



## 55A St. Multi-Use Pathway Extension Engagement Summary

At the Regular Meeting on November 17, Council referred the 55A Street Multi-Use Pathway Extension to the City Manager for review following receipt of a petition signed by 17 neighbourhood residents representing 12 properties. The City Manager requested that Delta’s Engagement team works with Engineering to consult further with the residents who raised concerns. The following is a summary of the activities undertaken and the findings.

### How We Consulted

The petition raised several questions about the pathway extension including concerns about project need and location, traffic and safety, cost and timing, and design preferences. Residents of the 21 properties in the original consultation area were given information in response to the questions raised and an invitation to discuss the pathway further with staff if interested. Consultation efforts focused on the six properties that front the pathway, and that may be most directly impacted. Staff provided these owners and tenants with an opportunity to meet to discuss impacts on their properties and mitigation options. The following is a summary of the activities conducted and the timeline:

Date	Consultation Activity
Nov. 24-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct outreach to all six property owners and tenants in front of the proposed pathway with invitation to meet with staff.</li> </ul>
Nov. 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hand-delivered Q&amp;A to the remaining 16 properties within the original consultation area.</li> <li>Onsite meeting held with property owners of the two homes indicating interest in a site visit (876 55A Street and 5566 9 Avenue)</li> </ul>
Nov. 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow up meeting with owners at 876 55A Street to review a revised option to mitigate outstanding concerns.</li> </ul>
Dec. 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff will provide a report to the Council and an update on the outcome will be provided to all residents within the original 21 property consultation area.</li> </ul>

### What We Learned

The following is a summary of what staff learned through the consultation and the mitigation options discussed.

Property	Concerns	Mitigation
845 56 St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff spoke with the owner who had no concerns about the pathway project.</li> <li>Staff also spoke to the tenant who had concerns about impacts to the driveway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff will follow up with the tenant at 845 56 St. to discuss options to mitigate impact to driveway.</li> <li>No further action recommended.</li> </ul>
5565 8A Ave.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff spoke with the owner who had no concerns about the pathway project.</li> <li>No response from the tenant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action recommended.</li> </ul>
856 55A St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff spoke with the owner who originally had concerns about the removal of a birch tree.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff confirmed that the plans were revised to keep the birch tree.</li> <li>No further action recommended.</li> </ul>
866 55A St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff spoke with the owner of who had no concerns about the pathway project.</li> <li>No response from the tenant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action recommended.</li> </ul>



## 55A St. Multi-Use Pathway Extension Engagement Summary

Property	Concerns	Mitigation
876 55A St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners expressed interest in meeting with staff to discuss their concerns.</li> <li>• They reiterated the concerns in the petition and opposed the pathway extension, stating the views that it is unnecessary, in the wrong location, and increases activity on the quiet street. They suggested returning the project funding, building the path on the west side of the street, delaying the work until future land assembly occurs, or installing a painted on-road bike lane instead of a raised pathway.</li> <li>• Staff acknowledged concerns about the pathway extension and focussed the meeting on discussing the direct impacts to their property and mitigation options should the extension move forward. These concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of two driveway parking spaces on City Road dedication</li> <li>• increased competition for limited on-street parking from Winskill users</li> <li>• reduced visibility when backing out and liability concerns</li> <li>• potential drainage and flooding issues</li> <li>• light intrusion from pathway lighting</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff outlined mitigation options including drainage improvements, relocating the pathway light, and repaving the driveway.</li> <li>• As these options did not address concerns about the loss of onsite parking, staff explored alternatives.</li> <li>• Staff prepared a revised design featuring a pathway “bump-out” in front of the property, preserving on-site parking and eliminating pathway lighting (but removing street parking). This option also provides a traffic calming effect along the street.</li> <li>• In a second meeting, owners confirmed they still oppose the extension but would prefer the revised design if it proceeds.</li> <li>• Staff agreed to monitor ongoing concerns about Winskill-related parking for potential residential parking considerations.</li> </ul>
5566 9 Ave.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners also expressed interest in meeting with staff to discuss concerns about the project and potential drainage impacts.</li> <li>• One owner shared the concerns raised in the petition and questioned the need for the project, suggested it be relocated, and feared it would increase traffic in an area that already requires traffic calming.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff were able to respond to concerns about drainage impacts on the property and confirmed a small Allan Block retaining wall would be constructed to ensure the pathway was level.</li> <li>• Concerns about traffic calming will be addressed with the revised design and will be monitored.</li> <li>• No further action is recommended.</li> </ul>

### Conclusion

Overall, the consultation confirmed that most owners directly adjacent to the proposed pathway have no objection to the project, and that specific property-level concerns raised were either addressed through design refinements or can be managed through minor mitigation. Two properties expressed broader opposition to the pathway extension, citing project need, location, and neighbourhood impacts; however, staff were able to work with these owners to identify options that would mitigate direct impacts to their properties should the project proceed. A revised design was developed to address the most significant concerns, and affected owners indicated it would be preferable to the original concept. Staff will continue to respond to inquiries and will provide residents with an update following Council’s direction