

*File*

A G E N D A

For the meeting of Council to be held in the Council Chambers  
on Monday, March 11, 1957 at 7:30 p.m.

---

1. Present:

Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held March 4th, 1957.

2. Correspondence:

- |   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| 1. G.S. Frizzell                            | re | Extension of services to Property          |
| 2. House Builders Assn.                     | re | Basement Suites in houses in Card Property |
| 3. A. Chesterman                            | re | Refund on Cost of Electric Line to House   |
| 4. Canadian National<br>Institute for Blind | re | Grant from City                            |
| 5. H. Russell                               | re | Subdivision of Property                    |

3. Reports:

1. Re: Gaetz Ave. Reconstruction
2. Re: Building Permits
3. Re: Color of City Vehicles
4. R.C.M.P. Monthly Report
5. Voluntary Traffic Fines - February, 1957
6. Summary of Activities - Rec. Commission - Feb., 1957

4. Aldermen's New Business:

5. New Business:

1. Payment of Accounts.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1.

LETTER NO. 1

March 1, 1957

Mr. J.M. McAfee, Mayor  
City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alta.

Dear Mr. Mayor & Council:

I have applied to the Planning Commission to be rezoned for the purpose of erecting a modern service station and trailer court. This has been approved in principle. The reports from the City Engineers are that it is physically possible to extend City sewer and water to the north end of my property. I would like to make this my application to be taken into the City and obtain sewer and water facilities.

Yours truly,

"G.S. Frizzell

NOTE:

The above request for rezoning was approved by R.D.D.P.C., subject to the City being willing to supply services if possible. It has since been checked and we could connect them to our existing system.

However, it has not been the policy of the City to extend services outside our boundaries.

Would suggest Mr. Frizzell be advised that his application to be incorporated within the City will be considered with our proposed extension.

COMMISSIONERS

---

LETTER NO. 2

February 25, 1957

City Commissioner, E. Newman  
City of Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sir:

During the meeting of the Red Deer & District House Builder's Association on Feb. 20/57, the basement suite situation was brought up; as a result the Association wish to request consideration on this situation in the proposed new "Card" property.

We would like to request consideration in zoning of the new "Card" property for single family dwellings only, thus eliminating the possibilities of having basement suites in the new residences to be built there.

The local Builder's Association would appreciate meeting with members of the City on this subject at any time to have a further discussion on this objective.

Yours truly,

The Red Deer & District House  
Builder's Association

per W.V. Plante, Sec. Mgr.

for N.C. Alton, President

NOTE:

Suggest this matter be referred to R.D.D.P.C.

COMMISSIONERS

December 28, 1956

The Commissioner  
City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sir:

That whereas I did pay for all the poles and wire on 69th Street on May 28, 1951, and whereas you have another service on this Street, I am entitled to cost of Poles and Wire refunded or rental on same at ten dollars (\$10.00) per month. I wish to know which you are prepared to do. I have a receipt dated May 28, 1951 for \$162.25 for poles and wire from paved road to my house, plus \$80.00 share in the old line, also dated July 7, 1951, I have a receipt for \$3.00 Utility deposit.

Hoping to hear from you in the near future.

Yours very truly,

Alf Chesterman

-----  
March 5/57

City Commissioners  
City of Red Deer

Gentlemen:

Re: Attached letter from Mr. A. Chesterman

At the time Mr. Chestermans house was connected to our lines it was City policy that we would pay \$75.00 towards the cost of connecting a customer, the balance payable by the customer. It would therefore appear, using Mr. Chesterman figures, that the line "from paved road to house" actually cost \$237.25. The additional \$80.00 was an assessment on the original line to this general area, which all customers were required to pay until the original cost of the line was recovered.

This was a straight-forward deal made to provide electric service to Mr. Chestermans house at his request, and no mention was made of refunding any portion of the cost at any time.

The part of the line being used to serve another customer is actually located in a public road allowance and it is quite doubtful if Mr. Chesterman could claim ownership of lines on this public property. This second customer paid the actual cost of connecting his premises, this being the present policy for this district.

