

## A G E N D A

For Regular Meeting of Council of the City of Red Deer to be held in Council Chambers, City Hall, Red Deer, Monday, August 28th, 1967, commencing at 5:00 P.M.

=====

### 1. PRESENT:

Confirmation of Minutes of Regular Meeting of August 15th, 1967.

### 2. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Alderman McCullough - RE: Written Inquiry -  
"Waiving of Formalities" . . . . . 1
2. City Clerk - RE: Proposed Construction of  
10-Suite Apartment, 5605 - 42nd Street . . . . . 2
3. City Clerk - RE: Diamond Investments Ltd. . . . . 3
4. City Commissioner - RE: Jubilee Beverages  
Ltd. - Application to Rezone South Portion,  
Lot 3, Block 2, Plan 737 H.W. . . . . 3
5. City Purchasing Agent - RE: Purchase of  
Bulldozer for Public Works Department. . . . . 6
6. City Purchasing Agent - RE: Guarantees  
for Re-Roofing of Water Treatment Plant. . . . . 7

### 3. REPORTS:

1. City Treasurer - RE: Completed Capital  
Projects . . . . . 9
2. City Clerk - RE: Council Meetings . . . . . 9
3. Alderman McCullough - RE: Tendering  
Airport Management Facilities. . . . . 10
4. City Commissioner - RE: Space Vacated  
by Library, City Hall. . . . . 10
5. City Commissioners - RE: Western Stock-  
yards Ltd. . . . . 11
6. City Engineer - RE: 1967 Programme  
Progress Report. . . . . 12
7. Alberta Urban Municipalities Association -  
RE: August, 1967 Bulletin
8. H. Pohl - RE: 1967 Tax Notice - Lot 9,  
Block E, Plan 5031 H.W. . . . . 13

### 4. WRITTEN INQUIRIES:

1. Alderman R. McGregor - RE: Purchase of  
Harvard Aircraft . . . . . 15
2. Alderman R. McGregor - RE: Speeding on  
43rd Avenue from 39th Street to 50th  
Street . . . . . 15

5. CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Mr. H. Gilbert - RE: Used Car Lot -  
Lot 9, Block 1, Plan 3289 K.S. . . . . 17

2. Holmes, Crowe, Power & Johnston - RE:  
Request to Rezone Part of Lot E, Plan  
5812 K.S. to Accommodate a New and Used  
Car Storage Lot. . . . . 18

6. PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS:

1. Property Owners East of Gaetz Avenue North  
of 68th Street - RE: Request for Construction  
of Sanitary Sewer. . . . . 20

7. BY-LAWS:

1. By-law No. 2273 - RE: Establishment of a Social Service  
Board.

2. By-law No. 2085/K - RE: Amendment to By-law No. 2085,  
being the Utility By-law.

8. NOTICES OF MOTION:

UNFINISHED BUSINESSNO. 1.

The following Inquiry and replies to same were tabled at meeting of Council August 15th, 1967.

"It is understood that present City tenders permit the 'waiving of formalities' within those tenders when they are awarded. Would the Administration please explain the implication of this policy and the pros and cons of continuing with this policy."

\* \* \*

July 28th, 1967

TO: City Commissioner

FROM: City Treasurer

SUBJECT: Written Inquiry - Purchasing

Alderman McCullough's written inquiry of July 17th requests information regarding use of a condition in City tenders for "waiving of formalities". This term gives the City the right to accept a tender which is submitted on a basis somewhat different, than as laid out in the tender specifications.

An example might be a truck tender where the specification calls for a 365 cubic inch engine. The best and lowest tender may be for a 363 cubic inch engine and in this case the City would waive the requirement for a 365 cubic inch engine. A further example would be a situation where no tenders comply with the original specification but an alternative material is offered which the City agrees will be quite adequate. The right to waive conditions permits the City to accept a non-conforming tender without the need to retender.

The waiving of conditions is subject to management approval, and I would consider this an adequate safeguard to ensure that the recommendations that a condition be waived is properly justified.

H. K. HALL,  
City Treasurer

\* \* \*

August 9th, 1967

TO: City Clerk

FROM: City Engineer

RE: Written Inquiry - "Waiving of Formalities"

The tender document is a formal legal document. In order to provide a limited amount of flexibility, we normally insert a clause in the tender allowing the City to waive formalities.

The bidder may make minor errors, omissions, add conditional statements, etc. with his tender. The aforementioned clause makes it possible to accept the tender despite the fact that it is not formally submitted.

The City must use good judgement in applying this clause. Otherwise a bidder may have an advantage over other bidders.

We have used this clause a number of times without raising any problems. I would suggest that the benefits of retaining the clause outweigh the disadvantages of omitting it.

N. J. DECK, P. Eng.,  
City Engineer

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 2.

RE: Proposed Construction of 10-Suite Apartment  
on Property Located at 5605 - 42nd Street  
(Lots 10 & 11, Block E, Plan K.11)

On April 4th, 1967, an application for approval of construction of an apartment building on Lots 10, 11 & 12 was considered by the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission were advised at that meeting that a survey of the residents within 200 feet of the proposed development had been made and resulted in six objectors out of a total of seventeen surveyed. The plans submitted indicated this apartment would contain twelve, two-bedroom suites.

