

City of Maple Ridge

***COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA***

***September 19, 2017***

***6:00 p.m.***

***Blaney Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, City Hall***

*The purpose of the Council Workshop is to review and discuss policies and other items of interest to Council. Although resolutions may be passed at this meeting, the intent is to make a consensus decision to send an item to Council for debate and vote or refer the item back to staff for more information or clarification. The meeting is live streamed and recorded by the City of Maple Ridge.*

***REMINDERS***

**September 19, 2017**

Public Hearing  
Council Meeting

7:00 p.m.  
following Public Hearing

1. ***ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA***
2. ***ADOPTION OF MINUTES - N/A***
3. ***PRESENTATIONS AT THE REQUEST OF COUNCIL***
4. ***MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS' REPORTS***
5. ***UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS***
  - 5.1 **Community Charter - Section 57 Notice on Title**

Verbal update by the Manager of Bylaw & Licensing Services
  - 5.2 **Sign Control Bylaw Update**

Verbal update by the Manager of Bylaw & Licensing Services

### 5.3 Rental Housing Program: Secondary Suite Update and Next Steps

Staff report dated September 19, 2017 recommending that the proposed Community Engagement Program be endorsed.

### 5.4 2017 Traffic Calming Update

Staff report dated September 19, 2017 recommending that Policy 9.07 – Traffic Calming Policy be adopted.

### 5.5 Municipal Solid Waste Curbside Collection – Request for Proposal

Presentation by the Municipal Engineer

## 6. ***CORRESPONDENCE***

*The following correspondence has been received and requires a response. Staff is seeking direction from Council on each item. Options that Council may consider include:*

- a) Acknowledge receipt of correspondence and advise that no further action will be taken.*
- b) Direct staff to prepare a report and recommendation regarding the subject matter.*
- c) Forward the correspondence to a regular Council meeting for further discussion.*
- d) Other.*

*Once direction is given the appropriate response will be sent.*

### 6.1 Metro Vancouver – Metro Vancouver 2040: Bylaw No. 1246, 2017

Letter dated August 1, 2017 from Greg Moore, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board providing notification of an amendment to proposed Metro 2040 incorporating Metro 2040 regional land use designation and overlay map revisions for the Township of Langley, City of North Vancouver and City of Surrey and inviting written comments on the proposed amendment.

## 7. ***BRIEFING ON OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST/QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL***

Links to member associations:

- Union of British Columbia Municipalities (“UBCM”) Newsletter *The Compass*
  - <http://www.ubcm.ca/EN/main/resources/past-issues-compass/2016-archive.html>
- Lower Mainland Local Government Association (“LMLGA”)
  - <http://www.lmlga.ca/>
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities (“FCM”)
  - <https://www.fcm.ca/>

8. ***MATTERS DEEMED EXPEDIENT***

9. ***ADJOURNMENT***

Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## City of Maple Ridge

**TO:** Her Worship Mayor Nicole Read and Members of Council      **MEETING DATE:** September 19, 2017  
**FROM:** Chief Administrative Officer      **MEETING:** Council Workshop  
**SUBJECT:** Rental Housing Program: Secondary Suite Update and Next Steps

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Working from an August 29, 2016 Council direction, this report presents the results from a staff review of the City's secondary suites program and possible new opportunities for accommodating suites in Maple Ridge, as a way to expand rental housing options in the City.

The conversation regarding secondary suites is long standing, with the original program having been introduced in 1999 and a follow up review undertaken in 2012/13. Since that time, the development of secondary suites appears wide-spread across the City, with an expected concentration within the Urban Area Boundary. In comparing the City's existing secondary suite program with those found across the Metro region, our requirements were generally found to be consistent. Staff have also identified that the number of secondary suite related complaints received by the Licences, Permits & Bylaws Department has steadily declined since 2014.

From the opportunities presented in August 2016 and the results from the subsequent staff review of the secondary suites program, a number of possible expansion options have been identified, including:

- Permitting Secondary Suites in Duplexes
- Permitting Secondary Suites in Multi-Family Developments
- Permitting Secondary Suites Plus a Detached Garden Suite on the same lot
- Permitting Secondary Suites without requiring Owner Occupancy

Such opportunities to expand the City's secondary suite program are envisioned to be shared with the public in order to gain wide community input before seeking further Council direction regarding any possible bylaw amendments. As well, staff notes that the creation of a rental housing program involves a number of regulatory and policy initiatives that extend beyond changes to the secondary suites program. Council has directed staff to undertake additional assessments, that when brought forward over the remainder of 2017 and in early 2018, could compliment the possible expansion of the secondary suites program.

### RECOMMENDATION:

That the "Proposed Community Engagement Program" section of the report titled "Rental Housing Program: Secondary Suite Update and Next Steps", dated September 19, 2017 be endorsed.

## **BACKGROUND:**

Since 1999, the City has allowed secondary suites as an accessory use in some single-family residential zones, one of the first municipalities to do so in the Lower Mainland. A key original intent of the program was to provide affordable and rental housing options in the City.

In 2012/2013, the City undertook a review of its Secondary Suites program. Through the community dialogue that took place, residents expressed support for secondary suites as a means of providing household mortgage assistance, facilitating aging in place, as well as a measure of affordable rental housing. Key issues identified by the community included, in order of priority, parking spill-over and resulting on-street parking shortages, the process and costs associated with constructing, approving and licencing a secondary suite and owner occupation.

On September 23, 2013, based on the input and discussion stemming from the City review of the secondary suites program, the Council of the day approved a number of regulatory changes, including: establishing BC Building Code equivalencies; maintaining the owner occupation requirement; assessing the use of restrictive covenants to prohibit illegal suites; continuing to prohibit rear basement access; prohibiting Temporary Residential Uses in the R-3 Special Amenity Residential District Zone; and pursuing regulatory compliance for secondary suites.

On May 25, 2015, Council opted to amend the zoning bylaw further to allow secondary suites as a permitted use in the R-1, CD-1-93 and CD-1-99 zones.

On September 14, 2015 Council endorsed the Housing Action Plan (HAP) Implementation Framework. The HAP Implementation Framework builds from the key strategies recommended in the Housing Action Plan and prioritised several actions to facilitate and preserve affordable housing in Maple Ridge. Strategy Four of the HAP is to Create New Rental Housing Opportunities.

On August 29, 2016, Council reviewed a number of possible measures to facilitate the development of greater rental opportunities in the City. Based on the staff report presented, Council directed the review of the below programs, policies and regulations:

1. Review and expand the Secondary Suites Program;
2. Review and expand the Detached Garden Suites Program;
3. Permit duplexes in Single Family zones without rezoning, on minimum, lot sizes of 557 m<sup>2</sup> in the town Centre and 750 m<sup>2</sup> within the Urban Area Boundary; and
4. Develop a policy to support rental units above commercial.

## **DISCUSSION:**

The intent of this report is to respond to Council's request to review and expand its secondary suites program, with the remaining items identified above being addressed through separate reports. Following Council's direction, staff undertook a review of the current secondary suite context in the City and Region.

Locally, there are currently about 400 secondary suites in the City, with another 200 presently in process. In mapping the development of secondary suites, they appear wide spread across the City, with an expected concentration within the Urban Area Boundary.

In terms of how our existing secondary suites program compares to other municipalities across the Metro and Fraser Valley regions, and to potentially identify where the issue of secondary suites has evolved since such units were first approved in Maple Ridge in the late 1990's, staff reviewed our requirements in light of other peer communities, the results of which are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Municipal Comparison of Secondary Suite Regulations**

Municipality	Floor Area Min	Floor Area Max	Permit in Duplex	Permit both Sec Suite and DGS	Permit in Multi-Fam	Require Owner Occupy	Required Parking Spaces
Abbotsford	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	N	1
Burnaby	32 m <sup>2</sup> (344 ft <sup>2</sup> )	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	Y	N	1
Coquitlam	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	N	1
Langley Township	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	Y	1
<b>Maple Ridge</b>	<b>37 m<sup>2</sup> (398 ft<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>90 m<sup>2</sup> (968 ft<sup>2</sup>) or 40% of GFA</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>1</b>
Mission	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	Y	1
New Westminster	32 m <sup>2</sup> (344 ft <sup>2</sup> )	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	N	1
North Vancouver City	37 m <sup>2</sup> (398 ft <sup>2</sup> )	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
North Vancouver District	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	Y	1
Pitt Meadows	33 m <sup>2</sup> (355 ft <sup>2</sup> )	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	Y	1
Port Coquitlam	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	N	1
Port Moody	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	N	1
Richmond	33 m <sup>2</sup> (355 ft <sup>2</sup> )	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	Y (Limited)	N	1
Surrey	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	Y	1
West Vancouver	20 m <sup>2</sup> (215 ft <sup>2</sup> )	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	Y (or a Prop. Manager)	1
White Rock	-	90 m <sup>2</sup> (968 ft <sup>2</sup> ) or 40% of GFA	N	N	N	N	1
Vancouver	37 m <sup>2</sup> (398 ft <sup>2</sup> )	Related to overall building floor area and finished grade	Y	Y	Y	N	1

In addition to the above comparison, and in working with the Licences, Permits & Bylaws Department, staff also assessed the number and type of complaints received by the City as a proxy for how well secondary suites have been integrated into the community. Staff notes that since the last secondary suite update in 2012/13, the number of complaints regarding secondary suites has been steadily decreasing: specifically; 62 complaints were received in 2013, 67 in 2014, 35 in 2015, 32 in 2016 and to-date in 2017, the City has received 17 complaints. It is noted that the highest complaint levels identified coincide with the timing of the last review of the secondary suites program.

Currently, the three areas of most complaints relate to not having the landowner occupy either the principle dwelling or accessory secondary suite (5 complaints), secondary suites existing in a dwelling that does not have the proper zoning (5 complaints), and having more than one secondary suite unit present on a lot (4 complaints). Again, these three areas reflect the same decreasing level of complaints received over the past five years that is observed across all enforcement issues related to the secondary suite program.

