



Corporate *NO: L005*

Report *COUNCIL DATE: April 8, 2002*

REGULAR COUNCIL – LAND USE			
TO:	Mayor & Council	DATE:	April 2, 2002
FROM:	General Manager, Planning & Development	FILE:	7901-0339-00
SUBJECT:	Subdivision Application Proposed Walkway in the Vicinity of 81 Avenue and 154B Street 15448 - 81 Avenue and 8106 - 154B Street		

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Development Department recommends that Council receive this report as information.

BACKGROUND

On December 19, 2001, an application was submitted to consolidate two properties in Fleetwood (15448 – 81 Avenue and 8106 – 154B Street) and subdivide the resulting parcel into three lots, retaining an existing house on one of the lots. The properties are currently zoned Single Family Residential Zone (RF) and are located west of Coyote Creek Park and Coyote Creek Elementary School (Appendix I).

The two subject lots were rezoned from RS to R-F(R) in two separate applications. The south-westerly lot (15448 – 81 Avenue) was rezoned on July 30, 1990 and the lot was subsequently created as part of a 10 lot subdivision. The north-easterly lot (8106 - 154B Street) was rezoned on April 2, 1990 and the lot was subsequently created as part of a 100-lot subdivision. The intention was that the two over-sized lots could be resubdivided to create a third lot and the house subsequently constructed on the north-easterly lot (8106 – 154B Street) was sited to allow future subdivision.

DISCUSSION

Upon receipt of the current subdivision application, as is normal practice, the applicant was required to erect a Development Proposal Sign outlining the proposed subdivision (attached as Appendix II). Following the installation of the sign, a concerned resident in the neighbourhood contacted the Planning and Development Department and advised that she and many of her neighbours, were concerned that the proposed subdivision would result in the loss of an informal pathway located on the subject lots. She also expressed concern that the designs of the houses, on the

proposed lots, should be compatible with the existing neighbourhood character.

Planning and Development Department staff explained to the resident that the building designs will be regulated by a building scheme. Given that a walkway has been provided as part of the previous subdivision only four lots to the north of the subject site, a second walkway was not considered necessary. However, since the Concept Plan for the area does not indicate a walkway on the subject site, the resident was advised that staff would need to consult with other Departments and the applicant to determine if a walkway would be feasible.

The informal pathway is a well-worn, dirt path running through both properties in the application. The area Concept Plan does not identify a walkway on the subject site, but rather identifies a dedicated walkway four lots to the north of the subject site. This walkway is constructed and connects with a walkway to the west and with Coyote Creek Elementary School to the east, as illustrated in Appendix III. To access Coyote Creek Park from this northerly walkway, the Coyote Creek Elementary School playing fields must be crossed.

Staff held a meeting with two residents from the neighbourhood. The residents advised that, despite the existence of the walkway to the north, the informal pathway is used to access Coyote Creek Park (which is immediately adjacent) and Fleetwood Park Secondary School (which is located to the southeast at 7940 – 156 Street).

Following the meeting, the Planning and Development Department received a petition from residents, representing 31 properties, in the immediate area. The petition stated the residents' desire to have the informal pathway dedicated, as a permanent walkway, as a condition of the proposed subdivision. A copy of the petition and a map illustrating the location of each address on the petition, is attached as Appendix IV.

To determine the feasibility of providing an additional walkway, as requested by the residents, Planning and Development Department staff prepared an alternative subdivision layout with a walkway (Appendix V). The alternative layout did not affect the proposed lot yield of three and met the basic by-law requirements for lot width, lot depth and lot area of the RF Zone. The layout was referred to the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department and to the applicant for comments.

The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department indicated that pedestrians can access the park and school site via the walkway to the north. However, an additional walkway, sited in the same location as the existing path, would be acceptable. Because the walkway would now become a formal connection into the park, the path within the park would need to be improved to City standards at the cost of the applicant.

The applicant expressed a concern that constructing the walkway within the subdivision and providing the connecting path in the park, cannot be justified with this subdivision, creating only one additional lot. The applicant also advised that the informal path is on private property and that adequate, formal (i.e. dedicated) pedestrian connections to the park currently exist, including the walkway four lots to the north.

The Approving Officer has seriously considered the comments from the applicant and the residents. The area Concept Plan does not identify a need for an additional walkway on the subject site and this is not considered to be an omission. Requiring the walkway, as part of the proposed subdivision, would satisfy the wishes of the residents of the Fleetwood neighbourhood. However, requiring the construction of a walkway, as part of the proposed subdivision, would result in the applicant having to pay unanticipated additional costs, which appear to be onerous for a subdivision that only creates one new lot, is contrary to the existing area Concept Plan and is not considered necessary from a pedestrian circulation point of view.

CONCLUSION

In the absence of being given other direction by Council, the Approving Officer intends to issue a Preliminary Layout Approval (PLA) letter to the applicant, based on the proposed subdivision layout, without a walkway.

Murray D. Dinwoodie

General Manager

Planning & Development Department

AP/kms/saw

Attachments

Appendix I Subject Site

Appendix II Initial Subdivision Layout without Walkway

Appendix III Existing Dedicated Walkways in Neighbourhood

Appendix IV Petition and Map

Appendix V Alternate Subdivision Layout with Walkway

v:\wp-docs\planning\02data\apr-june\04021152.ap.doc

S 4/8/02 2:22