

Present:

Councillor Bose – Chairperson
Councillor Hepner
Councillor Rasode

Absent:

Councillor Hunt

Staff Present:

J. Boan, Transportation Manager, Engineering
P. Bellefontaine, Transportation Planning Manager, Engineering
P. Lee, Rapid Transit & Strategic Projects Manager, Engineering
V. Lalonde, General Manager, Engineering
J. Hunter, Legislative Services
T. Mueller, Legislative Services

Guest:

Elizabeth Model, Downtown Surrey BIA

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the January 12, 2011 meeting to be adopted.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hepner

Seconded by Councillor Rasode

That the minutes of the Transportation

Committee meeting held on January 12, 2011, be received.

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS**C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS****D. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Review the role / function of the Committee**

Effect of Transportation Committee (TC) on Transportation in Surrey (since creation in 2007)

The following comments were made:

- Established in 2007 as a Mayor's Committee and the Terms of Reference emphasised looking at the higher level issues.
- The mandate is a standing committee to advise Council on issues related to transportation.
- Over its 5 years in operation, the TC has provided detailed information which has allowed Council to make informed decisions relative to transportation initiatives.

- Staff commented that the committee has been very valuable in vetting reports / programs, allowing staff to adjust and refine the material prior to taking it to Council. Guidance and direction provided has enabled staff to respond quickly to issues and successfully implement programs.
- The general themes for 2010 were policy, TransLink and transit, education, road network planning, network management, capital projects and community transportation concerns.

Completed Program Updates:

- **2010 Transportation Report** – First of annual review of the City's progress towards the Transportation Strategic Plan goals. Includes highlights of projects and monitoring of key objectives.
- **Newton Transit Exchange** – There is ongoing dialogue with TransLink to move forward with the plans for the area. There is a two stage strategy for the exchange: interim improvements to the existing location including moving layover out of the exchange; and ultimate relocation of the exchange with separated layover..
- **Surrey SFU Program** – The Committee stated that the program was world class and had some senior level transportation professionals as attendees. The Committee suggested that staff could bring in key-note speakers and offer different levels of training, i.e., basic, intermediate and advanced. Staff focussed on having some technical people along with residents and community group representatives to provide a broad cross-section that is reflective of the City's population. In the next offering, staff will try to get more interest from community groups. Letters went out to 50 – 60 community groups this past year but unfortunately only two representatives attended.
- **Portland Tour** – Not only did it demonstrate the benefits of a finer grid road network and LRT/streetcar system, it also provided a model of how the City of Portland used planning tools to revitalize their City. This strategy highlighted the importance and interaction of land use with transportation and how to leverage transit improvements (LRT/streetcar) through the support and partial funding of adjacent development/businesses.
- **Road Network Planning** – Successes have included updating the R-91 map, introducing a new road allowance map and achieving road links through development by providing more information and clarity on requirements prior to applications being made and working cooperatively with developers to best achieve the goals of both parties.
- **Traffic Control Centre** – Surrey's plans for a state-of-the-art Traffic Control Centre has impressed many around the region.
- **Pay Parking in Newton** – Staff will continue to monitor the program and report back any modifications of the program if needed.

- **Surrey Olympic Transportation Plan.** The Olympic Transportation Plan involved successfully managing parking and reducing congestion around the celebration site.
- **Douglas Boarder Crossing** – Staff setup a working group with Ministry and others and provided an update with some options.
- **Arterial Median Road Design Projects** – since our new process which includes bringing these before the Transportation Committee, we have not had any public/community issues. The pilot of permitting u-turns at two locations on King George Boulevard in South Surrey are proving to be well used and we are not aware of any safety issues associated with them. Staff plans to implement them where possible and appropriate in conjunction with other road widening/median projects. Staff will undertake further review of the locations where u-turns are permitted, including the signage.
- **Community Issues - Delegations & Staff Presentations:**
 - 144A Street
 - West Panorama Ratepayers with respect to Roberts Bank Railway (RBRC).
 - Surrey Citizen Transportation Initiative
 - Newton Employment Centre (pay parking)
 - Crescent Beach Emergency Access. Have a consultant on board and will come back with options in the next couple of months.

Councillor Hepner left the meeting at 12:33 p.m.

- **Committee Expectations and Terms of Reference (TOR) Comments:**
 - Focus on strategic / high level issues
 - Appropriate level of community input
 - Right focus on appropriate issues and items
 - Presentations of appropriate length, quality and interest
 - Clarity and value of staff feedback and recommendations.

