

Maple Ridge Transportation Plan / cycling network

From: Jackie Chow (jchow23708@yahoo.ca)

To: mhalpin@mapleridge.ca

Cc: fsmith@mapleridge.ca; aclavelle@urbansystems.ca

Date: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 at 09:23 a.m. PDT

Hi Mark,

We really appreciate that many of the changes that we suggested for the cycling network map were included in the latest map as presented to Council at Council Workshop on July 12. Thank you! 😊

We would just like to make one more last pitch for inclusion of some route sections that are still missing in the network, because we feel there are very valid reasons for it and it's important to us to get it right.


- The map does not show the connection between 113B and Airport Way. We know that the section from 113B to Airport Way, with the two roundabouts to connect to and from Golden Ears Way/the bridge, are the responsibility of, and are planned to be upgraded by TransLink. I think it's important that the map shows this as a cycling connection, to show the City's support for this, and to ensure that the needs of people cycling of AAA are going to be considered.
- The cycling network map does not show a secondary, recreational route between Lower Hammond to Pitt Meadows. This connection would be a real asset. It would encourage more recreational (and utilitarian!) cycling by more people, because they can avoid the busy and intimidating Golden Ears roundabouts. What's the rationale for exclusion?
- We do feel it's important to include all of Tamarack between 104 Ave. and Hwy 7 in the cycling network. There is no adequate alternative route connection between this area south of Kanaka Creek to the downtown via Lougheed. People would have to travel to 240th, go north and then take old Kanaka Road or Kanaka Way then Lougheed, or go south on 240th and then take Hwy 7/Lougheed. Nobody will do that. Tamarack is by far the most logical, fastest and safest way. The gravel pathway through the Kanaka Creek area, which is shown as a secondary route, is not for everyone. There's a very steep section where most people will have to dismount. There is no lighting - and I doubt there ever will be since it's in a regional park where wildlife should not be disturbed. It is not safe to use at night due to dense forest cover so very poor visibility. Also, not everyone is comfortable traveling along this path due to concern about bears.
- We again want to stress that we feel it's super important to provide AAA facilities on Dewdney Trunk Road east of 240 St. to allow safe travel of kids to school. We understand that, even if it's shown as a secondary route, every effort will be made to provide safe, separated facilities. Thanks for that.
- We are concerned that 110 Ave. east of 240 St. is not shown as part of the cycling network. The City and Metro Vancouver have agreed on 110 Ave. as part of the Regional Greenway network, and as it's the goal of the Regional Greenways plan to provide safe, separated facilities, we do not understand the rationale for exclusion. Are there plans to change the Regional Greenways network in this area?
- We understand that 203 St. between Golden Ears Way and Old Dewdney is a shared responsibility with Pitt Meadows (east side of the road is MR, west side is PM) and the steep ditches make it a challenging fix. Nevertheless, it provides an important connection and cyclists will continue to use it when it's the most logical route. Would it be possible to keep it on the map as a secondary route? Perhaps advisory bike lanes might be a solution here?
- The connecting pathway between Burnett and 228 St. has been part of the plan for about 20 years. Why is it being taken off the map now? It's a very useful and important connection between Burnett and 228 St. We're seeing a number of development proposals for 6-storey medium rise apartments east of Burnett on the south side of Dewdney now. The hundreds of new residents in these buildings could easily bike to the downtown and beyond, but cycling connectivity between Burnett and 228 is totally non-existent right now. Either you ~~bike~~ walk on the sidewalk on Dewdney or Lougheed, or you have to, somehow, make your way to north of Dewdney and follow a convoluted route that would take much longer to bike than it takes to walk to the downtown via Lougheed or Dewdney.
- We also wonder about the rationale for exclusion of 256 St. Including this route in the network and providing some basic safety for people cycling would make it possible to do a loop (of a reasonable distance for most), which is usually what people try to do when they go for a ride. This will enable more people to enjoy cycling in east Maple Ridge.

Finally, I've attached a summary of our updated gap list. Not much has changed since the last one except our top priorities have been changed (highlighted in green).

Thanks again for listening to us and seriously considering our suggestions! 😊

With kind regards,

Jackie Chow
HUB Cycling
Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows Committee

 2022 07 22 attachment HUB Cycling Gap Priority List Maple Ridge summary.pdf
84.4kB