

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

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

Wednesday, May 1, 2019 at 6:00 pm

M I N U T E S

Present: Bradley Cuzen
Brent Hillier
Carol Reimer
Christie Sacré
Dolores Altin
Martin Davies
Matthew Carter
Patrick Stafford-Smith
Rohan Soulsby
Trevor Bowden
Councillor Tony Valente

Staff: Daniel Watson, Transportation Planner
Tanis Huckell, Committee Clerk
Jennifer Draper, Manager, Transportation Planning

Presenters: Julian Kendall, Cressey Developments
Daniel Fung, Bunt & Associates Engineering
Will Blair, Bingham & Hill Architects
Doug Nelson, Bingham & Hill Architects

Apologies: Sgt. Bryan Fedirchuk

1.0 CALL TO ORDER, ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF MARCH 6, 2019

T. Bowden called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., welcoming T. Huckell and M. Friesen, and noted that Councillor Valente would try to arrive later in the evening.

D. Watson informed the group that Item 4 (Electric Vehicles in the City of North Vancouver) will be postponed to July. With none opposed, the agenda for May 1, 2019 was adopted as amended and the minutes of March 6, 2019 were adopted as circulated.

2.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

None.

3.0 250 EAST 15TH STREET DEVELOPMENT

M. Friesen introduced the project, reiterating that staff are particularly asking for the Committee's input concerning:

1. Road alignment of East 16th to accommodate an expanded park and to better align with future transportation objectives;
2. Required signalization of the various intersections to ensure efficiency and safety;
3. Cycling infrastructure along St. Andrew's Avenue; and
4. Functionality and safety of laneway along eastern property edge.

The applicants presented.

Key points included:

- The current building at the site is comprised of two 4-story rental buildings, with 101 rental units.
- The proposal is to demolish the existing structure and build three purpose-built rental buildings, with all three at Step Code 3 standards. Targeting a 2.95 FSR, 240,000 square feet total, with 25% Level 2 Accessible. This would represent an increase of 178% to rental units in the City, compared to the existing site.
- The density would result in a new park, taking up ¼ of the site.
- The project includes two levels of underground parking, with 261 secure parking spaces (232 for residents, 29 for visitors). There would be 462 long-term bike spaces.
- The park location was derived in consultation with City staff; City stipulated that the public have access to the park; it is accessible from all 4 frontages.
- As a community development, the design is meant to encourage movement through and between the buildings.
- With respect to transit, the area is quite well connected. The #240 goes downtown, and comes at a good frequency.
- A surplus of parking stalls is being provided, as well as a good bike benching system. More than adequate bike parking is being suggested, based on the design requirements.
- Site traffic is distributing onto the larger network, consultant looked at 15th Street and St. George's, as well as 16th and St. Andrew's. Analysis anticipates low numbers of additional trips per intersection.
- Asked by City staff to look at general parking in the area. Around 400m, in the immediate vicinity of the site, parking has a high level of occupancy. Beyond the 400m walkable range, there is more parking available.

Questions/Comments from ITC:

- Have you taken into account demand for E-bikes and charging stations in the on-site bike parking?
 - There will be a certain percentage. Electric vehicle parking will definitely be available. Since the development is 100% rental, we can manage as they come. There will be an additional fee, but enough space for one per unit. Extension cords could be used but ultimately, every bike should have access.
- Any space for car sharing?
 - Yes, we have been looking at. It has been hard to manage in our condo buildings, as we are out of the picture after they are sold. Here, I think it will work well, looking at a global arrangement for all three buildings. Not confirmed yet but there is space.
- Commend you for putting in the extra parking.
- With respect to the traffic forecast, wondering about a couple of additional areas that maybe should have been considered, e.g. Lonsdale and 13th, also an area on 15th that's being rebuilt (on St. George's, across from the hospital). To me, that is being new and improved, so there will likely be more cars. Did you overlay that increased number of people with street parking on the front?
 - Yes, we were directed by staff specifically to add those new sites, as well as any potential Harry Jerome traffic coming down. The area we covered was from 13th to 17th.
- Question around parking provision, and on-street parking occupancy:
 - The on-street parking occupancy in the surrounding area is about 50%, so there is quite a bit of capacity left. This development is actually providing a lot more on-site parking than usual.
 - D. Watson: A lot of the parking around there is 2-hour only, resident exempt. If this were a commercial site, we would have done a lot more on the street parking review, but given the on-site provision 400m/5min walk is sufficient.
- The peak movements in and out of the parkade are 1-2 vehicles per minute, that is an average over a period of time. Have no sense of volume from other buildings, can you provide a reference?
 - From a pure traffic engineering sense, we don't do a full traffic study until we see 100 trips per hour. The City acknowledges that we're only doing a Level 1 study. So in that case, it's not a significant amount of traffic. The numbers we showed were for a peak hour, not over the entire day.
- With respect to the surface parking spaces provided, can they be managed such that those spaces become additional parking for the neighbourhood during certain times?
 - Would defer that question to the City. Have only seen that in a commercial project, or at least a portion of commercial. You could dedicate part of public parking, but there would have to be some sort of legal instrument to allow people into the buildings.
 - D. Watson: It would have to be an ancillary use to the development, or not a purely residential development, but one that includes some sort