I must admit that the above system is not a good one in that the first customer in a location pays a large sum to obtain electric service and the late-comers reap the benefit. Much though has gone into this matter over the years but there just does not seem to be a completely suitable solution. More recently we have used a proportional refunding system based on a ten year period and the number of customers required to pay complete cost of the line. In this particular case the \$237.00 divided by \$75.00 would mean that 3 customers could absorb the cost of the line, and if 3 customers were served the first year the line was built, the full amount of \$237.00 would be refunded. If 3 customers were served 4 years after the line was built, then the remaining portion of 6 tenths of the original cost would be refunded, or \$142.00. If at the present time 3 customers were connected to this line apparently built in 1951, then the remaining value would be (1956-1951 - 5 years) five years so 5 tenths would be refundable, the amount being \$118.00. However, we still have only two customers on the line so no refund would be in order even under this system.

3.

Much as I can appreciate Mr. Chestermans point of view, I cannot see how the City can justifiably refund anything on this line. We have dozens of similar situations in and around the City and any relaxation at this time could result in numerous similar claims. I might point out that Calgary Power Ltd. have used the same system for quite a number of years and are still handling it the same way, the customer pays the full cost of service.

Respectfully submitted.

O.C. Mills, Elec. Supt.

NOTE:

Agree with above.

COMMISSIONERS

---

LETTER NO. 4

To Chairman of County Councils:  
Reeves of Municipal District Councils:  
Mayors of Cities, Towns and Villages:

Gentlemen:

The Canadian National Institute for the Blind again respectfully requests an appropriation from your municipality for our fiscal year commencing April 1st, 1957. Enclosed herewith is a copy of our latest annual report of services and statistics, covering the last fiscal year.

We would again suggest that your municipality determine your grant to the CNIB on the basis of \$25.00 per million of total assessments, including land, buildings, and improvements. This arrangement ensures that each municipality is contributing to our program of service to the blind to the same extent, and the total sought is in line with our minimum financial needs. It comprises only a portion of our required operating revenue each year, with the balance being made up of a Provincial Government grant, donations from the general public through our annual fall campaign held in non-Community Chest areas; and through our allotments from Community Chests in which we participate.

We would emphasise that the CNIB is the only service organization in Alberta having an active program of services to the blind. These services are of a special nature and are not available from any other source. We hope that the pamphlet and statistical survey of our work will be of interest to you.

Stability and progress in our ever-increasing program of work requires stabilized income. We would therefore earnestly and respectfully request your Council to base your annual grant on the principle suggested in the second paragraph of this letter, even though it may possibly result in an increase over previous years. We believe and feel sure you will agree, that it is far better to rehabilitate blind people by construction services on their behalf, than to encourage them to become municipal charges by failing to help provide adequately for their adjustment as self-supporting citizens.

We deeply appreciate your interest and support in the past. We feel sure we can confidently rely on your support and cooperation in the future.

With kindest personal regards on behalf of the Southern Alberta Board of Directors.

I am,

Yours faithfully

R.V. Hewlett\*  
Executive Officer

\*blind

LETTER NO. 5

4.  
4222 - 43 Avenue  
Red Deer, Alberta  
March 6, 1957

Mr. E. Newman  
City Commissioner  
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sir:

We will agree to the proposed subdivision of our property providing:

1. The width of the boulevard on the West side of 43 A Avenue be cut down to five feet.
2. The City leave us access to our property during construction of the lane and road.
3. That any planted trees or shrubs between the property line on the West side of 43A Avenue and the sidewalk which have to be destroyed or moved, will be replaced or moved onto the property at no cost to us. (There are seven(7) lilacs, white and mauve and one (1) Japanese lilac).
4. As 18% of our land is being used for road and lane construction as compared to an average of 9% on the other properties and as the proposed extension of 43A Avenue necessitates the tearing down of our double garage we feel that the City should reimburse us to the extent of two hundred (\$200.00). In consideration of this, we will grant the City permission to dump the dirt excavated from the road and lane over the bank on the North portion of our property. This will save the City an amount well in excess of \$200.00 as it will not be necessary to truck the dirt to another dumping site.

Remarks: A five foot boulevard is wide enough for the necessary service units (light poles, fire hydrant, etc.) and is far enough back from the edge of the sidewalk to eliminate any obstruction occurring on the sidewalk. Also, an additional five feet on the property will eliminate the removal of several of the aforementioned lilac trees.