The Municipal Planning Commission, on April 4th, approved the application as per plan submitted, with revised enlarged parking spaces and subject to the objectors being advised of the results of the survey, and the decision of the Commission, and further, of the right to enter an appeal with the Development Appeal Board against the decision of the Commission within a period of fourteen days. The Commission further agreed that should no appeal be lodged within the required time, a building permit may be issued for the development. The decision of the Municipal Planning Commission noted above was forwarded to the objectors on April 5th.

On April 17th, George M. and Sheila B. Turner of 5602 - 41st Street, lodged with the Secretary of the Development Appeal Board, an appeal against the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission. All property owners surveyed in the original survey were advised on April 25th that the Development Appeal Board would consider the appeal on May 17th. At the hearing on May 17th, the appellants were represented by Mr. H. Fielding. In addition, four other property owners in this vicinity appeared before the Appeal Board.

The Appeal Board, having considered all evidence produced, agreed that the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission of April 4th, be not upheld and, accordingly, the appeal by Mr. and Mrs. Turner was granted. The decision of the Development Appeal Board was forwarded on May 18th to all property owners contacted in the original survey.

On August 8th, a further proposal to construct a 10-suite apartment on Lots 10 & 11, Block E, Plan K.11, was brought before the Municipal Planning Commission. This proposal indicated each suite would contain one bedroom. The Commission were advised that a survey letter had been sent out to twenty-four property owners (some beyond the 200' radius) and that thirteen homeowners had indicated objections to the proposal. The Municipal Planning Commission agreed, in view of the previous decision of the Development Appeal Board, that this matter should be referred to City Council for a decision, and accordingly, same was brought before Council August 15th, at which time Council directed same be tabled for a period of two weeks to enable all property owners in this vicinity to be advised that this application will be heard by City Council August 28th. In accordance with Council's decision August 15th, letters were forwarded to twenty-three property owners in the area and as of this date, one letter has been returned marked "Unknown" and one objection has been received.

F. A. AMY,  
City Clerk

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 3.

RE: Diamond Investments Ltd.

Mr. J. Dubasz, President of Diamond Investments Ltd., has requested that his application for rezoning of a portion of the N.E.  $\frac{1}{4}$  21-38-27-W4 be tabled for a further two weeks to enable him to be present when same is considered.

F. A. AMY,  
City Clerk

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 4.

August 24th, 1967

TO: City Council

FROM: City Commissioner

RE: Jubilee Beverages Ltd. - South Portion -  
Lot 3, Block 2, Plan 737 H.W.

Attached please find a copy of a report from the Industrial Director to the Marketing Committee regarding negotiations with the above mentioned Company to find them a suitable site.

The site applied for is located in an R.C. District (reserved for future commercial development). This district is one in which small holding uses are permitted until such time as Council deems that it should be rezoned for commercial purposes.

Up to the present time, Council has been rezoning this area from R/C District to C.5 District (Highway Commercial) as applications for highway commercial development have been received, but such rezoning has only taken place in an orderly manner working gradually Southward from the existing C.5 District which is developed and serviced. i.e. Council has not rezoned individual isolated lots but rather has gradually extended the C.5 zoning in a Southerly direction, and such rezoning has been conditional on prepayment for the extension of services.

It has been the view of the administration (supported by Council up to the present time), that the valuable frontage to the main access route through the City should be reserved for those businesses which primarily serve the travelling public, and in particular the tourist. The uses permitted in this district include motels, hotels, licensed premises, garages and service stations, restaurants, drive-in or take-out food and refreshment establishments. A number of conditional uses related to such highway traffic are also permitted.

South of this area, which is reserved under our Zoning By-law for highway commercial development, there is half a mile of land on both sides of Highway No. 2A zoned for high standard industrial development. The land on the West side is within the City Limits and extends from the new Agratec plant to the Chrysler plant. This land is privately owned. On the opposite side (the East side) the land lies in the County and is used for farm purposes but under the County By-law, is zoned for industrial purposes.

The small portion of land reserved for future highway commercial development could be rezoned for industry, but this would mean that there would be virtually no land within the City or adjacent to the City, which would be available for future commercial development related to the tourist trade and the travelling public.

Council may wish to consider permitting both commercial and industrial uses in this area. It is submitted that such a policy would not be wise because these two uses do not mix well together.

The third alternative is to leave the zoning as it stands and pursue the possibilities of locating Jubilee Beverages in the industrial area between Agratec and Chrysler or on the land within the County on the opposite side of the road. In this connection the Industrial Director points out that the provision of sewer service to this area will involve an expenditure of forty to fifty thousand dollars. It should be pointed out that the City is committed to provide sewer service to Agratec within five years but this sewer cannot be extended further South. It is further submitted that if industry requires sewer service in this area, the City must be prepared to lay out the necessary initial costs for services in advance. These costs will be recovered as development occurs. It should be noted that the City has already invested a substantial sum in extending water to the Chrysler plant, and it is only logical that sewer service be extended there as soon as there is a demand for it. However, it is more than probable that industries locating in this area will have sufficiently large parcels that it will be more economic to service them with individual fields.

