

A G E N D A

For the Regular Meeting of the Council of the City of Red Deer, to be held in Council Chambers, City Hall, Red Deer, Alberta, commencing at 5:00 P.M., Monday, March 25th, 1968.

=====

1. PRESENT:

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council of March 11th, 1968, and Special Meeting of Council, March 18th, 1968.

2. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. City Clerk - RE: Urban Renewal Program 1
2. City Clerk - RE: Future Industrial Sites 2
3. City Commissioner - RE: Accidents at 49th Avenue and 55th Street 4
4. Murphy, Armstrong, Beames & Chapman - RE: Alderman Hansum - Vote in Council on Housebuilder's Association Submission 4
5. City Commissioner - RE: Possibility of Acquiring a Standard Type Vehicle for Use as a City Ambulance 5
6. City Commissioner - RE: Report - Johnsson & Gehrke 5

3. REPORTS:

1. Chairman, By-laws Committee - RE: Burning of Refuse to Recover Material of Commercial Value 8
2. City Engineer - RE: Provision of Services for a Subdivision in the V.L.A. Area in Mountview 9
3. R. E. Barrett, Mayor - RE: Appointment of Court of Revision 10
4. City Clerk - RE: Replotting Scheme 10
5. City Clerk - RE: 1967 Financial Statement 11
6. City Treasurer - RE: Cash Position - December 31st, 1967 11
7. City Commissioner - RE: Review of Home Occupations 14
8. Building Inspector - RE: Applications for Home Occupations 30

4. WRITTEN INQUIRIES:

1. Alderman Dale - RE: Inventory City Stores
and Fire Department 31

5. CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Red Deer Horticultural Society - RE: Request for
Grant 32
2. Canadian National Institute for the Blind - RE:
Request for Grant 33
3. J. R. McParland & G. E. Aboussofy - RE: Offer to
Sell Land to the City 34
4. Ultra Sales & Service Ltd. - RE: Lease of Balance
of Lots 2 & 3 and Sale of Lane 36
5. City of Edmonton - RE: Canadian Federation of
Mayors & Municipalities Banquet 38
6. Vellner Motors Ltd. - RE: Return of Speed Curve
on Lot 17, Block 6, Plan 6077 H.W. 39
7. Mr. E. J. Hermary - RE: Industrial Off Track
Properties 42

6. PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS:

1. Petition - RE: Residents of North Selkirk Blvd.
and Sunnybrook - Development of Apartment Block
on Selkirk Blvd. 43

7. BY-LAWS:

1. By-law No. 2281 - To establish a Court of Revision

8. NOTICES OF MOTION:

1. Alderman Dale - RE: Rising Costs of Education 51
2. Alderman Hansum - RE: Use of Salt on City Streets 52
3. Alderman R. L. Dale - RE: Establishment of City of
Red Deer Police or Protective Force 58

UNFINISHED BUSINESSNO. 1.

March 20th, 1968

RE: Urban Renewal Program

The above item was considered by Council March 11th, 1968, and at a Special Meeting March 18th, 1968. A resolution as follows, was introduced March 11th, 1968 and was tabled until the March 25th meeting.

F. A. AMY,
City Clerk

*

*

*

Moved by Alderman Taylor, Seconded by Alderman Parkinson,

"WHEREAS there is a need for a general study of urban conditions within the corporate limits of the City of Red Deer, Alberta, in which to -

- (a) identify the areas of the City which are of a blighted or substandard nature.
- (b) provide information and to formulate recommendations upon which an orderly program of urban renewal may be based, and
- (c) examine and recommend upon those aspects of municipal planning, policy and control necessary to prevent the deterioration of areas not presently blighted within the City.

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RED DEER RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:-

- (1) That application be made to the Alberta Housing and Urban Renewal Corporation for Provincial approval to permit the City of Red Deer to enter into agreement with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to undertake and prepare an Urban Renewal Study for the total area within the corporate limits of the City.
- (2) That the total cost of preparing the Urban Renewal Study will not exceed \$22,500.
- (3) That application be made to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation pursuant to Clause (h) Subsection (1) Section 33 of the National Housing Act, 1954, for an agreement on an Urban Renewal Study and for a contribution not to exceed \$16,875 or 75% of the actual cost of preparing an Urban Renewal Study, provided such costs do not exceed the authorized total cost approved under Item (2) above.

(4) That the City of Red Deer contribution will not exceed \$5,625 or 25% of the actual cost, provided such costs do not exceed the authorized total cost approved under Item (2) above.

(5) That the study be prepared under the supervision of the Director of the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission, which Commission is responsible for advising the City of Red Deer on all matters related to City planning and of which the City of Red Deer is a member."

*

*

*

Several businessmen from the downtown area have indicated they wish to appear before Council at 7:00 P.M., March 25th, 1968, to speak briefly to the subject of Urban Renewal.

F. A. AMY,
City Clerk

* * * * *

NO. 2.

March 20th, 1968

RE: Future Industrial Sites

At the meeting of Council March 11th, 1968, Council tabled recommendations of the Industrial Expansion Committee, (see Pages 14 - 19 of March 11th, Agenda), until the March 25th meeting.

Members of the Committee have been invited to attend the Council meeting at 7:00 P.M.

F. A. AMY,
City Clerk

*

*

*

RE: Proposed Industrial Area

There is clearly some uncertainty regarding the selection of a site for servicing small industries.

On the one hand, the Choate Bryant property has a number of advantages, as listed in the report to the Industrial Expansion Committee. The three prime advantages would seem to be:-

(1) The City owns the land

(2) The area lends itself to expansion over other lands owned by the City.

(3) A variety of lot sizes can be provided

The suitability of this land for residential development is debatable, some considering it good, but the majority considering it poor.

On the other hand the cash outlay in respect of the Hermery land is less.

While the Choate/Bryant property would appear to have definite advantages over the Hermery land from the point of view of industrial applicants, a commitment in this respect has very great implications.

Our present consumption of lots of this type is in the order of 5 acres a year. Once we start developing this area for industry, some 200 acres would be committed, and the possibility of using the land for other purposes would be remote.

Furthermore, the cash outlay will be in the order of \$190,000.

In view of the very disturbed economic and money situation, both from the point of view of developers and the City, it is considered that Council should give serious consideration to buying time before making the irrevocable decision to commit this 200 acres of City owned land to industrial use, at a cash outlay of \$190,000.

It is suggested that Council and the Industrial Expansion Committee consider the following alternative for 1968.

	<u>Est. Cost 1968</u>
(1) Build 52nd Avenue and drain	\$ 43,000
(2) Extend sewer and water to west side of 52nd Avenue	10,000
(3) Acquire the 20 acres from Hermery over a period of 5 years . 1968 cost	6,000
(4) Grade the whole 20 acres	16,500
<u>TOTAL outlay 1968</u>	<u>\$ 75,500</u>

This would make the private lots on the East side of 52nd available for sale or development, and we could extend sewer and water either North or South along the West side of 52nd Avenue as required.

This is not an ideal arrangement, but it will keep the City's outlay to a minimum, it will give us time to evaluate the situation regarding the ultimate use of the Choate/Bryant property, and it will make available lots for developers as required.

It is submitted that this would materially reduce City expenditure in 1968 and it would leave the City in a more flexible position for the future.

50% of the cost of the road and drainage (\$21,500) would be debentured and the lot owners on the East side charged the standard frontage rate, the balance would be charged to prepayment (working capital) and recovered in due course on sale of the 20 acres on the West side of the road.

Submitted for consideration

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

March 21st, 1968

RE: Accidents at 49th Avenue and 55th Street

Council requested the Administration to study the accident reports for 1967 in respect of this intersection to ascertain whether there was any pattern to the accidents and to assist in arriving at a conclusion as to what, if anything, could be done to reduce the accident rate at this intersection.

Unfortunately the accident records are not filed by the R.C.M.P. in a manner which would permit us easily to extract the records pertaining to this intersection.

It has now been arranged with the R.C.M.P. for an extra copy of each accident report to be filed by location so that we can examine and evaluate such reports as they relate to particular intersections.

With Council approval, we would therefore request that the report on this intersection be delayed for 6 months, by which time we will be in a position to evaluate the accident reports and recommend measures to be taken.

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 4.

MURPHY, ARMSTRONG, BEAMES, CHAPMAN & FOSTER

201 Regal Building
5017 - Ross Street
Red Deer, Alberta

March 20th, 1968

City of Red Deer
City Hall
RED DEER, Alberta

Attention: City Clerk

Dear Sir:

RE: Alderman Hansum - Vote in Council on
Housebuilder's Association Submission

We refer to your letter of March 13 and would advise that prior to the said vote being taken, the writer discussed the matter with Alderman Hansum and it was the writer's view at that time that Alderman Hansum's connection with the Association and with any company engaged in the building of houses was too

remote to be included in the prohibitions contained in Sections 37, 38 and 98(2) and (3) of the City Act. At that time, the writer was not aware that the apartment in question may not comply with the City's requirements respecting incinerators. The writer also is not aware whether or not at the time of the vote, Alderman Hansum had any interest, direct or indirect, in such apartment. We assume that he had no such interest, in which case our above view would remain unchanged. If he had such an interest, it would have been our view that he should not have participated in or voted on the question.

We trust the foregoing will be of assistance.

Yours faithfully,

J. W. BEAMES

* * * * *

NO. 5.

March 21st, 1968

RE: Possibility of Acquiring a Standard
Type Vehicle for Use as a City Ambulance.

As directed by Council at meeting March 11th, 1968, the Fire Chief is examining the possibility of acquiring a standard type vehicle for use as a City ambulance and the necessary information will be available for Council's consideration when reviewing the proposed 1968 Budget.

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 6.

March 21st, 1968

RE: Johansson and Gehrke

On November 20th, 1967, Council passed two resolutions requiring specific works to be carried out on the above-mentioned premises to abate a nuisance.

On December 21st, 1967, the expiry of the notice, the Building Inspector inspected these properties and reported little change.

On January 9th, 1968 the properties were again inspected but the snow cover and drifts made it difficult to establish the situation, although no action appeared to have been taken.

Consultations between the City Solicitor, Building Inspector and myself, indicate that the administration would have difficulty and extra costs would be involved, if Council now causes such work to be done and the cost thereof charged to the owners.

Following is resolution of Council of November 20th, 1967:

"Council of the City of Red Deer hereby:

(1) declare and resolves that by reason of the storage of used household goods and furniture, used unlicensed motor vehicles and used motor vehicle parts, the premises described as _____ residentially known as _____ Street, Red Deer, Alberta are untidy and unsightly and constitute a nuisance.

(2) directs and resolves that _____, the owner of the said premises be and is hereby required and directed, within 30 days of service of a copy of this resolution upon him either personally or by prepaid mail addressed to him at the address shown in the last revised Assessment Roll, remedy the said untidy and unsightly condition and abate the said nuisance by removing the said used household goods and furniture, used unlicensed motor vehicles and used motor vehicle parts from the said premises.

And that in the event the said owners fail, neglect or refuse so to do, that Council cause such work to be done and that the cost thereof be charged to the said owners and in default of payment, be charged against the said lands as taxes due and owing in respect of the said lands and be recovered as such."

The City Solicitor recommends that Council pass a further resolution in respect of each property directing the administration regarding the disposition of the items concerned, in the event that the nuisance is not remedied by the owners on or before April 30th, 1968.

It is therefore recommended that the following resolutions be approved by Council.

"WHEREAS the resolution hereunto annexed (hereinafter called "the said resolution") was passed by Council at its meeting held November 20th, 1967;

AND WHEREAS it appears that the owner referred to in the said resolution has not remedied the untidy and unsightly condition, nor abated the nuisance referred to therein.

NOW THEREFORE Council of the City of Red Deer hereby resolves and directs that unless the said untidy and unsightly condition is remedied and the said nuisance abated on or before April 30th, 1968:

1. That the City Commissioners cause City crews to remedy and abate the same in the manner set out in the said resolution.

2. That the goods and chattels referred to in the said resolution be stored at the City's yards and that notice be served upon the said owner in one of the manners specified in the said resolution, that the said goods and chattels are stored and will be held for the said owner's disposal for a period of 30 days upon payment of the costs of removal thereof and of storage charges of \$1.00 per day and upon the condition that the same not be returned to the premises described in the said resolution.

3. That failing redemption by the said owner in accordance with item 2 hereof, the said goods and chattels shall, if possible, be sold by public auction or private sale and the proceeds therefrom, if any, be applied to the costs of such sale, the said costs of removal and the said storage charges, any excess being paid to the said owner and that any such goods and chattels not sold shall be disposed of at the City's nuisance grounds.

4. That all of the said costs of removal, the said storage charges and the costs of sale, if any, not recovered by the City from the proceeds of any sale or not paid by the said owner forthwith on demand shall be charged against the said premises as taxes due and owing in respect thereof and shall be recovered as such.

AND COUNCIL further resolves and directs that a copy of this resolution be served upon the said owner in one of the manners specified in the said resolution."

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

REPORTSNO. 1.

March 19th, 1968

TO: City Council

FROM: Chairman, By-laws Committee

RE: Burning of Refuse to Recover Material of
Commercial Value

As requested by Council at meeting of January 29th, 1968, the Committee gave study to the Garbage By-law to ascertain any amendments required thereto to permit the burning of refuse required to recover commercial material, particularly in respect to Harper's Metals, Hanson's Autowreckers Ltd., Pioneer Electric Co. and similar firms who may require burning of useless material to recover metals of commercial value.

After study the Committee were agreed present provisions of Section 7 of the Garbage By-law were sufficient to permit the burning required. The City Solicitor was in agreement with this view. The Building Inspector and Fire Chief felt no difficulties would be encountered in getting co-operation of firms concerned to assure such burning was carried out at most suitable time to alleviate complaints of neighbouring residential districts.

The Committee also gave consideration to the following resolution passed by Council at meeting of January 15th, 1968.

"That the Administrator of the Refuse Collection Department and the By-laws Committee consider measures which would assist the Community and Corner Stores in better controlling the waste paper which litters the streets and properties in the immediate vicinity of such businesses."

Alderman Mrs. E. Taylor, who had moved the resolution at Council, was present at the Committee meeting and advised in her opinion the store owners endeavour to keep the premises outside their stores, in a neat and tidy condition, but that litter did appear to accumulate in the vicinity of these business establishments, which might be overcome by provision of more "litter receptacles" in the area.

Representation of both Public and Separate School Boards were also present at the meeting, and expressed the view that the holding of recreation meets, hockey games, ball games etc. on joint school-recreation areas, and at which spectators were present, possibly increased the litter problem in these areas.

The Committee have requested the Building Inspection Department to study ways and means of providing more "litter containers" and to study strategic location for same and to report back to the Committee on these matters as soon as possible.

The Committee, following discussion, were agreed to recommend to Council that existing provisions of the Garbage By-law be enforced with specific reference to garbage receptacle requirements.

It is anticipated a further report on this matter will be made to Council by this Committee when studies now underway, are completed.

Yours truly,

ALDERMAN MRS. A. PARKINSON,
Chairman, By-laws Committee

* * * * *

NO. 2.

March 13th, 1968

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: City Engineer

This will confirm our discussion regarding the provision of services for a subdivision in the V.L.A. area in Mountview.

Last year City Council approved the subdivision of Block 4, bounded by 35th Street, 37th Street, 44th Avenue and 45th Avenue. This created 44A Avenue. To service the newly created property abutting 44A Avenue, we must construct a water main, sanitary sewer and a gravelled access. The capital outlay required is \$12,300. This money is financed through working capital. It is recovered by prepayment as development proceeds.

If the City were developing this land we would have included the \$12,300 allowance in our prepaid programme for City Council's approval. However, this is privately owned land and therefore we have no control over development timing.

The owner of Lot 11 is most anxious to start house construction right now. We agree that the request is similar to others we have dealt with in the area over the past years and which have been approved by City Council as a matter of routine.

This will confirm that you have given approval to issue the necessary permits which in effect commits us to the above mentioned capital expenditure in 1968. You may wish to use this report to advise City Council of our action in this regard.

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

*

*

*

Council approved the subdivision of this Block as required by the owners. It is therefore necessary to construct the sanitary sewer and water main, together with a gravelled access through the centre of the Block to allow the lot owners to subdivide. The first application has been received for subdivision and a building permit. Authority has therefore been given by the Commissioner to carry out this prepayment project.

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 3.

March 20th, 1968

RE: Appointment of Court of Revision

It is necessary that a By-law be passed by Council appointing a Court of Revision for 1968.

A resolution passed by Council February 7th, 1966, directed that City Policy in respect of appointments to the Court of Revision be such that three members of Council and two members from the Public at large, be appointed annually as the Court.

Members appointed in 1967 were: Alderman Mrs. E. Taylor; Alderman W. Bowerman; Alderman R. L. Dale; Mr. W. Code and Mr. P. Power.

Would Members of Council wish to suggest names of persons to be appointed for 1968?

A draft By-law will be available for Council's consideration.

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

* * * * *

NO. 4.

March 20th, 1968

RE: Replotting Scheme

It is necessary that Council pass resolutions authorizing, approving and adopting a replotting scheme affecting Lots 4 to 10 inclusive and lane South of Lot 18, all in Block 30, Plan 7604 S. (Rio Vista Garage site and lane immediately north).

Draft resolutions and plans will be available for Council's consideration.

F. A. AMY,
City Clerk

* * * * *

NO. 5.

March 21st, 1968

RE: 1967 Financial Statement

Mr. D. J. Sheridan will appear before Council March 25th, 1968 for the purpose of reviewing detailed Financial Statement for the year ended December 31st, 1967.

F. A. AMY,
City Clerk

* * * * *

NO. 6.

March 20th, 1968

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: City Treasurer

RE: Cash Position - December 31st, 1967

The Agenda for the meeting of Council on March 25th will include the Financial Statements for the various City Funds as at December 31st, 1967. Probably the most important areas for examination in these statements are those which indicate our cash position and our need for cash.

This report is submitted to outline the City's cash position at December 31st, 1967.

Any discussion of cash position must also include other liquid assets such as receivables and inventories which directly affect cash position. These other liquid assets, less liabilities such as accounts payable, are the elements which result in changes in our need for cash. Collectively, all of these elements, plus cash, form what is commonly referred to as working capital.

Changes in Cash Requirements

Schedule 1, attached, is a statement of the change in our need for cash in the past year. The five "elements" listed at the top of the schedule are the categories of expenditure aside from operating or capital expenditure which require the outlay of cash.

The five "elements" listed at the bottom of the schedule are all amounts which we owe to others for materials or services or deposits etc. The cash resources to meet these obligations are on hand although they may be temporarily invested in accounts receivable or inventories.

The difference between cash requirements and amounts owing to suppliers and others is our net cash requirements. At the end of 1967, our requirements amounted to \$1,372,825, an increase of \$ 102,000 over our requirements at December 31st, 1966.

Improvement in Cash Position

Despite an increase in cash requirements, our cash position improved by \$73,000 during 1967 as follows:

Cash deficit, December 31st, 1966	\$ 271,375
Cash deficit, December 31st, 1967	198,375
	<hr/>
Improvement	\$ 73,000
	<hr/>

This improvement resulted from the following:

(a) Cash was generated by:

1. An operating surplus in 1967 of	\$162,872	
Less: prior year surplus used	<u>25,000</u>	\$137,872
2. A reduction in amounts advanced temporarily for capital construction projects pending issue of debentures or receipt of cost sharing proceeds		\$ 36,919
		<hr/>
Total Improvements		\$174,791

Less:

(b) An increased requirement for cash for working capital purposes	\$101,791
	<hr/>
Improvement in cash position	\$ 73,000
	<hr/>

The cash deficit or loan position at December 31st, 1967 can be further segregated to show the amount attributable to our general operations and capital funds:

Borrowing for advances for capital projects	\$ 6,057
Borrowing for advances for general operations	192,318
	<hr/>
Cash deficit	\$198,375
	<hr/>

Comments

It is perhaps significant to note that despite a substantial surplus in 1967 (\$138,000) and other improvements, our requirements for cash still exceeded available funds by some \$200,000. Our requirements for cash will continue to grow as the City grows.

Our need for cash is largely due to the substantial investment in subdivisions and in fact this investment at December 31st, 1967 required almost all of our available cash with the balance of our requirements being financed through bank borrowings;

Net cash requirements (Schedule 1)	\$1,372,825
Subdivisions investment requirements	1,104,337
	<hr/>
Other requirements	268,488
	<hr/>
Bank Borrowings	266,085
	<hr/>

Summary

The net cash requirement calculated and shown in this report is, of course, a fluctuating amount which varies according to time of year. It increases considerably during the construction season unless debenture proceeds are received before construction commences.

Undoubtedly, our cash requirements will continue to grow as Red Deer grows. Extensive cost sharing projects under construction in 1968 will result in heavy demands on cash until we are repaid by the senior governments for their share of costs. Permanent increases in our cash requirements already known amount to some \$55,000 and include repayment of one third of the off street parking fund payments recently authorized by Council.

Pressures on the mill rate in a year of reduced assessment will undoubtedly result in a proposal to use "surplus". The use of surplus once again reduces our cash resources and results in an increased cash requirements which can only be provided through bank borrowing.

Recommendation

Although it may not be possible to balance the 1968 Budget without the use of "surplus" funds, it is strongly recommended that in future years increased cash resources be provided through surplus budgeting.

H. K. HALL,
City Treasurer

*

*

*

THE CITY OF RED DEERStatement of Changes in Cash RequirementsDecember 31, 1966 and 1967

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>Change</u>
<u>Cash was required to finance:</u>			
Unpaid taxes	\$ 218,142	\$ 215,114	
Amounts due from customers or other governments	664,376	637,340	
Inventories of materials	227,873	281,382	
Deferred and prepaid expenses	76,727	67,757	
Subdivision investment	1,114,720	1,104,337	
	<hr/>		
Total cash requirements	\$2,301,838	\$2,305,930	\$ 4,092
	<hr/>		
<u>Funds are on hand for:</u>			
Amounts due to suppliers	516,545	559,798	
Employees wages due	26,720	29,525	
Customers deposits	165,763	164,494	
Reserves	281,040	177,189	
Other liabilities	40,736	2,099	
	<hr/>		
Total reductions (liabilities)	\$1,030,804	\$ 933,105	\$ 97,699
	<hr/>		
Net Cash Requirements	\$1,271,034	\$1,372,825	
	<hr/>		
Increase in Cash Requirements			<u>\$101,791</u>

* * * * *

NO. 7.

March 21st, 1968

RE: Report on Home Occupations

Attached as Appendix A is a list of all those businesses which have been licensed and authorised to operate from residences in the City, as at March 1968. They total 103. This compares with a total of 118 at the same time last year.

In order to comply with the Zoning By-law, a home occupation must meet the following requirements:-

(a) Which are approved by Council for the dwelling where they are carried on or for any other building where they are carried on by a person medically certified as handicapped, and

(b) Which do not have connected with them, the display of goods or stock in trade upon the premises, and

(c) Which do not employ persons other than members of a family actually occupying the dwelling in which they are carried on.

In addition, it should be noted, that approximately another 100 or so homes are being used as a base for business but are not formally approved by Council. Some of these businesses were being conducted prior to the Zoning By-law coming into effect in 1960. These are protected as continuing uses under the Planning Act. However these are subject to business tax and for license where applicable. The balance are those types of business where business is not conducted on the premises such as commercial travellers.

Attached as Appendix B are a list of small businesses conducting comparable classes of business as those conducted in homes. Most of those businesses included in Appendix B are occupying small floor areas in the business districts comparable to those that home occupations would use.

It will be observed that the business tax and license fee produce a comparable revenue for the City, but of course, the home occupation is not paying a commercial rent.

It therefore is suggested that the business operating from a home is not contributing less to community expenditures than the business operating out of a business district if comparable floor space is used.

Council can consider the desirability of requiring the business in a home to contribute more than a business located in a business district in order to discourage home occupations. Such a provision would have to be incorporated in the license fee because the business tax rate cannot be varied by district, only by class of business. A higher license fee is now being paid by a home occupation than one located in a business district.

I have discussed this matter with the City Solicitor and have obtained his opinion on the following proposal. A license fee applicable to all or some home occupations which will vary over a three (3) year period in such a manner that the present license fee should only apply in the first year. In the second year it would be increased and in the third and subsequent years materially increased again.

The Solicitor is of the view that it may be possible to word a license by-law along these lines but there would always be a risk of challenge on the grounds of discrimination.

It is our view that Council would be most unwise to prohibit all home occupations as the enforcement of such a prohibition would be difficult if not impossible, and very costly. Other cities have had little success with prohibition. It is submitted that economic pressure to discourage long term home occupations would be far more practical, if Council wishes to change the present situation.

There is little doubt that the present By-law enables certain types of business to become established in the City which might otherwise have difficulty. It might be agreed that after 2-3 years such a business should be sufficiently well established that it can move to business premises.

It is submitted, however, that while this argument may be true of some businesses, e.g. full time beauty parlours, it would not be applicable to a part time hairdresser.

Many of such businesses involve a phone number and an address only, e.g. a distributor's agent taking orders throughout the Central Alberta district. They do not actually conduct business from their homes apart from occasional phone orders and it would be very difficult to take action if Council sought to prohibit such operations.

Another approach might be considered. Where a home has a basement suite or two households, the owner is charged a special (higher) rate for power for the whole house (about 50% higher). The City could fairly consider charging all homes where a home occupation is conducted at such special rate. This would require an amendment to the power rate by-law.

Generally speaking we do not believe that the present situation is serious, or that any changes will materially improve downtown business occupancy. For these reasons we would be hesitant to recommend any major changes in present policy.

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

*

*

*

APPENDIX "A"

HOME OCCUPATION

<u>GENERAL CONTRACTORS (BUILDING)</u>	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
1. Ken Anderson 3501 - 43 A Avenue 18-3-2423 N.Y.	\$24.00	\$30.00	\$125.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
<u>GENERAL CONTRACTORS (BUILDING)</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
2. Pete Basso (Basso Construction) 5337 - 46th Avenue 13-G-2263 M.C.	24.00	30.00	125.00
3. Gil Bauer (G. Bauer Construction) 11 Stanhope Avenue 18-8-5109 M.C.	24.00	30.00	125.00
4. Syd Buruma (Buruma Const. Ltd.) 117 Selkirk Blvd. 55-9-5552 M.C.	24.00	30.00	125.00
5. Nicholas Dykes 3919 - 57th Avenue 15-2-4618 K.S.	24.00	30.00	125.00
6. U. Wunsch (Harsim Const. Ltd.) 4719 - 56th Street 8-13-K1	24.00	30.00	125.00
7. Kaare Idland (Kidd Const. Ltd.) 5939-West Park Crescent 4-41-7063 K.S.	24.00	30.00	Oilfield Work Out of City
8. H. Kwantes (Red Deer Const.) 6 McBride Crescent 25-3-794 N.Y.	24.00	30.00	125.00
9. Bert Knopp (Built Well Const) 4316-35th Street 14B-3-2423 N.Y.	24.00	30.00	125.00
10. Raymond Matulka (Centennial Const.) 16 Otterbury Avenue 8-4-5828 M.C.	24.00	30.00	Out of City
<u>EXCAVATORS</u>			
11. Philip De Maere 5530-37th Street 11-11-970 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00
12. W. J. Mitchell 5846-38th Street Close 39-40-5187 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
<u>CONCRETE</u>			
13. William J. Beckley (United Concrete Finishing) 5422-39th Street 6-2-2171 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
14. James Caddy (Central Precasts Ltd.) 6404 - 61st Avenue B- -4024 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
15. Carl Jorgensen 5520-60th Avenue 6B-8-6241 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
16. Pasquale Mancuso (Pasquale Mancuso Concrete Service) 4610-47th Street 18 & 19-C-K8	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>PLASTERER, STUCCO, DRYWALL</u>			
17. Andy Buruma (Alco Drywall Ltd.) 17 Scott Street 9-4-3800 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
18. Wallace Kingcott (Dun-Rite Plasterers) 7419-59th Avenue C- -528 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
19. A. Schuetz (Standard Drywall Ltd.) 4734-53rd Street 22-34-6925 E.T.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>MASONRY, BLOCK AND BRICKLAYERS</u>			
20. I. Tromposch (Tromposch Bros.) 3334-43rd Avenue 9-17-5963 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>FLOORING SERVICES</u>			
21. Otto E. Jonas (Jonas Floor Covering) 20 McIntosh Avenue 12B-2-1676 N.Y.	24.00	30.00	25.00
22. C. Koenig 3337-44 A Avenue 5-17-5963 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
23. Peter J. Schmidt 26 Fern Road 7-7-4175 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
24. Gerhard Schulz 4228-34th Street Close 8-18-4512 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>TILING AND TERRAZZO</u>			
25. A. Heykants (H.M.H. Tile Co.) 3531-59th Avenue Crescent 19-32-5187 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>PAINTER</u>			
26. Adolf Bauman 5940 West Park Crescent 13-42-7063 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00
27. Charles W. Fowlie (Inter-Provincial Painting and Decorating Ltd.) 3520-49th Avenue 7-1-8324 E.T.	24.00	30.00	25.00
28. Cor Van Der Hoek (Cor's Painting and Decorating) 5560-35th Street 18-25-4739 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00
29. Oscar Holz 11 Spencer Street 7-11-5552 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
30. W. Lipinski (Parkland Decorators)	24.00	30.00	25.00
31. T. Pollock (Superior Decorators) 531 Edmund Heights 28 & 20-6289	24.00	30.00	25.00
32. W. H. Speer 88 Selkirk Blvd. 14-13-5863 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
33. Otto Terndrup (Centralta Painting and Decorating) 5334-42nd Avenue 20-50-3239 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
34. Casey Van Staaldueenen (Thorne Bros) 6305-61st Avenue 18 & 19-1-2546 A.I.	24.00	30.00	25.00

INSULATORS

35. Teuvo Kouhia (Deluxe Insulation) 3506-46th Street 9-29-80 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
36. L. Weeteringen (Red Deer Insulation Co. Ltd.) 5512-60th Avenue 4E-8-222 N.Y.	24.00	30.00	25.00

CARPENTER, CABINET MAKER, WOODWORKER

37. Gilbert J. Cummings (Cummings's Home Repair) 513 Terrace Park 13-5-1645 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
38. Walter Leibinnes 5874-70th Street 8-E-5031 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
39. Jack Michalezki (Jack's Home Repair Service) 3943-38th Avenue 1-14-4828 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00
40. G. E. Motta 16 Oxbow Street 25-5-5828 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
41. David H. Pearson 5940-59th Avenue 21-23-A-4359 A.H.	24.00	30.00	25.00

PLUMBER

42. W. Bayko (Bayko Plumbing & Heating Ltd.) 4102-52nd Street 14-12-3586 A.E.	24.00	30.00	50.00
43. R. C. Bruin (Bruin's Plumbing) 17 Ockley Close 25-6-5828 M.C.	24.00	30.00	50.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
44. J. K. Waldroff (Ken's Plumbing) 5333-42 n Avenue 9-50-1231 H.W.	24.00	30.00	50.00
<u>STEAMFITTER</u>			
45. Wally MacLeod (MacLeod's Boiler Service) 4127-35th Street 3-13-5812 H.W.	24.00	30.00	50.00
<u>ELECTRICIAN</u>			
46. Adolf Opoendries (Adolf's Electric) 3436-47th Street 16-20-38-5555 A.F.	24.00	30.00	50.00
47. Siebrand Postma (Sid's Electric) 3919-56th Avenue 25-27-1-223 A.I.	24.00	30.00	50.00
<u>SHEETMETAL WORKER</u>			
48. W. A. McKinnon 7060-58th Avenue 7- -804 K.S.	24.00	30.00	50.00
<u>LANDSCAPERS</u>			
49. G. Giebelhous (Giebelhous' Landscaping) 4005-47th Street 7-2-1376 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
50. H. Mathews (Shamrock Landscaping) 2 Shamrock Close 28-9-5552 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
51. E. A. Trautman (Ed's Landscaping) 3326-43rd Avenue 11-17-5963 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
52. George Zee (Parkland Landscaping) 4633-48th Street 29-41-C-K8	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>WELDER</u>			
53. Koop Welland 5514-37th Street 20-10-6269 K.S.	24.00	30.00	25.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
<u>PICTURE FRAMING</u>			
54. Melvin S. Floen (Woodcraft Custom Framing Service) 4025-47th Street 2-2-1376 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>CONTRACTOR - OILFIELD</u>			
55. John Delsing (Delsing Const. Ltd.) 4122-44th Street 6-4A-5960 H.W.	24.00	30.00	Out of City
<u>FOUNDATION BORING AND AIR DRILLING</u>			
56. V. Pobihuschy (Vic-Air Drilling) 22 Spencer Street 31-8-5109 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>JANITOR SERVICE</u>			
57. Gordon Baillie (Baillie's Cleaning Service) 3832-47th Street 15, 16, 17-37-5555 A.F.	24.00	30.00	25.00
58. Lloyd A Duff 4926-45th Street 25-22-6416 E.T.	24.00	30.00	25.00
59. Ithamar W. Francis 4523-45th Street 26-L-8510 E.T.	24.00	30.00	25.00
60. William Hay (Bill's Janitor Service) 3317-41 Avenue 14-11-4320 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
61. Grant MacKay (MacKay's Janitor Service) 4815-47th Street 14, 15-24-K5	24.00	30.00	25.00
62. Gregory Mancuso (Mancuso's Janitor Service) 4605-47th Street 26-D-K10	24.00	30.00	25.00
63. Fred B. Ritten (Fred B. Ritten Janitor Service) 3818-44th Street 9-11-24-5555 A.F.	24.00	30.00	25.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
64. Cecil Switzer (Kleen Rite Janitor Service) 52 Fern Road 20-7-4175 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00

RUG AND UPHOLSTERY CLEANING

65. Harry Brown (Red Deer Interior Cleaners) 3722-44th Street 11-23-5555 A.F.	24.00	30.00	25.00
66. Earl J. MacLeod (Magic Carpet Cleaners) 13 Oxbow Street 45-6-5828 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00

DELIVERY SERVICE

67. Allen Dahlberg (United Deliveries and Cartage) 4244-34th Street Close 12-18-4512 M.C.	24.00	30.00	
--	-------	-------	--

ELECTRONIC SERVICES

68. H. Visser, Sr. (Radio, T.V. Repair Service) 3930-50th Street 8-1-4705 W.	24.00	30.00	25.00
69. William H. Baugh (Sound Enterprises) 5824-44th Avenue 12-6-861 H.W.	24.00	30.00	25.00

PHOTOGRAPHER

70. Eric Bundy (Eric Bundy Photographs) 5621-41st Street 11-2-4618 K.S.	24.00	30.00	50.00
---	-------	-------	-------

LAND SURVEYOR

71. D. M. Grant (Clark Swanby & Assoc. Ltd.) 4405-43 Avenue 12-4A-5860 H.W.	24.00	30.00	
---	-------	-------	--

BUSINESS SERVICES

72. Karl Rajchert (Income Tax Consultant) 5011-47th Avenue 13, 14-45-5084 E.T.	24.00	30.00	
--	-------	-------	--

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
<u>BEAUTY PARLOURS</u>			
73. Mrs. Eileen Armstrong 11 Sutton Close 30-4-3800 M.C.	24.00	30.00	50.00
74. Mrs. Ethel Berge 5741 West Park Crescent 9-35-5187 K.S.	24.00	30.00	50.00
75. Mrs. Nancy Cole 41 Selkirk Blvd. 21-2-3800 M.C.	24.00	30.00	50.00
76. Mrs. Eileen Kitt 41 McIntosh Avenue 20-10-2342 N.Y.	24.00	30.00	50.00
77. Mrs. Diane Peterson 65 Fern Road 13-5-4176 M.C.	24.00	30.00	50.00
78. Mrs. Edna Rajchert 5011-47th Avenue 13,14-45-5084 E.T.	24.00	30.00	50.00
79. Mrs. Doris Bryant 17 Forest Close 17-2-4175 M.C.	24.00	30.00	50.00
80. Mrs. Marie Sibert 3942-38 A Avenue 9-18-3227 K.S.	24.00	30.00	50.00
81. Mrs. Sylvia Soderberg 3923-35 A Avenue 7-12-6337 K.S.	24.00	30.00	50.00
82. Mrs. Eva Troy 4508-55th Street 21 Pt. 22, 23 E 3'-1-1292 A.O	24.00	30.00	50.00
83. Mrs. Lillian Willsie 5726-41st Street Cresc. 26-35-5187 K.S.	24.00	30.00	50.00
<u>PIANO TUNING</u>			
84. Edgar Styles 5321-41st Avenue 23-49-1231 H.W.	24.00	30.00	

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
85. Peter Westrate 4225-41st Avenue 1-10-2453 H.W.	24.00	30.00	
<u>MUSIC INSTRUCTION</u>			
86. Mrs. A. A. Woody (Accordion) 3618-50th Avenue 5-2-6159 E.	24.00	30.00	
87. Donald George 3333-42A Avenue 36-18-4512 M.C.	24.00	30.00	
<u>SIGNS</u>			
88. James Speers (Speers Sign Service) 14 Onslow Square 8-5-5828 M.C.	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>AGENCY</u>			
89. A. Hewlett (Seed Broker) 4316-53rd Street Crescent 18-F-790 K.S.	24.00	30.00	
<u>AQUARIUM SUPPLIES</u>			
90. J. A. Fleming (Tropical Fish) 11 Ockley Close 31-6-5828 M.C.	24.00	30.00	
<u>PUMP SERVICE</u>			
91. Ken Waldo (Service Stations, Bulk 5126-42nd Street Plants) 7-D-K11	24.00	30.00	25.00
<u>AGENTS - DISTRIBUTORS</u>			
92. Mrs. Marie Winter (Avon Beauty Products) 4422-33 A Street 25-16-902 M.C.	24.00	30.00	20.00
93. Peter Wamstecker (Nalley's Food Products) 4130-37th Avenue 20-20-4828 K.S.	24.00	30.00	

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	
94. Laverne Crabb (Mrs. Wilham's Cakes and Cookies) 5519-38th Street 1-3-10-6269 A.F.	24.00	30.00	
95. Clarence Schmidt (Novelties) 5545-35th Street 7-30-4739 K.S.	24.00	30.00	
96. E. A. Babcock (Watkins) 5823-60th Street 1-B-5534 H.W.	24.00	30.00	20.00
97. Mrs. Eleanor Butz (Sarah Coventry Costume Jewellery) 21 Stirling Close 18-11-5552 M.C.	24.00	30.00	20.00
98. W. R. Harlow (Best-O Milk Dairy Products) 24 Fern Road 6-7-4175 M.C.	24.00	30.00	
99. R. Overman (Amway Household Products) 3810-58th Avenue 28-40-5187 K.S.	24.00	30.00	20.00
100. Ray Chabillon (R. and D. Distributors Household Products) 3613-41st Avenue 42-10-5162 H.W.	24.00	30.00	20.00
<u>CATERING SERVICE</u>			
101. Mrs. Maria C. deWit (Decorating Cakes, Cookies) 6 McConnell Close 15-4-794 N.Y.	24.00	30.00	20.00
<u>DANCE STUDIO</u>			
102. E. Roy-Poulsen 97 Selkirk Blvd. 36-6-5552 M.C.	24.00	30.00	

*

*

*

APPENDIX "B"COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL

	<u>Business Tax</u>	<u>License</u>
	1967 <u>@ 8%</u>	In 1968 <u>10%</u>
<u>GENERAL CONTRACTOR (BUILDING)</u>		
1. Germain Construction Ltd.	\$ 34.80	\$ 100.00
2. Hansum Bros. 4921-49th Street	58.80	100.00
3. Hornstrom Bros. Construction 6785-52nd Avenue	24.00	100.00
4. Western Builders Limited 4719-52nd Avenue	35.20	100.00
<u>PLASTERERS, STUCCO, DRYWALL</u>		
5. C. Beckett Co. Ltd. 4930-53rd Avenue (no comparison - large floor area)	80.80	10.00
<u>MASONRY, BLOCK AND BRICKLAYER</u>		
6. Louis Victor Ltd. 4723-60th Street (no comparison - large floor area)	156.00	10.00
<u>PAINTERS</u>		
7. Canadian Well Service & Tank Co. Ltd. 6720-50th Avenue	56.80	10.00
<u>INSULATORS</u>		
8. Otto Roofing Ltd. 6794-50th Avenue (no comparison - large floor area)	84.80	10.00
<u>CARPENTERS, WOODWORKERS, CABINET-MAKERS</u>		
9. Leo Sveinson 5012-45th Street	66.40	10.00
<u>ELECTRONICS</u>		
10. Central TV & Appliance Repair 4354-52nd Avenue (repair only)	24.00	10.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	<u>1967</u>	<u>In 1968</u>	
	<u>3 8%</u>	<u>10%</u>	
<u>ELECTRICIANS</u>			
11. Dohlman Electrical Services 6880-50th Avenue	24.00		20.00
12. Light Electric 5929-48th Avenue	24.00		20.00
<u>PLUMBERS</u>			
13. Parkside Plumbing & Heating Ltd. 51st Street & 49th Avenue (rear)	24.00		20.00
14. Watson Bros. Plumbing Ltd. 6782-50th Avenue	25.20		20.00
<u>SHEET METAL</u>			
15. Guy's Sheet Metal Service 5034-45th Street	39.20		20.00
<u>SIGNS</u>			
16. Art's Signs 5014-50th Avenue	24.00		10.00
<u>WELDER</u>			
17. North End Trailer & Welding Shop 5902-54th Avenue	24.00		10.00
<u>BEAUTY PARLOUR</u>			
18. Clares Beauty Shoppe 117-4818-50th Avenue	26.60		5.00
19. Coiffure De Balmoral 4929-50th Street	24.00		5.00
<u>DELIVERY SERVICE</u>			
20. Duckering's Delivery Service 5102-52nd Street	31.20		
<u>PHOTOGRAPHERS</u>			
21. Foto-Arts Studios and Color Lab Ltd. 4808-50th Street	66.40		20.00

	<u>Business Tax</u>		<u>License</u>
	1967 <u>@ 8%</u>	In 1968 <u>10%</u>	
22. Foto Bull Studio 4928-51st Street	86.80		20.00
23. Kanata Studios 5022-50th Avenue	103.20		20.00
<u>LAND SURVEYOR</u>			
24. Snell & Oslund 4915-48th Avenue	24.00		
<u>BUSINESS SERVICES</u>			
25. Alberta Business Services 4921-49th Street (Full accounting services against limited service)	40.88		
<u>MUSIC SCHOOL</u>			
26. Galts School of Music 5113 - 50th Avenue	63.60		
<u>PUMP SERVICE</u>			
27. Red Deer Pump Service Ltd. 5420B-45th Street (Warehousing)	63.20		
<u>AGENTS-DISTRIBUTORS</u>			
28. Electrolux (Canada) Ltd. 5311-50th Avenue (Display area for sales and some storage)	61.60		4.00 per year per salesman
<u>CATERING SERVICE</u>			
29. Mildred's Catering Port-O-call Shopping Center	49.20		
<u>DANCE STUDIO</u>			
30. Martin School of Dancing 5315-50th Avenue	30.40		

* * * * *

NO. 8.

March 20th, 1968

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: Building Inspector

RE: Home Occupation Applications

The following applications meet with the requirements of Zoning By-law No. 2011 and are submitted for Council approval:

1. Leonard A. Olson 5914-56th Avenue Building Contractor
2. John W. Smart 3589-54 Avenue Cresc. Building Mover

G. K. JORGENSEN,
Building Inspector

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

WRITTEN INQUIRYNO. 1.

March 21st, 1968

RE: Inquiry by Alderman Dale - Inventory -
City Stores & Fire Department

At meeting of Council February 26th, 1968, Alderman Dale submitted an inquiry requesting information as to the inventory at City Stores and the Fire Department effective December 31st, 1967.

Time has not permitted us to prepare this report. However, same should be available for the meeting of April 8th, 1968.

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

CORRESPONDENCENO. 1.

March 12th, 1968

The Red Deer Horticultural Society

c/o 4134-44th Street
Red Deer, Alberta

TO: The Mayor and City Aldermen

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The above Society re-apply for grant of \$100 (one hundred dollars). Notice this has been reduced by half from the last application. We feel this is very necessary and on a par with some of the grants already approved. Gardening is a form of recreation for all age Classes. Please find Balance Sheet enclosed. Trusting this letter will receive your most worthy consideration.

Yours very truly,

(Mrs.) DOROTHY WALKER,
Secretary

*

*

*

RED DEER HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY
FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSES Oct. 13/66 to Feb. 15/68

Balance in Bank as of Oct. 13, 1966	\$101.85
Petty Cash	2.03

INCOME

Miscellaneous	\$ 5.00	
Memberships	216.00	
Donations	2.20	
Advertising	144.50	
Entry Fees	51.50	
Gate Receipts and Sundry	353.87	
Prepaid Memberships	<u>3.00</u>	
		776.07
		<u>379.95</u>
	TOTAL	

EXPENSES

Alberta Horticulture Society	\$ 45.00
General Meetings	63.50
Membership tickets	
Prize List	16.05
Gestetner	42.55
Envelopes	<u>6.50</u>
	65.10

Gardens - Gas	\$ 6.00	
Spoons	16.40	
Engraving	24.00	
Signs	<u>15.12</u>	
Prize Money		
Ribbons		61.52
Arena Rental		296.31
Trophies		70.00
Advertising CKRD	15.00	100.00
Advocate	<u>18.20</u>	14.17
Typing		
Petty Cash		33.20
Imperial Lumber		10.00
Luncheons		17.07
Miscellaneous	21.35	15.00
	9.65	15.00
	5.44	
	<u>18.77</u>	
Trophy Repairs		55.21
Bank Charges		5.00
		9.65
CASH ON HAND IN BANK		
		<u>4.22</u>
	TOTAL	<u>879.95</u>

Respectfully submitted by
E. F. KRAUSS,
Treasurer

* * * * *

NO. 2.

THE CANADIAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE BLIND

1260 Memorial Drive E.,
Calgary, Alberta

March, 1968

Dear Secretary-Treasurer:

On March 30th, 1968, The Canadian National Institute for the Blind will be celebrating its Golden Anniversary of service to the blind people of Canada. From a very small beginning by a group of seven interested Canadians in 1918 the CNIB has, over the past fifty years, grown to a national organization and one which is highly respected throughout the entire world. This achievement has been made possible through the dedicated work of many Canadians and through the excellent support which governments at all levels and individuals throughout the country have given to us.

Although CNIB has now reached its Golden Anniversary we cannot afford to sit back and rest on our laurels but must look forward and prepare ourselves for the needs of the blind people of the future. May I, on behalf of the CNIB, Alberta Division, solicit the support of your Council in the form of a Grant towards our services to the blind people of this Province. Some years ago a formula for considering our annual Grant from municipalities, based on \$25.00 for every \$1,000,000 of assessment, was presented to the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and the Union of Alberta Municipalities and received their approval. We are enclosing a copy of our latest service report for the CNIB Alberta Division covering the year ending March 31st, 1967. As has been mentioned in previous years the CNIB endeavors to receive 50% of its financial support from government sources and the remainder from the general public.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. TYMCHUK
Executive Officer

* * * * *

NO. 3.

February 27th, 1968

Land Department
City of Red Deer
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sirs:

We have four lots, Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, Block 3, Plan 4706 A.N. We wish to sell to the City at \$400.00 a lot as we believe this is the price paid by the City for lots in that location. Thanking you, we are,

Yours truly,

S. McPARLAND

J. R. McPARLAND

*

*

*

February 27th, 1968

Land Department
City of Red Deer
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sirs:

I have two lots Nos. 13 & 14, Block 3, Plan 4706 A.N. I wish to sell to the City at \$400.00 a lot, as I believe this is the price paid by the City for lots in that location.

Thanking you, I am,

Yours truly,

J. R. McPARLAND

*

*

*

February 27th, 1968

Land Department
City of Red Deer
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sirs:

I have four lots Nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, Block 3, Plan 4706 A.N. I wish to sell to the City at \$400.00 a lot, as I believe this is the price paid by the City for lots in that vicinity.

Yours truly,

G. E. ABOUSSOFY

*

*

*

TO: City Commissioner

FROM: Land Administrator

RE: Lots 13, 14, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28,
33, 34, 35, 36, Block 3, Plan 4706 A.N.

Attached, are three letters offering to sell the above described lots to the City of Red Deer for the sum of \$400.00 each.

As you are aware, the lots in question are located in the Bryant, Choate area, north of 67th Street and east of Gaetz Avenue.

The former land committee were of the view, that whereas Blocks 3 and 4 would be required for future replotting of the area, that the City should acquire the lots involved when funds were available.

Of the 72 lots in Blocks 3 & 4, the City since 1964, has acquired 43 of same at a price of \$400.00 each. We have had discussions with the Church people for a possible future exchange of properties. (They own 10 lots). A breakdown of the lots in question would be as follows:-

City owned lots	43
Lots offered	<u>10</u>
	53

Church	10
Private (3 owners)	9
	<hr/>
	72

Attached, for your guidance, is a print indicating the lot ownership distribution.

Recommend that the City accept the offer subject to clear Titles.

D. J. WILSON,
Land Administrator

*

*

*

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

It is definitely in the long term interest of the City to acquire these parcels in order to replot the area, either for residential or industrial use. The construction of roads and services on the basis of the present subdivision is impracticable.

It is recommended that the City agree to purchase these 10 lots at \$400.00 per lot, \$200.00 per lot payable in 1968 and the balance of \$200 in 1969, i.e. \$2,000 this year and \$2,000 next year.

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 4.

ULTRA SALES & SERVICE LTD.

4303 - Gaetz Avenue
Red Deer, Alberta

March 20th, 1968

City Commissioner, Denis Cole,
City Hall
City of Red Deer
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sir:

RE: My correspondence of February 14th, 1968 and
your Mr. Amy's reply of March 4, 1968.

I appreciate Council's resolution in regards to leasing of the balance of Lots 2 and 3 and sale of lane. Unfortunately, this is not acceptable to our firm. If this property were leased to us on a five year lease, or in fact, any length of lease, it would make it impossible for us to mutually re-develop and expand our dealership in conjunction with a manufacturer.

In a dealer development program, such as those available through G.M., Ford, or American Motors, the Company would re-develop the dealership on a long term basis. With a lease only, on land, which would give sales lot exposure to 49th Avenue, no manufacturer would be interested in a re-development and expansion program. As you can appreciate, additional land and extra capital from major manufacturers is of prime importance to our growing firm.

I would respectfully ask Council to consider the following proposal:

- a. The said land, balance of Lots 2 and 3 and lane between Lots 4 and 5 be sold to our firm for the amount of \$4,400.00.
- b. That a caveat or supplementary agreement, be drawn up stipulating that no building or zoning relaxation be allowed on balance of Lots 2 and 3.
- c. That if, at a later date, for some reason, it was necessary for us to have this caveat lifted, that we would apply to City Council for this consideration. If it was feasible and Council agreed to lift the caveat, it would be on the terms that we would have the property in question reappraised in value, without a caveat in effect and our firm would be willing to pay the difference between what we paid for the property and the new appraised value.

I believe this proposal has merit, because by ownership of the land, we would be able to work out a possible re-development of the entire property and Clause "C" would assure the City that there would be no gain on value as far as our firm is concerned.

It is very probable that even with a development of the whole property, the land in question would still be used only as a sales display lot on 49th Avenue.

It is not the intent of our firm to realize any gain in land value whatever from this property, but rather, to align ourselves in a position so that we can attract a manufacturer and with additional capital, re-develop our entire facility. Our company has grown from sales of \$120,000.00 and three employees in 1956 to near 1½ million dollars in annual sales and twenty-four employees in 1967. Therefore, in order to keep pace with the growth of the City and of the industry we are in, it is essential that we look at concrete expansion plans for the future.

If there is any other information that is required, or if Council would like me to appear before Council, kindly advise.

Respectfully submitted,

Yours very truly,

ULTRA SALES & SERVICE LTD.

B. P. JANKO,
President.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

After consultation with the City Solicitor and Land Administrator, we recommend that the proposal of Mr. Janko be accepted, subject to the conditions contained in the previous report to Council and subject to agreement(s) being entered into satisfactory to the Solicitor and Commissioners.

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

Concur.

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

* * * * *

NO. 5.

THE CITY OF EDMONTON

March 20th, 1968

His Worship
Mayor R. E. Barrett
City of Red Deer
Alberta

Dear Mr. Mayor:

Further to my telephone call and our discussion regarding a joint sponsorship of the Thursday evening banquet, please accept this as a formal request of the Budgetary Section of the General Committee for the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities Conference to be held in Edmonton June 2-6, 1968.

May I say that it was indeed encouraging to be treated in a most co-operative and courteous manner by all the mayors of the cities of Alberta and certainly this is true in your case.

We have changed the date for the banquet from Tuesday to Thursday because of joint attendance by conference delegates and their wives. We think it appropriate, and inasmuch as this is to be a fun night we thought the gesture would receive much greater acceptance. Accordingly, we are suggesting that the City of Red Deer contribute the sum of \$1,000 to the general fund to defray the cost of the banquet, and although we have not carried out the assessment on a pro rata basis, we have endeavored to graduate the request based upon population figures. The collective total does not come up the necessary \$6,000 figure that is needed, but The City of Edmonton will pick up any deficit that remains.

Again thanking you for your support, and in the hope that your Council will confirm this commitment at the earliest opportunity, I am

Yours sincerely,

J. L. BODIE,
Alderman

*

*

*

CITY OF EDMONTON

March 20th, 1968

Mayor R. E. Barrett
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Ed:

When I spoke to you I believe that I mentioned the sum of \$750.00

However, when speaking to the mayors of Wetaskiwin, Camrose, Lloydminster and Drumheller they suggested the fairest way to share was on a per capita basis rather than a straight 8 way split. With this I agree. Unfortunately some calls were made before this issue was raised.

On a per capital basis, Red Deer's share would be \$1308.65. Our Committee has agreed to pick up the excess over \$1,000. and I hope that your Council would agree to join with the Cities of Alberta dinner for the amount suggested.

If you have already discussed this and obtained approval of the original request we will have to absorb the difference. Thanks again for your support.

Sincerely,

LES BODIE

* * * * *

NO. 6.

VELLNER MOTORS LTD.

4314 Gaetz Avenue
Red Deer, Alberta

February 28th, 1968

City of Red Deer,
Red Deer, Alberta

ATTENTION: Mr. D. Wilson

Dear Sir:

RE: Return of speed curve on our lot
17, Block 6, Plan 6077 H.W.

We are interested in having the portion of land on the corner of Gaetz Avenue and 43rd Street, which constitutes a speed turn, revert back to our present property. We feel it most necessary to square this corner at this time as it has become a hindrance to our display area. At one time we enjoyed heavy Westpark traffic on this corner, which made it good display space. Now there is little or no traffic. This curve also showed up nicely from the South for the North bound traffic which we will also be losing.

We feel that this piece of property should revert back to us in consideration for the many favours we have extended to the City. We are referring to the 7' easement along Gaetz Avenue for the widening of the street, waterline easement, powerpole easement etc.

We are considering an expansion and if it materializes we would put a building on that end of our property; this would bring the City more tax dollars in the future.

Your early comments would be most welcome.

Yours very truly,

VELLNER MOTORS LTD.

Application by Vellner Motors Ltd.
43rd Street & Gaetz Avenue

This is an application to delete the curved road permitting right hand turns in a westerly direction at this corner. i.e. Mr. Vellner wishes to square off his property.

The City Engineer reports as follows:-

The cancellation of the right of way for a right hand turn with a normal 25' radius corner would involve

(1)	Relocation of hydrant	\$ 500
(2)	Construction of new sidewalk, curb and gutter	\$ 2550
(3)	Relocation of traffic control pole	\$ 250
		<hr/>
		\$ 3300
		<hr/>

An easement would be required to protect a pole anchor which cannot be removed. An easement would also be required to protect underground wiring, but this could be moved at a cost of about \$800.

The Land Administrator reports as follows:-

If Council agrees to the proposal, it is recommended that the sale be on the following terms:-

(1)	Sale of land	\$ 6,600
(2)	Cost of replacing City facilities (as per Eng. report)	\$ 3,300

TOTAL	<hr/>	\$ 9,900
	<hr/>	

- (3) Purchaser to pay all costs of replot (with 25' radius on corner)
- (4) Easement to be provided for pole anchor
- (5) Easement to be provided for underground wiring or alternatively cost of removal estimated at \$800.
- (6) Purchaser to take land in "as is" condition.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

A traffic count was conducted on Tuesday, March 19th, 1968 between the hours of 8 A.M. and 6 P.M. During this 10 hour period, 192 cars used this turn (an average of 19 cars per hour).

While this turn was very convenient and useful when 43rd Street was a through street, the volume of traffic now making this movement does not necessitate such a facility.

It is submitted that the City could not justify however, the removal of this convenience unless it receives fair compensation for the land plus all costs and expenses.

It is therefore recommended that Council endorse the proposal of the Land Administrator, but in the event the property owner considers these costs do not warrant acquisition by him, that no further action be taken.

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

*

*

*

Although I can not find fault with the Commissioner's approach to this request, as an administrator, and do not question the arithmetic, I must take a different view.

Although this is a traffic facility, once extensively used, it would cause no particular problem, if it were removed.

The land itself is of no value to the City or for that matter to anyone else except the owner of the adjoining land.

It is quite conceivable that the possession of this corner, eventually will necessitate paying higher taxes in one way or another.

However, we cannot transfer it to anyone without any charge and we must recover the costs to us of relocating it, the sidewalk and other facilities.

Therefore to me it would appear more reasonable to deduct the relocation costs from the value established by the Land Administrator. That is that the \$3,300.00 plus \$800.00 be deducted from \$6,600.00 leaving a net return to the City of \$2,500.00. I suggest this for the consideration of Council.

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

* * * * *

NO. 7.

March 14th, 1968

Mr. Mayor and Aldermen
City of Red Deer
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sirs:

The Red Deer Advocate of March 13th, 1968 gave an account of the meeting of City Council, it brought to my (E. J. Hermary) attention matters which interest me regarding Industrial off Track Properties. In view of the fact that the City has now spent a considerable amount of "Tax Monies" to service the present Industrial Area adjoining my property, it is logical that these services should be serving the public at full capacity.

As my land was discussed as a possible location for further development I feel that the Council should be informed of my feelings in this matter.

On several occasions I have proposed that the City enter into a long term deal with me for the E₂ 29-38-27-4. As under the present situation I feel myself somewhat handicapped to farm my land as I would wish to do so.

It would also be advisable for the City to come to some satisfactory deal so that we would know where we stand and also what to look forward to in the future and would be far more economical in the long run for the City.

I am confident that we could come to some satisfactory agreement.

Thanking you,

Yours truly,

MR. E. J. HERMARY

* * * * *

PETITIONS & DELEGATIONSNO. 1.Red Deer, Alberta
March 9, 1968

Your Worship Mayor Barrett, and Members of City Council,
Red Deer, Alberta

We, the residents of North Selkirk Blvd. and Sunnybrook, wish to protest the unattractive development of the apartment block on Selkirk Blvd.

Specifically, we object to the following:

1. Insufficient parking space with no provision for visitor parking or two car families, resulting in on street double row parking. This in turn, (a) endangers the lives of many preschoolers who live on the street and others who attend Kindergarten classes in the Lutheran Church; (b) results in single lane traffic as only one car can pass through these double parked cars; (c) causes blocking of many driveways; (d) causes difficulty in backing out of driveways.

This congestion is intensified by the traffic around the store and further endangers the lives of other children riding bicycles and those who use the recreational facilities at the G.W. Smith and Mountview Schools.
2. Parking lots facing Selkirk Blvd., a boulevard of city-planted trees. These large gravel or paved parking lots extend to the very edge of the sidewalk and make no provision for landscaping along Selkirk Blvd., which will detract from the beauty and value of the residential lots on this street. Even the appearance of the parking plug-ins leaves much to be desired.
3. The placing of utility boxes and garbage containers on Selkirk Blvd. which converts Selkirk Blvd. into a back alley and results in litter surrounding the garbage boxes and our front lawns.
4. No incinerator within the building which would reduce the need for garbage containers.
5. The use of Selkirk Blvd. as a service entrance resulting in truck traffic backing in and out of Selkirk Blvd.
6. The unattractive appearance of the building itself which does not conform to Sunnybrook residential architecture but resembles an industrial building.
7. No playground area provided for the children from the apartment block.

We feel that the above conditions have detracted from the value of our properties and will eventually result in a lower tax assessment on our property and in the conversion of this area to revenue housing.

Many of us now have our homes up for sale and are experiencing difficulty in selling, while others are considering renting out their homes.

We respectfully request City Council to consider a complete re-evaluation of this housing development in terms of:

- 44.
- (a) Reducing the number of proposed buildings to two which would allow the developers to provide more parking area, more playground area, more playground space, and more landscaping
 - (b) The removal of all utility boxes and garbage containers from the Selkirk Blvd. side to the 32nd St. side.
 - (c) Installation of incinerators to reduce the number of garbage containers.
 - (d) The use of the 32nd St. entrances as service entrances.
 - (e) The parking areas to face 32nd St. with access roads either from Springfield Ave. or a driveway alongside the Lutheran Church or a U-shaped driveway with one-way traffic leading in and out of Selkirk Blvd.
 - (f) Guarantees from the new owners of adequate landscaping and upgrading of the apartment buildings facing Selkirk Blvd.

Thank you for your serious consideration in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

*

*

*

This petition signed by 163 residents in Sunnybrook Area.

City Clerk

*

*

*

March 20, 1968

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: CITY COMMISSIONER

RE: Report on Petition from Residents of Selkirk Boulevard

1. Street Parking

The petitioners claim:-

- (a) No provision for visitors or two car families
- (b) Street parking endangers preschool children attending kindergarten at Lutheran Church
- (c) Single lane traffic movement due to parked cars
- (d) Blocking of driveways
- (e) General congestion

It is submitted that:-

- (a) The approved plans provide for one parking space per suite in accordance with the By-law. This requirement is identical to the requirement throughout the City of all dwelling units including single family.

- (b) The parking of visitors' cars on the street is no different here than on any other residential street in the City. The carriageway of the street is 32 feet wide (curb to curb) and although all single family residences are required to construct front driveways, many cars are parked on both sides of the street throughout this and other subdivisions. This restricts the traffic lanes to a minimum and necessitates driving slowly and with care, which is highly desirable. There would be no traffic difficulty if the single family residences parked their cars on their own property as they are proposing the occupants of the apartments should do.
- (c) As per (b) above
- (d) If occupants of or visitors to the apartments are parking in front of driveways, this is contrary to the City By-laws and residents have only to telephone the police to have this matter rectified.
- (e) Council can reduce the congestion, if it considers the situation serious, by prohibiting parking on both sides of the street. It is suggested, however, that such action should be delayed until such time as construction is completed and the situation can be better evaluated.

2. The Parking Lot and General Appearance

The petitioners claim:-

- (a) The parking lot extends to the sidewalk leaving no boulevard.
- (b) The appearance of the plug-ins is unattractive.
- (c) The transformers and garbage containers are detrimental to the area.
- (d) No incinerator is provided
- (e) Using Selkirk Boulevard as a service entrance results in traffic backing out on to Selkirk Boulevard.
- (f) The building is unattractive.
- (g) No playground area.

It is submitted that:-

- (a) The parking lot will extend to the property line and not to the sidewalk. A City boulevard of 12 feet will be retained between the parking lot and the sidewalk. This is adequate to plant trees and, if necessary, a hedge.
- (b) The parking lot and landscaping are not completed (due to winter conditions) and it is difficult to judge the general appearance at this time.
- (c) Regarding the transformer, similar installations are in front of some of the most expensive homes in Red Deer (see also the "Willows"). As to the garbage containers, it is agreed that these are most unsatisfactory and alternative arrangements are now being proposed.
- (d) The matter of the installation of an incinerator has been reviewed and is reported on separately hereunder.
- (e) All vehicles back out of their front driveways on to Selkirk Boulevard. The fact that service vehicles back out from the parking lot is not considered a problem.
- (f) Council was informed that the building would be brick faced. The front and rear elevations are brick faced but the side elevations are concrete

blocks. The brick-facing was not a condition of approval and is not required under the By-law. Due to winter construction conditions, the side elevations, balconies, etc. the painting has not yet been completed and it is considered that the general appearance cannot be fairly judged when the building and landscaping are not finished.

- (g) It is understood that there is a large general purpose room in the building (3372 sq. ft.) where the washer and dryer are located. This room is intended to be used as a recreation area for the tenants and children during inclement weather. The area of landscaping around the building meets the City By-law requirements.

3. Proposals of Petitions

The petitioners request:-

- (a) A reduction of the number of buildings to two (instead of three) and increasing the parking and landscaping area.

NOTE: In accordance with Council's decision, an agreement has been entered into with the purchasers to sell them one lot with an option to purchase the other two lots as each building is completed. It would not be possible to change this agreement except with the consent of the developer.

- (b) The removal of all utility boxes and garbage containers.

NOTE: The removal of the transformer would not be practical for the existing building as all underground wires have been installed. A new location for a proper garbage compound is proposed.

- (c) Installation of incinerators to reduce the number of garbage containers.

NOTE: It is planned to reduce the number of containers to 12 (one per suite plus one) by increasing collection from once every two weeks to once every week. If this is found insufficient, collection will be increased to twice a week. (See comment on incinerators below).

- (d) The use of 32nd Street as a service entrance.

NOTE: 32nd Street is a limited access thoroughfare. For this reason, we have insisted on restricted access to 32nd Street from 40th Avenue to Gaetz Avenue. It was a condition of the subdivision that access be from Selkirk Boulevard. It would be most unwise, as well as unfair, to make any change for this particular location.

- (e) Parking areas to face 32nd Street with access from Springfield Avenue or along Lutheran Church boundary, or U-shaped property.

NOTE (1): Council has agreed to property being sold in 3 lots and to a general plan of development with 3 similar buildings containing, in all, 33 suites, providing the development meets the By-laws. The first building has been sold and it may well be that each of the 3 sites and buildings will eventually be in separate ownership. This makes difficult the provision of joint access arrangements and the City cannot now insist on such a change.

NOTE (2): The sites do not lend themselves to the access arrangements proposed.

- (f) Guarantees from the owners of adequate landscaping and up-grading of the apartment building.

NOTE: It is understood that trees are already on order but cannot be planted at this time. We have every reason to believe that those areas not occupied by the building and parking lot will be properly grassed and trees planted. As to the building, the non-brick portions of the exterior have yet to be painted.

4. Incinerator

Council requirements regarding incinerators are covered by a resolution. This resolution applies to sale agreements of City-owned land in new subdivisions and includes Sunnybrook.

We have discussed this matter with the developer, and he has pointed out some of the difficulties of installing an incinerator in a small apartment block which cannot support a full-time caretaker.

- (1) If the lid is lifted while combustion is taking place, bad odors can quickly permeate the building. A homeowner can control this but if the incinerator is used by a number of tenants, it cannot be controlled.
- (2) If aerosol cans are placed in the incinerator, an explosion can occur, which would be very dangerous.

The developers have expressed their willingness to pay the extra cost of weekly pick-up (instead of every two weeks), or if found necessary, the extra cost of pick-up twice a week.

5. General

It must be emphasized very strongly that this site was set aside for "multiple family development" and was so zoned prior to any of the single family lots being sold, and was subsequently posted to that effect.

This site was originally designed for one apartment and due to its special location, it was recommended that the number of suites permitted should be restricted to a lesser number than the general requirement under the By-law so as to permit a more spacious layout.

Two applications were submitted for the site some years ago. One to erect a single building and the other to erect 3 apartment units of 12 suites each. The administration recommended the single building which contained approximately the same number of suites because it would leave more of the site free for parking and landscaping and would permit a better layout.

Council felt at that time that the only criteria should be whether the buildings met the By-law requirements.

Neither of these proposals came to fruition.

We would have preferred to see a single apartment building with 24-30 suites on the site in one ownership in order to ensure that a full-time caretaker would be economically possible and more landscaping and parking could be provided.

However, we must be realistic and recognize what is economically feasible at the time.

The present proposal was considered by Council on March 13th, 1967 and some discussion took place regarding the location of the parking, the surfacing of the parking lots and the landscaping at that meeting. Council resolved, however, that it approved the proposal in principle, subject to an agreement being entered into regarding the sale and option and subject to "all City requirements being met, i.e. Building Code, side yards, landscaping, etc."

It was moved by Alderman Taylor and seconded by Alderman Parkinson, that the motion be amended by adding the words: "and that a detailed plot plan be submitted for Council's approval."

The developer stated that he wanted approval in principle so that he could arrange for detailed plans to be prepared, for mortgage money and subdivision with the assurance that he would be able to proceed, on the understanding that he would meet all City By-law and subdivision requirements. The amending motion was then voted on and defeated and approval in principle subject to these conditions carried.

It is submitted that the proposed development will be reasonably satisfactory when the building is painted, the landscaping completed, the garbage arrangements changed and the parking lot paved and we do not consider that it will be inappropriate to the area when it is completed.

Unfortunately the developer asked to be relieved of the normal obligation to pave his parking lot within a specified time. He preferred to give an assurance that it would be paved as soon as practicable and this was accepted by Council. It is submitted that a permit to proceed with the second building should be withheld until an agreement is entered into for "the completion" of the parking lot on the first lot, i.e. its paving. It would be recommended that June 30th, 1968 would be a reasonable completion date.

The developers have now verbally confirmed that arrangements have been made for the paving of the parking lot.

This situation does, however, point out that Council would be well advised to exercise its discretionary authority to rule on matters of appearance (especially where it owns the land). It is suggested that in the matter of concentrated multiple family development and development on major thoroughfares, Council should seriously consider this philosophy as the appearance of buildings, landscaping and layout can materially effect values of adjacent property and the general appearance of the City as a whole.

Submitted for consideration.

R.E. BARRETT
Mayor

DENIS COLE
City Commissioner

*

*

*

RED DEER REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
4920 - 53 Street
Red Deer, Alberta

March 22, 1968

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

Dear Sir:

RE: Petition from Selkirk Blvd.

As requested in your letter of March 13th, 1968, I am enclosing my comments for the consideration of Council on the above matter.

1. Subdivision designs prepared by the Commission and approved by the City for all new residential areas such as Sunnybrook encourages the residential neighbourhood concept, whereby all forms of housing lots (single and multiple family) are made available within each subdivision for all income groups. The street widths are designed according to their function or role within the subdivision and in the Sunnybrook and Morrisroe areas, a mandatory combined off street driveway and parking space is required. The school sites and park areas are so located to be of ease of access to all citizens residing in each area. However, while every effort is made to encourage the residential neighbourhood concept, regulations do not exist under the Zoning By-law in residential areas throughout the City to control the type or form of the structure that may be built upon a single and multiple family site, whereby the appearance of a single or multiple family building may be examined.
2. A review of the proposal submitted to develop three independent apartment buildings on three separate sites is in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning By-law. The development of three apartments on one site or one apartment with the same total number of units would of course provide more flexibility in site layout but three separate sites were requested of Council.
3. It must be appreciated that the development was commenced in the fall of 1967 and as of to date, the owner has not been able because of the winter season, to complete the landscaping, etc. on the first phase of the development.
4. No playground facilities are required to be provided under the Zoning Bylaw in connection with multiple or single family units.
5. The parking provisions are in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw. The Bylaw requires one parking space per dwelling unit and no provision is made in the Zoning Bylaw for visitor or two cars per family parking in single and multiple family areas. Street parking is allowed in all residential areas unless prohibited by Bylaw. Council could consider prohibiting street parking in the areas of the corner store, (Springfield Avenue), and the apartments (Selkirk Blvd.) during peak periods of traffic movement but it is doubtful, in my opinion, if such action is warranted.
6. Agree that the relocation and the development of a more attractive garbage container would be desirable and Council should discuss this point with the developers. The need for incinerators in future apartment developments should be studied before any final decision is made.

7. Proper landscaping could overcome the problem of utility boxes and this aspect should be watched when the landscaping is carried out.

The following points should be noted on the suggestions proposed by the petitioners:-

1. Reduction of the number of apartments from three to two does have merit, but acquisition of land and prepayment of utilities for two sites would make the second apartment building most uneconomical. Also, the developers and the City have signed an agreement related to construction of three apartment buildings and as indicated above, the total development is in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Bylaw.
2. The relocating of the off street parking and a service entrance off 32nd Street would in my opinion cause traffic problems associated with 32nd Street being designed and developed as a major thoroughfare with a median strip dividing traffic lanes.

Enclosed for the consideration of Council is a sketch plan showing how it would be possible to improve the situation in this area. The enclosed sketch Plan has the following major advantages:-

1. Apartment parking would not be visible from Selkirk Blvd.
2. Plug-ins for cars could be installed in retaining wall and not on separate posts.
3. The area used by driveway and automobiles for parking should be paved.
4. Garbage containers could be built into the landscaping areas, etc.
5. The landscaping of the site as shown would also make the development attractive from 32nd Street.

In presenting this sketch plan, it must be fully understood that the developers present submission complies with the provision of the Zoning Bylaw.

However Council should be aware of a possible alternate layout for this area which provides some advantages over the present layout. There may be some merit in this layout being discussed with all concerned, but it must be noted that this proposal will be more expensive to achieve than the developers' present plan.

Should any further explanation be required on our sketch Plan, I would be pleased to answer questions at the Council meeting.

Yours truly,

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

* * * * *

NOTICES OF MOTIONNO. 1.

The following Notice of Motion was submitted by Alderman Dale at meeting of Council March 11th, 1968.

"As most tax payers are very concerned about rising costs of education in Red Deer and the Province of Alberta.

WHEREAS most tax payers must live within their financial means, and

WHEREAS the tax payer on a fixed income of less than \$2400.00 a year or older persons on small pensions are hard pressed to make ends meet, and cannot afford to pay any increase in property taxes in 1968, and

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Red Deer will do the utmost to hold the mill rate in 1968 as was the case last year, and

WHEREAS local School Boards are expected to budget and finance within the equalized school assessment structure.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Red Deer inform the Red Deer School District Board #104 and the Separate School Board #17, that in view of cut-back in spending of both Federal and Provincial Governments, particularly lack of money available for school construction from Municipal Financing Corporation, Council of the City of Red Deer cannot entertain or approve any supplementary requisition requested or asked for by the two School Boards, in 1968."

*

*

*

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

While we can appreciate the concern of Council generally, and Alderman Dale in particular, over the fact that more than half of all taxes collected on property are required for education purposes, we must point out the following facts.

(1) The School Board is an elected body, and has the power to requisition funds from the Municipality which it in turn must collect by way of taxes.

(2) The Foundation grants are not intended to cover all costs. e.g. If the School Board has to acquire a site and service it to erect a new school, no portion of such costs are met from the School Foundation Fund.

(3) The supplementary requisitions of the Red Deer School Boards, have, in the past, indicated good management, and restraint in comparison with other School Boards.

(4) City Council may appeal a requisition to the Province if it can show that expenditures which are proposed are unreasonable or unjustified.

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 2.

The following Notice of Motion was introduced by Alderman Hansum and Alderman Dale at meeting of Council February 26th, 1968 and was tabled at that time to enable the City Engineer to submit a report on same for Council's consideration.

"WHEREAS the policy of using salt mixed with sand to safeguard icy City Streets causes damage to motor vehicles using the City Streets, and also causes damage to concrete driveways and garage floors, and

WHEREAS the purchase of this salt costs the taxpayers approximately \$4,000 per annum.

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RED DEER RESOLVE that the use of salt when sanding City Streets, be discontinued."

* * *

March 21st, 1968

TO: City Commissioners

FROM: City Engineer

RE: Use of Salt on City Streets

City Council has asked me to submit a report on the use of salt on City Streets, Herewith is the report:

Advantages in Using Salt

1. It makes streets safer for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Disadvantages in Using Salt

1. It costs money to apply.
2. It causes damage to vehicles, concrete, vegetation, etc.

The Notice of Motion implies that the use of salt should be discontinued because the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. I think it would be impossible to prove conclusively that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages or vice versa. However, we can make a broad comparison.

Advantages

In 1967 the accidents reported to the R.C.M.P. accounted for a vehicular damage loss of \$276,000. Considering the length of winter and the number of vehicles that use our streets, this seems like a very low figure. One can only guess what the loss might have been if we had not used salt. I am sure it would have been substantial. (Accidents involving less than \$100 damage are not reportable).

The number of persons injured in accidents in 1967 was 157. For every injury there is suffering, inconvenience, loss of work time, etc. I don't have any figures in terms of dollars to evaluate the loss due to injury. However, I suspect that it would be substantial. If salt were not used I am certain the number of injuries would increase dramatically.

Disadvantages

Vehicles will rust whether salt is used or not. The use of salt on streets will increase the amount of rusting. Studies to date have not been able to evaluate the increased loss due to use of salt. I have no doubt that this loss could be very high if the average car owner repaired the rusted components. However, the rusting does not become very obvious until a car is seven or eight years old. The owner of the car at this stage rarely considers it worthwhile to repair the damage. He continues to drive the vehicle until it fails, and this is usually due to reasons other than rusting. In other words, the life of the car has not been reduced due to rusting. This may not be true in coastal areas where there are a great number of freeze-thaw cycles. It may not be true of vehicles like trucks and buses that travel many miles in a year.

Damage to concrete can be kept minimal if the concrete is of good quality and has air entrained in it. Damage to vegetation, etc., is not a major factor.

We have used about \$8,000 worth of salt in each of the past two winters. If we had not used salt we would have used much more sand which would have cost as much as the salt. I am sure it would not have been as effective. Furthermore, it must be swept off the streets in spring.

Conclusion

The practise of using salt on City Streets makes travel safer for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. This is an accepted practise in many communities. I believe we have a moral and perhaps legal obligation to provide safe streets. Until we find a method that is proven better we are obliged to continue with our present practise.

I am attaching supporting information on the use of salt, i.e.

1. Use of Salt in Other Cities.
2. Excerpt from February 1968 publication "Within our Borders"... This is an Alberta Government Publication.

3. Report from Road Foreman.

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

*

*

*

USE OF SALT IN WESTERN CITIES

<u>City</u>	<u>Years of Usage</u>	<u>Tons/Year</u>
Calgary	over 12	3,000 - 4,000
Edmonton	16	2,000 - 3,000
Saskatoon	7	120 - 635
Regina	10	295 - 528
Red Deer	over 13	400
Yorkton	15	100
Moose Jaw	20	90
Dawson Creek	3	27 - 58
Grand Prairie	10	45
North Battleford	12	30
Lloydminster	10	10 - 15
Lethbridge	nil	nil
Medicine Hat	nil	nil

*

*

*

Excerpt from February 1968 publication of "Within Our Borders".

RESULTS OF FOUR PROVINCE SURVEY PROVE ALBERTA HAS LOWEST AUTO CORROSION RATE

Alberta Motorists appear to be among the most favoured when it comes to the effects of atmospheric corrosion on automobiles. The same situation appears to exist in connection with the corrosive effects of winter salt applied to roads and highways.

The Alberta Department of Highways, joined with its Ontario counterpart in various tests designed to gauge the effects of corrosion on automobiles in various parts of Canada. One group of test vehicles was operated out of Edmonton, another at Fredericton, New Brunswick and a third from Halifax, Nova Scotia. In Ontario, test vehicles were centered at Toronto, Ottawa, Chatham, North Bay and Cochrane.

The period of testing covered 19 months and included two winter seasons and one summer. To determine the extent of corrosion of autobodies as the result of salt applied to roads and highways the vehicles were fitted with plates of autobody steel mounted under the rear fenders above the wheels. Some of the plates were smooth metal surface and others were creviced.

The results showed that the test plates mounted on vehicles in Nova Scotia suffered the worst corrosion while those in Edmonton area were least affected. The wind-blown salt spray from the Atlantic which falls on every part of the Maritime province is blamed for the faster rate of corrosion.

The results of the tests were expressed in relative numbers which have no special meaning other than their value as comparative figures.

For the smooth plates, Edmonton had a corrosion rate of 8. This compared to 10 at Chatham, 10 at Ottawa, 12 at Cochrane, 16 at Fredricton, 18 at North Bay, 23 at Toronto and total destruction at Halifax. The results on the creviced plates were just as varied: Edmonton 9, Fredericton 14, Cochrane 15, Ottawa 17, Chatham 18, Toronto 30 and Halifax, again, total destruction.

Other groups of plates of autobody steel were exposed only to atmospheric corrosion, free of the effects of added salt and constant splashing. The resulting loss of material due to corrosion measured in milligrams per square centimeter ranged from 12.5 at Edmonton through 22 at Cochrane, 25 at North Bay, 43 at Catham, 51 at Toronto, 40 at Ottawa, 40 at Fredericton and 50 at Halifax.

The Alberta Department of Highways uses about 15,000 tons of salt per year on provincial roads. The City of Toronto alone consumes about 80,000 tons of salt per year.

*

*

*

March 14th, 1968

TO: City Engineer

FROM: General Foreman, Roads Division

RE: Your Memorandum of March 11th, 1968 - USE OF SALT

An essential part of a safe road is a skid resistant driving surface. In summer the pavement is usually not slippery because good asphalt even when wet, is relatively skid resistant. A car travelling at less than design speed and with the driver in full control, will usually be able to stop in time to avoid an accident.

Winter driving with snow and ice on the road could be something entirely different. A driver may easily lose control of his vehicle on an icy surface.

The prime concern is to provide the safest possible driving surface under all conditions and not whether it is best for a car to be slowly consumed by corrosion or suddenly destroyed by an accident on a slippery road.

Therefore, in the interest of safety, the snow and ice should be removed (as much as practical) to permit the driver to be in full control of his car. Snow removal by mechanical means does not remove the thin ice layers that adhere to the pavement as the subsequent application of ice melting chemicals will.

The application of a mixture of chemicals and abrasives will result in the abrasives anchoring themselves into the icy surfaces and becoming effective almost immediately.

The application of abrasives alone will result in much lower effectiveness as the finer materials are whipped off to the side by the traffic and as the rocks cannot penetrate the hardened icy surface they are also displaced by the tires of the moving vehicles.

The application of chemicals to roadways has one of the following objectives:

1. To prevent the formation of ice films due to freezing rain, or water from melting snow.
2. To prevent snow from adhering to the road surface and the subsequent formation of compacted ice.
3. To melt fresh snow as it falls.
4. To melt ice layers and snow that remain on pavement after plowing operations are completed.
5. To assist in the penetration of the abrasives into ice through the softening of the ice.

Compacted snow or ice requires larger quantities of chemical application than it does to prevent its bonding to the pavement. The most effective and economical time to apply chemicals is immediately before or during the very onset of a snow fall or at the completion of snow plowing operations.

The requirements of the chemicals suitable for the control of snow and ice on roads must:

1. Lower the freezing point of water to temperatures that are encountered on the roads.
2. Have a minimum damaging effect on metals, pavement and clothing.
3. Be non-toxic to people, animals and plants.
4. Be available in bulk at low cost.
5. Be easy to handle, store and spread.
6. Act on ice in a short time.
7. Have a non-lubricating effect when spread on dry pavement or in solution.

No chemical has been found to date that combines low price, low eutectic point (lowest temperature at which solution is possible), non-toxicity and non-lubricating effect better than Sodium Chloride (salt). The cost of salt to the City of Red Deer is approximately \$21.60 per ton.

The remaining factor of major concern is corrosion. Corrosion has many causes. There are several independent studies being undertaken at present and hopefully within the next year the results of these tests will be published.

The Department of Highways of Ontario is conducting various tests to determine the proportion of the annual corrosion that takes place during the de-icing salt period. Also included in their studies is the effectiveness of rust inhibitors.

Another study by Metropolitan Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba will be to measure the amount of corrosion throughout the year under actual traffic conditions.

These studies are essential if some of the very fundamental questions are to be answered. For instance: How does temperature and humidity affect the amount of corrosion in conjunction with the salts? What effect does air pollution have on car bodies? How much more does a car body corrode in an area where salt is used to melt snow than where no salt is used?

If salt assists us in providing a safer driving surface for the motoring public, should we concern ourselves about the effects of corrosion, when considering every other place that the vehicles may travel outside our City limits may be applying salt for provision of better traction?

In the interest of reducing the effects of corrosion on motor vehicles the following measures can be taken:

1. Removal of salt and salt solutions by frequent and thorough washings. This is probably one of the best methods at present for protection against corrosion.
2. Keeping vehicles at constant low temperatures and not storing them in a heated garage.
3. Application and maintenance of a protective undercoating covering.
4. Use of non-corrosive chemicals (regardless of higher cost, availability, or effect on surfaces being treated).
5. Public demand forcing the manufacturer to electroplate car bodies inside and out at the factory, leaving no place for the corrosion to start.

The following chemicals may be used when no corrosive effects can be tolerated.

1. Urea (NH_2CONH_2)

For temperatures between +12°F. and +32°F. about twice the amount of this material must be used to cause equal melting done by salt. The cost of urea is approximately \$90.00 per ton.

2. Alcohol

Glycol mixtures cause melting to temperatures as low as -30°F . but the application of this chemical creates a hazardous condition in that they cover the surface with a slippery film. The cost of alcohol de-icers is approximately \$220.00 per ton, or ten times that of salt.

There are other chemicals less corrosive than Sodium Chloride available and aside from various other disadvantages, the costs range from five to fifteen times greater than that of salt.

JOHN HILL,
General Foreman, Roads Division

* * * * *

NO. 3.

The following Notice of Motion was submitted by Alderman R. L. Dale.

"The City of Red Deer must soon consider establishing a protective force, administered by a Police Commission independent of Council but responsible to Council.

WHEREAS the R.C.M.P. have done a fine job of policing the town and City since early 1940, and

WHEREAS the R.C.M.P. is essentially in make-up, policy and in all other ways, a territorial constabulary and is largely unsuited to policing of metropolitan areas.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Red Deer do conduct an immediate study into the establishing of our own Police or Protective Force."

* * * * *

BY-LAW NO. 2281

Being a By-law to establish a Court of Revision.

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

1. There is hereby established a Court of Revision consisting of five (5) members, namely:-

2. The members hereby appointed to the Court of Revision shall hold office until the 16th of October, 1968.
3. The said members shall be remunerated for their services on the Court of Revision as follows:

Ten (\$10.00) Dollars per member per day for each day attending the Court of Revision.
- 4.(a) The City Clerk of The City of Red Deer, or in the case of his absence, the Assistant City Clerk of The City of Red Deer, is hereby appointed Clerk of the Court of Revision.

(b) The said Clerk shall, when required to do so, issue a summons to any person to attend as a witness at the Court of Revision.

(c) The said Clerk shall keep in a summary form a record of the proceedings of the Court of Revision, and shall perform such other duties as the Court of Revision may direct.

(d) The said Clerk shall be remunerated for his services to the Court of Revision as follows: NIL
5. In the event of any vacancy arising in the membership of the Court of Revision, the Council shall as soon as is practicable make an appointment to fill such vacancy.
6. No person who is interested, directly, or indirectly, in any property or business in connection with the assessment of which an appeal has been filed, shall act as a member of the Court of Revision on such appeal.

7. The majority of the members of the Court of Revision shall constitute a quorum.

READ A FIRST TIME IN OPEN COUNCIL this _____ day of _____

A.D. 1968.

READ A SECOND TIME IN OPEN COUNCIL this _____ day of _____

A.D. 1968.

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

_____ A.D. 1968.

MAYOR

CITY CLERK

March 18th, 1968

MEMBERS OF THE INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION COMMITTEE:

Dear Committee Member:

The following item was placed on our Council Agenda of March 11th, 1968.

"TO: City Council

FROM: City Commissioners

RE: Report on Servicing of Industrial Lands

The following report was submitted to the Red Deer Industrial Expansion Committee on Tuesday, March 5th, 1968. The Committee, after full study and discussion, passed the following motion for submission to City Council:

"That the Red Deer Industrial Expansion Committee recommend to Red Deer City Council that they consider the Choate Bryant property for extension of industrial sites, and that steps be taken to proceed with development of Stage I of this area, in 1968."

R. E. BARRETT,
Mayor

DENIS COLE,
City Commissioner"

Also the Agenda contained the complete report on the Hermary Land, and the Choate-Bryant area, which was so thoroughly discussed at our Committee meetings. All the details were explained to Council, both pro and con for both locations.

Council members also discussed the matter at some length, and several different views were expressed even as there were at Committee level.


I am sure you appreciate what a difficult decision this is for Council to make. The implications are many and far reaching; once made and the plan started, there is no turning back; and the amount of taxpayers money involved is considerable.

Finally the wish was expressed to have the opportunity to discuss this question with representatives of the committee and to hear their personal views.

In view of this, the matter was tabled until the meeting of March 25th; and we were directed to invite you to this meeting, if it is possible, so that Council may hear these opinions, and together with you review this most important program.

I know you are busy and have already spent considerable time on this project. I also know, you have the welfare of the community at heart. So would you oblige us by attending at 7:00 P.M., and assist us in resolving it.

Yours truly,


R. E. BARRETT
Mayor

REB/lw

ADDITIONAL AGENDA

For Regular Meeting of Council of the City of Red Deer to be held in Council Chambers, City Hall, Red Deer, Monday, March 25th, 1968 commencing at 5:00 P.M.

=====

NO. 1

RE: Tenders - Sale and removal of building
re 60th Street underpass construction

The City Land Department advertised in a local newspaper on March 15th and 16th for tenders for purchase and removal of house and garage located on Lots 15 and 16, Block 29, Plan 7604 S. (5828 - 50th Avenue), said lots being required in the construction of 60th Street underpass.

On closing date, March 22nd, only one tender was received, being that of Bonanza Movers Ltd. in the amount of \$55.00. The tender specifications require the removal of these buildings not later than April 20th, 1968.

The Land Administrator recommends Council approval of acceptance of tender received, and sale of buildings in question, to Bonanza Movers Ltd. at tendered price of \$55.00.

We concur with this recommendation.

R.E. BARRETT
Mayor

DENIS COLE
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 2

RE: Petition for Sewer Services North of 67th Street

At the meeting of Council dated February 12th, 1968, the Council passed the following resolution:

"That this matter be tabled until March 31st, 1968, at which time the administration shall bring forth a report on industrial sites, possibility of installing septic tanks in the area North of 67th Street, and estimated costs of same, together with information on the Red Deer Health Unit's views and observations in this particular area."

The report on industrial sites was presented on March 11th, 1968 and a further report is contained on the Agenda of today's date.

Re garding the report on sewer services North of 67th Street, the Inspection Department has collected a great deal of information on these properties which must now be studied in order to present a report. The Commissioners have been so occupied with preparation of the budget, union negotiations and routine administration duties that it has not been possible to complete this report to date.

Preliminary examination of the data assembled by the Inspection Department, leads us to believe that Council should either appoint a Committee to review this information or should meet as a Committee of the Whole to discuss it, prior to bringing the matter back to Council.

The administration hope to have the necessary information assembled for discussion within the next two weeks.

DENIS COLE
City Commissioner

* * * * *

NO. 3

Red Deer Rustlers Hockey Club
#22 Riverview Park
Red Deer, Alberta
March 20, 1968

Mr. Pat Amy,
City Clerk,
Red Deer, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

The Red Deer Rustler Hockey Club would like to send a delegation to the City Council Meeting on Monday, March 25th, 1968.

We would like to discuss the possibility of having the use of the Red Deer Arena for two home games of our final series at no cost.

Further particulars will be brought forth by the delegation.

Thank you,

GEORGE A. GRAY
Red Deer Rustlers Hockey Club Ltd.

*

*

*

March 4, 1968.

Office of:-
Recreation Department
City Hall, Red Deer.

Mr. Bob Worobetz, President
Red Deer Rustler Hockey Club
City.

Dear Sir:

Your request for free use of the arena for Alberta Junior Hockey League playoff games which was presented to a special meeting of the Board on March 4th, 1968 by Mr. George Gray was turned down by the Board.

The Board Members felt that it was unfair to burden the taxpayer with this problem and were further concerned that approval of the request would lead to many similar requests by other organizations using various City owned facilities.

The decision of the Board is, of course, appealable to City Council.

Yours sincerely,

GORDON KASER
Chairman.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

Between September 30th, 1967 and March 17th, 1968, there have been 28 games yielding to the City \$4,054.70 and to the Rustlers Hockey Club, \$7,763. The City share represents \$145 per game. We would recommend that Council support the Recreation Board in its recommendations.

Mr. Dennis Moffat will attend on behalf of the Board.

R.E. BARRETT
Mayor

DENIS COLE
City Commissioner

NO. 4

Ste. #1, 4904 Ross Street,
Red Deer, Alberta,
March 22nd, 1968.

Dennis Cole, Esq.,
City Commissioner,
City Hall,
Red Deer, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

RE: Sunnybrook Apartment Building

We have read of the Petition submitted to Council, which will again be raised at the Council Meeting Monday, March 25th, 1968.

As the new owners of the existing Apartment, our only comment is that when weather permits, the building and premises will be completed in accordance with the original Plans and Specifications submitted to and approved by the City.

In addition we have already contracted for paving of the Parking Lot and the erection of a Garbage Compound with concrete screen walls, which will obscure the view of the garbage containers.

Yours truly,

P.F. INVESTMENTS

Per: A.R. PORKKA

J.W. FOWLER

* * * * *

Additional Agenda March 25, 1968

No. 1 Re: Tenders - Sale and removal of buildings
re. 60 Street underpass construction.

No. 2 Re: Petition for Sewer Services North of 67 Street

No. 3 Re: Red Deer Rustler Hockey Club

No. 4 Re: Sunnybrook Apartment Building