



To:	Richmond City Council	Date:	July 19 th , 2007
From:	Councillor Derek Dang, Chair Public Works & Transportation Committee	File:	10-6455-01/2007-Vol 01
Re:	STEVESTON VILLAGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS – DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS		

The Public Works & Transportation Committee, at its meeting held on Wednesday, July 18th, 2007, considered the attached report, and recommends as follows:

Committee Recommendation

- (1) *That the proposed draft recommendations for parking improvements in the Steveston Village area, (as described in the report dated June 29th, 2007, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed, subject to Draft Recommendation No. 9 - Construct angle parking on the north side of Bayview Street when sufficient funds are available in the Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund, being referred to staff for further consideration in conjunction with discussions relating to the future of the Steveston Tram.*
- (2) *That staff carry out public consultation on the above draft recommendations and report back on the outcome, along with the implementation and funding strategy for the improvements.*
- (3) *That a letter be sent through the Mayor to the Board of the Steveston Harbour Authority, indicating City Council's desire to utilize the Authority's Chatham Street property as a parking lot.*

Councillor Derek Dang, Chair
Public Works & Transportation Committee

Attach.

VARIANCE

Please note that staff recommended the following for Part (1), and that the Committee added Part (3) above:

1. That the proposed draft recommendations for parking improvements in the Steveston Village area, (as described in the report dated June 29th, 2007, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed.

Staff Report

Origin

At the March 22, 2006 meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, staff presented a report that summarized the findings of the Steveston Parking Study and identified a number of potential parking improvement options for the Steveston Village area. The following resolutions were carried with respect to that report:

- (1) That the various parking improvement options identified from the Steveston Parking Study, (as described in the report dated February 21st, 2006, from the Acting Director, Transportation), be considered in the development of the upcoming Steveston Village Conservation Strategy and Implementation Program.*
- (2) That staff report on the recommended parking-related improvement options for the Steveston Village area upon completion of the Steveston Village Conservation Strategy and Implementation Program in early 2007.*

This report presents the results of a public open house held in Steveston in July 2006 to solicit feedback on a number of parking improvement ideas for the Steveston Village area and provides a list of draft recommendations based on the results of the open house and staff's analysis.

Analysis

1. Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas Open House – July 28-29, 2006

A public open house was held at the Steveston Community Centre on July 28-29, 2006 to jointly solicit feedback on the Steveston Village Conservation Strategy (i.e., identify what is valued and how best to preserve it) as well as parking improvement ideas (see **Attachment 1** for the parking improvement display boards). A total of 138 people attended the joint open house and 88 parking questionnaires (see **Attachment 2**) were returned. Based on the 88 feedback forms:

- 66 of the respondents (75%) were residents of Steveston;
- 50 (57%) were landowners in Steveston;
- 17 (17%) were residents of Richmond outside of the Steveston area;
- seven (8%) were employees in Steveston; and
- six (7%) were business owners in Steveston.

2. Open House Feedback Results and Draft Recommendations

The number and percentage of total responses to the questionnaire are summarized below followed by the proposed draft recommendation and its rationale. Additional written comments by respondents are shown in **Attachment 3**.

Idea 1a	I support the following planned public parking improvements over the next 3 years:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> designate parking spaces in laneways; convert on-street bus layover areas to on-street parking spaces upon establishment of off-street transit exchange; and provide new off-street public parking as part of the final development of the Imperial Landing site (east of No. 1 Road and bounded by Bayview Street). 				
	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
52 (59%)	7 (8%)	20 (22%)	3 (3%)	6 (7%)	

Draft Recommendation 1: Undertake the identified planned parking improvements

Relatively strong support is indicated for the planned parking improvements. Per Section 12.3(i) of the City's current Traffic Control and Regulation Bylaw 5870, parking in lanes is not permitted except for commercial vehicles engaged in loading or unloading of materials or where parking is designated by sign or road markings. Richmond Fire-Rescue prefers no parking in laneways but, if parking is permitted, requires that the parking and loading spaces be clearly designated to ensure unobstructed access by all emergency service providers as well as adequate space for the deployment of their equipment. Staff are continuing to work with TransLink to identify an appropriate site for an off-street bus exchange in the Steveston area and have already secured the provision of new off-street public parking as part of the final development of the Imperial Landing site.

Idea 1b	Do you think more public parking is required within the next 3 years than what is currently planned?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response	
36 (41%)	20 (23%)	22 (25%)	1 (1%)	10 (10%)	

Draft Recommendation 2: Undertake selected parking improvements (see Preliminary Recommendation 9)

As the feedback results do not demonstrate that there is a strong demand for additional parking in the short-term, staff propose to undertake selected parking improvements as funding allows (i.e., via the Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund and/or new revenue sources) and as development opportunities arise. A potential public parking improvement is identified in Preliminary Recommendation 9.

Idea 2a	Do you support the City seeking long-term leases of sites for public parking and the construction of pedestrian links between these parking sites and the Village waterfront?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response	
66 (75%)	2 (2%)	11 (13%)	0 (0%)	9 (10%)	

Draft Recommendation 3: Continue discussion with the Steveston Harbour Authority (SHA) to secure shared use and/or long-term lease of the existing public parking area on Chatham Street as part of development of the site. Initiate discussion with the Gulf of Georgia Cannery regarding the long-term shared public use of its parking lot. Upgrade pedestrian links between major public facilities and the waterfront where required.

Very strong support is indicated for the more efficient use of existing public parking facilities before providing additional public parking. Both of the identified sites are within walking distance of the Village core and improved pedestrian amenities would enhance wayfinding and the overall streetscape.

Idea 2b Do you support the establishment of designated employee parking within a portion of these public parking lots?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
57 (65%)	11 (13%)	12 (14%)	1 (1%)	7 (8%)

Draft Recommendation 4: Work with Steveston Village business owners and employers to promote and encourage the use of the existing designated long-term public parking lot at the east end of Chatham Street for employee parking.

There is strong support for encouraging employees to park outside the Village core in order to free up public parking spaces for visitors. Unlike the SHA site on Chatham Street between 4th and 6th Avenues, the public parking lot at the east end of Chatham Street is owned and controlled by the City and thus its availability in the long-term is more secure. The site is within walking distance of the Village core and has adequate capacity. This lot can also be considered for pay permit parking by all-day users.

Idea 3a Do you support the use of streets and laneways for commercial loading instead of within new private developments?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
38 (43%)	19 (22%)	15 (17%)	5 (6%)	11 (13%)

Draft Recommendation 5: For small-scale developments within the Steveston Village core, examine the feasibility of on-street loading provisions as part of the development review (i.e., where loading cannot be accommodated on-site, allow loading to occur in the laneway (first preference) or the street (second preference)).

Unlike other parts of the city, Steveston Village has predominantly smaller sized lots that can make the accommodation of on-site loading and parking requirements difficult. Staff propose that an exemption for on-site loading be examined on a case-by-case basis for small-scale developments as part of the City's review of its existing Zoning and Development Bylaw. Loading activities could be accommodated in the existing laneways (first choice, as they already serve this function), or a commercial loading zone could be designated on-street (second choice, as this could require the removal of public parking spaces).

Idea 3b Do you support the need for a tour bus parking zone within the Village core?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
58 (66%)	6 (7%)	18 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (7%)

Idea 3c Do you support the proposed location for a tour bus parking zone within the Village core? (West side of 3 rd Avenue between Moncton Street and Bayview Street)				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
49 (56%)	8 (9%)	25 (28%)	0 (0%)	6 (7%)

Draft Recommendation 6: Establish a tour bus loading zone for pick up and drop off only within the Village core with the staging area to be outside the Village core.

Written and verbal comments from open house participants indicated support for a tour bus loading zone in the Steveston Village core for temporary pick up and drop off only and a preference that longer term tour bus parking be accommodated outside the Village core. Tour bus parking could be accommodated within the existing long-term public parking lots or on Chatham Street.

Idea 4a Do you support the conversion of any of the proposed street sections to one-way?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
39 (44%)	12 (14%)	30 (34%)	3 (3%)	4 (5%)

Idea 4b If so, which street sections should be converted?								
	Bayview St			1st Ave	3rd Ave	Moncton St		
	No. 1 Rd to 1st Ave	1st Ave to 2nd Ave	2nd Ave to 3rd Ave	Bayview to Moncton	Bayview to Moncton	No. 1 Rd to 1st Ave	1st Ave to 2nd Ave	2nd Ave to 3rd Ave
I support the conversion of the following street sections to a one-way system.	33 (38%)	31 (35%)	31 (35%)	37 (42%)	36 (41%)	29 (33%)	26 (30%)	26 (30%)
I support the conversion of the following street sections to a one-way system but in the reverse direction.	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)
No response.	52 (59%)	54 (61%)	54 (61%)	48 (55%)	49 (56%)	56 (64%)	59 (67%)	59 (67%)

Draft Recommendation 7: Retain the existing street patterns at this time.