From the review, staff is confident that our existing regulatory requirements are generally consistent with those from the communities across the Metro area and that the secondary suites program has been successfully accommodated within the City. That said, from the earlier presented staff report in August 2016 and our current more detailed assessment, staff have observed a few opportunities that could expand our existing program.

#### **a) Secondary Suites in Duplexes**

Since 2013, the City of North Vancouver has permitted one “Accessory Dwelling Unit” per side in a side-by-side duplex, thereby providing a secondary unit to the principal unit on each side. According to the City’s program, this provision requires the construction of a BC Building Code (BCBC) compliant firewall capable of maintaining the code required fire-resistance rating for the code required duration. With such a firewall in place, the resulting configuration would essentially create two separate buildings under the BCBC allowing for the accommodation of an accessory dwelling unit per each individual building.

Staff are recommending that Council consider including the opportunity to provide secondary suites in duplexes as part of an expanded secondary suites program.

#### **b) Secondary Suites in Multi-Family Developments**

The Cities of Burnaby, North Vancouver and Richmond permit the accommodation of secondary suites in multi-family developments. In Burnaby, as part of its UniverCity development, the City allows what it defines as “Multi-Family Flex Units” provided that such units are not less than 24m<sup>2</sup> (258 sq. ft.) and not more than 35 per cent of the gross floor area of the apartment or townhouse dwelling unit in which it is located. Further, such units must contain a separate kitchen area and at least one bathroom as well as a separate entrance door that locks-off the accessory unit from the overall principal unit. Similar provisions exist in Richmond, albeit such a use is only permitted under a limited number of zones. In the City of North Vancouver these lock-off units are required in their ground-oriented townhouse and medium density apartment zones, where more than 10 units are being proposed, at a ratio of 1 per 5 principal dwelling units.

Staff is recommending that Council consider including the opportunity to provide a secondary suite in townhouse and apartment dwellings as part of an expanded secondary suites program.

**c) Secondary Suites Plus a Detached Garden Suite**

Starting in 2017, the City of North Vancouver has started to accommodate both secondary suites and detached garden suites (or coach houses as these units are referred to in the City of North Vancouver) on the same lot. Minimum lot sizes where both accessory dwelling units may be accommodated on the same lot as the principal single-family house start at 362.3 sq. m. (3,900 sq. ft.). Parking requirements for both units combined is 1 stall, plus 1 for the single-family home. Based on initial industry discussions, it has been raised that the combination of both a secondary suite and a DGS on the same lot removes any sense of comparative cost advantage of one form over another. Further, it is suggested that there exist economic synergies when both types of units are permitted on a lot, reducing the period it takes to pay back the financial outlay required to develop a secondary suite and a DGS, offering a potential incentive to landowners to invest in creating more rental units in the City.

Staff is recommending that Council consider including the opportunity to accommodate both a secondary suite and a detached garden suite on the same single-family residentially zoned lot as part of an expanded secondary suites program.

**d) Requirement for Owner Occupancy**

The concept of requiring the home to be “owner-occupied” has long been discussed in Maple Ridge. During the past 2012/2013 review of our secondary suites program, a questionnaire specifically asked residents whether or not they supported the owner occupancy requirement. From the 65 responses, 45 or 69% indicated positively that they support owner occupancy. Reasons for indicating support for owner occupancy included: adding a measure of control over the tenant and landlord to ensure accountability and responsibility of both parties; ensuring proper maintenance of the property and the neighbourhood character; and preventing illegal activity on the property on which the suite is located. Those respondents not supporting the requirement emphasised the benefits of secondary suites to provide affordable housing, increase rental options, and provide mortgage assistance, suggesting that the type of tenancy/residency should not determine the housing choice made available.

Seemingly at odds with the above findings, however, are the results from the question that asked residents to identify the main outstanding issues relating to the secondary suites that need resolution. Overwhelmingly, from the 50 responses to this question, the key issue was parking (34 out of the 50 responses), followed by issues with the overall process of establishing a suite (especially the costs) being identified by 10 respondents. The issue of Owner Occupancy was identified by 4 responses.

Based on the outcomes for the questionnaire and discussions tied to the overall review process, the Council of the day opted in 2013 to maintain the requirement of owner occupancy. It was felt that on compassionate grounds, however, such a requirement could be made more flexible to include immediate family.

As part of the current review, the assessment of our neighbouring communities indicated that 7 municipalities of those reviewed across the Metro and Fraser Valley regions are requiring owner occupancy, with the majority having no such requirement or, in the case of West Vancouver, a more flexible requirement that also entertains the use of a property manager and the sharing of contact information with the City. From examining the number of complaints received to-date that specifically relate to non-owner occupied secondary suites, staff further observed that the number of complaints is decreasing. This occurrence might infer that such units are becoming more common place in our community and possibly that there is a growing acceptance of secondary suites as part of our built form.



Acknowledging these findings, and in light of the current intent of re-examining the City's secondary suites program towards creating greater rental opportunities in the City, staff are recommending that the owner occupancy requirement be lifted as part of an expanded secondary suites program. Of the above opportunities, it is raised that the removal of the owner occupancy requirement could present a relatively straight forward amendment requiring minimal resources to implement.

#### **PROPOSED COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM:**

The opportunities initially outlined in the earlier August 2016 staff report along with the above analysis point to a number of potential options for Council's consideration that could expand the City's current secondary suite program. Acknowledging that much discussion has already taken place with the community regarding secondary suites during the 2013 review, staff does appreciate that in presenting a wider array of housing options, despite the decreasing number of community complaints received regarding secondary suites, such opportunities may be perceived by some residents as potential challenges to neighbourhood character. It is therefore proposed that the proposed expansion opportunities be brought forward to local residents and stakeholders over the course of October and November 2017 to assess current interests and perspectives.

Such a conversation is timely as there is an opportunity to coincide the engagement process along with a parallel outreach to discuss opportunities to expand the City's Detached Garden Suite Program. The extent of the Council directed Detached Garden Suite review will be detailed further in a subsequent report anticipated to come before Council in October, but it is noted now that some of the proposed measures from that review will overlap with the secondary suite expansion options presented in this report. Combined, the two expansion proposals will give the community a complete picture of the possible opportunities available to create more housing choice and greater rental accommodations.

Specific to the possible expansion options for the secondary suites program, the pending community engagement program is outlined generally below:

- Stakeholder workshops – to further explore in small group sessions the regulatory, process and construction implications that may stem from the proposed new secondary suite opportunities. Such stakeholder sessions may include discussions with our Builder's Forum, the Development Liaison Group as well as local real estate professionals.
- Community open house – to present the proposed secondary suites expansion options for the community to review and identify community interests and comments.
- Survey and social media input – to provide online and in-person surveys along with social media opportunities will be made available to augment the input received.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

Staff note that through the coming Fall 2017 and into early 2018, staff will be bringing forward additional reports on possible other regulatory and policy changes to further enhance rental opportunities in the City, including the aforementioned proposed options to expand the City's Detached Garden Suite Program.

In terms of Secondary Suites, the outcomes from the proposed community engagement program will be reported back to Council and, subject to further Council direction, could lead to bylaw amendments to facilitate the proposed expanded secondary suite opportunities.

## ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The above proposed areas of expansion for the City's secondary suite program have the potential to increase housing choice and the rental housing stock in Maple Ridge. As the topic of secondary suites has been much discussed and noting the decreasing levels of complaints received since the last update to the program, staff also present a set of alternative recommendations, one for each of the above discussed options. If instructed to do so, staff can bring forward in short order amending bylaw(s) for any or all of the below:

1. That an amending bylaw be prepared to expand the secondary suite program by including the option to permit secondary suites without requiring owner occupancy; *and/or*
2. That an amending bylaw be prepared to expand the secondary suite program by including the option to permit secondary suites in duplex developments; *and/or*
3. That an amending bylaw be prepared to expand the secondary suite program by including the option to permit secondary suites in multi-family developments; *and/or*
4. That an amending bylaw be prepared to expand the secondary suite program by including the option to permit secondary suites on the same lot as a detached garden suite.

## CONCLUSION:

Expanding the current secondary suite program to include a range of innovative options along with reduction in the requirement for owner occupancy could create new opportunities for both homeowners and renters in Maple Ridge. Homeowners are presented with increased flexibility in creating a mortgage helper as per the proposed secondary suites program expansion, while renters can take advantage of more and different kinds of rental options to choose from. Further, such possible expansion steps would position the City of Maple Ridge as one of the more innovative communities across the Metro region in the accommodation of secondary suites.

"Original signed by Brent Elliott"

---

**Prepared by:** Brent Elliott, MCIP, RPP,  
Manager of Community Planning

"Original signed by Christine Carter"

---

**Approved by:** Christine Carter, MPL, MCIP, RPP  
Director of Planning

"Original signed by Frank Quinn"

---

**Approved by:** Frank Quinn, MBA, P. Eng.  
General Manager, Public Works and  
Development Services

"Original signed by Paul Gill"

---

**Approved by:** Paul Gill, CPA, CGA  
Chief Administrative Officer

<b>TO:</b>	Her Worship Mayor Nicole Read and Members of Council	<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	September 19, 2017
<b>FROM:</b>	Chief Administrative Officer	<b>FILE NO:</b>	11-5460-06-20
		<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	2017 Traffic Calming Update		

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

“Policy 9.07 – Neighbourhood Traffic Management” was created in 2004 to guide requests from residents for the management of concerns related to traffic concerns in residential neighbourhoods. The “Neighbourhood Traffic Management Practices” document was superseded by the development of a new Traffic Calming Policy (TCP) in 2012 that was created in response to concerns of residents regarding traffic in and through neighbourhoods. The ongoing growth of the community and resultant increase traffic volumes often generates concerns from residents, especially in established neighbourhoods. The TCP, when brought forward in 2012 was intended to remain in draft status until a number of projects were implemented using the proposed process. The evaluation process outlined in the TCP has proven sound, although the timelines can be a challenge depending upon the complexity of the sites – it is relatively simple to deal with a street that is a block or two in length but there have been a number of projects where it is necessary to consider an extended corridor, such as River Road from 207 Street to Carhill Street, where the physical form of the roadway itself can vary markedly along the corridor.

In an effort to streamline the process and move the traffic calming requests through in a faster manner, rather than the first step being the data collection, the process was amended in 2016 so that when a request is first received, the City now sends out letters to the neighbourhood asking them to confirm their support for consideration of traffic calming in their neighbourhood. If a majority does not support traffic calming then the process is terminated with notification to the neighbourhood, but if they respond in the affirmative then the traffic calming process is initiated, commencing with the collection of speed and volume traffic data.

Following the recent amendment to the TCP it is proposed that the existing “Policy 9.07 – Neighbourhood traffic Management” be renamed “Policy 9.07 – Traffic Calming Policy” and be formally endorsed by Council.

There are currently 63 active traffic calming requests throughout the City, of which 20 are in progress, the majority of which are located in established areas of the City. The time required to work through the process can be frustrating for the residents but there are limited resources to collect the data, undertake the analysis and then work with the residents.

Of the 63 active locations, there are some significant locations and corridors in progress including:

- River Road (207 Street to Carhill Street)
- 132 Avenue (216 Street to 232 Street)
- 123 Avenue (203 Street to Laity Street, and Laity Street to 216 Street)

On River Road the challenge has been to incorporate the proposed works without impacting adjacent properties and impeding driveway accesses. The concept has now been modified to incorporate the traffic calming facilities without impacting properties and a RFP is ready to be issued for the detailed design. There is funding in place to construct the requisite works.

132 Avenue has had interim solutions installed but the ultimate configuration will entail significant road upgrading. The conceptual design, which includes drainage modifications will be undertaken in 2018.

123 Avenue is proceeding as two separate projects;

- From Laity Street to 216 Street it is proposed that the road be reconstructed to provide curbs and sidewalks as well as limited on-street parking. The detailed design is scheduled for 2018. There are interim measures in place, including a traffic button that has been installed over the summer.
- On the section of 123 Avenue from 203 Street to Laity Street the original exercise with the Neighbourhood Transportation Advisory Committee included a series of traffic calming measures that were incorporated into an overall concept for the corridor that would assist in moderating traffic speeds. Through that process the concept of constructing uni-directional protected bicycles lanes was identified and Council endorsed the consideration of such a facility at the July 25, 2016 Council Workshop. It was acknowledged that the protected bicycle lane concept would eliminate on-street parking on 123 Avenue. The protected bicycle lane concept was presented at an Open House on August 01, 2017 and the loss of parking was the over-riding concern of the neighbourhood as evidenced in the feedback. Concern was expressed that the traffic calming objective was over-ridden by the provision of the cycling facilities but the protected bicycle lane concept would include appropriate traffic calming measures to ensure that the vehicle speed issue would be addressed. At the meeting and in subsequent correspondence the possibility of a hybrid asphalt Multi-Use Path behind the existing sidewalks on 123 Avenue was raised and it is believed that this is an option worth considering. Such an option could provide the balance between the accommodation of bicycles while preserving on-street parking. If this concept is found to be viable then additional public consultation will be undertaken with the 123 Avenue residents. If supported, the MUP would proceed in conjunction with the originally identified traffic calming works.

Cities and regions are seeking to encourage a shift in transportation use to a more multi-modal network that incorporates pedestrians, cyclists and automobiles. As bicycle facility design evolves and with the emergence of Triple A (All Ages and Abilities) bicycling facilities as the desired standard there can be significant challenges in balancing the provision of the bicycle facility and the impact upon on-street parking as is the case on 123 Avenue. The development of a similar concept on 227 Street from Dewdney Trunk Road to Abernethy Way has been received quite positively by the neighbourhood, although in this instance parking has been largely retained on one side of the roadway rather than fully eliminated.

The purpose of this report is twofold: to seek Council's endorsement of the revised and renamed "Policy 9.07 - Traffic Calming Policy" as well as to update Council on selected traffic calming projects underway.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**That Policy 9.07 – Neighbourhood Traffic Management be revised and renamed as Policy 9.07 - Traffic Calming Policy; and further**

**That Policy 9.07- Traffic Calming Policy be adopted.**

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **a) Background Context:**

#### **Draft Traffic Calming Policy**

“Policy 9.07 – Neighbourhood Traffic Management” was created in 2004 to guide requests from residents for the management of concerns related to traffic concerns in residential neighbourhoods. The “Neighbourhood Traffic Management Practices” document was superseded by the development of a new Traffic Calming Policy (TCP) in 2012 that was created in response to concerns of residents regarding traffic in and through neighbourhoods.

The ongoing growth of the community and resultant increase traffic volumes often generates concerns from residents, especially in established neighbourhoods. The TCP, when brought forward in 2012 was intended to remain in draft status until a number of projects were implemented using the proposed process. The evaluation process outlined in the TCP has proven sound, although the timelines can be a challenge depending upon the complexity of the sites – it is relatively simple to deal with a street that is a block or two in length but there have been a number of projects where it is necessary to consider an extended corridor, such as River Road from 207 Street to Carhill Street, where the physical form of the roadway itself can vary markedly along the corridor.

In an effort to streamline the process and move the traffic calming requests through in a faster manner, rather than the first step being the data collection, the process was amended in 2016 so that when a request is first received, the City now sends out letters to the neighbourhood asking them to confirm their support for consideration of traffic calming in their neighbourhood. If a majority does not support traffic calming then the process is terminated with notification to the neighbourhood, but if they respond in the affirmative then the process proceeds, starting off with the collection of speed and volume traffic data.

Following the recent amendment to the TCP it is proposed that the existing “Policy 9.07 – Neighbourhood traffic Management” be renamed “Policy 9.07 – Traffic Calming Policy” and be formally endorsed by Council.

#### **Traffic Calming Project Overview**

There are a large number of requests – over 63 - that are at various stages of the traffic calming process. The recent amendment to the Policy allows the City to ascertain the level of community support without significant delays and allows staff to reduce the backlog and move forward on pending projects.

#### **Select Projects**

There are number of large scale projects that dominate the traffic calming program that are all at different stages in the process and a number are highlighted for information:

##### River Road (207 Street to Laity Street)

River Road is a major collector roadway and a concept was developed and supported by the community that included the construction of a series of traffic circles along the corridor. Considerable time and effort has been expended by staff trying to resolve driveway access concerns as well as fitting the circles in the existing road allowance. The traffic circle layouts have been amended to accommodate them within the existing road allowance and to maintain existing driveway accesses and an RFP is being prepared for issuance for the detailed design with construction to follow utilizing funding already in the Financial Plan.

#### 132 Avenue (216 Street to 232 Street)

132 Avenue is an arterial roadway and therefore this project was more about management of traffic along the corridor. An interim solution was developed and constructed that entailed the construction of a post and rail fence as well as a multi-use pathway. The development of a concept for an ultimate solution entailing re-alignment of the roadway as well as physical deflections has been developed and will be undertaken in 2018 but the costs are expected to be significant, including land acquisition and drainage improvements.

#### 123 Avenue (203 Street to Laity Street)

On the section of 123 Avenue from 203 Street to Laity Street the original exercise with the Neighbourhood Transportation Advisory Committee included a series of traffic calming measures that were incorporated into an overall concept for the corridor that would assist in moderating traffic speeds. Through that process the concept of constructing uni-directional protected bicycles lanes was identified and Council endorsed the consideration of such a facility at the July 25, 2016 Council Workshop and it was acknowledged that the protected bicycle lane concept would eliminate on-street parking on 123 Avenue. The protected bicycle lane concept was presented at an Open House on August 01, 2017 and the loss of parking was the over-riding concern of the neighbourhood as evidenced in the feedback. Concern was expressed that the traffic calming objective was over-ridden by the provision of the cycling facilities but the protected bicycle lane concept would include appropriate traffic calming measures to ensure that the vehicle speed issue would be addressed.

Cities and regions are seeking to encourage a shift in transportation use to a more multi-modal network that incorporates pedestrians, cyclists and automobiles. As bicycle facility design evolves and with the emergence of Triple A (All Ages and Abilities) bicycling facilities as the desired standard there can be significant challenges in balancing the provision of the bicycle facility and the impact upon on-street parking as is the case on 123 Avenue. The development of a similar concept on 227 Street from Dewdney Trunk Road to Abernethy Way has been received quite positively by the neighbourhood, although in this instance parking has been retained on one side of the roadway rather than fully eliminated.

At the 123 Avenue meeting and in subsequent correspondence the possibility of a hybrid asphalt Multi-Use Path (MUP) behind the existing sidewalks on 123 Avenue was raised and it is believed that this is an option worth evaluating. Such an option could provide the balance between the accommodation of bicycles while preserving on-street parking. If this concept is found to be viable then additional public consultation will be undertaken with the 123 Avenue residents. If approved, the MUP would proceed in conjunction with the originally identified traffic calming works.

#### 123 Avenue (Laity Street to 216 Street)

This section of 123 Avenue is both a bus route and a bicycle route but currently has no sidewalks or drainage and the road allowance is quite narrow. It is proposed that the road be reconstructed to provide curbs and sidewalks as well as limited on-street parking (design is scheduled for 2018). There are interim measures in place, including a traffic button that has been installed over the summer. The bicycle route will be re-routed to 124 Avenue.

#### **b) Desired Outcome:**

The goal of the Traffic Calming Policy is to develop safe neighbourhood roadway environments that contribute to community liveability and quality of life for residents.

**c) Citizen/Customer Implications:**

Residents may raise concerns around excessive speeding or traffic volumes in their neighbourhoods that can impact livability, and rightly so. The goal is to provide a framework for residents to voice their concerns, confirm if there is a problem and assist in the development of a solution that addresses the root cause and is supported by the neighbourhood.

**d) Interdepartmental Implications:**

The Engineering and Operations Departments work collaboratively on developing and implementing traffic calming solutions and both design and construction of the works may be undertaken in-house, depending upon the scale of the project.

**e) Business Plan/Financial Implications:**

Certain projects, such as River Road and 123 Avenue are included in the current Financial Plan. As new projects are identified a project scope and costing will be developed for consideration in upcoming budget deliberations.

