be coldly analytical and critical of all developments, however desirable they may appear, so that

April 29/63

Council can make its decisions knowing both the advantages and disadvantages of every proposal. In the circumstances, I hereby confirm that I strongly support the proposal, subject to the applicant or the City being able to re-invest the whole appraised value of the site in acquiring a similar or larger area in the same block and having a minimum of 100 feet frontage to 49th Street and I would recommend the following resolution to Council:-

"Be it resolved that the City approve in principle the sale of the City owned parking lot for its value as appraised, subject to the purchaser entering into an agreement to erect on this and adjacent land a building having not less than 68,000 square feet on the ground and upper floors and facilities for a minimum of 174 stalls."

This sale, however, to be subject to:-

- (a) The Hudson Bay Company approving the arrangement (in view of the City agreement with this Company regarding the use of the said site) and
- (b) The City being able to acquire adequate lands in the vicinity and suitably located to replace the land to be sold.

It would be recommended that the City be given a period of six weeks at least within which to find out whether they can obtain such lands. It would be further recommended that the applicants should leave with the City a deposit which would be returned if the City decided not to sell because of either (a) or (b) above, but would be forfeited to the City if after six weeks the City had obtained options on alternate lands and the applicant would not then proceed with the scheme, but would be applied to the purchase price in the event that both the City and the purchaser were ready to complete the transaction.

It is particularly important, I believe, to obtain further information on the second development proposed for this block as I believe much of the land is now held under option by the promoters. In my opinion this reason alone would justify holding off on irrevocable decisions at this time.

Submitted for consideration.

Yours truly,

DC:ts

Denis Cole,
Director

The development envisaged would result in between 250-275 car parking spaces being provided in our own main commercial area in conjunction with a large commercial building. The overall cost to be in vicinity of one million dollars. The total building including the parking structure would be tax producing property when constructed.

The proposal would require closing of existing lane to 49th Avenue - this would be replaced by an "L" lane opening on 48th Street on property provided by developer.

The developer would purchase the City owned parking lot at actual value. The area of building proposed would require provision of some 175 parking stalls, and the additional roughly 100 parking stalls contemplated would be some 40 more stalls than are presently provided on the existing City parking lot.

In effect the developer is proposing to construct a parkade for roughly 250-275 cars, as a commercial venture and requests the City sell him the present City parking lot for this purpose.

There is an agreement between the City and Hudson Bay Co., that parking spaces presently on the City owned parking lot will be maintained as parking spaces, within below ground, ground level, or above ground level, for period of 25 years. Any agreement, therefore, with this developer would be subject to agreement being reached with Hudson Bay Co., in respect of this parking agreement.

Your Commissioners feel the overall proposal has considerable merit, and providing satisfactory arrangements can be made to assure the public parking spaces will be continued in the proposed structure for the life of the whole building, and providing the money derived from the sale of our land is placed in the Off-Street Parking Fund.

Your Commissioners recommend approval in principle of this development, subject to plans being acceptable and complying with our Building By-law and agreement re the relocation of the lane with 5 ft. set back and other details to be prepared between the City Solicitor and the applicant in an agreement form, final details to be approved later by Council.

With respect to the service station, our Zoning By-law prohibits construction of same in this area and we do not recommend any change.

COMMISSIONERS

April 29th, 1963.

R.E.Stollings,
City Clerk,
City of Red Deer.

Re: Your Memo dated April 19th, 1963
Sale of Power to Deerhome Institute and Hudson Bay Co.

In compliance with City Council's request, attached is an analysis indicating the profits derived from the sale of power to the above mentioned consumers for the year 1962.

You will appreciate that the proration of expenses is not precise but only representative with view to the rather arbitrary bases available.

It is interesting to note, however, that the profits earned from these two consumers are comparable percentage-wise to the profit earned by the electric light and power utility during 1962.

Respectfully submitted,
O.C.Mills - Electrical Superintendent
J.H.Pallo - Asst. City Treasurer.

THE CITY OF RED DEER

Revenue Derived in 1962 from Two Power Consumers and
Revenue Consequently Used for Capital Expenditures and
Relief of Taxation.

<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Deerhome</u>	<u>Hudson Bay</u>
Kilowatt hours sold	<u>3,201,600</u>	<u>1,311,600</u>
Sales	\$ 51,480.00	\$ 21,383.50
Discount	<u>nil</u>	<u>nil</u>
Net Sales	\$ <u>51,480.00</u>	\$ <u>21,383.50</u>
<u>Expenditures</u>		
Electrical Energy Purchases	\$ 30,269.78	\$ 12,400.62
Billing, Servicing and Other Costs	57.74	57.74
Cost of money	288.00	144.00
Return on Investment	<u>288.00</u>	<u>144.00</u>
Total Expenditures	\$ <u>30,903.52</u>	\$ <u>12,746.36</u>
Contribution to Capital Expenditures and Relief of Taxation	\$ <u><u>20,576.48</u></u>	<u><u>8,637.14</u></u>
Percentage of Profit to Sales	40%	40%

NOTE:

The above information was requested by Council April 15th, 1963.

City Clerk.
