City of North Vancouver

INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

City Hall, Atrium Meeting Room
141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver

Wednesday, May 7, 2014 at 6:00pm

M I N U T E S

Present:	Alex Boston
	Ann McAlister
	Cam McLeod
	Heather Drugge
	Melina Scholefield (Chair)
	Pam Horton
	Robert Glover
Staff:	Clare Husk, Committee Clerk
	Daniel Watson, Transportation Planner
Apologies:	Brian Polydore
	Craig Keating
	Susan Skinner
	Michael Epp, Planner

Quorum 5   0360-20-ITC

1.0   CALL TO ORDER, ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The meeting was called to order by Melina Schofield at 6:05pm with a quorum present.   The revised agenda was adopted.

2.0   ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was regularly moved, seconded and carried unanimously:

THAT the minutes of the regular Integrated Transportation Committee meeting held on Wednesday, March 5, and Wednesday April 23, 2014 be adopted.

3.0   BUSINESS ARISING

The Committee Clerk investigated having a Committee delegation appear in front of Council. However, as the main communication for the Committee is via the Annual Report no other Committee goes to Council as a delegation. In addition either late July would be the earliest slot for a delegation to Council, therefore the annual report is going to Council on Monday May 26, 2013. Anyone is welcome speak for two minutes.

4.0   PARKING IN LANES

Staff gave a quick overview and wished the Committee to comment on their preferred option.

Options

1. Status Quo: i.e. No change to the current policy, and continuing to enforce the existing Street and Traffic bylaw in respect of parking in lanes on an 'as needs' basis.

2. Allow parking in lanes on a case-by-case basis when adjacent on-street parking is reduced.

3. Allow parking in lanes on a case-by-case basis when adjacent on-street parking is reduced and by resident request.

4. Allow parking in lanes throughout the City.

Questions from the Committee included, but were not limited to:

Q: Could this be requested as per resident exempt parking? A: Yes, that could be a consideration. Staff noted that old buildings were built without on-site parking, but they could have resident exempt parking in their block.

It was commented that enforcement could be both onerous and confusing for Bylaws. Staff did confirm they had spoken with Bylaws, Police and Fire Departments on these proposals.

Q: Concerns with options 2 and 3 and with peoples' ability to understand the changes? A: We would put signage on the lanes, as per the on-street signs. Help people to understand where they can park. Unless we go for option 4 the blanket coverage.

Q: Would it be preferable to see more animation of the lanes through commercial and pedestrian activity? A: This proposal is in conflict with the 100 year sustainability vision. Once parking is granted in the lanes it will be difficult to take it away.

Q: has there been a study undertaken on the volume of traffic in lanes? A: No. However, the City is putting in a cross-walk in busy Lower Lonsdale lane.

Q: Could this be granted on a case by case basis, considering safety implications and traffic volumes? A: yes, and likewise staff will review pedestrian use.

Q: This could be different in single family home areas, as there is not much traffic in those areas? A: It might create a different feel in the lanes. For example the City only paves to 5 meters.

Comments from the Committee included, but were not limited to:

- Did not want it to be unrestricted laneway parking.
- On a commercial laneway would suggest time limited parking.
- It was acknowledged there could be negative implications for commercial and construction parking.
- Could also have negative impact on existing or potential pedestrian activity.
- Concerns were expressed with options 2 and 3 - could it be difficult for residents' to understand.
- Problems with parking in lanes tends to be neighbourly conflict; for example the Issue of when others parking the lane behind another's residence.
- Like the idea of opening up the potential for lane parking, especially where there are older commercial areas off laneways.

- Where there are secondary micro suites within duplexes which may increase parking demand, this idea might help ease that.
- Would like to allow it but also wish to consider the safety for pedestrians, and if the lane has a role in our pedestrian and bike network.
- Support for a level of discretion for support of this. Needs more analysis.
- Would support option two the provision of extra criteria such as when adjacent parking is reduced.

The Committee Recessed at 6:56pm
for the Green necklace Presentation

Reconvened at 8:05pm
with the same persons present

5.0 GREEN NECKLACE RESOLUTION

THAT the Integrated Transportation Committee, having reviewed the Green Necklace at Mahon Park project, and although supporting the project, including the alignment, feels that the following has not been adequately resolved and request that staff:

- Investigate any opportunity to increase the width of the multiuse path to reduce potential pedestrian/cyclist conflicts;

- Investigate removal of parking on the east side, particularly in the segment of Keith Road to West 16th;

- Seek good integration with other cycling network routes; and

- Consider more aggressive traffic calming, including modification of the design of the bump outs to allow for regular cyclist access, or as a diversionary measure;

AND THAT the Committee recommends that the City puts greater emphasis on the safety, quality and convenience of on-street cycling facilities on Jones Avenue.

Unanimous

Mr. McLeod left the meeting at 8:37pm

6.0   PARKING IN LANES RESOLUTION

THAT the Integrated Transportation Committee, having reviewed the Parking in Lanes as presented, supports Option 2;

AND THAT the Committee recognises that there may be other potential situations that might necessitate the City to look laneway parking, such as when adjacent on-street parking availability is reduced or circumstances such as increased parking demand resulting from land use changes.

Unanimous

7.0   ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52pm.

_____   _____
Melina Scholefield, Chair   Clare Husk, Committee Clerk