We must have access to our property in case of an emergency (fire, illness etc.) Also, the nearest point to the house at which we could leave our car would be 43 Avenue, or 43<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> Avenue, a distance of 300 feet.

We are anxious to help Mr. Alton who has purchased the Pearson property but at the same time, this subdivision will put us to considerable expense which we had not anticipated. We would prefer to continue under our contract with the D.V.A. which does not expire for another twelve (12) years. However, if the City will grant the concessions listed above, we will take steps to subdivide, which will enable the City to complete construction in this area this year.

Yours very truly,

"H. Russell"

5.

To City Commissioners:

Russell/Pearson Subdivision

Comments on letter dated March 6, 1957 from Mr. & Mrs. K. Russell

ITEM (1)

The road allowance should be registered 66 feet wide to tie in with 43rd A across the Lancaster subdivision and the half street of 33 feet on the Leclerc/Patterson subdivision.

The standard use of this 66 feet is as follows:

- 10 foot boulevard (next to the property)
- 5 foot curb and sidewalk.
- 36 foot road
- 5 foot curb, gutter and sidewalk.
- 10 foot boulevard (next to the property)

In general the construction of fences and hedges on the City boulevard has been prohibited for the following reasons:

- (i) Water and gas shut offs are normally located within 1 foot of the property line.
- (ii) Fences and hedges close to the sidewalk tend to slow up the rate of thaw and encourage drifts of snow on City sidewalks.
- (iii) Hedges close to the sidewalk, if not regularly trimmed will overhang the sidewalk and become a nuisance or obstruction.
- (iv) Power poles, telephone poles and water hydrants are located within the 10 foot boulevard and any underground cables for lighting which may be installed in the future would be laid in the boulevard.

In spite of the foregoing, no particular objective can be seen to the City permitting a fence being erected 5 feet from the sidewalk except that any fence parallel to the sidewalk leaves a boulevard which is unlikely to be maintained by the property owner whereas an unobstructed lawn out to the sidewalk is normally maintained by the property owner.

RECOMMENDATION RE: (1)

Road will be registered 66 feet wide with sidewalk construction 10 feet from property line. Permission be granted for hedge or fence to be erected by property owners enclosing 5 feet of boulevards for as long as he maintains 5 feet from fence or hedge to sidewalk in clean, neat and tidy condition.

ITEM 2

It would be impossible for the City to give such an undertaking. It is believed however, that the purchaser of the lots to the east of 43rd A Avenue (Mr. Alton from Russell) will agree to leave the lots where Mr. Russell's driveway is at present until after the road is constructed. I understand that there was concern that the road and lane might be under construction at the same time. This would not normally be the case and I do not believe the lane is on the 1957 programme.

RECOMMENDATION RE: (2)

City agree that lane shall not be constructed before new road is accessible to traffic. Owners must make arrangements with purchaser to leave lots which present driveway crosses free of obstructions and open to traffic until new road is open to traffic.

ITEM (3)

The City would be under no obligation regarding any tree or shrub on the City road allowance. Specialty lilacs can be purchased from Lacombe Nurseries at under \$5.00 per shrub. The maximum commitment the City is asked to make should be in the order of \$5.00 per lilac for 7 lilacs - \$35.

RECOMMENDATION RE: (3)

Prior to construction, the line of the sidewalk will be staked. The owners shall have permission to move such lilacs as they can (or wish) which are likely to be effected by the construction. The balance will be saved if possible but no obligation should be incurred by City.

ITEM (4)

In fact the City will not directly save any money as a result of the shorter haul, as contracts are worded that the unit price for excavation includes haul up to  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile and an alternative location is available within a  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile.

It would be necessary however to haul over other paved or gravelled roads or over gravelled lanes and it is quite possible \$200 of damage to these roads could be effected and time will be saved which is an important factor. Under no circumstances should the City pay for removal of obstructions from City road allowances.

RECOMMENDATION RE: (4)

The City will pay no costs in connection with the removal of the garage. The City offer the sum of \$235.00 for permission to dump surplus material off the roads over the bank on the north portion of the Russell property. (This would in practise compensate the owners for all seven of the lilacs and the removal of the garage but would not be a precedent for any future payments for trees and shrubs or buildings on City road allowances.