The feedback results do not indicate strong support for converting selected two-way streets to one-way streets. The existing road patterns function well and establishing more one-way streets could impact the exposure and access to businesses on those streets and lead to more vehicle circulation within the Village. Indeed, several cities are converting one-way streets back to two-way streets (e.g., Vancouver within its downtown core).

Idea 4c Do you support the signalization of the No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
49 (56%)	5 (6%)	26 (30%)	1 (1%)	7 (8%)

Idea 4d Do you support the suggested intersection treatments? If so, which ones?				
	Patterned/textured surface for crosswalk	Artistic treatment in centre of intersection	Raised intersection	Other
I support the following intersection treatments at this location.	39 (44%)	27 (31%)	26 (30%)	7 (8%)
No response.	49 (56%)	61 (69%)	62 (70%)	81 (92%)

Draft Recommendation 8: Retain the existing traffic control at the No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection at this time. Investigate the use of a traffic control person to direct vehicle and pedestrian traffic at this location during peak periods only (i.e., summer weekends). Do not introduce any intersection treatments at this time.

The feedback results do not indicate overwhelmingly strong support for signaling the No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection and even less support for any intersection treatments. Staff's analysis indicates that the current level of traffic control, stop signs, is appropriate given existing traffic volumes and thus signalization is not warranted at this time. Based on past traffic engineering experience, the introduction of new traffic signals would generally result in more severe traffic accidents mainly due to higher operating speeds. However, during periodic busy times such as weekends during the summer, congested conditions can arise due to heavy pedestrian and vehicle volumes. Staff therefore propose that a traffic control person be assigned to direct traffic at the intersection during the typically busier times of 11:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturdays, Sundays and statutory holidays for the summer months of June through September. Staff estimate the annual operating costs for a traffic control person at \$30,000-\$45,000 performed either by a specially designated RCMP officer or a certified traffic controller.

Idea 5 Do you support the creation of approximately 47 on-street angle parking spaces on the north side of Bayview Street between No. 1 Road and 3 rd Avenue?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
47 (53%)	9 (10%)	23 (26%)	0 (0%)	9 (10%)

Draft Recommendation 9: Construct angle parking on the north side of Bayview Street when sufficient funds are available in the Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund.

The feedback results indicate modest support for the creation of the additional parking along Bayview Street. As of December 31, 2006 the balance of the Fund is \$162,000 while the construction cost is estimated at \$365,000. The rate of accumulation of the Fund would be significantly accelerated if, as recommended by the Steveston Parking Study, the current cash-in-lieu parking space rate of \$10,500 (set in 1989) is raised to around \$25,000 – \$30,000 to reflect today's property and construction costs. Staff propose that the rate be raised as part of a number of housekeeping amendments to the City's Zoning and Development Bylaw by year's end.

Idea 6a Do you support the implementation of pay parking in the Village core?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
15 (17%)	6 (7%)	62 (70%)	0 (0%)	5 (6%)

Idea 6b If so, do you think it should be in effect during busy times only?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
17 (19%)	12 (14%)	46 (52%)	1 (1%)	12 (14%)

Draft Recommendation 10: Do not establish pay parking at existing public on-street and off-street parking sites at this time. Establish pay parking for any new additional public parking spaces owned or leased by the City.

Strong opposition to the introduction of pay parking is indicated. Per written comments, Steveston area residents feel that the imposition of pay parking would penalize them for shopping locally and lead to their choosing to shop at a nearby mall with free parking which, in turn, would negatively impact Steveston businesses. Notwithstanding, staff propose that pay parking be established for any new additional public parking, including the new spaces to be created on Bayview Street, in order to encourage parking space turnover, enable more efficient parking enforcement, and offset the costs of providing the public parking. At such time, consideration could be given to establishing pay parking on a seasonal basis only, such as during the peak summer periods.

Idea 7 Do you support the establishment of a Steveston Business Improvement Area?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
53 (60%)	9 (10%)	13 (15%)	3 (3%)	10 (11%)

Draft Recommendation 11: City staff to explore the potential for establishing a Steveston Business Improvement Area (BIA) with local business and property owners.

The feedback results indicate good support for the establishment of a Steveston BIA, however, the majority of questionnaires were completed by residents who are not business and/or property owners. Working with the Economic Development Division, discussions with local business stakeholders would need to be initiated to assess the potential for and benefits of a Steveston BIA. Some of the funding could be used for parking improvements and heritage restoration. (Note: The scope of BIA functions are expected to considerably exceed these two areas).

Idea 8a Do you support a new parkade in the long-term (beyond 5 years from now)?				
Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	Unsure/Don't Know	No Response
40 (45%)	9 (10%)	17 (19%)	5 (6%)	11 (13%)

Idea 8b If so, what is your preferred location?					
	Steveston Community Centre	City Lot at Moncton St & Easthope St	City Lot H between walkway & river	SHA Site on Chatham St	Other
I prefer the following location for the parkade.	13 (15%)	16 (18%)	8 (9%)	32 (36%)	2 (2%)
No response.	75 (85%)	72 (82%)	80 (91%)	56 (64%)	86 (98%)

Draft Recommendation 12: Continue to monitor developments in the Steveston Village area for potential City-private partnership opportunities, including the SHA site on Chatham Street, to facilitate the construction of a joint development that incorporates public parking and is located outside the Village core.

Relatively low support for a parkade is indicated and of those who indicated a preferred location, the SHA site recorded the highest number of responses. As there is no overwhelming preference for a site, staff would continue to track developments in the area for potential City-private partnership opportunities to create additional public parking outside the Village core, which would divert vehicle traffic from the pedestrian areas and free up existing off-street parking sites within the Village core for higher uses.

3. Consultation with Stakeholders

Staff presented a draft version of this report to the Richmond Heritage Commission, which is participating in the *Steveston Village Conservation Program*, and the Richmond Parking Advisory Committee, which provides input and advice to the City on parking-related issues.

3.1 Richmond Heritage Commission

Staff discussed the draft recommendations with members at a meeting of the Commission held February 22, 2007. Committee members provided the following comments on specific recommendations.

- Parking in Laneways: prefer that existing conditions and uses in the laneways be maintained.
- Signalization of No. 1 Rd/Moncton St Intersection: strongly support the recommendation for a traffic controller, particularly if the individual is presented as a welcoming ambassador for the area.
- One-Way Streets: consider converting 1st Avenue between Moncton St and Bayview St from two-way to one-way northbound as it is currently one-way northbound between Moncton St and Chatham St and would complement 2nd Avenue, which is currently one-way southbound between Chatham St and Bayview St.
- Angle Parking on Bayview Street: do not support angle parking and prefer that any new parking be provided in selected parallel parking bays along the north side of the street so as to preserve the majority of the existing grassed boulevard and the pedestrian-friendliness of the street engendered by the building set-backs and sunny exposure.

Recognizing that designating formal parking spaces in laneways is needed to address existing traffic and safety concerns, staff will carefully assess each lane in order to maximize the retention of its heritage characteristics and minimize the loss of informal parking spaces. With respect to the suggestions regarding more one-way streets and no angle parking on Bayview Street, public feedback from the first open house did not indicate support for the conversion of existing two-way streets to one-way and did indicate support for angle parking on Bayview Street, which is reflected in the draft recommendations. Staff will consider the Commission's comments along with the second round public feedback results when developing the final recommendations for Council approval.

3.2 Richmond Parking Advisory Committee

Staff discussed the draft recommendations with members at a meeting of the Committee held January 30, 2007. Committee members indicated support for the draft recommendations and agreed that they should be presented to the public for feedback at an open house. Specific comments are summarized below.

- Signalization of No. 1 Rd/Moncton St Intersection: agree that signalization is not warranted but pedestrian flows need to be better managed. Support the recommendation for a traffic controller, as Steveston is a unique heritage area that draws many tourists.
- Angle Parking on Bayview St: consider restricting any new angle parking to selected parallel parking bays rather than provide parking along the entire street so as to preserve some of the existing grassed boulevard. Angle parking is considered consistent with the Village characteristics as angle parking already exists in the Village (e.g., on Second Avenue). The additional spaces would be an increase of almost 25% in public parking supply within the south area of the Village.
- Pay Parking: agree that pay parking should apply to any new angle parking on Bayview St. It is feasible to segment the market – people will be willing to pay in order to park close to the waterfront. Consider using “smart” cards that could assign a different parking tariff for Steveston residents (versus visitors) and allow variable pricing based on time of day, day of week, etc. The data would also provide demographic information on users and indicate the willingness of local residents to pay for parking.
- Business Improvement Area: smaller towns in Washington / State (Leavenworth, La Conner) have implemented BIAs, which have helped to revitalize them and draw significant levels of tourism. Consider establishing BIAs in the City Centre so Steveston is not singled out as having to pay its own way. Suggest contacting the Steveston Community Society and the Steveston Rotary Club when initiating discussions regarding a possible Steveston BIA as these groups have good representation from local businesses.

The proposed draft recommendations were developed with consideration to the public feedback received at the July 2006 open house. Staff will consider the Committee’s comments along with the second round of public feedback results when developing the final recommendations for Council approval.

