

Preliminary Design Consultation Summary Report

Lions Bay

November 30, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
1.1 Project Scope	1
1.2 Project Goals	2
1.3 Community Consultation	2
1.4 Traffic Management	2
2. OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION ON HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT DESIGN	3
2.1 Stages of Consultation	3
2.2 Preliminary Design Consultation Goals	3
2.3 Preliminary Design Consultation Topics	3
2.4 Preliminary Design Consultation Methods	4
3. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	6
3.1 Summary of Feedback Form Responses	7
3.2 Key Theme Summary of Comments from Small Group Meetings	17
3.3 Key Theme Summary of Comments from Post Consultation Meeting	18
4. APPENDICES:	
1. Small Group Meeting Notes	Volume 1
2. Statistical Analysis of Feedback Forms	Volume 1
3. List of Registered Attendees	Volume 1
4. Public Advertisement and Postcard	Volume 1
5. Discussion Guide and Feedback Form	Volume 1
6. Preliminary Meeting Notes	Volume 1
7. Notes – Post Consultation Meeting	Volume 1
8. Open House, Web and E-Mail Feedback Forms	Volume 2

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1 PROJECT SCOPE

The Sea-to-Sky Highway links communities from West Vancouver to Whistler. With its spectacular mountain landscape, the highway presents complex engineering and construction challenges.

British Columbia's Ministry of Transportation is undertaking improvements to the highway between West Vancouver and Whistler to improve its safety, reliability and capacity. By 2009, extensive improvements will make travel along the corridor safer for residents, commuters and tourists. To be completed before the Olympics, the highway improvements will serve population growth and economic development in the corridor as demand increases for resident and visitor travel, as well as goods movement.

Improvements will include highway widening and straightening, improved sightlines, passing lanes and other design innovations to reduce hazards, shorten travel times and increase capacity of the Sea-to-Sky Highway.

The Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project will result in the following:

- **West Vancouver to Lions Bay** - 4-lane sections with continuous median barrier including straightening, widening and improved sightlines (eliminating several sharp curves).
- **North of Lions Bay to Murrin Park** - 2, 3 and 4-lane sections; about half of this section includes improved 2-lane sections, and the remaining sections include additional passing opportunities with 3 and 4 lanes. Those sections that are 4 lanes will include a median barrier to prevent crossover accidents. Sections adjacent to Murrin Park and within the community of Britannia will include improved 2-lane sections, which is consistent with community input from pre-design consultations. In Furry Creek, there will be 3 lanes moving to 4 lanes with a median barrier.
- **North of Murrin Park through Squamish** - 4-lane divided highway. This section will include median barriers throughout, including the addition of urban design features to the median within Squamish.
- **Squamish to Whistler** - 3 lanes throughout this section, including improved 2-lane sections and alternating passing opportunities provided by alternating the third lane.

Improvements will meet population growth and travel demands until 2020, with additional improvements phased in as required over approximately 20 years. The project will create 6,000 new jobs throughout the province as a result of economic activity generated along the corridor, and will increase provincial GDP by \$300 million over the period of 2010 to 2025.

1.2 PROJECT GOALS

The **primary goals** for the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project include:

- Safety improvements
- Reliability improvements
- Capacity improvements
- Project completion by late 2009
- Management of traffic flows during construction in order to minimize disruption and maximize predictability
- Completion of the project on time and on budget

1.3 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The Ministry of Transportation (MoT) has consulted about the scope of highway improvements over the last three years with communities, businesses and residents along the corridor. The MoT project team has attended approximately 400 meetings. Much of the consultation has complemented various technical studies undertaken by the MoT on tolling, other route options, and transportation alternatives.

- **Once consultation on preliminary design is complete, construction of the highway improvements will start. Community consultation on detailed design will be conducted prior to completion of the improvements. Construction is underway in some areas of Lions Bay at the request of the Village of Lions Bay.**

The S2S Transportation Group is the contractor responsible for designing, building, operating and maintaining the Sea-to-Sky Highway. A key outcome of the preliminary design consultation is practical feedback on preliminary designs for consideration by the Ministry of Transportation and the S2S Transportation Group as they develop detailed and final designs.

The next stage of consultation, detailed design consultation, generally involves the discussion of fewer but very specific treatments related to the final design, including such things as specific traffic calming and noise reduction features, shape and colour of light fixtures, and detailed landscaping and other aesthetic treatments.

1.4 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

A key goal of the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project is to manage traffic flows during construction in order to minimize disruption and maximize predictability for travelers. Highway closures will be implemented at set times and publicized well in advance.

To plan ahead for a safe trip, the following travel planning tools are available on the project website (www.seatoskyimprovements.ca):

- **Weekly Schedule** – Weekly update on confirmed highway closures and delays
- **Travel Planner** – A list of the available closure/delay windows to November 30

- **Closure & Delay Windows** – The maximum closure/delay windows to 2009
- **Trip Calculator** – Use our interactive trip calculator for suggested departure times to reach your destination
- **Road Alerts Service** – Frequent Sea to Sky travelers can receive text message alerts about major or unscheduled events that affect highway travel.

2. OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION ON HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

2.1 STAGES OF CONSULTATION

As the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project proceeds through various design stages and ultimately into construction, communities and key stakeholders are being consulted. The design stages include:

1. Project Definition Consultation (completed)
2. Pre-Design Consultation (completed)
3. **Preliminary Design Consultation (CURRENT STAGE)**
4. Detailed Design Consultation

2.2 PRELIMINARY DESIGN CONSULTATION GOALS

The purpose of the consultation is to:

- Inform the community and stakeholders about the draft preliminary design improvements to the Sea-to-Sky Highway within the Lions Bay area as well as the corridor-wide features.
- Gather input and feedback regarding preliminary design features for highway improvements from the community and stakeholders.
- Summarize community and stakeholder input for consideration by the Ministry of Transportation and the S2S Transportation Group.
- Distribute the Consultation Summary Report to consultation participants, the Village of Lions Bay and other stakeholders.

2.3 PRELIMINARY DESIGN CONSULTATION TOPICS

The following consultation topics were discussed in the Lions Bay preliminary design community consultation:

- Kelvin Grove mini-change
- Brunswick Beach mini-change
- Additional¹ noise mitigation measures (noise walls and residential options)

¹ MoT has already committed to using quiet pavement and introducing traffic calming measures to reduce current sound levels by approximately 5 dB which is projected to keep traffic noise below current levels, even with increases in traffic until 2031.

- East Boulevard landscaping
- Village atmosphere
- Interchange lighting
- Pedestrian and cyclist interconnectivity (Kelvin Grove to Central Lions Bay and Central Lions Bay to Brunswick Beach)
- Gateway locations
- Gateway feature options
- Speed enforcement areas
- Transit stop locations (Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach)

2.4 PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION METHODS

a. DISCUSSION GUIDE AND FEEDBACK FORM

A consultation discussion guide was developed to explain the purpose of the preliminary design consultation and describe the highway improvement features on which community feedback was sought. The Discussion Guide included a feedback form to assist in gathering community input.

The discussion guide also included:

- Maps showing the location of highway improvements and features
- Background on the Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project's response to community input from the pre-design consultation
- Description and graphics illustrating the Kelvin Grove minichange
- Description and graphics illustrating the Brunswick Beach minichange
- Descriptions, comparative tables and graphics regarding additional noise mitigation options (noise walls and residential options)
- Descriptions and graphics of the landscape options and treatments
- Graphics illustrating the gateway feature options

Feedback was gathered at three small group meetings², at two open houses and by an on-line feedback form, fax and mail.

b. WEB-BASED CONSULTATION

All consultation materials were available on www.seatoskyimprovements.ca, including an on-line feedback form.

c. LIONS BAY SEA-TO-SKY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Beginning in June, the project team met with the Lions Bay Sea-to-Sky Advisory Committee to discuss and help shape the options for the preliminary design consultation with the community³. These meetings were held on:

² Notes from the small group meetings are included in Volume 1 of the Appendix to this Consultation Summary Report. The key themes from each of the meetings have been included in this summary of consultation input.

³ Notes from these preliminary meetings with the Advisory Committee are included in Volume 1 of the Appendix to this Consultation Summary Report.

- June 7, 2006
- June 28, 2006
- July 27, 2006
- August 22, 2006
- September 20, 2006
- September 25, 2006

d. SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

The Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project team met with three community groups over four days.

Event	Attendance
• October 16, 2006	14
• October 17, 2006	16
• October 19, 2006	14

The discussion guide and table top versions of the display boards were reviewed at the small group meetings. Attendees provided comments on preliminary design features for the Lions Bay community, and had the opportunity to ask questions.

A facilitator, recorder, Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project staff and members of the S2S Transportation Group attended the small group meetings, answered questions and provided information.

e. OPEN HOUSES

Two open houses were held in Lions Bay to provide residents, community organizations, businesses, and stakeholders with the opportunity to provide feedback on the preliminary design options.

Event	Attendance
• October 21, 2006 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. Lions Bay Community Hall	55
• October 23, 2006 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Lions Bay Community Hall	98

Display boards provided background on the project and illustrated the proposed improvements through Lions Bay. Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project staff and S2S Transportation Group team members were available to answer questions.

f. Stakeholder/Public Contact and Advertisements

Contact with stakeholders for the small group meetings and advertisement for the Open Houses were as follows:

Date	Contact
September 8	Original Email Invitations to Stakeholders
September 10	<i>North Shore News</i> Ad – Open Houses (Original Dates)
September 13	Change of Date Notice Sent to Stakeholders
September 19	Change of Date Invitations to Stakeholders
September 20	<i>North Shore News</i> Ad – Open House Cancellation
October 5	Reminder Emails to Stakeholders
October 11	<i>North Shore News</i> Ad – Open Houses (New Dates)
October 13	<i>Squamish Chief</i> Ad – Open Houses (New Dates)
October 15	<i>North Shore News</i> Ad – Open Houses (New Dates)

3. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

The Lions Bay Preliminary Design community consultation included gathering community feedback and input regarding mini-changes, additional noise mitigation options, village atmosphere (interchange lighting, boulevard landscaping and pathways), community gateways (locations and features), transit locations and speed enforcement locations.

209 people participated in the Lions Bay Preliminary Design consultation. Participation was as follows:

- 44 people attended the small group meetings
- 153 people attended the open houses
- 12 additional people provided feedback but did not attend meetings or open houses

The number of feedback forms received was as follows:

- 58 written feedback forms
- 49 participated via online feedback form or by fax

Highlights of the consultation input can be summarized as:

- General support for the highway improvement project.
- A strong sentiment that effective noise mitigation measures must be put into place.

- The highway improvements must add to, not take away from the quality of life for Village residents.

The following provides a summary of input provided through the consultation feedback forms. The quantitative results are presented below together with a qualitative summary of feedback form comments.

A. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FORM RESPONSES⁴

MINI-CHANGES

1. Kelvin Grove mini-change

Participants were asked to provide comments on the proposed overpass mini-change at Kelvin Grove. The following summarizes these comments:

- Many participants commented that they support the overpass design as presented and felt that this would provide safer access and egress as well as improve connectivity for pedestrians.
- Many participants raised issues they believe need to be carefully addressed as the design moves forward; most significantly these included:
 - ⇒ emergency vehicle accommodation
 - ⇒ additional noise from the ramps and the intrusion of noise mitigation measures into lines of sight for residents
 - ⇒ light pollution for surrounding homes
 - ⇒ change to the residential nature of Tidewater Road and Periwinkle Place
 - ⇒ the steepness of the grade, particularly in winter conditions
 - ⇒ safety of pedestrians and cyclists
 - ⇒ need for assurances about landscaping
 - ⇒ access and workability of the proposed drop-off zone

2. Brunswick Beach mini-change

Participants were asked to provide comments on the proposed underpass mini-change at Brunswick Beach. The following summarizes these comments:

- Many participants commented that they support the underpass design as presented and felt that this would provide safer access and egress as well as improve connectivity for pedestrians.
- Many participants raised issues they believe need to be carefully addressed as the design moves forward; most significantly these included:
 - ⇒ the sheer size of the design for the volume of traffic
 - ⇒ emergency vehicle accommodation
 - ⇒ ease of pedestrians and cyclist connectivity
 - ⇒ need for noise mitigation – primarily from heavy truck usage

⁴ Copies of all the feedback forms provided are gathered in a separate volume from the Consultation Summary Report.

- ⇒ covered bus-stop
- ⇒ appropriate landscaping
- ⇒ parking

NOISE MITIGATION

3. Residential location and support for noise walls

The following table correlates location with support for noise walls based on area of residency. The scale used was:

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Somewhat Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Somewhat Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree.
	Agreement with noise walls				
	1	2	3	4	5
Upper and lower Kelvin Grove (Southern Village limit to Rundle Creek)	14	3	0	0	0
Central Lions Bay (Rundle Creek to Alberta Creek)	9	6	0	1	0
Central Lions Bay to Brunswick Beach (Alberta Creek to Northern Village limit)	14	2	1	0	0
Do not live in area	0	1	1	0	0

In summary, based on area of residency:

- The majority of residents in all areas strongly supported the use of sound walls where feasible.
- All but two of the remaining residents somewhat supported the use of sound walls for noise mitigation.

4. Proximity to highway and support for noise walls

In order to correlate noise mitigation preferences with location, participants were asked to note where they live. The scale used was:

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Somewhat Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Somewhat Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree.
	Agreement with noise walls				
	1	2	3	4	5
Live next to the highway	41	3	1	1	1
Do not live next to the highway	32	15	3	3	1

In summary, based on proximity to the highway:

- The majority of residents, both those that live next to the highway as well as those that do not live next to the highway, strongly supported the use of sound walls where feasible.

- A significant number of the remaining residents that do not live next to the highway somewhat supported the use of sound walls for noise mitigation.

Additional comments regarding noise walls included the following:

- Many participants provided comments with regards to design considerations including:
 - ⇒ ensuring that the aesthetics of the noise walls are pleasing and that the landscaping is integrated with the use of these walls (both around and on the walls themselves)
 - ⇒ paying attention to the visual impacts (line of sight as well as visual aesthetics) for residents in the vicinity of noise walls
 - ⇒ ensuring that the walls do not have a “tunnel” impact on the village atmosphere
 - ⇒ ensuring that the ramps at both Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach have noise-mitigating walls
 - ⇒ combining berms and noise walls wherever practical
- Many participants noted that the locations of the walls needed to be expanded, including:
 - ⇒ extending the length of some of the locations that are currently proposed, including additional noise walls, notably at the school and on the west side of the highway in certain locations
- Participants also strongly supported the use of multiple methods to reduce noise including:
 - ⇒ extending the quiet pavement past the village boundaries
 - ⇒ using quiet pavement on the bridges and ramps
 - ⇒ addressing the noise impacts of the bridge expansion joints
 - ⇒ taking measures to ensure that the planned speed reduction will actually happen
 - ⇒ using noise walls along with residential solutions

5. Residential location and support for residential options

The following table correlates location with support for residential options for homes immediately next to the highway – responses have been presented based on area of residency. The scale used was:

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Somewhat Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Somewhat Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree.
	Agreement with residential solutions				
	1	2	3	4	5
Upper and lower Kelvin Grove (Southern Village limit to Rundle Creek)	6	2	4	1	4
Central Lions Bay (Rundle Creek to Alberta Creek)	4	6	4	0	0
Central Lions Bay to Brunswick Beach (Alberta Creek to northern Village limit)	8	1	3	2	1

In summary, based on area of residency:

- There is a mixed but somewhat positive level of support for the use of residential options where noise walls are not feasible - 27 either strongly or somewhat support the use of residential options to address noise concerns and 8 either somewhat or strongly oppose this option.

6. Proximity to highway and support for residential options

The following table correlates location with support for residential options for homes immediately next to the highway – responses have been presented based on whether or not the respondent lives next to the highway. The scale used was:

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Somewhat Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Somewhat Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree.
	Agreement with residential solutions				
	1	2	3	4	5
Live next to the highway	22	7	8	2	4
Do not live next to the highway	13	16	11	5	7

In summary, based on proximity to the highway:

- While there are some who opposed or are neutral on the use of residential solutions, the majority of residents that live next to the highway as well as those that do not live next to the highway supported the use of residential options where noise walls are not feasible; this support is strongest for those residents that live next to the highway

Additional comments regarding residential solutions included the following:

- While there was support for the use of residential options for noise reduction as a concept, the lack of details on specific properties and how such a program would be implemented was confusing to a number of those responding to this item.
- Many participants indicated that residential solutions should not preclude other noise reduction measures such as noise walls where these are feasible. A number of participants suggested that residential solutions should be considered only after other measures are already in place.
- Some participants indicated that design considerations need to address both the use of outdoor property as well as the ability to have doors and windows open in the summer.

VILLAGE ATMOSPHERE

7. Interchange lighting

Participants were asked to indicate their preference for interchange lighting. Two options were presented to the community:

Option 1 – Lighting using standard height highway light poles (11-14m high)

Option 2 – Lighting using architectural style light fixtures (4-4.5m high)

The following indicates the community’s preference for options:

Option 1: Standard highway lighting	12% preferred Option 1
Option 2: Architectural lighting	88% preferred Option 2

Additional comments regarding interchange lighting included the following:

- Participants strongly supported the use of architectural lighting at the interchanges as part of the overall village atmosphere and to signal the urban setting to motorists.
- Many participants voiced their concerns about light pollution and encouraged a design that will minimize this.
- Some participants also expressed the need for additional lighting for landscaping and pathways.

8. East boulevard landscaping

Participants were asked to indicate their preference for east boulevard landscaping. Two options were presented to the community:

Option 1 – East boulevard planting with deciduous trees and shrubs

Option 2 – East boulevard planting with clusters of native trees where width permits.

The following indicates the community’s preference for options:

Option 1: Deciduous trees and shrubs	32% preferred Option 1
Option 2: Native trees	66% preferred Option 2

Additional comments regarding landscaping of the east boulevard included the following:

- While the number indicating preference for native trees on the east boulevard appears to be much stronger than those choosing the deciduous trees and shrubs, many participants commented that they would prefer a mixture.
- There is a wide variety of opinions on the type of landscaping and preferred species.

- Concerns about landscaping include:
 - ⇒ responsibility for ongoing maintenance
 - ⇒ requirements for irrigation
 - ⇒ the need for a path, regardless of what option or mixture is chosen
 - ⇒ selection of species that will not block views
 - ⇒ the need to integrate the east boulevard landscaping with median landscaping

9. Pedestrian Path on east side - Kelvin Grove to Central Lions Bay

Participants were asked to provide their feedback regarding a pedestrian path on the east side of the highway in Central Lions Bay, in addition to the restored Tidewater Trail on the west side. The following is a key theme summary of the comments:

- Of the 88 responses to this item, 54 were strongly in favour of a pedestrian path option between Kelvin Grove and Central Lions Bay citing safety and improved connectivity as the main reasons.
- Many who supported improved pathway connectivity noted that the path should be on the west side although some questioned the need for two paths. Concerns included the safety of a route beside the highway or the need for a path in this area in addition to Tidewater Trail. Some of the objections also are concerned about the proximity of this path to private property and safety concerns related to the closeness to the highway.

10. Pedestrian access Central Lions Bay to Brunswick Beach

Participants were asked to provide their feedback regarding pedestrian access between Central Lions Bay and Brunswick Beach on the east boulevard. The following is a key theme summary of the comments:

- The provision of pedestrian access between Central Lions Bay and Brunswick Beach was unanimously supported.
- There was a very strong majority suggesting that this must be an off-highway connection on the west side.

COMMUNITY GATEWAYS

11. North gateway location

Participants were asked to indicate their level of support for the proposed location of the north gateway 350 metres north of Brunswick Beach mini-change.

Strongly agree	45% Strongly agreed with the proposed location
Somewhat agree	34% Somewhat agreed with the proposed location
Neither agree or disagree	16% Neither agree or disagreed with the proposed location
Somewhat disagree	2% Somewhat disagreed with the proposed location
Strongly disagree	4% Strongly disagreed with the proposed location

Additional comments regarding the north gateway location included the following:

- A total of 79% agreed (strongly or somewhat) with the proposed location.
- Several participants suggested that the location should be closer to M Creek.
- Participants recognized the importance of this gateway in signaling to drivers that they are entering an urban area and proposed that the gateways are integrated with speed reduction measures (including prior warning that motorists are coming to a speed-reduced area).

12. South gateway location

Participants were asked to indicate their level of support for the proposed location of the south gateway 600 metres south of Kelvin Grove mini-change.

Strongly agree	44% Strongly agreed with the proposed location
Somewhat agree	39% Somewhat agreed with the proposed location
Neither agree or disagree	11% Neither agree or disagreed with the proposed location
Somewhat disagree	4% Somewhat disagreed with the proposed location
Strongly disagree	2% Strongly disagreed with the proposed location

Additional comments regarding the south gateway location included the following:

- A total of 83% agreed (strongly or somewhat) with the proposed location.
- Several participants suggested that the location should be closer to Lonetree Creek.
- Again, participants recognized the importance of this gateway in signaling to drivers that they are entering an urban area and proposed that the gateways are integrated with speed reduction measures (including prior warning that motorists are coming to a speed reduced area).

13. Gateway feature options

Participants were asked to indicate how appealing each of the four gateway feature options proposed for Lions Bay were on a scale of 1 to 5 (Not at all appealing) to 5 (Very appealing). The following is a statistical summary of how respondents rated the Gateway Feature options on an appeal scale:

	Very appealing	Somewhat appealing
Option 1: Community Rock	54% ⁵	27%
Option 2: Community Links	2%	15%
Option 3: Community Rings	1%	5%
Option 4: Community Blades	2%	2%

Additional comments regarding community gateway features included the following:

- 81% of participants preferred the community rock rating this as either very or somewhat appealing.
- There was a strong voice stating that real, not faux, materials be used.
- There is a strong desire to ensure that the gateway feature embodies:
 - ⇒ distinctive Lions Bay components
 - ⇒ lighting
 - ⇒ landscaping
 - ⇒ other measures to ensure motorists recognize they are entering an urban area

OTHER FEATURES

14. Transit stop location at Kelvin Grove

Participants were asked to indicate their support for the proposed transit stops at Kelvin Grove at the northbound off-ramp and at the southbound off-ramp – both near the overpass bridge to provide connections for bus travelers in either direction.

Strongly agree	49% Strongly agreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Somewhat agree	25% Somewhat agreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Neither agree or disagree	22% Neither agree or disagreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Somewhat disagree	1% Somewhat disagreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Strongly disagree	3% Strongly disagreed with the proposed transit stop locations

⁵ Some totals may not add up to 100% as some participants did not indicate a preference

Additional comments regarding the proposed Kelvin Grove transit stop locations included the following:

- 74% of participants strongly or somewhat agreed with the proposed transit locations at Kelvin Grove
- Many participants commented that Park-and-Ride space and adequate drop-off space was mandatory
- Some participants expressed concern about the changing nature of the area and increased disturbance for Periwinkle Place residents

15. Transit stop location at Brunswick Beach

Participants were asked to indicate their support for the proposed transit stops at Brunswick Beach mini-change.

Strongly agree	41% Strongly agreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Somewhat agree	28% Somewhat agreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Neither agree or disagree	18% Neither agree or disagreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Somewhat disagree	1% Somewhat disagreed with the proposed transit stop locations
Strongly disagree	1% Strongly disagreed with the proposed transit stop locations

Additional comments regarding the proposed Brunswick Beach transit stop locations included the following:

- 69% of the participants either strongly or somewhat support the proposed transit location in the Brunswick Beach mini-change
- Many participants commented that the design needs to include:
 - ⇒ Park-and-Ride space and adequate drop-off space
 - ⇒ pedestrian safety (e.g. crosswalks)

16. Speed enforcement areas

Participants were asked to comment on the potential location of speed enforcement areas at the north and south ends of the village. Comments regarding the proposed speed enforcement areas included the following:

- Most participants agreed with the proposed locations while also citing the need for more speed enforcement areas within the village
- Concerns were raised with regard to having the southern speed enforcement area outside of the gateway if this is still at a highway speed

- Considerable comment was made with respect to a feeling of speed being under-enforced in Lions Bay
- A number of participants suggested that speed indicating signage should be used to augment police enforcement, while others called for the return of radar cameras

17. Relative priorities for spending

Participants were asked to provide a priority ranking for various improvements to provide the project team with a sense of relative importance for spending priorities. The following scale was used – 1 (highest spending priority) to 4 (lowest spending priority). The figures indicate the percentage of participants’ priority responses for each feature.

	1	2	3	4
Additional noise reduction (beyond the 4-5 decibel reduction from quiet pavement and speed reduction)	63	7	8	11
Landscaping	26	26	22	22
Lighting	15	22	26	21
Pedestrian facilities	30	22	17	21

Additional comments regarding spending priorities included the following:

- While the statistics indicate that noise is the most important, relatively speaking, the majority of participants stated clearly that this was not a useful way of assessing design features and that these spending areas are a totality and must be considered as a whole package, not an either-or decision
- There was considerable recognition that noise and safety are primary concerns and that these are both supported by enhancement of Lions Bay as a village (village atmosphere items, speed enforcement, pedestrian connectivity and safety) as well as wanting assurances that the highway improvement will not be at the “expense” of Lions Bay in terms of livability and enjoyment of property

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Participants were provided the opportunity to add comments on areas not addressed in the questions asked; these included the following:

- A few participants noted other improvements/changes they hoped would happen including:
 - ⇒ improving the appearance and functionality of the Central Lions Bay mini-change
 - ⇒ addressing the use of village interchanges for truck u-turn routes
- A few participants provided comments on the preliminary design consultation process with some positive feedback and some expressions of cynicism

3.2 KEY THEME SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

The Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project team met with three stakeholder groups over two days:

- October 16, 2006
- October 17, 2006
- October 19, 2006

At each of the small group meetings, notes were recorded⁶, including participant comments. The following provides a summary of these comments for each of the small group meetings.

Meeting #1 – October 16, 2006

- Participants identified noise reduction as a major concern.
- Participants felt that the noise reduction options were not addressing all the areas where noise concerns are felt and expressed the need for more detailed design.
- Participants felt that speed enforcement was an important element in managing the noise.

Meeting #2 – October 17, 2006

- Participants believed that noise mitigation must be done on the west side of the highway as well as the east side.
- Participants stated that more attention needs to be paid to speed enforcement – design is not enough.
- Best efforts at noise mitigation means that every opportunity must be taken for incremental improvements.

Meeting #3 – October 19, 2006

- Participants commented that the design of the highway may not be enough to achieve the projected speed reductions.
- Participants requested that more attention be paid to the west side of the highway in terms of noise reduction.
- Participants expressed concern regarding the traffic hazard at the north end of Lions Bay that will be caused, by the current design, where two-northbound lanes will merge into one-lane; there has historically been a high accident rate at this location.

⁶ The notes from these meetings are gathered in a separate volume from the Consultation Summary Report.

3.2 KEY THEME SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM POST CONSULTATION MEETING

The Sea-to-Sky Highway Improvement Project team met with on November 27, 2006 with the Lions Bay Sea-to-Sky Advisory Committee to review the Consultation Summary Report⁷. In summary, their comments were as follows:

Mini-changes

- Design considerations for Brunswick Beach need to include:
 - ⇒ avoidance of light pollution
 - ⇒ noise mitigation for the uphill side
 - ⇒ pedestrian access across Magnesia Creek for residents on the north side

Noise mitigation

- There needs to be a clear baseline for noise levels established for determining performance of noise mitigation measures
- Plans need to be firmly in place for assessing the effectiveness of noise mitigation measures and a commitment to ensure that sound level promises are being met, with additional measures to be taken should noise levels exceed these

Village atmosphere

- It is important that the Central Lions Bay interchange lighting will also be upgraded to architectural lighting and that attention is paid to improving the appearance of this interchange in keeping with the overall village atmosphere
- There needs to be a pedestrian underpass at Alberta Creek
- There should not be a path next to the highway on the east side between Kelvin Grove and Central Lions Bay although enhanced pedestrian access on the west side is supported
- The community should be directly involved in helping to determine landscaping plans

Gateways

- RCMP should be consulted with respect to the function of the gateway location and speed reduction and enforcement
- the committee reinforced the importance of having the uniqueness of Lions Bay captured as part of the gateway feature

Other features

- The committee was divided on the need for park-and-ride facilities at the Kelvin Grove and Brunswick Beach mini-changes but agreed that the Village needs to work with transit providers and MoT to determine what is most appropriate for the future
- Speed enforcement areas were strongly supported and an acknowledgement that the Village needs to find ways to support and work cooperatively with the RCMP with regards to enhancing enforcement activities

Miscellaneous

- Underground services (electrical, telephone and cable service) should be done as part of the highway improvements

⁷ Notes from this meeting with the Advisory Committee are included in Volume 3 of the Appendix to this Consultation Summary Report.

- The split grade component should be longer than shown in the current design (starting close to Harvey Creek)
- The committee was divided on the need for public washroom facilities as part of the highway improvements
- There need to be adequate provisions for ensuring effective emergency vehicle connections to all parts of the community