

MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

16 FEBRUARY 2000

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

Members: M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, R. Cantin, L. Davis, C. Doucet, H. Kreling,
J. Legendre, M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Meilleur

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 2 February 2000.

CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. WOODROFFE AVENUE BUS-ONLY LANES - BASELINE STATION TO THE
NEPEAN SPORTSPLEX - PRELIMINARY DESIGN

- Director, Engineering Division report dated 27 Jan 00
- RCAG comments dated 15 Feb 00

The Director of Engineering, Jim Miller provided a brief overview of Phases 1 and 2 of the proposal. A short video illustrated the project limits and the particular elements of each phase. He confirmed that a 3.5m bus lane and an 1.8m bicycle lane will be provided for the entire length of the project. Some obstacles that this project faces include relocation of utilities and the implementation of the lane as it travels under the railway overpass; constraints in Phase 2 involve

-
- Note:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 23 February and 8 March 2000 in Transportation Committee Reports 55 and 56, respectively.

property acquisitions at a number of townhouse developments. Extending the bus lanes further south to Fallowfield Road (Phase 3), will be brought forward in the near future.

In a powerpoint presentation, Paul Clarke, Project Manager provided further details about the project as follows:

- it is hoped that Phase 1 (Baseline Station to Knoxdale Road) will be constructed this year and Phase 2 (Knoxdale Road to the Nepean Sportsplex) in 2001;
- there has been extensive public consultation and residents on Birchview Road whose yards back onto Woodroffe Avenue, have expressed a number of concerns about this proposal including noise, vibration, speeding and removal of the bus shelter at Parkglen; with respect to the latter, Mr. Clarke explained that buses have a difficult time merging back into the traffic, especially when they must get into Baseline Station which is almost directly opposite from this stop;
- unlike Phase 2, Phase 1 can be implemented independent of property acquisition;
- the property requirement from Carleton Condominium Corporation #298 involves a 1.5m strip near a cedar hedge (the distance between the hedge and the parking area for the condominium is approximately 5 metres and there will be no impact on their internal road);
- in the southbound direction there is a greater impact with respect to property requirement; however, near Manor Village (north of Hunt Club) staff will take advantage of the wide median so not as much property will be required from alongside those homes;
- negotiations have begun for all properties concerned;
- in order to widen the lane on the east side of the road, there is a need to relocate the hydro lines currently above and below ground; the option to bury these lines is extremely expensive;
- the Council Motion of 26 May 1999, directed staff to investigate the possibility of incorporating HOV usage in the bus lanes; however, staff recommend that these lanes be used exclusively for transit.

With respect to the concerns raised by residents on Birchview Road, Councillor Loney wondered whether they would qualify for some kind of sound attenuation because the noise level is currently above 70 dBA. He referred to what was implemented on Baseline Road

where the Region erected a privacy fence along the length of that project and he questioned whether the Birchview area would qualify for a privacy fence because of the reconstruction. Mr. Miller agreed there is an impact from Woodroffe and advised that a privacy fence could be considered, even though the project for the Birchview Road area is on the adjacent side of Woodroffe that is in the project limits. The costs associated with such installation would be in the order of \$100,000. The councillor asked that as part of this construction, that consideration be given to installing a privacy fence for those residents.

Councillor Loney raised another concern with respect to how the Region plans to acquire the necessary property for this project; he thought residents would be put on notice of expropriation and then staff would negotiate. If they were not willing to negotiate, the process would have already been triggered and the Region would proceed to expropriate the land in a timely fashion. The Commissioner advised there are a number of properties that cannot be expropriated because other levels of government are involved. He added that the owners of private property may request a hearing during expropriation and this can delay the process. The councillor referred to the townhomes along Woodroffe that will be especially impacted, and recalled that several years ago the Region was originally talking about purchasing and removing those homes and then tunneling through there as part of the transitway. Mr. Miller advised that from a property value of that to be acquired, there will be an additional 15% cost for property acquisition and therefore did not approach the value of acquisition of those properties. The councillor questioned whether staff have considered purchasing the property as was done for a section of the West Transitway and then selling the surplus property. The Commissioner indicated that during that project, residents held the position that they were very concerned about any action that would effectively dislodge them from the community. As a result, the committee and Council at that time, decided not to proceed with the purchase and resale or other options that would disrupt the community.

Councillor Legendre thought staff would be recommending a 3 metre noise barrier for those townhomes which are going to be extremely close to the road. P. Clarke explained that the privacy fence that is proposed will function as a noise barrier. They did not consider a 3 metre high noise barrier because it would completely shade the back yards of those properties. To illustrate how intrusive such a barrier would be, he explained that the 1.8 metre privacy fence will be on top of a 1 metre high toe wall. Given the additional height of the curb, the net affect from the difference in elevation from the top of the wall to the road would be in the order of 3 metres or 10 feet. The councillor explained that he looked at the distinction between something that blocks the view but allows the noise to go through, vs something that blocks the noise and is much more solid. P. Clarke stated that the privacy fence they recommend meets those kind of sound absorptive qualities and is similar to the sound barrier installed on Baseline Road.

With respect to the latter point, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen noted that some of the fences that were installed along Baseline Road were 2-3 city blocks long and actually blocked

residential access to the Regional road. She questioned whether this will be addressed in this project so residents will not be denied such access and J. Miller confirmed there would be dialogue with the community in this regard.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen was surprised to see the recommendation that the bus-only lanes not be used as HOV lanes as well and questioned how many buses per hour go to and from Baseline Station through this corridor. Helen Gault, Manager, OC Transpo, advised there are three peak hour routes and three local routes using Woodroffe Avenue, including those which take students to and from school. The councillor questioned whether there were any plans to work with residents of south Nepean to increase ridership prior to construction and Dr. Gault advised they have discussed that possibility. The councillor advised that she would be proposing a Motion to that effect in order to assist the congestion and at the same time, encourage people to avail themselves of this service.

The councillor further questioned whether the design accommodates the property for HOV should Council agree to go with it after a five-year time period. Doug Brousseau, Director of Mobility Services advised that the construction of the lane itself will accommodate other vehicles, but the difficulties come at intersections where buses would be given priority over private vehicles. If Council is serious about transit, it has to be aware of them getting ahead at intersections (bus priority signal). He advised that the Transit Services Committee has requested an independent review of HOV lanes at its meeting next week and suggested the councillor may wish to attend for the discussion of that matter. Councillor Loney encouraged all members to attend because he believed it would provide further insight to the issue of HOV lanes.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen reiterated the fact that she was concerned HOV usage would not be accommodated. She went on to state that considering the growth in south Nepean and the fact that the majority of residents do not use transit, she was concerned that there will still be a need for the capacity of those lanes for the short term.

Speaking to a related issue, Councillor Cantin referred to the continuing situation in the HOV lanes on Montreal Road and Rideau Street where cars use these lanes all the time, regardless of the number of passengers in the vehicle. He questioned whether the reason staff did not want to recommend the bus-only lanes on Woodroffe for HOV as well was because of this example of mis-use. D. Brousseau advised that is a concern, but added that more enforcement must be provided to ensure these lanes function as they were intended. The councillor renewed his request made previously that staff review the enforcement on Montreal Road and Rideau Street.

Councillor Legendre wondered whether the cost of burying the high voltage lines would be more expensive than relocating them. He suggested that since the road is going to be torn up anyway, perhaps it would not be that much more expensive to bury them at the same time. Mr.

Miller advised that relocating the hydro lines will be in Phase 2 so there is a little time to consider that suggestion. He agreed to provide further information as the time gets closer.

Peter McNichol, Regional Cycling Advisory Group indicated RCAG's support of this project. He advised that they had serious discussions with staff about the width of the bicycle lanes because they preferred a greater width (2.0 m instead of 1.8m). Further, RCAG is concerned about ensuring that the traveled speed on this portion of Woodroffe remain at 60 km/h and when the rural section is considered (Phase 3), he requested that a wider bicycle facility be provided throughout that section. While they are basically in support of the report, he also referred committee to a number of other concerns as detailed in his comments dated 15 February 2000.

