

Oral Submission at Silverback Public Hearing – March 26, 2008

By Ian Winn

My Name is Ian Winn of Tuwanek and my comments are part of those of the East Inlet Associations Group. My designated area of concern is the roads.

I'm disappointed and concerned that a comprehensive traffic study has not been done, or is planned to be done, that addresses the cumulative volumes of traffic for all of the proposed or approved developments along Sechelt Inlet Road. A true visionary analysis of developments along the eastern shores of Sechelt Inlet over the next decade would show that our roads will be seriously under capacity and lack the intrinsic safety features required for these cumulative volumes.

Silverback will be the largest of all of these developments to date and its' development plans should address not only the traffic volumes and intersection safety and flow within the development but also share the responsibility for the road improvements that lead into the development from the village and Highway 101 access. Once again this should be based on the cumulative volumes not just the volumes derived from the isolated traffic volume studies for just Silverback. A proportioned cost sharing is in order.

Specifically, of critical concern are the 2 intersections that all vehicles accessing the east inlet area must currently pass through in order to get to and from their homes or places of work. These intersections, and especially the one at Wharf Rd. and Hwy. 101 are already encountering long traffic delays during peak times and with the addition of up to 3000 additional vehicles the situation will be unbearable. A proposed "Link Road" through the Sechelt First Nation band land might reduce some of this extreme volume for a period of time, but even at that major upgrades to these intersections would still be needed to handle cumulative projected traffic volumes. However, it is my understanding, that the Link Road is no longer an option that the Sechelt Indian Band wishes to support. In which case, it is imperative that a comprehensive analysis of roads and intersections that factors in cumulative volumes without a Link Road bypass be completed before the Silverback development is allowed to proceed.

Also of concern to me is the location and size of the "leave strip" or "conservation strip" to be incorporated into the improvements of Sechelt Inlet Rd. within the Silverback development. Once again, my concerns are based on short sighted traffic analyses of individual developments along the east side of the inlet. If these analyses are completed in isolation and as they state, "at the current level of trip generation", then the conservation strip will be in jeopardy of needing to be used for a wider road. Planning for the future would ensure that the road width allowances would be sized such that future widening would not encroach into the conservation strip.

In summary, it should be obvious that with so many changed or new factors regarding cumulative traffic volumes and options that are no longer possible the advancement of any bylaw amendments pertinent to the Silverback development should be tabled pending the

completion of a comprehensive traffic and road analysis that addresses the needs of today and the visions for the future.

Thank you.