SUMMARY

It may be questioned as to why the City should make the two concessions proposed i.e. the permission to fence 5 feet of the boulevard and the payment of \$235.00 for a dumping location which in practise will cover the cost of removing the garage and replacing 7 lilacs.

The reason is that it is very much in the City interest that this subdivision goes through. It will provide 24 very desirable lots close in which will be cheaper to service than the Card property lots. No account of this subdivision was taken when the number of lots to be opened up on the Card property was recommended. Difficulties will be experienced in constructing services in the half Street (43rd Street) without encroaching on the Russell property. The property owners on the North of 43rd Street have all offered to prepay their services as they are anxious to build this year.

It is considered that any reasonable concession, which will not prejudice the City's position in any future subdivision, is well justified and that the proposed concessions are reasonable.

Denis Cole  
Director  
R.D.D.P.C.

The overall subdivision plan of the area is attached.

## NOTE:

Under the circumstances as outlined by Mr. Cole, we recommend acceptance of above suggestions.

COMMISSIONERS

REPORTS:

Re: Gaetz Avenue Reconstruction

Suggest a meeting be arranged to discuss plans for routing traffic, etc. re above.

All interested parties welcome.

Wish to discuss this matter with Council.

COMMISSIONERS.

Re: Building Permits

At our last Council meeting it was suggested that it might be advisable to change the wording to cover ourselves in respect to verbal agreements.

We will submit samples of our existing permits to Council for consideration. However, in our opinion the present permit is satisfactory.

Commissioners.

To Commissioner:

Our Water Tank Vehicle should be painted as a protective measure against corrosion. Also a clean, neat vehicle is desirable particularly in this case where water may actually be delivered to the home owner for domestic use. The inside of the tank has already been painted with a rust inhibitor.

Some thought should be given to the selection of a color or colors which would be in agreement with a long term policy of having all our City vehicles assume the same colour.

Our Insuring Agents inform me that accident frequency for publicly owned vehicles becomes less if said vehicles have a distinctive color or colours. If this is true, then we might expect lower insurance premiums at some future time.

Don Williams

-----

There has been suggestions in the past that the City adopt standard color or colors for City vehicles. Inasmuch as we have to paint the aforementioned vehicle and also since we will be buying several new units this year, perhaps we should have the Councils' ideas on the matter.

N.J. Deck

NOTE:

Would suggest this matter be studied and reported on by Public Works Committee and City Engineer.

If it is agreed that a color be established, then we would recommend that on all future purchases of equipment the color be stated as part of the tender.

COMMISSIONERS

To: The City Commissioner,  
City of RED DEER,  
RED DEER, Alta.

Monthly Report Covering Policing of ..... The CITY OF RED DEER  
for the month of ....February..... 19 57..

1. Members on Duty ..... Suff. members on duty to comply with Policing Contract .....
2. Disposition of Cases under Municipal By-Laws:

	COURT CONVICTIONS	VOLUNTARY PENALTIES	WARNINGS	DISMISSED	WITH DRAWN
Traffic, excluding Parking:	6	34	8	-	-
Parking:	20	1389	129	-	5
Other By-Laws:	-	-	-	-	-
3. Complaints Received ..... 71 .....					
4. Complaints Investigated ..... 71 .....					
5. Unlighted Street Lamps ..... 20 .....					
6. Fires Attended ..... 1 .....					
7. Business Places Unlocked .... 3 .....					
8. Recoverable Expenses ..... Nil .....					
9. Number of Liquor Cases ..... 9 .....					
10. Liquor Situation ..... Under Control .....					
11. Articles Lost ..... 7 .....					
12. Articles Found ..... 13 .....					
13. Bicycles Stolen ..... Nil .....					
14. Bicycles Recovered ..... Nil .....					
15. Prisoners' Expenses and Maintenance (deals) ..... deals (15.85) Guards (30.00) ..					
16. Fines Imposed Under Municipal By-Laws ..... 200.00 .....					
17. Revenue Collected in Municipal Cases and Payable to:					

	MUNICIPALITY	PROVINCE	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Fines:	2417.50	32.50	Nil
Costs	-	76.50	16.00

18. Mileage on Municipal Duties:

	R. C. P. Transport	Municipal Transport	Hired Transport
.....	3981	Nil	Nil

19. Number of Cases where Assistance Rendered to Municipality and no report Submitted .... 3 .....

20. Remarks: Contact maintained with City Officials. No Juvenile crime of serious trends encountered. Criminal Offences during the month were of a minor nature. Traffic light during month. Court cases shown withdrawn were meter violations where defendant had moved from the province and Voluntary Penalty being paid prior to charges being preferred. Vol. Penalty tickets issued - 1389 of which 129 were warnings.