of commercial component. We're not encouraging free parking as a municipality. We are moving forward to developing a parking strategy, to better manage all off-street and on-street parking. Ideas like that could potentially be considered, but that's further down the road.

- How did you come up with the 9-10 car delay? (in reference to West Bound Traffic at the 15th and St. George's intersection)
 - We used the highway capacity method for calculating delays. We report the 95th percentile queue; that's usually only during rush hour, but that tends to be what people are interested in. Each vehicle needs 6-7m or so. Our models show that they clear the intersection every single light. For the un-signalized areas, the general delay is less than 10 seconds per vehicle.
- Question for staff: When were traffic studies in that area last completed, from which this group derived a baseline?
 - D. Watson: The consultant carried out counts to ascertain volumes on the road, and grew 0.5% per year, compounded (to account for general growth in the area). Then we had them add traffic relating to developments that have not yet reached occupancy; they didn't take our data and build on it.
- Curious about alleyway accessibility and traffic.
 - There will be no parking in the alley. In relation to the driveway location; in this configuration, we would have a left turn lock situation. Normally we'd have more separation between the driveway and the lane, but with the low volumes anticipated and the intent of this lane, volume is not expected to be an issue. We plan benches, nodes for people to sit, to activate the laneway a little more. (This is in line with the City's guidelines.)
- Was the redevelopment of Lions Gate Hospital considered?
 - No.
- More concerned about the older building next door; people won't want to change their habits.
 - There won't be any vehicular access. The driveways for those buildings connect to the laneway that is perpendicular.
- Staff were hoping for input on the realignment at East 16th. Can someone provide more information?
 - The City wanted to maximize the amount of park space, by pushing the curb as far north as possible. The existing curb is actually quite close to the property line. Pushing the curb north will result in a realignment for cars heading eastbound.
 - The displacement would likely be less than a couple of metres. The center line of 16th would deviate; the south half of the road would narrow.
- What cycling infrastructure will be added?
 - We are proposing a shared travel lane with painted sharrows on St. Andrews.

- D. Watson: We are looking at ultimately doing the rest of the street. The block to the south would have to be separated; the volume on St. Andrews increases south of 15th.
- Is the curb on St. Andrews moving at all? Point being this is a huge re-development, new paint doesn't seem satisfactory in comparison to the size of the development, with new park, etc. With St. Andrews being a formal bike route, more attention seems warranted.
 - D. Watson: This route is be part of the Bicycling Master Plan but is not yet implemented.
- Another question regarding pedestrian infrastructure, in light of the signalization issue staff would like feedback on; there is an overhead pedestrian triggered light at 15th and St. Andrews. Are additional pedestrian controlled crossings required?
 - We are following Transport Association of Canada guidelines.
- Looking at the way the model is built, what's been put into its scope (potential impacts, pedestrians in particular), it seems like the buildings have been modeled but the existence of a new park has not been considered
 - Yes and no. We did not artificially grow the number of pedestrians on intersections; however, we did take a look at the traffic flows and considered additional traffic volumes.
- I think there will be many young families in these units. You should expect to see lots of people coming and going with kids. St. Andrews is a toddlers' park, basically, and a destination park. Having the hospital across the street, people will be looking to the park as a place to pass time. I would think that whatever crossing infrastructure the model suggests, you probably want to think on the high side, at a minimum.
 - Agreed; maybe more context would be helpful. We provided 6 hours of traffic information. We normally take into account an am/pm model. We do a very conservative estimate, and multiply by 90%. In most cases, that's more than conservative, which is why we're quite comfortable with this modeling. We will have to look at how it plays out into the future; our studies take us to opening day.
 - Understand that argument but we should not be pushing the responsibility to someone else in the future. The issue will be created by this development. If the draft Pedestrian Plan has an objective of putting more pedestrians on East 15th, that's a good reason to round up the amount of traffic expected.
- Suggestion for the City: at this intersection and others, there are lots of people who cut around drivers turning left. It may be time to consider more formal left turn bays.
 - D. Watson: We have several other projects underway, all of which build upon one another. The St. Andrews bike project is ongoing, which is likely to warrant a signal at that location. TransLink has also highlighted the 15th and St. Georges intersection. We are trying to figure out the best use of the lanes there. Slight widening is needed but whether it's a left turn lane, or a bus queue jump, we need to allow transit to get through that intersection.

- If people are going to and from the hospital, they'll be crossing mid-block. This is a potential point of conflict.

T. Bowden thanked the presenters for their time and presentation.

The group left the meeting at 7:20pm.

The committee proceeded to draft a resolution, as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Integrated Transportation Committee supports the proposed development at 250 East 15th Street as presented at the May 1, 2019 meeting, but notes the following issues for further consideration through discussion with staff:

- that future pedestrian activity as a result of the park and other developments result in reconsideration of a higher standard of signalization requirements and an investigation of mid-block crossings as appropriate;
- that bicycling infrastructure aligns with the St. Andrews bike route as identified in the Bicycle Master Plan;
- that the Integrated Transportation Committee supports the development of the laneway along the western property edge in alignment with the City's draft living laneway guidelines;

AND THAT the Integrated Transportation Committee supports the road realignment at East 16th Street.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Councillor Valente and J. Draper arrived at 7:30pm.

It was noted that it would be helpful if future presentations could focus more specifically on transportation related aspects of a development.

4.0 EVs IN THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

Removed from agenda.

5.0 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY

J. Draper presented on TransLink's RTS (Regional Transportation Strategy) 2050. This is "a long-range plan that explains how people will live, work, play, and move around the region today and in the future" (<https://www.translink.ca/Plans-and-Projects/Regional-Transportation-Strategy.aspx>).

Key points included:

- We are hoping to get the committee excited about next month's presentation from TransLink, and to start generating ideas about how best to support the North Shore.
- There are favourable conditions for increased ridership in the City of North Vancouver. Sensitive to the design context in which we are living.
- Similar to the previous 10-year vision, there is going to be a competition. It is important for the City to put together a phenomenal presentation, with lots of stakeholder input and support, regarding what will benefit the region.
- We are generating ideas as municipal staff, but we also really want to encourage our public. Policy ideas can be submitted, governance ideas, funding ideas, etc. What tools and programs should we use? What TDM models should we be leveraging?
- There will be lots of coordination on the North Shore, and Council will need to endorse in the fall, to ultimately take to the Mayors' Council, so we want to do this well.

The committee split into two groups to brainstorm ideas with the large-scale maps provided of Burrard Inlet / Vancouver Harbour.

Ideas shared after the mini workshop included:

- Having some sort of a rapid fixed link in the future, essentially looping around Burrard Inlet, connecting everything on the North Shore with elsewhere.
- The SeaBus is the north-south connection, so more important to focus on east-west connections right now.
- Upgrade the rail bridge.
- Discussed travel up the Sea to Sky corridor, more formal road to rail connections.
- More effective and expanded home zones for car shares.
- Work with tourist destinations to deliver people.
- Encourage more co-working spaces in the City, so people don't have to travel as much.
- Noted that a lot of recreational traffic is not actually coming to the North Shore, so much as it is going through the North Shore.
- Extending service hours of the West Coast Express, maybe run a train from Squamish/Whistler along the BC Rail right-of-way? Possible link to SkyTrain or West Coast Express?
- Possible other SeaBus routes; e.g. something to/from Deep Cove (to Port Moody?), or to/from UBC.
- Points of access to recreation (4-5 main choke points on the North Shore).
- From a policy point of view – congestion charging points across bridges.
- Data collection should be run more centrally, rather than each municipality buying the rights to data.
- Changes to the workday could be considered; more flexible, shorter days, to really spread out people's options.

