

Committee of Council Agenda

Tuesday, October 26, 2021 2:00 p.m. Virtual Meeting

Pages

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

2.1. Adoption of the Agenda

Recommendation: That the Tuesday, October 26, 2021, Committee of Council Meeting Agenda be adopted as circulated.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4. **REPORTS**

4.1. Development Permit Amendment Application for 2387 and 2399 Atkins Avenue

Recommendation:

That Committee of Council approve an amendment to Development Permit DP000371 which regulates the development of an apartment building and landscaping at 2387 and 2399 Atkins Avenue.

4.2. McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

Recommendation: That Committee of Council:

Direct staff to proceed with detailed design and construction services for Option 2 (single span, signature style bridge).

4.3. 2022-2023 Capital Plan

Recommendation:

That Committee of Council direct staff to proceed with award of the 2022 and 2023 capital projects as listed in:

Attachment 1 – 2022 Amendments totalling \$6,540,603 and 2022

46

33

Additions totalling \$280,000

- Attachment 2 2023 Neighbourhood Rehabilitation totalling \$12,400,000, 2023 Other Rehabilitation totalling \$2,777,591 and 2023 New Projects \$1,750,000
- 5. COUNCILLORS' UPDATE
- 6. MAYOR'S UPDATE
- 7. CAO UPDATE
- 8. RESOLUTION TO CLOSE

8.1. Resolution to Close

Recommendation:

That the Committee of Council Meeting of Tuesday, October 26, 2021, be closed to the public pursuant to the following subsections(s) of Section 90(1) of the Community Charter:

<u>Item 5.1</u>

k. negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public;

I. discussions with municipal officers and employees respecting municipal objectives, measures and progress reports for the purposes of preparing an annual report under section 98 [annual municipal report].

<u>Item 5.2</u>

e. the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the

municipality.

<u>Item 5.3</u>

e. the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the

municipality;

g. litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality;

I. discussions with municipal officers and employees respecting municipal

objectives, measures and progress reports for the purposes of preparing an annual report under section 98 [annual municipal report].

<u>Item 5.4</u>

i. the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;

k. negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public;

I. discussions with municipal officers and employees respecting municipal objectives, measures and progress reports for the purposes of preparing an annual report under section 98 [annual municipal report].

9. ADJOURNMENT

9.1. Adjournment of the Meeting

Recommendation: That the Tuesday, October 26, 2021, Committee of Council Meeting be adjourned.

10. MEETING NOTES

RECOMMENDATION:

That Committee of Council approve an amendment to Development Permit DP000371 which regulates the development of an apartment building and landscaping at 2387 and 2399 Atkins Avenue.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL/COMMITTEE ACTION

June 18, 2019, the Committee of Council approved development permit DP000371 regulating the development of a six-storey 33-unit apartment building and landscaping at 2387 and 2399 Atkins Avenue.

REPORT SUMMARY

This report describes an application to amend development permit DP000371 to permit a substantial redesign of the six-storey apartment building and landscaping at 2387 and 2399 Atkins Avenue. The proposed development continues to be attractive and conform to city bylaws and the downtown and environmental conservation development permit area objectives and guidelines. Staff recommend approval.

BACKGROUND

Proposal: The applicant, Atelier Pacific Architecture, propose to amend development permit DP000371 to allow for changes to the previously approved apartment development design at 2387 and 2399 Atkins Avenue and request an extension to the permit expiry date.



Location map



Report To: Department: Approved by: Meeting Date: Committee of Council Development Services L. Grant October 26, 2021

Context: The 1,347m² (14,500 ft²) site is relatively flat and was previously occupied by two older houses. These houses were nuisance properties and recently demolished by the new owner. Surrounding land uses include apartments and a few older single-family houses. The site is well located in close proximity to the Downtown, public transit, schools, numerous parks and the Port Coquitlam Community Centre.

Policy and Regulations: The Official Community Plan (OCP) designates the site as High-Density Apartment Residential and allows for multiple-family developments within this designation to have a higher profile. The property is zoned RA2 (Residential Apartment 2).

The site is included within the Downtown and Environmental Conservation development permit (DP) area designations of the OCP. The Downtown DP design guidelines promote coordination of siting and building design; use of high-quality cladding materials; consideration of the relationship between buildings and open areas; and, the overall visual impact of buildings and landscaping. The environmental conservation DP objectives and guidelines encourage sustainable development and building design; efficient use of energy, water and other resources; and, reduction of waste and pollution.

The Development Procedures and the Delegation of Powers Bylaws define procedures for development permit amendments. Minor amendments that do not include a significant change to the building design or vary any bylaw can be approved by the Director of Development Services; all other amendments must be considered by the Committee of Council. In review of the amendment application staff determined the change in design to be significant and outside of the Directors delegated authority to approve.

	Bylaw Regulations ¹	Proposed ²
Site area minimum	1,000 m ²	1,346.5 m ²
Floor area ratio	2.5	2.15
Dwelling units	n/a	35
Adaptable units	30% (10 units)	40% (14 units)
Family Friendly units	25% (9 units)	46% (16 units)
Building lot coverage	60%	56.5%
Building height	30m	22.2 m
Setbacks:		
Front (Atkins Avenue)	4.0 m	4.0 m
Rear (south lane)	7.5 m	7.5 m
Interior side (east)	3.0 m	3.2 m
Interior side (west)	3.0 m	4.0 m
Underground Setbacks:		

Project profile:

¹ Refer to the Zoning, Parking and Development Management and Building and Plumbing bylaws for specific regulations ² Information provided by applicant



Report To:CoDepartment:DeApproved by:L.Meeting Date:Oo

Committee of Council Development Services L. Grant October 26, 2021

	Bylaw Regulations ¹	Proposed ²
Front (Atkins)	1.2 m	1.22 m
Rear (lane)	1.2 m	1.22 m
Interior side (east)	1.2 m	1.22 m
Interior side (west)	1.2 m	1.58 m
Parking (total)	55	49 + 6 cash in lieu
Resident parking	48	42
Visitor Parking	7 (1 per 5 d.u.)	7
Small car	14 (25% max)	14
Cash-in-lieu	6 (10% max)	6
Indoor recreation area	70 m ²	77 m ²
Outdoor recreation area	122.5 m ²	135 m ²
Bicycle parking		
Long-term (bike room)	35 (1 per d.u.)	35
Short-term (bike rack)	6 per building	6

Project description: The applicant has proposed a variety of changes to the approved design of the previously approved development permit including:

- Slight increase in floor area and lot coverage,
- Addition of 2 dwelling units,
- Increase the percentage of adaptable dwelling units from 30% to 40%,
- Increase the percentage of family-oriented dwelling units from 36% to 46%,
- Relocation of the amenity room to connect it to the outdoor amenity space,
- Reconfigure the apartment unit floor plans,
- Increase the ceiling height of the sixth floor to 13 feet,
- Reconfigure the parking areas,
- Redesign the outdoor amenity area to add a bbq area and gardening opportunities including access to water and a gardening shed,
- Addition of a car/bike wash station,
- Reconfigure the bicycle storage rooms,
- Revise the architectural character of all building facades,
- Revise the landscaping to add light bollards and wall lighting to improved safety to all exits and additional landscape planters.

