



Corporate Report

NO: R116

COUNCIL DATE: May 18, 2005

REGULAR COUNCIL

TO: Mayor & Council DATE: May 13, 2005
FROM: General Manager,
Engineering FILE: 7905-0007-00
SUBJECT: Chantrell Park Drive Extension

RECOMMENDATION

That Chantrell Park Drive not be opened to through vehicular traffic, but allow access for pedestrians and bicycles only.

INTENT

The intent of this Corporate Report is to provide information to Council regarding the completion of Chantrell Park Drive, regarding the traffic, environmental, and linear park concerns raised by a delegation at the April 3, 2005 Council meeting, and to seek direction regarding an extension option.

BACKGROUND

Planning and initial development of the Chantrell Lakes Area (Figure 1, appended) was initiated in the early 1990s with many rezoning/development applications on both sides of 24 Avenue, between 134 and 140 Streets, as shown on Figure 2, appended. Council approved a road network plan for the area on September 14, 1993, establishing Chantrell Park Drive as the preferred north-south connection from 24 Avenue to 20 Avenue (copy attached). The proposed alignment connected 24 Avenue at 137 Street with 20 Avenue at 136 Street. The north half of Chantrell Park Drive has been built along with the development, while construction of the south half has been planned to coincide with the developments on the north side of 20 Avenue at 136 Street. Since approved, Chantrell Park Drive has been designated within the Subdivision By-law (Drawing R91) as a collector road, and the Chantrell Lakes Area continues to develop according to the approved road network plan. The land use and road layout plan for this area is a public document and most people who purchased homes in the area have been aware of the plans to complete Chantrell Park Drive.

Recently, the last remaining land parcel necessary for the completion of the south part of Chantrell Park Drive came forward as a residential land development proposal. The potential construction of the second part of Chantrell Park Drive initiated a discussion among the Chantrell Lakes Area residents about the implementation of the 1993 approved road network plan.

At the April 3, 2005 Council meeting, a representative of the Chantrell Lakes Area residents voiced their opposition to the proposed Chantrell Park Drive extension. In addition, a 300 name petition from residents and linear park users representing 157 households was submitted. Figure 2, appended, illustrates the distribution of petitioners and locations relative to Chantrell Park Drive.

Previously analyzed road network plan options for the Chantrell Lakes Area were presented to Council on September 14, 1993. All four presented options contained some connection between 24 and 20 Avenue. No option without a

connection between 24 and 20 Avenues was analyzed, since it was determined that a north–south link is needed between 128 Street and 140 Street, which are 2.5 km apart (1.6 miles). In three of the four options, the connection was planned to be along Chantrell Park Drive. Based on a separate report addressing road design requirements to be used in the subject area, an alternative road design standard was approved by Council in principle on November 3, 1993.

The main reason for the residents' fear of extending Chantrell Park Drive to 20 Avenue, is the concern that an existing local, low traffic volume road will become a through road with speeding and shortcutting drivers from outside the neighbourhood. In addition, the residents expressed their concern related to the road extension through the existing linear park with possible negative effects.

DISCUSSION

Council's original decision in 1993 that Chantrell Park Drive be ultimately connected between 24 Avenue and 20 Avenue was based on good planning, transportation and environmental principles. Overall connectivity, safety, environmental sustainability, and accessibility is better served by having more connections between 24 Avenue and 20 Avenue than the current ones of just 128 and 140 Street.

However, it is recognized that the neighbourhoods in and around the Chantrell Park area are substantially in their final developed state. Residents in and around the area have come to accept the traffic patterns imposed by the current road network and apart from periodic congestion due to school traffic, the network functions in a reasonably acceptable manner. This, together with the level of opposition from area residents to the road being opened, indicates that a second look at the original road concept is required.

Options for Chantrell Park Drive

Options for Chantrell Park Drive are as follows:

1. Not Open Chantrell Park Drive for vehicular traffic.

Chantrell Park Drive would be constructed as part of the new development as a cul-de-sac. A pedestrian and bike trail would connect through to the existing road pavement on the north side of the linear park (please see Figure 3). There are some trails already in the area around the detention pond; however, pedestrian traffic would take the more direct route between the two ends of Chantrell Park Drive so a new linkage is proposed. The pedestrian/bike trail would use the existing culvert crossing of the creek and not result in any loss of creek habitat area.

Pros

- Provides some transportation choices, i.e., easy bicycle and pedestrian access, etc.
- Preferred by the neighbourhood.

Cons

- Reduced vehicular accessibility.

2. Open Chantrell Park Drive as a through road to all vehicular traffic.

Full road construction as originally approved Local Area Plan utilizing the existing culvert crossing of the creek. Provide traffic calming to deal with traffic speed and volume concerns.

Pros

- Provides increased level of overall accessibility and connectivity.
- Reduces congestion on surrounding roads.

Cons

- Some intrusion of external traffic on Chantrell Park Drive.
- Extensive neighbourhood opposition.
- Road crosses linear park.

CONCLUSION

As outlined previously, Council's original approval that eventually Chantrell Park Drive should be opened as a through road between 20 and 24 Avenues was based on good planning and transportation principles. However, in light of the extensive opposition and apparent acceptability of the function of existing road network, it is proposed that Council support Option 1 (i.e., no through access for vehicles).

Paul Ham, P.Eng.
General Manager, Engineering

PH/KZ/rdd/brb
Attachments

g:\wp-docs\2005\transportation\04260845kz.doc
BRB 5/16/05 12:03 PM