**f) Policy Implications:**

The Traffic Calming Policy developed in 2012 will replace the original 2004 document. Since its development it has remained as a draft to establish its effectiveness, and with a recent minor amendment on process it is recommended that "Policy 9.07 – Traffic Calming Policy" be renamed and endorsed.

**g) Alternatives:**

The current draft Traffic Calming Policy is a comprehensive document that lays out a clear defined process for addressing neighbourhood traffic calming concerns and it is the basis for guiding all traffic calming requests. The policy could remain as a draft but there is little benefit seen in doing so.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

The Traffic Calming Policy sets out a clear process to deal with resident concerns around traffic and seeks to identify and remedy the root cause with measures that are appropriate for that street given its classification and place in the overall road transportation network.

"Original signed by David Pollock"

Prepared by: **David Pollock, PEng.**  
**Municipal Engineer**

"Original signed by Frank Quinn"

Approved by: **Frank Quinn, MBA, PEng.**  
**General Manager: Public Works & Development Services**

"Original signed by Paul Gill"

Concurrence: **Paul Gill, CPA, CGA**  
**Chief Administrative Officer**

DP:dp

Att: Traffic Calming Policy No. 9.07

# POLICY MANUAL

<b>Title:</b> <b>Traffic Calming</b>	<b>Policy No :</b> 9.07  <b>Supersedes:</b> 9.07 (2004)
<b>Authority:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Legislative</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Operational</b>  <b>Approval:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Council</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>CMT</b>  <span style="margin-left: 200px;"><input type="checkbox"/> <b>General Manager</b></span>	<b>Effective Date:</b>  <hr/> <b>Review Date:</b> September 2019
<p><b>Policy Statement:</b></p> <p>The Traffic Calming policy provides a framework to enable the City and affected residents to identify neighbourhood transportation issues, determine if traffic calming is a suitable solution, and design and implement traffic calming plans where appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>Roads serve many functions in the life of a community. They ensure access to homes and businesses, provide mobility for residents and visitors to get from point A to point B, and can enhance or compromise the livability of neighbourhoods. Residents and business owners in the City of Maple Ridge want safe roadways that contribute positively to community livability and quality of life.</p> <p>However, in some cases neighbourhood transportation issues can cause concerns among community members. In some cases, City staff may identify locations where the road network may not be fulfilling its intended role, while other times residents and businesses may express transportation concerns to the City. If the root causes of the concerns are identified to be problems with speeding or excessive traffic volumes, traffic calming may be applied to address these concerns.</p> <p>Traffic calming plans are suitable for local and minor collector road classifications. Major collectors or arterial roadways may consider certain traffic calming elements as part of a larger corridor management strategy.</p> <p>Traffic calming processes are often more complex than they initially appear. Traffic calming measures, such as diverters, speed humps, and traffic circles can have unintended effects on travel patterns. As such, it is essential that the true issues and potential impacts are fully understood before traffic calming is implemented. Because of this, the City has developed this Traffic Calming Policy. This Traffic Calming Policy will enable City staff, residents, and business owners to identify neighbourhood transportation issues, determine if traffic calming is an appropriate solution, and design and implement Traffic Calming Plans where appropriate.</p>	



Attached to this policy is the detailed process document prepared by Urban Systems Ltd (USL) to provide guidance when considering traffic calming projects and the various steps required, from the original request through to approval and construction.

The policy outlines a four step process to determine if a Traffic Calming Plan is needed and, if so, to develop and implement that plan. The four steps are Pre-Assessment, Assessment, Plan Development, and Implementation / Re-assessment.

### **PRE-ASSESSMENT**

When a resident(s) on a neighbourhood street submits a concern regarding traffic behaviours on a neighbourhood street the first step is to determine if a majority of residents support the consideration of traffic calming. A letter will be sent to each property owner and resident asking that they indicate their support (or not) for evaluating traffic calming. For small area traffic calming plans a 75% support threshold has been established while on a larger area, 67 % is the requisite level of support.

**\*\*Note:** The Traffic Calming Policy process document attached notes that the determination of public support would proceed in the Assessment phase, after data collection (Section 4.2 of the USL report). Staff have found this to cause delays due to limited resources in collecting and analysing data as there were a number of sites where the majority of residents did not support pursuing traffic calming when presented with the data. Council supported a revision to the process where the survey letter is issued first, then where there is support, the data collection takes place.

### **ASSESSMENT**

If the requisite level of support is achieved, the City will then install traffic counters for one week to measure traffic speeds and volumes.

If the recorded traffic volumes or speeds do not exceed the specified thresholds, then the traffic calming process will cease for this particular area and not be considered for a period of two years.

If there is a large number of sites requesting traffic calming, it may be necessary to prioritize certain locations over others.

### **DEVELOPMENT**

Upon determination that traffic calming is warranted a Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Committee, comprised of local residents will be established and a plan will be developed. There will be public consultation with the neighbourhood for comments, and if necessary the plan may be revised.

The neighbourhood will be then surveyed again to determine support for the proposed plan and if majority support is secured then the plan will be finalized.

