

Disclaimer: These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a transcription.



Minutes of the Active Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

April 7, 2025, 2:00 PM

Meadows Room

12007 Harris Road, Pitt Meadows, BC V3Y 2B5

Voting Members:	C. Ameli K. Burns P. Jongbloed E. O'Melinn C. Murphy N. Vranic
Council Liaisons:	Councillor Evans Councillor Hayes (Alternate)
Regrets:	J. Barnes B. McCain
Staff:	S. Maki, Director of Engineering & Operations (Chair) E. Borromeo, Engineering Services Technician A. Seed, Manager of Engineering & Facilities
Recording Clerk:	T. McCaw, Administrative Services Supervisor

1. CALL TO ORDER

S. Maki, Director of Engineering & Operations, acknowledged with respect and gratitude that the City of Pitt Meadows is located on the traditional, unceded territory of ᑭᓴᓴᓴ (Katzie) First Nation who were stewards of this land since time immemorial.

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 PM.

2. LATE ITEMS

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There was general consent amongst the Committee to approve the April 7, 2025 Active Transportation Advisory Committee agenda as circulated.

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

There was general consent amongst the committee to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2024 Active Transportation Advisory Committee meeting as circulated.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Harris Road Complete Street – Conceptual Design Options

R. Skeet, Senior Project Manager & J. Park, Engineering Designer from Aplin Martin (Aplin), provided a presentation on the three conceptual options and initial works for the complete street feasibility study for discussion and feedback. Some of the highlights included:

- Project background;
- Project timelines;
- Project objectives and constraints; and
- Proposed concept options and estimated construction costs.

The Committee participated in a discussion with the following main themes noted after the presentation portion regarding Segments 1 & 2: Fraser Way to Fieldstone Walk:

- Discussions clarifying the differences between the three options (retrofit, reconstruction, hybrid);
- Support was given for narrowing down the options to unilateral bike lanes (not multi-use paths (MUPs) or bi-directional bike lanes);
- A recommendation was made to prioritize construction of norther segments over Segments 1 & 2 given that some improvements (wider bike lane with buffer, nearby MUPs) have already been implemented and the lower usage levels outside the urban core;
- A question was raised around whether there were any pedestrian counts completed (Staff mentioned they didn't believe so; however, vehicle

counts were completed. Post Meeting Note: Aplin later confirmed that pedestrian and cyclist counts were taken for one day in January);

- Staff confirmed that the presentation only captures construction costs and not operational or maintenance costs, which will be included in the full feasibility study;
- Questions were raised around the new standard of 1.8m sidewalks and the costs to redo new sidewalks (Aplin noted that 1.8m sidewalks is the new standard. Staff mentioned that possibly this is not included in the scope if other items and Segments are higher priority, and considering overall cost/benefit);
- A suggestion was made to reduce the number of poles and sign posts in the sidewalks (Staff mentioned that both boulevard poles and sidewalk poles align with standards, and some signage is preferred near the curb for bylaw enforcement or due to TransLink requirements, but noted the comment about having consistency);
- A question was raised asking if any thoughts were given for e-bikes and their incorporation during this study (Aplin noted this project will use road markings and signage to identify high conflict zones, and with green paint. Aplin also mentioned the different perspectives of commuter vs. recreational cyclists. Staff noted that complexities with e-scooters and active transportation modes of varying speeds is likely to be a challenge with or without the complete street);
- A comment was made on whether the modeling was developed based on projected future pedestrian or vehicle data trends (Aplin confirmed it was designed using current data with a minimal increase due to density/growth);
- A question was raised around the common design standard for a bus stop with bike lanes (Aplin clarified the typical bus stop layout with having a centre island for pedestrians to access via crosswalk, and having the bike lane transition between the bus stop and the sidewalk for less 'higher speed' conflict and alignment with TransLinks' design guide); and
- A suggestion was made to possibly swapping the labelling of Option 2 and 3, as Option 3 includes the wider sidewalk, so closer to the reconstruction concept.

The Committee participated in a discussion with the following main themes noted after the presentation portion regarding Segment 3: Fieldstone Walk to Hammond Rd:

- It was identified that both Options 1 & 3 have a bike lane at sidewalk level without a buffer between the bike lane and vehicle lane, which doesn't align with the BC Active Transportation Design Guidelines. Further comments were made that such designs could lessen grant opportunities. It was also noted that the buffer between the bike lane and sidewalk would be better suited between the bike lane and vehicle lane;
- The MUP connection between Parkside Trail and the Airport Trail was discussed. It was stated that completion of this MUP connection is important, connects to school routes, and should be prioritized. Smooth and clear transitions between the bike lanes to MUPs (and vice versa) are key;
- Questions were asked about the existing street parking on the west side of the street and staff clarified that it is intended to remain in all with concepts. Suggestions were made to remove street parking on the west side, as well as the east, in an effort to reduce the risk of injuries to cyclists from doors opening, and for consistency along the Harris Corridor (Staff noted that there will likely be concern from impacted residents, but that parking reduction is being considered and further engagement will need to occur as the study progresses);
- A comment was made with a different perspective regarding potential concerns for cyclists if drivers had to reverse out of driveways along Harris Road instead of parallel parking along the roadway;
- Discussions were held around removing street parking on Harris Road in this segment to allow for more of a buffer between cyclists and pedestrians; and
- Preference was stated for Option 2: Reconstruction, but without street parking.

The Committee participated in a discussion with the following main themes noted after the presentation portion regarding Segments 4-7:

- Comments were made around supporting slightly reducing travel lanes to accommodate wider sidewalks;
- Discussions were held around utilities and costs associated with these options (Staff clarified that there could be substantial costs with relocation of third party utilities such as BC Hydro, and also with City fibre, and storm tie-ins);
- Trees as natural assets were discussed, the opportunity of having green infrastructure only if the existing trees are removed to accommodate, and that not all trees are equal in asset value (Staff confirmed tree planting options will be reviewed and will be working in conjunction with the Urban Forest Strategy);
- Comments were made around no street buffer and limited sidewalks on Options 1 and 3, similar to comments above in Segment 3;
- Support was given for Option 2: Reconstruction as it appears to have the best approach supporting AAA cyclists, economic development, livability, and considering the substantial cost of all options. Options 1 and 3 seem to be a half-measure. (A question was raised by Staff whether the committee would choose Option 2 vs. proceeding with Options 1 or 3, if it meant waiting more years for implementation. There was general consensus the group would prefer Option 2);
- Discussions were held around what the bike lanes could look like at the future Harris Road Grade Separation (Staff clarified that options for both grade separation, and existing at-grade conditions are being considered, but are not currently incorporated into the cost estimates. Any grade separation at the railway would be outside the scope of this project);
- A question was raised around how the complete street would tie into Lougheed Highway (Staff mentioned that MOTI's concepts for Harris/Lougheed are being considered, but are not part of the scope of this project. The scope stops just before the Lougheed Hwy Corridor);
- A question was raised around whether the driveways and current driver maneuvering (such as left-turns of painted median) along Harris Road, had been taken into consideration when drafting the plans (Staff confirmed that conflict zones had been considered, but at this time – there is no intent to change current driving patterns for entrances or

exits onto Harris Rd, except potentially changing the number of lanes approaching intersections (east/west) once further review is conducted); and

- A question was raised around whether there would be any medians added or extended along Harris Road (Staff mentioned that there currently is no plans to extend existing medians).

The Committee participated in a discussion with the following main themes noted after the presentation portion regarding Typical Intersection Detail:

- Discussions were held around curb extensions and truck traffic in Option 2;
- Discussions were held on truck movements along Harris Road and Ford Road, and accommodating for necessary turning radiuses; and
- A suggestion was made for additional awareness campaigns to bring attention to the green paint markings and what they mean.

S. Maki, Director of Engineering & Operations, shared the next steps for the project, which included:

- A HaveYourSay survey will be shared for public feedback on the City project webpage in the coming weeks:
<https://www.pittmeadows.ca/our-community/city-planning-projects/harris-road-complete-street-feasibility-study> ;
- Concepts for the full length of the corridor will be shared on the City's project webpage before the Open House;
- A Public Open House will be taking place in May;
- A presentation is anticipated at the June Engagement & Priorities Committee meeting; and
- Final presentation to Council July 2025 for consideration prior to future business planning.

5.2 Closing Remarks from Staff

S. Maki, Director of Engineering & Operations, provided closing remarks in relation to the committee, grants and next steps for active transportation in the City. Some of the highlights included:

- Thanking everyone for their input through this ATAC term, and acknowledging the updated Active Transportation Plan and associated project prioritization to guide future implementation;
- Staff's intention to transition into a staff-led Safer City Committee, which would likely consist of various City departments (Engineering, Bylaws, Fire, etc.), School District 42, RCMP, and ICBC. Staff mentioned that this would further foster efficient implementation of the various operational initiatives relating to active transportation, and merge ongoing City processes for tracking and prioritizing tasks. It was also mentioned that there could likely be delegations from the public, and also the creation of working groups or tasks forces for specific projects, as needed in the future. More information to be presented to Council in Q2;
- Staff confirmed the City applied and received a number of grants; however, we are not able to share all of the details at this time until it is announced by various agencies.

The Committee participated in a discussion with the following main themes noted:

- A question was raised around whether the new committee will include accessibility;
- A question was raised around where to bring up future requests or concerns (Staff confirmed this can be done directly through to Staff);
- Committee members and Council Liaisons shared their perspectives on potential changes to the Committee;
- Questions were raised around the reasoning for the change; and
- The importance of health and wellness, accessibility, and active transportation initiatives was expressed.

6. ROUNDTABLE (15 Minutes)

The Committee participated in a roundtable discussion there were no formal motions or recommendations put forward.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Certified as correct:

Tatiana McCaw,

Administrative Services Supervisor