4. Next Steps

Staff propose that the draft recommendations identified in this report be presented to the public for feedback as part of a joint open house that will also present the draft conservation strategy of the Steveston Village Conservation Program, which is planned for Fall 2007. Upon compilation of the feedback on the draft recommendations, staff will bring forward a set of final parking recommendations, along with the associated implementation and funding strategy, for Council’s consideration.

Financial Impact

None at this time. Staff attendance at the planned open house may result in overtime costs to the City, which can be absorbed in the divisional operating budget provided the current service level is maintained.

Conclusion

Staff held a joint open house in July 2006 to present the Steveston Village Conservation Program as well as proposed parking improvement options for the Steveston Village area. Upon analysis and review of the feedback, staff have developed a number of draft recommendations and propose that these recommendations be presented to the public at a joint open house with the Steveston Village Conservation Program planned for Fall 2007.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joan Caravan".

Joan Caravan
Transportation Planner
(4035)

JC:lce

Parking in Steveston Village Open House - July 2006

RICHMOND
Better in Every Way

1

Why Are We Examining Parking?


- On-going concern of the community.
- Recommendation of Steveston Advisory Task Force on Parking (2002).
- Steveston continues to be a popular tourist destination with high seasonal parking demand.
- Maximize use of limited parking spaces in the Village core.
- Improve public safety and encourage alternative transportation modes (walking, cycling, transit).



Bayview St./No. 1 Rd. intersection looking east from Bayview St

Recent Public Parking Improvements

- Fall 2003: stall markings of public parking adjusted to add more spaces.
- Winter 2003: 2-hour time limit set to ensure turnover.
- Winter 2003: identification of 2 all day public parking areas and new overhead directional signage.
- Spring 2006: opening of Bayview Street connection east of No. 1 Road with access to ± 35 on-street parking spaces.



Overhead directional sign

Planned Public Parking Improvements

- New off-street bus exchange in Steveston area.
 - convert existing on-street bus layover areas to on-street parking spaces
 - estimated gain of 18-24 spaces on Chatham St and Moncton St (east of No. 1 Rd)
- Final development of Imperial Landing may include a minimum of ± 25 off-street public parking spaces within waterfront area east of No. 1 Road and bounded by Bayview Street.
- Address public safety concerns of parking in laneways by marking spaces.
 - would result in ± 25 marked parking spaces and loading areas
 - 50-60 vehicles currently use laneways for parking



Buses on Chatham St



Parked vehicles in laneway

Parking in Steveston Village


Open House - July 2006

RICHMOND
Better in Every Way

2

Steveston Village Parking Study (May 2005)

- Purpose: develop a 10-year (to 2014) parking strategy for the Steveston Village area.
- Study area bounded by Chatham Street, No. 1 Road, Bayview Street, and 7th Avenue.



Parking Study Findings

- There are 1,375 parking spaces in the Village area.

Current Number of Parking Spaces

Area	Public			Private (Off-Street)	Total
	On-Street	Off-Street	Total		
North	182	0	182	362	544
South	143	74	217	290	507
Village Core	325	74	399	652	1,051
West	88	164	252	72	324
Total	413	238	651	724	1,375

- Overall parking supply is adequate for current needs but the distribution of spaces is not optimal.
 - South and North Areas operating at average of 84- 99% capacity on weekends.
 - Excess capacity in West Area, which had an average parking usage rate of 42%.
- Time restriction of 2 hours for public parking is adequate.
 - 70-80% of vehicles park for less than 1 hour in North and South Areas.
- Parking demand is seasonal and is typically more acute on weekends and during spring/summer (May to September).



two hour parking sign

Parking Study Suggestions

- Additional 50 spaces required by 2014 in North and South areas only, based on historical 1% annual traffic growth rate.
- Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund is inadequate to support significant parking improvements.
 - Current "cash-in-lieu" payment of \$10,500 per space (set in 1989) should be raised to ± \$25,000 per space to reflect today's property and construction costs.
 - The current (July 2006) balance in this Fund is \$141,103

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006

RICHMOND
Better in Every Way

3

What Parking Issues Need to be Addressed?

- Maximize use of existing parking for owners, residents, visitors, and employees.
- Designate zones for tour bus parking and commercial loading.
- Improve public safety and traffic circulation within the Village.
- Determine the location and timing of any additional public parking to meet future demand.
 - Maximize existing public parking via better management before adding new public parking capacity.
 - Limiting the supply of additional parking could reduce private vehicle travel and encourage greater use of sustainable transportation modes (cycling, walking, transit) thereby mitigating traffic growth and congestion.
- Funding strategies to support public parking improvements.


Suggested Ideas

The City has developed a variety of ideas to address these parking issues in Steveston in both the short-term and long-term.

We are seeking feedback from you on these ideas, which are explained in detail on the next several boards. These ideas could be implemented individually or in combination with each other.

Short-Term (Within 3 Years)

- Idea 1: Current Planned Improvements
- Idea 2: Long-term Leases of Parking Lots & Pedestrian Connections
- Idea 3: Commercial Loading Zones & Tour Bus Parking
- Idea 4: More One-Way Streets & Signalize No. 1 Road / Moncton Street Intersection
- Idea 5: Angle Parking on North Side of Bayview Street
- Idea 6: Pay Parking in Steveston Village Area
- Idea 7: Steveston Business Improvement Area



Vehicles in public parking site

Long-Term (Beyond 3 Years)

- Idea 8: Pursue New Parkade

We'd like Your Feedback

Your opinions are important to us. Community feedback is an important component when considering changes to public parking in Steveston Village.

Please fill out the questionnaire as you view the boards.



2nd Ave with angle parking

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006




Idea 1: Undertake Planned Improvements


No further expansion of on-street or off-street public parking beyond current planned improvements over the next 3 years.

Planned Actions

- Address public safety concerns of parking in laneways by designating spaces.
- Convert existing on-street bus layover areas to on-street parking spaces upon establishment of off-street transit exchange for public buses.
- Provide off-street public parking within waterfront area east of No. 1 Road and bounded by Bayview Street Final as part of final development of Imperial Landing.



Parking site at east end of Orm's site



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net gain of ± 40 parking spaces. • Maximizes use of existing underutilized parking lots, which are within an 8-10 minute walking distance of Steveston's main waterfront area. • Improved safety in laneways. • Improved sightlines at driveways currently obstructed by parked buses. • Encourages sustainable transportation modes (walking, cycling, transit) and mitigates traffic growth and congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not create any new parking spaces in Village core. • Loss of parking in laneways. • May not meet long-term parking demand in Village core.

Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion of Laneways: \$25,000-\$30,000 • Conversion of Bus Layover Areas: \$1,000 • Off-Street Bus Exchange: responsibility of TransLink 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund • New Pay Parking Revenues • City's Minor Capital Program

Question

Idea 1a Do you support the planned parking improvements?

Idea 1b Do you think more public parking is required within the next 3 years than what is currently planned?

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006



5

Idea 2: Leases of Parking Sites & Pedestrian Connections

Negotiate long-term leases of existing off-street parking sites for public use and provide improved pedestrian connections between these sites and the Village core.

Suggested Actions

- Secure long-term leases of selected properties for public parking that are within walking distance of Village core.
- Construct inviting, well-marked pedestrian links between these existing underutilized parking lots in West area and Village waterfront.
- Establish designated long-term employee parking in underutilized parking lots to free up spaces in Village core for visitors.
- Negotiate shared public use of private parking sites outside of regular business hours.



Paved pathway through Imperial Landing with streetlights and banners



SHA Chatham St parking lot



Gulf of Georgia Cannery parking lot



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If negotiations successful, would secure additional public parking spaces. • More efficient use of existing facilities. • Improved pedestrian amenities would enhance overall Village streetscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide any new parking capacity within the Village core.

Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term Leases: to be negotiated • Pedestrian Links: \$250,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund • New Pay Parking Revenues

Questions

- Idea 2a Do you support the City seeking long-term leases of sites for public parking and the construction of pedestrian links between these parking sites and the Village waterfront?
- Idea 2b Do you support the establishment of designated employee parking within a portion of these public parking lots?

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006



6

Idea 3: Commercial Loading Zones & Tour Bus Parking

Designate on-street or laneway commercial loading zones and an on-street tour bus parking zone within the Village core.

Suggested Actions

- New on-street or laneway commercial loading zones established as redevelopment occurs with option of paying cash-in-lieu instead of providing on-site loading.
- Convert existing on-street parking spaces to create parking zone for tour buses only.
- Proposed location is west side of 3rd Avenue between Moncton Street and Bayview Street.



Tour bus on street in Steveston



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated spaces for tour buses and commercial loading. • More valuable use of development site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of ± 4 on-street parking spaces for tour bus parking zone. • Loss of ± 2 on-street parking spaces for commercial loading zone.

Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Parking Signs: \$300 per site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund • New Pay Parking Revenues

Questions

Idea 3a Do you support the use of streets and laneways for commercial loading instead of within new private developments?

