ITEM

12 78

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 70 COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

Re: BOUNDARY ROAD

Following is a report from the Director of Planning on all correspondence and presentations that Council has received from citizens on Boundary Road.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT a copy of this report be sent to the Vancouver City Council.

* * * *

Planning Department December 1, 1976

File #08.640/B

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

FROM: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

RE: BOUNDARY ROAD

At their meeting of November 8, 1976, Council requested that the Planning Department report on all correspondence and presentations concerning Boundary Road including a report of the Public Meeting held on November 3, 1976. This report is submitted in response to that request.

While two letters were received in early 1974, the bulk of the concerns surrounding the proposed widening of Boundary Road have been received during this year between April and November. This spate of recent activity started around April, 1976, when the intentions of Vancouver City Council (VCC) to divert trucks to Boundary Road became more widely publicised at the VCC public meeting held in Killarney School on April 8, 1976.

The analysis of all reports received on Boundary Road concerns has been treated in three parts.

- 1. An analysis of letters, delegations, and group submissions, by subject matter (see Attachment "A").
- 2. Petitions received (see Attachment "B").
- 3. Public Meetings Held (see Attachment "C").

Boundary Road Page 2 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 78
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

From Studying these three attachments there are several recurrent issues which would appear to be held in common. There is a general feeling that the residents:

129

- 1. do not want a major truck corridor on Boundary Road;
- 2. want a multi-level government study of goods movements in the region to assess needs;
- 3. are concerned on the effects increases in traffic will have on their environment (e.g. noise, dust, vibration);
- 4. are against any encroachment into Central Park for road widening purposes;
- 5. are against the widening of Boundary Road, particularly to a 6 lane standard;
- 6. are concerned for the future safety of pedestrians adjacent the route and adjacent the park facilities;
- 7. are concerned on the effects increased traffic would have on property values:
- 8. wish to be involved on an ongoing basis in studies and planning decisions which affect their neighbourhoods.

The present status of Boundary Road, south of 29th Avenue, is that Vancouver City Council and Burnaby Council are presently widening only that portion of Boundary Road between Thurston Street and Kingsway, including the widening to 4 lanes of the B.C. Hydro railway overpass.

The associated intersection widening proposed for Boundary Road on the south side of Kingsway has not been proceeded with as a result of the direction from the Minister of Environment that Central Park could not be encroached on for road widening purposes. While the widening of the memaining sections of Boundary Road are currently staged in the Capital Improvement Program between 1979-1981 as follows:

29th to Dubois (excluding Thurston to Kingsway) -1979/1980

Dubois to Marine Way -1981

the function, design standards, and staging are likely to be the subject of considerable ongoing discussions between the respective design staffs of Vancouver City and Burnaby.

It should be noted that Vancouver City Council have stated that it is their intention to also hold a public meeting of interested citizens to discuss all aspects of the future use of Boundary Road, but as yet, no date has been set for this meeting.

Therefore, it would appear that, given the programming already established for Boundary Road between 29th and Marine Way (i.e. over the period 1979-1981) that advantage should be taken during the interim for all interested parties to review the road's function and design standards in the knowledge of the citizens concerns expressed.

Boundary Road Page 3 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 78
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

At the same time, Council should be cognizant of the fact that:

- (i) the GVRD were formally requested by Burnaby, on August 5, 1976, to undertake a comprehensive study of goods movements and;
- (ii) the Provincial Government were requested by Burnaby, on November 23, 1976, as to their willingness to participate in a multi-government study of Boundary Road and whether the Province would be prepared to participate in the cost of any study to determine the standard of Boundary Road as to Municipal, Regional, or Provincial needs.

RECOMMENDATION

- The Planning Department recommends:
 - 1. THAT a copy of this report be sent to Vancouver City Council.

A. L. Parr DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

GDH/dm Attachments cc Municipal Engineer

ITEM 12
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 78
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

ANALYSIS OF LETTERS, DELEGATIONS, AND GROUP SUBMISSIONS

BY SUBJECT MATTER

The following analysis of concerns represents the input from 89 letters and submissions of 10 groups and delegations for the period of February, 1974 to mid-November, 1976.