- Important to be wary of demonizing tourists. As visitor numbers are increasingly pointed to as a cause of congestion, it is important to keep in mind that a lot of the North Shore economy / communities benefit from visitors.

J. Draper asked what trade-offs the committee thinks people might be willing to make to secure transportation funding and investments for the longer term. Ideas included:

- Feel like people are willing to pay a fair bit, if it was some kind of a time-limited development charge, for something that was clearly going to improve the system.
- If we can decrease the time difference between driving and taking transit to a destination, people would be more interested.
- Improved longer-range transit service. People may be willing to put up with slightly less frequency during the day, because that is not what they really need. So reducing local service in favour of longer distances might be a good idea.
- Consider more transit-oriented development. In this jurisdiction, transit consideration often comes after the fact.
- Transit needs to be comfortable; the quality of the ride needs to be generally improved.
- Believe it is a generational thing. Sceptical of the North Shore, because of age and general reluctance to consider the future. We will not get traction until the next generation recognizes it's their turn to invest in the future.
- In areas currently well serviced by transit, you could significantly increase the cost of parking.

Interest was expressed in sharing J. Draper's PowerPoint presentation with the group; she will forward it to T. Huckell or E. Barker to share with the committee.

Jennifer Draper left the meeting at 8:40pm.

6.0 FIELD TRIP

For the benefit of new members, T. Bowden gave a brief review of the concept of the "ITC Field Trip".

ITC has a tradition of doing a field trip every year. The purpose is to get into the community and see some practical implications of our decisions and discussions. Previously the group went to the intersection of Marine and Bewicke, looking at pedestrian infrastructure, stratified buildings with parking, bike storage, different amenities, etc. Have also been to the shipyards in Lonsdale Quay, with a focus on accessibility.

Suggestions can be for anywhere; hopefully local, but most importantly, somewhere where we can see things that we can apply to the North Shore. The

trip usually takes a morning or an afternoon. Please send your thoughts to the Chair in the week couple of weeks; Trevor will send out a reminder.

7.0 COUNCILLOR UPDATE

- 125 East 20th Street was approved by Council (Vancouver Resource Society development). This proposal highlighted how well connected the Lonsdale corridor is.
- Staff responded to the Notice of Motion on bike valets, and have been directed by Council to amend the Shipyards and Foot of Lonsdale Events Policy to require promotion of active transportation modes.
- Council has directed staff to work with TransLink to connect the Phibbs Exchange to the SkyTrain network (INSTPP priority action).
- Amendment to the Street and Traffic Bylaw (snow and ice removal); this one is more about pedestrians, making sure people do a better job of clearing sidewalks.
- Several budget appropriations for active transportation investments.
- Metro Vancouver wants to put a pipeline through Sunrise Park, could present some opportunities to improve some trails through that park.

8.0 ITC – ROSTER OF PROJECTS WORKSHEET

D. Watson updated the group on the project worksheet.

9.0 TRANSPORTATION EVENTS

T. Bowden: There is an Urban Transit conference May 8-9 about building urban transit networks, etc. (<https://www.canadianinstitute.com/2nd-annual-urban-transit-infrastructure-west/>)

B. Hillier: The North Shore Mountain Bike Association has a town hall on May 14. Open to anyone who wants to join, 7-10pm, at the Lynn Valley Centre (community space next to the library). (<https://nsmba.ca/>)

10.0 ROUND TABLE

T. Bowden discussed upcoming agendas and potential items for the remainder of the year. Some items have specific timelines, while others are more flexible. If anyone has suggestions, they can certainly be brought forward. One item of personal interest is a parking study that Metro Van and TransLink sponsored, for parking in buildings. An interesting outcome is the suggestion that we are massively overbuilding parking in buildings, particularly rental buildings (the region, not just CNV). It could be interesting to circulate a link to the study, possibly have someone come and present to the committee.

P. Stafford-Smith mentioned that one way the North Vancouver Chamber could push ideas that are important to us provincially, or nationally, is through policy resolutions. All of the Chambers in BC vote on these. If one passes, it becomes

part of the policy book, and illustrates what business want. For example, this can help to support ways of helping access to bikes (by cost reducing incentives, end of trip use, etc.), connectivity, highways, bridges, and so forth. Less about fitness and health and more about the economics of biking to work, as a real means of commuting. We can show leadership on the North Shore in this area.

11.0 ADJOURNMENT – 9:05 p.m.



Chair Signature



Date