Idea 3b Do you support the need for a tour bus parking zone within the Village core?

Idea 3c Do you support the proposed location for a tour bus parking zone within the Village core?

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006

RICHMOND
Better in Every Way

7

Idea 4: More One-Way Streets & Signalize No. 1 Rd / Moncton St

Convert selected two-way streets to one-way to create more on-street parking spaces.

Signalize a retrofitted No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection.




One-way street sign

Suggested Actions:

(a) One-Way Street System

Potential street sections that could be converted to one-way:

- Bayview Street – one-way westbound between No. 1 Road and 3rd Avenue.
- 1st Avenue – one-way northbound between Bayview Street and Moncton Street.
- 3rd Avenue – one-way northbound between Bayview Street and Moncton Street.
- Moncton Street – one-way eastbound between 3rd Avenue and No. 1 Road.



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces traffic turning conflict points. • Depending on streets converted, gain from 3 to 73 on-street angle parking spaces. • Creates greater operational efficiency at potential signalized intersection of No. 1 Road and Moncton Street. • Enhanced pedestrian safety in crosswalks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition for local businesses, residents and visitors. • Some reduced exposure and access to businesses on streets converted to one-way. • Increased circulation in Village core and potential impact on commercial delivery routes.

Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5,000-\$40,000, depending on number of sections of streets converted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund • New Pay Parking Revenues

Questions

Idea 4a Do you support conversion of any of the proposed street sections to one-way?

Idea 4b If so, which street sections should be converted?

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006




8

Idea 4: More One-Way Streets & Signalize No. 1 Rd / Moncton St


Convert selected two-way streets to one-way to create more on-street parking spaces and signalize a retrofitted No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection.

Suggested Actions: (b) No. 1 Road & Moncton Street Intersection Treatment

- Signalization of intersection.
- Installation of decorative elements and/or traffic calming measures to identify it as a gateway to the Village and a pedestrianized environment.
- Decorative elements could include:
 - textured and/or patterned surfaces at the crosswalks
 - artistic treatment of intersection (e.g., textured pavement in the shape of a salmon)
- Traffic calming measures could include entire intersection being raised to sidewalk level.



Raised intersection with surface treatments



Surface treatments

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signalization reduces confusion regarding right-of-way priorities. • Signalization combined with conversion of Moncton Street to one-way eastbound would eliminate potential for motorists to enter Village at higher speeds. • Raised intersection reduces through traffic speeds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised intersection slows emergency vehicles to approximately 25 km/h. • May eliminate some on-street parking near the intersection.

Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signalization: \$50,000 • Decorative textured pavement: \$80,000 • Raised Intersection: \$20,000 (if combined with textured pavement treatment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund • New Pay Parking Revenues • City's Minor Capital Program

Questions

Idea 4c Do you support the signalization of the No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection?

Idea 4d Do you support the suggested intersection treatments? If so, which one(s)?

Parking in Steveston Village
 Open House - July 2006

RICHMOND
Better in Every Way

9

Idea 5: On-Street Angle Parking on North Side of Bayview Street

Convert north side of Bayview Street to on-street angle parking spaces.

Suggested Action

- Relocate existing curb and gutter on north side of Bayview Street and create ± 47 on-street angle parking spaces with street trees between No. 1 Road and 3rd Avenue.



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gains ± 47 on-street angle parking spaces on north side of Bayview Street. Opportunity for streetscape enhancements. Increased pedestrian presence on north side. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced grass boulevard on north side of Bayview Street.

Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$365,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund New Pay Parking Revenues

Question

Idea 5: Do you support the creation of ± 47 on-street angle parking spaces on the north side of Bayview Street between No. 1 Road and 3rd Avenue?



Bayview Street looking east

Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006



10

Idea 6: Implement Pay Parking


Convert on-street and public off-street parking areas in the Village core to pay parking. Convert a portion of parking areas outside the Village core to monthly permit parking for employees.

Suggested Actions

- Inside Village Core: Establish a pay parking rate of \$1 per hour between 9:00 am and 8:00 pm in the Village core area bounded by No. 1 Road, Bayview Street, 3rd Avenue, and Chatham Street.
- Outside Village Core: Establish a monthly fee of \$40 for permit parking for employees.
- Consider initial implementation of pay parking during peak periods only (e.g., weekends and summer).



Close-up of a black meter



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages increased turnover of limited parking spaces available in Village core. • Public safety enhanced by increased presence of uniformed patrollers. • Revenue from pay parking helps to offset rising City costs, reduce tax increases and fund local parking improvements. • Encourages use of transportation modes other than private vehicles. • More efficient means of enforcement than time-limited parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May impact patronage of businesses in the Village core. • Surrounding residential neighbourhood areas may experience spillover of parking.

Estimated Costs	Estimated Revenues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$150,000 / year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300,000 / year

Questions

Idea 6a Do you support the implementation of pay parking in the Village core?

Idea 6b If so, do you think it should be in effect during busy times only?



Permit parking signs

Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006



Idea 7: Steveston Business Improvement Area


Designate a Business Improvement Area (BIA) in Steveston that encompasses the commercial operations in the area so that special designated funding can be collected and used to enhance Steveston Village. Local examples include 15 BIAs in Vancouver (e.g., Chinatown, Gastown, Kerrisdale) plus BIAs in Tsawwassen, White Rock and New Westminster.



Steveston Streetscape

Suggested Actions

- Establish Steveston BIA
- Levy special charge on businesses within the BIA with funds being used to improve and beautify the area.
- Improve on-street and off-street public parking, tree plantings, street furniture, flower boxes and baskets, street banners, and other commercial area public amenities through the BIA process.



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables commercial businesses to achieve improvements. • Creates certainty of funding for improvements and is only viable means to support construction of a major parking facility such as a parkade. • Committed program for streetscape enhancements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial businesses within Steveston may not support the BIA process.

Estimated Revenues
<p>Depends on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • size of designated area and number of properties within the area; and • method of determining contribution, which is commonly assessment (millrate percentage) or frontage (fixed sum per linear foot frontage).

Question

Idea 7 Do you support the establishment of a Steveston Business Improvement Area?

Parking in Steveston Village Open House - July 2006




12

Idea 8: Pursue New Parkade

Pursue the location and construction of a new parking structure within walking distance of Village core.

Suggested Actions

- Identify a site for and construct a multi-level parkade with 100-150 parking stall capacity.
- Four potential sites have been identified.



Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would meet long-term parking demand for the Village area. • Frees up existing off-street parking sites within Village core for other uses. • Centralizes parking in one area and diverts vehicle traffic from the Village core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High capital cost. • Would not discourage vehicle traffic to the general area. • No suitable site within Village core area.


Estimated Costs	Potential Funding Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4 million (excluding land costs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steveston Business Improvement Area • New Pay Parking Revenues

Questions

- Idea 8a Do you support a new parkade in the long-term (beyond 5 years from now)?
Idea 8b If so, what is your preferred location?



River Road Castro parkade



Parkade example

Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas

Parking in Steveston Village

Open House - July 2006



Preliminary Estimated Costs

Undertaking ALL of the suggested ideas presented here could cost at least approximately \$5 million.

Preliminary Estimated Costs		Potential Funding Sources	
• Conversion of Lanes	\$25,000-\$35,000	• Steveston Off-Street Parking Reserve Fund	
• Conversion of Bus Layover Areas	\$1,000	• Pay Parking Revenues	
• Long-term Leases of Parking Sites	TBD	• Steveston BIA Revenues	
• Pedestrian Links	\$250,000	• City Minor Capital Program	
• Tour Bus Parking & Commercial Loading	\$300	• Other Special Funding Initiatives	
• One-Way Streets	\$5,000-\$40,000		
• Signalize & Retrofit No. 1 Rd/Moncton St	\$150,000		
• Angle Parking on Bayview St	\$340,000		
Sub-total	\$771,300 - \$816,300		
• Pursue New Parkade (excluding land)	\$4,000,000		
Total	\$4,771,300-\$4,816,300		
Rounded	\$5,000,000		

Next Steps

1. Compile and analyze feedback from open house.
2. In coordination with the Steveston Village Conservation Program, report to Council on the recommended parking improvements by the end of 2006.

Thank You for Your Input!

Please drop your completed feedback form in the box provided at the open house.



Steveston Village



Steveston Village

Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas

Open House
July 2006

Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas Feedback Form

Are you...

- a resident of Steveston? _____
- a landowner in Steveston? _____
- a business owner in Steveston? _____
- an employee in Steveston? _____
- a resident of Richmond, outside the Steveston area? _____
- other _____

What do you think?

