

MayorandCouncillors

From: Ralph and Edith Turner [returner2@shaw.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, 19 February 2013 15:16
To: MayorandCouncillors
Cc: Bruce Rozenhart; Jim Kojima
Subject: Steveston Parking
Attachments: 2012_03_29 009.jpg; 2012_03_29 008.jpg; 2012_03_29 007.jpg

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing with regard to the parking issues in Steveston. Since the staff report being presented to the Planning meeting of Council this afternoon was not available on the Richmond website until some time Saturday, February 16, 2013, I have had only a cursory look at the options. My concerns include:

1) Do not increase the parking problem by allowing reduced parking requirements for new developments in Steveston, such as the proposed development at 3531 Bayview Street which is noted on page PLN 83:

"With the **potential** for 75 additional on-street parking spaces in the Steveston Village, staff is of the opinion that the proposed reduction in commercial parking will have minimal impacts on the surrounding streets." Just because the local zoning allows a 33% reduction in parking requirements, it doesn't mean that there **has** to be a reduction given.

2) Is the city really suggesting that \$2.4 to \$2.8 million dollars (approximately \$40 to \$50 thousand per spot) be spent to increase on-street parking on Chatham Street for 55 new parking spots as noted on page PLN 154 of the staff report?

Would it not be more fiscally prudent to take this money and build proper parking facilities either on the city owned property on First Ave., south of Moncton and/or opposite the Steveston Community Centre and recoup, in parking fees, some of the cost of taxpayers' money.

An elevated pedestrian walkway could be constructed over Moncton Street to provide community center access.

3) Re the options presented for increased parking on Chatham Street, I note that on page PLN 158 of the staff report that the city has taken the liberty of proposing public parking on private property, i.e. the Common Property of Strata Plan BCS1862 at 3591 Chatham Street and their adjacent strata neighbours. Has the city had discussions with those strata owners?

4) With regard to the idea of proposing angle parking anywhere on Chatham Street, but especially down the centre, I can only predict that this will lead to accidents in the future as there is very little room for angle parking with the volume of traffic, especially buses, along the street. I enclose some photos of a small car that is angle parked on the 3400 block of Chatham. Note the wide berth that vehicles had to make in passing that parked car. Larger vehicles, or pickups like mine that would extend another 4 feet into the driving lane, would make safe passing even more difficult.

To compare the safety of angle parking on First and Second Avenues with that of Chatham (PLN - 161) is totally inappropriate. Both avenues are only one block long - not the half mile straightaway that Chatham is. They are also one-way roads and neither is a bus route.

I hope there will be more public consultation on this issue before the city takes any action.

Respectfully yours,
Ralph Turner