•		Number of times thi concern cited	.8
1.	Against widening	55	
2.	Complained of lack of information	12	
3.	Requested Citizen Participation	7	
4.	Concerned over Environmental Issues (Noise, dust, vibration)	70	
5.	Against encroachment into Central Park, and concerns for recreation facilities	ad 72	
6.	Concerned on effects on property e.g. Devaluation, Property Taxes, Resale	36	
7.	Concerned re safety for humans	45	
8.	Against increases in trucks or a major truck corrido	o r 66	
9.	Requested removal of road works from Capital Works Program and/or the Referendum	17	
10.	Requested a restriction on hours of truck use	2	
11.	Requested an investigation of alternate methods of goods movement.	2	

 $\label{eq:definition} A_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} -$

PETITIONS RECEIVED

The wording for each of the three petitions concerning Boundary Road that have been received is as follows:

1. April, 1976 - with 37 signatures

"We, the undersigned, oppose the 6 lane major transport route designed for Boundary Road."

2. April, 1976 - with 1189 signatures

"We, the undersigned, residents of the Champlain Heights area of Vancouver and Burnaby, protest the plans to make Boundary Road a truck route and major traffic artery and urge the immediate reconsideration of any plans for the area and involvement of all citizens of the area in future plans."

3. November, 1976 - with 709 signatures

"In view of Alderman Emmott's request at the Council Meeting of October 25, 1976 re: a map to be made posting locations of the residents from Burnaby and Vancouver concerned with all aspects of Boundary Road, we submit the below list of signatures which were sent to the Honourable James Nielson protecting encroachment of Central Park for road purposes. We expect these names to be used in the proposed map on the Council Agenda." Burnaby Citizens Roads Committee.

NOTE: The names from this petition were included in the analysis of responses by area, received by Council as Supplementary Item 17, Manager's Report 71, at the Council Meeting of November 8, 1976.

ATTACHMENT "B"

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 78
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

PUBLIC MEETINGS HELD

This last year, two related public meetings have been held. The first was a public meeting held by Vancouver City's standing Committee for Planning and Development. This meeting was held at Killarney High School on April 8, 1976. The second public meeting was held by the Burnaby Municipal Council at Nelson School on November 3, 1976.

Notes on both of these public meetings are attached.

ATTACHMENT "C"

MANAGER'S REPORT NO.
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

SUMMARY NOTES OF A PUBLIC MEETING HELD BY BURNABY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL AT NELSON SCHOOL ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1976.

PRESENT:

Mayor

- T. W. Constable (Chairman)

Aldermen

- Ast, Drummond, Emmott, Gunn, McLean, Randall, Stusiak

Staff

- Municipal Manager
Director of Planning
Transportation Planners (2)
Municipal Clerks Office (2)

Public

- Approximately 450-500 members of the public attended.

Mayor Constable indicated that the purpose of the public meeting was for Council Members to listen to the concerns citizens had on all aspects of the Boundary Road widening.

A formal list of speakers was the prime basis of the order of speakers for the meeting. Altogether, some 22 speakers addressed the meeting with only one speaker, the representative of the Automotive Transport Association of B.C., speaking strongly in favour of the upgrading of Boundary Road. The other 21 speakers (some of whom represented area groups) were generally negatively disposed toward the project of widening Boundary Road.

In view of all the points made by the various interests represented, there were five key points which were paramount:

- 1. There was a general feeling that Vancouver City were wanting to "dump" trucks onto Boundary Road.
- 2. The residents did not want an increase in truck volumes.
- 3. There was concern over environmental issues such as noise, air pollution, and encroachment onto park land (at Central Park).
- 4. There was felt to be a need for a multi-level government study of goods movement in the region.
- 5. There was a strong desire for citizens to be involved on an ongoing basis on all studies affecting the future of the area.

The meeting was adjourned at 11 p.m., after all speakers who had formally requested permission to address the meeting were heard.

MANAGER'S MEPURT NO. 25 O MICIL MEETING Apr. 20/76

Re: BOUNDARY ROAD

(ITEM 20, REPORT NO. 20, MARCH 29, 1976)

Following is a further report from the Director of Planning regarding Boundary Road.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT a copy of this report be sent to Mr. Basil D. Whitehead who appeared as a spokesman for Boundary Road residents at the March 15, 1976 meeting of Council.

135

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 78
COUNCIL MEETING Dec. 6/76

Planning Department, Our File #08.640-B April 14, 1976

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

FROM: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

RE: BOUNDARY ROAD.

On April 8, 1976 a Public Information meeting was held by Vancouver's Standing Committee for Planning and Development in the Killarney High School auditorium at 49th Avenue and Killarney St., Vancouver, B. C.

The Planning and Development Committee is comprised of the following members of Vancouver Council.

Alderman F. Bowers (Chairman)

Alderman W. Kennedy

Alderman H. Bird

Alderman A. Cowie

Alderman M. Harcourt

Vancouver staff from the Planning and Engineering Departments were also in attendance.