The fourth alternative available to Council is to treat this as an application under the section of the new Planning Act which empowers the Council to permit a development on any site for a use which is not permitted in the zone. i.e. The Council can approve this industrial proposal in the middle of a block intended for commercial purposes without changing the zoning. It is suggested that such a decision is most likely to result in other applications of a similar nature and the end result will be partial development of this area with mixed industry and commerce.

In considering this problem it is suggested that Council must weigh up the need of land on the highway for development designed to serve the tourist during the next 10-20 years, and Council would be well advised to ensure that there is adequate land available and reserved for such future development.

On the other hand Council must decide as to whether this application for a development involving the expansion of an existing industry should over-ride all other considerations.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\*

\*

\*

August 22nd, 1967

TO: Marketing Committee

FROM: Industrial Director

RE: Jubilee Beverages Ltd. - South Portion -  
Lot 3, Block 2, Plan 737 H.W.

The application by Botterill McKee Anderson Ltd. on behalf of Jubilee Beverages Ltd. for approval of the above site for construction of a development to accommodate Jubilee Beverages Ltd. was referred to this Department by City Council on August 15th, when the following motion was carried.

"That this matter be tabled for a period of two weeks to enable the Industrial Director and City officials to meet with representatives of Jubilee Beverages with the view to finding a more suitable location for this type of operation."

In my report to the Marketing Committee of May 26th, Item 2 of "New Files" read:

"2. Jubilee Beverages: Local firm possibly interested in expansion and relocation. Maps and quotations for land and services supplied. Nine discussions with principals to date since March 28th." The name of the firm was deleted from the copy of the report presented by the Committee to the public meeting of Council on June 5th, 1967.

The requirements of Jubilee Beverages as outlined to this Department were as follows:

Site: 2 to 2½ acres.  
 Services: Sewer, water, access roads, etc.  
 Location: Preferably adjacent to current location or on Highway 2A South.

The only available City-owned site adjacent to Jubilee Beverages is a 1.23 acre lot adjoining the North property-line of the present location. The cost of this lot would be \$15,902. The firm rejected this lot for two reasons:

1. It is too expensive.
2. Even if it were added to the existing Jubilee Beverage lot of .52 acres and if the firm were also to purchase the available privately owned site of approximately .5 acres on their western boundary for a total site area of approximately 2¼ acres, the total parcel would not be suitable for the proposed development.

Mr. Hanson states that the Company does not wish to expand the present building as it would not be suitable for the single-level operation planned for the enlarged new premises. It is desired to plan and construct a completely new building that will integrate the various stages of the production, bottling and shipping operation, and to provide room for future expansion on the site. It is proposed to set the new building on a landscaped lot with decorative fencing around the limited storage areas.

The Company has other plans for the existing building rather than demolishing it to make room for the new building in the present location with adjacent sites added.

#### Alternative Sites

The Company does not wish to locate in Riverside Park, nor is there any other City-owned site suitable for their requirements.

There is land zoned R.I. to the West of 51st Avenue between 67th and 71st Streets in North Red Deer. The necessary services could be connected by the City at a cost to the City of about \$7,800. This land, however, is included for discussion in the general review of industrial zoning arising from the Fantus Report. In any event, the Company does not particularly wish to locate in that area.

There is land zoned I.1 to the South of Lot 3, Block 2, Plan 737 H.W. (between Agro Equipment and Chrysler on Gaetz Avenue). This land is privately owned and is not available for sale at the time of this report as it is under option to a private development company. A decision is expected by the end of August which will reveal if a site could be purchased by Jubilee Beverages. This would be suitable to the Company if the price compares favourably with the price of Lot 3, Block 2, Plan 737 H.W. A sewer connection would be essential and this will involve an expenditure of \$40,000 to \$50,000 by the City.

Jubilee Beverages Ltd. wish to locate on Highway 2A South. The only land within the City zoned for this purpose on this highway is the parcel lying between Chrysler and Agro Equipment. The County of Red Deer land East of Gaetz Avenue from this area is zoned for industry but services are not available. No other appropriately-zoned sites can be found to meet the expressed requirements of Jubilee Beverages.

Respectfully submitted,

M. C. HOGAN,  
 Industrial Director

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 5.

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: Purchasing Agent

RE: Dozer

In conjunction with Council's resolution of August 15th in connection with the purchase of a Bulldozer, we have contacted the owners of the two Bulldozers in question.

Mr. Jensen, owner of the machine presently being used in our sanitary land fill operation, has signified he will offer this Bulldozer to us complete with accessories for a price of \$13,000.00. This is a D7 model 17A Caterpillar, 1958, complete with cable control Bulldozer. There is no turbo-charger on this unit. For our particular operations, we would have to install hydraulics on this particular machine. Union Tractor have indicated they may be able to supply us with a used hydraulic system for this machine at a cost of \$2,000.00. This is not a firm offer as they do not, at present, own this equipment, but expect to procure it within the next short while. In the event this used equipment is not available, they felt we should be able to procure similar equipment for not more than \$3,000.00.

