

# *Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Minutes*

2E - Community Room A  
City Hall  
13450 -104 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
**MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2015**  
Time: 2:30 PM

---

**Present:**

Chair - Councillor Gill  
Councillor LeFranc  
Councillor Woods  
C. Davidson (YR)  
R. Dhaliwal (YR)

**Absent:****Staff Present:**

F. Smith, General Manager, Engineering  
J. Boan, Manager, Transportation, Engineering  
P. Lee, Rapid Transit & Strategic Projects  
Manager, Engineering  
J. Rehal, Manager, By-Law Enforcement  
D. Harkins, Parking Services Manager  
D. Luymes, Community Planning Manager  
L. Luaifoa, Legislative Services

---

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

1. The Committee was requested to pass a motion adopting the minutes of April 20, 2015.

Deferred to June 22, 2015.

The agenda was varied.

**C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS**

1. **Transit Update**  
File: 8310-01

The Rapid Transit & Strategic Projects Manager provided a verbal update to the TIC on the rapid transit project.

The following comments were made:

- Between 2009 and 2012, the joint TransLink and Province study identified different rapid transit technologies to be applied to various corridors in Surrey. The study recommended the following rapid transit corridors for Surrey: i) 104 Avenue between Guildford Town Centre and Surrey City Centre, ii) King George Boulevard between Surrey City Centre and Newton Town Centre, and iii) Fraser Highway between Surrey City Centre and Langley Centre.
- In June 2014, the Mayors' Council for Regional Transportation adopted LRT-1 (the alternative where light rail transit was to be implemented on all three rapid transit corridors) as the preferred rapid transit system for Surrey. The first phase of the Surrey rapid transit program entailed completion of construction of LRT along the L-line (104 Avenue and King George Boulevard) within seven years from funding commitment, and the

second phase of LRT constructed along Fraser Highway within five years after completion of the L-line. Current planning has identified 19 to 21 stations for the entire system and they will be finalized with further design considerations.

- LRT is capable of meeting future demand of 4,000 to 5,000 riders per hour. Additional capacity can be generated by longer trains and shortened operational headways.
- TransLink will likely be the asset owner of the Surrey LRT network. At the present, a public-private partnership (P3) arrangement is being considered for the procurement of the Surrey LRT project. A P3 delivery of the Surrey project will likely see a concessionaire responsible for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the system over a period of 25 to 30 years, in a similar fashion to how the Canada Line is being operated.
- In February, Surrey co-hosted with TransLink a day-long session with PPP Canada and discussed the next steps for the Surrey LRT project. To sustain the funding application, TransLink will make the Round Seven application to PPP Canada with the acknowledgment that Surrey is the full partner in this project.

The Committee made the following comments:

- The recently completed Seattle LRT project has insufficient stations along its route, in particular on Martin Luther King Way. It was recommended that station location and spacing be given due consideration for the Surrey LRT project.

#### **D. NEW BUSINESS**

The Traffic Signal Team Leader, Traffic Operations Section, provided a presentation to the Committee on safety improvements at the following Surrey locations:

##### **a) Superstore Access at 76 Avenue**

The following comments were made:

- This item was brought to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (TIC) in January. The Committee suggested that staff have the applicant commission a traffic study on the issue for staff to review and bring back recommendations to the Committee.
- The owner hired a consultant to conduct a review of the site. The consultant reported that ICBC's collision data was accurate and agreed with the volume number and layout used by the City for the analysis. The consultant recommended that the City continue to monitor the location, address the sight line issue and consider installation of a traffic signal if similar crash trends continued.

- Transportation staff determined that the sight line is adequate for east bound movement and a traffic signal is not appropriate as the signal would be too close to the 76 Avenue / King George Boulevard intersection which would create operational and safety issues (insufficient left turn lane storage).
- Based on the following conclusions, the City is going to proceed with restriction of the left out movement at the 76 Avenue Superstore access:
  - significant collision history at the location
  - ICBC supports the restriction
  - other access alternatives exist out of the parking lot
  - the consultant's review confirmed city findings

**b) Scott Road at 84 Avenue and 86 Avenue**

- **Scott Road and 84 Avenue**
  - The City is proposing to install left turn signals at all 4 approaches at the intersection at Scott Road and 84 Avenue to improve safety.
  - The current signal is a Full Traffic Signal for thru vehicle movements with permissive left turns.
  - The total number of collisions over 5 years for this intersection is 180 and 35 of those were right angle collisions. Typically, right angle collisions are the most serious type of collision and most likely to result in injury.
  - The Corporation of Delta is not in support of the proposed improvement for protected left turn phases.
  - Coast Mountain Bus Company (CMBC) and residents have made numerous requests to the City for installation of left turn signals.
  - ICBC is in support of the City's proposal to install left turn signals at all 4 approaches in the intersection.
- **Scott Road and 86 Avenue**
  - The City is proposing to install a Full Traffic Signal at Scott Road and 86 Avenue.
  - The current signal at this intersection is for pedestrians and requires east-west traffic to stop at a stop sign.
  - The total number of collisions over 5 years for this intersection is 141 and 33 of those were right angled collisions. 26 out of the 33 collisions could have been prevented with signalization in place.
  - The Corporation of Delta is not in support of the upgrade from pedestrian signal to full signal.
  - Residents and business owners have forwarded numerous requests to the City for a Full Traffic Signal at this intersection.

- ICBC is in support of the proposed improvement to a full traffic signal.

The Committee made the following comments:

- Staff noted that the Corporation of Delta is not in support of the improvements due to the potential increase in the volumes of traffic on 84 Avenue in Delta.
- Staff recommended that Council send a letter to the Corporation of Delta Council regarding the proposed safety improvements at the intersections at Scott Road and 84 Avenue and Scott Road and 86 Avenue. It was further recommended that Surrey staff provide the Corporation of Delta Council and staff with a presentation on the improvements, if needed.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It was Moved by Councillor LeFranc  
 Seconded by Councillor Woods  
 That the Transportation Infrastructure  
 Advisory Committee recommends that Council endorse a letter being sent  
 under the Mayor’s signature to the Corporation of Delta Council regarding  
 the City of Surrey’s requests for:

- a) proposed safety improvements at Scott Road and 84 Avenue
- b) proposed safety improvements at Scott Road and 86 Avenue

Carried

**B. DELEGATIONS**

**1. Mike Bola, President, Cloverdale Community Association**

In attendance as a delegation to the TIC to provide comments from the Cloverdale Community Association (CCA) regarding parking pads.

The following comments were made:

- The CCA proposed that the best solution to the issue of parking pads is to widen the lots to accommodate parking pads. An example would be a 6m driveway widened to 9m. This may be best accomplished by shifting the house closer to one side of the lot. It is uncommon to allow tenants to park in the driveway. This would allow them to have a driveway space that does not block the owner’s car in the driveway or garage.
- If the widening of the lot and driveway is not feasible, then CCA recommends changing the bylaw to eliminate the requirement for an extra parking space on site for a secondary suite.

**C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS****RECOMMENDATION****2. Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Terms of Reference**

The Committee was requested to pass a motion to adopt the revised Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Terms of Reference 2015 (attached as **Appendix A**).

It was Moved by Councillor LeFranc  
Seconded by Councillor Gill  
That the Transportation and Infrastructure  
Advisory Committee recommends that Council endorse the Transportation and  
Infrastructure Committee Terms of Reference for 2015.  
Carried

**D. NEW BUSINESS****1. Parking Updates****a) Single Family Residential Parking Review**

Staff presented the Single Family Residential Parking Review to the TIC meeting in May. The review outlined policy options and recommendations that were also provided to the Development Advisory Committee (DAC) for comment.

The Community Planning Manager presented the TIC with the following revised recommendations that includes feedback from the DAC:

1. **All Single Family lots** - Increase the number of required on-site parking spaces from 2 to 3 (indoor and outdoor).
2. **RF Zone Standard & Cul-de-sac lot** –Consider permitting up to 60% (from 33%) front yard paved and increase outdoor parking spaces from 2 to 4 total (including boat and trailer parking), with approved porous pavement screening and no loss of curbside parking.
3. **RF Zone Standard & Cul-de-sac lot** - Consider permitting offset side-yard setbacks (2.8m on one side with corresponding reduction to 1.2m on the other side) in new subdivisions.
4. **RF-12 Zone Lane Accessed lot** – Consider increased setback for garage from lane to 6m on lots with a minimum of 25m depth (additional consultation with house designers required).

