



Public Works & Transportation Committee

Date: Wednesday, November 19th, 2003
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Rob Howard, Chair
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai, Vice-Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Derek Dang
Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Also Present: Councillor Bill McNulty
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee held on Wednesday, October 22nd, 2003, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

POLICIES / STRATEGIES (1)

ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

2. **LANE POLICY**
(Report: Oct. 31/03, File No.: 6360-07) (REDMS No. 1087611, 1071744, 152016, 144922, 144691, 143631, 442122, 943226, 961545)

The Manager, Engineering Design & Construction, Robert Gonzales, accompanied by the Manager, Transportation Planning, Victor Wei, and the Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, referred to a memorandum circulated to all members of Council, and noted that the memo provided a comparison of lane standards in certain Lower Mainland municipalities.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

Councillor Howard advised that he had asked staff to submit the report now being considered because of his concern about the costs associated with the lane policy and the heavy footprint on the land caused by the additional pavement was not sustainable. He then referred to his memorandum (Appendix A to the staff report), and added the following points to the impacts faced by the City:

- the invasiveness of the policy to existing backyards where developing arterial lanes forces the City to remove any greenery and trees; and
- between the lane boundary and the property line of older backyards, there was a 'no man's land' between the lane and the rear property.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the lane policy, during which the following comments and opinions were offered:

- the lane way width of 6 metres was adequate from a maintenance point of view; however, curb and gutter and ornamental street lighting in a lane was not required, and would not be supported
- the benefits of lane development make sense, however, sustainability footprints were being rediscovered; the impact of the lane policy increased road surfaces in the City by 20%; the comparisons were appreciated however it did not make it right; consideration had been given to the possibility of relocating rear lanes to the front, however this would require a 12 metre right-of-way instead of 6 metres, and many lots in Richmond could not accommodate such a wide right-of-way.

Mr. Don Flintoff, 6071 Dover Road, raised a number of questions about the width required for a rear lane with two-directional traffic; the width required if the lane was constructed at the front of the property, and whether any consideration had been given to using frontage roads rather than lanes. Information was provided that (i) rear lanes required a width of 6 metres; (ii) front lanes required 12 metres – 6 metres to allow for turning and 6 metres for the lane itself, and (iii) staff were not precluding the use of frontage roads.

Mr. Flintoff expressed agreement with statements made earlier that if a lane was constructed with curb and gutter and street lighting, the end result would be a road. He stated that in his area he would prefer to have a single lane frontage road with a narrow median, as compared to a back lane of 6 metres.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, the delegation and staff on the feasibility of constructing a frontage road on No. 2 Road, between Westminster Highway and Walton Road. Staff commented that a frontage road was an option which could be considered, if plans presented by a developer for a project with a frontage road addressed the necessary traffic safety issues.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

In response to questions, Mr. Flintoff advised that he was opposed to lanes in general because of the increased cost and the requirement for the provision of lighting. He noted that with a frontage road, street lighting would already be provided. He added that if the frontage road was a single width, the width of the right-of-way would be reduced; less pavement would be required and most likely would cost less to construct than a rear lane.

Discussion continued, with advice being given that a typical lane width provided access to garages from the lane; that trees and shrubs had been found to be encroaching into the lane right-of-way, which made it difficult for two vehicles to pass each other. Reference was made to a one-way lane system, and advice was given that the creation of a single lane would create more circular traffic, and in a majority of cases, garages would be constructed right up to the property line. Staff commented that from a practical point of view, a one-way lane system did not function well. Mr. Flintoff, in response, commented that for a majority of roadways, traffic could only travel in one direction because of a centre median, and having a two-way service connection did not make sense. Questions were also raised about the cost of installing and maintaining curb and gutter and street lighting on a frontage road.

Mr. Peter Mitchell, of 6271 Nanika Crescent, suggested that the Committee should think about the direction which Richmond was taking, which was to high density housing. He noted that frontage roads had been constructed in a number of locations throughout Richmond, and voiced the opinion that these types of roads only caused problems. Mr. Mitchell referred to the frontage road constructed along Granville Avenue, and stated that pedestrians would rather walk down the middle of the road than use the sidewalk, (ii) motor vehicles were always parked along the road which left just enough room for emergency vehicles to pass through, and (iii) trees were now growing over the road. Mr. Mitchell suggested that a much better example of what would work in the future was Livingstone Road, to which access was provided through a private driveway which the City did not have to maintain.

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated October 31st, 2003, from the General Manager, Engineering & Public Works), regarding a Lane Policy, be received for information.

The question on the motion was not called, as a lengthy discussion ensued among Committee members on the current lane policy. Mayor Brodie commented that while the delegations had provided the Committee with creative ideas which could be considered by staff in the future, the current policy should not be compromised.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

The Mayor also commented that lanes could be done away with, however, it was important to realize that the future was being provided for as much as the current day. He noted that security was becoming much more of an issue, and he expressed the opinion that the current standard was necessary, especially when the focus of the policy was on the next twenty to thirty years.

Councillor Barnes expressed agreement with the statements made by the Mayor, however, she suggested that the issue of sustainable environment issues as they related to lanes be referred to staff to deal with. Reference was made to the requirement for the provision of street lighting in lanes, and Cllr. Barnes expressed concern about delaying the installation of such lighting to sometime in the future, stating that the result would be an even greater cost to install.

Councillor Kumagai indicated that he was not prepared to support the recommendation, and discussion then ensued between him and the Chair on the need to reach a compromise. Cllr. Howard commented that the City could not afford to continue to require the construction of lanes, as the cost in the long run would be too high. He noted that Councillors were hearing from individuals who were being impacted by the lanes and from developers who were questioning the sustainability and the disruption to the neighbourhood caused by lane construction.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Kumagai opposed.

It was moved and seconded

That staff report to the Public Works & Transportation Committee with respect to the feasibility of holding a design charette with various community groups to determine if there was a different way of dealing with lanes.

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion continued on the issue of sustainability and the negative impact to the environment which was created by lane construction.

Staff were further directed to develop a stakeholders' list for review by the Committee, and to report to the December 17th, 2003 meeting of the Committee with a timeframe which would provide a work plan to address the lane issue with respect to sustainability and environmental issues.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Dang and Kumagai opposed.

(Cllr. McNulty left the meeting at 6:00 p.m., and did not return.)

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

DECISIONS / ACTIONS (5)

ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

3. **MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT – IMPLICATIONS OF LISTING OF AMMONIA UNDER THE CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT (CEPA)**
(Report: Nov. 5/03, File No.: 6400-01) (REDMS No. 1089043)

It was moved and seconded

That (as outlined in the report dated November 5th, 2003, from the Manager, Engineering Planning):

- (1) *Letters be written to Honourable Joyce Murray, Minister of Water, Land and Air Protection and to the Honourable David Anderson, Minister of Environment advising of Council's position that the management of environmental issues pertaining to municipal wastewater be conducted using a "one window" regulatory approach and in a manner which considers site-specific conditions to ensure wise use of financial resources and meaningful environmental benefits.*
- (2) *That copies of these letters be sent to the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD), the Union of BC Municipalities and the Federation of Municipalities.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, advice was given in response to a question, that consideration of 'site specific' conditions was recommended to ensure that all characteristics of the water were examined.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

4. **INDUSTRY PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP**
(Report: Nov. 7/03, File No.: 6370-01) (REDMS No. 1070013)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That a letter be written to the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, the Minister of State for Deregulation, the Union of BC Municipalities and the BC Dairy Council advising of Council's position that the B.C. Dairy Council's proposal for a 'top-up payment' program is not supported, and that milk containers be included in the deposit-refund system, and that such program be implemented as soon as possible.*

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

- (2) *That a letter be written to the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Natural Resources Canada, the Minister of Water, Land and Air Protection, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Union of BC Municipalities and Electronics Product Stewardship Canada advising of Council's position that an industry product stewardship program be developed as quickly as possible for managing electronic waste (e-waste), whereby industry assumes full responsibility for all aspects of e-waste, including establishing collection, recycling, transportation and disposal methods, and that such program be undertaken in accordance with the Basel Convention.*

The question on the motion was not called, as questions were raised about the feasibility of asking a company to pay the City for the collection of milk containers. Advice was given that the staff report was asking that Council take the position that the industry should assume full responsibility as to how milk containers were handled, collected and disposed of. Further advice was given that the main statement would be that the City would not accept responsibility for the collection and disposal of milk containers.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

5. **TRANSLINK 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION OUTLOOK AND 3-YEAR (2005-2007) PLAN**

(Report: Nov. 5/03, File No.: 0154-04) (REDMS No. 1079075)