Short-Term Ideas (within 3 years)

Idea 1a (Board No. 4)

I support the planned public parking improvements over the next 3 years.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments: _____

Idea 1b (Board No. 4)

I believe more public parking is required in the Steveston Village area beyond what is currently planned within the next 3 years.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments: _____

Idea 2a (Board No. 5)

I support the City seeking shared use and long-term leases of sites for public parking and the construction of pedestrian links between these parking sites and the Village waterfront.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments: _____

Open House
July 2006

**Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas
Feedback Form**

Idea 2b (Board No. 5)

I support the designation of employee parking within a portion of the public parking lots.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 3a (Board No. 6)

I support the use of streets and laneways for commercial loading instead of within new private developments.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 3b (Board No. 6)

I support the need for a tour bus parking zone within the Steveston Village core.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 3c (Board No. 6)

I support the proposed location for the tour bus parking zone within the Steveston Village core.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 4a (Board No. 7)

I support the conversion of selected street sections to a one-way system.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 4b (Board No. 7)

I support the conversion of the following street sections to a one-way system.

Bayview Street	1st Avenue	3rd Avenue	Moncton Street
<input type="checkbox"/> No. 1 Road to 1st Ave	<input type="checkbox"/> Bayview St to Moncton St	<input type="checkbox"/> Bayview St to Moncton St	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 1 Road to 1st Ave
<input type="checkbox"/> 1st Ave to 2nd Ave			<input type="checkbox"/> 1st Ave to 2nd Ave
<input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Ave to 3rd Ave			<input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Ave to 3rd Ave

Open House
July 2006

**Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas
Feedback Form**

Idea 4c (Board No. 8)

I support the signalization of the No. 1 Road & Moncton Street intersection.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 4d (Board No. 8)

I support the following intersection treatments at this location.

<input type="checkbox"/> Patterned/textured surface for crosswalk areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Raised Intersection
<input type="checkbox"/> Artistic treatment in centre of intersection	<input type="checkbox"/> Other please specify

Comments:

Idea 5 (Board No. 9)

I support new angle parking on the north side of Bayview St between No. 1 Rd & 3rd Ave.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 6a (Board No. 10)

I support the implementation of pay parking in the Steveston Village core.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 6b (Board No. 10)

I believe pay parking in the Steveston Village core should be in effect during busy times only.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Open House
July 2006

Steveston Parking Improvement Ideas Feedback Form

Idea 7 (Board No. 11)

I support the establishment of a Steveston Business Improvement Area.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Long-Term Ideas (beyond 3 years)

Idea 8a (Board No. 12)

I support a new parkade in the long-term (beyond 5 years from now).

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure / Don't Know

Comments:

Idea 8b (Board No. 12)

I prefer the following location for the parkade.

<input type="checkbox"/> Steveston Community Centre parking lot	<input type="checkbox"/> Small Crafts & Harbours site on Chatham St
<input type="checkbox"/> City lot at Moncton St & Easthope St	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify
<input type="checkbox"/> City Lot "H" between public walkway & Fraser River	

Comments:

Thank you for your input!

It will be considered in the preparation of the Steveston Village Conservation Program and when making recommendations to City Council regarding future parking improvements in the Steveston Village area.

Please drop your completed feedback form in the box provided at the Open House. You may also fax your completed form to 604-276-4052 or mail to:

City of Richmond, Transportation Division
6911 No 3 Road, Richmond BC V6Y 2C1 - Attn: Joan Caravan

Due date of complete form: August 4, 2006

Feedback Form Comments

Idea 1a: I support the planned public parking improvements over the next 3 years.

- To be paid with money in Steveston parking fund not by remainder of city.
- It's increasingly difficult to find parking.
- Safety concerns in laneways?? Where will the buses park?
- Except Bayview St waterfront. Why would you waste waterfront area for parking?
- No lights at Moncton St & No. 1 Rd.
- No pay parking.
- Where would you put a bus loop? Using the gravel lot on Chatham St would result in a net loss of parking spaces. It would only translate to extra parking if there are no bus stops anywhere on Chatham St – would everyone have to walk to the loop?
- No parking on Bayview St east of No. 1 Rd.
- Must develop a long term parking plan for a 5-year period.
- Make people walk. No parking on Bayview St east of No. 1 Rd.
- Get buses off Chatham.
- Yes, I'd get involved.
- Removing parking from the Village core is not an improvement.
- Except for 'pay parking.'
- I agree with everything with the exception of using waterfront parking at Imperial Landing.
- Moving bus layover area off-street will use up more parking places than is currently being used.
- At minimum, it makes sense to use these low cost options, regardless of future plans.
- Yes - designate lane spaces. Yes - parking on No. 1 Rd east waterfront. No - leave buses as is -- good alternative to driving.
- Don't designate lane parking. I do think more public parking is required in next 3 years. Current bus route serves our business well.
- No parkades!
- Yes to parking in lanes (allow 60 cars and keep the bylaw officers out of Steveston). Yes to parking east of No. 1 Rd and Bayview. No to moving buses - we need to support people not cars. No to one-way streets. No to signal at No. 1 Rd and Moncton. No to angle parking on Bayview. This should be a tram route from Steveston Community Centre to Garry Pt Park. Yes to parking on BC Packers site outside the dyke.
- However, I do not believe in Idea 6 for pay parking.
- No pay parking.
- Agree, with the exception of funding using pay parking. There should be no pay parking in Steveston except perhaps in a future parkade building. Steveston is not a White Rock. Even Granville Island parking is free on streets.
- Parking on the waterfront should not happen. Do not understand what the \$10,500/\$25,000 cost per space is.
- Parking should be back from riverfront.
- Parts of it 'yes', parts 'no'. I don't mind walking a bit but I prefer 2 hr 'free' parking to pay parking.
- It is important to relocate the lay-over buses from the prime parking locations and to reduce the safety hazards for both pedestrians and drivers due to lack of visibility.

Idea 1b: I believe more public parking is required in the Steveston Village area beyond what is currently planned within the next 3 years.

- Encourage TransLink to get the new bus loop done now! It's way too dangerous with all the buses parked on Chatham.
- Keep Steveston as a 'walking village' not a parking lot!
- There is ample parking space on Chatham St if people are prepared to walk from there into the village.
- Make Garry Point and Chatham St as the main place to park. In the village should be short time parking.
- Yes - we are losing valuable dollars due to lack of improvement on this issue.
- In the core, more parking. Not in the residential area around the core.

Feedback Form Comments

- I would like to see a plan that encourage people to park in the Chatham St between 4th and 6th Ave. Attempt to keep the core village for pedestrians.
- Stronger enforcement. Shorter street parking.
- Possibly with more visitors coming in summer.
- Parking closer to water's edge for older people wishing to stroll.
- Final development of Imperial Landing should include many open plaza / park areas with increased parking to make it a real people area for enjoyment.
- For residents yes - but this should be provided by the residential buildings. Off-street bus layover would be more dangerous with people running in and around buses. Would also use up more parking spaces than currently used. If we are trying to protect people crossing the street, best to remember we can't protect people from their own stupidity no matter what you try to do.
- We certainly don't need less!
- Encourage cycling, walking, transit, provide parking outside village (like west of Gulf of Georgia).
- Off-site parking with walking into village could be encouraged.
- Put parking on BC Packers site at foot of No. 1 Rd instead. We don't have a parking problem in Steveston if one is prepared to walk one block from Chatham to Moncton St.
- Steveston's population is expanding too much.
- No pay parking.
- Move new parking out of sight of the North and South Area parking - plant grasses and trees.
- Maximize use of current lots in West Area.
- Absolutely, growth is going to be huge.
- Parking is already maxed out. I often park in the gravelled lot on Chatham because there is nothing else available.
- The ongoing increase in visitors in Steveston will require additional parking providing existing parking is maximized.
- Parking is only a problem for 2 months of the year. Better [??] is required before spending big \$\$\$ on parking lots.

Idea 2a: I support the City seeking shared use and long-term leases of sites for public parking and the construction of pedestrian links between these parking sites and the Village waterfront.

- Not everyone works 'business' hours.
- Contract with SHA.
- The parking should be at a point where people get out of their cars and walk the whole town. This good for the merchants.
- No, not needed.
- This is close enough to the village core to work.
- Links are in place.
- Long-term agreement to use federal sites on Chatham.
- Uncertain where \$250,000 is going? We walk there all the time. I believe sidewalks already exist or ?
- Gulf of Georgia lot could be confusing - sometimes it's needed for the Cannery - but less so when the Cannery is closed.
- Keep pay parking only for covered underground spaces. Above/open parking should be free.
- Let's not overdo it.
- Today (Saturday afternoon) the Harbour Authority parking lot on Chatham St was basically empty, except for some trucks. There was also parking available along Chatham St to No. 1 Rd.
- Disagree if it is pay parking.
- No pay parking.
- \$250,000 needs more explanation. Would the long-term leases be with the city? Who owns the land?
- Who owns property to be leased? The city? Presume pedestrian links and cost estimate would be discussed with residents, i.e., options for degrees of development.
- Long-term leases to who? Lot owners, equals pay parking. Employees who pay. They would park all day and discourage 2 hr visitors. No, no, no - short free good. Long-term pay bad.