Lois Smith indicated that as a member of the Audible Pedestrian Signals (APS) Advisory Committee, she had some very real concerns about what protection will be offered to the visually impaired across the bus-only lanes. She noted that blind people move along by listening to traffic sounds and she wondered whether they would get some leeway to proceed and whether they will be given protection at the islands. With regards to the proposal to move the bus stop at Park Glen, Ms. Smith advised that she uses that stop and while there are not often a lot of passengers being picked up there, it is certainly a popular spot for disembarking. She was also concerned about the privacy fence and hoped staff would explore having a decorative noise barrier.

D. Brousseau reminded committee that Council just recently adopted the APS report and he confirmed that all new infrastructure will include APS.

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

That OC Transpo market South Nepean to increase ridership prior to construction of bus only lanes on Woodroffe Avenue in order to relieve congestion during construction.

CARRIED

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

That a privacy fence, with landscaping, be provided for residents of Birchview Road, whose properties back onto Woodroffe Avenue.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That with regards to the road widenings adjacent to Triole Investments and Manor Village, that staff be requested to design noise barriers, with landscaping, according to the RMO standards (to be adopted).

CARRIED

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

Having held a public hearing, that Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the preliminary design for the Woodroffe Avenue Bus-Only lanes between Baseline Station and the Nepean Sportsplex, as amended by the foregoing.

CARRIED

2. **MODIFICATIONS TO MERIVALE ROAD BETWEEN Central PARK DRIVE (NORTH) AND BASELINE ROAD TO ACCOMMODATE PHASE II OF THE CENTRAL PARK SUBDIVISION**

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 2 Feb 00

Matthew Darwin, Central Park Citizens Group highlighted the following concerns (staff's response incorporated in italics):

- wanted assurance that the entrance to the Nortel parking lot, which is very close to the new proposed intersection will be removed; *it would be;*
- wanted assurance that both signalized intersections will be timed so as not to cause a high volume of traffic backing up along Merivale Road; there is also a long waiting period at the signals coming out of the development on weekends; *agreed to examine the signal timing to maximize it; signals at the side streets may become traffic actuated;*
- near the new south intersection, traffic does back up during peak periods when traffic is turning left onto Baseline Road; he asked that the Region push the priority up on redeveloping that intersection; *there is currently a study underway at Baseline and Merivale and staff are examining that intersection from a safety perspective, not a capacity perspective;*
- the proposal for a median from the north to the south entrance of Central Park Drive will prohibit access by cyclists to McCooeye Lane which is widely used by cyclists and

pedestrians; *staff want to make it accessible for cyclists, but not motorists, and this issue will be addressed in the detailed design;*

- suggested that transit shelters be provided for the recommended bus stops at the south intersection; *the suggestion would be passed along to OC Transpo;*
- the numbers quoted in the staff report are much higher in terms of traffic volume than what they have seen in the Central Park Traffic Impact Study which is being used for other design documents; they wanted future Regional committees to use these new numbers when they are estimating the traffic volumes; *agreed to look again at the traffic volumes, however, the Maitland Avenue overpass was closed at that time and may explain why those numbers were so high.*

With respect to staff's response to the last point, Mr. Darwin noted that the overpass will probably be closed again this summer so there will be increased volume on Merivale Road and therefore the timing as to when the construction on Merivale vs the construction on Maitland may be an issue. Mr. Brousseau agreed to look at the timing of the construction for these projects and agreed to work with the Ministry to ensure both projects are not done at the same time.

Lois Smith was not in favour of providing the second entrance or permitting right-in/right-out movements. While she was very supportive of a median through this area, she suggested the proposed height would not be high enough to deter motorists from cutting across. She suggested it be at least 8 inches high to deter such movement.

Ron Jack, Delcan, representing the adjacent owner of the subdivision (who?) advised that Delcan conducted the Traffic Impact Study for Central Park. He explained that the reason this project is before committee now is because the large commercial block to the north feels they need a right-in/right-out access. However, the intersection to the sales centre was approved a couple of years ago to provide all-directional movement with a break in the median. During the Traffic Study, the access to the sales centre was not addressed because this intersection had been previously approved. However, with this change to the north corner coming forward, staff are now recommending that a median be installed, with no breaks. While the developer agrees that in the long term, access to the sales centre should be restricted to right-in and right-out, Mr. Jack advised that in view of the low traffic volumes at this entrance, a median break should be provided for a year or two, until such time as the centre is no longer required.