The redesigned six-storey building is comprised of 1 studio, 1 one-bedroom, 17 one-bedroom plus den, 5 two-bedroom plus den, 6 three-bedroom, and 5 three-bedroom plus den homes. These apartments vary in size from $46m^2$ (494 ft²) to $108m^2$ (1,164 ft²).

The building is constructed over one and a half storey's of covered parking. The lower level of parking will be accessed off Atkins Avenue and the upper level of parking including the visitor parking will be accessed off the rear lane. Each of the parking spaces will have access to rough-in electoral service for electric vehicle charging and a car and bike wash area is located on the



northwest corner of the site. A garbage and recycling room is located within the lower parking level where it can be directly accessed by residents and a temporary staging area has been located adjacent to the street for ease of pick-up on collection days.

The applicant proposes a west coast contemporary architectural style that includes quality cladding materials in keeping with other recent development in Port Coquitlam and includes generous applications of brick, fibre-cement panel, aluminum and glass balcony railing, extensive glazing,

wood timber, and ledgestone to clad concrete retaining walls. The building has a prominent front entrance along Atkins Avenue that is framed by landscape planters and a heavy timber and glass canopy providing weather protection. The overall building design employs strong vertical elements, with a variation of materials, architectural elements, colours and stepping of the mass, intended to help break up the large building, create visual interest and a



Atkins Avenue facade

balanced architectural program. The appearance of the building's mass is further reduced by having a modest stepping back of the front of the building at the 3th floor and a more substantial step of the entire 6th floor of the building.

The proposed landscape plan provides for 3 dogwood trees on site as well as 4 street trees, a variety of shrubs, grasses, perennials and ground cover plants at-grade and in integrated landscape planters along street frontages and modular planters in the second-floor outdoor amenity area. The landscape plan also calls for outdoor barbeque area and seating along with raised garden beds and garden shed to create resident opportunities for gardening.

The project is designed to comply with the environmental conservation area designation by including such measures as using light colour roofing material to minimize solar hear gain, highefficiency windows with Low-E glazing, energy star rated appliances and LED lighting, using highefficiency irrigations systems with rain sensors and low-flow plumbing fixtures, provision of bicycle parking, use of low volatile organic compound (VOC) finishes and paints, and installation of garden beds to promote urban agriculture. A complete list of conservation measures is provided in Schedule A of the draft development permit.



Committee of Council Development Services L. Grant October 26, 2021

This project requires off-site upgrades, including: half-road, curb, gutter and sidewalk, street lighting, street trees, undergrounding of the overhead wiring, and reconstructing the rear lane.

DISCUSSION

The applicant has proposed a variety of changes to the approved design of the previously approved development permit that include a significant reconfiguration of the overall design. Similar to the previously approved design, they have used a variety of techniques to reduce the volumetric impact of this large-scale development on the pedestrian realm and to meet the intent of the Downtown development permit guidelines for form and character. These mechanisms include designing the building with a distinct pedestrian-scaled building entrance, articulating the façade by using variable setbacks, architectural elements, materials, and high-quality cladding materials. While providing for a modern building style, the design includes architectural elements that are reflective of the historic downtown character.

It is staff's opinion that the design of the proposed apartment and landscaping is attractive and meets the overall intent of the development permit guidelines. Accordingly, staff recommend approval.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

With the proposed new apartment development, it is anticipated that there will be an increase in both property tax and utility fee revenue.

<u>OPTIONS</u> (\checkmark = Staff Recommendation)

	#	Description
K	1	Approve Development Permit DP000371 amendment 1.
	2	Request additional information or amendments if the Committee is of the opinion that such information or amendment would assist in its evaluation of how the design complies with the development permit area designation.
	3	Recommend rejection of the application if the Committee is of the opinion the application does not conform to the design guidelines. Pursuant to the delegated authority, the applicant may then request the application be forwarded to Council for consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Draft development permit amendment

Lead author(s): Bryan Sherrell



THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF PORT COQUITLAM

"DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES BYLAW, 2013, NO. 3849"

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

NO. DP000371 (amendment 1)

Issued to: ORO ON ATKINS BT LTD (Owner as defined in the Local Government Act, hereinafter referred to as the Permittee)

- Address: 9360 DOLPHIN AVE RICHMOND BC V6Y 1C8
- 1. This Development Permit Amendment applies to and only to DP000371 issued June 18, 2019.
- 2. DP000371 is amended to:
 - a. Replace drawings numbered DP000371 (1) to DP000371 (22) with drawings numbered DP000371 amendment 1 (1) to DP000371 Amendment 1 (25) which are attached hereto and form part of this permit.
 - b. Replace Schedule A with Schedule A amendment 1 which is attached hereto and form part of this permit.
 - c. Replace the landscape security with \$121,047.00.
 - d. Extend the date of expiry to June 18, 2023.

APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL THE _____ DAY OF OCTOBER, 2021.

SIGNED THIS _____ DAY OF _____2021.

Mayor

Corporate Officer

I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS UPON WHICH THIS PERMIT IS ISSUED.

Applicant (or Authorized Agent or Representative of Applicant)

PROJECT TEAM DIRECTORY

OWNER: ORO ON ATKINS LIMITED PARTINERSHIP ARCHITEGT: ATELIER PACHIC ARCHITECTURE INC. LINDSCAPE CONSULTANT N2 LINDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE ARBORTS N2 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE. GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANT: HORZON ENGINEERING INC GUIL CONSULTANT: HY ENGINEERING ITD.

SURVEYOR: TERRA PACIFIC LAND SURVEYING LTD

ARCHITECTURAL DRAWING LIST DP 0.1 CONTEXT/AERIAL SITE PLAN DP 0.2 CONTEXT/SITE PHOTOGRAPHS DP 0.2A SHADOW STUDY

DP 0.3a DESIGN RATIONALE DP 0.3b DESIGN RATIONALE DP 0.4 ARCHITECTURAL AESTHETICS DP 0.6a PROJECT DATA DP 0.6b PROJECT DATA CONTINUED DP 0.6 PRELIMINARY CODE ANALYSIS

DP 1,0a SURVEY DP 1,0 SITE PLAN

DP 2.1 PARKADE PLAN LEVEL P1 DP 2.2 LEVEL ONE PLAN DP 2.3 LEVEL TWO PLAN DP 2.4 LEVEL THREE PLAN DP 2.4 LEVEL THREE PLAN DP 2.6 LEVEL SUP LAN DP 2.6 LEVEL SUP LAN DP 2.7 ROOF PLAN

HODO3711

G Mendmen

(-)

DF 5,1 3D RENDERINGS DF 5,2 3D MASSING VIEWS DF 5,3 3D MASSING VIEWS

LANDSCAPE DRAWING LIST

LO OFFSITE STREET TREE PLAN L1 LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN L2 LANDSCAPE GRADING PLAN L3 ZND FLOOR PLAN L4 LANDSCAPE DETAILS L5 LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATION



DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT SUBMISSION Date: MAY 26, 2021 REVISED / RESUBMITTED Date: SEPTEMBER 17, 2021

n

ede

PROPOSED MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

2587-2388 ATRINE AVENUE, FORT COOULTAN, BC

SERVICE BC LTD.

<u>DP_0.0</u>

State all

国際市場長をある事業

COVER PAGE

Project Data Sheet

CIVIC ADDRESS

2399 & 2387 ATKINS AVENUE, PORT COQUITLAM, B.C.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

LOT A, DISTRICT LOT 289, NEW WEST DISTRICT, PLAN NWP20715 LOT B, DISTRICT LOT 289, NEW WEST DISTRICT, PLAN NWP20715, GROUP 1

SITE LOCATION

NORTH SIDE OF ATKINS AVENUE & WEST OF SHAUGHNESSY STREET

EXISTING ZONING t RA2 ğ PROPOSED ZONING RA2

Ŵ

-

-

2

mendment

PROPOSED BUILDING TYPE

SIX-STOREY WOOD FRAME RESIDENTIAL BUILDING WITH UNDERGROUND CONCRETE PARKADE AND PARKING ON THE MAIN FLOOR FROM THE LANE. GROSS SITE AREA 14,477 ft2 (1,345 m2)

NET SITE AREA (after 5 m X 5 m ROAD DEDUCTION FOR VEHICLE TURNAROUND) 14,224.50 ft2 (1,321.50 m2)

BUILDING HEIGHT	ALLOWED	PROPOSED
BUILDING	98.4 ft (30 m)	76.90 ft (23.44m)
COMMON AMENITY SPACE	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
OUTDOOR 35 UNITS X 3,5 m ²	1,318 sf (122.5 m²)	1,458 sf (135 m²)
INDOOR 35 UNITS X 2.0 m ²	753.47 sf (70 m²)	830 sf (77 m²)
N		
FLOOR SPACE RATIO	ALLOWED	PROPOSED
	2.5	2.15
SITE COVERAGE	ALLOWED	PRPOSED

60% 56.51%

REQUIRED BUILDING SETBACKS

	REQ	UIRED	PRO	POSED
	PARKING	RESIDENTIAL	PARKING	RESIDENTIAL
FRONT (SOUTH)	1.22 m	4.0 m	1.22 m	4.0 m
REAR (NORTH)	1.22 m	7.5 m	1,22 m	7,5 m
SIDE (WEST)	1,22 m	4,0 m	1,58 m	4.0 m
SIDE (EAST)	1.22 m	3.0 m	1.22 m	3.2 m

AREA DISTRIBUTION

LEVEL	CATEGORY	AREA
LEVEL 1 (Parking+Residential)	Net Parking Floor Area	5,813.66 fl ² (540.11 m ²)
	Vertical Circulation	175.51 ft² (16.31 m²)
	Residential Common Area/Corridor	911.69 ft² (84.70 m²)
	Mechanical/Electrical	133,07 fl² (12,36m²)
	*Net Residential Floor Area	2,674.16 ft² (248.44m²)
	SUBTOTAL:	9,708.09 ft² (902.76 m²)
LEVEL 2 (Residential)	*Net Residential Floor Area	5,626,34 ft² (522,70m²)
	Vertical Circulation	395,42 ft² (36,74 m²)
	Residential Corridor	300,65 ft² (27,93 m²)
	Mechanical/Electrical	29.24 ft ² (2.72 m ²)
	Indoor Amenity:	829.75 ft ² (77.09 m ²)
	SUBTOTAL:	7,181.41 fl² (667.17 m²)
LEVEL 3-5 (Residential)	*Net Residential Floor Area	6,025.73 ft² (559.81m²)
	Vertical Circulation	395.42 ft² (36.74 m²)
	Residential Corridor	334.40 ft² (31.07 m²)
	Mechanical/Electrical	15.54 ft² (1.44 m²)
	PER FLOOR TOTAL:	6,771.09 fl ² (629.05 m ²)
	SUBTOTAL:	20,313,26 ft2 (1,887,16 m2)
LEVEL 6 (Residential)	*Net Residential Floor Area	4,548.84 ft² (422.60 m²)
	Vertical Circulation	251,42 ft ² (23,36 m ²)
	Residential Corridor	285,11 ft² (26,49 m²)
	Mechanical/Electrical	22.84 ft ² (2.12 m ²)
	SUBTOTAL:	5,108,22 ft² (474,57 m²)
	Outdoor Amenity	1,458.07 ft² (135.46m²)
Floor Area Included in FAR Calc	ulation	
TOTAL GROSS FLOOR		42,310,97ft2 (3,930,82 m2)
*TOTAL FSR FLOOR AREA:	2,674.16 ft² (248.44m²) + 5,626.34 ft² (522.70m²) + [6,025.73 ft² (559.70m²) x 3] +4,548,84 ft² (422,60 m²) = 30.926,53 ft² (2,873,17 m²)	30,926.53 ft² (2,873.17 m²)
ADAPTABLE UNIT ALLOWANCE	18 units x 2 m² = 387,50 tł² (-36 m²)	-387.50 ft² (-36.0 m²)
TOTAL		30,539.03 tt² (2,897.17 m²)

PROPOSED MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

2387 -3499 ATKING AVENUE, FORT COOUTLAM, INC.

DP 0.5a PROJECT DATA

SERVICE SECURIC ADDITION OF ADDITION

IN THE ME SHOE 22

Project Data Sheet

RESIDENTIAL UNIT DISTRIBUTION

UNIT TYPE	NUMBER OF UNITS		
	TYPE	TOTAL	%BREAKDOWN
STUDIO	ADAPTABLE	1	2,86%
ONE BED		1	2.86%
ONE BED + DEN*	ADAPTABLE	5	14.29%
ONE BED + DEN*		12	34,29%
TWO BED + DEN*	ADAPTABLE / FAMILY ORIENTED	4	11.43%
TWO BED + DEN*	FAMILY ORIENTED	1	2,86%
THREE BED	ADAPTABLE / FAMILY ORIENTED	4	11.43%
THREE BED	FAMILY ORIENTED	2	5,71%
THREE BED + DEN*	FAMILY ORIENTED	5	14.29%
TOTAL		35	100%
*ALL DEN AREA MUST BE 4	.5M2 = 14.77 SQF IN AREA OR MORE		

RESIDENTIAL UNIT PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN

1

UNIT TYPE	COUNT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
ADAPTABLE	14 of 35	30%	40%
FAMILY ORIENTED	16 of 35	25%	46.71%
3 BED ROOMS	11 of 35	5%	31.43%

PARKING REQUIREMENT

	REQUIRED/ALLOWED	PROPOSED	
TOTAL:	55 (55.4)	49	
RESIDENTIAL STUDIO	1 x 1 = 1(1.0)		
RESIDENTIAL ONE BEDROOM (1.3 SPACE PER EACH UNIT)	18 x 1,3 = 23 (23.4)	42 STALL	
RESIDENTIAL TWO OR MORE BEDROOM (1.5 SPACE PER EACH UNIT)	16 x 1,5 = 24 (24.0)		
VISITOR (1 PER 5 UNIT)	35 UNITS / 5 = 7 (7.0)	6 + 1 B-F = 7 STALL	
BARRIER-FREE STALLS (1/ 51-100 STALL = 1 STALL)	1/55 STALL = 1 (1.0)		
10% PARKING PER CASH IN LIEU (55 X 10% = 5.5)	55 X 10% STALL = 6 (5.5)	6 RESIDENTIAL STALLS	
TOTAL:	55 (55.4)	55 (STALLS)	
SMALL CAR (MAX 25%)	55 x 0.25 = 14	14	
*ALL VISITOR & RESIDENTIAL PARKIN	G STALLS TO BE PROVIDED WITH	A ROUGH-IN ELECTRIC VEHICLE	

BICYCLE STORAGE REQUIREMENT

	REQUIRED/ALLOWED	PROPOSED
VISITOR	6	6
RESIDENTIAL (1.0 SPACES PER DWELLING)	35	35
VERTICAL BICYCLE STALL (MAX 40%)	14 (14.0)	14

GARBAGE / RECYCLING REQUIREMENTS

RESIDENTIAL USE	REQUIRED	PROPÓSED
RESIDENTIAL USE	0.19 m ² per unit + 50%	
	35x0.19 = 6.65m ² + 6.65/2 = 3.33m ²	
TOTAL	107.40 ft2 (9,98 m2)	141,34 ft² (13,13 m²)

PROPOSED MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

2587 -2599 ATRINE AVENUE, PORT COOMITLAN. BC

DP 0.5b

I CHERT SEAT



DD000371 GMendment 1 (4)



NADOSI Amendment 1 (3)



Oppossi amendment 1 (6)









(1)

\$



DD000371 amendment 1 (1)

























AND THE PALANC AND IN

DP 3.6

「開発の東京を受加ます

BALL STR



1 DP4.1 INST 1-0



11200311

amendment 1 (18)









KEYPLAN





VIEW LOOKING MORTH EAST



26



NEW LODITING FROM ATKING AVE SOUTH EAST





PROPOSED MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 2447 4344 ATANKA AVENUE PORT COOMITAN, KC MARKAN AVENUE PORT COOMITAN, KC







Schedule A Gmendment 1

Energy Conservation:

Conservation Measure	Verification Method
Building to be constructed to meet City requirement	BP stage; written confirmation by Architect along
for BC Energy Step Code.	with staff review of BP submission
Roof to utilize light colour roofing material to	BP stage; written confirmation by Architect along
minimize solar heat gain	with staff review of BP submission
Window placement to provide opportunities for	DP and BP stage; staff review of building plans
natural light	
Windows are to be high efficiency with Low-E glazing	BP stage; written confirmation by Architect along
to reduce solar heat gain	with staff review of BP submission
Use of Energy Star rated appliances and LED lighting	BP stage; written confirmation by developer

Water conservation:

Conservation Measure	Verification Method
Native and drought tolerant plant selections are to be	DP and BP stage; staff review of landscape drawing,
included for the project to reduce water consumption	site inspection by Landscape Architect and City
	Arbourist
High efficiency landscape irrigation system with rain	DP and BP stage; staff review of landscape drawing,
sensors is to be installed	site inspection by Landscape Architect and City
	Arbourist
Use of low-flow plumbing fixture	BP stage; written confirmation by Architect along
	with staff review of BP submission

GHG Reduction:

Conservation Measure	Verification Method
Provision of bicycle racks and storage to promote	DP and BP stage; staff review of building plans
alternative transportation	
Use of low volatile organic compounds (VOC) finishes	BP stage; written confirmation by developer
and paints	
All parking spaces to include EV charging rough-in	BP stage; written confirmation by developer
Provision of space for recycling facilities to promote	DP and BP stage; staff review of building plans
waste diversion	
Raised garden beds to be provided in outdoor	DP and BP stage; staff review of landscape drawing,
amenity area to promote urban agriculture	site inspection by Landscape Architect and City
	Arbourist

per OCP Sec. 9.11 Environmental Conservation DPA designation

RECOMMENDATION:

That Committee of Council:

Direct staff to proceed with detailed design and construction services for Option 2 (single span, signature style bridge).

PREVIOUS COUNCIL/COMMITTEE ACTION

At the November 4, 2020 Committee of Council meeting, the following motion was passed:

That \$100,000 be approved in 2021 for detailed design and \$1,650,000 be approved in 2022 for replacement of the McAllister Pedestrian Bridge, funded by General Capital Reserve (\$1,385,000), Water Infrastructure Reserve (\$125,000), and Federal Gas Tax (\$240,000).

REPORT SUMMARY

This report provides information and three options for replacement of the McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge: a prefabricated, single span steel truss bridge (Option 1), a single span signature style bridge with steel box girders (Option 2), and a new bridge deck and elements constructed on the existing foundations and piers (Option 3). Evaluation criteria are used to compare the three bridge options with respect to construction methodology, cost, impacts, schedule, aesthetics and environmental impact. A recommendation is made to proceed with detailed design and construction of the single span signature style bridge option.

BACKGROUND

The McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge crosses the Coquitlam River, providing a pedestrian link between the Traboulay PoCo Trail and Port Coquitlam on the east side of the river to the trail network and Coquitlam located on the west side. The existing bridge consists of three spans bound by two abutments located to the north at Gately Avenue, and to the south at the intersection of McAllister Avenue and Maple Street, and further supported by two piers in the Coquitlam River.

The existing deck width is 2.1m which is insufficient for mixed use active transportation. The recommended lower limit for shared multi-use paths per the Transportation of Canada and BC Active Transportation Guidelines is 3.0m. The bridge was constructed in 1982 with a service life of approximately 50 years and scheduled for replacement in 2032. The bridge is in poor condition requiring a number of repairs to maintain a safe and acceptable service level until the replacement year. The repairs are estimated at \$150,000 and include: replacement of the deck joints, abutment



McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

and pier bearings, and repairs to the concrete deck. Furthermore, there is an existing 250mm diameter water main suspended beneath the existing bridge which requires replacement.

During the 2021 capital budgeting process, staff recommended repairs to the bridge structure to be completed in 2022 in order to maintain service until the bridge is replaced. Committee of Council requested information with regards to replacing the bridge as an alternative to rehabilitation. A project scope for full bridge replacement was subsequently presented and approved for detailed design in 2021 with construction in 2022.

The approved capital funding was based on a prefabricated steel truss style bridge (Option 1), similar to the existing structure. However, the project scope included consideration of a signature style bridge with the design.

DISCUSSION

This report presents information on bridge replacement options that have been explored and compared during the design phase: a prefabricated single span steel truss bridge (Option 1), a single span signature style bridge with steel box girders (Option 2), and a new bridge deck and elements constructed on the existing foundations and piers (Option 3). Information regarding alignment, archaeological considerations, environmental impacts, and constructability are provided for each of the options. Evaluation criteria are then used to compare the three options with respect to construction methodology, cost, impacts, schedule, aesthetics and environmental impact. Widening of the bridge to safely and comfortably accommodate pedestrians and cyclists was included with all three bridge options.

Alignment

For Options 1 and 2, the optimal alignment for a new structure is immediately upstream (north) of the existing bridge. This is because the river banks immediately downstream (south) of the existing bridge begin to diverge and would require an increased bridge span length and would not line up with McAllister Avenue, reducing visibility and ease of wayfinding.

Archaeological

The Coquitlam River is considered to have a high potential for the presence of archaeological sites; several locations have been recorded and the river is identified as having been used as a transportation route in the past. Due to excavation and soil disturbance resulting from construction of a new bridge, further archaeological investigation and inspections are required to address concerns; monitoring during construction is also required to minimize impacts and recover any artifacts or remains. Staff are working with First Nation groups to ensure that indigenous consultation requirements are being met and that the appropriate permits and authorizations are applied for.



Environmental Impact

A detailed assessment was undertaken to assess: the existing environmental conditions, the potential impacts of construction and, mitigation of environmental impacts. There are environmental impacts associated with each of the three options; however, Options 1 and 2 provide an overall improvement via removal of the two piers situated within the riverbed which returns the river to a more natural state. Option 3 has no net permanent impact as the current footprint would not be changed. Trees within the project area are relatively young and observed to be in generally good health. For Options 1 and 2, it is estimated that 12 trees would need to be removed and for Option 3, two trees removed.

Because Options 1 and 2 involve construction above the existing high-water mark in the river, they should only require a notification to the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (FLNRORD) of which the Habitat Office has 45 days to respond to the application. Option 3 would require a Change Approval due to modifications of the existing substructure, requiring access below the high-water mark. Currently, Change Approvals can take up to 12-18 months of review prior to receiving a permit with authorization and a plan to proceed with construction.

For both Options 1 and 2, removal of the existing bridge will require a Change Approval in order to remove the existing piers from the river. However, this work could be undertaken in a separate, subsequent agreement to avoid delays with construction of the new structure due to the permitting approval process.

Constructability

For each of the options, new abutments, or modifications to the existing abutments could be constructed conventionally from the river banks. Access is available for excavation and shoring, as well as concrete pouring on both sides of the proposed structure. However, erection of the new bridge structure spanning between the abutments poses a combination of different methods and challenges for each of the options:

Method 1 – Pick and Place

- Fabricated truss or box girder segments are transported and placed onsite next to the Traboulay PoCo Trail;
- The segments are assembled into single span elements and lifted into place using a high capacity crane, connecting the spans with transverse members and bracing; and
- Decking and finishing are installed in place.



Method 2 – Launch

- Fabricated truss or box girder segments are transported and placed on McAllister Avenue west of the Maple Street intersection, aligned with the proposed bridge alignment;
- Segments are cantilevered in place over the bridge abutment and incrementally launched into place over the water, using counterweights on the back segments;
- As the span approaches the west abutment, a crane on that side picks the west end, directing it into final position; and
- Decking and finishing are installed in place.

Method 3 – Assembly on Existing Bridge

- Bridge segments are transported and assembled into complete span elements on the existing bridge structure using standard size cranes; and
- \circ $\;$ Decking and finishing are installed in place.

The advantages and disadvantages of the three construction methods are compared below in Table 1:

Table 1: Comparison of	Construction	Methods
------------------------	--------------	---------

Method	Advantages	Disadvantages
1	 Existing bridge and watermain 	- High capacity crane required which
Pick and	open during construction	is difficult and very expensive to
Place	 Conventional method of 	mobilize
	construction with low risk of	 Underground utilities protection
	delays	where the crane is situated
	 Closures to Maple Street and 	 Considerable additional effort and
	McAllister Avenue limited to	materials to stabilize span elements
	crane operations	prior to lifting into place
	 Existing trees to be removed are 	 Removal of approximately 12 trees
	relatively young and not	
	significant	



McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

Method	Advantages	Disadvantages
2	 Existing bridge and watermain 	 Requires a significant staging area
Launch	open during construction	including closures to Maple Street
	 Crane requirements at the west 	and the west end of McAllister
	embankment are minimalized	Avenue
	requiring a small capacity crane	 Complex method requiring
	- Construction tasks over water	specialized equipment and analysis
	are minimalized; completed	to execute
	spans are stabilized and braced	- Underground utilities will need to be
	as they are cantilevered at the	considered for protection where the
	east abutment	crane is situated
3	 Closures to Maple Street and 	- Existing bridge cannot remain open
Assembly	McAllister Avenue limited to	during construction
on	specific construction tasks	 Careful control required while
Existing	 Reduced crane capacity 	loading the existing structure during
Bridge	requirements at each abutment	construction tasks

Options Comparison

Cross section schematics for each of the options can be found in Appendix A. Several evaluation criteria were considered to compare the three bridge options: construction methodology, cost, impacts, schedule, aesthetics and environmental impact. These are discussed in further detail below.

Construction Methodology and Impacts

Three construction methods were compared with associated benefits and impacts considered for each of the three bridge types.

The conventional method of constructing a bridge of this magnitude involves assembling bridge elements on site and lifting them into place with one or more crane picks (Method 1). Space is required as a laydown area to drop off, store, and assemble materials; space is also required to stage and utilize construction equipment. For Options 1 and 2, the new standard truss or box girder would require a high capacity crane in order to lift the pre-assembled structure into place from the east abutment at Maple Street and McAllister Avenue. This method minimizes impact to the public as road closures would be limited to certain activities and the existing bridge could remain open. However, it is significantly more expensive due to the engineering and equipment required. This method is best suited for Option 2 as the proposed box girders are relatively shallow, significantly lighter and laterally stable compared to the truss chords. For Option 1, the truss chords would need to be laterally stabilized during the lift and then further braced once set in place over the water.



