

LETTER FROM STEPHENSON POINT NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION

2021 – May 05

RE: Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) Review – Stephenson Point Neighbourhood Association (SPNA) Response

Thank you for the request for input. This response is based on SPNA executive questions, conversations with City's Lisa Brinkman, and in the context of Stephenson Point (SP).

SPNA urges the City to reconsider the Draft Policy to allow the following:

- 1) **CAC's be used for pedestrian infrastructure improvements within road r.o.w.'s**, especially as it relates to major arterials. This would provide a new and critically needed revenue stream to fund elementary pedestrian improvements that are not adequately addressed through existing/proposed revenue streams. Using the context of SP's portion of Hammond Bay Rd (HBRd) as an example:

- *94.5% of its 3.5km frontage has no rolled curb or sidewalk,*
- *21.5% has no white fog line,*
- *50.0% of households have no access to a logical crosswalk location,*
- *2 of 4 major intersections have no crosswalk,*
- *4 critical points have a width less than the width of a walker/stroller,*
- *75.0% of households have no viable pedestrian route to get to neighbourhoods playgrounds or major parks.*

Currently, other revenue sources do not/will not address elementary and urgently required pedestrian infrastructure improvements in SP.

- **Capital/small-scale project funding** is not scheduled for SP's HBRd for the foreseeable future. Under current practices, funding will only take place if utility, vehicle lane, slope stabilization, or riparian area improvements are required; elementary pedestrian improvements are only undertaken as a consequence of the above being addressed. In addition, City gives priority to those roads within 'Mobility Hubs' and can not tell SPNA/residents where SP's HBRd, and its critical pedestrian needs in particular, sit on City's priority list.
- **Contributions from developers of HBRd frontage properties** have provided six short non-contiguous sections, limited to the frontage of the property being developed. Future opportunities for similar developer contributions are few, short in length, repeat the fractured non-contiguous pattern, and not in the areas which require the most urgent attention.
- **'Localized improvement' funding** not requiring Council approval would cover crosswalks, 'no parking zones', and paint lines, but would only partially address the solutions required.
- **Partner in Community (PIC) funding**, as currently proposed, will not be applied to pedestrian infrastructure in r.o.w.'s. Even if allowed, as a grant program, it would represent a danger precedent for addressing elementary pedestrian infrastructure.

The addition of funding through CAC's, while not assuring a solution to SP's issues, would:

- **provide one more possible revenue source**, to make up for the inability of the other existing/proposed funding sources to address issues.
- **address the reality on the ground**; that the extent of the problem can not be adequately addressed solely by the "subsidization of existing property owners".
- **address the Policy's stated purpose** of "meeting the needs of a growing community", and "to address increased demand or pressure..., by adding, improving and expanding public facilities and services". Specifically, as it relates to SP, improvements limited to parks/playgrounds are of little or no value when the primary need to be addressed is that 75.0% of SP households have no viable/safe pedestrian access to those same playgrounds and parks.
- **would strategically and clearly provide "a proportional and demonstrable link between the amenity and the impacts of development"** and "ensure that amenities are responsive to market realities and community needs".

- 2) **CAC's be applied to those properties previously rezoned through the City's introduction of the R-10 zoning.**

The Draft Policy, as written:

- **is biased in favour of 'Mobility Hub's, or inner-City areas**, and more likely to see rezoning applications. This effectively denies revenue sources to all other areas to address stresses on their transportation and parks. Areas which, more likely than not, have pressures applied to them because of city-wide park users or because they are part of a city-wide arterial road network.
- **does not acknowledge that large areas were relatively recently rezoned** through the introduction of R-10 zoning, to govern development on steep slopes. This in effect means that those properties which most likely would have been, in SP's case, the source for CAC funding are no longer.

To exacerbate SP's situation, the three R-10 development approvals granted have not adequately considered on-site parking or vehicle circulation. While the frontage of these properties provided a few short lengths of fractured HBRd pedestrian infrastructure, the inadequacies on-site have caused problems with off-site parking on lawns, around bus stops, and most critically, on already compromised pedestrian areas – including well beyond the frontage of the properties approved for development.

SPNA/residents brought this problem to City's attention clearly and pro-actively, during the approvals process, during construction of development phases, and since completion. The City has acknowledged the inadequacies and undertaken mitigative measures. It has been marginally successful in the immediate area, but also pushed the problem further down HBRd. Importantly, the City to date has not responded as to how not to replicate these problems in regard to possible future development applications on remaining R-10 zoned properties.

Allowing the remaining R-10 rezoned properties to be a CAC funding source for pedestrian improvements beyond the frontage of the property in question would help safeguard further problems to residents of SP and other areas.

From:

Barry Lyseng (Chair – SPNA)