

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
CHAMPLAIN ROOM

3 JULY 1996

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: R. Cantin

Members: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, L. Davis, D. Holmes, J. Legendre, H. Kreling,
M. Meilleur, D. Pratt

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That Transportation Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting of 5 June 1996.

CARRIED

ROAD CLOSING

1. PROPOSED CLOSING OF KNOXDALE ROAD - IMMEDIATELY NORTH OF HUNT CLUB ROAD AND WEST OF GREENBANK ROAD - PUBLIC HEARING
- joint Regional Solicitor and Environment and Transportation Commissioner report dated 30 May 96

That the Transportation Committee and Council approve and pass a By-law for the closing of that portion of Knoxdale Road not presently used by the public, and described as parts 1 to 9 both inclusive on Reference Plan 4R-11190.

CARRIED

-
- Note:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 10 July 1996 in Transportation Committee Report 32.

REGULAR ITEMS

2. REGIONAL CORPORATE REVIEW - ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT (TRANSPORTATION SECTION)
- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 4 Jun 96

That the Transportation Committee and Council receive this Annex for information.

CARRIED

3. SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE
- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 21 Jun 96

That the Transportation Committee cancel its meeting scheduled for 7 August 1996.

CARRIED

4. FALLOWFIELD ROAD ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY - FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
- Director, Transportation Planning Division report dated 17 Jun 96

Rob McCallum, Manager, Environmental Planning Branch, provided a brief summary of the report. He noted that of the 23 comment sheets that were distributed to the public, 20 were returned and indicated support for the widening of the roadway, but that it should be done in conjunction with noise mitigation. Accordingly, staff are recommending the installation of a privacy fence to reduce anticipated noise levels following construction. It will be installed at the Region's cost, on the provision that the local municipality would then assume ownership and ongoing maintenance responsibility for the fence. He confirmed the City of Nepean has agreed to this. In response to a question posed by Councillor Cullen, R. McCallum confirmed this project will not proceed further until funding becomes available.

Councillor Cullen noted that a stone house on Fallowfield Road will have to be replaced or relocated as a result of the widening, and questioned whether the local heritage committee in Nepean was aware of this fact. Councillor Pratt explained that that group has been aware of the environmental assessment (EA) process and he believed the house had not been designated a heritage structure because it did not have any special features that set it apart from others constructed in the same period. He further questioned whether that organization would even have the right to designate it a heritage structure, because the building is located on federal property. Councillor Cullen was seeking assurance they were aware of the EA and have been advised of the future proposals for this building. Staff confirmed they would be notified.

Councillor Legendre was somewhat skeptical of the effectiveness of a privacy fence vs a sound attenuation barrier for reducing noise impact on a community and questioned what anticipated attenuation would be expected from a sound attenuation barrier. R. McCallum responded by stating both fences would have the same degree of attenuation; a privacy fence is built to reduce noise and the difference is more in some of the treatments i.e. the detail of the structure itself and ensuring that at all locations along the fence 5 dB attenuation is required; with a privacy fence, some of these details are not accommodated because in an effort to keep costs at a minimum, they may go strictly according to achieving the full attenuation across the entire project. However, they are built to similar standards as noise fences, and in this situation, a 2m high fence will achieve 5.5 dB attenuation.

The Councillor noted that since the main concern expressed by residents was noise, why would staff not recommend a sound attenuation barrier instead. Dr. Shallal, Director, Transportation Planning advised this situation does not meet the warrants for such a barrier, further noting this recommendation is in keeping with the practice and policy adopted by Council. He clarified by stating that the Region must meet the requirements of the EA when noise impacts exceed 5 dB; however, when warrants for mitigation are not met (as in this project), such noise attenuation barriers are not required. He added that a privacy fence is being recommended as it will have privacy advantages and noise mitigation, but which is not the same level of mitigation that a berm would provide. He stated this is an affordable option and one that will meet the requirements of the residents. In response to concerns posed by Councillor Legendre, he confirmed the final detailed design of the road will include the specs for the privacy fence i.e. that a noise attenuation figure of 5.5 dB will be built into the specs.

Councillor Legendre was troubled about noise as an environmental pollutant and felt that if the Region does not want to pay for noise attenuation, it should say so and then hear from the public accordingly.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the preparation and filing of an Environmental Study Report for the widening of Fallowfield Road between a point just west of Cedarview Road and just east of Woodroffe Avenue, as detailed in this report.

CARRIED

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

5. SCOTT STREET AT CLIFTON ROAD - TURN PROHIBITIONS
- Dir. Mobility Services/Corporate Fleet Services report dated 12 Jun 96

Councillor Legendre did not understand the problem at this intersection, particularly since the vehicle volumes on Clifton Road during peak hours were not that high. The Commissioner advised that this was a request of the local municipality and since it does not impact on the Regional road system, staff had no objections to implementing the turn restrictions.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the prohibition of northbound right-turning movements from Clifton Road to Scott Street between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday, and westbound left-turning movements from Scott Street to Clifton Road between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., Monday to Friday, (bicycles and authorized vehicles excepted) and the Traffic and Parking By-Law be amended to reflect this change.

CARRIED
(J. Legendre dissented)

PRELIMINARY/FUNCTIONAL DESIGNS

6. MEDIAN OPENING ON EAGLESON ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 49) JUST SOUTH OF FORMER CP RAILWAY, FOR A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 105 DENZIL DOYLE COURT
- Director, Transportation Planning report dated 27 Jun 96

The Director of Transportation Planning highlighted the main points in the staff report which clearly outlined staff's reasons for recommending the rejection of the application for a median break on Eagleson Road at this site.

Noting the concerns expressed by staff with respect to the future use of the abandoned rail corridor, Councillor Legendre suggested that if the Committee were to approve a median break, it could be conditional on the owner of the site paying for the closure of the opening should it be required in the future. The Solicitor confirmed this condition could be registered on title for any future owner of the site.

Keith McLean, McLean Transportation Engineering Consultants Ltd., spoke on behalf of the owner of the site, Gray Pynn and Associates Inc. He indicated that there is access to this site from Denzil Doyle Court, however it is a very circuitous route for motorists and the owner would prefer that access was made as conveniently as possible. In addition,

prospective tenants of the site do not want to locate there without full access/egress to and from Eagleson Road. He provided figures of projected traffic volumes entering and leaving the site from all directions and submitted a detailed drawing of the site, with the median break as proposed.

Chair Cantin questioned whether the southerly entrance at the site could be moved further south and Mr. McLean indicated the developer must maintain a minimum distance between driveways according to Regional standards; however, it could be moved if the Committee wanted to and if it is acceptable to the owner. The Commissioner confirmed that should the Committee approve a median opening at this location, staff would work with the developer on the design to ensure the two driveways work properly. L. Shallal understood the intent was for southbound traffic to enter from the northerly access and exit from the southerly access; however, Mr. Pynn indicated the southerly driveway will serve a gas station and would provide a right-in/right-out for that business.

In response to concerns expressed by Committee members, the Commissioner advised that he has the authority to close a median if it is deemed a safety hazard and the costs associated with such would be borne by the owner of the site.

Councillor Meilleur proposed that the Committee approve the application for a median opening, and the installation of traffic control signals at the expense of the developer of the site. Tom Pynn, of Gray Pynn and Associates Inc., confirmed that condition was acceptable.

Councillor Lance Mitchell, Ward 4, City of Kanata indicated the rezoning application to develop a business park at this site has been submitted to the City of Kanata, but has not yet been dealt with by the local council. At a recent meeting held in Bridlewood, the community did not support the proposed median break because it did not make sense from a traffic point of view. He too did not support the break and suggested that access to the site from Denzil Doyle Court was sufficient, as was originally intended since the site was part of an industrial subdivision which was developed respecting the access restrictions on Eagleson Road. He strongly urged the Committee to support the staff recommendation and reject the request for a median opening.

Councillor Pratt questioned how warrants could be met at this site based on the low volume of projected vehicles. K. McLean clarified this site meets the minimum delay warrants (75 vehicles/hour minimum) because of the level of traffic volumes on Eagleson Road, although it does not meet the warrants for minimum vehicle volume warrants.

Based on the comments submitted by Councillor Mitchell of Kanata, Councillor Meilleur suggested the following be added to the end of her Motion: “conditional on site plan approval”. Councillor Legendre suggested the Motion be further amended by including the following phrase: “and conditional on the owner agreeing to pay for the closure of the

median to Regional standards should a future underpass on Eagleson Road to the transportation corridor to the north be required”.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the Meilleur Motion be amended to include “and conditional on the owner agreeing to pay for the closure of the median to Regional standards should a future underpass on Eagleson Road to the transportation corridor to the north be required.”

CARRIED

In considering the Motion as amended, Councillor Pratt believed approving the application for a median break would set a precedent and encourage nearby businesses to request similar treatment, which would further undermine the Regional road function. He referred to the concerns expressed by the local councillor and did not feel the Committee was being as cognizant as it should be with respect to the interference with the arterial road function and what that can do in terms of accidents; the posted speed limit is 60 km/h at this location and there will probably be more traffic conflicts. As a result, he believed the Committee should defer the report, until the City has dealt with the rezoning application.

Councillor Kreling indicated the Meilleur Motion states that approval is conditional on site plan approval, however, Councillor Pratt firmly believed the Region should wait for that process to be dealt with before making a decision because it will provide additional information.

Moved by D. Pratt

That this report be deferred until such time as the City of Kanata has considered site plan approval for the use of this site.

LOST

YEAS: D. Pratt....1

NAYS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, A. Cullen, L. Davis, D. Holmes, H. Kreling,
J. Legendre, M. Meilleur....8

Moved by M. Meilleur

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the application for a median opening on Eagleson Road for a proposed development at 105 Denzil Doyle Court and installation of traffic control signals at the expense of the developer, conditional on site plan approval and the owner agreeing to pay for the closure of the median to Regional standards should a future underpass on Eagleson Road to the transportation corridor to the north be required, and subject to a public hearing if required.

CARRIED
(D. Pratt dissented)

RESPONSE TO MOTIONS/INQUIRIES

7. SIGNAGE AT HUNT CLUB ROAD WEST - INQUIRY TC-22
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner report dated 18 Jun 96

That the Transportation Committee receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

ADDITIONAL ITEM

8. NCC'S DECISION RE CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE

Councillor Cullen brought forward a Motion for the Committee's consideration regarding the NCC's proposed decision regarding the widening of the Champlain Bridge.

Moved by A. Cullen

That the rules of procedure be suspended so that the Transportation Committee can consider the Motion.

CARRIED

Councillor Pratt questioned the reference to the Region's opposition to the third lane for safety reasons, as stated in the Motion. In response, Dr. L. Shallal, Director of Transportation Planning clarified that staff had written a letter to the NCC stating that when a micro-level of analysis is examined on how they are going to designate which lanes are mixed-flow and which are for high-occupancy vehicles (HOV), staff believe there will

be weaving problems on the bridge and possible conflicts as a result of motorists trying to go straight down Island Park Drive and those that want to turn left onto the Ottawa River Parkway. This safety concern had not been included by the NCC's consultant in their evaluation. He further stated that staff are satisfied the only way to mitigate this problem is to build HOV lanes further up the bridge, but even then there are no guarantees that it wouldn't create a safety concern. He confirmed these concerns were brought to the NCC last week and staff believe it should be reiterated through the Motion.

Further to this, Councillor Davis indicated there is a prohibition of left-hand turn lanes from Island Park Drive onto the Ottawa River Parkway and noted the community would like to revert back to the previous configurations at that intersection and therefore there will be safety concerns with traffic coming off the bridge.

In addition, the Councillor noted the recommendation the NCC Board voted on was not costed, was not recommended by their consultants and was never looked at through public consultation and as a result there are many questions on the whole issue. She hoped the NCC and its consultants would come to the Committee to give members information on how they arrived at their decision made behind closed doors on 28 June 1996. Dr. Shallal indicated he just recently received a press release on the Commission's decision, as well as a Submission Sheet from the NCC detailing the proposal for a third lane on the Champlain Bridge and distributed copies to Committee members for their information.