Method 2 involves launching the bridge structure from the east abutment and allows for the existing structure to remain open during construction. However, the impact to Maple Street and McAllister Avenue would be significant as back spans would need to be assembled east of the abutment and pushed from McAllister Avenue resulting in long term closures and impacts to traffic. This method is also the most time intensive and complex, requiring engineering analysis at each stage of the procedure as well as specialized equipment. This construction method is equally viable for Options 1 or 2 as this launching method allows the truss chords to be braced prior to being launched above the water, which minimizes over water work. Furthermore, the crane requirements are not nearly as significant as Method 1, requiring only small capacity cranes to pick and position the bridge elements into place.

Method 3 involves assembling bridge elements on site and then lifting and placing them on the existing bridge deck from either end of the sections with smaller capacity cranes situated at each of the abutments. This method minimizes the impact to McAllister Avenue and Maple Street as road closures would be limited to certain activities. However, the existing bridge could not remain open to pedestrians during construction of the new bridge. This method is best suited for Option 2 as the proposed box girders are relatively shallow, significantly lighter and laterally stable compared to the truss chords. For Option 1, the truss chords would need to be laterally stabilized during the lifts and then further braced once set in place on the existing bridge. Method 3 is not applicable for Option 3 which involves removal of the existing deck and finishing elements and then placing a new superstructure over the existing substructure minimizes the span lengths that need to be lifted into place which reduces the crane capacity; therefore, the level of effort to construct Option 3 is similar to that of Method 3 for Option 1.

Cost

The cost estimates for the three options, including 15% contingency, are shown below in Table 2. It should be noted that these are class C estimates which are prepared with limited site information and based on some assumed site conditions (typically +/- 25 - 40% of actual project costs). Class C estimates are used for project planning; more accurate estimates will be prepared with further investigations and the detailed design.

ltem	Option 1: Prefabricated	Option 2: Signature	Option 3: Reuse
Bridge	\$2,641,000	\$2,238,000	\$2,016,000
Remove	\$518,000	\$518,000	\$518,000*
Existing			
Total	\$3,159,000	\$2,756,000	\$2,534,000

Table 2: Cost Estimate

*Removal of existing bridge at time of new bridge construction is required for Option 3



Report To: Department: Approved by: Meeting Date: The estimates are based on construction Method 3 (build new superstructure on existing bridge) for Options 1 and 2, and on Method 1 (lifting completed sections onto the existing substructure) for Option 3. Due to the significant equipment, engineering and analysis required for Methods 1 and 2, Method 3 is estimated to be \$500,000 less expensive.

In developing a costing for Option 1, a prefabricated steel truss bridge, quotes were solicited from a renowned Canadian bridge manufacturer capable of fabricating this type of structure. For a span of this length, the proposed box section truss is the only viable standard bridge option in order to minimize weight, keep the truss sections within transportable sizes, and ensure availability of materials. Custom steel sections would be considerably more expensive and require more lead time to procure. It should also be noted that the quote was received for a standard bridge option in August 2020 and since then, steel indexes are showing price increases in the order of 30%, resulting in an increase of approximately \$300,000 in material costs. Option 2, a signature style bridge with steel box girders, is estimated to cost approximately \$400,000 less than Option 1, predominantly due to the reduced material costs considering the girder depths range from approximately 20% to 50% of the truss chords. In order to build Option 3, removal of the existing foundations and piers would be used to support the new superstructure. The resulting cost to remove the existing structure would thus be incurred at the time of construction rather than a future date.

Design and Schedule

Design and schedule considerations include material lead times, permitting requirements and timelines, and the potential for unforeseen site conditions. Options 1 and 2 have the least amount of risk as they both require the least amount of permitting and do not rely on the condition of the existing structure, whereas Option 3 includes risk related to potential issues with reusing the existing substructure. Furthermore, Option 3 involves working below the high-water mark with additional permitting requirements resulting in the delayed onset of construction.

Given the current schedule milestones, staff anticipate tendering this project in March 2022. Bridge material procurement is expected to take three to four months during which a contractor could set up and establish the site, receive deliveries and perform work on the new (Options 1 and 2) or existing (Option 3) abutments. If awarded in late spring, the abutments for Options 1 and 2 could be completed and ready to receive the superstructure by late summer. The existing bridge would need to be closed for approximately two months while the new structure was assembled on the existing bridge deck. For Option 3, removal of existing bridge elements below the high-water mark requires a Change Approval permit so construction of the new superstructure would be delayed to the following construction year (2023).



McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

Aesthetics

Simplicity of the box girder superstructure, combined with the flexibility for detailing, means that aesthetic elements can be integrated into the structure itself for the Option 2 signature style bridge, unlike the prefabricated steel truss bridge for Option 1 which is not customizable. For example, fairing plates or panels could be installed along the profile of the girders to diminish bulky appearances. As shown below in Figure 1, a signature style bridge would flare outward widthwise towards the abutments, opening up sightlines, and creating a safe and inviting entry point which creates a welcoming gateway to the trail systems.



Figure 1: Signature Style Bridge (Option 2)

Public artwork can be incorporated into the final system for each of the three options. However, due to the sheer mass of Option 1, the addition of materials over and above the base structure would need to be limited.

Examples of aesthetic additions include titles suspended on cable netting within the railing system, as shown below in Figure 2. These types of additions provide an opportunity to incorporate First Nation art and can be installed with different types of effects to compose imagery, allow for movement creating a kinetic display, or to create effects of transition and dissolve depending on the lighting and view angles.



McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge



Figure 2: Suspended tiles on cable netting

Environmental Impact

As summarized above, Options 1 and 2 have the least anticipated overall environmental impacts. Option 3 requires work below the high-water mark and would therefore require additional permitting and mitigation requirements.

RECOMMENDATION

The following table is a summary of the options comparison used to evaluate the three alternatives. Rankings are from one to three, with one being the most favorable and three being the least. For the purpose of the final ranking, each criterion has been considered to hold the same weight for simplicity. Note that this results in Options 1 and 3 receiving an overall equal ranking.

-			
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Construction Method & Impacts	2	1	3
Cost	3	2	1
Design and Schedule	1	1	2
Aesthetics	3	1	2
Environmental Impact	1	1	2
Final Ranking	2	1	2

Table 3: Comparison of Evaluation Criteria

Staff are recommending proceeding with detailed design and construction of Option 2, a new signature style bridge with steel girders, and Method 3 for construction as these alternatives received the highest ranking during our evaluation. Method 3 has the lowest construction costs but has a community impact as the existing structure would need to be closed for the duration of the new superstructure placement. Method 1 would remove the need to close the existing bridge during construction but would drive the cost up considerably (~\$500,000) due to the significance of



Report To: Department: Approved by: Meeting Date:

the equipment required for the predicted lifts. Method 2 would also remove the need to close the existing bridge but is inherently expensive and would require significant impact and closures to Maple Street and McAllister Avenue. Methods 1 and 3 are more expensive for Option 1 due to the requirement to brace and laterally support the heavier and inherently less stable truss members.