The unit owned by Mr. Jensen appears to be in very good condition with the complete undercarriage having less than 700 hours of operation. There are 9,000 hours indicated on the hour meter but this could possibly also mean 19,000 hours as the meter only has 4 digits. The motor and final drives on this unit were overhauled within the past two years.

We also contacted Mr. Evan Jones of Red Deer District regarding the D7, 1961 model. This unit has 14,000 hours on the meter and he advised that he has put new rails, pins, bushings and rollers this spring. There were several of the pads which were cracked and the drive sprockets were somewhat worn. Mr. Jones is asking \$20,000.00 without the scraper control unit which is presently attached to the machine. If we were to purchase this machine, it would not leave us sufficient funds to obtain the ripper unit required, under the \$20,000.00 ceiling price set for the purchase of this Bulldozer.

I would therefore recommend we purchase the D7 Model 17A Caterpillar offered by Mr. Jensen for a price of \$13,000.00 and purchase a hydraulic system from Union Tractor of Red Deer, if and when available.

It is also requested that permission be given to the undersigned and the City Engineer to procure a used ripper for this unit when and if such item becomes available.

A. S. KRAUSE,  
Purchasing Agent

\*

\*

\*

TREASURER'S COMMENTS:

The 1967 Budget contains provision for \$7,500 only. If Council approves purchase of this machine, installation of hydraulics and purchase of a used ripper, the resolution should provide that all costs in excess of \$7,500 be provided for in the 1968 budget.

H. K. HALL,  
City Treasurer

\*

\*

\*

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

Council's decision is requested.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 6.

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: Purchasing Agent

RE: Roofing

In accordance with your request for further information on the roofing guarantees, I have contacted the two low bidders in this respect.

I contacted Otto Roofing Ltd. with regard to the guarantee for hot mix application. This guarantee is made by the Alberta Roofing Contractors Association to guarantee any defaults by a member of the A.R.C.A. when such a guarantee is required on any particular job. This guarantee also includes inspections of the roof by an independent firm.

I was concerned with this guarantee as to materials because the guarantee is subject to certain conditions. Attached hereto is a copy of the guarantee. I was contacted by a Mr. Thomas of A.R.C.A. in this regard and he advised me the implication of the overall guarantee is that they, A.R.C.A., would make good any faults in a roof during the period of the guarantee which was caused by faulty workmanship or materials and that they would deal with the manufacturer of the materials if such materials were the cause of the defect.

In respect of the guarantee offered by the cold process roofing, I contacted Mr. W. E. Cooper. There is no guarantee as to workmanship in the bid as submitted by Mr. Cooper, but the materials are covered to a degree by the manufacturer - Texas Refinery Corporation of Canada Ltd. Their guarantee reads as follows: - "Should MIGHTYPLATE Liquid Asbestos Roof Coating and MIGHTYPLATE Plastic-Cement be applied according to our simple printed instructions and the account paid in full when due for terms of order and fail to give you roof protection for seven years from invoice date, excepting in case of earthquakes, cyclones, hailstorms, and other unusual acts of nature, or structural breakup of building, we hereby agree only to furnish at no charge at our factory or warehouse, sufficient additional coating for you to make necessary repairs for the duration of this seven year period."

It should be borne in mind that neither of the foregoing guarantees will cover damage to a roof caused by factors other than workmanship or materials. It is my understanding that most roof damage is caused by such other forces as building settlement and work done by building owners after roofs have been installed, and as such, would not be covered by such guarantees.

In view of the foregoing, I would recommend we award the contract for this roofing as recommended in the original report, that is, to Otto Roofing Ltd. for a cost of \$3,494.00.

A. S. KRAUSE,  
Purchasing Agent

\* \* \*

Concur with recommendation.

H. K. HALL,  
City Treasurer

\* \* \*

Concur with recommendation.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \* \* \*

R E P O R T SNO. 1.

August 22nd, 1967

TO: City Clerk  
 FROM: City Treasurer

RE: Completed Capital Projects

The resolution passed by Council on July 17th authorizing use of capital funds of \$ 38,454.07 toward the 67th Street Construction project has been returned by the Local Authorities Board for minor amendment as follows:

1. Included in the resolution was an "overexpenditure" of \$ 77,084.58 for By-law No. 2177. This amount represents the total expenditure under this By-law and no funds were borrowed because it was known that surplus funds were available in By-law No. 2168. The Local Authorities Board does not consider this to be an overexpenditure and therefore it is necessary to provide for this amount by an allocation of surplus.
2. The amount actually borrowed for By-law No. 2203 (bottom of Page 2) is shown as \$74,000. This amount includes an amount of \$12,333.25 which is not repayable under the forgiveness of debt provisions of the Municipal Development and Loan Act. The Board has requested that this be explained by footnote.