Councillor Cantin questioned whether there were incremental costs associated with delaying the full construction of the median and was advised by staff that the developer is paying for the roadway modifications. The councillor then asked whether the Region has received financial guarantees from the developer to cover the costs associated with the signals and staff confirmed

they have a letter of credit for the full value of this work. In response to an inquiry posed by the Committee Chair, D. Brousseau stated that since signals will be installed at the south intersection, motorists will be able to access the sales centre by turning right into the site and then making a left-turn to the sales centre. He confirmed that an open median would compromise safety on this high-volume roadway. No member of the committee was prepared to put forward a Motion to keep the median open.

Having held a public hearing, that Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of traffic control signals at the intersection of Central Park Drive and Merivale Road (south intersection) and the construction of associated roadway modifications on Merivale Road between Central Park Drive North and Baseline Road as described in the report and illustrated in Annex D, subject to the proponent, Ashcroft Development Incorporated:

- a. **funding the total cost for the roadway modifications and the associated utility relocations which would include paying the total cost for the traffic control signal installation and their annual maintenance costs until such time the signals meet the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario installation warrants and Council approves the assumption of the costs; and,**
- b. **executing a legal agreement with respect to the above.**

CARRIED

Councillor Loney referred to the work being done at the overpass at Maitland Avenue and suggested that staff obtain the traffic counts on Maitland and Merivale *before* the construction is undertaken and traffic is diverted, in order to get a realistic count. D. Brousseau confirmed staff would undertake to do that.

3. **MODIFICATIONS TO INNES ROAD BETWEEN DORIMA STREET
AND ORCHARDVIEW AVENUE TO ACCOMMODATE THE
EAST URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 2 Feb 00

Following a brief presentation, Councillor Cantin questioned when the Region will have the funds to widen Innes Road and staff advised it would not be before 2006. It is hoped that the environmental assessment (EA) will be completed by next year and then it will be part of the budget priority. The Commissioner added that the Region's fiscal plan shows no new capacity for 10 years.

The councillor relayed some concerns conveyed to him by ward Councillor van den Ham, which was that the developer is being asked to accommodate a bike lane that will only be torn up and replaced when the road is widened. He wondered how well-used this bike facility would be on this section of roadway and suggested that the developer be asked to put funds aside for the future construction of the bike lane, when the road is reconstructed. D. Brousseau stated that would be a policy decision for the committee. What staff are requesting of the developer is to pay for the paving of the shoulder at a small incremental cost of \$50,000. While he acknowledged there are very low bike volumes through this section, he believed this is an opportunity for the committee to deliver on the Transportation Master Plan at very little cost.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen referred to sections of Fallowfield Road which have had the shoulder paved and are used as cycling lanes. She questioned whether it was staff's experience that when those lanes are situated on rural cross-section roadways, that they are more often used for slip-around lanes and, whether or not they create more of a hazardous situation for pedestrians waiting for buses. D. Brousseau advised that this should not be a problem in this particular situation because there will be access provided in a slip-around lane and it is not the shoulder. He explained that the lane has to be built to a proper standard and was not aware of any bus stops through this area.

The councillor asked whether staff had discussed with the developer, the possibility of bringing bus service to the site, to encourage transit usage and reduce the dependency on the private automobile. D. Brousseau advised that when the Region reviews the subdivision application, part of the requirement is accommodating bus access; however, marketing issues are more an issue for OC Transpo. The councillor believed that the development industry is a missing piece in that marketing process.

Councillor Kreling advised that there is express bus service in the vicinity of this development, but there is no local service along this section of Innes Road. H. Gault confirmed this, adding that the transportation proposal is to extend another express route in the fall, assuming it is supported by the public.

With respect to the bike lane that is committed to being installed by the developer, Councillor Kreling questioned if that facility lines up with the existing bike lane and staff advised that it would be and that there will be a continuous bike lane. The councillor questioned whether there is another portion of bike lane on the other side of this development and D. Brousseau advised it does not yet exist, but staff are waiting for opportunities to present themselves. The councillor indicated that once that bike lane is in place, it is not known what the alignment will ultimately be, because the EA has only just commenced. D. Brousseau confirmed this fact and that staff only know that it will likely be in that corridor.

Dave Halpenny, consultant for Minto Developments Inc., explained that the developer is willing to build the cycling lane through the area where they have to pay, but takes issue with having to be financially responsible for constructing the bicycle lane on the other side of the road, where there are no roadway modifications. He explained that as a contributor to Regional Development Charges (RDC), Minto will be constructing the lane across areas where development is not taking place and therefore will be paying twice. Also, whatever is built today will be torn out and rebuilt when Innes Road is reconstructed. He claimed that the bike lane will only serve cyclists traveling in one direction and since there are no cycling facilities currently east of Orchardview, this will be a disjointed facility.

Councillor Legendre argued that not constructing this bike lane will make the cycling network even more disjointed. Dan Paquette of Minto, stated that he wanted to work with staff, however in this situation, it is a question of principle. He clarified that as part of this roadway modification, he will be required to pave the shoulder to create a bike lane - something he believes is an interim condition until Innes Road is reconstructed. He took issue with the notion that he is expected to pay for it now and again in the future when the road is widened. He added that as part of the site plan development, the City of Cumberland required Minto to cover the costs (which they have done) of an asphalt pathway; in view of low bicycle volumes in this area, he suggested cyclists could perhaps use that pathway. The councillor could not support the developer's position because RDC's pay for a very small fraction of what it costs to provide infrastructure to new development.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned whether or not there were other examples of where developers have been requested to pay for infrastructure that is not already included in the RDC. The Commissioner advised that it is relatively routine for staff to ask for site specific works e.g. intersection improvements, which are exempt from the RDC. If the Region is driven to require more of this type of assistance from developers, she wondered if the committee should be looking at some parameters to work within.

In response to a question posed by the Committee Chair, Mr. Paquette confirmed Minto was involved in lobbying for competitive RDC's. Of late, however, developers are being faced with a new policy that has never been discussed by the industry i.e. providing paved shoulders for cycling lanes. He believed this is a new policy that staff have put together based on one of the statements in various documents that point to the need for cycling lanes. He added that developers understand those statements meant that in the fullness of time there will be bicycle lanes; however, he did not believe the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) or the Regional Official Plan (ROP) speaks to the issue of interim plans, which he believed this to be.

The Environment and Transportation Commissioner explained to the delegation that it is Council's position that any new works on a road will include cycling lanes. Also, RDC's cover only 16% of the works, so the Region has to find the remaining balance.

Councillor van den Ham read a statement contained in the TMP that effectively states that where feasible, cycling lanes shall be implemented in the design of all new, reconstructed or rehabilitated Regional roads not included in the cycling transportation network. Having said that, he explained that the proposal before committee today is not about new, reconstructed or rehabilitated roads: it is about intersection improvements and he suggested there is a grey area with respect to interim facilities, such as this paving of the shoulder for a bicycle lane. He questioned whether it was fair to ask developers to pay for things that are paid for through RDC's and asked whether it was even appropriate to be installing a bicycle facility now, when there are so few cyclists. He suggested it would be more of a hazard than a betterment at this point in time.

If development is going to continue on the southeast side of Innes Road, Councillor Meilleur questioned whether the Region is going to ask the developer to do the same thing as is being asked in this situation. D. Brousseau confirmed they would unless directed to do otherwise; whenever a parcel of land is being developed, staff attempt to make improvements along the frontage of that property. The councillor then questioned whether it was staff's experience that cycling use will increase if the shoulder is paved. D. Brousseau responded by stating this is an unusual situation in that this portion of Innes Road is a country road in a city environment and the development is exploding in the area. Because of the residential development at this site, he could see the potential for more usage. He added that there is also an off-road facility that will probably get as much bicycle traffic as the on-road facility.

Councillor Cantin referred to the development to the east of this site where staff missed the opportunity to request the developer to pay for bicycle lanes. He suggested that if the Region did not require that developer to do it then, perhaps it should encourage Minto to go back to the City and ask them to add half a metre to the off-road path to accommodate cyclists. He believed this would be more friendly to users rather than putting them on a road where very few motorists travel at the posted speed.

D. Brousseau reiterated his comment that there very well may be more cyclists on the off-road pathway as on the shoulder lane, but suggested that that is really a policy issue. Councillor Cantin believed, therefore, that the committee should go beyond established policy when appropriate. He believed it was ludicrous to have an eastbound bicycle lane, but not one in the opposite direction. D. Brousseau explained that staff present this as an opportunity and if the Region does not require the developer to pay for the paved shoulder for a cycling lane, then it will not get done until the road is expanded.

Councillor Kreling proposed the following:

That the recommendation be amended to delete the requirement of the developer to provide the "interim" bike/shoulder lane paving and therefore reduce the estimated costs by approximately \$50,000.

In speaking to his Motion, he explained that the existing sidewalk east of Orchardview is of a substantive width and those who want to bike or walk can utilize that facility. The reason why the City requested the multi-purpose pathway was because it functions as more than just a sidewalk. He believed that the continuation of that pathway westerly to Dorima Street will accommodate the immediate needs as well as those for a number of years, recognizing full well that Innes will not be widened for a few years. If the multi-purpose path needs to be utilized by cyclists and pedestrians during that time, he believed that it would accommodate those uses.

Councillor Legendre did not support the Motion because he believed it behooved the committee to provide pedestrian facilities. He noted that the existing conditions now do not exactly encourage bicycle or pedestrian use; however, this is a rapidly expanding area and the Region must take into consideration future demographics. He stated that as the Region allows these developments to connect to the Regional road, developers are requested to put in facilities that serve the general population. While he appreciated the delegation's concerns that the bike lane will be torn up and rebuilt in the future, he believed that in this case the future is a long way off and therefore, reference to the term "interim" is very misleading. In conclusion, the councillor believed that the report reflects what meets the ROP and the TMP and should therefore be supported.

In support of the Motion, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen related her experience with Woodroffe Avenue south of Fallowfield Road which is constructed to a rural cross-section, but there are approximately 15,000 residents living in that area there who use Woodroffe as an access point. She explained that there are no bicycle or pedestrian facilities on that road and people are therefore unable to walk or cycle to the Sportsplex which is 10 minutes to the north, which she believed they would readily do if the facilities existed. She believed staff should sit down with building industry with a view to establishing a policy or documentation that spells out what the Region can require of them over and above what is covered through the RDC, what is being collected in the development charge and that consistency is maintained.

Other councillors voiced their opposition to the Motion based on the fact the road is not going to be reconstructed for at least 10 years. Also, the Region has required other developers to pay for similar facilities and it would be unfair to exempt this developer from that obligation. Councillor Meilleur stated that RDC's only cover a small percentage of roadway improvements and therefore the Region must obtain the remaining funds elsewhere, but without it being a burden to taxpayers. She agreed with a previous comment that the development industry should partner with the Region to help improve the transportation network.

With respect to the future reconstruction of Innes Road, Councillor van den Ham explained that the road is in dire need of upgrade and is dependent on dollars coming forward from the federal infrastructure program. He stated that if that program provides the necessary funds, the widening of Innes Road should be listed as a high priority. If those infrastructure dollars are forthcoming, he believed that the road could be reconstructed within 3 to 4 years. He agreed deleting the requirement for the developer to pay for the paved shoulder is an opportunity to save them some money. In an effort to save that money, he explained that he had met with staff and the developer and at that time, it became known that Minto is being charged double for these works. It was on that basis that he encouraged the developer to come forward and discuss the issue with committee.

Moved by H. Kreling

That the recommendation be amended to delete the requirement of the developer to provide the “interim” bike/shoulder lane paving and therefore reduce the estimated costs by approximately \$50,000.

LOST

YEAS: R. Cantin, H. Kreling, M. McGoldrick-Larsen....3

NAYS:M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, J. Legendre,
M. Meilleur....7

Having held a public hearing, that Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of traffic control signals at the intersection of Innes Road and Orchardview Avenue and the construction of associated roadway modifications on Innes Road between Dorima Street and Orchardview Avenue as described in the report and illustrated in Annexes B, C and D, subject to the proponent, Minto Developments Incorporated:

- 1. funding the total cost for the roadway modifications and the associated utility relocations which would include paying the total cost for the traffic control signal installation and their annual maintenance costs until such time the signals meet the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario installation warrants and Council approves the assumption of the costs; and,**
- 2. executing a legal agreement with respect to the above.**

CARRIED*

- * Councillors Cantin, Kreling and McGoldrick-Larsen dissented on the portion of the report which required the developer to pay for the bike lane.

REGULAR ITEMS

4. OTTAWA RIVER PARKWAY BUS STOPS - PROPOSED AMBLESIDE COMMUNITY LOCATION - CONCEPT DESIGN STATUS REPORT
- Director, Engineering Division report dated 28 Jan 00
 - A. Cullen letter dated 11 Feb 00
 - R. Francis e-mailed comments dated 14 Feb 00

Jim Miller, Director of Engineering, advised committee members that this report is for information purposes, prior to the official submission to the National Capital Commission (NCC), who are required to approve the detail of these facilities. He provided a summary of the report. Councillor Byrne noted that Appendix A of the staff report failed to reflect the public open house held in January 1998 on Ambleside at which time between 60 and 70 people attended.

Councillor Legendre thought there had been some signal from the committee in the past to proceed with this project and Helen Gault, Manager, OC Transpo advised that it was at a meeting of the Transit Services Committee where the general arrangements were discussed.

Councillor Byrne asked staff to elaborate on the issues raised by residents e.g. lighting, safety, landscaping, cost benefit, et cetera and the measures taken to address those concerns. Mike Richards, Manager, Transitway Projects, advised that those concerns were raised by the community in the Ambleside Drive and immediate areas. The concerns expressed by the NCC are similar i.e. the intrusion of bus stops into the Parkway environment. A precondition of these bus stops is that they be extensively landscaped. He advised that staff would make every effort not to impact the existing vegetation. With respect to the issue of spring runoff and its impact on the pathways and the underpass, Mr. Richards advised that the plan is to implement a backflow valve on the culvert and a well with a pump to address the flooding issue. Once this is in place, the path will remain open throughout the whole season, which is not the case today.

In regards to the illumination of the underpass, he advised that it could be done with little impact on the Parkway corridor itself. However, the NCC has expressed concern about the level of lighting, taking into consideration the Parkway is only lit at Island Park Drive and where the transitway enters at Dominion Avenue. He agreed it will be a challenge to provide enough lighting to satisfy both the Commission's requirements and safety and security, which is of utmost importance. Further, the lights will be turned off when the last bus uses the stop (1:30 a.m. - 2:00 a.m.) and would only come back on again with the first service in the morning.

To improve safety at these locations, Mr. Richards advised that any landscaping to be integrated would have to take into consideration the visibility of the users of the pedestrian connections; there will also be emergency phones located at the bus stops. With respect to the

bikepaths, the north approach into the underpass is used by both pedestrians, skateboarders and cyclists and this would have to be reconstructed to separate these activities from each other.

Councillor Byrne raised another concern that this is a Parkway and not a transitway and asked staff to clarify that comment on that statement. Dr. Gault acknowledged that this road is indeed a Parkway, but it is also part of the transitway in that the main service runs along that route. Approximately 150 buses/hour travel this route in the peak direction and the agreement between the Region and the NCC will permit such use until 2031. If the buses were not on the Parkway, there are a number of alternatives that have been proposed, but none of them is particularly attractive to the community i.e. land between Byron and Richmond. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner advised that there had been a proposal for a depressed transitway through that section, but the cost was excessive as stated by Dr. Gault, was not supported by the community.

With respect to the concern that the cost of this proposal is not worth the benefit, Dr. Gault commented that the preliminary cost of \$550,000 would put about 3000 residents within walking distance of very high quality transit service. She confirmed there would be no requirement to put extra buses on the route because there are already many of them using the Parkway. OC Transpo anticipates ridership at these stops to be comparable to what occurs at the stations located at Abbey, Iris and Smyth. Councillor Byrne agreed with these projections, noting that in the meetings held in the community 60 - 70% of those in attendance indicated they would use these bus stops.

