### Kitsilano Beach Park Seaside Greenway – Round 3 Engagement

**Frequently Asked Questions** 

#### ENGAGEMENT

- 1. What did you learn from Round 2 engagement? What public feedback / input have you heard?
  - Zone 1 (Balsam Street to Yew Street):
    - o Option A best reflects Directness, Connections, and Parking
    - Option B best reflects Greenspace and Impact
  - **Zone 2** (Yew Street to Arbutus Street and Creelman Avenue)
    - Option C best reflects Connections, Directness, and Impact (and reflects Parking better than D)
    - Option D best reflects Greenspace
    - Option E best reflects Parking (and reflects Connections, Directness, and Impact better than D)
  - **Zone 3** (Arbutus Street from Creelman Avenue to McNicoll Avenue)
    - Option G reflects all values better than Option F, except Parking

The following Table provides a summary of peoples' like and dislikes about the options.

|        | Option | Main Reasons for Liking   | Main Reasons for Disliking   |
|--------|--------|---|--|
| ZONE 1 | A<br>B | Separates pedestrians and cyclists<br>Separates cyclists from vehicular traffic<br>Current multi-use pathway users continue<br>to have pathways options inside the park<br>Preserves greenspace<br>Separates pedestrians and cyclists | Loss of greenspace<br>Disrupts one of the park's most popular<br>social gathering and sunbathing areas.<br>Proximity of sidewalk next to a busy road.<br>3 to 4 trees need to be removed and |
|        |        | Improves access for people using off-peak parking on Cornwall   | replaced though an arborist has determined<br>they are in poor health  |
|        | С      | Separates pedestrians and cyclists<br>Direct and clear route  | Reduced access to amenities/views/beach<br>Interaction with cars near parking lot<br>Loss of greenspace  |
| ZONE 2 | D      | Separates pedestrians and cyclists<br>Minimizes impact on greenspace  | Possible conflict between pedestrians and cyclists<br>Loss of parking spaces   |
|        | E      | Proximity to the beach and ocean views<br>Access to park amenities<br>Separates cyclists from vehicular traffic   | Bike path is close to pedestrians and a busy<br>area, which could create conflicts between<br>park users<br>Loss of greenspace   |

| ZONE 3 | F | Separates cyclists from vehicular traffic                            | Loss of greenspace  |
|--------|---|--|---|
|        |   | Preserves parking spaces along Arbutus<br>Keeps cyclists in the park | The cycle path crosses a key walking/rolling pathway that accesses the playground and beach |
|        | G | Preserves greenspace   | Loss of parking spaces  |
|        |   | Separates cyclists from cars and<br>pedestrians                      | Route takes cyclists on road/close to vehicular traffic                                     |
|        |   | Minimizes impact as pathway is already in place and works well       |   |

- We also heard from external stakeholders, including event organizers and neighbourhood residents about how the options would impact them.
- We also worked with our colleagues in Engineering operations, special events, business development, real estate, and transportation
- 2. Why are you more concerned about a conflict between bicycles and cars than you are about conflicts between people walking/rolling in the park and people cycling at fast speeds?
  - We are interested in reducing conflict between all park users. Provided separated pathways for people travelling at different speeds (e.g. walking vs cycling) improves safety for all park users.
- 3. How will you ensure safety and comfort for people walking and rolling in the park when there is a cycle path that will bring people cycling into the centre of the park in a very busy area?
  - People are and will continue to cycle into the centre of the park to access park amenities. Providing a dedicated and separated cycle path makes it clearer where people can walk/roll and cycle.
  - Where the cycle path intersects with walking/rolling paths pavement markings and signage will alert all users to the intersection
  - More bike parking options will be added to encourage people cycling to park their bike and walking to their final park destination
- 4. How will you ensure safety and comfort for people cycling in the service lane when it is also used for restaurant deliveries?
  - The lane is restricted to commercial vehicles servicing the restaurant and vehicle volumes are well below the maximum vehicle threshold for designation as AAA facility
  - Based on traffic data collected in 2021 the lane is used by commercial vehicles on average for about 30 min per day
  - Deliveries occur between 8am-4pm, whereas peak weekday summer cycle traffic is later in the day (roughly 3-8pm). We will work with the restaurant, to explore enforcement for parking and unauthorized lane use
  - There are similar shared cycling and vehicle roadways elsewhere on the Seaside Greenway

- By contrast, the south Kitsilano Beach Park parking lot driveways are used by hundreds of vehicles per day
- 5. How will you prevent / deter unauthorized uses of the service lane behind the restaurant?
  - The original drop-off zone in parking lot will be restored
  - Signage at the entry to the service lane will be improved
  - We will explore enforcement options in collaboration with restaurant
- 6. The Round 2 survey results suggest that people felt Option C in Zone 2 best reflected the values determined during the first round of engagement. Yet you recommending a variation of Option E. Why?
  - In addition to public feedback, we needed to consider safety, comfort, technical, and operational requirements.
  - A key technical constraint is Engineering's requirement for unrestricted access to an existing sewer pump station located beside Arbutus Street, near the southeast of corner of the Tennis Courts.
  - Adding a separated cycle path along this section of Arbutus, that also preserved access to the pump station, would require significant changes to the alignment of Arbutus Street and the removal of numerous 'resident only' parking spaces, that we determined were not practical for the interim timeline of our project.

### 7. Why did you show Option C, D, and E to begin with?

- These options were brought forward in 2018, and provided us with a starting point for the conversations we have had with the public, and internal and external stakeholders
- 8. Why did you show Option C if it was eventually discounted for safety reasons? / Why would you show an unsafe option in the first place?
  - Creating a crossing between people cycling on the separated cycle path and the parking lot driveway is not an unprecedented or unacceptable condition. This happens elsewhere on Greenway. However, because there are options that avoid this higher risk conflict, and because safety is our top priority, we have disqualified Option C.

### 9. What happens next? When will this proposed cycle route be built?

- Board decision in spring 2022
- o Detailed design work is still required
- Subject to Board approval we anticipate construction could occur as early as late 2022 and/or 2023 depending on City resourcing

## TECHNICAL / DETAILED DESIGN QUESTIONS

- 1. What 'additional criteria' did you consider (other than public and stakeholder input)?
  - In addition to the values of greenspace, connections, directness, impact and parking, staff used additional criteria to assess each option, including:
    - Safety (mode crossings, separation, sightlines, operational safety)
      - Crossings: How many and what kind of crossings are required between people cycling, walking, and driving?

- Separation: All of the options separate the walking and cycling paths, but what degree of separation is there? (e.g. widened pathway, pathways with grass/planters in between, pathways that are at different heights)
- Comfort (for walking/rolling, for cycling)
  - How comfortable is this option for people walking/rolling?
  - How comfortable is it for people cycling?
  - Feasibility (costs, "future proof", street right of way impacts, operational needs)
    - How costly is this option to build? How costly is it to operate? Is this an acceptable cost for pathway that will be in place for approximately 5 years?
    - How significant (and costly) is the change required on the street right of way?
    - Can this option work with operational requirements (e.g. regular access and maintenance requirements for Parks, Engineering, and other city staff)?
- Impact (special events, neighbourhood parking, neighbourhood traffic)
  - How great is the impact to special events that take place in and near the park? Can these impacts be mitigated?
  - How great is the impact on the neighbourhood (changes to parking and to traffic patterns)?
  - Accessibility (clarity of access, accessible parking)
    - Does this option maintain clear and direct access for people using mobility aids between park entrances and concession, washrooms, tennis courts, beach, and across the park?
    - Does this option maintain accessible parking stalls that provide direct access into the park?

# 2. Why aren't you recommending Option C?

- <u>Key issue</u>: safety risk of conflict between people cycling on the path and people driving into and out of the parking lot
- A majority of survey respondents said that Option C best reflects the values of connections, directness, and impact, but didn't think that it best reflected the value of greenspace. This option results in the largest loss of greenspace among the three options in Zone 2.
- Option C also requires the cycle path cross the parking lot driveways. Even if we reduce the number of entrances to the parking lot, potential conflicts remain between cyclists and high volumes of vehicle traffic moving into and out of the parking lot. The other two options allow us to avoid this potential conflict.
- Option C also needs to connect to Arbutus Street. The challenges with this (two-way traffic, EV stations, and pump station access) are the same as for Option D, described below.

## 3. Why aren't you recommending Option D?

- Key issue: either creates a safety risk for both people cycling and crew members accessing the pump station, or requires significant and costly changes to Arbutus Street between Cornwall and Creelman, or requires removal of the majority of street parking on Arbutus Street between Cornwall and Creelman
- Staff considered adjustments to Option D to respond to feedback, including:

- Creating a 'bike hub' with lots of bike parking to establish a clear arrival area for people cycling to the park
- Returning the accessible parking stalls to their original location, to bring them closer to and provide direct access to park amenities like the tennis courts, restaurant, and washrooms
- Bringing the cycle path inside the park east of the tennis courts so that this section of Arbutus Street can be converted back to two-way traffic
- $\circ$  Two of the additional criteria staff considered were safety and operations access.
  - The pump station at the southeast corner of the tennis courts is an important piece of infrastructure that requires near-daily access by crews to ensure it continues to operate as expected.
  - Bringing the cycle path inside the park and close to the pump station creates a safety risk to both people cycling and crew members accessing the pump station.
  - Staff considered putting the cycle path on Arbutus Street to create enough distance from the pump station, but this presents some challenges described below
- In order to create more space for pump station access, staff looked at an on-street option on Arbutus that would restore two-way traffic:
  - Arbutus Street is relatively narrow between Cornwall and Creelman, so this would require the removal of 30-40 parking spaces and decommissioning or relocating at least two of the four available EV charging spots
  - Relocating the EV charging stations is possible, but it is an expensive undertaking, especially given that this cycle path will be in place for only the next approximately 5 years or so until more is known about the anticipated Kitsilano Beach Park renewal/master plan, Senakw development, and Broadway Plan.
  - Adding a separated cycle path along this section of Arbutus, that preserves operational access to the pump station, would require significant changes to the alignment of Arbutus Street and the removal of numerous 'resident only' parking spaces, that we determined were expensive and not practical for the timeline of our project

# 4. Why are you recommending Option E?

- $\circ$   $\;$  Staff made changes to Option E to reflect public input during engagement:
  - Staff heard that physical separation between walking/rolling and cycling paths is important
  - Staff also heard that having the cycle path immediately west of the tennis courts could make tennis court access challenging, particularly for disabled users, so staff relocated it further west
- Moving the cycle path further from the parking lot and tennis courts makes access to the tennis courts and restaurant clearer and more comfortable
- The proposed treatment is similar to that found in other parks (e.g. Harbour Green, Devonian Harbour, Stanley, George Wainborn, David Lam, Charleson Parks) along the Seaside Greenway where walking/rolling and cycling paths are both near the water and in close proximity to one another, yet physically separated to enhance safety and reduce conflicts.