The Committee members indicated that they considered the TOR, presentations and overall focus to be appropriate and that the Committee was of value to them. The Committee requested staff to continue to focus on proactive visioning and innovative approaches, specifically in the context of looking at challenges and solutions that other communities have encountered. The Committee requested staff to include 'Proactive Visioning' as a standing agenda item to draw ideas from other communities.

- **Proposed Agenda Items for 2011:**
 1. TransLink/Transit Updates
 2. Rapid Transit Review
 3. Walking Plan
 4. Crescent Beach Access
 5. Parking Management
 6. Transportation Committee Terms of Reference
 7. Rapid Transit Opportunities
 8. Noise Walls
 9. Traffic Control Centre Tour/ITS Initiatives

10. MRN/Truck Route/Dangerous Goods Review
11. Cycling Plan
12. Transportation Funding Needs
13. Transportation Funding Strategy
14. Traffic Calming Policy Review
15. Pay Parking Update
16. Street Light Technology (Energy Reduction)
17. Speed Limit Review
18. Public Engagement
19. Safer Schools Update/Communication Plan
20. Cloverdale Streetcar / Heritage Rail Update
21. New Construction Traffic Control Strategy
22. Report Card

Councillor Hepner returned at 12:42 p.m.

The Committee raised the issue of considering implementing a transportation utility to provide stable funding for capital projects and infrastructure. Staff offered to provide the committee with a detailed analysis outlining the current funding practises for transportation, benefits of keeping the same model versus benefits of changing to a utility. It was noted that any changes to the TOR would involve a recommendation to the Mayor.

2. **Parking Management** **File No: 5480-01**

The Transportation Manager conducted a PowerPoint presentation on Parking Management. The following comments were made:

Staff noted there is a shortage of on street parking to accommodate the number of vehicles in some areas of the City.

Typical Complaints Include:

- In high density residential
 - Over subscription for parking
 - Ineffective garages
 - Conflict between neighbours
 - Challenges for garbage and recycling vehicles to navigate some streets
 - Multifamily complexes have limited car allowance per unit – creates heavy on-street demand.
 - Retail commercial areas – limited stay parking restrictions (i.e., 2 hrs) are difficult to manage, creating reduced turnover for businesses.
 - Undesirable behaviour adjacent to Parks.
 - Commuter parking in some residential areas.
 - Crescent Beach has issues due to heavy tourism demand.

Tools to Manage Complaints:

- No parking signage
- Limited stay free parking (2-3 hrs. Max)
- Night time parking ban (dusk till dawn)

- Pay Parking:
 - Applied week days or full week
 - Varied enforcement times (e.g., 8 a.m. – 8 p.m.) based on localized demands
 - Varied max stay hours, 2-4 maximum stay
 - Potential to charge differential rates per site.
- Existing tools are broadly successful, some locations still raise challenges.

Challenges in some residential areas (e.g. East Clayton):

- Oversized vehicles – garages too small
- Garages used for storage
- conversion of parking pad to yard space
- High demand due to suites.

Planned Review of Parking Strategies

- Engineering & Planning conducting a small lot review
 - RF-9 bylaw requirements for parking versus real need
 - Parking dimensions in relation to industry standard
 - Optimization of garage width and lengths
- Future review of overall parking bylaw
- Review of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) options - TDM can be an effective tool to manage parking and auto trip demand.

Resident Parking Permits (RPP):

- Part of on-street parking management toolbox
- Provides priority to residents and their visitors in areas with high and chronic competition for on street parking between residents, their visitors, and other road users
- Different models are available, each with their own benefits and implementation challenges:
- Considerations in implementing include:
 - Majority public support and Willingness to pay
 - Sufficient on-street parking supply to meet demand (limited curb space)
 - Minimum area for RPP to avoid “displacement of problem”
 - Will not address social issues. Sometimes involves residents from within the neighbourhood and those involved will find other ways to continue their activity.
- Increased resources to administer and enforce system.

Applicability to Surrey

- Secondary Suites generate the highest demand for parking and hence issues – an RPP will not solve this issue
- Open space recreational areas have issues at times, but it is undesirable to limit Surrey residents from a Surrey asset
- Limited number of requests
 - City Centre – close to Tax Office
 - Kwantlen University – Newton
 - Crescent Beach Area
 - Chimney Heights

- Requests typically apply to only 1 or 2 streets and do not represent sustained, chronic parking problems.
- Insufficient basis to introduce a new and complex parking management infrastructure at this time.
- Potential for projects in some locations in the future but they are limited
 - e.g., City Centre periphery (because of area wide on street parking restriction and / or pay parking).