It is recommended that Council rescind the resolution of July 17th, 1967 and pass the amended resolution attached. Sufficient copies of the new resolution are attached for members of Council.

H. K. HALL,  
 City Treasurer

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 2.

August 24th, 1967

TO: City Council  
 FROM: City Clerk

RE: Council Meetings

At meeting of City Council Monday, June 12th, Council agreed that meetings be held every second Monday through the balance of June, July and August, 1967. Do Council wish to revert to holding meetings every Monday with the next meeting being scheduled for September 5th, or do they wish to continue on every second Monday basis, with a provision as at present of holding special meetings in the intervening period if urgent matters arise requiring Council decision.

Should Council agree to continue meeting every second Monday, we would bring to your attention that it would be necessary to hold a meeting on September 18th, as Court of Revision - RE: List of Electors has been established and advertised for that date.

Council's direction is requested in this instance.

F. A. AMY,  
 City Clerk

\* \* \*

Recommend that Council continue holding meetings bi-weekly unless urgent business arises requiring the calling of a special meeting.

R. E. BARRETT,  
Mayor

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 3.

TO: Commissioners and Council

FROM: Alderman R. G. McCullough

RE: Tendering Airport Management Facilities

The Airport Commission, at its meeting of Aug. 14th, 1967, recommended the extension of present management arrangements at the Airport for 60 days to allow time for completion of arrangements to lease Hangar No. 1 until June 30th, 1968.

The Department of National Defense cannot give assurance of longer tenure on the Hangar at this time.

It is difficult if not impossible, to put together a tender package that assures hangar occupancy for only ten months. The Airport tender package would more properly cover a term of 3 to 5 years.

Should Council agree to extend present management arrangements for 10 months to ~~next~~ June 30th, the Airport Commission would support this action.

The Commission considers the present performance to be satisfactory and has had no requests from other parties wishing to take over this function.

Alderman R. G. McCullough,  
Chairman,  
Red Deer Airport Commission

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 4.

TO: City Council

RE: Space Vacated by Library  
City Hall

Council has provided \$2,750 in the 1967 budget for partitioning and other changes in the City Hall proposed to be undertaken on vacation of the Library. This amount was one third of the total estimated cost of \$8,200.00. Council ruled that the balance of the estimated cost amounting to \$5,450.00, would be provided for in the 1968 budget.

Council wished to study further the proposals before authorizing the work.

Since that time, the City Treasurer has had an opportunity to study carefully the proposed layout, as it will effect the operation of his Department over the next few years. Some changes have been made and he is now satisfied that the layout insofar as his Department is concerned, will meet his needs. Built-in cupboards, counters, etcetera, exceed those included in the original proposal and may add \$300 - \$400 to the total cost. It is very difficult to estimate the cost of such alterations but we believe that bids should be within 10% (plus or minus) of \$8,500.00.

The amended plan will be available for Council. It is desirable that Council's authority to proceed should not be delayed so that the work can be completed and the Treasury Department moved before year-end, which is a peak work time for this Department. If approval is now received, it is anticipated that detailed plans and specifications for tender can be ready by September 11th, with a closing date for bids on October 2nd. Council could consider the award of the contract at its meeting on October 10th. Based on this schedule, we would expect the work to be completed by November 21st, 1967.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 5.

August 24th, 1967

TO: City Council  
FROM: City Commissioners

RE: Western Stockyards Ltd.

At a Closed Meeting of City Council February 20th, the following resolution was passed.

"WHEREAS the use of Agricultural Auction Mart is a 'conditional use' for the site occupied by Sims Auction Mart, and

WHEREAS Council is of the view that a Public Stockyards Terminal Market is a different use to that envisaged by an Agricultural Auction Mart, and

WHEREAS the Sims Auction Mart is not a site which in the opinion of the City would contribute to the orderly development of the City if developed as a Stockyard.

COUNCIL HEREBY RESOLVES THAT the applicants be informed that Council does not favour the use of the Sim's Auction Mart as a Public Stockyard."

At Regular Meeting of Council of February 27th, a further resolution was passed as follows approving the proposal of Western Stockyards Ltd. to purchase the equity stock of Sims Auction Mart Ltd.

"Resolved Council of the City of Red Deer approve the proposal of Western Stockyards Ltd. to purchase the equity stock of Sims Auction Mart Ltd., and approve their plans to change the operation to that of a terminal livestock market, subject to satisfactory arrangements being worked out for transfer of the operation to the general area of the Intercontinental Packers at some future date, after the necessary facilities and amenities are available in that area."

Prior to voting on the above motion, a motion to amend was introduced as follows. As there was no seconder to this amendment, same was defeated.

"That the motion as introduced be amended by deleting therefrom the words 'subject to satisfactory arrangements being worked out for transfer of the operation at the general area of Intercontinental Packers at some future date after the necessary facilities and amenities are available in that area'."

As it appears unlikely at this time that the City is going to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement with Western Stockyards Ltd. to transfer their operations from Sims Auction Mart Ltd. site to the Riverside Industrial area, it is recommended that Council rescind the resolution of February 20th and the latter portion of the resolution of February 27th.