5. **RF-10 Zone** – Require Type II lots (7.9m frontage) to be 36m minimum depth.
6. **Other** (non-zoning): Avoid RF-12 and RF-10 lots along arterial roads (no on-street parking); avoid RF-12 lots on cul-de-sac streets.

At the May TIC meeting, the TIC requested that staff provide additional context on porous pavement. The Community Planning, Manager provided the following update:

- Porous pavement has generally good drainage performance with correct installation.
- It is crucial to use the correct sub-base and to continue on-going maintenance (vacuum sweeping).
- The cost of installation is 20 to 40% more than conventional asphalt.
- Additional resources and staff training are required to ensure proper installation.
- There are concerns over homeowner maintenance in private residential settings (seal coating etc.).

Staff will provide an update to TIC after further consultation with developers and homeowners regarding porous pavement.

The Committee made the following comments:

- The Committee requested that staff update the TIC with schematic drawings to more clearly illustrate all of the recommendations.
- It was suggested that applicants illustrate in their plans exactly how vehicles would be parked on the lot.
- The Committee suggested that if the entire driveway was constructed with porous pavement this would provide additional infiltration even if the effectiveness diminished over time.
- The Committee agreed that RF-12 in cul-de-sacs is problematic due to parking and asked staff to look at appropriate lot dimensions between RF-12 and RF to provide another option for cul-de-sacs.
- Mike Bola noted that the residents deal with the parking issues after the developers have done their job and further noted that it is costly for anyone to put in an expensive driveway. The alternative to a porous paved driveway could be to construct drainage another way.

**b) Shared Parking**

The Transportation Manager provided a presentation to the TIC on Shared Parking, as follow-up to a previous request of the TIC.

The following comments were made:

- The two forms of Shared Parking are:
  - Shared Trip Ends (e.g. commercial sites with multiple stores)
  - Shared parking based on Temporal Distribution (shared parking for two or more establishments with different time of day demand for parking)
- Shared Parking is important for efficient use of land; reduced construction costs; reduced maintenance costs and urban design benefits.
- The current Zoning Bylaw permits the following:

**Shared Trip Ends parking** (where operating hours overlap) - each establishment may share a maximum of 25% of its individually required parking spaces, but the total number of parking spaces must be equal to or greater than the required number of parking spaces for the establishment that has the higher individual overall parking space requirement.

**Temporal Distribution parking** (where operating hours do not overlap) - shared parking facilities for two or more establishments may be permitted when the establishments have different temporal distributions of parking demand (time of day or day of week).

- Shared Trip Ends – current approach is valid with few issues experienced, but there is an opportunity to improve the clarity and review best practices as part of the planned broader parking by-law review.
- Temporal Distribution - valid approach but there is an opportunity for refinement through a review of best practices which would be done as part of the planned broader parking bylaw review.

**c) Parking near LRT Stations**

The Transportation Manager provided a presentation to the TIC on Parking near LRT Stations.

The following comments were made:

- LRT lines will affect parking needs in Surrey. The City needs to consider the following items:

- Parking relaxations for developments and potential impact that would have to on-street parking demand.
  - Rising on-street parking issues with people driving to station areas to use transit.
  - Off-street facilities and whether they will be required and if so, how much is needed. Should they be public or private.
- LRT lines will accommodate an estimated 170,000 passengers daily. When built, 195,000 people will be within walking distance of high-quality rapid transit. This will influence travel patterns and should reduce auto demand and thus parking demand.
  - Currently there is no policy or direction regarding park'n'ride or kiss'n'ride facilities.
  - There is a need to establish refined parking standards for rapid transit corridors outside the City Centre.
  - Staff will look at best practices in other comparable cities like Portland, Calgary and Edmonton.
  - Next steps include finalization of LRT station areas and undertaking an integrated land use planning process (similar to NCPs) which would include reviewing access to LRT and parking.

**d) Pay Parking Approach & Introduction in Guildford**

The Parking Services Manager presented to the TIC on the Pay Parking Approach & Introduction in Guildford.

The following comments were made:

- The area adjacent to Guildford Corporate Centre currently has 1,196 off-street pay parking spaces, including 200 spaces recently created in Guildford Mall.
- There is a high level of off-street pay parking in the 105 Avenue and 153 Street area. Other off-street parking is highly regulated with time limited patrol arrangements on all surface lots.
- On-street parking management in the area is highly varied with 5 different time restrictions in 11 separate zones.
- On-street parking is highly attractive to employees and visitors to commercial offices and medical clinics which cause parking overstay issues. A minimum of 41% and maximum of 83%, with median 65% of vehicles are staying in excess of the posted limits. Enforcement is challenging with the varied time restrictions (with some as short as 15 min).

- The following recommendations are consistent with the policies that the TIC approved in 2013 for expansion of on-street parking zones:
  - Implement meter parking controls on 105 Avenue in 72 business adjacent spaces.
  - Transfer 8 meters recently deactivated in Newton.
  - Set rates at or near market to achieve average 85-95% occupancy.
  - Rationalize rates and time limits to common limit and amount.
  - No change at present in 85 stalls identified as overnight use by residents.
  - Carry out meetings with residents and local businesses.

The Committee made the following comments:

- The Committee supported the approach of pricing pay parking to reflect an occupancy rate of 85-95% (known as the Shoup model).
- The Chair noted that most parking on 152 Street is employees from ICBC and questioned where they will be able to park once the meters are implemented.
- In response to the question of why pay parking was being implemented, staff noted that although revenue will be generated, it is not the primary motivating principle. The area has a high demand for short-term on-street parking. The businesses in the area have clients that are constantly in and out and visits are shorter. Pay parking will help address the abuse of overstays with on-street parking.
- The Chair expressed reservations about pay parking and requested that staff consult with the stratas and businesses and bring back to the TIC.
- The Committee also noted that there are parking challenges in the area and noted that employee parking is creating issues for residents.
- Staff were asked to look into the issue of drivers not stopping when turning onto Lincoln Drive from 105 Avenue.

## E. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

**F. INFORMATION ITEMS**

There were no information items.

**G. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

**H. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is scheduled for **Monday, June 22 @ 2:30 pm** City Hall, 2E Community Room A.

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

It was

Moved by Councillor LeFranc

Seconded by Councillor Gill

That the Transportation and Infrastructure

Advisory Committee meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Transportation and Infrastructure Advisory Committee adjourned at 4:40 pm.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Councillor Gill, Chair

**CITY OF SURREY**

**TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**1. DEFINITION:**

- Transportation: Roads, Traffic Operations, Parking, Active Transportation, Transit, and Transportation Planning.
- Infrastructure: Sewer, Water, Drainage, District Energy, Solid Waste, and any Engineering Operation and Maintenance.

**2. PURPOSE:**

- To advise Council on issues related to Transportation and Infrastructure.
- To receive presentations from City staff and other stakeholder groups and/or agencies.
- To provide feedback to staff and make recommendations to council.
- To review and comment on, at a broad policy/overall objectives level; transportation and infrastructure related to:
  - City strategies, programs and initiatives
  - Senior government policies and programs

**3. COMPOSITION:**

- The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is a standing committee appointed by the Mayor.
- Up to 4 Council Members at Mayor's discretion (voting members).
- 2 Youth Representatives (non-voting member)
- General Manager, Engineering (non-voting member).
- Manager, Transportation; Manager, Utilities; Manager, Operations (non-voting members, attendance as required).
- Clerk's Office (recording secretary).
- Other City staff as required.
- External delegations as approved.

**4. MEETINGS:**

- Meetings to be typically monthly at the call of the Chair.
- That at all meetings a majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum.
- Minutes of the Committee shall be recorded by the Clerks Department for Council information and approval.
- The Chair shall be appointed by the Mayor.
- The Vice Chair shall be elected by Committee majority.

**5. CRITERIA TO APPEAR AS DELEGATION:**

- Broad community issue/interest.
- Specific issues recommended by staff or Councillors.
- Approval of delegation by Chair.

**6. TERMS OF REFERENCE APPROVAL BY COMMITTEE**

- JUNE 1, 2015

Received by Council: July 27, 2015 (Res. # to be inserted)