

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

12 OCTOBER 1999

4:30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: B. Hill, P. Hume, A. Munter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham

Regrets: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare and J. Legendre

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 28 September 99

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

1. NEW WASTE MANAGEMENT COLLECTION PROGRAM

- Originally issued as Information Previously Distributed;
request from Committee Member to add this item to the agenda
- Planning and Environment Committee Co-ordinator's report
dated 29 Sept 99

Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation Department, introduced Messrs. Kevin Wylie, Co-ordinator, Waste Diversion, and Dave Redmond, Redmond and Associates. Mr. McNally gave a brief overview of the staff report and Mr. Redmond provided highlights of the public survey.

Committee Chair Hunter noted an approximate 9% increase in product (recycling, curbside garbage and apartment garbage combined), but that there had been no similar increase in population or households. He asked if this was of concern to staff.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 27 October 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 44.

Mr. McNally advised staff were not troubled at this point. However, he noted staff are trying to find reasons for the increase. He said ongoing work, including a detailed set-out study, will indicate how many people are participating, and how many bags or recycling containers are being put out each week. As well, he said additional work will be done to determine the quality of the material in the different waste streams. He noted that as the Department accumulates a few more months worth of data with respect to this contract, results could be brought back to Committee for further discussion.

Councillor Molly McGoldrick-Larsen stated the three main points brought to her attention dealt with storage, weight of the box and bi-weekly collection. She asked if, when the survey was done, there had been a differentiation between housing types. Mr. Redmond advised there was no detailed breakdown by housing type (e.g. single-, row- or multiple-unit dwellings), but that there was one by geographic area (i.e. urban, suburban and rural).

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen said she had been informed that the type of housing could determine storage capability.

Mr. Redmond noted one of the findings was that those with the biggest problems or the most criticism, were those in upper income households in suburban areas. He surmised these individuals produce more waste, have more to recycle and are more likely to use more than one blue or black box. He said previous experience indicated most of these people tended to live in single family dwellings, but felt that in these cases, income was more of a factor than housing.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen noted she had received numerous calls from residents of townhouses, which have no garages and little storage capacity. She said their desire to participate in the program was being limited by their lack of storage for two weeks' worth of recyclable material. She asked if there was a need to identify possible solutions for this group, apart from the regular residential collection.

Mr. McNally advised that when the Department proceeds with studies such as the set-out study, it tries to encompass different types of housing groups. He said the Department could then look at multi-unit dwellings. With respect to storage of an extra box, Mr. McNally noted blue boxes could be stacked within black boxes to use the same footprint. He stated the Department had to consider mechanisms to disseminate such tips to the public, and to determine if there were broader areas of common concern. He noted much positive feedback and ideas had been received from residents. Responding to a question from the Councillor regarding scheduling, Mr. McNally explained that currently, there were no plans for the Region to go back to a weekly pickup in the future.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen encouraged staff to get the message out and to provide tips to the public, noting she had done so to residents who had contacted her. She suggested possible solutions could include a wheeled black box or using a child's wagon to get material to curbside. She felt the Region needed to encourage residents to take up such solutions to their problems.

Councillor Stewart stated she had received calls on this item from a lower-tier municipal Councillor and from the public. She noted it had originally been listed on the 28 Sept 99 agenda as *Information Previously Distributed* but had not been publicly advertised as such. The Councillor felt the public would have been better served had such a potentially controversial item been advertised, and explained she had asked for this item to be put on the current agenda in order to allow for public comment, not because she had any concern with the study.

Mr. McNally advised it is standard procedure to advertise items listed as Information Previously Distributed and said staff would ensure that in future, all such items are listed in the newspapers.

The Chair asked if staff anticipated repeating a yearly distribution of recycling calendars, noting that some people, not recognizing their significance, threw them away. Mr. McNally confirmed calendars would be distributed each year.

That the Planning and Environment Committee receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AND FINANCE ITEM

2. FRONTAGE CHARGES - FRINGEWOOD INDUSTRIAL PARK,
RELOCATABLE HOMES LTD. - 06T-97010
- Director of Engineering and Finance Commissioner's joint report
dated 28 Sept 99

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve that the applicable frontage charges for the Relocatable Homes subdivision be \$210,000.00 to be secured by letter of credit.

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEM

3. CLYDE AVENUE HOLDINGS INC., 1199 CLYDE AVENUE
SUBDIVISION, CLYDE/MERIVALE - CITY OF OTTAWA
REFERRAL TO ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 22 Sept 99

Barry Edgington, Director, Development Approvals Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, provided Committee with a brief overview of the staff report.

Responding to questions from Committee Chair Hunter, Mr. Edgington confirmed the application did not include the property located immediately at Clyde and Maitland (this land is owned by the Department of Communications (DOC)) and, would in effect be an off-site condition if it were imposed. He explained, however, the concept plan that dealt with the development of the whole area, did deal with whether there should be two accesses on Merivale and a third onto Clyde/Maitland or just the two accesses on Merivale. Mr. Edgington noted even though this subdivision could proceed without this determination at this time, it still is an issue that involves the total development of the site.

Mr. Edgington confirmed at Councillor Stewart's request that when the RMOC owned the subject land and the matter went to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) the first time, they imposed a third access so both communities would have some of the traffic generated by the whole site. At that time, there was enough capacity on both Maitland and Merivale for the expected generated traffic.

Councillor Stewart pointed out the intersection at Baseline and Merivale was recently named the third most dangerous intersection in Ontario by State Farm. She questioned why, given the way traffic changes, the Region would not want to keep the option of a third access open.

Mr. Edgington replied, from a land use planning perspective, it is always good to keep options open. He said however, the transportation analysis concluded an intersection at Clyde/Maitland would fail and further, because of the pedestrian access time that must be given the signalizations, it could cause the Clyde/Baseline intersection to fail as well or be somewhat reduced in its efficiency. In light of this information, Mr. Edgington felt it behooved the Region to make a decision on the issue.

Mr. Edgington went on to say staff had been very careful during this whole process, to reserve their decision until the Regional transportation analysis was completed, noting the City of Ottawa had already taken the position there would only be two accesses.

Councillor Stewart asked staff if every conceivable intersection had been modeled. John Fraser, Senior Review Engineer, Environment and Transportation Department, replied when staff first reported back, they had reviewed the analysis prepared by the consultant and had run the analysis based on what the consultant had provided. At that time, there were philosophical differences in the way staff analyzed the intersection and the consultant's analysis; the consultant said it would work and staff (running it according to Regional standards) were of the opinion it would not work. Mr. Fraser said from that point on he tried to find a decent solution and the analysis became more detailed.

The Councillor then asked if the intersections modeled all failed and if there were others that were not modeled that might not have failed. Mr. Fraser said the latter part of the question was unanswerable. He said staff tried to come up with as many scenarios as possible. He explained this is a very complex intersection because the primary movement is right-angled movement and it is a very difficult intersection to analyze because of the nature of analysis package used and because there are so many conflicting movements. In this case, trying to get pedestrians across the Clyde/Maitland arterial was really the determining factor. He said there was one scenario, where pedestrians were absolutely prohibited from crossing the road, that would marginally work.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Fraser advised there is currently a barrier along this section of Clyde/Maitland to prevent pedestrians from crossing. He confirmed if an intersection were to be built (given the Region's transit/walking/cycling policies), the Region would want to provide pedestrian crossing at that intersection. He noted the Region has not banned pedestrians from crossing an arterial anywhere where there are traffic lights; there is a certain expectation, that where there are traffic lights, pedestrians will be able to cross the road.

Councillor Stewart expressed concern about Central Park residents' ability to access public transit and the strip mall on the west side of Clyde, in a safe manner, without traffic lights. She referred to the Regional Official Plan (ROP) policy of walking first and also pointed out it is very difficult to absolutely prevent people from crossing such an arterial.

Nancy Schepers, Deputy Commissioner, Environment, stated the issue of pedestrian access is a significant one. She agreed it is not possible to completely prohibit pedestrians from crossing arterial roadways but pointed out there are examples of where the Region has put in barriers to effectively ensure that pedestrians cannot cross or to channel them to a safe crossing location. She pointed out there are already some restrictions on the subject section of Clyde, to discourage pedestrian access (i.e. a raised boulevard and barrier).

Ms. Schepers went on to say the significant movement is to get cars to the freeway and return. There are a number of safety features already incorporated into the 90 degree angle to ensure that it operates safely. She cautioned that if any other movement is

introduced, there is significant potential for conflict and the intersection will fail. As well, because of the proximity to the intersection at Baseline, there will be significant impacts at that intersection as well.

Councillor Stewart opined the Baseline and Clyde intersection is in any event, due for modification, (i.e. another left turn lane is needed in the southerly direction) as it is currently backed up considerably. She asked if it was not just a matter of securing the land and getting on with it. Ms. Schepers advised there are opportunities for this intersection, however, the difficulty is that once another intersection is added so close to it, the opportunities for intersection modifications at Baseline/Clyde become limited.

The Councillor went on to note that Annex E of the staff report sets out OC Transpo's conditions, should the OMB impose that this intersection be built. She stated she did not believe the OMB would impose an intersection that was sure to fail but rather, they would impose an intersection designed to work. She emphasized the option of a third intersection should be kept open, at least until the DOC lands are dealt with.

Councillor McGoldrick Larsen had questions concerning schools to be utilized by this subdivision. Mr. Edgington replied there were no schools proposed within the subdivision. He pointed out Laurentian High School is located to the south of the community and there will be a walkway to access it from the residential area. Mr. Edgington went on to note all of the school boards were circulated and the only one that expressed a concern was the Ottawa School Board who would have liked to see the third access, so they could run their school buses through the Clyde/Maitland intersection.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen stated the reason she raised the question, was that she hired a university student this summer to do a land use and transportation study in South Nepean (which will be tabled with Planning and Environment Committee and Transportation Committee), and one of the findings of that report was if communities are going to be blocked off from one another in such a way that they are not going to easily connect (i.e. pedestrians, cycling and public transit), this will drive the need for the private car up. She stated this concerned her.

The Committee then heard from the following delegations.

Lois K. Smith, noted she had submitted her comments in writing (held on file with the Regional Clerk). Miss Smith indicated she had studied the matter thoroughly and would have a full, detailed report (including maps) to the Region in approximately two days. She offered the following points:

- there are flaws in both the Traffic Impact Study and the addendum but even if they were perfect, she would still fight for emergency access into the subdivision and/or a third access

- there should be a 20 metre reserve placed between the DOC lands (to be held for two years) and another one near the high school, next to block 55; these two reserves would provide eleven options, of which four or five could be put into effect with deterrents to cut-through traffic.
- her detailed report will show that, with careful timing of the lights, an intersection can be built that will accommodate pedestrians.
- even if 100% public access is not possible, there could be restricted access which would not make the intersection fail, for example, commercial vehicles could be restricted so as not to disturb the flow of the other kinds of traffic; commercial vehicles would have to go in through Merivale.
- she was very pleased to see OC Transpo is in the picture.
- if the DOC lands are not brought into circulation, the entrance could be transferred but there would have to be an agreement between the land owners with respect to costs.
- there are a number of editing points that need to be addressed.

Committee Chair Hunter suggested the details of Miss Smith's editing points should be discussed with staff. Mr. Edgington agreed that staff would undertake to meet with Miss Smith to address her concerns.

David Kardish, Clyde Avenue Holdings, expressed concurrence with the staff recommendations contained in the second report. He noted his client was prepared to concur a month earlier, with the initial report prepared by staff, in order to move ahead with this project. Mr. Kardish acknowledged this matter is controversial and unfortunately, sets communities against each other. He said for this reason they had referred the matter to the OMB. He went on to speak of Dr. Smith's objections on the zoning bylaw which preceded the subdivision. He said although his client attempted to meet with Dr. Smith, they were unable to conclude an agreement and therefore have asked that this matter be referred to the Board and settled there at a future date.

Mr. Kardish asked, in light of the fact this report was originally to be brought forward to Planning and Environment Committee in August, that the report be waived to Council the next day.

Chair Hunter noted the major issue appeared to be the access in the Clyde Avenue/Maitland area. He asked what Mr. Kardish's client's position was on that?

Mr. Kardish stated his client's position has always been that they would prefer to have two accesses onto Merivale Road. He explained when his client purchased the land from the Region and from Assaly, they had the opportunity to "re-think" the subdivision and they decided they did not want to establish a community that was going to result in cut-through traffic from day one. Mr. Kardish advised they looked at the traffic impact, and were able to prove that two accesses on Merivale Road were more than sufficient for this

subdivision and he noted that both OC Transpo and the City of Ottawa were satisfied with this. Mr. Kardish then stated that although his client's preference would be to limit it to the two accesses on Merivale Road, they did understand how contentious this issue was and they would really just like to move forward on this project.

Councillor Stewart pointed out that Clyde Avenue Holdings does not own the land in question and suggested it was not necessary to make a decision on the third access right now. The Councillor noted that Mr. Kardish was initially happy with the position contained in the original staff report, namely that a decision not be made regarding the third access.

Mr. Kardish stated his client's opinion concerning the two accesses on Merivale being sufficient had never changed. Initially, Regional staff had wanted to leave the option for a third access open and in order to get this project moving forward, his client concurred with those conditions. Subsequent to that, Regional staff concluded their analysis, and arrived at a definitive position, which supports Clyde Avenue Holding's original conclusions and analysis, namely two accesses on Merivale are sufficient.

Councillor Stewart stated it was obvious that Mr. Kardish's client did not want to have a third access. She asked if Mr. Kardish was aware of what the existing community wants. Mr. Kardish replied he was not aware of their position.

Councillor Stewart then asked what would happen if Mr. Kardish's client were to purchase the DOC lands at some point in the future, and it is determined that a third access is needed. Would they consider it at that point?

Mr. Kardish noted his client's transportation impact analysis included certain development densities for the DOC lands which were developed in consultation with the Department of Communications. He explained, for example, if his client procured the lands within the next year or so, they would come forward with a new application and would likely submit the current traffic study and hope that would be sufficient. He said if this were to happen three or four years from now, Regional staff may insist on a new traffic impact study. If that traffic impact study indicated that an access is required and is desirable because of changing circumstances, then the opportunity is still there.

Councillor Stewart again questioned why the option could not be kept open, until a decision is made on the DOC lands. Mr. Kardish stated it would be desirable to finalize this issue and set the road pattern so that his client can, effectively market this project on the basis of an approved plan.

Harold Carswell and Kathie Yach, Copeland Park Community Alliance (CPCA). Mr. Carswell explained Copeland Park is the residential area immediately west of the Central

Park development; Clyde Avenue adjoins both Copeland Park and Central Park and Copeland Park is bisected by Maitland Avenue.

Mr. Carswell advised CPCA's major concern was with the issue of the "third access" and its suggested location at the intersection of Clyde and Maitland Avenues. He expressed CPCA's support for the position of the developer, the City of Ottawa Planning Committee, City of Ottawa Council and Regional planning staff, that there should not be a third access at Clyde and Maitland. He noted that letters from over 530 Copeland Park residents had been submitted to Ottawa City Council in opposition to such an access.

Mr. Carswell went on to explain the reasoning behind CPCA's position, namely, the differing nature of the two streets that would be most directly affected (i.e. Merivale and Maitland); the relative traffic volumes on each; the likelihood of failure of a Clyde/Maitland intersection; and the potential for increased cut-through traffic in Copeland Park South. He noted Maitland Avenue is a residential street with a speed limit of 50 kph, on which there is an elementary school (children from Copeland Park North must cross Maitland to reach their schools), a church, and approximately 70 private driveways; while Merivale Road north of Central Park is almost entirely commercial or open space (i.e. Experimental Farm on the eastern side). The speed limit on this stretch of Merivale is 60 kph. As per data obtained from the Regional Transportation Department, Merivale's average daily traffic in 1999 is 26,000 vehicles, while Maitland's daily volume in 1999 is 35,600.

The speaker pointed out the rate of growth of Maitland traffic over the past seven years has been 60% greater than Merivale's and Delcan has forecasted that Maitland's traffic will continue to grow faster than Merivale's. When the trends of the past seven years are projected, by the year 2004, Maitland traffic volume will be 48,000 vehicles, or 16,000 per day more than Merivale's. He disputed claims of the proponents of the Clyde/Maitland intersection, that each community (i.e. Carlington and Copeland Park) should have their "fair share" of the additional traffic, noting the higher volumes on Maitland. Mr. Carswell opined Maitland simply cannot take any additional traffic that can possibly be avoided.

On the issue of cut-through traffic, Mr. Carswell explained there is already a problem with drivers coming from the Queensway cutting through Copeland Park South to avoid the Clyde/Baseline intersection. He stated if an intersection were constructed at Clyde/Maitland, there would be an even greater incentive to cut through Copeland Park South to avoid both Clyde/Baseline and the new intersection.

Mr. Carswell urged the Committee to give its support to the existing Ashcroft traffic plan and to recommend that Council endorse such a position with the Ontario Municipal Board. He went on to say that should the OMB direct that a Clyde Maitland intersection be built, CPCA will petition the Board to also impose a key aspect of their 1992 ruling,

namely a reorganization of the Central Park Development so that only the western third of the park would have access to Clyde.

The speaker expressed concern, that should a third access be approved by the OMB, it would not have been the subject of an intense traffic analysis (as was the developer's original traffic proposal), including the impact on the adjacent community. He requested that Annex E of the staff report be amended to add a condition that a traffic study as detailed and as thorough as the original Delcan study, with addendum, be conducted to analyze all of the consequences of the Clyde/Maitland intersection on the adjacent community, including traffic volumes, intersection service, cut through traffic, pedestrian safety and all other significant factors as well as the means by which impacts can be remedied. The OMB should be asked to make this an essential prerequisite to a final decision on the intersection and Copeland Park should have input into the terms of reference.

Referring to comments with respect to an emergency access between Central Park and Clyde Avenue, Mr. Carswell pointed out the City of Ottawa canvassed all relevant regional and city authorities (including police and fire) and none supported the need for such an emergency access nor the expense of year round maintenance. He opined this appeal for an emergency access was merely an attempt "to end run" any decision not to construct the Clyde/Maitland intersection. He offered as well, that such an access higher above Clyde than the Maitland entrance would create a traffic nightmare since all exit and entry could only be through the residential streets of Copeland Park North.

As his final comment, Mr. Carswell noted there were three references in the staff report, to a storm sewer on Clyde Avenue and the report suggests that development might be permitted for the lots fronting on Clyde in advance of general development approval elsewhere because of the presence of that storm sewer. He advised there is no storm sewer at Clyde Avenue nor at Baseline, only an open ditch and there have been occasions during spring run off, where water has run into basement windows of houses on Clyde. He said obviously, there is no spare capacity for storm runoff and no development of any part of Clyde should be approved until the storm water issue has been properly addressed.

At Committee Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Edgington responded to the speaker's last comment. He noted the City of Ottawa had indicated there is some capacity for storm services along that portion of Clyde where they are proposing sixty doubles. Regional staff are still in negotiations with the City of Ottawa to see if there is in fact capacity there for some development to proceed before the storm water pond is built. He assured Committee, if there was not capacity, these lots would not proceed, until there was capacity.

Councillor Stewart stated she could appreciate that the residents of Copeland Park are concerned about cut-through traffic and she felt the request that Mr. Carswell made with respect to the detailed study of the impacts of an intersection at Clyde/Maitland, (should the OMB so decide), was a very good suggestion.

Councillor Stewart then had questions of staff with respect to this traffic impact study. Mr. Edgington advised that Delcan did not study the off-site traffic implications of this development to the extent that cut through traffic was looked at in each of the surrounding communities. He said this was the case with any in-filling subdivision in the Region and noted that when densities are increased on vacant parcels, it has implications on the traffic system generally throughout the whole system. He indicated he would have to defer to Transportation staff, as to whether they would be capable of undertaking such a wide ranging study.

Councillor Stewart then asked if the amount of traffic expected to use the Clyde/Maitland intersection had been quantified. Mr. Fraser advised there were two scenarios done by Delcan for the amount of traffic and the results were either 20 percent of the development traffic would use the Clyde/Maitland access or 30 percent (therefore 70 or 80 percent would still use Merivale, even if there is a third access).

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Fraser advised Merivale/Kirkwood is a truck traffic route and Maitland/Clyde is not. Councillor Stewart noted that Merivale/Kirkwood has taken the truck traffic off Maitland; although the car traffic has not grown, the truck route has made a large impact on Merivale/Kirkwood. Mr. Carswell stated there are still over 300 trucks a day using Clyde/Maitland.

Bruce Cole, President, Central Park Citizen's Group (CPCG), referred to a letter he submitted (held on file with the Regional Clerk), which covered the concerns of the residents of Central Park. He noted there had been negotiations between the developer, the City, the Region and the respective community associations and although the problem is not going to be resolved to everyone's satisfaction, there has to be some compromises made. Mr. Cole emphasized the need to plan for the future and he said he could not believe the Region was considering isolating a community of 4000 to 5000 people, which could grow in the future. He said CPCG is merely asking that the provision for a third access be protected and he expressed support for the position conveyed by Dr. Smith.

Mr. Cole went on to say there are other options (some of them bi-directional, some single directional) that have not been considered and he said CPCG has requested and will continue to request that these options be considered. He advised he took exception to the comments made by the Copeland Park representative and said he could not believe they are willing to lock in a neighbouring community. Mr. Cole noted his group had tried to work with Copeland Park and keep an open dialogue, however, they had been rebuffed.

In concluding his comments, Mr. Cole urged the Committee to look at the options for a third access into Central Park.

Katie Cleghorn, Central Park Citizen's Group, referred to a comment made by Mr. Kardish with respect to him not being aware of the wishes of the residents of Central Park regarding the third access. Ms. Cleghorn stated, for the record, the citizens of Central Park had in fact entered into discussions with the developer on this issue. As well, she noted a survey of the residents was undertaken, concerning the third access (which the residents support) and this had been provided to the developer.

Ms. Cleghorn emphasized the third access does not have to be at Clyde/Maitland. She said there are other potential options that have not been examined (e.g. access onto Baseline Road near the Scouts location) and the residents of Central Park would like all of the potential accesses looked at.

Responding to questions posed by Committee Chair Hunter, Ms. Cleghorn advised when she purchased in Central Park, there were going to be two separate subdivisions, with nothing, except perhaps a transit emergency link between Central Park and the former Assaly lands. She indicated that she did not have a problem with this, based on the population that was expected to be in the Central Park portion, exiting onto Merivale. However, once the application was expanded and the Assaly lands were purchased by Clyde Avenue Holdings, and the plan was conceived that would mean all of this increased traffic would go past her front door, this was not acceptable to her. She said it is the residents' position that the original OMB ruling (from the Assaly lands) with respect to the Clyde/Maitland access, should still apply.

Chair Hunter then asked the speaker if her preference would be that the residents of the subject lands would be able to access Clyde Avenue, but not Merivale and the residents of Central Park would not be able to access Clyde Avenue. Ms. Cleghorn said this would be acceptable if the developments were kept as two separate sites; if they are incorporated into one entire site, another access is needed.

Chair Hunter questioned whether the residents of Central Park would accept the cut-through traffic that would come with the access on Clyde/Maitland, noting that in his experience most communities fight to prevent such cut-through traffic. Ms. Cleghorn said without the access onto Clyde/Maitland the 4,000 to 5,000 residents of Central Park will be forced to enter onto Merivale in order to go west. She stated that the presumption that everybody from Central Park wants to go down Merivale, and that the only reason that they are leaving their subdivision is to go to Highway 417, is incorrect. Ms. Cleghorn pointed out many of the residents of Central Park are high tech employees who work in Kanata. For them it is a convenience factor to be able to exit their subdivision on the west

side, rather than having to go east, south and then west in order to get to work. Again, she pointed out there are options that can be put in place (as Dr. Smith has identified), to restrict cut-through traffic. Ms. Cleghorn said as well, the residents of Central Park do not want to cut the residents of Copeland Park off from the commercial areas that are going to be developed in Central Park.

Ms. Cleghorn said she found it very interesting that the big concern about creating a full intersection at Clyde/Maitland is because of its proximity to Clyde/Baseline. Yet there is no similar concern about the Merivale/Baseline intersection, when a full intersection is going to be put in place even closer to Baseline when the Central Park south intersection is fully in place.

Chair Hunter stated he did not think the concern was so much with the proximity to Baseline, as it was with the anticipated number of left hand turns northbound. If there has to be a traffic light, it means the intersection would not be able to handle the volume, and it would fail. Ms. Cleghorn pointed out, currently the left hand turning traffic going east onto Baseline from Merivale backs up beyond where the intersection of Central Park South and Merivale is going to be put in.

Councillor Stewart had questions of the delegations concerning the survey conducted of the residents of Central Park. Mr. Cole advised, as of the second week of July, the survey (which is continually being updated as new residents move in), results from almost 80% of the residents showed 63% still want a third access or another access at some point. He said the questions were clearly articulated to give residents the options and the questions did not focus on Clyde/Maitland.

Councillor Stewart noted the developer had asked that this item be fast-tracked to Council the next day; she asked the delegations their opinion on this. Mr. Cole replied, given the fact the Region's technical traffic analysis was only released to the public the previous Friday and he had not been able to review it in detail, he requested that the item proceed to Council in the normal process.

On hearing Mr. Cole's response, Councillor Stewart urged the Committee not agree to waive the item to Council, but rather allow it to follow the regular process (i.e. rise to Council in two weeks).

Mark Lavinkas, President, Carlington Community Association, referred to a letter he had submitted to the Committee (held on file with the Regional Clerk). Mr. Lavinkas stated the Carlington Community also has concerns about the cut-through traffic they will have to deal with and yet, most of the attention is being focused on Copeland Park and the Central Park Community.

Referencing traffic figures provided by the Copeland Park Community Alliance (35,000 vehicles per day on Maitland as opposed to 26,000 vehicles per day on Merivale Road), Mr. Lavinskas stated he had no idea where these figures came from, nor how relevant they are. He felt these figures should be discounted and not be given any credence because there is no relevance to any of the other data that has been looked at. He noted in the Traffic Impact Study done by Delcan, that an additional 2,000 vehicles per hour or more would be put onto Merivale Road. This study showed the current volumes per hour on Clyde was approximately 2,683 vehicles per hour in the peak volume, whereas Merivale was 2,300; a net difference of 383 vehicles.

Mr. Lavinskas stated, from the outset, all the Carlington Community has ever asked was to be dealt with fairly and equitably. He said they fully anticipate a big brunt of the traffic from Central Park but they request some relief so there can be a free dispersment of the traffic under certain conditions, and secondly, that the third access act as an emergency access. He referred to a tragedy that occurred in 1989, where a fuel tanker hit a bus and there was a massive explosion and Merivale was cut off. He said it would not be fair to the Central Park community to leave them cut off from all essential services and basically trapped.

Mr. Lavinskas went on to point out that he mentioned in his submission, the fact that the intersection of Baseline and Merivale was named by State Farm Insurance as the third most dangerous intersection in the province of Ontario. As well, an article in the November, 1998 issue of Readers Digest that spoke of the worst drivers in Canada, referred to the intersection of Baseline and Merivale and talked of how dangerous it was. He suggested this would also have an impact on Central Park and the Carlington Community.

Mr. Lavinskas stated although he could sympathize with Copeland Park concerning the cut-through traffic, the two streets (Maitland and Merivale) are almost equal in terms of the traffic impact/current volumes. He questioned why he could not impose upon the Committee to say, "Let's have all the traffic go out onto Clyde/Maitland and we'll take care of that cut-through traffic?". He said the Carlington Community is prepared to take their fair share of the traffic impact but it would be very difficult for this community to accept that there is no traffic that is going to go anywhere else but their community.

Chair Hunter asked where the figure of 2,000 vehicles per hour, referred to by Mr. Lavinskas, was coming from. Mr. Lavinskas advised the 2,000 vehicles per hour was found in the Delcan Traffic Impact Study, where they mentioned that the number of vehicles per hour (Scenario 1) during peak times would be 1,860.

At Chair Hunter's Request, Ron Jack, Delcan, advised the total traffic generation in the afternoon peak hour would be slightly less than 2,000 because of the retail; in the morning

peak hour it would be a little over 1,000. He explained the difference as being due to the fair amount of retail and office commercial uses proposed along the Merivale Road frontage, in addition to the residential units.

Mr. Jack confirmed this could be traffic coming from anywhere and stated a key point to keep in mind is that a lot of the traffic that would be generated or attracted by the retail is already travelling on Merivale Road, it is called pass-by traffic.

Chair Hunter asked what volume of traffic would be generated from both parts of Central Park. Mr. Jack advised in the morning peak, it would be about 1,100; in the afternoon, it would be about 1,900. He went on to say that new traffic (which is new traffic to the overall community) would be about 880 in the morning, and in the afternoon, about 1,250. The difference between 2,000 and 1,250 is traffic already travelling on the adjacent roads or traffic between the new residential and the new retail that stays internal to the community.

Mr. Jack confirmed for Chair Hunter that a third access would disperse the traffic but would not create new traffic, except for the potential for cut-through traffic.

Having heard from all public delegations, the matter returned to Committee.

Councillor Stewart stated when the first staff report on this issue came out, it preserved the option of a third access until the DOC lands became available and all the parties were satisfied with this. She said there is no reason that this could still not be done. The Councillor felt that the reason given by staff to explain why the intersection at Clyde/Maitland would fail, was not valid because all of the types of intersections have not been looked at (e.g. a 'one way in, one way out' or a 'right in, right out'). In this regard, Councillor Stewart indicated she would be putting forward the following motion:

That a new recommendation 6 be added: That staff be directed to examine in greater detail the advantages and disadvantages of requiring the construction of a four way intersection at Clyde/Maitland, as well as any other options (i.e. right in, right out) which are identified by staff and the community.

She explained this motion would protect the Regional option, as she was not convinced a decision had to be made at this time. If the DOC land is not picked up by this developer it may be many years down the road before Industry Canada disposes of it. Councillor Stewart said she was not asking that a third access be approved at this time but that the option be kept open. She urged the Committee to support her motion.

Chair Hunter asked staff how much such an examination would cost. Mr. Fraser advised it would be difficult to assign a cost to such an exercise. He said it would be worked on

in-house, however, other of Council's priorities would fall behind. Mr. Fraser noted delegations had indicated they had found options that would work, and he was certainly willing to look at those options.

Councillor Stewart explained part of the intent of this motion is so that when the Region goes to the OMB, staff can say they have not had a chance to find an option that works and not "we have looked at all the options and nothing works".

The Committee then considered the following motion.

Moved by W. Stewart

That a new recommendation 6 be added: That staff be directed to examine in greater detail the advantages and disadvantages of requiring the construction of a four way intersection at Clyde/Maitland, as well as any other options (i.e. right in, right out) which are identified by staff and the community.

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented)

At Chair Hunter's request, Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, advised the Region is under a statutory obligation to forward the plan of subdivision to the Ontario Municipal Board. He said this could be done now (prior to Council consideration), and Council could then establish its position on the subdivision in the regular course, with the report going forward on October 27th. He explained this would be done without any prejudice to Council establishing its position on October 27th or indeed at a later date.

On hearing Mr. Marc's advice, Councillor Stewart indicated she would move that Council be requested to waive the rules to consider this item at its meeting the next day.

The Committee then considered the report as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. That subdivision application 06T-99003 (former Assaly lands), be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board;**
- 2. That the OMB be advised that prior to registration of the final plan for subdivision application 06T-99003, the Owner shall be required to enter into an Agreement with the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton to repay the Region its share of the costs, including but not limited to: parkland dedication; stormwater design; sanitary sewers; water services;**

3. That the OMB be advised that the Regional Subdivision Agreement applying to subdivision application 06T-99003 will include a requirement that the construction of the Stormwater Management Facility must be completed, and the storm sewers connecting this subdivision to the stormwater treatment facility must be constructed, before an Inhibiting Order for any part or parts of the final plan are removed (with the possible exception of the lots fronting on Clyde Avenue whose development may be permitted if the City of Ottawa identifies capacity in the storm sewer on Clyde Avenue);
4. That should the Board approve the Subdivision application, the OMB impose the Conditions For Final Approval attached as Annex D to this Report; and
5. That should the Board determine that a Clyde/Maitland intersection is required, the OMB impose the additional Conditions For Final Approval attached as Annex E to this Report.
6. That staff be directed to examine in greater detail the advantages and disadvantages of requiring the construction of a four way intersection at Clyde/Maitland, as well as any other options (i.e. right in, right out) which are identified by staff and the community.

CARRIED as amended

Moved by W. Stewart

That Council be requested to waive the rules of procedure to consider this item at its meeting of 13 October 1999.

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. Hazeldean Pumping Station - Status Report
and Notice of Completion of Environmental Assessment
- Director, Engineering Division,
Environment and Transportation Department memo dated 24 Sept 99

2. Water Environment Protection in RMOC 1998
- Director, Water Environment Protection Division,
Environment and Transportation Department memo dated 23 Sept 99

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Original signed by
Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original signed by
Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR