

Corporate Report

NO: R155

COUNCIL DATE: July 14, 2003



REGULAR COUNCIL

TO: **Mayor & Council** DATE: **July 4, 2003**
FROM: **General Manager,
Engineering** FILE: **8630-20(FRC)**
SUBJECT: **New Fraser River Crossing - Alignment Alternatives**

RECOMMENDATION

That Council endorse an alignment alternative for the connecting roadway to the New Fraser River Crossing, between 176 Street and Highway No. 1, that integrates with the B.C. Gas and B.C. Hydro corridor south of 96 Avenue, conceptually shown as Option 2 on Figure 1.

INTENT

To advise Council of alignment alternatives for the New Fraser Crossing connecting roadway which have been investigated subsequent to earlier presentations and public information meetings regarding alignment options, and to seek endorsement of the recommended alignment in the Port Kells South and Abbey Ridge neighbourhoods.

BACKGROUND

TransLink has been working on the development of a new Fraser River crossing. Alternative bridge and tunnel crossings of the river have been evaluated and, prior to the approval of a recommended alignment by the GVTA Board (bridge crossing at 200 Street), public information meetings were held. The original roadway alignment presented to the public at this time (see Figure 1) caused concerns to be voiced by residents of the Abbey Ridge neighbourhood, the Anniedale School parents, and residents in the Port Kells South area in the vicinity of 96 Avenue. Initial meetings were held with these groups to further explain the nature and detail of the project and to fully ascertain the issues of concern. Concerns of the Abbey Ridge residents focussed on proximity of the alignment and noise impact, as well as impacts to the environment and the undeveloped area perceived to be a neighbourhood "buffer zone". Concerns of the Anniedale School parents focussed on access to the school and traffic safety. Concerns of the residents in the vicinity of 96 Avenue focussed on traffic and noise impacts, possible restrictions to access, and property impacts and compensation for property needed for the new road. The TransLink project team undertook to evaluate alignment alternatives through the area, from 176 Street to approximately 184 Street, to better address community concerns and to meet again with the residents to discuss these alternatives. Two community meetings were held with Abbey Ridge residents (April 1, May 6), and two meetings were held with residents in the Anniedale area (May 7, June 5) to discuss alignment options. A meeting was also held with the Anniedale School Parent Advisory Committee on April 10.

DISCUSSION

Figure 1 illustrates the various alignment alternatives that were identified. The original alignment alternative consists of a new four-lane roadway on the north side of 96 Avenue, with the existing 96 Avenue remaining as a frontage road for access for the properties along the south side of 96 Avenue. The alignment then underpasses Highway No. 1 at approximately 180 Street, swinging north and east to align with 98 Avenue at approximately 184 Street.

Alignment Option One again follows the north side of 96 Avenue but extends further eastward prior to underpassing

Highway No. 1 at approximately 182A Street before swinging north and east to align with 98 Avenue at approximately 184 Street.

Alignment Option Two parallels the B.C. Gas and B.C. Hydro corridor located south of 96 Avenue. Variations of this option would place the alignment either adjacent to the B.C. Gas alignment on the north side or within the B.C. Hydro alignment with relocation of the Hydro pole system (identified as Option Three in the GVTA Options Evaluation). These alignments would underpass Highway No. 1 at approximately 182A Street and continue similar to Option One.

A comparative assessment of the alternatives was carried out by TransLink staff considering the technical issues of alignment functionality, Highway 1 overpass cost and functionality, Highway 15 connection cost and functionality, construct ability and overall cost. Socio-community comparison topics included number of houses displaced, number of abutting properties, impact on Anniedale School, noise, and archaeological resource impact. Environmental comparison topics included air quality, fish and fish habitat, wildlife habitat, and accommodation of planned greenway. The comparative assessment resulted in Option Two and its variant being preferred over Option One. Details of the Options Evaluation are attached as Appendix 1. As outlined in the Options Evaluation, a larger number of existing homes (i.e., 17) are displaced for Option One. Options Two and Three displace six (6) homes, substantially less than Option One. Option Two has an advantage in that it places the road virtually equal distance between the residences on 94 Avenue and 96 Avenue. Also, Option Two, by being adjacent to the BC Gas/BC Hydro Corridor, has more potential for sound mitigation through berming and noise fencing than does Option One. (Please see the cross-sections – Appendix 2).

The alternatives and their assessment were presented to and discussed with residents at community meetings in both Abbey Ridge and Anniedale. Both alternatives appear to satisfy the residents of Abbey Ridge, being located as far as is practical from their neighbourhood. With access to the new roadway via a signalised intersection planned at 180 Street, the major concerns of the Anniedale School parents appear to be addressed. Residents of the Port Kells South area in the general project vicinity voiced a variety of opinions and concerns – from those who wish no changes to the area (i.e. no project) to those who wish the road to take an alignment having the least impact on themselves, to those who welcome the opportunity to sell all or part of their property. Noise, traffic impact, individual access considerations, and property compensation continue to be the issues voiced. However, residents have recently become aware that a Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP) planning process is about to be initiated for the area. This seems to have given rise among a number of residents to an expectation that land use in the area will be re-designated for high density residential, light industrial and/or commercial uses and thereby increasing property values. They would like this expectation confirmed prior to any negotiation of any property sale for roadway purposes.

The TransLink project team made a commitment that individual access and property impact concerns would be dealt with on an individual basis through the further stages of project development. As well, based on the comparative assessment, their preferred alignment would be Option Two, with the roadway along the north side of the B.C. Gas Right-of-Way. They also undertook to the residents that endorsement by the City of Surrey would be sought prior to further advancement of this alternative and their request for this endorsement is attached as Appendix 1.

CONCLUSION

Through comparative assessment, TransLink staff have determined that Alignment Option Two has the least community impact and provides the greatest opportunity for the mitigation of those impacts. City staff agrees with this conclusion. Consequently, it is recommended that Council endorse Option Two, involving the alignment of the New Fraser River Crossing connecting roadway from 176 Street to Highway No. 1 integrating with the existing B.C. Gas and B.C. Hydro corridor, with resolution of detailed individual issues of alignment, property access, property acquisition and compensation, and impact mitigation to proceed in parallel with the NCP planning process for the area.

The information outlined in the Options Evaluation document (Appendix I), together with the conclusions on the preferred Option, were presented at the public meeting of June 5, 2003. While the participants generally support the Crossing, there was no consensus on a preferred alignment in the Anniedale area. Participants tended to prefer the option with the least impact to their own property.

Paul Ham, P.Eng.
General Manager, Engineering

KZ/rdd
Attachment

c.c. - General Manager, Planning & Development

g:\wp-docs\2003\transportation\06090724kz.doc
BRB 7/14/03 9:03 AM