It should be noted that Western Stockyards Ltd. have acquired the site in Riverside and will be paying for the services over five years, and it is therefore possible that they will move to this location at some future date.

R. E. BARRETT,  
Mayor

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 6.

August 24th, 1967

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: City Engineer

RE: 1967 Programme Progress Report

1. 67th Street Underpass

Tenders will be received on September 5th. An award can be made shortly thereafter, subject to final approval from the contributing agencies. With good weather we would expect that the structure can be completed this fall and some of the road construction also completed.

2. 67th Street - 65th Avenue to 50th Avenue

The Contractor, Standard General Construction (S.G.C.) is progressing very satisfactorily on this project. It is expected that curb and gutter construction on the East 1,700 feet will be started about September 1st.

3. South End of the One-Way Couplet

S.G.C. have not started this project as yet. They hope to obtain surplus earth from other roadways and therefore construction on this project will be late.

4. Bridge at 49th Avenue and Waskasoo Creek

Progress on this project is a little slow although the Contractor should meet his completion date quite easily. The North abutment of the bridge is ready for concrete placement.

5. 60th Street Underpass

We expect to receive preliminary plans within one week so that we will be in a position to determine our property requirements. Tenders can be called about the 1st of November and work could start about April 1st, 1968.

6. Alberta School Hospital Hill

City crews have completed the earth work and some gravelling on this road. S.G.C. will start construction of sidewalk, curb and gutter on August 24th, and expect to complete the concrete work about September 5th. They will then carry on with gravelling and if the weather is good, they will pave the road this fall. City crews will construct the guard rail and landscape the road and the borrow pit this fall.

7. North End of One-Way Couplet (49th Avenue)

City crews will complete the earth work, landscaping and some gravelling by August 26th. S.G.C. expect to complete gravelling and construction of curb and gutter and possibly pave the road before winter. City crews will construct a guard rail this fall, providing the road is opened to traffic.

8. S.G.C. have completed construction of curb and gutter South and West of Red Deer Motors and they have also completed the sidewalk, curb and gutter in the Morrisroe Subdivision.

9. Crown Paving

Crown paving should be complete by September 1st.

10. Sanitary Land Fill Site

The move to the new sanitary land fill site was made very smoothly. We have had some trouble with seagulls, however this problem now seems to be in hand.

N. J. DECK, P. Eng.,  
City Engineer

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 8.

August 25th, 1967

TO: City Council

RE: Lot 9, Block E, Plan 5031 H.W.

With reference to the 1967 tax notice respecting the above described property.

I purchased this property from the City of Red Deer through the tax sale procedure and one of the conditions were that the existing building be demolished within sixty days. Due to complications on registration of the property, the building was not demolished in time to be removed from the 1967 Assessment Roll.

As it was a condition of City Council (tax sale), that the building be removed, I hereby request that the tax levy of \$60.50 on the building only be cancelled.

Yours truly,

H. POHL

\* \* \*

With respect to the above application for a tax cancellation.

The property in question was sold by City Council in October, 1966 through the Tax Recovery Act. A condition of sale was the removal of the existing house within 60 days, however due to the length of time required for the registration and approval of the sale in Edmonton, Mr. Pohl was not allowed to remove the building until after the closing of the Assessment Roll for 1967.

In view of the circumstances involved, it is hereby recommended that the building tax of \$60.50 be cancelled.

(Building assessed 1090 tax \$60.50)

Respectfully submitted,

D. J. WILSON, Tax Collector

\* \* \*

Concur with recommendation.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \* \* \*

WRITTEN INQUIRIESNO. 1.

The following Written Inquiry was submitted by Alderman R. N. McGregor at meeting of Council August 15th, 1967.

"As it is now almost two years since the City of Red Deer contributed \$500.00 towards the purchase of an aircraft to be used to commemorate Penhold activities of the past, may Council be advised as to the present disposition of this aircraft and when we may expect to see this unit properly located."

\* \* \*

RE: Alderman McGregor's Written Inquiry - Harvard

This plane was purchased by the City for \$500.00. In addition, \$700.00 was provided to the C.O.C. for its installation, who at that time, were contemplating putting it on the land in front of their building. Due to the weather and other factors, the plane had to be stored in one of the hangars at Penhold for sometime. During this period, rentals amounting to about \$200.00 charged by the D.N.D. were paid by the Chamber. Later, the plan to install it by the Chamber building was not approved and at this time, there are no firm plans to put it anywhere.

The Chamber has agreed to refund to the City the balance of the \$700.00 and let the City undertake the installation.

A possible location has been suggested North of the A.M.A. Building between 49th and Gaetz Avenues at the bottom of the hill.

I would suggest that we defer any action until these roads are completed and in the meantime, consider any alternate location.

R. E. BARRETT,  
Mayor

\* \* \* \* \*

NO. 2.

The following Written Inquiry was submitted by Alderman R. N. McGregor at meeting of Council August 15th, 1967.

"It is my understanding that we purchased a Radar unit to control speeding on City streets. During the past few months the excessive speeds on 43rd Avenue from 39th Street to 50th Street has increased considerably. Would the administration check this matter with our Police Department before a serious accident occurs. The matter of speeding throughout the entire City should be checked."

\* \* \*

In answer to Alderman McGregor's Written Inquiry, the following report has been obtained from the Sgt. i/c of the Red Deer City Detachment.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\* \* \*

Red Deer, Alberta  
August 25th, 1967

Mr. Denis Cole  
City Commissioner  
City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alberta

Sir:

This is in reply to your letter of August 24th, 1967. I have obtained the following information from our records respecting the use of the Radar unit from January 1st to July 31st, 1967:

<u>MONTH</u>	<u>PROSECUTIONS</u>
January	12
February	52
March	48
April	126
May	47
June	97
July	<u>113</u>
TOTAL	495

There have been 193 prosecutions entered for the offence of speeding in addition to charges preferred as the result of radar checks. This makes a total of 688 to the end of July, 1967 compared with a total of 405 during the same period of 1966. Between 40 and 50 of the total prosecutions resulted from radar checks on 43rd Avenue.

There has been an increase in prosecutions for traffic offences generally. Our records show a total of 1,552 charges laid to July 31st, 1967 compared to a total of 943 for the same period last year. It is our opinion that one of the major causes of motor vehicle accidents is the drinking driver. In this connection I would like to point out there have been 51 prosecutions for impaired driving to July 31st, 1967 as compared to 11 during the same period last year.

With respect to the suggestion that there is a speeding problem on 43rd Avenue, I believe this subject has been brought up at past Police Committee meetings, and it is felt that the narrowness of this street creates an illusion that vehicles are travelling at a higher rate of speed than they actually are. However, this has been brought to the attention of our Traffic Section who will make a determined effort to obtain evidence against the offending persons.

I trust the foregoing information is sufficient. I would be pleased to supply any further comments or details that you require.

Yours truly,

(D. E. HARRISON) Sgt.  
i/c Red Deer City Detachment

\* \* \* \* \*

CORRESPONDENCENO. 1.Red Deer, Alberta  
August 21st, 1967City Council  
Red DeerATTENTION: Mayor E. Barrett

Dear Sir:

I see by the paper, Council plans to revoke my privileges to operate a Car Lot on the North Hill. Possibly due to a change of mailing address, I did not receive an invitation to attend the meeting of the 15th. I thought the main problem was the cars I had on my lot with fenders or parts removed and the photos taken should have shown that I had removed all of these. I am also in the process of removing all older cars that are not runable or saleable. As the fence was supposed to hide the dismantled cars it will not be necessary any longer. The building I have for the use of repair shop, I had an offer to purchase with the assurance it would be gone before the 15th of August but this deal fell through when the buyer said he couldn't get permission to move it to his place near Lacombe. But I am still going to remove this building as it is not adaptable to my plans. I am building a reconditioning depot out of the City and would like the use of the lot in question as strictly a Sales Lot for good roadworthy cars and trucks as set out by the new Motor Vehicle Branch regulations.

I am not and never have been, at this location, engaged in any salvage or wrecking business. If I were not trying to run a legal operation I would not have applied for license in the first place but would have sold cars out of my service station like many other operators do in Red Deer. But as I do most of my work myself, I would like to ask for the following consideration of my situation. By the time you have your next meeting, I should have all the questionable cars removed as well as the fence and one building and will try to have my office redecorated.

Would you consider a deferment of any action till then and take another look at the picture.

Sincerely,

HERB GILBERT

\*

\*

\*

Mr. Gilbert advises he moved from his former address, 60 Oberlin Avenue, to which address notice of August 15th meeting was sent, to Midway Service, R.R. #1, shortly after August 1st, 1967. The notice was mailed August 10th; Mr. Gilbert states he did not receive same until August 16th.

Mr. Gilbert has been invited to attend Council meeting of August 28th at 7:00 P.M.

F. A. AMY,  
City Clerk

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

NO. 2.

HOLMES, CROWE, POWER &amp; JOHNSTON

4929 - Ross Street  
Red Deer, Alberta  
August 18th, 1967

City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sirs:

RE: Our File No. 3019

Parkland Parkways Ltd. are in the process of selling the land directly South of Orme & McIntosh Funeral Homes Ltd. This property has a Western boundary fronting on 49th Avenue of approximately 131.53', a Northern boundary of approximately 175', an Eastern boundary of approximately 220' and a Southern boundary of approximately 225'.

The property will be used for the storage of new and used cars and we would request that the property be rezoned from a C.6 to a C.5 in order to allow this use.

Yours very truly,

P. C. POWER

\*

\*

\*

RED DEER REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

4920 - 53rd Street  
Red Deer, Alberta  
August 25th, 1967

Mr. F. A. Amy  
City Clerk  
City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sir:

RE: Request to Rezone Part of Lot E, Plan 5812 K.S.  
to Accommodate a New and Used Car Storage Lot.

In my previous report to Council dated April 5th, 1967, regarding parcel E and a request to subdivide for a church site, I commented that C.5 uses would be a more compatible use with uses now located in the area, and registered no objection to such rezoning.

It however, should be noted that the remainder of parcel E is still zoned C.6 wherein trailer courts, motels and hotels are permitted uses with drugstores, hairdressers, barbershops and grocery stores in conjunction with and accessory to motels and hotels as conditional uses. I also expressed my concern over access to and from the remainder of Parcel E as only right-hand turning movement would be allowed because of a median strip located in 32nd Street.

It therefore must be understood that with the severance of the front portion of parcel E out of the parcel, the remainder of the parcel is still zoned C.6 and the possibility still exists that the C.6 uses could be located on the site as a permitted use. Such uses, in my opinion, would not be compatible with existing multiple family use to the North of 32nd Street. I would therefore suggest that Council should consider the rezoning of the remainder of parcel E to R.2.B Zone.

As this office is also in receipt of a subdivision application, Council's resolution should cover the following:

- (1) The developer to provide all easements necessary to serve the site with utilities.
- (2) The developer to make satisfactory arrangements with the City for the prepayment of City services.
- (3) It is to be understood that the balance of Parcel E is to have only one access to 32nd Street with only right-hand turning movement being permitted because of the presence of a median strip in 32nd Street.

Yours truly,

ROBERT R. CUNDY, M.T.P.I.C.,  
Director

\*

\*

\*

Concur with recommendation.

DENIS COLE,  
City Commissioner

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

PETITIONS & DELEGATIONSNO. 1.P E T I T I O NFOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENT

TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF RED DEER

Gentlemen:

We, the undersigned property owners, request that you will construct Sanitary Sewer on Lane East of Gaetz Avenue from 68th Street North to Summit Esso Service Station, as a Local Improvement to be assessed by way of a Unit Rate to be fixed by the Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City Act and the By-laws of the City of Red Deer.

---

Signature of Person Registered  
or Assessed as Owner

Address

W. A. Speller

A & W Drive-Inn (W.A. Speller) Ltd.

George Galon

Galon Motors Ltd.

Rachel McLure

M & K Trailer Sales Ltd.

J. E. Templeton (Imperial Oil Ltd. Sales Representative)

Summit Esso Service

\*

\*

\*

August 17th, 1967

TO: City Clerk

FROM: City Engineer

I recommend this be considered with the 1968 Public Works Program.

N. J. DECK, P. Eng.,  
City Engineer

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

BY-LAW NO. 2085/K

A By-law to amend By-law No. 2085, The Utility By-law of the City of Red Deer.

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RED DEER DULY ASSEMBLED ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Section 8 (2) is amended by deleting the words and figures  
"one dollar (\$1.00)"  
and by substituting therefor the words and figures  
"two dollars (\$2.00)"
2. Section 12 (1) is amended by deleting the words and figures  
"one dollar (\$1.00)"  
and by substituting therefor the words and figures  
"two dollars (\$2.00)"
3. Section 12 (2) is amended by deleting the words and figures  
"one dollar (\$1.00)"  
and by substituting therefor the words and figures  
"Two dollars (\$2.00)"
4. Schedule "A" is deleted and new Schedule "A" is substituted therefor as follows:

SCHEDULE "A"

1. Domestic - Bi-Monthly

<u>Consumption</u>	<u>Rate per 100 c.f.</u>	<u>Min. Charge</u>
From 0 to 2,000 cu. ft.	35¢	\$ 6.40 (Bi-Monthly)
From 2,001 cu. ft. & over	30¢	7.00 (Bi-Monthly)

2. Commercial - Monthly

From 0 to 600 cu. ft.	75¢	\$ 4.05 per month
" 601 - 2,000 cu. ft.	67¢	4.50 " "
" 2,001 - 7,000 cu. ft.	52¢	13.40 " "
" 7,001 -13,000 cu. ft.	43¢	36.40 " "
"13,001 -23,000 cu. ft.	34¢	55.90 " "
"23,001 -75,000 & over	23¢	78.20 " "

3. Industrial - Monthly

This rate applies only to those consumers whose premises, to which water is supplied, are used for industrial purposes in connection with the manufacture, production, distribution or sale of goods, wares, merchandise or service.

BY-LAW NO. 2085/K

From 0 to	600 cu. ft.	75¢	\$ 4.05 per month
" 601 to	2,000 cu. ft.	67¢	4.50
"2,001 to	7,000 cu. ft.	52¢	13.40
"7,001 to	13,000 cu. ft.	43¢	36.40
13,001 to	23,000 cu. ft.	34¢	55.90
23,001 to	75,000 cu. ft.	23¢	78.20
75,001 & over		20¢	172.50

4. Discount - Applicable to Rates 1, 2 and 3. - 10%

READ A FIRST TIME IN OPEN COUNCIL this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

A.D. 1967.

READ A SECOND TIME IN OPEN COUNCIL this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

A.D. 1967.

READ A THIRD TIME IN OPEN COUNCIL AND FINALLY PASSED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of

\_\_\_\_\_ A.D. 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK