



## CULTUS LAKE PARK

### REPORT/RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD

**DATE:** October 18, 2017 **FILE:** 0550

**SUBMITTED BY:** Bonny Bryant  
Chief Administrative Officer

**SUBJECT:** Community Response via e-mail to Cultus Lake Parking Review  
(March 2017)

---

#### **PURPOSE:**

This purpose of the report is to provide information to the Board on the Community Response to the March 2017 Parking Report prepared by Sharon Fletcher.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

*THAT the Cultus Lake Park Board receive this report for information.*

#### **DISCUSSION:**

##### **Background**

In early 2017, the Cultus Lake Park Board worked with a consultant to undertake a review of parking in Cultus Lake. The report date is March 2017. The report was drafted and publicly released on August 18, 2017. Community feedback on the report was requested by September 5, 2017. In response to community feedback, the deadline for this feedback was extended to September 29, 2017.

##### **Responses**

The Park Board received a total of 59 e-mail submissions. They addressed commercial and residential parking in response to the Parking Review report. The residential parking components received substantially more feedback than those regarding commercial parking.

There were 16 responses on commercial parking and 57 on residential parking, with some submissions addressing both.

This report on community feedback has been broken into two main areas – residential and commercial. Submissions have been edited for context, length, clarity and civility.

Several submissions cited concerns regarding the complexity of the report, what stakeholders were contacted and interviewed and what studies or reports informed the report. In addition, the short time frame to review the document was mentioned several times. This was addressed through an extension to the submission deadline.

In addition, a technology challenge with the Park Board e-mail server resulted in some submissions being duplicated. When the content of the e-mail and the signature matched a duplicated e-mail, it was tabulated as one submission.

### **Residential Parking Themes**

The community provided thoughtful feedback on the residential parking options outlined in the Parking Review, as well as in providing additional and alternative ideas and solutions.

In a review of the responses, individually and as a whole, several themes emerged within the feedback. They are:

#### **Agreement**

Several submissions agreed with the majority of the proposed options, along with feedback on specifics or implementation that they didn't agree with.

#### **"If It Ain't Broken, Don't Fix It"**

A large number of responses stated that they felt that much of the concern over elements of residential parking was being addressed, as these issues were a "regular occurrence," rather than happening on high-volume summer days – especially long weekends.

Many felt that, for the most part, residents of Cultus Lake work on parking issues one neighbour to another and that changes to the status quo in the area of residential parking could create barriers to doing this. A range of comments described the new process of parking spots per residence as confusing and too complicated.

Much of the "don't change it" message was directed at the proposed change in parking permits, the potential plan of adding 200 additional parking spots on Sunnyside Blvd and, overall, any changes to a process that many respondents feel is only a real challenge for a few weekends a year.

Other "don't change it" feedback was in regards to residential and guest-parking permits – although most of this feedback was also accompanied by requests or recommendations to increase passes for leaseholders and guests.

One submission also addressed the point that making any substantial changes to parking today, based on the current form of transportation, may not be of value because with self-driving vehicles and other technological advancements, in less than a decade, the parking challenge may no longer exist.

#### **Confusing and Costly**

Many submissions indicated that the residential parking pass options are overly complicated, making it difficult to understand how they would work.

A majority of people's submissions also communicated that they felt that increases in leaseholder "extra" pass fees and guest-parking charges were too high and felt punitive. One e-mail asked if it seemed reasonable for a resident to host a BBQ for 15 people and to have it cost \$210 for guest parking.

## **New (Yearly, Colour-Coded) Passes vs. Status Quo**

The response to the idea of an annual colour-coded pass was mixed. Some believed this would alleviate a range of challenges, including an apparently regular and well-known situation where previous residential owners, who have moved, keep their parking passes and use them when they come for the day. Others said that an annual, colour-coded pass would add additional bureaucracy and costs to residential parking management.

## **We're Full!**

A sizeable number of respondents are concerned about the intent of creating more parking spaces that would be used by "day trippers." They are troubled by the perception that the Park Board is working to accommodate an unlimited number of visitors who come to Cultus Park for the day.

People asked why public parking is not limited to the number of spaces available. Many would prefer that once all of the spaces are taken on any given day, the park is considered to be FULL and signs are put up in strategic spots along Columbia Valley Road and potentially as far as Yarrow Central Road and Vedder Road to communicate that.

Many respondents felt that deciding to clearly limit the number of people to the area by announcing that parking is full is a necessity. They cited concerns over an overburdened natural area, not enough public facilities (washrooms, etc.), increased alcohol and drug use at Cultus Lake, as well as a substantial rise in trash being left in the parks, on the foreshore and in parking lots. They also described too many people on the beaches impeding enjoyment for both visitors and residents, as well as creating safety concerns. They referred to other public spaces such as Granville Island, Stanley Park and Ambleside Park as examples of how this is done in other areas.

## **Staff the Kiosk**

A large number of responses also cited the opportunity in staffing the kiosk at the entrance into Cultus Lake at Sunnyside Blvd. There were several ideas put forward regarding the purpose of doing this. They included:

- Keeping this area open to residents and their guests only (a sign-in or checkpoint that redirects day visitors to a specific parking lot with space available)
- Security
- Managing the flow of traffic (including speed and potential issues)

## **Residents vs. Visitors**

Quite a few responses also questioned which stakeholder group the potential parking changes are meant to benefit. They wanted to know who was top priority regarding making changes – residents or visitors. Many felt that the proposed options were set to benefit those who visit Cultus Lake on a daily basis, rather than addressing real needs of leaseholders, who submit payment to the Park Board.

In the area of residents and visitors, submissions also addressed using the boat launch for residents and buoy renters only as an effective approach.

## **Is the Park Board Trying to Increase Revenue/Make Money?**

There was strong concern regarding the Parking Review document about increased costs for residents – this included paying for additional permits, parking passes for guests, pay parking, etc.

Many responses questioned whether this was a way for the Park Board to increase revenue because the organization is in need of additional funding.

Several responses said they would prefer to have parking costs transparently included in their leasehold fees, rather than be “nickel and dimed to death” by the Park Board.

## **Don't Pave Paradise to Put Up a Parking Lot**

A large majority of respondents cited serious concerns that trees would be taken down on Sunnyside Blvd to create 200 additional parking spots. While many responses offered extensive feedback on the subject matter as identified in other themes (“We’re Full” and “Is the Park Board Trying to Increase Revenue”), there was almost universal concern and/or absolute objection to cutting down trees to accommodate parking. This was addressed by approximately 90% of respondents providing residential feedback.

In addition, there were concerns that by putting 200 additional parking spaces on Sunnyside Blvd, this would increase congestion on an already busy area and create safety issues (listed in the “We’re Full” theme).

## **Increase Enforcement (and Solve the Problem)**

A large number of respondents said that they believed that enforcement of bylaws and parking rules was not being implemented, which contributes to issues with both visitors and residents. They explained that they felt that those responsible for enforcement are doing their best, but are unable to keep up with the situation.

## **My Situation is Unique – Have You Thought of Those Like Me?**

Quite a few respondents cited that they had a situation that could be considered unique (shared leaseholdership with several parties, multiple generations living in a home, etc.) that required additional parking passes.

In addition, there was a clear definition made between those who use their residences themselves and those who have B&Bs and rent out their houses.

## **Repurposing the Septic**

A large number of submissions supported the idea of repurposing the area currently used for the septic fields for parking.

## **Commercial Parking**

There were considerably less responses focused on commercial parking than for residential. The commercial parking submissions are grouped into five areas, relevant to the subject matter that was addressed in the community feedback.

Several submissions did express approval of the approach outlined in the Parking Review document, with some specific feedback on where the person disagreed.

The areas addressed in community feedback on the report were:

### **Staff/Customer Parking**

Several submissions agreed/supported the conclusion that commercial parking has challenges that could be addressed by better use of the space.

There was concern that the numbers used to calculate required staff parking in the report were not accurate – that total staff numbers were used rather than identifying the maximum number on a shift at any given time.

### **Enforcement**

Some feedback identified a lack of enforcement regarding improper/illegal and overtime parking in commercial lots.

### **Safety**

A need for safer options for crossing the highway near businesses was discussed. The need to relocate the entrance to the Cultus Lake Golf Club – to decrease the risk of accidents coming in and out of the facility – was also addressed (identified in the report as an opportunity to create additional parking spaces).

### **Calculation of Costs**

Several submissions addressed how businesses pay for the parking (in their lease) and who manages the parking in specific locations – and why it isn't consistent.

### **Specific Concerns Regarding Commercial Parking**

- Some feedback showed support for the Marina operating Parking Lot C – as long as revenue would be properly recorded and submitted to the Park Board.
- Feedback also questioned the effectiveness of Adventure Park not opening until noon – citing the loss of revenue from parking.
- Disagreement regarding what was called the “status quo” of Parking Lot C, as presented in the Parking Review report.

### **Ideas and Suggestions**

In addition to providing feedback on the report, a large portion of respondents also submitted alternatives and other ideas. In order to respect confidentiality, the ideas and suggestions have been compiled in Appendix A and have been edited for brevity. They have been grouped into the main areas they address.

---

Prepared and approved for submission to the Board:



Bonny Bryant  
Chief Administrative Officer