

**From:** Barry <[nobell@telus.net](mailto:nobell@telus.net)>  
**Sent:** April-06-20 10:56 AM  
**To:** 'Michael Canning' <[mcanning@mapleridge.ca](mailto:mcanning@mapleridge.ca)>  
**Subject:** 117th improvement project

Hi again, Michael.

Here's the initial pitch on what would hopefully please the residents and cyclists along the route. Sorry for the delay but this response is the result of a collection of ideas over a few weeks.

As I mentioned in our prior conversation, those of us who ride along the route just wish to move along in the same fluid manner in which we have for so very long. Obviously, with what we understand about the potential for conflict when the wrong mix of users are sharing a path, the current design presents a clear dilemma for regular cyclists. Two very undesirable alternatives: almost certain conflict with pedestrians (and their dogs) and with kids biking along slowly never leaving the neighborhood or riding off to the side of 117<sup>th</sup> until the need for a shoulder check as we approach an extension then becoming part of the traffic flow with motorists unsure as to why we might pop out in front of them despite being on a designated bike route and having the right of way, by being ahead of the motorist.

#### Permeable/passable curb extensions

As we understand the need for these as primary components in slowing down motorists and shortening crossings, let's try to tailor them for cycling while not reducing their effect on traffic.

Simply form curbing along the outer lines of the extensions running parallel with traffic but leave the main area of the extensions at grade. Rather like the cycle track along 203<sup>rd</sup>. The start and stop points of the extensions where curbing would otherwise be, can begin and end with green paint and the usual tin warning posts. The crossing points at side streets would be unaffected if the curbing resumed where it contours around the corner.

The residents' driveways would be also be unaffected as, with the exception of a short letdown to grade from the MUP, the driveway portion of the extension would be at grade anyway. This assumption is based on my understanding that the typical width of the extensions is 2.2 meters. Correct? I should think that is enough space to accommodate a letdown for the driveway while leaving at least 1.5 meters for bikes to pass by the driveways – that is, as long as the MUP surface is not any higher above grade than necessary. The plan does show driveway crossings to be level with the MUP.

With this design, pedestrians crossing 117<sup>th</sup> from these extensions would be bound to yielding to cyclists as this is essentially a cycle path. Signage can clarify. Further, it's no different from the responsibility pedestrians currently bear with respect to designated cycling routes in Vancouver. Just be caught once snoozing while crossing a bike path downtown and you become trained forever. Given the current and still anticipated sporadic ridership along the route, I expect those crossing 117<sup>th</sup> should rarely be inconvenienced.

Re: parked cars on the south side, only during a brief t-ball season do vehicles appear from outside the neighborhood in front of Jordan Park. The road is still more than wide enough there so it remains negotiable as has been in the past.

Bear in mind that even if more cars occupy curb space between extensions on the south side, we as cyclists can opt to remain in the traffic lane if not busy or we will use the cycle path inside the extensions and carefully ride around the vehicles as we enter and exit.

Stop signs?

We're unsure as to why stop signs are no longer part of the traffic management. Have you considerable objections from the residents? Would they not consider those to be valuable as part of the traffic calming or discouragement to non-local motorists? If you're looking for support, we're quite cool with maintaining stop signs wherever effective, especially at Jordan Park.

Lastly, what's with the curb extension on Laity just south of Lougheed as we approach the hospital? That's a narrow southbound traffic lane as it is, and yet us cyclists must ride into that lane to go around the extension. Has that installation had any real benefit in retrospect? We feel the improvements on the 117<sup>th</sup> bike route would be incomplete without the removal of that extension. It's the only impedance in what could otherwise be considered a streamlined route from 216<sup>th</sup> to 203<sup>rd</sup>.

So, Michael, it's understandable that this project's timeline may have fallen victim to the pandemic fallout like so many other initiatives but HUB's interest still remains so that the city can make necessary improvements which qualify for external funding from TransLink. Have cities been given undetermined extensions for such fundable projects in light of our current challenges?

When you and colleagues (Maria) have some time, lemme know your thoughts on our recommendations for 117<sup>th</sup> or need for clarification and please advise on new timelines, if any, and shifts in funding criteria. HUB can offer considerable influence in these matters.

Thanks for your consideration and a sincere good luck as you prioritize and manage during this virtual period of house arrest.

Barry D. Bellamy

Co-chair, HUB Ridge Meadows