

Present:

Chair - Councillor Bose
Councillor Hunt
Councillor Rasode
Mayor Watts

Absent:**Guests:**

Residents of 156 Street:
- Jim Pelton
- Neal Davidge
- Tara Patry
- Andy Green
- Debbie Drewlo

Staff Present:

V. Lalonde, GM Engineering Department
J. Boan, Transportation Manager
P. Bellefontaine, Transportation Engineer
J. McLeod, Manager, Long Range Planning
& Policy Development
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Mayor Watts

That the minutes of the Transportation

Committee meeting held on September 22, 2009, be adopted.

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS**1. Seraphina Wales**
File No. 5400-80

Seraphina Wales, a delegation to provide a presentation regarding the road closure of 156 Street and 40 Avenue, was not in attendance.

The Agenda was varied.

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**1. Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes**
Monday, October 19, 2009 – RES.R09-1867
File: 5400-80; 0550-20-10

Delegation request from Lisa Fox regarding Bear Creek Park 84 Avenue extension.

Councillor Bose advised that he had spoken to Ms. Fox who has agreed to have her delegation deferred to a later date in order to allow the Engineering Department to work through the process.

D. NEW BUSINESS**2. City Centre Road Name Changes**

J. Boan reviewed the results of consultation regarding City Centre road name changes and noted the following:

- Further to the last meeting of the Committee, a consultation meeting was held with the Downtown Surrey BIA, as well as a joint meeting with the Whalley Community Association, Bolivar Heights Community Association, Port Mann Community Association and Bridgeview in Motion. Together, there was general support of the name change of Whalley Ring Roads, noting that the name should be short and should recognize the history of the area and not to be any variation of City Centre.
- There was agreement for King George Blvd.
- The affected agencies (post office, etc.) need to be notified and a date should be set as the effective date for name change. When City Parkway was renamed, the process was to have the post office aware of the date of change, however this was never followed through with. A protocol is now in place to ensure this will not happen again.
- Suggestion was for West Whalley Ring Road to be University Drive or Holland Drive. The BIA favoured Holland Drive, however the community associations made the point that there is already Holland Park recognizing the Holland family, and that instead we should be looking to the future. They recommended the name University Drive.
- University Drive is interesting and some have already labeled the area the “university district”. It has all kinds of nuances, sets a context, a central driving issue for Surrey.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Mayor Watts
Seconded by Councillor Rasode
That the Transportation Committee
recommend to Council that West Whalley Ring Road be renamed University Drive.
Carried

- It was favoured that the history of the Whalley name be kept by changing East Whalley Ring Road to Whalley Drive; there is merit in keeping the clearly recognized Whalley name alive. Other suggestions included the Forsyth name, another one of the pioneer families.

A mock up of the signs with the various names was shown.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Councillor Rasode
Seconded by Mayor Watts
That the Transportation Committee
recommend to Council that East Whalley Ring Road be renamed to Whalley Drive
and that there be a short report to Council to explain the consultation and
recommendations for the proposed name changes.

Carried

C. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**1. Achieving Road Network Linkages – Problems and Successes**

DEFERRED from September 22, 2009.

V. Lalonde provided a PowerPoint presentation to review the successes and challenges in achieving road linkages. In seeking direction from the Committee, the following was noted:

- The last few years a fairly robust policy framework has been in place. The Sustainability Charter also talks about the benefits, however we do know that there is a fair amount of opposition when we come to add road linkages. Developers often feel that the roads are unnecessary and unfair.
- In general, when the development community talks about road networks, they do not associate the road requirements as needed. There is a perceived loss of yield. Increasing density triggers the need for additional road infrastructure. While the value of the road will be seen over time, they do not see it initially.
- The current process is quite lengthy as unless there is an early agreement with the developer, there can be a lot of back and forth.
- The general public in established neighbourhoods sees densification and new roads as extra traffic through their neighbourhood. The loss of a dead end road is a concern as well as safety, increased volume and speeds.
- From the City's perspective, failing to establish links over time will make the City less livable. A good grid network will create broader community benefits.
- The more roads with linkages we have, the less traffic we have on any one road. We often hear 'roads on diets'. Our plan is to build more linkages, not wider roads. With an increasing population there also needs to be increases to transit, walking and cycling. Our goal is to create more than just one solution and to create these options, we need more road connections.
- Essentially, there are two Options:
 - A – Continue to pursue finer grid network of roads:
 - Short term – Update our plans more frequently;
 - Long term – Negotiations/persuasion; and
 - Better long term city network.
 - B – Be more accepting of the 'status quo' of our road network:
 - Short term – less costly, faster approval; and
 - Longer term – widen existing roads, more congestion.

The Committee had the following discussion:

- When you look at Vancouver, they would never be where they are (very good modal splits) if it weren't for their tight grid network.
- Once a road pattern is decided on, it stays for a very long time.
- The equity of road construction is sometimes seen as an issue. The City's DCCs fund the arterial road program, generally development builds collector roads with DCC's funding the upsizing from a local road standard, and local roads are fully constructed/funded by developers. Staff are looking at a DCC upsizing model for arterials as well, which would then create a consistent obligation for developers irrespective of the road classification.
- In the example of the properties on 64th Avenue between 138th Street and 140th Street, it was noted that although identified and planned for, it would be difficult to achieve the linkage between the properties as there is a property between them that will not develop at this time. It was suggested that since this is still in the development stage, a restrictive covenant could be put in place regarding the future access connection. Alternately, the City could require developers to obtain Statutory Right-of-Ways on adjacent properties to achieve the road or access linkages at the time of development. This would avoid future opposition from the residents to having new sites taking access through their site.
- A suggestion was made to investigate transferred development rights to encourage consolidation of properties and avoid dealing with one parcel at a time.
- The City's involvement needs to be considered in order to advance the network. Perhaps we should require advancement on other developments as well.
- The City is being more proactive in some areas in trying to purchase critical lots. What can happen otherwise is that the lot never develops and you can never achieve the linkage.
- Roads are achieved in a number of ways, in the example of 152A Street north of 16th Avenue in Semiahmoo, staff concluded that this was a strategically important route and that sections of it would be unachievable unless the City acquired some of the properties. Sections have since been acquired by the City.
- There have been connections lost because of timing which has created more pressure on the arterials, some of this are with low densities and thus the impact is less. The higher the density the more critical the links are and the bigger the impact of the lost links.
- Comment was made that there is a critical need for a connection between 24th and 20th Avenues through Mrs. Laronde's property and this should be looked into.
- In the Newton area in general, there are not many linkages that go east-west. The City wasn't able to secure the planned road (72A Avenue) between King George Highway and 137th Street in Newton Town Centre. A drive aisle linkage was obtained, but visually, it is not as obvious.
- The City needs to work through all the development sites to find linkages as they will provide a lot of benefits with respect to access for transit, walking and cycling in addition to cars.
- The site beside the Cloverdale Baptist Church was seeking higher density and with the high volumes on the adjacent roads the City required a new north-south road. The developer was concerned, but by modifying the cross-section and

agreeing to a fixed price (based on Engineering estimates) the developer was able to support the addition of the road.

- Newton Town Centre is under study for densification. TransLink acquired land for a new exchange which furthered the need for additional east-west road connections. Proposed routes affect the Rona and bingo hall development sites. Achieving the new routes has been very complicated and challenging as there was a railway crossing, a bingo hall application and proposed Rona development. The City negotiated with the bingo hall and Rona and got them on board by refining the road alignment and demonstrating the benefits to development on both sides of the new road. Achieving these linkages in situations like this, take time and at first you find resistance, but through compromise and dialogue, we can be successful.
- The area around 107th Avenue will need a resolution as well if this area densifies as predicted. The City currently does not have a solution for this area and this issue may be brought to Council. We will need to highlight where we are willing to compromise and what the other parties involved are willing to do as well.
- During the City Centre Plan Open Houses, when staff went over all the roads, the one thing that was always brought up was the continuous network for City Centre and how this needs to be continued. With respect to 98B Avenue south of Holland Park, we were able to negotiate with the developer of the Holland Pointe site and achieve the road linkage. The key issue was allowing the development to connect under the proposed road.
- Another site is the Days Inn at the King George SkyTrain Station. It is critical for the site and neighbourhood to achieve the continuation of 98B Avenue. Negotiations are still underway concerning the look and feel of the road to minimize impact, but we believe that the applicant now recognizes the importance of the road and thus we will be able to achieve this linkage.
- There are really two ways to go about accommodating the additional road capacity needed for additional densification and those are to continue to pursue a finer grid road network and to update our long term road plans more frequently.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Mayor Watts

That the Transportation Committee

recommend to Council that a full presentation be heard at Council-in-Committee and that 'Option A' be approved to continue to pursue a finer grid road network.

Carried

- The City needs to do some of the work to acquire the property in advance and then get back when the development comes. This has been a constant problem over time.
- All of these strategies are needed to make these connections for the future and to prevent a lot of the issues that have been faced to date.

D. NEW BUSINESS**3. Croyden Drive/20 Ave Alignment Options**

J. Boan provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining two options regarding the 164 Street/Croyden Drive alignment options. Comments were as follows:

- Two big land holders have concerns with the planned road alignments for 164th Street and Croyden Drive (Option A) as originally planned in the Hwy 99 corridor and Grandview Heights NCP#2. Their desire was to have 164th continue straight down along the existing 164th Street road allowance through the area (Option B).
- Issues with Option B include:
 - Direct impact on Class B watercourses – significant mitigation cost implication;
 - Greater traffic volumes on 164th Street expected north of 20th Avenue intersection;
 - 4-lane cross-section on 164th Street would be required south of 20th Avenue;
 - Shift in burden from some property owners to the others; and
 - More challenging construction staging.
- However, there are also some advantages:
 - Volumes may be better split between 160th Street and 164th Street which may improve overall traffic operation;
 - Maximizes contiguous land parcels which may provide more flexibility and value for land holders; and
 - Maximizes use of existing road allowances, which may spur development to occur more quickly.
- Option A, the original plan, could be constructed at any time without the need to re-profile 20th Avenue immediately, which provides more flexibility in timing for development.
- For Option B, at a minimum, a 300 meter length of 20th Avenue must be reconstructed to raise the intersection area by 4 meters to enable the 164th Street intersection to operate safely. This will also require advance flashers due to the steep approach grade on 20th Avenue.
- In terms of the overall costs, these are still being refined, but there is an approximate \$7 million cost premium in going with Option B.
- Specifically, the construction costs increase by \$2.7 million and there will be environmental compensation required of approximately \$3.5 million to \$6.1 million.
- As well, by going to 164th Street, the dedication requirements and construction costs would be shifted from one property owner to another. For the large land holders, there is a \$5 million road dedication savings by making use of the 164th Street alignment (Option B). Implications on 20th Avenue it would depend on how development proceeds.
- Staff met with all of the major developers in the area to discuss the details of the issue and the conclusion from that meeting was to suggest that Council approve the base plan (Option A), but also have approved alternate plan (Option B) subject to the following conditions:
 - Obtain DFO approval and address creek relocation/mitigation;

- Regrade the 20th Avenue intersection area;
 - Provide all added dedication needs to 164th Street; and
 - Overall agreement on funding the 'extra' cost of Option B.
- There were no concerns from other developers present as they didn't feel there would be a significant impact. They felt it would protect their interests if there was approval of Option B. The proponents indicated that they agreed in principle but need to assess the economics in more detail.

The Committee had the following discussion:

- The two issues are money and DFO will need to give approval. It is not a 100% given that the DFO will approve. Even if we want to go to Option B, then we don't know if we can deliver. We figured we could approve a plan we can deliver and give options to change.
- Option B is approvable. It basically comes down to the owners of those properties working out the solutions. There are advantages to that as 20th Avenue will go over the freeway, so then it would make sense to have feeders going into it. Staff should work with the developers to find a solution to enable Option B to be approved.
- One of the reasons both A and B have been suggested is because the Grandview Heights NCP #2 needs to be wrapped up to move on with plans to have the road networking shown.
- There are problems with putting this through to complete the NCP because when there are changes amendments will need to be made. It would be better to be clearer so changes don't need to be made.
- Suggestion was made to have an update at the next meeting and bring back information and comments from the owners who will be impacted by the change in the roads.

1. **88 Ave/KGH – Next Steps**

The following comments were made:

- There is significant support and technical justification for completion of 84th Avenue.
- There is also significant local and environmental opposition to completion of 84th Avenue.
- Right now, there are some that would like to "save" Bear Creek Park which they believe requires that the City remove the existing 84th Avenue road dedication.
- As the City continues to grow and build out/optimize the surrounding road network, fewer & fewer options to minimize congestion will remain
- Transit, cycling & walking have important roles in providing choice & reducing auto demand, but traffic volumes & congestion will continue to increase due to significant ongoing population and employment growth
- Existing 84th Avenue road allowance must be maintained to ensure options available for a future route for all modes
- We are currently looking into trying to purchase additional lands for Bear Creek Park that could offset any additional future road needs.

- With respect to the intersection of 88th Avenue/King George Highway, we do not currently have an appropriate solution to the congestion and safety issues. We intend to do the following to best manage the situation:
 - Monitor and regularly update the signal timing plan;
 - Continue to lobby for more transit; and
 - Pursue completing 128th Street to King George Highway, and wait to see the impacts/benefits of Highway #1, the South Fraser Perimeter Road and 96th Avenue widening (with Golden Ears Bridge option now available) then reassess the roundabout option for 88th Avenue/King George Highway.
- With respect to the roundabout, there is nothing stopping us from proceeding with it at this time, however, the international experts did not recommend proceeding with it until we achieved further road connectivity (84th Avenue and 128th Street). The other concern is with a high volume 2 to 3 lane roundabout, we have concerns with how drivers will manager with it. It could potentially compound congestion issues. Additional time for the public to get used to single land roundabouts and possibly the implementation of a two lane roundabout at another lower volume location would be beneficial.
- Staff suggested the following steps in moving forward:
 - Undertake broad public consultation on the Transportation Plan and missing links over a 6 to 12 month period;
 - Evaluate missing linkages based on cost/benefit; and
 - Over the next 10 years, complete missing links, considering both the cost/benefit and the level of controversy associated with the projects.

The Committee had the following discussion:

- A roundabout can certainly be implemented, but there is concern about installing it at the City's most congested intersection. The other concern is with installing the roundabout, there will be issues and congestion moved to other intersections.
- Perhaps there can be a high occupancy bus put onto 88th Avenue.
- If there were more east and west linkages this could possibly work. However, there is fear that without the additional linkages there will be more demand than available capacity.
- The public will want us to explore every other option.
- Education is an issue with respect to roundabouts and whether people know how to use them. An additional concern is if traffic lights are needed on the approaches (which has happened in other cities) it destroys the efficiency of the roundabouts.

5. 20th Avenue Overpass of Hwy 99

A presentation was given by J. Boan regarding the proposed future 20 Avenue overpass over Highway 99 [a companion to Item D.3]. The merits/need for the crossing was recapped (presented previously to the Committee) and new renderings were shown. Additional comments were as follows:

- Additional design and modeling work was undertaken in order to consult with the public on the proposed future crossing.

The Mayor left the meeting at 11:48 a.m.

- Approximately 7,000 letters were sent out to residents in the area advising of the Open House and providing project information with a feedback form. The open house was held on September 29, 2009 with an attendance of approximately 300 people. As well, there was an information page and feedback form put up on the City's website.
- Overall, in terms of response rate by mail, only 8.9% responded, but between that and the open house and the website, a total of 620 responses were received.
- Online support for the project was 70%. Mail responses prior to the open house were 60% in favour. Support at the Open House and a small number of subsequent mail responses was only 33%. However, this is not unexpected as typically, the majority of attendees at Open Houses are opposed to the project being presented.
- Overall, 57% of respondents support the overpass.
- Key concerns raised were the impact on livability for adjacent residents, property access challenges, property impact pedestrian safety.
- Staff believe these issues can be addressed through the roadway design, by including a two-way left turn lane for property access, including landscaping/fencing treatments and sidewalk/pathway enhancements.

The Mayor returned to the meeting at 11:54 a.m.

- It was also noted that the implementation of the 20th Avenue overpass is not expected in the immediate term and that due to property constraints on the west side of the bridge it would likely begin as a 2 lane roadway with 4 laning being a future expansion option.
- In terms of timing, we agreed with concerned residents that consideration should be given to other works prior to installing the 20th Avenue overpass, such as widening 16th Avenue and 24th Avenue and installing freeway ramps at 16th Avenue and 24th Avenue
- The conclusion was that given almost 60% support for the proposed 20th Avenue overpass, the City should protect a 30 meter wide corridor for 20th Avenue between King George Highway and Croydon Drive/164th Street to facilitate the Hwy 99 crossing and multi-use pathway.
- The public should also be advised through the website and mail outs of the results, the Council decision and key points to address concerns.
- A number of immediate concerns were also identified by the public which staff will be reviewing and addressing as required.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt
Seconded by Councillor Rasode
That the Transportation Committee
recommend to Council to approve the concept of the 20 Avenue overpass and
required protection of a 30m wide corridor and that an executive report from the
Engineering Department be prepared to accompany this resolution.
Carried

4. R-91 Update

DEFERRED to the November meeting.

6. Community Rail Working Group

Mayor Rick Green and the Valley Transportation Advisory Committee (VALTAC)
requested that a member of Council be appointed to the working group on
community rail.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

It was Moved by Councillor Rasode
Seconded by Councillor Hunt
That the Transportation Committee
recommend to Council that Councillor Bose be appointed to the VALTAC
Community Rail Working Group.
Carried

E. CORRESPONDENCE

F. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Regular Council – Public Hearing Minutes
Monday, October 19, 2009 – RES.R09-1832
 2. Electric Car BC – Booth at UBCM Municipal Marketplace
- DEFERRED to November meeting.

G. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

H. NEXT MEETING

It was
earlier than the scheduled meeting date of November 23, 2009, in order that there be two meetings before the end of the year.

Moved by Councillor Bose
Seconded by Councillor Rasode
That the Transportation Committee meet

Carried

The Clerk's office will advise alternate dates.

I. ADJOURNMENT

It was
now adjourn.

Moved by Mayor Watts
Seconded by Councillor Hunt
That the Transportation Committee meeting do

Carried

The Transportation Committee adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Councillor Bose, Chair
Transportation Committee