Mr. Wei, briefly reviewed certain aspects of the report with the Committee.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposed recommendations. Reference was made to Recommendation No. (4)(h) which dealt with the application of a proposed parking area/stall tax as a funding source across the region. It was noted that there was great concern about how this revenue source would be incorporate into TransLink's 10 Year Plan, and the suggestion was made that that particular recommendation be reworded to read as follows, *'That any parking tax as a funding source be equitable across the region, and that TransLink report back to Council on a public consultation plan to be conducted prior to any implementation of the measure.'*

Reference was also made to Recommendation No. (4)(g), which dealt with 1-zone bus fare charges, and the suggestion was made that that clause be amended to read as follows, *'(g)(i) should a fare increase in April 2005 be approved, retention of the 1-zone cash fare at \$2.00 to encourage local travel by transit; and (ii) carry out a review of zone structure as part of implementing the 10 Year Outlook Strategy.'*

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

Discussion continued among Committee members and staff on such issues as the proposed expanded passenger-only ferry system; the proposed financial strategy to seek the return of a portion of the Federal fuel taxes collected in the GVRD, and whether efforts were being made to lobby Richmond's Federal Government representatives for the return of this revenue.

As a result of the discussion, the following **amended** recommendation was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the overall transportation objectives and initiatives of TransLink's 10-Year Outlook, including the specific transportation improvements and the financial strategy to fund those improvements identified in TransLink's 3-Year Plan for 2005-2007, (as described in the report dated November 5th, 2003, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed.*
- (2) *That TransLink be requested to incorporate the following aspects into the 10-Year Outlook:*
 - (a) *recognition that the proposed Blundell Road/Highway 99 interchange and Blundell Road/Nelson Road corridor between Highway 99 and Westminster Highway is part of the Greater Vancouver Gateway Council's Major Commercial Transportation System (MCTS); and*
 - (b) *identification of all elements of the MCTS as candidate Major Road Capital Projects for implementation beyond 2007 to support goods movement and economic growth in the region.*
- (3) *That TransLink be requested to establish, as part of the 10-Year Outlook, a structured review and evaluation process to determine future Major Road Capital Projects that allows consideration of facilities outside of municipal jurisdictions in recognition of their importance to the regional road network, such as the Steveston Highway/Highway 99 Interchange Upgrade project.*
- (4) *That TransLink be requested to consider implementing the following initiatives as part of the 10-Year Outlook:*
 - (a) *the remaining transit service improvements identified in Richmond's Area Transit Plan by 2007 and the regular update of all Area Transit Plans to coincide with TransLink's three-year planning cycle;*
 - (b) *the testing of alternative fuels for transit vehicles include both conventional buses and community shuttles;*
 - (c) *expanded use of marine transportation for both passenger and goods movements to areas beyond the identified Burrard Inlet crossings;*

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

- (d) *broadening the criteria for potential projects eligible for Major Road Network (MRN) Minor Capital Program funding to provide municipalities with greater flexibility in the allocation of funds to other capital program areas such as cycling and transit infrastructure;*
- (e) *greater use of transportation demand management measures and encouragement of alternative transportation modes to mitigate the need for continued road capacity expansion for single occupant vehicles and to help Canada meet its Kyoto Accord targets of a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions;*
- (f) *encourage increased travel by cycling via the initiation of promotional and educational programs, provision for cyclists on all new or upgraded TransLink facilities and establishment of a Major Capital Bicycle Program to support construction of regionally significant cycling infrastructure;*
- (g)
 - (i) *should a fare increase in April 2005 be approved, retention of the 1-zone cash fare at \$2.00 to encourage local travel by transit;*
 - (ii) *carry out a review of zone structure as part of the implementation of the 10 Year Outlook strategy.*
- (h) *that any parking tax as a funding source be equitable across the region and that TransLink report back to Council on a public consultation plan to be conducted prior to any implementation of the measure;*
- (i) *establishment of a sustainable long-term financial strategy to provide certainty as to the transportation improvements feasible beyond the end of the 3-Year Plan in 2007 and the end of the 10-Year Outlook in 2013.*
- (5) *That TransLink be requested to report back to Council on the results of its public consultation activities for the 10-Year Outlook following their conclusion in December 2003.*
- (6) *That the above recommendations be conveyed to TransLink Board of Directors for their consideration.*

CARRIED

6. CITY CENTRE NORTH TRANSIT AND TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE - RECOMMENDATIONS

(Report: Oct. 29/03, File No.: 0100-20-CCNT1-01) (REDMS No. 1050386)

Mr. Wei introduced the Chair of the City Centre North Transit & Transportation Task Force, Mr. Bob Cowan, and he thanked Mr. Cowan for his hard work. Mr. Wei then briefly reviewed the report and recommendations with the Committee.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

Mr. Cowan, in addressing the Committee, provided information on the composition of the Task Force, which he thought provided a good cross section of people who lived and worked within the City Centre area; briefly reviewed the work of the Task Force, and reviewed a number of the recommendations put forward by the Task Force which were felt to be key to providing a meaningful improvement in parking and road congestion in the area. He also reviewed the three steps which the City was being asked to take to assist with the implementation of the Task Force recommendations.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, staff and the delegation on the recommendations submitted by the Task Force, including the three which the City was being asked to undertake. Addressed during the discussion was the impact that adoption and subsequent funding of the proposed recommendations could have on the City's budget, and the need to find more innovative ways of expediting funding for the immediate requirements to relieve parking concerns in this area.

Reference was made to the recent opening of the Garden City Road extension and a question was raised about whether there had been a decrease in traffic congestion on No. 3 Road as a result of this opening. Concern was expressed that there had not been sufficient public notification of the road opening.

During the discussion, the Task Force was congratulated on a job well done. It was noted that there were some recommendations which could be worked on in an effort to address some of the concerns.

Discussion continued on the issue of taking revenue from pay parking fees to fund improvements, during which it was noted that this was undertaken in Steveston. The Chair commented that it was felt that this proposal would help to make pay parking in the City Centre area more acceptable because it was felt that people would be willing to pay for parking if they knew that the funds were coming back into the area.

Also raised during the discussion, was the need to address revenue generation, and the fact that businesses needed to be encouraged to provide shared parking, especially shopping centres. The comment was made that a revenue source would not exist until all concerned were on-stream; and further, competition with municipal parking or paid parking created an unfair balance which needed to be addressed.

Reference was made to the three recommendations of the Task Force contained in the correspondence from Mr. Cowan (Attachment 1 to the staff report). In response to questions about the three recommendations, advice was given that these recommendations were not part of the formal Task Force recommendations. The comment was made that these three recommendations should be referred to staff to obtain more information and undertake an analysis on the implications of these recommendations.

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

Reference was made to the design problems of the entrance into the Parker Place mall, and information was provided that the developer had been requested to create a new design to ensure that it would adequately address the current traffic problems. Further information was provided that it had been made clear to the developer that it was City policy that the City would not fund any driveway modifications.

Concern was expressed during the discussion about adopting the staff recommendations, and the suggestion was made that the matter should be referred to the Planning Committee to determine if there was any merit in (i) rezoning the properties on the west side of No. 3 Road, between Sea Island Way and Cambie Road, to a zone which would allow a higher density residential type of development, and (ii) charging an additional fee of \$2 to \$3 based on square footage to improve transportation in the area. The opinion was voiced that use of the transit system would increase if the character of the area was improved.

The Chair, in concluding the discussion, thanked Mr. Cowan and the Task Force for their hard work, and asked that when the matter was forwarded to Council, that a brief presentation be made to increase public awareness.

As a result of the discussion, the following **amended** recommendation was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the recommendations of the City Centre North Transit and Transportation Task Force, (as described in the report dated October 29th, 2003, from the Director, Transportation), be endorsed.*
- (2) *That staff report back through separate reports or other regular work program initiatives on the required action plans to address the above recommendations from the Task Force in a timely manner.*
- (3) *That the contributions of the City Centre North Transit and Transportation Task Force towards improving traffic, parking and transit conditions in the City Centre north area be formally acknowledged; and*
- (4) *That the following three recommendations from the City Centre North Transit & Transportation Task Force:*
 - (a) *that the City participate in funding through allocation of pay parking revenue and other sources toward these transit and transportation improvements;*
 - (b) *that the City take the lead in facilitating recommendations such as shared parking between merchants; and*
 - (c) *that the City strongly advocate for transit improvements identified by the Task Force,*

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

be referred to staff for their comments and report to the Public Works & Transportation Committee; and that staff in the Urban Development Division be asked to review possibilities for the rezoning of the RAV Corridor and the west side of No. 3 Road, between Sea Island Way and Cambie Road, at the same time, examining the feasibility of adding a square footage cost to future developments in this area to assist with transportation charges in the area; and that this matter be referred to the December 10th, 2003 Regular Council Meeting for presentation.

CARRIED

(Councillor Dang left the meeting at 5:55 p.m., and did not return.)

7. **PACEMORE AVENUE WALKWAY – FINAL SURVEY RESULTS**

(Report: Oct. 30/03, File No.: 6360-12-01) (REDMS No. 1071705)

Mr. Wei reviewed the report with the Committee.

(At this point in the meeting, the Chair advised that there would not be sufficient time to deal with Item No. 8 - Development And Engineering Costs Referral, and stated that this matter would be deferred to the next meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee.)

Mr. Wei then advised that correspondence had been received from Nancy Rees-Thomas, a Pacemore resident, who asked that Council approve the construction of sidewalks, with curb and gutter, on Pacemore Avenue. A copy of the correspondence is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

Mr. Neil Smith, of 3780 Pacemore Avenue, advised that he had supported the first petition for the construction of a sidewalk. He further advised that he felt that the survey undertaken by City staff was flawed as it only asked for comment on two different walkway designs or no walkway at all, and had only been sent to the residents of Pacemore Avenue. Mr. Smith referred to the initial report and stated that the resident concerns about pedestrian safety which were outlined in that report were still valid. He voiced the opinion that the proposed signage would do nothing to resolve the current problems.

Mr. Smith advised that he had a number of ideas, such as placing barriers along the street or blocking off certain streets, which he felt would be acceptable alternatives. He noted that the Mores subdivision had no sidewalks or walkways, while the Seafair subdivision had both. He also questioned whether staff were aware of how much traffic went through the Seafair subdivision to get to No. 1 Road. Mr. Smith suggested that by installing a barrier along Pacemore Avenue and encouraging traffic to use streets which have sidewalks would be more cost effective than installing signs which would be ignored by motorists.

(Mayor Brodie left the meeting at 6:00 p.m., and did not return.)

Public Works & Transportation Committee

Wednesday, November 19th, 2003

Mr. Smith also spoke about the push to encourage children to become healthier by walking to school, and advised that there was no walkway leading to Gilmore Elementary School which was a major concern to students.

The Chair noted during the brief discussion with the delegation that other options which had been suggested had been rejected by the neighbourhood. In response, Mr. Smith voiced the opinion that staff had not examined the feasibility of blocking off some of the streets in the neighbourhood to reduce through traffic.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the proposed pedestrian walkway along Pacemore Avenue be cancelled based on the results of the latest survey of the residents in the area.*
- (2) *That special advisory signage be installed to encourage drivers to respect the residential nature of the area and to enhance pedestrian safety.*

The question on the motion was not called, as Councillor Barnes asked staff to think further on the issue and address the issue of walkways in the area, and especially around Gilmore Elementary School, to determine what would be the best way to incorporate some form of walkway to address the concerns for student safety.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (6:05 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, November 19th, 2003.

Councillor Rob Howard
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office

Nov. 19th/03.

Richmond City Council

Pacemore Resident - Nancy Rees-Thomas.

Sorry I can't attend the meeting, I had planned to.
Please accept these notes:

Consideration for Council Initiated Action.

Please consider the number of new constructions on
Pacemore Ave. as well as those in progress and one
more that has not yet started.

Pacemore Ave is the only access road to ~~Alamo~~ Alanmore
Bairdmore and Cairnmore!

Bairdmore and Cairnmore are full of new homes, with ongoing
construction on Bairdmore Crescent.

Royalmore, Dalemore + Ellesmore highschool students walk
daily on Pacemore and say its quite nerve wracking!

City Council Planning Dept. please step in and complete the
sidewalks + curbs before any incidents occur. The
Pacemore sidewalk ends at Ellesmore + needs to be
continued up to No 1 Road. Thanks.

The drainage problem along the Pacemore corridor could
then be resolved + the Residents on the north side would
no longer have to put out the dangerous big boulders.
Those boulders are a hazard to drivers, walkers and
cyclists. Drainage especially bad on N.W corner Baird + Pace + N.W. corner Pacemore - Dalemore
- Sorry I am not in attendance - Thanks for your continued
consideration in this concern. Sincerely Nancy Rees-Thomas