Small traffic calming projects may be able to proceed without Council approval if funds are available but larger projects may require the securing of additional funds, either as a one-time request or as part of the Financial Plan deliberations.

## IMPLEMENTATION

Upon securing funding, the traffic calming installation may include a phased approach to test the effectiveness of the proposed measures before proceeding with the permanent installation.

### Definitions:

**Traffic Calming:** The use of physical design and other measures to improve safety for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. It aims to encourage safer, more responsible driving and potentially reduce traffic speed and flow.

**85<sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed:** The speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point.

Key Areas of Responsibility	Responsibility
Submit a request for consideration of traffic calming on a neighbourhood street.	Resident(s)
Issue Survey to defined area to determine support	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section
Undertake traffic data collection and evaluation	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section
Seek nominations for participation on Neighbourhood Transportation Advisory Committee (NTAC)	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section
Lead traffic calming review process and development of options in conjunction with the NTAC. May retain engineering consultant if required.	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section, in conjunction with the NTAC
Liaise with local neighbourhood on design options and implications.	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section
Seek funding as required	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section
Implement traffic calming design	Eng. Dept – Traffic Section

AUG 01 2017

File: CR-12-01  
Ref: RD 2017 Jun 23

Mayor Nicole Read and Council  
City of Maple Ridge  
11995 Haney Place  
Maple Ridge, BC V2X 6A9

Dear Mayor Nicole Read and Council:

**Re: Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future Amendment to Reflect Accepted Regional Context Statements – Bylaw 1246, 2017**

This letter provides notification to affected local governments and other agencies, in accordance with Section 437 of the *Local Government Act*, and Section 6.4.2 of *Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future (Metro 2040)*, the regional growth strategy.

At its June 23, 2017 regular meeting, the Board of Directors of the Metro Vancouver Regional District (Metro Vancouver) adopted the following resolution:

*That the MVRD Board:*

- a) Initiate the Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future amendment process for a Type 3 Minor Amendment to the regional growth strategy to incorporate land use designation changes and the addition of Frequent Transit Development Areas stemming from accepted Regional Context Statements; and*
- b) Give first and second readings to Metro Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1246, 2017; and*
- c) Direct staff to notify affected local governments and appropriate agencies as per Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future Section 6.4.2.*

*Metro 2040* Section 6.2.6 allows the MVRD Board to accept Regional Context Statements (RCS) that include revisions to *Metro 2040* that the MVRD Board deems to be 'generally consistent' with *Metro 2040*. *Metro 2040* Section 6.3.4 i) provides that these revisions can be incorporated into the regional growth strategy through a Type 3 amendment. Adoption of a Type 3 amendment requires adoption of an amendment bylaw by an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote of the Board, and does not require a regional Public Hearing.

The proposed *Metro 2040* amendment would incorporate *Metro 2040* regional land use designation and overlay map revisions contained within the MVRD Board accepted Regional Context Statements for the Township of Langley, City of North Vancouver and City of Surrey. The amendment would revise *Metro 2040* Maps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12.

**6.1**

Please note that a complete Metro Vancouver staff analysis for all of the map revisions was considered and accepted by the MVRD Board as part of the respective Regional Context Statement acceptance processes. A summary of the land use designation changes is as follows:

*The Township of Langley RCS includes 21 amendments to the Metro 2040 Land Use Designation Map. Eighteen of the amendments involve a variety of land use designation changes that were considered minor and considered by the MVRD Board to be generally consistent with Metro 2040. Three of the amendments involve changes from the Agricultural designation to General Urban regional land use designation, which were accepted in the RCS following the October 21, 2016 settlement agreement between the Township of Langley Council and the MVRD Board. The Township's RCS also includes the addition of one Frequent Transit Development area.*

*The City of Surrey RCS includes minor regional land use designation amendments from Rural to Mixed Employment that were accepted by the MVRD Board as generally consistent with Metro 2040.*

*The City of North Vancouver RCS includes a minor regional land use designation amendment from Industrial to Conservation and Recreation to correct a mapping error. This change was accepted by the MVRD Board as consistent with Metro 2040.*

Metro 2040 Section 6.4.2 'Notification and Request for Comments', states that for all proposed amendments to the regional growth strategy, the MVRD Board will provide written notice of the proposed amendment to all affected local governments; provide a minimum of 30 days for affected local governments, and the appropriate agencies, to respond to the proposed amendment; and post notification of the proposed amendment on the Metro Vancouver website, for a minimum of 30 days.

You are invited to provide written comments on the proposed amendment to *Metro 2040*. Please provide comments in the form of a Council or Board resolution, as applicable, and submit to [Chris.Plagnol@metrovancover.org](mailto:Chris.Plagnol@metrovancover.org) by September 29, 2017.

If you have any questions with respect to the proposed amendment please contact Terry Hoff, Acting Division Manager of Growth Management, by email at [Terry.Hoff@metrovancover.org](mailto:Terry.Hoff@metrovancover.org) or by phone at 604-436-6703.

Yours truly,



Greg Moore  
Chair, Metro Vancouver Board

GM/HM/th

cc: Christine Carter, Director of Planning, City of Maple Ridge

22097343