The permitting requirements and negative environmental impacts of Option 2 are similar to Option 1 and significantly less than for Option 3. Furthermore, Option 2 has the greatest ability to integrate architectural treatments into the structural system. Even though Option 2 is estimated at approximately \$220,000 more than Option 3, the combined benefits related to design and schedule risk, aesthetics, and environmental impact result in significant value with only nominal additional funding.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

During the 2021-2022 capital budgeting process in August 2020, \$1,650,000 was approved for construction of the bridge in 2022. This quote was based on an estimate from a renowned Canadian bridge manufacturer who specializes in custom prefabricated and modular panel bridges. Since the time of the estimate, steel price indexes have risen approximately 30%, resulting in an estimated \$300,000 increase in material costs alone. Consequently, construction of a new signature style bridge is estimated to cost \$2,238,000, which is \$588,000 above the previously established budget.

In July 2021, the City applied for a BC Active Transportation grant in the amount of \$500,000 and staff anticipate that the application will be successful. Therefore, the \$1,650,000 originally funded will be supplemented with \$500,000 resulting in a total project budget of \$2,150,000, slightly less than the estimated cost of the Option 2 structure. The cost estimates prepared represent the best judgment based on similar past projects and knowledge of the site information available; however, some assumptions are made to account for risk of unknowns. It is anticipated that a new structure can be constructed with the existing capital funding, combined with the expected grant funding in 2022. However, removal of the existing bridge estimated at \$518,000 will require subsequent funding in 2023 which would be requested as an addition during the 2023-2024 budgeting process.



<u>OPTIONS</u> (✓ = Staff Recommendation)

	#	Description
$\mathbf{>}$	1	Direct staff to proceed with detailed design and construction of Option 2 (single span, signature style bridge).
	2	Provide direction for staff to proceed with a different option.
	3	Provide direction for an amended scope of work for staff to prepare and return to Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A – Cross Section Drawings

Lead author(s): Jason Daviduk



McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge



APPENDIX A – CROSS SECTION DRAWINGS







QUITLAM Report To: Department: Approved by: Meeting Date:

McAllister Avenue Pedestrian Bridge



Option 3 - New bridge deck and elements on existing foundations and piers



Report To: Department: Approved by: Meeting Date:

RECOMMENDATION:

That Committee of Council direct staff to proceed with award of the 2022 and 2023 capital projects as listed in:

- Attachment 1 2022 Amendments totalling \$6,540,603 and 2022 Additions totalling \$280,000
- Attachment 2 2023 Neighbourhood Rehabilitation totalling \$12,400,000, 2023 Other Rehabilitation totalling \$2,777,591 and 2023 New Projects \$1,750,000

PREVIOUS COUNCIL/COMMITTEE ACTION

May 25, 2021 – Council/Committee of Council:

That Committee of Council approve reallocating a portion of the LTR (approximately \$4.53M general, \$892K water, \$669K sanitary) in 2023 to the respective capital reserves for funding the capital plan, and

That the 2023 capital plan be prepared consistent with the 2017-2022 capital plans, utilizing the three project categories of neighbourhood rehabilitation, other rehabilitation and new.

July 14, 2020 - Committee of Council:

That Committee of Council approve reallocating a portion of the LTR (approximately \$4.5M general, \$890K water, \$670K sanitary) in 2022 to the respective capital reserves for funding the capital plan, and

That the 2022 capital plan be prepared consistent with the 2017-2021 capital plans, utilizing the three categories of neighbourhood rehabilitation, other rehabilitation and new projects.

REPORT SUMMARY

This report outlines the 2022-2023 draft capital plan for inclusion in the 2022-2026 Financial Plan bylaw and requests early approval to enable the commencement of the project procurement process.



BACKGROUND

Since 2017, the City has used a two-year budget process. This process has been highly successful in achieving competitive pricing for City projects, as well as ensuring projects are delivered on time. The proposed 2022-2023 capital plan continues this strategy.

The development of the projects contained within the 2022-2023 capital plan are guided by multiple sources including:

- Council's Action Plan for 2019-2022
- Council requests
- Resident feedback through the budget survey and other channels
- Staff input
- Plans, programs, studies, assessments, investigations and inspections
- City policies for Financial Management, Operating Costs of Capital.

The 2022-2023 Capital Plan builds on recent plans through continued investment in the renewal of the city's core infrastructure. A focus on "Getting the Basics Right" addresses infrastructure gaps with improvements to parks, sidewalks, intersections, streetlights, road/lane paving, pedestrian safety, and traffic calming.

The development of this plan required extensive coordination with all City departments. The process to develop the plan started at the end of 2020 with approval of the 2021-2022 capital plan and one-time decision packages. Since approval of the 2021-2022 plan, new information has become available requiring amendments to 2022. Amendments can be the result of new opportunities, risks, or unforeseen costs. In other cases, time-sensitive needs have also arisen requiring new project additions to the 2022 portion of the plan.

DISCUSSION

Capital Plan Highlights

Infrastructure is one of the City's top priorities which is reflected in the 2022-2023 capital plan. Building on recent plans, the 2022-2023 plan has a continued focus on renewal of our core infrastructure while new expenditures align with "Getting the Basics Right" and address infrastructure gaps with improvements to parks, sidewalks, intersections, streetlights, road/lane paving, pedestrian safety and traffic calming. The plan also includes specific projects which align with the recommendations of the Downtown Action Plan

Capital projects have been consolidated and sorted into three main categories:



2022-2023 Capital Plan

- 1. <u>Neighbourhood Infrastructure Rehabilitation</u> This category is intended to fund the replacement or renewal of existing civil infrastructure, including roads, water, sewer, storm, and associated pump stations and culverts.
- 2. <u>Other Rehabilitation</u> This category is intended to fund all other capital renewal and replacement, prioritized corporately (such as facilities, parks, recreation, software etc.)
- 3. <u>New</u> This category is for new assets, and in the long term will include the previously unfunded capital projects.

This format is intended to highlight and draw attention to what the City is doing to maintain existing assets and reduce the city's infrastructure backlog (categories 1 and 2), compared to new initiatives (category 3). Prioritization of categories 1 and 2 is consistent with policies in the City's Official Community Plan.

Proposed amendments and additions to the 2022 capital program are further detailed in Attachment 1.