Feedback Form Comments

- The Village is only 4 short blocks long and the proposed leased parking areas are not an unacceptable distance from any part of the Village. We need to maximize their use. This area would be ideal for paid employee parking.
- Yes! As noted, this is a 5-minute walk. Employees should be moved here to free up existing spaces.

Idea 2b: I support the designation of employee parking within a portion of the public parking lots.

- Yes they should park further outside area south of Chatham and walk to work.
- Outside village core.
- Car owners must be supplied a sticker for their car. Parking should be at least of couple of blocks from business area.
- Yes, as some employees need to drive here.
- Again, Chatham St is a good area.
- In all day parking.
- Let's get a tram to Steveston - encourage live & work in the same area. Let's get rid of cars.
- No, they will not use it.
- Employers should provide parking for employees - free of charge.
- I don't agree that this should be free parking - they should pay a monthly fee if there is no on-site parking provided. Otherwise it should be considered a taxable benefit as it is for anyone who has parking provided.
- Especially during peak season.
- This "allotted" parking space should be limited and enforced strictly.
- Yes, it's a necessity.
- Along Chatham St between 4th and 6th Ave only.
- See Idea 2a.
- Yes, this would free up 20-30 spaces in the village core.

Idea 3a: I support the use of streets and laneways for commercial loading instead of within new private developments.

- Don't understand question.
- OK to use existing laneways for existing businesses, new businesses should provide off-street loading areas.
- For existing businesses without parking you have to have lane or street loading zones. New or redevelopment areas should have to provide parking.
- Short-term parking.
- Commercial loading at the business they are delivering to -- yes.
- I support efficiency - if this is efficient, I would support it.
- I've parked in a lane for 25 years. They are safe and part of the picture of Steveston.
- Limited time for commercial loading.
- Lanes OK but not streets.
- Lanes all right.
- Within a certain "fixed" hours – e.g., 7 am to 9 am, etc.
- Makes things more difficult for businesses.
- Streets should not be used for loading - only laneways.
- Laneways designated area for loading zone only, not tour buses.
- Trucks must be made to pull over to a curb instead of parking smack in the middle of road. Size of vehicle should be limited. Deliveries to be made prior to 10:00 am.
- You have prime parking on streets eliminated and only used occasionally. Laneways are acceptable as they are now used continually but don't affect many parking areas.

Idea 3b: I support the need for a tour bus parking zone within the Steveston Village core.

- Tour buses can drop off & park outside the village.
- Sometimes in winter buses park by Papi's on No. 1 Rd & keep the engines running. The stench is horrid.
- Not in the Village core.

Feedback Form Comments

- We need 2-way bus travel on Moncton St.
- It should not be on Bayview St.
- It should not be on Bayview St.
- On Chatham St only.
- I don't want tour buses in Steveston. Don't encourage them.
- Yes - it gets people out of cars and promotes efficiency of ??
- Tour bus parking should be on the present gravel lots on Chatham - with a pick-up/drop off zone on 3rd Ave.
- See Idea 2.
- No, it could happen on federal lands on Chatham, ask people to walk (e.g., past Cannery).
- The tour buses should park outside the village core.
- Time periods - months limited.
- We need to encourage tour buses in Steveston.
- Very good idea as tourists' visits will definitely grow in the near future.
- I like the proposed location.
- On Chatham please.
- Not required year-round.
- Not too big though.
- RVs also.
- Tour buses can drop off and park 15-20 minutes away.
- Put in lots.
- The most natural choice would be on the Gulf of Georgia parking lot site...and only jitney buses used.
- There needs to be parking for tour bus traffic but not necessarily on the street. Long-term leasing on the Gulf of Georgia Cannery parking lot would be ideal.
- Good idea.

Idea 3c: I support the proposed location for the tour bus parking zone within the Steveston Village core.

- No!
- It could be the pick-up & drop off area.
- Tour buses should have parking away from core.
- A good location, it doesn't interfere with specific businesses.
- To this location only.
- Space must be available for at least 4 buses to park.
- Chatham St or Garry Point.
- Again, the village should be tour bus free.
- Yes.
- Not in village core. Bus parking outside core.
- This could be drop off only. Why not put tour bus parking in proposed lease space in Idea 2. The city wants to spend \$250,000 for a link...isn't that suitable enough for tourists??
- Vehicles coming along Bayview are speeding to make the corner.
- A good location.
- Good - to keep flow of business from congesting all around No. 1 Rd.
- Or use as off-load and pick-up only.
- Put it in the parking lot next to the Gulf of Georgia Cannery.
- Put on lots.
- We don't need tour buses in the core. They sure as hell shouldn't get free parking.
- If not above, then this would be okay.
- See Idea 3b above.
- Yes, in front of the Tourism booth.

Idea 4a: I support the conversion of selected street sections to a one-way system.

Feedback Form Comments

- Interferes with historical town character.
- Village too small - too much traffic on Bayview. Too much traffic in lanes!
- Agree to some. Moncton St should be one-way west as most people come into Steveston from the east, i.e. No. 1 Rd & Moncton St. Bayview St should then be one-way east; parking can still be on north side.
- Moncton St, if one-way, should go westbound. Most people enter Steveston from east anyway. Reverse the direction of travel on Bayview St. You can still allow parking on the north side - just reverse the stalls.
- An idea too long coming!
- More & more seniors ride bus and need 2-way traffic on Moncton St.
- Very careful thought re loss of business. Reverse directions proposed - Moncton EB & Bayview WB.
- It makes sense to have one-way.
- This is a great idea. Angle parking would increase parking in front of businesses. Great.
- However, at some stage, Moncton St could become pedestrian only?
- Yes.
- Village not big enough for 1-way streets.
- South section of 1st Ave only.
- What about a pedestrian zone? Maybe Sundays - no cars? Start slow in introducing this prospect...not all people seem to like walking!
- This is not the downtown area of a major city with 100K+ vehicles/hour. How about lowering the speed limit in the whole area - no one needs to be doing 50K in Steveston village. A couple of signs should do it.
- I am opposed to this if it paves the way for a signalized intersection at No. 1 Rd and Moncton.
- This will have to be implemented as traffic grows in the near future.
- Would draw people through the village and improve flow of traffic.
- Would increase Bayview St traffic by lack of option when coming south on No. 1 Rd.
- Detracts from the "village" feel.
- No way! This is heritage??
- No way Moncton can be one-way.
- No need.
- Moncton St cannot be one-way.
- Put in the stop light at No. 1 Rd and Moncton and see if you still need the one-way proposal.
- Suggest signal at No. 1 Rd and Moncton St be done first and one-way streets assessed in Phase 2.
- One-way traffic will make it easier for pedestrians to cross streets and help retain the village atmosphere and be more pedestrian-oriented rather than vehicle-oriented.
- No, this will create speed in the core and much confusion.

Idea 4c: I support the signalization of the No. 1 Road and Moncton Street intersection.

- No traffic lights! There will be too much speeding on Moncton when light turns green.
- No street lights! Not in Steveston!
- Absolutely! And also at Chatham St & No. 1 Rd too.
- Only with one-way Moncton St eastbound option, with raised intersection.
- No - it will be more dangerous.
- Leave as a 4-way stop. Then everyone comes to a full stop. If a red/green light put in - then people will drive thru on a red light, or try to beat the red.
- Every car should have to stop - leave it as it is.
- Why not a roundabout?
- Lights are answer to No. 1 Rd on Moncton. It will help to speed the traffic hold ups.
- Decorative and or police-controlled.
- Needed ASAP! Pedestrians cause major transport problems with uncontrolled intersection.
- Too dangerous.
- I fear people "racing" to get through while the light is green and yellow. At least now it's safe to walk across. Everywhere in Richmond that is signalized intersection, the walk sign is on so short a time.
- No driving on Moncton - make it beautiful - have vision! 4-way system works - it's a village not a city.
- It's about time!

Feedback Form Comments

- At present, all cars "stop" at the corner and enter 'village' streets at slow speed. When a car enters corner with a green light, the tendency will be to continue into the village at higher speeds than at present.
- If timed, especially weekends & evenings till 9 pm. About time!!
- This is a dangerous location. The problem is that there is too much for drivers to look out for.
- Either that or a pedestrian light.
- Long overdue.
- Only if it is a pedestrian-controlled light. As it is now, every car must stop. Traffic lights cause traffic jams and speed 'to make the light."
- Again, this was supposed to be done years ago.
- It will result in higher vehicle speeds in Steveston and less safety for pedestrians.
- Sooner than later! ASAP!
- Traffic has grown and increased tremendously. This should be a priority before something happens.
- Safer if every car at intersection must stop, not decide to run yellow light.
- This is a major hazard area and congested.
- Seems like a trick question - \$50,000 for the treatment. A light \$80,000!
- Only if Moncton is one-way EB and only if pedestrian enhancements at No. 1 Rd.
- Only if one-way designations are implemented.
- Put one in there now.
- Someone will be killed by a speeding car running the light and speeding down Moncton through pedestrians a block away from the light.
- What a brutal intersection, something here must change.
- It's only busy on weekends and still never takes more than a few minutes to go through.
- As long as there are left-turn arrows - maybe. The 4-way stop sign has worked well and could still if everyone knew how it works but they don't so for safety, I guess we need signals.
- But no more one-way streets.
- Do it now.
- This is such a dangerous intersection, it needed traffic lights years ago. Does someone need to die before something is done?
- At present, the corner is a free for all with pedestrians stepping out of turn to the rules of the road.
- Some type of signalization is required as many pedestrians cross without looking, without regard to moving traffic and at busy times, traffic remains frozen. Possibly consider a 4-way pedestrian signal and vehicles only on green.
- No!! This will increase speed, having a car running a yellow light going south on No. 1 Road. Keep it slow.

Idea 4d: I support the following intersection treatments at this location.

- Textured concrete hard on wheelchairs and those with pain issues.
- With stop sign.
- They all look great to me.
- Keep plain with well marked crosswalks.
- 4-way stop signs are safer for pedestrians.
- This would be so out of character with the heritage aspect of Steveston. Fancy roads don't improve driving.
- See Idea 4c comments.
- Roundabout for this intersection same as Easthope & Bayview.
- See Idea 4c comments. We have both a lot of walking and motor traffic. The system is needed to keep everyone moving.
- More public art at intersection.
- Please focus on safety for pedestrians and calming motorists.
- If it is beautiful.
- Don't know.
- Speed bumps on Moncton and Bayview.
- All excellent ideas - hope it happens soon!
- Disagree.

Feedback Form Comments

- Don't know.
- Speed bumps to be put in.
- This will not slow vehicles down! Looks nice but probably not worth the \$\$ or the loss of parking.
- I do not support any of these!
- Need to slow vehicles in this intersection.
- Ordinary intersection - let traffic flow.
- How about a roundabout? Nothing slows down traffic better. A traffic officer for busy times.
- Don't waste money decorating the intersection!
- Nothing fancy - this is a village not Hollywood or White Rock! Keep it simple to cut costs. Left-turn arrows, pedestrian stop and walk signs. Fund this from taxes NOT pay parking. This will hurt the merchants.
- Please keep the village as naturally charming as possible. Please don't make look modern and "decorative."
- Strongly disagree with all suggested treatments.
- This would further slow action at intersection. Have one light for a pedestrian freeflow in all directions.
- While giving the area a 'village atmosphere', it would also ensure vehicles use the intersection at low speeds for entry to the village rather than another traffic route.
- Neutral.

Idea 5: I support new angle parking on the north side of Bayview St between No. 1 Rd and 3rd Ave.

- Or perhaps parallel parking and notation of historical dyke feature.
- There's enough parking close to the village. People can walk a few steps.
- Along Moncton St as well.
- If the street is one-way.
- Keep cars off this street as a parking area. Leave it open.
- This could be done only if Bayview is a 1-way going west.
- Everywhere.
- Keep parking away from village centre. People can walk a few blocks: it is so rare to be able to be somewhere without vehicle congestion. Let's not ruin what we have.
- Yes.
- Why do we need to ruin it all with cars, cars and cars. We can carry shopping to an area outside of Moncton.
- If it is 1-way traffic flow.
- To keep traffic flowing, first step is no parking on Bayview / Moncton.
- I would really like to see Bayview being closed to traffic. Foot traffic only.
- Is the street wide enough?
- Not aesthetic. More parking = more traffic. Keep cars parking in Idea 2.
- Again, this would take away from the character of the area. What's wrong with using school parking lots and shuttle buses or better yet, more frequent reliable bus service. Granville Island still survives and there's no increase in parking there.
- With Bayview becoming one-way, does this create a conflict with cars backing out onto the primary westbound routes through Steveston?
- If one-way traffic established.
- Please leave some grass!
- No - Bayview should be used as a tram route from the Steveston Community Centre to Garry Point Park.
- Great idea as long as there is no pay parking.
- Get more parking lots in the 8-10 minute arc.
- This should be discretionary and not impinge on already unique landscaped areas.
- While the additional parking is needed, the areas at front of the Country Mouse and Tapenade help give the village atmosphere. Possibly consider retaining two nodules without parking and some innovative landscaping.
- No, this is unnecessary and will be ugly. It will make Bayview into a big parking lot.

Idea 6a: I support the implementation of pay parking in the Steveston Village core.

Feedback Form Comments

- Steveston must show IT will pay for its parking improvements.
- Not good for residents!
- Let's not be like downtown Vancouver & White Rock. Limited parking like 1 hour/2 hour zone would discourage employees from using the free space to park all day.
- We are taxed enough!
- Takes away from small village feeling and is not tourism friendly, nor 'locals' friendly.
- We want to keep people in Steveston, not chase them away.
- Absolutely not!!
- This would affect the local businesses and "turn off" the tourist from visiting the village.
- Paid parking will kill it for the merchants.
- No.
- Watch the parking migrate to the residential areas if you do this.
- I live here - I spend my money here and support local business. How dare you even think of it. Rip off - money grab.
- Board 2 states that 70-80% of vehicles park for less than 1 hour. Why does Board 10 say that pay parking will increase turnover? Quick turnover is happening now. Why diminish people's enjoyment of Steveston with pay parking when it is not needed?
- This will deter / hinder development of tourism.
- Visitor parking only, not street parking.
- Should also have lesser increments - \$0.25 for 15 min. Businesses could opt to lease parking spaces for their customers.
- However, if signalization or other intersection upgrades, then I strongly agree. I'd hope the pay parking on Chatham might be paved?
- There's no reason why parking should be free in high demand areas.
- We could limit them to within an hour of "free parking" and have them strictly enforced.
- Limit to 9:00 am to 6:00 pm, this will encourage drivers to park free outside village.
- Attraction of the village is free access - especially for tourists and the elderly.
- Don't want pay parking on streets.
- Why should vehicle storage be free?
- No.
- All of our parking problems would be solved. People who are prepared to walk won't have to pay but keep transit buses out of the SHA Chatham St parking lot.
- No pay parking.
- Some things should still be free.
- Oppose all pay parking ideas. Takes away from small town feel. Seems like a penalty or tax on residents and visitors.
- No pay parking.
- Since I do most of my shopping in Steveston, I do not support pay parking. This would add considerable costs to my shopping and I may have to consider going elsewhere. One doesn't pay to shop at the major malls or places like Seafair. I support small business and hate mall stores and always shop at Steveston. I live too far away to walk, also need close by parking for the heavy shopping.
- It would reduce my visits, why make all good things cost money?
- No pay parking. Short-term free parking will increase turnover. Pay will increase length of stay, exclude low income people, etc.
- Provided the long-term lot on Chatham & 4th Ave is protected with a long-term lease. The existing 'free use' by the city could disappear next year.
- In high profile areas like Bayview and Moncton, sure.

Idea 6b: I believe pay parking in the Steveston Village core should be in effect during busy times only.

- All summer, busy weekend times otherwise. When tourist demand occurs.
- No pay parking.
- Please no pay parking. We pay enough!

Feedback Form Comments

- No pay parking.
- We want to make Steveston a welcoming area to come to.
- See above.
- Just make people walk. There is plenty of parking on Chatham and Garry Point.
- No - other cities don't.
- Don't do it at all.
- Weekends / holidays only.
- Not at all.
- Will discourage tourists.
- Busy times only.
- Or business hours.
- My suggestion to this is similar to Idea 6a.
- Busy periods of the day drive our sales. This could hurt us all.
- Don't want pay parking on street.
- Why encourage pollution?
- Pay parking takes away from the welcoming village feel - please not!
- No.
- No need, money is hard enough to make to go into parking.
- No pay parking.
- This is an extra tax on people who live close to Steveston and go to shop at all the little stores. I go to many from food to coffee to gift places to specialty stores to sometimes restaurants and spend hundreds of dollars at Prickly Pear. This is a very bad idea and business will suffer. We keep Steveston going in the "off season." No pay parking.
- Though I still resent pay parking, at least make the tourists pay, we already pay enough in city taxes.
- What a poorly written question - I don't support pay parking. Limited time only parking is the key.
- Consider no pay parking until 11 am or noon Mon thru Fri so Steveston residents can do their shopping without penalty.

Idea 7: I support the establishment of a Steveston Business Improvement Area.

- If the merchants want it and will pay for it.
- No flower boxes. Steveston never had flower boxes. Don't try to make it "cute" like La Conner. Steveston's charm is in the grit, no beautifying!
- Have you ever been to Chinatown lately (one of the examples). It is decaying, dirty & stinks -- begs the question, where is the money being spent?
- Where did this come from, this has nothing to do with parking. Why is this being slipped in - to beautify Steveston with flower baskets etc is going against the heritage questionnaire. BIA is way beyond "parking."
- No parking garages.
- We tried this and it failed. Do you even know there is a heritage conservation study being done by the city - we don't want flower baskets/boxes/banners.
- As long as it's in good taste.
- Yes, but funds need to put toward other things. Taxes are quite high and should already be covered.
- Yet another tax! Just protect what you have.
- Need to understand financial ramifications to existing small businesses.
- We have to beautify at all costs.
- Don't try to gentrify Steveston - it's an industrial, fishing community.
- Think Steveston looks OK as it is.
- But difficult to implement because of the fragmented nature of business professionalism in Steveston - i.e., too many "hobby" owners.
- But a number of family-owned businesses are struggling \$-wise. Why should areas of Richmond have gardens and planting yet nothing down the main drag for Steveston.
- Please - another reason why we do not want the big chains (American or other).
- Good luck!

Feedback Form Comments

- It is very nice the way it is. We don't need a shiny, phoney Steveston and a look-a-like of other places. It has its own charm. Leave it be!
- Same comments as Idea 4d.
- Is there a similar situation elsewhere in Richmond and if so, where?
- Assurances would have to be given that all funds are for the Steveston area only and not used for work normally paid for by the city.

Idea 8a: I support a new parkade in the long-term (beyond 5 years from now).

- Only if Steveston pay parking revenue will pay for it.
- Please no parkade!
- Wait as long as possible.
- Put the parkade outside the village area.
- The area should not include the parking anywhere in Steveston Park.
- But not on Moncton or on the Steveston Community park lot. July 1st needs that ground and they need every spare foot for the future.
- Where?
- Let's work out ways to get to the village other than cars. Parkades, etc are car magnets.
- Parkades don't fit the environment do they?
- Depending on location.
- Ugly - better to have underground parking if possible or if really necessary, have a small low parking garage.
- No. This will urbanize the area too much. Too much like inner city.
- This will destroy the village atmosphere.
- Forget it!
- What about promoting public transportation, walking, biking?
- This will definitely need to be decided upon seriously.
- City Lot H - never!
- Keep revenues to pay parking. Don't penalize businesses in Steveston. Not all will be serviced by these lots.
- Waste of property. Ugly. Steveston should be a place for people and heritage elements - not cars.
- No parkades!
- Build it now so we don't need parallel parking on Bayview and one-way streets or \$25,000 parking fees.
- Perhaps on the "westside" we have a parkade now, thanks to Onni.
- Maybe it will be necessary - all these condo and townhouse people have 1 or 2 cars and visitors - this may accommodate their visitors as it is close to that Onni development. Being City lot you already own the land at Lot H.
- Are these pay? Or like the free library parkade at Brighthouse? Loaded question.
- Sooner rather than later.
- Consideration should be given to a P3 development where the cost and operation is by the private sector. Commercial/offices on ground level makes for an upscale development with better security and less loitering.
- No, people and staff need to learn to park further out.

Idea 8b: I prefer the following location for the parkade.

- Site 1: Not Community Centre lot until Small Crafts site already done. 3rd best choice. Site 2: 2nd best choice. Site 3: Absolutely NOT. Site 4: yes do parking here.
- No parkade on the waterfront!
- Encourage more use of buses. Maybe more buses from Brighthouse more often.
- No parkade please!
- No parkade!
- Not Lot "H". This will have a lot of resistance from residents.
- No parkade.

Feedback Form Comments

- Why would we want to use Site 1 and preclude Community Centre space for July 1st activities, etc. Other: use the current parking area at NE corner of Bayview St & 1st Avenue.
- Don't support parkade. This is a heritage village.
- A parkade on the community centre parking lot would preclude use of that space for community activities like July 1st Salmon Festival. Other: existing gravel lot on 1st Ave at Bayview St.
- Under no circumstances should anything be built in what you call City Lot "H". We have waited 100 years for walking (public) access to the riverfront. Leave it open.
- Definitely NOT Steveston Community Centre or the lot across the street at Moncton & Easthope.
- Do not want parkade. If any place, the SCH site. Needs to be hidden and nowhere near waterfront.
- No building on the "H" lot or the Community Centre parking. No, no to both of these ideas. Keep the openness to the Fraser River.
- Need parking for fishermen.
- If it would be free - it's a great idea. We could make most of the village pedestrian as in most European cities now - at least the main street and practically all heritage villages. I've been in England, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, Spain, Argentina, and Brazil in the last 2 years and traffic is not allowed in most centres. We have legs!
- Why are there no options presented for pedestrian plazas? Can part of Bayview not be "pedestrian" only?
- Definitely not at Steveston Community Centre. Possibly City Lot H.
- Village communities don't need parkades - cities do.
- Other areas must be retained for community needs of growing population of Steveston.
- Community centre if not more than one storey high.
- No.
- Not necessary - again - this would take away from the character of Richmond. They would be absolute eyesores.
- No parking on dyke extension - City Lot H.
- Certainly not City Lot H.
- No parkades in residential areas please (i.e., Moncton/Easthope). Too many kids around at Community Centre. Should be in Steveston business core.
- No - City Lot H & City lot at Moncton/Easthope.
- Encourage foot traffic through the village west to east. Too much congestion on No. 1 Rd now.
- Strongly disagree of any parkade such as Lot H.
- Definitely not Lot H - people will camp there!
- No thanks.
- Poor Steveston Community Centre planning! Should have had BC Packers property. Police station in a portable trailer (was to have been temporary!) for 10 years now. Over-building of Steveston = more people!! More cars!! Other choices are too far from the village. Yet if allowed on the SCH site, it would take from the disappearing skyline.
- How about Russ Baker Way?
- Not City Lot H.
- Definitely not Lot H.
- No parkades!
- Talking to people here no one knows that the city owns land outside the dyke at Lot H or that it was even land.
- SCH lot is a good site.
- Absolutely not City Lot H. I think your presentation materials significantly fails to make clear what this option is about. I only picked up on it because I had been looking for it having heard rumours about it.
- City Lot H - this could work for the tourist to area who has driven and won't impact the local people who shop/work etc in Steveston.
- Hide these facilities - move them out.
- None of the above.
- Don't screw up Steveston Community Centre. It is a hub for families. Parking fees discourage this and parkades are not safe for children and a hassle for wheelchairs and strollers. Don't mess up Steveston communities.

Feedback Form Comments

- Who owns this? The DOT, the City, or ? This is the most feasible site with a perfect flow through. It would be negligent of the city not to secure this land. It is an insult to include City Lot H! Why do you keep trying to cram that down our throats.
- Site 4 is the direction any new commercial development will locate and will ultimately be in the centre of the village. Also affords an excellent opportunity to incorporate commercial office space and include in an innovative way, TransLink transportation centre. Use a P3 development for some innovative thinking that is revenue-generating and not a city operation.

Other Comments

- This open house was VERY poorly advertised!! A flyer should have gone to each business and residence in the Steveston postal code!! No-one in our sphere of influence that we spoke with had any idea this was happening!!
- Cash in lieu of providing parking space will not work, it doesn't help the parking problem. Where are we going to move the buses to when they are taken off Chatham St?
- Cash-in-lieu payments don't solve parking problems.
- The Steveston Community Centre needs to be replaced with a brand new bigger building.
- Any and all parking and traffic considerations has to maintain Steveston as a village. Re Idea 4c, did you mean for cars only or for pedestrians only or for both? No one should answer Idea 4c until they do this: just stand at the intersection at No. 1 Rd/Moncton like I did when a traffic flagger held back the traffic once he flagged a row of cars. They zoomed off. I walked down at least to 2nd Ave & Moncton and could see that all cars maintained the above normal speed. No village feel more like a rat race. The 4-way stop should be called an 8-way as pedestrians like motorists need to learn to count. To take their turns. Pedestrians stepping out are causing a lot of the problems. Lights cannot solve the problem otherwise there wouldn't be accidents! Consideration needs to be for the disabled. More could be walking or biking to the shops and community centre as well as their visitors. I didn't want to go to White Rock because of the pay parking. Any parking areas need to preserve the streetscape, waterscape and look of the village. Parking isn't the problem it appears - it's just no one knows where to park - the signage is lousy.
- This parking study is in total conflict with the heritage study. One-way streets and parallel parking are not Steveston.
- First, this is too much information for people to adequately consider and respond to in conjunction with the heritage consultation at the same time. City needs to do something about the mess it made on Moncton by building out the planters into the street lanes. This used to be a safe street to bike or rollerblade down. Not anymore. Similarly, there are now so many cars on Bayview St (parked) and driving, it's not safe to rollerblade or bike with a child to get to Garry Point from Britannia once the boardwalk ends. The boardwalk is already very congested. City should not allow developers to sell condos which don't include parking like Onni did - they charged for the spaces so owners didn't buy and park on the streets instead, making it unsafe for bicyclists and rollerblading.
- Another point against your pay parking - the seniors and handicapped who need to come to Steveston to shop or eat need a place to leave their car close to where they are going at no extra cost and are not able to cycle or walk long distances and carry heavy trays of plants back to some central parking area.
- Strongly suggest a Steveston planning group be established.
- The consideration of Site 3 on the waterfront for a parkade is frightening. We worked over 5 years with BC Packers and rezoning committee to open the waterfront to the public. This is what makes Steveston so special. Leave the waterfront alone!