

5. Re: Vancouver - Burnaby, Boundary Road Crossings
Extensions of Rumble and Moscrop Streets.

On January 18, 1971, Council noted that the City of Vancouver was constructing roads which could be termed extensions of Rumble and Moscrop Streets.

At the April 26, 1971, Council Meeting it was noted that there was some activity in the area where Moscrop Street could be extended into Vancouver. The Planning Director advised that a subdivision was being created in the area and that the plan of it made no provision for the westward extension of Moscrop into Vancouver. The Director was requested to indicate why the subdivision in Vancouver is proceeding without consultation with appropriate officials of Burnaby.

In order to provide Council with a greater perspective in this matter, it is necessary to briefly review the history of events leading up to the present:

1. According to correspondence, the first indication of inter-jurisdictional staff discussions took place immediately prior to July 17, 1959. The subject at that time was related to the relocation of Marine Drive and associated land use schemes. Subsequent to this meeting, Mr. Balfour and the then City Commissioner, Mr. J. Oliver, agreed that a "coordinating body" comprised of Planning and Engineering personnel from each jurisdiction be established to study problems involved in crossing Boundary Road by major streets.
2. The first meeting was held on November 30, 1959, when the following major street items were discussed:
 - (a) Marine Drive
 - (b) Possible connection between East 54th Ave. and Rumble Street.
 - (c) Possible connection between East 49th Ave. and Imperial Street.
 - (d) Proposed East 29th Avenue - Moscrop connection.
 - (e) Possible extension of 1st Avenue into Burnaby.
 - (f) Possible Scenic Highway - Bridgeway connection.

A "working" committee was established and priorities were set for the above.
3. Communications between Burnaby and Vancouver on major road crossings of Boundary lapsed until 1965 when it was noted via a local improvement notice in the newspaper that road improvements in the vicinity of East 29th Avenue and Boundary were proposed by Vancouver. We requested a meeting in April 1965 to discuss this subject and it was agreed that further meetings on crossings should be held jointly but no agreement could be reached as Vancouver staff indicated they preferred extension of East 29th into Burnaby, while Burnaby staff indicated that its plan and development had been directed toward extending Moscrop Street into Vancouver along the alignment proposed in the Harland Bartholomew & Associates' report for Vancouver.
4. The Vancouver Planning Department subsequently prepared a report which was translated into current policy when that Department's school and park development proposal was accepted by Vancouver Council. When development is initiated under this policy, it will effectively block the short extension of Moscrop Street to an easy connection at this time with Joyce Road through currently vacant city-owned land and will preclude east-west continuity across Boundary of the Moscrop arterial established in Burnaby.

The Burnaby Planning Department believes in view of the long range development concept proposed for the central area in its "Urban Structure" Report, the current facilities, the proposed near future development in

5. Re: Vancouver - Burnaby, Boundary Road Crossings
Extensions of Rumble and Moscrop Streets. (Cont'd)

the Municipal Hall-Administrative complex and the Provincial Government facilities adjacent to Moscrop, that east-west continuity across Boundary and connection with Joyce Road would provide the same desired degree of access and level of service as is desired by Vancouver in its connection of Kingsway to Rumble Street via Tyne Street.

The recent surveying in the Moscrop area in Vancouver could be the first step in the implementation of Vancouver's plans for this area.

In short, we feel that we must re-establish communications and in this connection the staff has already had a meeting with Vancouver officials to discuss these problems. A further meeting will be held shortly and a progress report will be submitted thereafter. In direct answer to the question, the subdivision is proceeding in Vancouver because, of course, it has authority to do what it wishes within its own boundaries, whether or not we agree. In any event, we are not asking for Council action on this subject at this time.