

MINUTES  
**SAANICH BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 2  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2005, AT 4:00 P.M.

Present: Chair: Councillor Derman  
Members: V. Faulkner, J. Gaylord, P. Shatzko, J. Grayson, N. Neate, D. DeShane  
Staff: A. Topp, Manager of Community Planning, C. Doyle, Director of Engineering, G. Fleming, Coordinator of Parks Design & Development, and M. Roper, Committee Clerk  
Regrets: D. Wick, Constable B. Brajcich  
Guest: J. Luton

---

### **INTRODUCTION OF THE CHAIR**

The Chair introduced himself to the other members of the committee. He observed that this is a well-functioning committee which he had heard of by repute. He advised that he will do all he can to assist the committee in carrying out its mandate. Further to this endeavour he will spend a reasonable part of his summer on his bike familiarizing himself with the trails and areas of interest to the Committee. The past Chair has discussed the current issues with him. He would also like to meet with staff to get their perspective. Each member of the committee was invited to call him or email him to express their comments about any issues pertaining to the committee.

### **MINUTES FOR ADOPTION**

**MOVED by D. DeShane and Seconded by V. Faulkner: That the minutes of the Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting held June 8, 2005 be adopted as amended.**

**Carried**

**MOVED by N. Neate and Seconded by P. Shatzko: That the agenda be amended by adding the following:**

- 5.(a) Interurban Road / Burnside Road Intersection with #1 Highway off Ramp**
- 7. Road Conversion Inventory**
- 8. Interurban Rail Trail.**

**Carried**

### **PROJECT UPDATES**

The Chair asked the committee member to bring forward any issues of concern.

#### **McKenzie Avenue Bike Lane**

J. Gaylord asked when the McKenzie Avenue bike lane project would begin. The Director of Engineering replied that it would be soon. There is still an outstanding issue with regards to property acquisition. We are re-examining our options. At some point we have to decide a deadline date for the acquisition so that we can move forward to construction.

#### **Lochside Trail between Sayward Road and Dooley Road**

The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development had concerns with the condition of the Lochside Trail in the Sayward Road area. He is intending to remove the sand section before the end of the year. He has capital money from the trail construction project which will allow him to proceed with the project. He has discussed the improvements with a representative of

the Lochside Equestrian Association. She confirmed that not everyone in the Association is happy with the plan but most members realize that the sand is not working. He will meet with Capital Regional Parks next week to determine the extent of their involvement. His objective is to undertake the work in September.

**Tuscany Village on McKenzie Avenue**

J. Gaylord inquired about the reconstruction of the bike lane on McKenzie Avenue adjacent to the new Tuscany Village development. C. Doyle advised that the schedule would be dictated by the developer. He predicted that the developer would want the foundation work completed first. He explained the bonding process and advised that this is the only control the municipality has over a project of this nature.

**Capital Regional District Parks**

The Committee members discussed the issues pertaining to the CRD management of the Galloping Goose Linear Park and other trails. It was suggested by one member that the Goose should be treated as a commuter corridor rather than a park. Another member wondered if anything was planned for the E & N Railway corridor in Central Saanich.

The Chair suggested that this is an ideal time for any individual to send comments in to the CRD Parks Department as they are reviewing their master plan. The trails are an integral part of their mandate. His own view was that the Galloping Goose is not strongly emphasized in the mandate. The master plan should have been referred to the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC). He offered to look into this and e-mail the BAC members regarding his findings. The draft Master Parks Plan can presently be viewed on the CRD Parks website.

**TRAIL STANDARDS**

The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development updated the committee on the study of trail standards which has been conducted by Judith Cullington & Associates. He had hoped to present the draft document to the committee at this meeting. However the consultant had to make a trip to England and was unable to have the material ready. The consultant will have to come before the committee in September. The material should be sent to the members prior to the meeting to allow a full discussion when she comes.

The Chair asked if there had been any direct communication with the community associations and SCAN. The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development confirmed that a presentation had been held for them and there are plans to contact the associations again in the fall. The Chair suggested that the design guidelines be mailed to the community associations.

**CENTENNIAL TRAILS UPDATE****Blenkinsop Connector**

The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development explained that the tender for the work on the Blenkinsop Connector will be advertised this Saturday. It will be closing July 12<sup>th</sup>. He hoped to place it on a Council agenda shortly after that. He explained the Department of Fisheries' time window for bridge construction. He advised that he is meeting with a steering group regarding the signs. This is something that we can also bring to this committee in September.

**Interurban Rail Trail**

**Stage I** The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development recognized that there are some issues with the size of the gravel in this location. However, nothing will be done to improve it this summer as we are still respecting the monitoring process.

**Stage II** The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development advised that the design process is with UMA at the present time.

A discussion arose regarding the use of asphalt for cyclists due to the small number of equestrian users. The Chair recognized the committee's affinity for asphalt, however, he pointed out that there are many members of the walking community who are not necessarily organized like the cyclists.

This led to a discussion of the multi-use aspect of the trails. The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development advised that at the recent open house, the issue that he heard clearly was that we have to educate people in trail use etiquette.

The Manager of Community Planning had noticed a shift in the focus of the Bicycle Advisory Committee from commuting on the road to commuting on the trail. This raises a concern in terms of the traveling speed. If the Interurban Rail Trail is paved, then why would you ride on the road? She suggested careful evaluation of this issue in the fall.

Committee comments were:

- There is a perfectly good bicycle lane on West Saanich Road. Those interested in speed are better to travel on the road.
- There is still a large section of the populace that do not want to use the road. It is a double edged sword. There are complexities.
- Maybe this is one of the things we should be looking at, maybe not just in Saanich.

The Chair was not sure that the trails were designed for commuter cyclists.

**Intermunicipal Trail Connections**

The Chair inquired if the committee had contacted other municipalities to discuss creating a cyclist network. J. Luton responded that there has been communication between the City of Victoria and Saanich on individual projects.

**INTERURBAN ROAD / BURNSIDE ROAD INTERSECTION WITH #1 HIGHWAY OFF-RAMP**

The Director of Engineering presented two design drawings of the intersection of Burnside Road with the off ramp for Highway 1. Each drawing shows an option for the bicycle lane. The first option showed the bicycle lane ending adjacent to the island crosswalk. The second option showed a bike lane extending beyond the island. Cyclists would have to merge with vehicle traffic at this point. The end of the lane could be problematic to less experienced cyclists.

Committee comments were:

- If people see the bike lane going on and then it peters out, I can see a potential for panic, especially if they have a baby trailer on the back. Option 1 is better.
- The surface on the island had better be a good one, high friction and durable

- The circles are our interface between a major trail and a crossing. I can see circles on Option 1 but not on Option 2.
- I think experienced cyclists will find their way. If you have ever traveled that area on a Saturday afternoon there is so much traffic into that mall.
- The biggest concern that I am hearing is that the bike lane ends.
- I like Option 2. Option 1 gives the experienced cyclist no choice. The roadway pinches quite a bit which should slow traffic down.
- The bike lane disappears. This is counter to “laning” principles everywhere. It is dangerous as it is counter to normal “laning”.
- With Option 1, what if you have a ten ton gravel truck beside you? There is no place for a cyclist to go.

The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development suggested that the bike lane be directed through the island beside the pedestrian area and cross walk. The bike lane could be well-defined. This suggestion was well-received by the committee members.

The Coordinator of Parks Design & Development left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

The Chair noted that this will probably be heavily used by kids as there is a school close by. Kids go the shortest route. He suggested formalizing the bike lane through the island and have a less dangerous situation.

Committee comments continued:

- I think Gerald (Fleming) is on to something.
- There could be a raised surface so the pedestrian and cyclist areas are easy to determine.
- The bike lane proposed in Option 2 could remain for experienced cyclists. It could be painted red so vehicles don't travel on it.

The Director of Engineering will check the "Motor Vehicle Act" to see if the painted gore would be a permissible alternative.

### **PEDESTRIAN PRIORITIES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The Director of Engineering gave a Power Point presentation regarding the draft "Pedestrian Priorities Implementation Plan" by Urban Systems. It is basically a report which lays out a method for prioritizing the construction of pedestrian facilities in the coming years. It is a good network planning tool and a good fiscal planning tool. It rates the need according to four primary factors: pedestrian safety index, network contribution rating, pedestrian demand rating, and transit priority rating. We need twenty to thirty million dollars worth of work. We have 1.4 million dollars which will cover five to ten percent of what we need. The Plan contains a map of the fourteen areas of the highest priority determined by the criteria.

The Chair noted that the Planning and Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) had reviewed the document. There is a great deal of overlap between the two committees. He asked if someone from this committee could attend the PTAC meetings on behalf of the Bicycle Advisory Committee. No one volunteered to attend.

The Manager of Community Planning advised that this document was created with the help of I.C.B.C. and Urban Systems, but there was a committee with a number of people that worked on it as well.

**MOVED by J. Gaylord and Seconded by N. Neate: That the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommend the endorsement of the “Pedestrian Priorities Implementation Plan”.**

**Carried**

The Chair suggested that in September the agenda should include an item regarding the significant gas tax money coming to municipalities for transit funding.

**Adjournment** The meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING SEPTEMBER 14, 2005**

---

CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

---

Committee Secretary