

File No. 04-1000-20-2014-056

May 13, 2014

s.22(1)

Dear s.22(1):

**Re: Request for Access to Records under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the "Act")**

I am responding to your request received on February 1, 2014 for:

**Letters from the public, excluding emails, received by the Streets and Transportation Dept., City of Vancouver, that make mention of the Point Grey bike lane or bike path, from May 1, 2013 to October 31, 2013.**

All responsive records are attached. Some information in the records has been severed, (blacked out), under s.22(1) of the Act. You can read or download this section here:

[http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws\\_new/document/ID/freeside/96165\\_00](http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/96165_00)

Under section 52 of the Act you may ask the Information & Privacy Commissioner to review any matter related to the City's response to your request. The Act allows you 30 business days from the date you receive this notice to request a review by writing to:

Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner,  
P.O. Box 9038, Stn. Prov. Govt.  
Victoria, B.C. V8W 9A4  
Tel. 250-387-5629; Fax 250-387-1696

If you request a review, please provide the Commissioner's office with:

- 1) the request number assigned to your request (#04-1000-20-2014-056);
- 2) a copy of this letter;
- 3) a copy of your original request for information sent to the City of Vancouver; and
- 4) detailed reasons or grounds on which you are seeking the review.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Freedom of Information Office at [foi@vancouver.ca](mailto:foi@vancouver.ca) if you have any questions.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Van Fraassen', written in a cursive style.

Barbara J. Van Fraassen, BA  
Director, Access to Information  
*City Clerk's Department, City of Vancouver*  
Email: [Barbara.vanfraassen@vancouver.ca](mailto:Barbara.vanfraassen@vancouver.ca)  
Telephone: 604.873.7999

Encl.

:kt

s.22 (1)

July 5, 2013

Via Email [gregor.robertson@vancouver.ca](mailto:gregor.robertson@vancouver.ca)  
[mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca)

Mayor and City Council  
Vancouver City Hall  
453 West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

**Re: Point Grey Road Bike Access and Greenway**

I am a resident of Point Grey Road s.22 (1)

I am writing to set out certain facts and to express views with respect to the options the City is considering for that stretch of road. The options are identified in the Phase 2 Consultation Documents as Point Grey Road – Alma to Macdonald, Option 2a and Option 2b.

**I strongly support Option 2a and oppose Option 2b.**

**General Comments**

The objectives of the Greenway are laudable, particularly with respect to the more peaceful integration of pedestrian, bike and vehicular traffic. The slowing of the speed of vehicular traffic and the minimizing of that traffic on Point Grey Road should be prime objectives. In that regard, it was pointed out by City staff, at an open house that I attended in May, 2013 that, in a study conducted by staff, 37% of the vehicles travelling on Point Grey Road had licence plates reflecting registration of the vehicles to owners living outside of Vancouver. It is a fair conclusion that this 37% of the vehicles on Point Grey Road are people travelling to and from the University of British Columbia, a single

destination. My further observation, in living on Point Grey Road, and in attempting to get in and out of my driveway, is that most of the vehicles contain only one occupant and most of them drive in excess of the speed limit.

A prime objective of the Greenway project should be to force those single destination UBC commuters on to mass transit or, to the extent they persist in using single vehicle transportation, force them to travel on established arterial routes such as Fourth Avenue, Broadway, 12<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, all of which flow directly into UBC.

## **Option 2a**

### **I support Option 2a.**

This option involves the closure of Point Grey Road at specific points permitting access to local vehicular traffic as well as bicycle and pedestrian through traffic, with the western portion of Point Grey Road turned into a one way street travelling east.

This presents the only realistic and viable option to satisfy the objectives of the Greenway Project for the following reasons:

- it permits the integration of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic at speeds and with diminished vehicle frequency that makes the roadway safe and usable for all people who reside in the neighborhood and who are properly utilizing Point Grey Road for access to waterfront, parks and the Jericho/Spanish Bank beaches.
- it will afford cyclists and pedestrians easy access to the waterfront through already established parks along Point Grey Road, and it will increase green space through the enlargement of parks that will run across Point Grey Road and down to the waterfront.
- importantly, it will maintain parking for vehicles on the south side of Point Grey Road and will result in far less loss of street parking than Option 2b. This street parking is critical, particularly to southside residents. If it is too severely diminished (as would be under Option 2b), it will result in increased street parking on streets off of Point Grey Road including West First, Second and Third, which are already heavily congested with street parking.

- it will funnel UBC traffic through major arterial routes which are equipped to handle the volume of traffic. In that regard all of West Fourth, Broadway, 12th and 16th have capacity, particularly west of Macdonald.

There are, on Fourth Avenue, traffic lights at Blenheim and a few other of the cross streets. These traffic lights are currently activated by pedestrian buttons. It will be necessary to create at least one intersection with a traffic light activated by vehicle traffic to allow local drivers north of Fourth to exit that area onto Fourth Avenue.

**I fully support Option 2a.**

### **Option 2b**

**I do not support Option 2b.**

This option involves creating a one way motor vehicle traffic lane on the north side of Point Grey Road travelling west and a separated bike lane on the south side of Point Grey Road. It also restricts parking to the north side of Point Grey Road.

The disadvantages of this option include the following:

- it will not substantially reduce vehicle volumes or speeds on Point Grey Road. Cars will funnel off of Cornwall at Macdonald and continue at speed. Further, it will contribute to the continued use of this road as a throughway by nonresident commuters to UBC.
- this option will severely limit the parking on Point Grey Road and will result in the loss of almost three times as many parking spaces along Point Grey Road. Whereas Option 2a results in the loss of 59 parking spaces (from the current 189 spaces), Option 2b results in the loss of 135 parking spaces.
- the only parking permitted, under this option, will be on the north side of Point Grey Road. Many of the cars parked on Point Grey Road belong to residents on the south side of Point Grey Road. The consequence of limiting parking to the north side will be that the south side residents will have to exit their cars, cross a moving lane of traffic, negotiate a barrier between the traffic lane and the bike lane, and cross the two-way bike lane before they access their residences.

- the separation of bike and car lanes will result in more limited access by cyclists to waterfront parks along Point Grey Road.
- this option will result in increased street parking and congestion in the four blocks between West Fourth and Point Grey Road which as stated above are already congested.
- cyclists will be required to cross major intersections at Macdonald and again at Alma Street. This will result in greater congestion at these intersections and will create a more dangerous environment for cyclists.

### **Modified Option 2b**

I reiterate that I support Option 2a and oppose Option 2b. However, if there is any consideration being given to Option 2b, it should be modified to have the one way vehicular lane on the south side (rather than the north side) of Point Grey Road, travelling east with parking maintained on the south side, and the dedicated bicycle lane on the north side of Point Grey Road. The advantages of this over the existing proposed Option 2b include the following:

- it will permit retention of a greater number of parking spaces (closer to the number envisioned in Option 2a, i.e., only approximately 60 lost versus 135 lost, from the current 189).
- Option 2a already contemplates that approximately one half of Point Grey Road, being the western end of Point Grey Road, be changed to a one-way eastbound vehicular street. A modified Option 2b would simply be a continuation of that one way street.
- by having the bike lane on the north side of Point Grey Road, cyclists could continue from Macdonald through to Alma without having to cross the road at those intersections.
- it would permit cyclists convenient access to waterfront parks.

## **General Conclusions**

The efforts by the City to further integrate the bicycle and pedestrian traffic, particularly along this corridor are laudable. Having lived on this street for many years, I can attest to the volume of bicycle and pedestrian traffic. In that regard, the street is as much a recreational facility as it is a vehicle through way.

**The adoption of Option 2a, i.e., the closing of portions of Point Grey Road resulting in greatly reduced vehicle volume and speeds, and resulting in the safe integration of bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle traffic, together with increased green space and access to waterfront, is clearly the best option, and I support it.**

Yours truly,

s.22 (1)



s.22 (1)

July 1, 2013

Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver

Re: Point Grey - Cornwall Bikeway Project

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am taking time away from my celebration of Canada Day to ask this question.

**Are you really spending our money in the best place possible to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety in the city?**

I do not believe that the safety concerns expressed by the Engineering Department, with the exception of the Cornwall and Burrard intersection, requires the investment proposed by the City. Indeed your 2012 Pedestrian Safety Study indicated that there have been no pedestrian collisions on Point Grey Road between MacDonald and Alma, an area where significant public investment is being proposed. I believe, and I am sure ICBC stats will suggest that there are other areas in the city where pedestrian, cyclist and motorist safety requires greater attention and investment. I believe we should be spending our limited resources in those areas where the greatest safety improvements can be achieved. While these improvements may not have the media appeal of a larger project I believe that really improving public safety should be your primary concern as elected officials.

I attended several public meetings that were held by the City and one organized by residents. Based on conversations with my neighbours and friends who live in Kits, I do not believe that the City effectively reached out and included them in the discussion about the changes proposed to their lives and in their neighbourhood that will result from the implementation of this project.

While I support the creation of a bicycle network in the city, indeed our household's primary modes of transportation for the past three years have been walking, cycling and transit, I do not support this project. I strongly urge you to take a step back and refocus the project to the areas that require safety improvements as indicated by your own research - the Burrard Cornwall intersection and Cornwall Street, and use the money you will save to improve safety throughout the city.

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)



s.22 (1)



Mayor Robertson and Council  
City Hall  
453 West 12<sup>th</sup>  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor Robertson and Council;

I am writing you this letter in strong opposition to the proposed bike lane changes for the 2 blocks of lower Point Grey Road in the 2500 and 2400 blocks. This will cause undue hardship and disruption for the owners and tenants.

1. Bike commuters will have the use of the main Cornwall street and have no need for 2 parallel bike lanes separated by a row of buildings. There is virtually no traffic on these 2 blocks of lower Point Grey Road and so bikes from the park can continue to safely use the road as they do now and connect up with Cornwall.
2. The proposed changes will force residents, many of whom use Permit Street Parking to find parking on other streets and jam up other's areas. These residents will be denied the right to park close to their place of residence as they have for decades and will be forced to walk and have to cart groceries etc. a considerable distance. This is not right for some, who require the use of a car for work or have any mobility handicaps.
3. This parking may not affect those with upgraded inside and underneath parking but it will affect those without it, their guests and any trade access. This appears to be a change that will affect the less affluent a lot more than the affluent in the neighbourhood.

Please consider and take the 2 blocks of lower Point Grey (2400,2500) road out of your proposed changes

s.22 (1)



s.22 (1)

Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver  
453 W 12th Ave  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4

July 11, 2013

Dear Mayor and Council:

Subject: Hands Off Point Grey Road

I join my voice to myriad others opposing any further restriction of vehicular traffic on Point Grey Road. I drive along the full length of that corridor several times each week in all seasons, and NEVER see many cyclists on it. Bicycle traffic on this road for most of the year (October to June) is extremely light. In the few remaining months, it is greater, but not unduly so.

If you imagine that a problem exists, then choose one of the following alternatives, while also *insisting that cyclists remain in single file* and never (as they sometimes do) ride two abreast:

1. Permit cyclists to use the sidewalks along that corridor (Many cyclists do this already);
2. Enforce the currently reduced vehicular speed limit of 30 kph.

One day – the sooner, the better – Vancouver will be rid of Vision Vancouver. But until then, you might consider trying to limit, just a little bit, the damage caused by the city-cramming and cyclist-pampering (I am a cyclist) policies concocted and imposed by your party. With one hand, you enable rampant densification, seeking to transform the entire city into a Yaletown without borders. With the other hand, you withdraw crucial roads and viaducts from vehicular access. The result is a hell of congestion. Yet Vision Vancouver remains in the heaven of its own refusal to acknowledge dissenting opinion.

s.22 (1)

7 July /13

Dear City of Vancouver Council:

Please delay the vote on  
any street changes to Cornwall,  
York, Stephens on 1<sup>st</sup> Ave, &  
Point Grey Road.



More communications  
are necessary to answer  
this important problem



to all property owners  
and businesses.



#2.

My personal feeling for  
the safety of cyclists &  
pedestrians is to build the  
seawall from Burrard to  
N. B.C.

s.22 (1)



CITYCLERK/DEPT 11:22 '13JUL16

July 12, 2013

Transportation Committee of the Whole, Vancouver City Council

Re: Proposed traffic reconfiguration on cornwall and point grey road

Any project should begin with the data, proceed to an analysis of the facts, and reach recommendations based on that analysis. Since everyone is working with the same data, consensus should be achievable. So let's look at the major facts.

Fact 1. St. Paul's hospital on burrard is the preferred destination for emergency ambulances for much of Vancouver west of burrard and south of English bay. The preferred route is cornwall, burrard bridge, and burrard street; not 4<sup>th</sup> roadway, or the single lane avenues.

Fact 2. The total passenger count in the peak direction in the 90 minute a.m. peak is at least as great on cornwall at cypress as it is on the 99 b-line west of macdonald, averaged over 365 days.

Pedestrian crossings, Parades, recycling/garbage, demonstrations, taxis, bicycles, goods and services movement, parking, festival days, and personal automobiles; all of these may also use the streets; but only to the degree that they do not adversely impact the two primary uses, transit and emergency!

The two dominant facts in the data have been absolutely ignored in the Cornwall corridor study. Therefore the conclusion is not a conclusion at all. This report began with a recommendation then worked backwards.

Emergency and transit are included in a list of 12 desirables on "The Proposal" page. "Current Conditions" includes "... cornwall ..are busy transit routes". And a bus stop would have to be moved. No further mention of transit.

The proposal (map 3) is to cut the 4 lanes between trafalgar and macdonald which are now used by ambulances, buses, general traffic, and some cyclists, to 2 lanes. "Incredibly"! Interestingly the map shows a car in one direction and an suv in the other, no bus or ambulance.

A one-lane street each way would create absolute chaos for the two most important users of the corridor. Ambulance times would increase.

The 2, 22, and 32 serve the people living adjacent to Cornwall. The 1 km stretch between Balsam and Cypress has extremely high transit passenger boardings per km. An empty #2 can easily fill in that 6 block section. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue has the 4, 7, and 44 going downtown, yet 2,100 90 minute a.m. peak commuters choose the 2/22/32. This corridor is also these peoples' connection to 4<sup>th</sup>, 41<sup>st</sup>, and all in-between.

Recommendation. Make a proper separated bike trail through Kits park right to the Maritime Museum, as I recommended to the Parks Board 2 years ago. (See detail design on [www.Vancouverrr.ca](http://www.Vancouverrr.ca)).

Facilitate cyclists' use of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue (better of the 2) or York east of MacDonald, and 3<sup>rd</sup> west of MacDonald

Pass a bylaw prohibiting bicycles and other slow vehicles from designated streets beginning with Cornwall west of Chestnut westbound and Cypress eastbound, Point Grey Road west of Trafalgar, and Burrard Street north of Drake.

What this team should be doing is looking for ways to speed up transit and ambulance service, not impede it. It often takes as long to get to Georgia Street from Kitsilano Pool as from Metrotown, Park Royal, or Bridgeport (20 minutes). As long to Granville as from Port Moody (25 minutes). Work on solutions for real problems.

As previously submitted, green light for transit is ideal for Cornwall, which has no transit or heavy traffic cross streets.

Hopefully Compass will facilitate all door loading on buses. Otherwise the time people take to "Compass Off" of the buses will increase trip times. Parking along Cornwall and on Burrard downtown needs to be trimmed significantly.

Taking these steps will speed transit a lot, and ambulances some.

I live on lower Point Grey Road. I cycle several days a week when the weather is nice, both to get to the places where I wish to go, and solely for the fun of cycling, and for exercise.

I never ride Cornwall west of Chestnut, or Point Grey except for lower Point Grey Road. There is no reason to do so. If one observes the red lights, as fewer and fewer cyclists seem to be doing these days, the avenues

are faster. Although I'm in my mid 70's and ride a sluggish 3 speed cruiser bike, 1<sup>st</sup> avenue and trafilgar are no problem for me. A bit of exercise, yes, but that's good for a person.

s.22 (1)



July 12, 2013

My name is <sup>s.22 (1)</sup> [REDACTED]. I live in the heart of Kitsilano and am a member of Brock House Society, a seniors activity centre of 1700+ members, which as you know, is next to Jericho Beach.

I have a physical handicap and it's a significant one. I am unable to walk, cycle, or do many of the other activities which your proposal would facilitate. And frankly, I don't care much for the notion of being told how wonderful traveling in a wheelchair during, say, the month of February will be.

I rely heavily on my car to access Brock House as there is no public transportation. If the project continues as proposed I am afraid that I will no longer be able to do so.

Brock House remarkable place and enriches the lives of many seniors. The primary concern is the loss of large number parking spaces in the area. I understand that the city is considering a provision of off-street parking for the Society. This is appreciated particularly since spaces on the grounds are few and most members come by car. However, for those of us with mobility issues, the walk from the Jericho Beach Parking Lot to Brock House is extremely difficult and, in some cases, impossible.

Further, as noted on Friday night, lack of parking in the area may adversely impact the annual Summer Fair. This is our major fundraiser and attracts hundreds to Brock



House. Many rely on parking in the community. A lack thereof may significantly reduce the number of attendees.

Is a bicycle lane on the west end of Point Grey Road really necessary? Will it really improve safety? It is essentially a dead-end. The speed limit is already reduced and the block between Alma and Highbury has speed bumps. Traffic volume is relatively low with most vehicles just looking for a place to park or pulling out from a spot. Bicycles, slow moving cars, and pedestrians already successfully watch out for other each between Alma and the park.

However, if the project does go forward, those of us at Brock House request that a minimum 60 free parking spaces be reserved for our members in the Jericho Beach parking lot.

July 20, 2013

s.22 (1)

Mayor Gregor Robertson and Vancouver City Council

Re: Point Grey Road Bike Lane Proposal for the 2600 and 2700 blocks.

s.22 (1)

Point Grey Road and I am writing this letter to inform you that I believe that the current City proposal substantially compromises the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and operators of all motorized vehicles and will make it impossible for me to safely enter and leave my driveway. I have spent many hours reviewing The City's available information and attending community meetings. I am concerned about the proposed 2 way separated bike lane for the following reasons:

1. I am concerned that I will have a collision with a cyclist while I am exiting or entering my driveway:

- Currently to exit my driveway and make a left turn onto Point Grey Road, I inch my car across the sidewalk and wait in the parking lane to ensure there is no traffic coming in either direction before turning. As it is, this is difficult because westbound cars come so quickly around the corner that there is little time to avoid being hit. I usually have to wait for several minutes before there is an appropriate break in the east and westbound traffic.
- Under the City's proposal, to make a left turn, I will have to cross 5 lanes going in different and conflicting directions simultaneously: the sidewalk, 2 bike lanes moving east and westward and 2 lanes of rapidly moving vehicle traffic, which is substantially more dangerous for me, pedestrians, the cyclists and vehicles on Point Grey Road.
- The ability to safely exit my driveway and turn right is similarly severely compromised by the City's proposal since I will have to cross the sidewalk, 2 lanes of bicycle traffic travelling in opposite directions and the lane of traffic proceeding westbound.
- This same safety concern applies when I want to make a left turn to enter my driveway. Traffic will have to stop behind me (likely for a substantial time) while I wait for a gap in the westbound vehicles, the two bike lanes travelling in opposite directions, and the pedestrians on the sidewalk.
- Making a right turn inbound will also be compromised. Traffic going westbound will have to stop behind me as I wait for a break to be able to safely cross the two bike lanes and the sidewalk. This will obviously be more dangerous than the current situation because where making a right turn is facilitated by the ability to stop in the parking lane before crossing the sidewalk and proceeding into the driveway.

2. The City's proposal will increase the risk of injury to cyclists travelling from Trafalgar to Macdonald on Point Grey Road:

- It is important for those not intimately familiar with this section of Point Grey Road just west of Trafalgar Street to understand the dynamics. At the west end of Cornwall, at Trafalgar, the road curves dramatically and westbound bicycles and motor vehicles accelerate significantly to safely negotiate the curve. Not infrequently, particularly after dark, vehicles overcompensate, lose control and collide with parked cars on either the north or south side of the street. With the current Bike Lane Proposal, cars travelling westward will have to move northward 1 or 2 lanes at Trafalgar, further increasing the amount of torque required to make the turn. It is likely that more cars will lose control and hit the bike lane barriers (probably with enough force to jump the barrier and land in the bike lane) resulting in major risk to cyclists or careen into the oncoming traffic which would risk the lives of pedestrians,

cyclists and other drivers. The risk of this happening will be increased by traffic having to stop to allow me to enter my driveway. Drivers in both directions have limited visibility at Cornwall and Trafalgar because of the curve in the road. It is a dangerous intersection currently and the current proposal will make the intersection much more dangerous.

Among a number of common sense solutions which I discussed with Mr. Kenji Komiya of Engineering Services on July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013, the following two described below are worthy of much more discussion and consultation with all stakeholders in this process :

- Using the exiting 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue bike lane or
- Locating a single bike lane on the south side of Point Grey Road where there are no driveways between Trafalgar and Stephens (compared to the 6 driveways on the north side of Point Grey Road, in the same block). This would substantially decrease the risk of a serious accident.

This note is being sent to you to formally notify you that should the City implement its current proposal and should there be any accident with anyone exiting or entering s. 22 (1) that I am on record of having advised you of the unsafe nature of the City's proposal.

I look forward to discussing my concerns with anyone at the City to ensure that a safe solution for all users of the sidewalk and road is implemented.

s.22 (1)

July 19, 2013

Mayor Robertson & Council:

I have a myriad of concerns with the proposed Point Grey-Cornwall Corridor. I will address these concerns in asking you four questions.

*Why was safety not a first and foremost consideration in this project?*

The present proposal will completely alter the community of Kitsilano at the cost of the safety of its residents and those who commute through the area, whether it be via bike, transit, foot, or vehicle. Vehicles will be shortcutting through side streets (not to mention speeding through narrow side streets) which will jeopardize the safety of pedestrians including the school children who attend the 3 elementary schools north of Broadway. Macdonald is already a major bus route which will be negatively impacted by the increase in traffic. In addition, collisions between busses and the other users of the road (motorists, motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians) is inevitable. Road rage will be an immediate outcome of the nightmare gridlock on Macdonald Street if this proposal goes through.

*Why is a project of such massive scope and impact being fast-tracked through council in the summer months, a mere 6 ~~months~~ <sup>weeks</sup> after the Open Houses?*

Clearly, it cannot be considered viable to take traffic off of one street, Point Grey Road, and divert it to an already-congested road elsewhere in the neighbourhood. Considering the high degree of angst and deep concern that this issue has created amongst the citizens, why is City Hall so intent on pushing this vote through?

I was hoping to enjoying some relaxation during our all too fleeting West Coast summer. When I was first made aware of the magnitude of this project and what was at stake for Kitsilano, there was no other choice but to become involved in the community push-back. It has been decades since an issue has so rapidly and passionately galvanized citizen engagement. Our community protest has required us to invest an inordinate amount of time, energy, and money. Which brings me to my third question:

*I wonder why are we, the citizens, having to spend our summer fighting a municipal government whom we elected to represent us?*

The definition of democracy is “government by the people.” Sir Karl Popper, a philosopher and professor at the London School of Economics and regarded as one of the greatest philosophers of science of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, saw the great strength of democracy as providing an opportunity for the people to control their leaders and to oust them without need for revolution. Instead, the residents of Kitsilano are finding ourselves in the position of having to fight for the safety and preservation of our community which also happens to be one of Vancouver's most beautiful and iconic neighbourhoods. We are alarmed and appalled at the way this municipal government is “forcing it's agenda” with total disregard to the taxpayers who have to pay for and live with the consequences.

As citizens of Vancouver and residents in the Kitsilano neighbourhood, we are feeling completely disenfranchised by our municipal government. We are alarmed and appalled at the way this municipal government is “forcing it's agenda” with total disregard to the taxpayers who have to pay for and live with the consequences. We are, frankly, outraged at the paucity of socially and fiscally responsible governance.

And Kitsilano residents are not alone in this fight. NDP MLA Shane Simpson stated at a meeting on Monday July 8<sup>th</sup> regarding the Grandview-Woodland community plan: “Across the community nobody is telling me this plan meets their needs. This plan is fundamentally flawed and may be fatally flawed. Go back to the drawing board and engage the people.” While Mr. Simpson is speaking about the Grandview-Woodland plan, this statement clearly applies to many of the proposals that Vision is pushing through in Vancouver with no thought to the fallout and impact to the respective neighbourhoods.

To quote Jessica Barrett in the July 17<sup>th</sup> issue of The Vancouver Sun, “As the city moves forward....focusing on major transit hubs and major corridors, neighbourhoods are balking.” There is community push-back coming from all over the city. The Mayor, Councillors and Vision Vancouver are now having to spend their summer attempting to placate outraged citizens in neighbourhoods all over the City because of the lack of effective community engagement.

*Have Councillors, Mayor Robertson, and the City Planning Department looked at the 1991 "Kitsilano Citizen's Planning Committee Kitsilano Traffic, Cycling and Parking Plan?"*

Over 20 years ago a similar plan was put forward by the Kitsilano Traffic, Cycling & Parking Subcommittee. The City of Vancouver Engineering Department strongly recommended against this proposal for two main reasons: 1) Livability, and 2) Safety. It defies logic why this could possibly be considered a viable idea when in 1991 it was rejected by the City of Vancouver Engineering Department. The 1991 report is an essential and informative document and I would urge you to review and consider it. As Winston Churchill once sagely advised: "Those who forget their history, live to repeat it."

It is well-known that the original proposal came from a select few home-owners on Point Grey Road who have long been seeking to close that stretch of road from Macdonald to Alma. However, as the Engineering Department of Vancouver noted in their recommendation against a very similar proposal in 1991, "Point Grey Road plays an important role as one of the leg (*sic*) of the arterial street system." So, my question is: why is an important part of the arterial street system, why is the City of Vancouver instead looking at changing this road into a private driveway and park for the wealthy?

That is my final question for you, Mayor Robertson, and Councillors. I would appreciate answers to all four of my questions. In closing, let me leave you with some words of wisdom spoken by Abraham Lincoln:

"You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)



## CORNWALL POINT GREY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR

### SUMMARY OUTLINING CONCERNS OF s. 22 (1)

#### **A. Improvements for Walking and Cycling ( see Appendix G, page 3)**

- I. Sidewalks on the north side of Point Grey Road would be widened.** As I understand, the widening of the sidewalks would replace the north portion of the present sidewalk, and eliminate a substantial amount of the planting that is currently between the existing sidewalk and the residents' property line. In the opinion of the writer, there is no need to widen the sidewalks on the north side as there is currently a full-width sidewalk on the south side of Point Grey Road. People prefer walking or jogging on the south side of the road for the following reasons:
  - a. there is less sun due to the shade afforded by the many trees; and
  - b. view lines from across Point Grey Road to the water are greater because of the distance

The widening of the sidewalks on the north side would be a total waste of money. Vegetation on the City right of way, which encroaches on the sidewalk, and thereby creates safety issues by blocking visibility, can easily be trimmed or removed. During the past 15 years, houses that were built or rebuilt under their current development permits were required to have the vegetation between the property line and sidewalk approved by the City. In fact, the sidewalk was paid for and installed by the property owners. The proposed bylaw to provide the City with the indiscriminate right to remove vegetation, provides the City a right to determine the "safety issues". In the future, the City may, for example, decide that the affected area be used for a dog path, and could remove the entire shrubbery along the north side of Point Grey Road, without consultation. Thousands of dollars have been spent to enhance the vegetation and irrigation adjacent to the property fences, which are primarily made of concrete or wood. I can appreciate that there are areas of trees that are encroaching on the sidewalk. There already exists a process by which these trees could be cut back, by sending notice to the property owner. Failure of the owner to comply would then allow the City to take the necessary action to cut or remove the trees, and charge this expense to the homeowner. This process is regularly used throughout the City in all areas.



**B. Required Changes to Parking (Appendix G, Page 3 bottom)**

In order to provide space for the wider sidewalks, approximately 60 parking spaces will be removed from the north side of Point Grey Road, between Waterloo and Macdonald. I do not support wider sidewalks on the north side of Point Grey Road. I do not support the removal of any parking spaces on north side of Point Grey Road, between Waterloo and Macdonald. While Engineering did do studies on the usage of parking on the north side of Point Grey Road, a substantial amount of their information is incorrect. At present, there is less local parking occurring on the north side of Point Grey Road due to the fact that each home has a driveway connecting into their property, as there is no rear access.

I have lived on Point Grey Road nearly 20 years, and I can confirm that parking on the north side of Point Grey Road is mostly short term and used by non-residents. Removing this parking would have a negative effect on those people who live in Vancouver and who want enjoy our beautiful beaches and scenery, without going to a congested area such as English Bay or Kits Beach. They come from areas which are not necessarily served by transit, or are not able to use bicycles or walk. They come to Point Grey Road to attend the smaller beaches, at the foot of either Bayswater or Balaclava Streets, or in fact, just come to sit and enjoy the foreshore on Point Grey Road from many of its available viewing locations. Removing any parking on Point Grey Road would mean that those people would need to park on the perimeter north-south roads, resulting in increased congestion, reducing the few parking spots available for the residents of the north-south roads from Point Grey Road to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This would also be detrimental to those with limited mobility, who would effectively be prevented from enjoying the Point Grey Road waterfront.

**Bicycle Lanes**

The writer does not feel that it is necessary to have bicycle lanes adjacent to the sidewalk on the north side of Point Grey Road. The suggestion is that the daily automobile traffic count will be reduced to 500 cars per day. I suggest that the number would be closer to 200 cars per day, as most of the drivers would be residents. During peak summer hours, this number could increase slightly as people in other areas of Vancouver tend visit the Point Grey waterfront.

**Given the significant reduction in car traffic, and speed, bicycles could easily be able to share Point Grey Road, without it being a safety issue.** Bicycles are a priority!. Automobile drivers would then either choose to travel at a reduced speed of the bicycle traffic or remove themselves from Point Grey Road by travelling the north-south roads being Dunbar, Collingwood, Waterloo, Blenheim, Trutch, Balaclava and Bayswater.



**C. Point Grey Road Would Become a Local Street (Appendix G, page 2)**

I agree with the Report proposal to close Point Grey Road at Macdonald and Alma. The plan to connect Tatlow Park to Volunteer Park and place greenery on Point Grey Road does not make any sense, in that Tatlow Park is not a female friendly park. Current usage of the Tatlow Park, except for the tennis courts, is limited. Additional greenery to be planted on Point Grey Road is an unnecessary cost. Expansion of Point Grey Road Park is also not necessary. Point Grey Road Park has very limited use, mostly because the Park is usually overgrown with grass and weeds, and the benches never seem to be cleaned. Adding an additional park to connect the small triangle of park between Trutch and Balaclava, is not necessary, and the expense is not warranted.

At present Blenheim Street, north of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a street that is used as a north-south passageway to connect to east-west streets such as 16<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 33<sup>rd</sup>, and 41<sup>st</sup> Avenues. There are a number of residents living on Point Grey Road who use Blenheim Street. Placing a barrier at Trutch would mean that anyone living east of Trutch, in order to reach Blenheim, would be required to go south on Balaclava or Bayswater, connect to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and then turning south on Blenheim to have a relatively easy route to the aforementioned east-west cross streets.

**D. Point Grey Road between Alma and Waterloo Would Become One-Way (Eastbound Only) for Motor Vehicles (Appendix G, page 2)**

In the opinion of the writer, this is not desirable as the non local traffic, which currently uses Alma Street, will continue to be able to proceed east on Point Grey Road and then be forced back south on Dunbar, Collingwood, or Waterloo to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, causing unnecessary traffic volumes. If Point Grey Road is closed at Alma (using a round-a-bout), to prevent eastbound traffic from Alma, there would still be access to Cameron Street, and east-west access to the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club and the Jericho Tennis Club. Residents between Alma and Waterloo on Point Grey Road would be required to access Point Grey Road from the various north-south streets from Dunbar to Blenheim.

While I understand that the Police and Fire Department have signed off on this plan, it would appear to the writer that, in case of an emergency, there would be tremendous difficulties for any emergency vehicles to travel on Point Grey Road. There would be chaos, and, quite possibly, lives would be lost due to the fact that the emergency vehicles could not attend as quickly as possible due to the barriers that you are proposing on Point Grey Road.

# Cornwall/Point Grey Road Corridor

## Background and Suggestions

This closure would redirect *at least* 7,000 cars a day to Macdonald, an already busy arterial. It will also have a significant negative impact on transit - nearly 60 buses use Macdonald during the 7-9 am rush-hour alone.

The proposal to close PGR from Macdonald to Alma in the name of safety for cyclists and pedestrians is not based on fact. From 2008 to 2012, ICBC reports NO crashes involving cyclists or pedestrians on that stretch of road. Furthermore, the proposal will dump up to 15,000 more cars a day onto the four highest crash rate intersections west of Granville, including 4<sup>th</sup> & Macdonald.

It appears that the proposal to close PGR west of Macdonald is largely about removing cars from the "Golden Mile". It is well-known that the original proposal came from home-owners who have long been agitating to close their exclusive road to through traffic. However, it is not an equitable solution to take traffic off one road and divert it onto already-congested roads elsewhere in the neighbourhood. This is especially senseless when traffic is being moved from a relatively safe road to already dangerous ones.

In 1991 a similar proposal to divert traffic up Macdonald went to the City but was rejected by the Engineering Department in part because of **the decrease in livability and safety in the North Macdonald/West 4th area.**

The City can meet its objectives in other, less expensive and less disruptive ways:

- There is strong community support for a third option - a lower-cost, local street bikeway on West 1<sup>st</sup> and/or West 3<sup>rd</sup> that would allow PGR west of Macdonald to continue as a key part of a well-distributed arterial road network.
- Increasing access to the waterfront could be achieved by adding pedestrian-operated lights opposite all the pocket parks (which would also calm traffic on PGR) and adding stairs from all the parks to the beach.
- Further traffic calming along PGR could be achieved in other ways, including speed-limit enforcement.
- A recreational route for all ages and abilities may be achieved along PGR by running a trial Sunday-only closure on PGR west of Macdonald. Other cities such as Winnipeg, Toronto, Bologna, and San Francisco close off certain streets on Sundays between May and September.

The current project's criteria are overly narrow, focusing only on a transportation corridor. We ask for community livability to be added as a criterion for this project.

NO ONE IN THE 2700 BLOCK WEST FIRST AVENUE RECEIVED ANY NOTICE OF THIS CHANGE EITHER BY MAIL OR TELEPHONE

July 2013

To Mayor and Councillors:

We, residents of Macdonald and neighbouring streets, support increasing cycling and pedestrian safety, but we strongly reject the closing of Point Grey Road at Macdonald.

**THIS VOLUME OF ADDED TRAFFIC WOULD IRREVOCABLY CHANGE THE SAFETY AND LIVABILITY OF OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD. FOR THOSE IN THE NORTH MACDONALD AREA THE CURRENT PROPOSAL TO CLOSE POINT GREY ROAD IS COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE.**

There is a third option available that works for everybody. Closing Point Grey Road does not. Closing Point Grey Road benefits a few with unacceptable negative impacts for too many.

Signed: 

s.22 (1)

Residents of Macdonald and neighbouring streets

s.22 (1)

P.S.

I WAS WONDERING IF YOU WOULD PLEASE HELP ME UNDERSTAND HOW CYCLISTS WOULD CONNECT TO SPANISH BANKS THROUGH JERICHO PARK, AND HOW CARS WOULD BE ABLE TO ~~REACH~~ GET TO THE PARKING LOT AT JERICHO BROCK HOUSE TENNIS CLUB & THE YACHT CLUB.

s.22 (1)

## NEWS RELEASE

### For Immediate Release

July 17, 2013

#### POINT GREY RESIDENTS SPEAK OUT IN FAVOUR OF COMMON SENSE TRAFFIC PLAN

*Cite 2,200 Signatures on Petition in Favour of Change;  
Calls Well-Funded Opposition PR Campaign a Red Herring*

Vancouver - A group of concerned residents are speaking out in favour of the Point Grey Road - Cornwall Avenue Corridor Active Transportation Project, which will be the topic of a report released today by the city's engineering department. The supporters of proposed safety improvements to the Point Grey-Cornwall Corridor are also concerned that a small, vocal minority of other residents are creating confusion about common-sense proposals that would increase safety along the stretch of road that runs from the Burrard Bridge to Jericho Beach. At the beginning of July a female cyclist was hit by a car on Pt. Grey Rd. and suffered two broken arms.

Pamela McColl, a spokesperson for the group, said the public consultation process started last December and included a dozen public meetings, an online questionnaire, business and customer engagement, and website and email outreach.

"I have been a part of the consultation process as a citizen all along and this was a completely thorough effort on the part of the city," said McColl. "The fact of the matter is that nearly 11,000 citizens participated in the consultation process, so it's simply inaccurate to contend that this was somehow a flawed process and that we need to slow down and hit the re-set button. Not to mention the fact that we have 2,200 signatures from residents who want to see common-sense safety improvements to traffic patterns along the Point Grey-Cornwall corridor."

McColl said a small group of residents opposed to traffic and safety improvements have hired PR consultants who are organizing a publicity campaign that is out of step with most residents' views.

"This is a classic red herring where you have a small, well-funded group of naysayers trying to change the conversation because they don't like the outcome, or because they want to maintain a few street parking spaces for their private use."

McColl said her group is supporting proposal 2(a) within the Point Grey Road - Cornwall Avenue Corridor Active Transportation Project, which would improve safety by widening sidewalks along the northside of the road and reducing automobile traffic volume throughout the corridor, while also increasing park space and access. A detailed summary can be found at:  
<http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/Point-Grey-Cornwall-Public-Consultation--Phase2-2a-Alma-Macdonald.pdf>

McColl said people that she has canvassed support plans that will make the Point Grey-Cornwall corridor safer to access for people of all ages and abilities using sustainable modes of transport between Kits Beach and Jericho Beach and to points beyond. She said people have told her the proposed plans, particularly improved park access, will enhance a sense of neighbourhood and community, as well as support local businesses.

Former Vancouver City Councillor Peter Ladner, who lives in the neighbourhood, has been urging action on a safe route along Pt. Grey for five years. "The city's proposal to divert through traffic to 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. is not a significant inconvenience to car drivers. It benefits businesses, it resolves the unsafe mix of users currently on Pt. Grey Rd., and it creates a new recreational amenity for the whole city."

**Media contacts:** Pamela McColl s.22 (1) or Peter Ladner s.22 (1)

NOTE: Additional residents who support the proposed safety improvements can be reached for comment, see next page.

### **Additional Supporters Available for Comment**

**Gary Bello** s.22 (1)

"I am so thankful that the safety issues we have been living with due to the speeding traffic in front of our home on Point Grey Road is now being addressed by council. Everyone who lives and visits our neighbourhood can now breathe a sigh of relief now that local traffic, bicyclists, joggers, walkers, and mothers with children in strollers will be able to enjoy the beauty of this area without fearing for their safety."

**Christopher Poole** s.22 (1)

"The majority of residents did take advantage of the consultative process provided by the City of Vancouver as early as February. Most of us see the benefits if the Point Grey/Cornwall Corridor linking up the downtown Stanley Park/English Bay/False Creek walking and cycling lanes with Jericho Beach and Spanish Banks. The small group of naysayers started their campaign late at the behest of one or two people and really have not come up with any concrete suggestions other than wanting to buy time to entrench the status quo"

**Susan Smith** s.22 (1)

"The City's Transportation Committee's Option 1(2a) for Point Grey Road between Alma and Macdonald Streets is a shared-use model that provides equality of free access to the road for pedestrians, cyclists and local resident motorists and their visitors. This model promotes safety for all users without accommodating separated bike lanes. It retains most of the parking on this almost exclusively residential route, while satisfying all of the City's Transportation Project Goals. Those include substantially reducing the dangerous volume and speed of cars on a narrow roadway which currently, as a designated secondary arterial, is not permitted to have traffic-calming measures, such as speed bumps or roundabouts. For the past two years, the City's Transportation Committee's qualified engineers and urban planners have diligently and openly investigated, studied and communicated the viable alternatives for this neighbourhood to all the parties who have expressed an interest. City Council unanimously ratified the Transportation 2040 Plan. It is now time for Option 1(2a) to be implemented. I have personally gathered

through face-to-face communication more than 500 of the 2200+ signatures on the Petition in support of Option 1(2a).

July 3, 2013

To: Vancouver City Council  
George Affleck  
Elizabeth Ball  
Adriane Carr  
Heather Deal  
Kerry Jang  
Raymond Louie  
Geoff Meggs  
Andrea Reimer  
Tim Stevenson  
Tony Tang

Dear Honourable Councilors:

Re: Point Grey Road - Cornwall Avenue Corridor

My family is very concerned about the proposed changes to Point Grey Road and we do not support these changes. We use this route every day to go to and from work. Please see below our concerns:

**1. Community Relations:**

- a. "Us and them" being caused between people who commute to work or school by car, and with people who commute by bike
- b. Drivers are always sacrificing while cyclists are gaining more and more without proper education, road sharing, or respect for people who need to drive
- c. My office was directly impacted by Hornby bike lane now my car idles more while I go to work. I have no showers in our building if I wanted to ride to work. There is an increase in parking rates and taxes. I am a professional CEO and I wear a suit to the office.

**2. Safety**

- a. Lack of public education around using bike paths, bike routes, and riding to slow on busy roads
- b. Lack of training, education, and public announcements on cyclist/pedestrian safety and rules
- c. More infrastructure being developed without proper training of cyclists in the "rules of the road"
- d. Who enforces law breaking of cyclists, i.e. no helmet, no stopping at lights, riding on sidewalks, especially when VPD has no biking unit anymore

**3. Environment**

- a. Changing the route of 22,000 cars daily to 4<sup>th</sup>, Broadway, 10<sup>th</sup>, or 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue (especially during rush hour) will cause cars to be in traffic longer and contribute more to pollution

**4. Survey**

- a. Lack of notice in mail, or by public announcement
- b. Lack of showing survey results for community effected in immediate area
- c. Questions written with a bias for people to support project
- d. Open house meetings were scary due to radical commuter cyclists who blame global warming on drivers and not the challenges in under regulated polluting countries around the world, i.e. China, India, Peru, Russia, Ukraine, etc....

e. Survey results are biased and are not presented from the opposing view points

**5. Alternatives**

- a. Cornwall & Chestnut property is adapted for cyclist / bike route to go through Kits point to sea wall
- b. There should be a development of 3<sup>rd</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue off of Burrard Street to go west, these intersections need more stop lights on McDonald and Alma. Then no stop signs on bike routes, except for major roads. Develop these roads to have diagonal parking on one side only.

**6. Negative Impact**

- a. Cost of corridor development versus adapting current bike routes?
- b. Too many businesses on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Broadway to use for car to access downtown or East of Vancouver. There are also too many businesses on Granville Street Bridge and to take that downtown is hectic, and Burrard Street bridge is the best route to downtown or to access Lions Gate
- c. Need to use 12<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and there is no light turn on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue on to Burrard Street. Therefore in rush hour traffic the only way to access Burrard Street Bridge smoothly would be 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

We are avid recreational cyclists and do not want these changes.

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)







# Putting Pedestrians First

s. 22 (1)

Point Grey/Cornwall Pedestrians/Cycling Improvements, July 23, 2013

Madam Chairman, Councillors:

We know a lot of things for sure, which will make it easy to approve both reports in their entirety and maybe speed implementation too.

There is no doubt that the status quo at the south access to the Burrard Bridge, the Chestnut corner and the Cornwall/Point Grey Road stretch is dangerous and uncomfortable for walkers and cyclists. All three of these inadequacies must be corrected.

The Bridge's south end with a six minute trek through five intersections thanks to an unnecessary double left turn bay, should have been fixed 12 years ago after an independent study, public process and council approval.

Pedestrians and cyclists have top priority in city transportation policy,

There is also no doubt that the critics of the report are wrong.

About congestion: Congestion is actually good because it slows traffic and improves safety. However, there will be no added congestion because there is enormous capacity on Fourth, Broadway and 12th west of Burrard and Macdonald. For an extra 17 seconds the near empty Granville Bridge will get you even closer to home than Cornwall.

About more crashes: The three most vulnerable road users are involved in only three percent of collisions but suffer 60% of fatalities. In pedestrian-driver conflicts, the driver is at fault 82% of the time. In 2/3 of crashes with motorcycles, the driver is at fault. Drivers complain that there will be reduced safety with the proposed changes. Survey results show that of five features, they consider other user safety their lowest concern.

About higher taxes: The truth is that refitting road space for folks on foot and bike is cheaper than maintaining it for drivers. Vehicles cost taxpayers \$3000-\$8000 annually, compared to cyclists at \$60-\$100, pedestrians \$150 and transit users \$250.

About no consultation: You would have to have been in Antarctica not to hear about this project over the last two years and certainly in the last 10 months. Post cards were mailed, groups were notified and the media advertised meetings. Two extensive surveys were distributed and project changes made in accordance with the results. City staff have done yeoman work, meeting with anyone and everyone, anywhere. They would have met with a raccoon and a skunk if asked.

The critics also claim there are no pedestrians or cyclists on this strip so why provide anything for them? There are not as many as there should be, because it is a horrible place to be. Riders and walkers deserve a direct and comfortable route to their destination. They should not be shoved on to a distant street, under a bridge or over a road. As the most benign form of transportation, they must have a direct path on their commute. Drivers are not entitled to exclusive use of the pavement.



Business will not suffer. 80% of Cornwall customers come now by bike, foot or transit. Walkability is the primary determinant for commercial property.

Cornwall is the natural route for tourists from downtown hotels to access our waterfront playground on foot and bike.

This is yet another of many planning and transportation projects coming before Council that have received ruthless and undeserved backlash. As always the major concerns expressed centre around driving and parking. There is no "they", in these debates, only "we". When the "we", decide to change their behavior, miraculous things will happen.

What is also undisputable, is the negative global impact that flow from the daily personal lifestyle choices of city residents. The big picture must be given significant weight in this decision.

A few include; warm water diseases in fish, melting artic ice, disoriented whales beaching themselves because of oil tanker traffic, ocean acidification, the recent tragedy in Lac Megantic and the frequency and severity of catastrophic storms, fires and drought. Just last week an ice shelf eight times the size of Manhattan broke free in the Antarctic.

Kinder Morgan is increasing tanker use in Burnaby by eight times. Like Northern Gateway or Keystone, these business decisions are made because of demand. And there is no "them" to blame, the thirst is from "us", so we can drive anywhere, anytime, as fast as possible with few impediments.

It is hard to argue the necessity for most of the drivers to use this route particularly west of Macdonald. We know that over 30% of vehicles coming off the Bridge are not registered in Vancouver. Another large percentage are headed to Dunbar, Kerrisdale, Point Grey and UBC. They love Point Grey west of Macdonald because they can go like hell ignoring anyone who wants to cross the road. The irony is that jaywalking is legal all along those seven blocks.

These numbers puzzle me because this route is illogical and out of their way. I live in the quadrant south and west of Point Grey and Macdonald and the obvious, quicker route is Macdonald to Fourth.

This area is also well serviced by transit.

Politicians are elected to sort fact from myth and reality from perception to make the best decision for the greatest number of people for the longest period of time in the most environmentally sensitive way. There is no requirement to ask permission.

In this case a more liveable Vancouver requires nothing less than the approval of all measures outlined in the reports before you.

s.22 (1)

CITYCLERK DEPT 13:42 '13 JUL 23

July 23, 2013

Transportation Committee of the Whole, Vancouver City Council

Re: Proposed traffic reconfiguration on Cornwall and Point Grey Road aka Cornwall Active Transit Corridor.

“This plan will link downtown to Kitsilano and Point Grey, and will provide a safe, convenient, and comfortable connection for pedestrians and cyclists” *Bus and ambulance riders do not matter.*

Fact 1. St. Paul’s hospital on Burrard is the preferred destination for emergency ambulances for much of Vancouver west of Burrard and south of English Bay. The preferred route is Cornwall, Burrard Bridge, and Burrard Street; not 4<sup>th</sup>, not Broadway, not the single lane avenues.

Fact 2. The total passenger count in the peak direction in the 90 minute a.m. peak is at least as great on Cornwall at Cypress as it is on the 99 B-Line west of MacDonald, averaged over 365 days. Transit passengers on Burrard at Georgia is similar to West Coast, Millennium, King George, or Canada Lines. Only the Expo and Granville Street are larger.

Fact 3. Peak transit service is now excellent. A bus every 135 seconds in the a.m. peak. 14 minutes schedule time from Broadway and MacDonald to Georgia Street, compared to 20 on route 14; and very reliable in the a.m. peak, before traffic congestion becomes a problem.

The two dominant facts in the data have been absolutely ignored in the Cornwall Corridor Study. The conclusion is not a conclusion at all. This report began with a recommendation then worked backwards.

On the “Proposal” sheet. 12 priorities are listed. Ambulance is included in number 3, buses are number 10. Wrong! They are numbers 1 and 2.

Map 3 shows traffic east of MacDonald reduced to 1 lane in each direction. It shows 1 car and 1 SUV, no ambulance, no bus.

Cutting peak period peak direction traffic from 2 lanes to 1 would create absolute traffic chaos. Translink would have no chance of meeting its current excellent peak service schedule in either direction. The study’s statement that Burrard and 4<sup>th</sup> can handle the traffic is nonsense.

As for anyone riding in an ambulance. you weren’t even considered.

The colour photograph shows two ambulances stuck in traffic on Burrard downtown. Notice the parking and the cab unable to turn. This would become the situation from the bridge right to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

A proper bike route through the parks is needed. I e-mailed a detailed route to the Parks Board 2 years ago.

Bicycles must be banned from Chestnut to Alma, and enforced.

York, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> are fine for bicycles as is. No separated lane is needed.

The so-called "seaside bike route" isn't seaside at all. Pt Grey Road is the back lane for the waterfront homes. Most of the view from the street is of garage doors, driveways; and the ugliest house in Canada.

Yes, the residents dress up with shrubbery. But 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenues are much prettier for riding. Gardens there are beautiful.

If Council is absolutely determined to have a lower bike route in the 2600 and 2700 blocks on Pt Grey it can be done, but here's how.

Leave the sidewalks where they are, nothing wrong with them except bikes.

Put the bike lane on one side, recognizing the driveways conflict.

This leaves three lanes for emergency, transit; and cars etc.

The centre lane is for alternating traffic, simpler than Lion's Gate.

6 a.m. to 1 p.m., 2 lanes eastbound.

1 p.m. to 6 p.m. 2 lanes westbound.

6 p.m. to 9 p.m., 2 lanes eastbound,

9 p.m. to midnight, 2 lanes westbound.

Midnight to 6 a.m. centre lane closed.

As automobile traffic continues to increase in the City, deliberately caused by Council adding 25,000 residential parking places this 3 yr term, the bike lane will eventually have to be removed.

s.22 (1)



My name is s.22 (1) I live on Point Grey road s.22 (1) I'm strongly opposed to this project. I drive to work and I enjoy cycling at any opportunity I have. The area where I live will be affected the most by the City Plan.

As Point Grey west of MacDonald will be closed for general public and will create problem for all other residents of Kitsilano by redistributing traffic to already congested roads like 4th and MacDonald, creating traffic congestion, dangerous intersections and adding pollution by idling cars.

The stretch of Point Grey road east of MacDonald will be affected the most. Half of the road two lanes on North side will be given to recreational cyclists, who are going to use it on the weekends two months of the year.

Only two lanes will be left for eastbound and west bound traffic including all commuters in the cars and buses, service vehicles, emergency vehicles etc. The transit schedule will be undoubtedly compromised.

With the introduction of the left turn signal on the intersection of 4th avenue and MacDonald street 17000 cars per day (twice as much as now) will be going down to Point Grey road and there will be only one possible turn - right to only one available lane on the 2700-2600 blocks of Point Grey road. With Extra street light proposed by the new plan on Stephens street there will be three street lights on that stretch of the road - recipe for massive congestion!

This design is deeply flawed it creates a bottleneck. And with Stephens street closure there wouldn't be any escape route.

Now will it be safe for cyclist to use those generously given two lanes behind the concrete divider? It will not!

Because every couple of meters on this two blocks is a driveway. On the 2600 block there are 6 driveways alone. When residents would try to exit or enter their houses they will face two opposite bike lanes and two opposite lanes of congested and idling traffic. This is a recipe for disaster - sooner or later cyclist will be hit, injured or killed! It is not making cycling any safer.

Quotes from research carried out world wide and including organizations that actively promote cycling, like the City of Copenhagen, reports that

“A decline in road safety at junctions has undoubtedly taken place after the construction of cycle tracks [separated bike lanes]”

- City of Copenhagen, Road and Park Department, Denmark

“Proportion of junction accidents significantly higher with cycle tracks [separated bike lanes]”

- German Federal Highways Institute Report



“Separation of bicycles and motor vehicles leads to blind conflicts at intersections.”  
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (Washington, DC)

“Cycle tracks [separated bike lanes] cause major safety problems at signalised junctions.”  
- Danish Road Directorate

“... cycle tracks [separated bike lanes] increase cyclists’ risk at junctions.”  
- Transportation Research Board, study based in Göteborg, Sweden.

“In Helsinki, using a road-side cycle path [separated bike lane] is nearly 2.5 times likely to result in injury than cycling on the carriageway with traffic.

At junctions the relative risk rises to more than 3 times. In those countries and cities which are just beginning to build cycling facilities, two-way cycle paths [separated bike lanes] in particular should be avoided in an urban street network.”

- Helsinki City Planning Department, Finland.

“42% of the collisions were localized at normal roadways, 44% at bicycle tracks [separated bike lane] and 9% at paths or at the pavement”  
- Odense Univ. Hospital, Denmark.

“Separated bicycle facilities are particularly troublesome in intersections involving automobile traffic and do not necessarily appear to be safer.”  
- Department of Transport, Walking and Cycling Branch, Melbourne, Australia

For us personally living on the south side of Point Grey the implementation of this plan would mean that we will not only be able to park near the house, we will not be able to stop near the house to unload the car, the service vehicles will hold the traffic behind them when they would need to stop, the emergency vehicle will not have an access to the house and again will hold completely the traffic including transit and all commuters in it. We are literally losing access to the house. And I think this is our right to have access to the property where we live and pay property taxes to the city!

Also two lanes will be built simultaneously in front of our house on Point Grey and behind on the York street. Stephens will be closed, so access to the house become questionable.

And as a taxpayer I feel this is waste of tax payers money to built two lanes on parallel road for recreational bikers and commuters. I think commuters can share a lane with recreational cyclist. Use those money to repair roads to solve homelessness, there so much more really useful things those money can do to the city!

Now let's see if this plan actually Green. According to this plan the Margaret Piggot park will be reduced to make a parking lot. Tree will be chopped to make it happen. In the

middle of 2600 block on the south side parking bay will be created by chopping down trees and reducing people's gardens including our own. It will reduce the property value and will add concretes instead of the lovely green spaces with flowers that we have now. Not even a notice has been given to us, that the corner of our property will be demolished with the retaining wall and trees.

The City plan to put bike lanes on Point Grey road is deeply flawed, really unbalanced and affects us all in the different ways. It is not going to make our city green by just redistributing traffic to already congested roads and adding to more pollution by idling cars while creating more congested and dangerous areas. It is going to create great hardship for residents of Point Grey east of Macdonald and all residents of Kitsilano south of Point Grey. The safety of all commuters, including safety of the cyclists by putting them on the arterial road will be greatly compromised.

I would really ask all City Councilors please do not vote in favor of this plan, please slow down, listen to people, let engineers to study this area more and create a plan, that will be embraced by everybody including residents of Kitsilano, commuters, businesses and visitors. All that is needed to put cyclist on the quiet residential streets, where they will be safe and will enjoy the ride, while residents will be able to access their houses and commuters will be happy.

I would like to remind the City Councilors, that they were elected to serve the people of Vancouver and listen to them. If they are not going to listen people of Marpole, East side Strathona, Oakridge, downtown, west side Kitsilano, people who use viaducts and do the right thing.

People will do the right thing on the next Election! Because Canada is a democracy first and foremost.

PRESENTATION  
TO CITY COUNCIL, JULY 25, 2013:  
VOTE YES FOR THE SEASIDE GREENWAY AND YORK BIKEWAY  
COMPLETION PROJECT

s.22 (1)

Good evening. My name is s.22 (1). I am an owner, resident and landlord in the s.22 (1) Point Grey Road on the South Side of the street s.22 (1). I have resided in s.22 (1) for the past fifteen years s.22 (1).

s.22 (1) As is true for the VAST majority of the owners and residents on Point Grey Road, we are NOT members of "the city's elite" and do NOT live in Vancouver's "swankiest oceanfront mansions." Nor are we looking to construct "a park for the wealthy." Diverting traffic and limiting cars to local motorists is nothing new or unique in Vancouver; it has been done in other areas of the city as needed for safety, such as in the West End. I fully support the thoroughly researched and thoughtfully tweaked City Transportation Committee's Recommendations for the Seaside Greenway and York Bikeway Completion Project, including Option 1(2a), redesignating Point Grey Road between Alma and Macdonald from a secondary arterial to a local street. The Transportation Committee remarkably has endeavoured long and hard to meet with individuals and address the specific needs of the diverse users of the road.

Two years ago, my neighbour, s.22 (1) expressed to me concern about the volume and speed of commuting cars on Point Grey Road, repeat damage to her car from passing vehicles, and the daily screeching tires from cars trying to stop suddenly at the crosswalk intersection of Bayswater. I informed her that I, too, had had my car damaged twice in hit-and-runs while temporarily parked on the road in front of my property; I had also witnessed an SUV strike a parked car at the intersection of Bayswater and flip over onto its roof as well as a cyclist being struck at the same intersection. s.22 (1) consulted with many other neighbours, the police, HUB, Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee and the City, discovering that Point Grey Road was indeed a well-recognized and formally studied hot-spot for speeding, accidents, injuries, property damage to parked vehicles as well as being underutilized due to the extreme fear of usage by pedestrians and cyclists. I volunteered to assist s.22 (1) in her efforts to bring about change for safety. Regarding ICBC data, ICBC reports, themselves, contain disclaimers for their inadequate statistics "related to the timeliness of the data, data quality and reliability, and stability of the data source"; consequently, ICBC admits to "the exclusion of thousands of crashes." Its data also does not include any of the near misses.



During the past two years, I have attended numerous neighbourhood meetings, public forums, all of the City's Open Houses, a stakeholder meeting at City offices, and street rallies as organized by different neighbourhood groups on York Avenue and Macdonald Street, at Point Grey Community Church and in Trafalgar and Crab parks. As well, I have regularly kept in touch by phone and e-mail with the City's Transportation Committee pertaining to updates of the Project. I have also regularly notified them of flawed, inaccurate descriptions of the Project by members of the public and media reporters. I filled out the City's questionnaire and online survey regarding the Project. I have sent personal e-mailed letters to the Mayor and Councillors to express and explain my support for the Project, and I have forwarded to them correspondence by others.

Last but not least, I have been directly involved in obtaining support by way of 2200 signatures to date on a Petition (vetted by the City's Transportation Committee) in favour of Option 1(2a), the City Transportation Committee's final recommended option for shared-road use of Point Grey Road between Alma and Macdonald. This option does NOT accommodate two-way separated bike lanes on the road, only in the enhanced parks. This option DOES retain much of the existing street parking for access to parks and residences for disabled persons, residents, visitors and home construction and maintenance contractors; it also substantially reduces car volume and speed through the redesignation of the road as a local street, while not impeding emergency vehicles. The reduction from 13,000 to 500 cars per day makes crossing the street and loading and unloading passengers (both able and disabled) finally possible. Planned wider sidewalks on the North side improve visibility for residents entering and exiting their driveways as well as enhanced, safer pedestrian space that accommodates wheelchairs. Thus, resident and through-travelling pedestrians and cyclists, as well as local and visiting motorists ALL benefit from the improved safety of traffic calming with advanced accessibility for users in this shared-use model.

Strangely, the Executive Director of the Kitsilano Chamber of Commerce, who was interviewed on CBC radio (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/story/2013/06/06/bc-kits-businesses-oppose-bike-lane.html>), stated that she surveyed her members and found that over 60% of Kits businesses did not favour closing Point Grey Road to accommodate bike lanes because they take away parking for businesses (Jeremy Allingham, CBC News). She also stated that "Our members want to see some compromise that addresses a shared-use model...it shouldn't be bikes versus cars." The fact is that Option 1(2a), making Point Grey Road a local street, IS a shared-use model, and there are NO businesses on the road between the areas of diverted traffic.

The Placespeak website article about the Project and some Petitions other than the one directly supporting Option 1(2a) similarly contain incorrect information designed to mislead members of the public. Deliberately and knowingly promulgating

misinformation to the public in an attempt to “derail” a City project, providing no accurate reasons for this attempt, and not offering any viable alternative proposals for the Project are unconscionable acts. They are a disservice to the taxpaying residents of the City and their duly-elected officials. Criticism that is based on false premises lacks validity and should be dismissed outright.

In contrast, accurate, verifiable and sincere support for the City’s Transportation Committee’s Option 1(2a) proposal has been shown on our Petition. I have personally been actively involved in gathering more than 700 of its 2200 signatures to date. As well, I have conducted the Petition administration, scanning new signatures daily to the City’s Transportation Committee, and more recently to the Mayor and Councillors as well. These signatures have been obtained almost exclusively through door-knocking and consulting with the public at their homes, on the street, at beaches, in parks, in businesses, at cyclist gatherings and at neighbourhood festivals. Support has been garnered through face-to-face contact, involving lengthy discussions with residents about the safety concerns on Point Grey Road and the City’s Transportation Committee’s design to improve safety. My neighbours and I have worked diligently toward educating residents person-to-person and directing them to the resources on the City’s website in order to help them provide accurately-informed input.

The vast majority of the public we addressed were excited, gracious and thankful for the personal notice and opportunity to participate in the decision-making process for necessary safety changes in their city, and they provided eager support for Option 1(2a). Our efforts at gathering Petition signatures have been intense and time-consuming, usurping our evenings, weekends and regular work hours at great personal expense, but they have also enlightened neighbours and brought the neighbourhood together in its desire to achieve safety for the users of the road. The naysayers of this Project would have you believe that the neighbourhood is divided on the proposed changes. This is NOT the case. The naysayers are relatively few. Due to limitations of time, beginning on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013, when the Transportation Committee released its proposals to the public, we focussed our efforts for our Petition primarily on the residents of our immediate neighbourhood North of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The naysayers stated incorrectly before you here on July 23, 2013 that our Petition has been on-going for two years. This is yet another example of overt and deliberate lying to the public and City by the group that is attempting to quash the Project.

Specifically, to date, West of Macdonald and East of Alma, 181 residents of Point Grey Road signed our Petition, 72 residents of First Avenue, 95 residents of Second Avenue, 91 of Third Avenue, 83 from the side streets of Macdonald, Bayswater, Balaclava, Trutch, Blenheim, Waterloo, Collingwood, Dunbar, Cameron and Alma, with the rest including 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue businesses, York Avenue residents, people living in all areas of the

Lower Mainland and tourists. Unlike some of the other petitions, ours includes signatories' names, addresses and contact information for verification, if necessary, of their authenticity. Signatures on this Petition were actively gathered from May 23, 2013 to July 16, 2013, the date that the City's Transportation Committee finalized its proposals and released its Report to Council. Signatures submitted to the City on our Petition after July 16, 2013 were the result of the public returning them to us at a late date.

I would personally like to thank the City's Transportation Committee for all its hard work in studying, designing, consulting, refining and presenting solutions for the Seaside Greenway and York Bikeway Completion Project from Jericho Beach to the Burrard Bridge. Council please Vote Yes to ratify and implement the Committee's recommendations for this Transportation Project. It is long overdue for urgent safety considerations, and it is the most reasonable option as a shared-use model that promotes safe residential and recreational use for all.

Thank you.



Monday, July 8, 2013

Mayor Gregor Robertson,  
Members of City Council  
City of Vancouver  
453 West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor Robertson and Members of Council,

**Re: Support for pedestrian/cycling improvements on Point Grey-Cornwall**

The Vancouver Public Space Network (VPSN) is a non-profit organization that works on matters of advocacy, education and outreach pertaining to the City's public spaces. A key focus of our activities includes looking at the role of transportation in fostering a liveable urban environment.

We are writing to you to express our support for the proposed upgrades to the Point Grey Road and Cornwall Street corridor. The improvements in safety as a result of the upgrade are an important part of ensuring cyclists of all ages and ability can reach their destinations safely and comfortably which, in turn, helps increase ridership. This plan also makes important strides towards reducing conflicts between travelers using different modes — particularly cyclists and pedestrians, and between cyclists and transit vehicles. The proposed improvements for the south end of the Burrard Street Bridge in particular, are vital to improve the experience of what has already proven to be an important connection for pedestrians, cyclists as well as other road users traveling in and out of downtown. As indicated in the City's Transportation 2040 plan, providing alternatives to motor vehicle travel is necessary for creating streets that function as high-quality, vibrant public spaces in neighbourhoods throughout the City; we support the Point Grey-Cornwall corridor as another step taken to realize that vision. We prefer the 2A option for Point Grey Road in particular, as it creates additional public park space and is most in keeping with established patterns of bike-car interaction that are found on other traffic-restricted neighbourhood bikeways throughout the City of Vancouver.

In addition to our general support, we wish to bring your attention to a few areas of potential concern regarding to the plan's accommodation of pedestrians using transit. Given the area's close proximity to downtown, and the fact that the 22 bus route is the City's fifth busiest bus route, careful consideration needs to be provided to any impacts on current and future transit users. Growing transit ridership will require that the quality of transit service on Cornwall between Burrard and McDonald, as well as other major routes in the area, to be maintained in the short-term, and preferably improved significantly in the long-term. To this end, we hope that the City will continue to monitor the transit situation on major routes in the area and work with Coast Mountain Bus Company and TransLink to ensure the impacts to traffic in the long-term will not impact travel time reliability or frequency for those traveling between downtown and areas to the southwest and west of the Point Grey-Cornwall corridor.

We also recommend that the City consider additional pedestrian improvements on Cornwall (from Cypress St to Yew St). Pedestrian improvements will benefit a large group of residents and commuters, as transit users are pedestrians; and it is noteworthy that 80% of the people who



659A Moberly Road,  
Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 4B2  
t (604) 677-0378  
f (604) 261-1395  
tml@uniserve.com  
trafalgargmt.com

## TRAFALGAR MANAGEMENT LTD.

---

Mayor Robertson and City Councilors  
City of Vancouver  
453 West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Mayor,

**Re: Bike route plan – Point Grey Road**

We must register our strong opposition to the plan as presented and displayed on the City of Vancouver website. There are many assumptions declared and implied that do not hold up to scrutiny. Where is the cost benefit analysis for this project?

1. **How many bikes are using this corridor now?** I manage 2 properties on lower Point Grey Road and there is very little bike traffic even in the summer. Most bike commuters run directly down Point Grey Road and Cornwall and would not detour to Lower Point Grey Road.
2. **Where will residents and their guests park?** The 2 dozen cars that rely on street parking will have to park in the lanes. Our ability to lease suites in this neighbourhood will be seriously jeopardized. Already we have callers saying that they are not interested in renting on Point Grey Road because of this impending change. Many residents are seniors who must have a vehicle.
3. **How will emergency vehicles and deliveries park?** They will simply park in the middle of the road.
4. **What will a concrete barrier look like?** The barrier is incredibly ugly and will ruin one of the nicest streets in Vancouver.

There is absolutely no reason to have a divided bikeway on Lower Point Grey Road. There is no traffic there and the few bikes that ride on the road are completely safe and will probably use the roadway despite the separation.

Please reconsider this enormous and unnecessary expense. I have heard that a private developer on Point Grey Road is behind this proposal. It would be a serious mistake if our City planning is now being decided in this fashion.

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)



July 10, 2013

---



Suite #505-325 Howe Street, Vancouver, BC V6C 1Z7 T: 604.683.7571 F: 604.683.2363 W: [equitablerealestate.ca](http://equitablerealestate.ca)

Mayor Gregor Robertson  
City Hall  
453 West 12th Ave.  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor Robertson:

I am the President of Equitable Real Estate Investment Corporation Ltd., which provides 584 units of middle income housing throughout the City of Vancouver including two buildings in Kitsilano, one on York Street.

We have a concern with the Point Grey Road closure. Although the planned elimination of parking has been reduced, we fear that these significant changes to the neighbourhood will result in unforeseen consequences such as through traffic being diverted to secondary streets due to the doubling of traffic on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Macdonald Street. We would not want to see the West End traffic labyrinth repeated in Kitsilano. We are concerned about parking for our tenants and access for our tradespeople.

We question the benefits of the Point Grey Road closure as opposed to the costs in terms of traffic congestion, confusion, tax dollars and most importantly, safety. The City's claim of either 51 or 5 accidents along Cornwall/Point Grey Road contradict ICBC stats of zero and the City's claim has not been substantiated. What is well substantiated is the accident rate on the streets to which the Point Grey Road traffic will be diverted.

We request that a third option be researched and considered, the whole process should be slowed with more community consultation and input.

Yours truly,

**Equitable Real Estate  
Investment Corporation Ltd.**

s.22 (1)

Mark Rahal  
President

MR/al

To the Mayor and City Council

City of Vancouver, BC.

July 6, 2013

Regarding the Point Grey Corridor issue:

Right now, the amount of traffic and the speed of both bikes and cars are incredible. From MacDonald to Alma St, there are very few crosswalks, and none of them have a light. The cars are parking too close to the crosswalks and therefore it is difficult to see when trying to cross the road. My senior dog and I have had close calls with the issues of crossing Point Grey Road.

This is a common corridor for not only cars and bikes, but home to a large group of pedestrians, and we all have to live and work together. Whether we choose to walk to the bus stop, for groceries, or take our dog for a walk, we need a safe passage through the traffic and to the parks along Point Grey Road.

Bottom line, the car traffic on Point Grey is too aggressive to accommodate the bikes and the pedestrians, and we all need to feel safe when crossing the streets in our neighbourhoods. There is no doubt that something **MUST** be done!

There has been so much talk about this corridor: this section, which section, plans A or B, etc. The plan to choose must be the best that ensures pedestrian safety while minimizing impact to the residents along the street. We strongly believe that this is Option 2A, which has significantly less impact on local parking.

s.22 (1)



July 16, 2013

Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver  
453 W 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4

**RE: Proposed Point Grey Active Transportation Corridor**

Dear Mayor and Council,

We are writing to voice our strong support for Option 2A west of MacDonald Street. We are two families who live among many other young families in the neighbourhood of West 2nd Avenue and Trutch Street.

Our primary concern with the existing Point Grey corridor is safety. This beautiful corridor is shared between cars, bicycles, pedestrians, joggers, moms and dads pushing strollers and people in wheelchairs. We are very concerned about the number of near misses we have seen as residents try to pull out of driveways onto a fast-moving street, with very poor visibility to users of the sidewalk. At its most extreme, we have seen conflict between cars and children on tricycles or on foot that could easily have had tragic results.

The majority of our neighbours have children under 10 years of age, and as such will be positively affected by the enhanced safety and park space that the proposed plan provides.

The Cornwall/Point Grey corridor is one of the most beautiful routes in the world, used by many members of community use for recreation and exercise. We believe we should be encouraging this. At present, the level of traffic on this narrow road discourages its use by anything other than cars.

While we will personally be slightly inconvenienced by a small amount of additional driving time we are still on balance strongly supportive of providing a safe, beautiful corridor that encourages our community to commute in a safer manner. We believe that Option 2A is the only option that accomplishes this. The additional inconvenience is less of a concern than the improved safety.

As frequent users of Tatlow Park with our children, both of our families are extremely excited about the potential that Option 2A presents for the expansion and improvement of this park. To me, this park is the centrepiece of this proposal and will be an enduring legacy of this Council. The unification of Volunteer and Tatlow parks will create a spectacular large park that brings waterfront access to the entire neighbourhood. Connecting the waterfront with the West 3rd Avenue bikeway will be beneficial to all residents of Kistilano. The usability of both parks is substantially enhanced; the whole is substantially greater than the sum of its parks!



Secondarily, the unification Point Grey Road Park between Trutch and Blenheim Streets with the two triangular green spaces south of Point Grey Road will turn three small, low-usage "pocket parks" bisected by vehicle traffic into an attractive usable destination that will be greatly enjoyed by my children. I believe that we could go further still; much of the pavement area on West 1<sup>st</sup> and Point Grey Road between Trutch and Blenheim is redundant (given that both streets only have homes on one side) and hence more could be given over to parkland. A reduction in the road standard width should be possible here. This should be explored as I believe that further enhancements can be made to really make Point Grey Road park perform like the jewel it should be. I trust Mr. Dobrovolny's group will look to maximize these opportunities in the detailed design phase.

Finally, we'd like to strongly articulate our non-support for Option 2B. In our opinion this creates a "worst of both worlds" scenario whereby westbound auto commuting is still impacted, however park space is not improved and the corridor is arguably made more dangerous since the one-way traffic will be encouraged to travel at significantly higher speeds still. As a bike commuter who typically travels Point Grey at 30-40 km/h I am keenly aware that current vehicle traffic well exceeds both my rate of travel and the 30 km/h posted limit. There is no chance that speeds will be reduced through the proposed 2B option. In my opinion, Option 2B is a lot of work and money for no benefit to residents and arguably exacerbates residents' safety concerns.

In closing we commend the foresight of Council in its effort to make this positive change for the City, and we would like to thank Mr. Dobrovolny and his staff for the great work that they have done on this landmark project for the City. We look forward to its completion and will be frequent users of the corridor and its parks!

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)



s.22 (1)

July 19, 2013

VIA EMAIL: [mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca)

**Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver**

Dear Mayor and Council,

**Re: Transportation Corridor  
Cornwall Point Grey Active Transportation Corridor**

I am in receipt of the administrative Report dated July 16, 2013.

The Report is difficult to follow, as there are a number of inconsistencies with previous information. In particular, there are inconsistencies in Appendix G of the Report, page 2 of 5, Section 2 *Point Grey Road, Alma Street to Macdonald Street*, and in *Proposal 2a Point Grey Road, Alma to Macdonald*, dated May 2013. I will also refer herein to my letter, dated June 10, 2013, to the Mayor and Council (a copy herewith enclosed).

I understand that revised versions of the options for *Point Grey Road – Alma to Macdonald* were presented at a meeting on approximately May the 23<sup>rd</sup> or 24<sup>th</sup>. Unfortunately I was not able to attend that meeting, as I was in Europe at the time.

Although I did sign the petition supporting Option 2a over Option 2b, at that time I was not aware of the May 2013 revised version of Option 2a, and **I am rescinding my support of Option 2a: Point Grey Road – Alma to Macdonald, except for the closure which I continue to support.**

The information that I put forth regarding items 1 to 5 in my letter of June 10, 2013 still stands. Attached herewith please find a summary, outlining my concerns regarding the May 2013 version of **Option 2a Point Grey Road - Alma Street to Macdonald Street.**

Based on my experience as a long time resident on Point Grey Road, a lot of thought and consideration has gone into the preparation of this letter. If my suggestions are in fact implemented, I know that it will cause hardship to my family. These changes to our neighbourhood will have a significant effect on our life and our routine. As you can appreciate, such change is often very difficult for seniors to implement and accept. Notwithstanding the negative impact on our lives, I believe that this is the best solution for our neighbourhood and the City at large, and will serve as a positive legacy for the citizens of Vancouver, for many years to come.

If you require any further information I will be speaker #18 on Tuesday, July 23<sup>rd</sup> at City Hall.

Sincerely

s.22 (1)

Attach.

Point Grey Road/Cornwall issue July 27, 2013

s.22 (1)

s.22 (1)

There are approximately 30 families, a mix of seniors and young families, living in this block, most of whom require vehicle transportation to get around or for their home businesses. I walk and bus wherever possible but need my car to transport my artwork.

At our block party last Saturday, which included the residents of both sides of 2700 block West first, North side of 2700 block West 2<sup>nd</sup> and West side of 1700 block Stephens, no one had received any notices from the City by way of mail or phone call about this plan.

Our neighbourhood is all for pedestrian, cycling, vehicle and transit safety. We **welcome** traffic management and respect being "green".

Right now, the corner of West 1<sup>st</sup> and MacDonald is already a challenging intersection without the need for any additional traffic going through.

Cars traveling North on MacDonald activate their right turn indicators for turning right onto Point Grey Road at least 1 – 2 blocks in advance, at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, as they are approaching the traffic light. It appears that they are **turning right on West 1<sup>st</sup>** but drive straight through instead. This makes it confusing and difficult to judge a safe crossing for cars, **and** for pedestrians needing to cross the street to catch public transit.

At the same time, when the traffic is backed up to the red light on MacDonald at Point Grey Road in the very short block, which is only 3 car lengths between 1<sup>st</sup> and Point Grey Road, cars suddenly bolt **East** onto West 1<sup>st</sup> from behind a high hedge **without** signalling. This makes it is also unsafe to cross **West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue** at MacDonald.

This hazardous intersection is further compounded by the fact that Westbound cars and buses on Point Grey Road **accelerate** in order to get through the yellow light when turning **left, South** onto MacDonald. When these vehicles come flying around this **other** blind corner, it becomes very unsafe to **get across** MacDonald by foot, bicycle or car. Sometimes a pedestrian can be caught in the middle of the street without notice.

All of the above is already creating havoc on the corner of West 1<sup>st</sup> and MacDonald, plus Point Grey Road.

Also, if Stephens is closed at Point Grey Road to York, there is a chance that cars will try to use the very narrow lane just wide enough for 1 car, between MacDonald and Stephens, off Point Grey to escape the congestion on the corner.

We, in the 2700 block of West 1<sup>st</sup> at MacDonald and all of West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue would also like some traffic **calming** instead of traffic **increasing** due to the changes which will inevitably bring increased traffic to the area. We are wondering what the plans are for a safer solution.

We would like the council to consider an amendment to the present option.

Just a few thoughts to consider BEFORE we decide to spend millions of taxpayer's money on bike lanes (anywhere in Vancouver)...

Let us be realistic...Vancouver is a major city and a majority of car traffic is and will be a fact now and in the future. So motorized traffic flow needs to remain a priority.

Promoting bike riding is a very positive thing indeed, but needs to be approached with common sense, not lofty ideas.

Should the proposed Point Grey plan become reality, let's keep in mind that that would **set a precedent for future bike lane plans** anywhere else in our city.

#### **USING EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE:**

All **main thorough fares** (E-W) should be for CAR traffic ONLY. i.e. NO CYCLISTS allowed.

The beauty of Vancouver is that there are side streets everywhere that provide direct transportation for cyclists from A to B with minimum car traffic, very safe and readily available at NO COST....

North-South main thorough fares, same rule, except where there are bridges. Bike lanes and on and off ramps from and to the nearest non major side street should be created there.

#### **EDUCATION:**

Both cars and cyclists need to learn to be aware of one another and be tolerant where needed. **A caution to cyclists:** no matter how right you think you may be, your helmet (if you are even wearing one) will not protect you from a collision with a car.

Schools could offer a mandatory course and (written and practical) test for cycling laws/traffic signs to 6 or 7 graders. (Start them young!)

Cyclists need to obey traffic rules...they CAN NOT (as frequently happens and just to name a few):

Ignore red lights and stop signs,  
ride on curb sides or pedestrian crossings  
race at high speeds

Police needs to enforce these cycling violations.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The whole issue of integrating bikes into a car dominated traffic world needs huge discussion and can not be forced upon the public by just creating bike lanes at random and at huge cost.

July 2, 2013

Mayor Gregor Robertson

Vancouver City Hall

453 West 12th Avenue

Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Mayor Robertson:

Re: Petition in Support of Option 1(2a) for Point Grey Road between Alma and Macdonald Streets as Part of the Point Grey Road-Cornwall Corridor Project within the City's Transportation 2040 Plan

---

The enclosed Petition supports enthusiastically Option 1(2a) with in excess of 1800 people supporting your initiative to address safety and access issues for people of all ages and abilities on Point Grey Road between Macdonald and Alma Street. Reduced traffic volumes and creating a shared road-use option for Point Grey Road between Alma and Macdonald streets has overwhelming support from the residents and users of the area. The petition was started on May 23, 2013, immediately after the City's Transportation Committee released its proposals to the public for the Point Grey Road-Cornwall Corridor Project. To our knowledge, it is the only Petition that has been vetted by the City's Transportation Committee for accuracy of information as presented to signatories. The first 1,000 names were submitted prior to June 10th. and therefore was in time to be included in the formal report process. The city also has a prior petition with 150 people that signed a version of this petition with one factual error which was corrected. There were some individuals who elected to submit their support for this petition directly to the city so the total number is to the best of our estimation in excess of 1900-2000 people. Those extra signatures will be with the Transportation Team and cannot be provided to be added to this presentation due to Privacy Issues. This position and support for 2A also has the official support of HUB – The Vancouver Cycling Coalition and pedestrian associations and many merchants on neighboring streets added their support as they saw these traffic changes as good for their businesses.

Residents of Point Grey Road on both sides of the street started this Petition to garner support for Option 1(2a) after careful consideration of the other options and after many meetings with city officials in the Transportation Team over several years and after doing other due diligence in discussions with various stakeholders and a review of University of British Columbia Urban Planning Departments recommendations in their 2011 study. It was also done after many after many of the residents attending stakeholder meetings, and public open houses conducted as part of the consultation process by the Transportation Team throughout the spring of 2013. It was also in response from the release of data from the first public survey of 1300 people who told the city that safety and access to the water were their priority issues. The people who signed this petition supported the goals of the Transportation 2040 plan wanted to support an option that provided better safety and access to this area of the city's recreational areas.

Option 2(2b) did not garner support for many reasons with the potential of such changes creating tension between cyclists and residents over the loss of parking and conflict as residents of Point Grey Road move to park on neighboring streets. This option is also left wanting as pedestrian safety is not adequately addressed in comparison with 2A. and the added element of cyclists needing to cross over two intersections to switch sides of the street.

The Petition for Option 1(2a) has been signed by residents, cyclists, pedestrians, joggers, dog-walkers, motorized vehicle users with disabilities and business owners in the immediate area. It also includes individuals from other parts of the city who regularly use the beaches and parks and the surprising number of tourists who also need to be considered in a conversation about safety and access. Many who signed the petition had either expressed a genuine fear and understood the risks only after finding themselves on the road. This perception of the dangers is supported by the UBC report and is clearly inhibiting full use of the area by all who would like to enjoy the area. Although tourists do not vote the fact that they find their way, often by foot or bike, to this area of the city means that they need to also be considered in a discussion regarding safety, especially in light of their lack of knowledge about the inherent risks of the inconsistencies of the street and the extent of speeding and uneven and narrow sidewalks.

The vast majority of signatures have been gathered by residents, volunteering their time to go door to door primarily North of 4th Avenue and West of Macdonald Street over a two-month window and took weeks of work. Often they were invited into homes and discussed the issue for lengthy periods. The public in this directly effected area is extremely well informed on the issue.

Each signatory was given the full petition in person and 22 of the signatures were collected online in a version of this petition. The decision was made to focus on in person support over the online version to make it more verifiable. The neighbours and passers-by on the streets, at beaches, in parks, at businesses, at cyclist gatherings and at neighbourhood festivals were engaged in the issue and were for the most part very pleased to have the opportunity to support a green initiative. Many young adults in their 30's took an interest in this project and as they have young families and have concerns for the future were very willing to support your proposal. The City's website address was offered if people had questions or wished to obtain more information.

We have worked diligently toward educating residents and business owners face-to-face about Option 1(2a) and 2(2B) in order to help people understand the differences between the two options and make an accurately-informed decision between them. This has been an arduous but extremely rewarding process that has galvanized the neighbourhood behind the goal of improving safety on Point Grey Road and cooperating on shared road use rather than separated bike lanes in a purely residential and recreational area.

The vast majority of the public that we have addressed were extremely happy, gracious and gratified to be participating in the decision-making process for necessary and safe transportation changes in their city. They were most willing to provide their support for Option 1(2a).

Our efforts have been intense, honest and open. We wish fervently to cooperate with the City in making Point Grey Road between Alma and Macdonald streets safe and accessible for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists desiring to access this area. We hope that in light of this support and the fact that only Option 1(2a) satisfies all of the Project goals, you will cast your vote in favour of Option 1(2a) when the matter is before yourself and Council.

This Petition in support of Option 1(2a) has just recently become accessible online at <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/pgr2a/>.

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)

representing the voices of this duly executed petition.

Encl: Petition in Support of Option 1(2a)





659A Moberly Road,  
Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 4B2  
t (604) 677-0378  
f (604) 261-1395  
tml@uniserve.com  
trafalgarmgmt.com

---

## TRAFALGAR MANAGEMENT LTD.

**Mayor Robertson and Council  
City of Vancouver  
By e-mail**

**July 29<sup>th</sup> 2013**

My name is s.22 (1), a planner and property manager with Trafalgar Management Ltd. As I could not wait for 120 speakers over 3 days, here is my submission.

I have quickly looked over the report titled RR-3 Point Grey Cornwall Active Transportation corridor and found very little in the way of what I would call traditional or rational transportation planning, the analysis of trips by mode over various periods of the day, analysis of alternatives, impacts, etc. No alternatives here, and the only impact analysis that was done was estimates of daily increases in traffic along arterials that would take the brunt of this planned re-routing. The most important data is volume at peak hours. These are 'trips', not number of vehicles as described here.

That said, the oddest part of the report however is it's lumping of **lower Point Grey Road** and Cornwall and upper Point Grey Road in the data, as if these were the same street. Has anyone at City Hall been there lately? It is night and day. One is a quiet tree-lined local no-thru traffic road and the other is a main commuter arterial. **Lower Point Grey Road** has local traffic to and from residences on that street or in summer, people looking to park for the beach. There is no commuter traffic. The same goes for bikes. Commuter bike traffic is on upper PGR and Cornwall and sightseeing leisurely driven bikes go to lower PGR. These are 2 vastly different transportation routes that have very different usage and must be analyzed separately.

All planning exercises start with a goal. I can see that the main goal repeated throughout is to provide "safe and comfortable connection" for bikes and foot traffic.

---

---



I can assure you, the plan showing a separated bike lane on the North side of the street on **lower PGR** is less safe than the existing condition for 2 reasons;

1. There are 16 driveways crossing this bike lane, some of them blind, on the 2 block **lower Point Grey Road**. I could not find any mention of this in the report, although it would seem to relate directly to this prime goal. The current mix of bikes and sporadic slow moving traffic on lower PGR is safer.

No one will use this section of the bike lane. They will use the roadway as they always have. The roadway is simply a very wide bike path.

2. And the commuter bike traffic will not jog down to lower PGR and back up again to Cornwall, but will cut across Cornwall at Trafalgar and continue straight. If you know commuter bikes, they go straight on the path of least resistance regardless of vehicular traffic.

There are many other reasons not to have a separated bike path on **lower PGR**, the reason creating the most severe hardship for tenants and residents is the removal of on street parking. My guess is that cars, emergency vehicles, and contractors will simply park in the street against the bike path separation.

To conclude, please keep lower PGR as it is. It works very well for bikes, pedestrians, and the residents.

Sincerely,

s.22 (1)