The full 2023 capital program is detailed in Attachment 2, but the highlights of the draft 2023 capital program are as follows:

The highlights of the 2023 capital program are as follows:

- \$9.4M for road paving and utility replacements (water, sewer, drainage)
 - \$2.75 Kingsway Avenue Coast Meridian to Kebet Way
- \$6.0 in major utility facility replacements/upgrades (culverts, pump stations, valves)
 - \$3.1M Maple Creek Drainage Pump Station
- \$810k for sidewalk and pedestrian safety improvements
- \$400k for lane paving
- \$200k for new streetlights
- \$120k for traffic calming
- \$300k Park Playground Improvements
- \$250k Routley Pool Rehabilitation

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Over the last few years, the amount of funding coming out of the City's reserves to fund the capital program and one-time enhancements has exceeded the annual contributions into these funding sources. All of the general capital reserve has been allocated, though the Long Term Infrastructure Reserves continue to be in place for future infrastructure replacement.



2022-2023 Capital Plan

The following table and graph show the total confidential capital expenditures by capital program category for the 2022-2023 capital plan with 2020-2021 included for comparative purposes. Capital projects are funded by various means including grants, development cost charges, reserves, and accumulated surplus; the amount of funding from each source is also listed in the table below.

	2020	2021	2022	2023
Capital Program Categories				
Neighbourhood Rehabilitation	\$12,177,000	\$13,285,000	\$14,135,000	\$12,400,000
Other Rehabilitation	6,681,500	4,398,800	6,995,600	2,777,591
New	3,165,000	10,445,500	2,868,000	1,750,000
Amendments	-	-	6,540,603	
Additions	-	-	2,130,000	0
Total Capital Expenditures	\$22,023,500	\$28,129,300	\$32,669,203	\$16,927,591
Capital Funding Sources				
Accumulated Surplus	\$119,000	\$290,000	\$5,985,000	\$ -
Grants	310,000	2,465,000	1,157,500	1,260,000
Development Cost Charges	115,000	76,667	709,500	62,000
Developer Contributions	-	-	1,105,000	660,000
Reserves	21,479,500	25,297,633	23,712,203	14,945,591
Total Capital Funding Sources	\$22,023,500	\$28,129,300	\$32,669,203	\$16,927,591

<u>OPTIONS</u> (✓ = Staff Recommendation)

#	Description
1 Approve the proposed plan.	
2	Adjust the proposed plan (funding sources and/or projects accordingly).
3	Request further information before making any decisions.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – 2022 Amendments and Additions

Attachment 2 - 2023 Capital Plan

Lead author(s): Melony Burton, Karen Grommada, Kushal Pachchigar



ATTACHMENT 1

2022 AMENDMENTS

Project	2022
2022 Fleet Replacement Program	160,000
2022 Public Safety Building Upgrades	30,603
Fibre Optic Conduit	260,000
LED Streetlight Conversion	100,000
Shaughnessy St - Marpole Ave To	75,000
Welcher Ave	
Trenton Water PRV Replacement	115,000
Veterans Park & Leigh Square	5,800,000
Total Amendments	\$6,540,603

2022 ADDITIONS

Project	2022
Pitt River Road Culvert	250,000
Survey GPS Unit	80,000
Total Additions	\$280,000

ATTACHMENT 2

2023 NEIGHBOURHOOD REHABILITATION

Project	2023	2024
Neighbourhood Rehabilitation – Major Facilities		
Cedar Drainage Pump Station Replacement	100,000	10,000
Dominion Ave Sanitary Main Replacement	620,000	
Dominion Sanitary Pump Station	90,000	1,200,000
Eastern Water PRV Replacement	250,000	
Handley Sanitary Pump Station Replacement	700,000	
Lions Park Sanitary Main Replacement	800,000	
Lougheed Culvert Replacement	125,000	
Maple Creek Drainage Pump Station	3,145,000	
Storm Pump Station Generators	50,000	
Water Blow-Off Valve Replacements	100,000	100,000
Subtotal Neighbourhood Rehabilitation – Major Facilities	\$5,980,000	\$1,310,000
Neighbourhood Rehabilitation – Road & Utilities		
Gordon Ave - Lancaster St to Raleigh St	275,000	
Hughes Pl - Patricia Ave to North End	230,000	
Jervis St - Kitchener Ave to Gail Ave	525,000	
Kingsway Avenue	2,750,000	
Kitchener Ave - Lancaster St to Raleigh St	570,000	
Kitchener Ave - Raleigh St to Jervis St	335,000	
Lancaster St - Shaftsbury Ave to Gordon Ave	505,000	
Patricia Ave - Hastings St to Hughes Pl	470,000	
Patricia Ave - Hughes Pl to Graham St	100,000	
Patricia Ave - Woodland Dr to Murchie Pl	210,000	
2024 Neighbourhood Rehabilitation Detailed Design	450,000	
Subtotal Neighbourhood Rehabilitation – Road & Utilities	\$6,420,000	-
Total Neighbourhood Rehabilitation	\$12,400,000	\$1,310,000

2023 OTHER REHABILITATION

Project	2023	2024
Athletic Field Upgrade Program (2022-2026)	50,000	50,000
Barrier Fencing Replacement (2020-2024)	50,000	50,000
Castle Park Drainage and Path Improvements	90,000	
Centralized Irrigation Systems (2020-2024)	30,000	30,000
Court Resurfacing (2020-2024)	30,000	30,000
Fleet Replacement Program	527,500	
Hyde Creek Emergency Generator	250,000	
Information Technology Hardware	275,000	
Information Technology Software	210,000	
Intersection Camera Replacements (2019-2024)	135,000	135,000
McLean Park Playground Fencing	50,000	
Park Furniture Replacements	20,000	20,000
Park Playground Improvements	300,000	320,000
Path Baffle Modifications	50,000	
PoCo Trail Resurfacing (2020-2024)	41,000	41,000
Public Safety Building Upgrades	57,091	
Routley Pool Rehabilitation	250,000	
Scada System Upgrades (2020-2024)	37,000	37,000
Secondary Path Resurfacing	30,000	30,000
Skate Bowl Resurfacing (2022-2023)	140,000	
Sport Court Components (2022-2024)	30,000	30,000
Solid Waste Carts & Locks	\$125,000	
2023 Other Rehabilitation Total	\$2,777,591	\$773,000

2023 NEW

Project	2023	2024
2023 Sidewalks & Pedestrian Safety	810,000	
2023 Traffic Calming	120,000	
Development Infrastructure Gaps	100,000	
Irrigation Expansion (2022-2026)	30,000	30,000
Lane Paving (2021-2025)	400,000	400,000
Streetlight Expansion (2021-2025)	200,000	200,000
Traffic Signal –	40,000	200,000
Riverside/Riverwood/Amazon		
Transit Shelters (2020-2024)	50,000	50,000
2023 New Total	\$1,750,000	\$880,000