Escort during month - 2 prisoners to Edmonton, Alta.

If additional information is desired it will be supplied upon request.

City of Red Deer Prosecution (By-Law) forms forwarded direct with original of this form to the City COMMISSIONER.

F.V..Trehearne.Ost..16570.....  
Red Deer City Detail

## MONTHLY REPORT

February 1957

Tickets Issued	1339
No. of Second Notices Sent	261
No. of Prosecutions	Nil
Amount of Tickets Paid	1,061.00

Tickets Paid for year 1957 to date: 1,974.00

ADDITIONAL AGENDA

March 11, 1957

-----

February 1/57

City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alberta

Attention: Mr. R. Wells:

Please be advised that we are interested in purchasing the City owned property as follows:

Lot 22 - Block 24, Plan 7604 S, for the purpose of storing new and used trucks.

Our intention would be to fence and light the lot. Also put a small warehouse on it to house bulk spare parts and used tires, truck equipment etc.

Please advise as to price, and if sold with or without the present village hall, and as to date of possession.

We ask your favourable consideration on this property as our storage problems are acute and it is the only open land in our area.

An early reply would be appreciated.

Yours truly,

"Louis Janko"  
Manager, Rio Vista Garage Ltd.

NOTES:

Lots 22, Block 24, Plan 7604 S  
Village Hall - N.R.D.  
Size - Triangle - 120' x 144'  
Assessed Value - Land - 510  
Improvements - 725

Zoned - Local Commercial 5%

Suggested Sale Price - Land 1696.00  
Survey 50.00  
Sidewalk 101.00  
Sewer 94.00  
1941.00

Lease - 5% of assessed value - \$62.00  
Taxes - 61.00  
Frontage Tax 55.00  
178.00 per year

-----  
City Commissioners:

Re: Application of Rio Vista Garage  
Lot 22, Block 44, 7604 S (Village Hall Site N.R.D.)

1. Above property owned by City and zoned for commercial purposes.
2. Would improvements proposed by applicant be adequate to meet City land sale policy.
3. Sale of land for purpose proposed may result in considerable opposition from nearby residents.
4. In view of adjacent land uses it is possible this land may be recommended for re-zoning as residential when new zoning plan submitted for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

City should either retain lot until question of new zoning plan is decided

or

until more substantial improvements are proposed

or

the City should ascertain by survey the views of the surrounding property owners.

D. Cole  
Director

NOTE: Recommend that we hold this land until Zoning By-law is prepared.

COMMISSIONERS.

# CITY OF RED DEER

## Notice of Local Improvements

Pursuant to the provisions of the City Act, Public Notice is hereby given that after the expiration of two weeks from the date of the last publication of this notice, unless petitioned against by the majority of the property owners represented by at least 50% of the value of the lands so affected, the City of Red Deer intends to undertake the following construction as local improvements.

A frontage assessment will be levied against each parcel of land abutting the said construction in such a manner as is herein after mentioned.

Construction of Paved Roads at a unit rate of 50 cents per front foot per year for 20 years.

<u>Location</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
51 Avenue	Ross Street	Gaetz Avenue
54 Street	50 Avenue	49 Avenue
49 Avenue	55 Street	50 Street
57 Avenue	58 A Street	60 Street
53 Street	48 Avenue	45 Avenue
43 Avenue	53 Street	55 Street
47 Avenue	44 Street	Ross Street
43 A Avenue	End of Construction	43 Avenue
44 A Avenue	37 Street	North to lane
44 Avenue	35 Street	37 Street
43 Avenue	35 Street	37 Street
34 Street	76 <sup>1</sup> West of 48 Ave.	47 Avenue
51 Street	46 Avenue	47 Avenue

Paving on Existing Gravel Roads at a unit rate of 26.5 cents per front foot per year for a period of 20 years.

<u>Location</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Springbett Drive	37 Street	39 Street
42 Avenue	39 Street	35 Street
38 Street	42 Avenue	41 Avenue
36 Street	41 Avenue	42 Avenue
35 Street	41 Avenue	42 Avenue
41 Avenue	38 Street	36 Street
41 Avenue	35 Street	South 255 <sup>1</sup>
35 Street	44 A Avenue	43 Avenue
34 Street	44 A Avenue	43 Avenue
44 A Avenue	35 Street	Lane south of 34 Street
43 Avenue	35 Street	Lane south of 34 Street
Moore Crescent	45 Avenue	45 Avenue
58 A Street	57 Street Crescent	Moore Crescent
57 Street Crescent	45 Avenue	45 Avenue

Construction of Gravelled Roads at a unit rate of 40 cents per front foot<sup>2.</sup> per year for 10 years.

<u>Location</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
54 Avenue	43 Street	C.P.R. Spur

Concrete Curb, Gutter and 4 foot 6 inch Sidewalk at a unit rate of 39 cents per front foot per year for 20 years.

<u>On</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Side</u>
58 Street	44 Avenue	East side of school	South
35 Street	(lane) Block 4	44 Avenue	North
35 Street	44 Avenue	43 Avenue	North
43 Avenue	35 Street	33 A Street	East
44 A Avenue	37 Street	North to lane	West
44 A Avenue	37 Street	North to lane	East
34 Street	43 Avenue	44 A Avenue	North
53 Street	47 Avenue	46 Avenue	North
57 Avenue	58 A Street	60 Street	Both
43 A Avenue	End of Construction on 43 A Avenue	43 Avenue	Both
34 Street	End of Construction	47 Avenue	Both
51 Avenue	Ross Street	Gaetz Avenue	East
50 Avenue	55 Street	Bridge	East
47 Avenue	Ross Street	46 Street	East
53 Street	C.N.R.	47 Avenue	South

Concrete Curb and Gutter at a unit rate of 21 cents per front foot per year for 20 years.

<u>On</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Side</u>
44 Avenue	35 Street	37 Street	Both
47 Avenue	44 Street	Ross Street	West
53 Street	C.N.R.	47 Avenue	North
53 Street	46 Avenue	45 Avenue	North
53 Street	47 Avenue	45 Avenue	South
43 Avenue	53 Street	55 Street	Both
58 A Street	57 St. Crescent	Moore Crescent	Both
Spruce Drive	Lot 1	Lct 10	Both
43 Avenue	35 Street	37 Street	Both
51 Street	47 Avenue	46 Avenue	Both
51 Avenue	Ross Street	Gaetz Avenue	West
49 Avenue	Ross Street	55 Street	Both
50 Avenue	SPL Pcl 1 Blk. D.	365' south	East

Construction of Gravelled Lanes at a unit rate of 20 cents per front foot per year for a period of 5 years.

<u>Location</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Lane east of Spruce Drive	37 St.	35 St.
Lane east of 42 Ave.	44 St.	Lane north of 42 St.
Lane west of 40 Ave.	N.P.L. of lot 6	Land south of 47 St.
Lane east of 43 Ave.	45 St.	Lane north of 44 St.
Lane north of 46 St.	43 Ave.	West 340'
Lane north of 46 St.	43 Ave.	East 298'
Lane north of 47 St.	43 (A) Ave.	Lane east of 43(A) Ave.
Lane east of 43 (A) Ave.	Lane north of 47 St.	Lane south of Blk. 5
Lane south of Blk 5	Lane east of 43 (A) Ave.	43 (A) Ave.
Lane north of 47 St.	43 Ave.	47 St.
Lane east of 55 Ave.	35 St.	Lane south of 35 St.
Lane south of 35 St. Blk 28	Lane east of Blk (R)	W.P.L. Lot 8 Blk 22
Lane east of Spruce Drive	35 St.	Lane south of 35 St. Crescent
Lane south of 35 St. Crescent	Lane east of Blk 21	Lane west of Blk 15
Lane south of 34 St.	Lane east of School	43 Ave.
Lane east of 41 Ave.	44 St.	S.P.L. Lot 1 Blk 10
Lane west of 41 Ave.	Lane south of 35 St.	South side of Lot 5
Lane south of 53 St. Crescent	Lane east of 44 Ave. Blk 52	53 St. Crescent
Lane east of 44 Ave.	53 st. Crescent	End of Lane.

Construction of Paved Lanes at a unit rate of 25 cents per front foot per year for a period of 20 years.

<u>Location</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Lane east of Gaetz Ave.	51 St.	Lane north of Ross Street.
Lane north of Ross St.	Gaetz Ave,	49 Ave.
Lane south of 42 St.	40 Ave.	40 (A) Ave.
Lane west of Spruce Drive	N.P.L. Lot 1	S.P.L. Lot 10

Note 1 Flankage is charged as frontage in Commercial areas.

Note 2 In prepayment areas, where the prepayment charge include the cost of a gravelled and oiled road, the annual frontage charge will be reduced from 50¢ to 26.5¢ per front foot per annum, from the date the prepayment charges are received up to the end of the 20 year period. This charge of 26.5 cents per front foot per annum represents the payments on the paving.

When these prepayment charges are collected credit will be allowed at the rate of 23.5 cents, less interest per front foot for each year that

frontage charges have been collected prior to prepayment.

Note 3 This charge will be for the paving and will be in addition to the 40 cents for 10 years in respect of the gravelled and oiled roads.

Note 4 Any payments which may fall due in respect of the existing paving after the completion of this construction shall be cancelled and the new assessment will be levied. Credit will be allowed accordingly in respect of those properties where the charges in respect of the existing paving have been paid in full.

All cost in excess of the above unit rates will be borne by the City at large.

The owner of any land affected, may at any time commute (Pay in cash) the amount or balance remaining unpaid in respect thereof by paying the amount of the original assessment charged against the land together with interest and penalties chargeable in respect thereof less any amounts previously paid on account thereof, as provided by the City Act, Section 599.

F. A. Amy,  
City Clerk.

Dated at Red Deer, Alberta, March 13, 1957.

Date of last publication of this notice March 20, 1957.

STANDARD FORM OF LETTER TO GAETZ AVENUE PROPERTY OWNERS

IN RESPECT OF USE OF SEVEN FOOT SET BACK FOR SIDEWALK PURPOSES

Dear Sir:

Re: Reconstruction of Gaetz Avenue

As you are no doubt aware in 1947 City Council resolved that all new buildings on Gaetz Avenue South of 47th Street and North of 52nd Street should be set back seven feet in order to permit widening of the road at a future date.

In 1957 Gaetz Avenue is to be reconstructed with provincial assistance from the Province, and both the City and Province are anxious to take this opportunity of widening the road wherever possible.

The present road is 44 feet wide with eleven foot sidewalks on each side. It has been decided by Council to widen the road by seven feet on each side between 42nd Street and 47th Street (52nd and 55th also) where your property is located, in order to permit parking on each side of the road and also to allow four lanes of traffic. This proposal will leave only four feet of City Property between the curb and your property line.

The City proposes at the same time to reconstruct the sidewalks along your property, but only four feet of City property will be available for this purpose.

Your permission is therefore requested to extend the new sidewalk seven feet into your property, that is to the line where all new buildings have been erected since 1947 and will be erected in the future. This will provide a sidewalk having a total width of eleven feet as is standard throughout the City in Commercial areas at the present time.

In most cases the owner has himself already concreted the seven feet between his building and the property line, and this request is made in order to obtain, if possible, a continuous sidewalk of eleven feet for the whole length of the Commercial area,

In the event that you feel unable to give this permission, the City will be obliged to limit the sidewalk to only four feet which would be most inconvenient to the shopping public.

It is considered that this major project will be of considerable benefit to your property, the shopping public, the City as a whole and the travelling public and it is hoped you will see your way clear to grant our request. It would be appreciated if you would reply on this matter before March 7th in order that the plans for reconstruction may be finalized without delay.

If there are any points you wish to clarify in respect to this request, City Council will be pleased to discuss them with you at its meeting on the 11th of March 1957 which commences at 7:30 P.M. in the City Hall.

Yours very truly,

F. A. Amy,  
City Clerk.

FAA:as