

## CITY OF VANCOUVER

### ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Report Date: April 12, 2006 Author: J. Griffin Phone No.: 604.873.7928

RTS No.: 5874

VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-50 Meeting Date: May 4, 2006

TO: Vancouver City Council

FROM: General Manager of Engineering Services

SUBJECT: Local Improvement Subsequent Procedure - May 4, 2006

### RECOMMENDATION

- A. THAT the projects by "Petition" in Court #621 be approved.
- B. THAT the projects by "Initiative Principle" in Court #622 be approved except for defeated Items #2, and #4 and Special Item #9 as explained in this report.

### **COUNCIL POLICY**

Policies governing the Local Improvement process are set out in the Vancouver Charter and Local Improvements Procedure By-law.

### **PURPOSE**

Projects by Petition and on the Initiative Principle have been advanced under the provisions of the Local Improvements Procedure By-law and will come before a Court of Revision on May 4, 2006.

The projects are identified as follows:

Court Petition	Item		Туре
#621	1-13 14-32 33 34-36 37-52		Pavement & Curbs, Local Residential Lane Pavement, Local Residential Speed Humps Pedestrian Collector Sidewalks Lane Lighting
		Items	
Court Initiative	Item	Defeated	Туре
#622	1-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 11	2,4	Pavement & Curbs, Higher Zoned Pavement & Curbs, Local Residential Lane Pavement, Local Residential Speed Humps Traffic Circle

### **DEFEATED ITEMS**

# Court 622, Item #2, Pavement & Curbs, Higher Zoned Salsbury Drive from Frances Street to Georgia Street

Objections for the above project have met the minimum number required for defeat (25 out of 46).

# Court 622, Item #4, Pavement & Curbs, Higher Zoned Tupper Street from 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue to 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

Objections for the above project have met the minimum number required for defeat (4 out of 6).

### SPECIAL ITEM

## Court 622, Item #9, Speed Humps

Lane south of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Woodland Drive to the lane west of Commercial Drive

Objections for the above project have met the minimum number required for defeat, (115 out of 144) but the assessed value represented by these objections has not met the required 50% of total assessed value. Due to the majority of property owners objecting, we recommend this project not proceed.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Funds for the City's share of the projects are available from existing Street Lighting Basic Capital Account or are subject to approval of the 2006 Streets Basic Capital Budget.

\* \* \* \*