A member of the Burnaby Planning Department attended the meeting as an observer. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss two topics:

- 1. The current proposals for further development in Champlain Heights Areas "E" and "F", and to receive the resident's views and comments on the subject.
- 2. The development of the Boundary Road alignment and the use of the street by truck traffic.

The majority of the approximately 500 persons in attendance were primarily concerned with the latter and made this point vocally at the outset of the meeting. Subsequent to the Vancouver Planning Department representative outlining the background to the Champlain Heights development the Committee heard a brief report from the Vancouver Engineering Dept. representative.

Re: Boundary Road...page 2.



The Engineer stated that it was not the City's intention to ban truck traffic from Oak St., Cambie St., and Knight St. and divert all trucks to Boundary Road. Rather, the City would intend to divert the trucks which are destined for Burnaby or the north shore via the Second Narrows Bridge from the route currently used. E. Knight St., 41st Ave., Joyce Road and Boundary Road and the freeway to reach their destination to a new routing eastbound along S. E. Marine Drive and then northbound along Boundary Road thence to points in Burnaby or along Boundary to the freeway and on to the Second Narrows Bridge.

He cited the following comparison of truck traffic on certain key routes as currently use these streets and estimated after the proposed improvement of the Boundary Road diversion at the Marine Drive intersection:

6	<u> 1926</u>	(4)		173	175.2	4,144	43	V14-4	det.	045	Alina.	2ut	37.7	, vi	والمراه	(L) (A	397	dida	WE.			2,75	1600	20,2	À.	: (1):	1150	À.,		الإيان	
	Ί	'n	UC	X	R	O.	IJŢ	E		С	U	R	E	\mathbf{r}	' Ί	R	UC	CK			ES	T	M	A'	rF	'n	T	RU	C	ĸ	10,
		M	60	רדים	T-1			5.07°	9.13	100				~ ~ ~		777	ÇT.			4 . 19						1 1 12		100	100	77.772	
	_		0	n	E	<u>. 1</u>	<u>5</u>	2.17.0	Mil	<u></u>	9,335	VC	ندر	UN	<u>1 E</u>		244, 1		Ù AS	700	V	OI.	JU	M	\mathbf{E}	''A	\mathbf{F}'	TE	ŀR'	1*	34
	200				400		137	(Sept)		100			J47 3	757	*-/-	100	·	10		5.03	JON.	9.3	324	77		577.00	100	4.13	Ser Gel		35
'n.	di s	7	j w	4-7	, a	A.W. C.		(vgc)	W.	(50)		4.44	inter.			144	i lig	julik,	girch.		62		ارتيد	= 4/	rinis.	96	634		830	<i>.</i>	27. 21.5
3	77	33	\mathbf{K}	ΝI	GI	T	400	130		74)			55	0			937		grave.	7,64			480		27	5		79	St.	1. 5	šė)
	97,	Ngi	¥.		T	20	T A		Mg	'nή		100	~~	_		100					96			•	- 6.7			ight. M			
			٧.	U	T	717	TW		16:0			• .	20	U	*								7755		ĮЗ	0	15.			250	i i
H			R	Oi	UN	n	T	v	7 (A.)		. 17.		27	Ε.				201	144	15.4	4.1	19,00	(h	3.0	SŽ	٠.	AdA	000	930		Š.
M	Ç.	įέ.	leen)	~ `	٠.,		1		A po	18.0	7.0			J,	900	100		100	124	j 6 5.	Gen.	O V	347	्र	2	U.	Sh.	110	(pleft		Ü

*Over an 8 hr. period

Following the presentation from the Engineering Dept. representative the Committee heard (14) speakers from the audience, representing various citizen's groups and individuals who spoke against the proposed diversion of truck traffic.

Conclusion

- The Committee voted unanimously to agree with Burnaby Council's request to:
 - "(a) not proceed with the proposed intersection redesign and construction at Boundary Road and S. E. Marine Drive.
 - "(b) provide the Municipality of Burnaby with an estimate of additional truck traffic that is proposed for diversion to this route, together with a report on the likely environmental impact of this additional truck traffic on ad acent residential areas.... with the understanding that discussions will be initiated with the City of Vancouver upon receipt of the requested information."
- 2. In a composite motion the Committee voted unanimously to have the Vancouver officials (Planners and Engineers) meet with representatives of the local groups to have further discussions about all the various alternatives with a report back to the Committee and that delegations be received.

Further, Alderman Harcourt, as one of the directors of the G. V. R. D., advised that he would request the G. V. R. D. to undertake a study of truck movement on a regional scale.

The meeting concluded at approximately 10:00 P. M.

This report is for the information of Council.

A. L. Parr, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING.

WSS;ow

MANAGER'S REPORT NO.