Councillor Davis noted that at the last meeting of the Transportation Committee she had asked whether the Region could seek a legal injunction to stop the NCC from proceeding with a third lane, because the costs associated with that will ultimately be downloaded on the Regional road system and Council has an obligation to protect the taxpayer's investment in the road system. The Solicitor, E. McArthur made reference to the Minutes of 5 June 1996 where he was asked whether another environmental assessment would be required, at which time he indicated he would investigate that and would be available to answer questions at the Council meeting on 26 June 1996. He apologized if it was the Councillor's intent that he provide a written response to councillors. With respect to commencing any litigation on this matter, he confirmed it would be a question for the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee because they have the jurisdiction over such matters.

When questioned what the Region can do in light of the NCC's proposed decision, Chair Cantin suggested staff reiterate the points stated in the Motion and put into serious question the NCC's estimated incremental costs for the third lane, which appears to be quite low. Dr. Shallal indicated staff would consolidate all the staff responses that have been provided to the NCC previously indicating Council's position and they will also comment on the costs outlined in the NCC's report and indicate where staff differ in the interpretation of the information. Councillor Davis noted the downstream costs will come to the Region and she wanted to be able to cost that and determine what it will mean for

the Region in the future and in addition, how will the Region address the request of residents, if successful, to close Island Park Drive. The Commissioner indicated Council should address what they have to do.

Councillor Cullen suggested staff's response to the Motion include reference to the 15 May 1996 letter sent to the consultant which states the Region's concern about additional traffic coming into Ottawa-Carleton. He also suggested staff use the Transportation Committee Minutes of 5 June 1996 because they clearly illustrate the Committee was getting professional advice and asked questions about the impact. He further suggested the Motion should rise to the Council meeting of 10 July 1996 in order that the Region can submit their response to the NCC within their 60-day timeframe.

Councillor Legendre noted that since NCC meetings are not open, the Region should invite them to a joint public information session and perhaps extend that invitation to the Outaouais so that all the players can listen to what each has to say before a decision is taken by the Commission in September. Chair Cantin suggested such direction should be sent to the National Capital Commission board members and not its staff.

Councillor Davis made reference to the NCC Board inflating the cost by \$6M for the proposed bridge expansion and felt that money could better be used elsewhere for things such as commuter rail, for example. She did not see any safety for her community - just more traffic. She submitted a slightly different Motion than the one previously submitted by Councillor Cullen and the Committee voted on this Motion as follows:

Moved by L. Davis

Whereas on June 28, 1996 the National Capital Commission (NCC) took a preliminary decision to reconstruct the Champlain Bridge to 3 lanes;

Whereas, as part of its environmental assessment process, the NCC has allowed 60 days for the public to respond to its preliminary decision;

Whereas the NCC will make a final decision at its Commission meeting in September 1996;

Whereas the RMOC previously indicated to the NCC's consultants its opposition to widening the Champlain Bridge, due to the traffic impacts on the road system in Ottawa-Carleton, safety, the lack of additional road capacity and the additional cost of the third lane;

Therefore be it resolved that the RMOC formally reiterate its position to the NCC by communicating directly to the members of the Board of the National Capital Commission its detailed opposition to the widening of the Champlain Bridge.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Transportation Committee recommend that Council invite the members of the National Capital Commission to an information session at which staff of the NCC, its consultants, the Communauté Urbaine de l'Outaouais (CUO) staff and the RMOC's staff would present information to the Commission members in a public forum.

CARRIED

The Committee agreed to forward the above Motions to Regional Council on 10 July 1996.

INQUIRIES

Status of Transitway Extensions

Councillor Cullen questioned the status of the transitway programme, particularly the west extension and what the province has decided with respect to these projects. The Commissioner advised staff have not yet received word from the province on this, noting the issue will not be resolved until the fall, with further discussion during budget deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR