TO:

CITY MANAGER

1998 September 23

FROM:

DIRECTOR PLANNING AND BUILDING

SUBJECT:

REZONING REFERENCE #98-22

6137 HASTINGS STREET

Response to Public Hearing Comments

PURPOSE:

To provide a response to the concerns stated at the Public Hearing

Meeting regarding this rezoning.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT Council receive this report for information purposes.

REPORT

1.0 BACKGROUND:

On 1998 August 25, the Public Hearing was held for the subject rezoning, which involves rezoning the property at 6137 Hastings Street from C7 Drive-In Restaurant District to C4 Service Commercial District and P8 Parking District in order to permit the development of a car wash and a commercial building on the front portion of the site, with the rear portion of the site to be developed as a parking lot.

At the Public Hearing, the owner of the abutting property at 6101 Hastings Street and 3 others with an interest in properties in the area expressed some concerns regarding the development of the subject property. The concerned citizens did not generally oppose the rezoning, but expressed some concerns focusing on traffic circulation in the area and particularly a possible access to the rear lane. The owner of 6101 Hastings Street, Mr. Adams, indicated that he feels that increasing vehicular access from the rear lane to Fell Avenue by allowing access from the subject property to the lane would create a traffic hazard and that the minimal setbacks for the B.C Collision building at 6101 Hastings Street contribute to the poor visibility at the corner of the lane and Fell Avenue.

On 1998 September 14 Council tabled the rezoning and requested staff to report back on the issues raised at the Public Hearing. This report is in response to that request.

City Manager
Rezoning Reference 98-22
6137 Hastings Street - Public Hearing Comments
1998 September 23 Page 2

2.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- 2.1 In response to the concerns stated at the Public Hearing regarding lane access to this site, Planning and Engineering (Traffic Division) staff have conducted another site visit to review traffic circulation, looked at trip generation for typical C4 uses and reviewed accesses with the Ministry of Transportation and Highways (MOTH). First, in terms of the proposed uses, the applicant is proposing to develop a car wash and a commercial building to accommodate permitted C4 District uses. Based on the car wash use and some typical C4 District uses, such as business offices and automobile repair services, the anticipated trip generation is fairly low and it is estimated that at the most only 50% of the cars accessing the site would utilize the lane.
- 2.2 The original recommendation of Transportation Planning and Engineering staff regarding permitted access to this site was that the site be permitted to have one right turn in and one right turn out access on Hastings Street and one full movement access on the lane. This recommendation was based on achieving a balance between avoiding generating excessive commercial traffic in the neighbouring residential area and avoiding excessive traffic movements on and off Hastings Street, which is classified as a Primary Arterial. The function of Primary Arterials is to provide mobility for traffic through the City and between Town Centres, with the intention of limiting the land accesses. Additionally, lanes which parallel Hastings Street are intended to provide access and circulation to commercial developments on Hastings Street.

Direct vehicular access from the property to Hastings Street is within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation and Highways (MOTH). While an access permit has not been applied for in conjunction with this rezoning, MOTH staff have indicated that they would prefer one right in/right out access on Hastings Street, but that the number of right turn movement accesses permitted on Hastings Street could be affected by a site plan review. MOTH does not have direct jurisdiction over the granting of access to the lane, however, MOTH staff have indicated that they would prefer that alternative access, such as to the lane be made available.

2.3 Finally, in terms of the site observations, staff visited the site to assess the visibility at the corner of Fell Avenue and the lane to the rear of the subject site and any potential obstructions. It is noted that the building occupied by B.C. Collision does have minimal setbacks along all property lines. The building was built in 1964 and is legally non-conforming. Site observations revealed, however, that the building does not create a visibility obstruction problem for vehicles coming on to Fell Avenue from the lane. The main obstruction was created by the illegal parking of vehicles by B.C Collision between the

building and the sidewalk on Fell Avenue. Engineering staff advise that in order to address the visibilty concerns at this corner, B.C. Collision should not illegally park vehicles between their building and Fell Avenue. However, if upon the redevelopment of the subject site, there is a problem with vehicular movement at this corner, Engineering would be prepared to ban street parking on the east side of Fell Avenue between the lane and Hastings Street. Furthermore, Engineering staff feel that the restriction of vehicular access to the lane would result in additional attempted left turn movements between the site and Hastings Street, which would be potentially more dangerous than the vehicular movement between the lane and Fell Avenue.

2.4 Issues were also raised at the Public Hearing regarding general traffic circulation in the area with respect to the rear lane being a dead end lane, and concerning commuter traffic short cutting through Capitol Hill and back on to Hastings Street at Fell Avenue. With respect to the dead end lane, the Public Hearing report on this rezoning stated that a dedication for a 6 meter by 6 meter square turnaround would be required at the northern end of the property. This should address the concerns regarding circulation in the lane.

With regard to the question of traffic short cutting through Capitol Hill and back on to Hastings Street at Fell Avenue, Engineering acknowledges that there is potential for short cutting done by traffic which theoretically should be using Hastings Street, however, no traffic counts are available for Fell Avenue. In terms of traffic coming from the McGill Avenue area of Vancouver to Burnaby, Engineering staff advise that restrictions are about to be reinstated in Vancouver limiting access through the Skeena Tunnel toward Burnaby. In addition, consideration is being given to the possible need for traffic calming measures in the Burnaby Heights area. These measures should help to reduce short cutting from that area of Burnaby down to Fell Avenue, which staff consider to be a primary route of any short cutting through Capitol Hill. At the Public Hearing, the idea of installing a full traffic signal at the corner of Fell Avenue and Hastings Street was raised. If the concept is solely to control short cutting in this area, staff would not favour the installation of a full traffic signal as it would actually make short cutting more attractive by providing an easier method to get back on to Hastings Street from Fell Avenue in the P.M. peak hours.

Other issues raised at the Public Hearing were the disposal of the water and chemicals used in the car wash and security and policing of the parking area. With regard to the disposal of the water and chemicals, the Engineering Department advises that they will be disposed of through the sanitary sewer, which is adequate for this site.

City Manager
Rezoning Reference 98-22
6137 Hastings Street - Public Hearing Comments
1998 September 23 Page 4

reports on this rezoning. The R.C.M.P had expressed concern regarding the use of the rear of this property through our standard review of ongoing development with regard to CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design). These concerns were primarily about the use of the rear of the property after the commercial businesses are closed. In this respect, the 1998 August 10 Public Hearing report on this rezoning stated that the applicant has agreed to fence off the parking area on the rear of the site with a gate, which would be locked at night. With adequate measures to maintain secuirity during the day and physical measures to prohibit access to the area at night, it is felt that the concerns regarding crime can be addressed. Planning will continue to work with the R.C.M.P. and the applicant to address security concerns regarding the development of the property.

3.0 CONCLUSION:

In light of the above comments, unless otherwise directed, the Director Engineering will permit vehicular access from the subject site to the rear lane and staff will work with MOTH to approve the appropriate access to Hastings Street.

D. G. Stenson

Director Planning and Building

BW:gk c:\Myfiles\Rz98-22