Staff Conclusions

- City should continue to use current tools to manage overall City parking needs.
- Staff will continue to tailor solutions to the problems they are trying to fix instead of implementing 'blanket' solutions.
- Small lot review will examine more on-site and on-street parking provision
- Recommend against an RPP at this time.

Committee Comments

- Support conclusions and agree we should deal with pressure points as opposed to a broad city wide program.
- Recommend dealing with the issues and requests on a case-by-case basis.
- Suggested the need for an array of options to discourage car use and hence parking demand, including more opportunity for transit use.

3. Millar Road Update

File No: 5250-20-17

Staff provided a brief update on Millar Road. The matter was raised during the Regular Council Public Hearing of January 24, 2011.

Concerns Raised at Public Hearing

- New development adds traffic and driveways
- Will increase current safety concerns when backing out of driveways
- No cyclists use Millar Road
- Don't support proposed cross-section
- Allowing development in order to achieve wider road.

City Rationale

- Development is not to facilitate a wider road
- Issue is the probability of collisions by increasing the number of driveways
- Challenge is too little dedication provided originally
- Not an immediate solution – ultimate cross-section can only be achieved with development of all fronting properties.
- Options are available for cross-section.

Millar Road Conditions

- Collector Road
- Only connection from River Road to Scott Road
- No direct connection to SFPR planned via Grace Road
- Approx 13% downgrade for half its length

- Little or no cyclist demand
- Highest traffic volume <200
- Existing Road Allowance – 12.2 m, pavement width 6.0 m.

Cross Section Options

- Recommend dedication from both sides to achieve a customized standard within a 16.6 m road allowance
- Enable the provision of sidewalks and some landscaping for both options
- Option 1 would provide street parking
- Option 2 would provide additional landscaping and side slope treatments
- One challenge to completing frontage works in conjunction with redevelopment is that the depth of the lots varies down the hill. Thus one side of the road cannot necessarily be completed to the ultimate standard without affecting the other side of the road. As a result, on-street parking likely could not be achieved until redevelopment of the whole road

Conclusions

Based on the additional road allowance Engineering is requesting, the City could ultimately achieve an appropriate road standard that would benefit the area residents.

Approval of the development should not be based on the Transportation issues/needs, but solely on the merits of the land use change. The Committee suggested including an aerial photograph showing the development and the consequences of the jogging in the road as an aid for future presentations.

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

F. CORRESPONDENCE

1. E-mail dated January 18, 2011 from D. M. Johnston regarding LRT

It was

Moved by Councillor Hepner

Seconded by Councillor Rasode

That the email correspondence from

D. M. Johnston dated January 18, 2011 be received as information and will be added to the agenda at the March 9, 2011 Transportation Committee meeting for further discussion.

Carried

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Rapid Transit Update

The following comments were made:

- TransLink and the provincial government have proceeded to Phase 2 with a short list of 9 network alternatives.

- The City has received the engineering drawings for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) options.
- We are awaiting drawings for Light Rapid Transit (LRT) and SkyTrain.
- TransLink will be undertaking Consultation in May. A formal submission to the TransLink Board will follow that but the date has not yet been determined
- The GM Engineering indicated there were encouraging signs that TransLink has received the information Surrey has delivered and Surrey’s requests will be incorporated into the Rapid Transit Study.
- The Committee noted that the Council of Delta endorsed leaving TransLink to create a south of the Fraser transportation agency.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Motion to hold a meeting in a closed session

It was Moved by Councillor Rasode
Seconded by Councillor Hepner

That pursuant to Section 90 (1) (e) of the *Community Charter*, which states:

“A part of a council meeting may be closed to the public if the subject matter being considered relates to or is one or more of the following:

- (e) the acquisition, disposition, or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interest of the municipality;”

this meeting be closed to the public.

Carried

The meeting was closed to the public at 1:45 p.m.

The regular meeting resumed at 1:57 p.m.

I. NEXT MEETING

The next Transportation Committee Wednesday, March 9, 2011, at 2:00 p.m., Executive Boardroom, City Hall.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The Transportation Committee adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Councillor Bose, Chair
Transportation Committee