Councillor Byrne questioned how much greenspace would be required to accommodate the acceleration/deceleration lanes and Mr. Richards advised that in the eastbound direction there would be a 1.75 m to 2 m widening for the bus stop area on both sides. In the westbound direction, there will be a nominal widening on the north side of the Parkway from the median where there are no trees, in order to protect the trees immediately to the east of the underpass.

In response to another question posed by Councillor Byrne with respect to the environmental and transit benefits this facility would provide, Dr. Gault stated it would offer people transitway service on a continuous basis, seven days a week. These same people currently have service of a much lower quality on Richmond Road and the Parkway would give users a travel time advantage of up to 15 minutes. She added that the new stop at Dominion Avenue has resulted in a great deal of positive feedback from people who have taken advantage of this facility. With respect to the environmental benefits, J. Miller advised that this proposal is in compliance with the objectives set out in the Official Plan of removing people from private vehicles and putting them in transit.

As Chair of the OC Transpo Commission, Councillor Loney encouraged committee to proceed with this endeavor, echoing the comments made earlier about the anticipated use of these stops. He recalled that when the Region negotiated the use of the Parkway with the NCC, it opted to lease this road rather than paying for another transitway and the agreement included the provision for two transit stops along the Parkway. With respect to the new stop at Dominion Avenue, he opined that this station is not really on the Parkway, but it does cut through NCC land. The station proposed at Ambleside is closer to people and he believed there would be far greater usage in that area because of the convenience. He believed that the argument for or against this proposal comes down to the number of people who are concerned about the destruction of greenspace, but he asked them to consider the number of automobiles that use that road everyday. And given the use of the Parkway by commuters and buses alike, it could be argued that it is not exactly green pristine space now. The alternative, however, is to have that many more cars on the road, so if the Region is serious about establishing priority for transit, this is the sort of project that needs to be implemented.

Councillor Davis agreed that the stop at Dominion has turned out to be an asset for her community, but commented that during the discussions of this proposal, there was no decision to have detailed design come back at a later date. With respect to the bus stops at New Orchard, she wondered why acceleration and deceleration lanes were required, when in fact they are similar to bus bays and would only prove to be a hardship for buses to get back into the flow of traffic. Dr. Gault advised that the Transit Priority Task Force does want to do away with bus bays, but the policy being brought forward by that group, recommends that controlled access roadways, especially those with no lighting would be excluded from that policy. In response to further comments by the councillor, she agreed that while these lanes are not ideal, they do function differently from a bus bay. She agreed that in the absence of other considerations, stopping in the traveled lane behind a bus is the ideal situation, however, staff have strongly recommended against that and the NCC will not give approval without these facilities for safety reasons.

Councillor Davis believed it would be more dangerous given the speed at which motorists drive on that road. She believed that the decision to have these acceleration/deceleration lanes was clearly made at the staff level and has never been brought before committee for consideration. Chair Holmes clarified that the issue of bus bays and acceleration/deceleration lanes has been considered by the committee previously and it was agreed there was a need for those lanes for transportation safety purposes..

Councillor Davis noted that the ward councillor has said the community is mixed with respect to their support for this proposal and asked what have staff done to capture that change from the majority original supporting this project, to the majority now being opposed. Dr. Gault advised that staff have provided support to Councillor Byrne with the consultation which is where they are at the moment. She added that if and when the stops are implemented, they will be

promoted the same way as the stop at Dominion. The councillor did not agree there could be a comparison between the two because there was no opposition to the station at Dominion and therefore no need for public meetings. She indicated that her community is immediately adjacent to the Parkway and residents are fearful that this is just another way of widening the Parkway. Dr. Gault advised that this is simply a way to provide access to high quality transit service. She thought it was a sound transit move and is in keeping with the Transportation Master Plan objectives.

Councillor Doucet questioned how much the Region pays to the NCC for use of the Parkway and was advised it costs \$600,000 a year. The councillor therefore believed the Region had an obligation to utilize this roadway in the most beneficial way possible.

In response to the comments raised about the support and opposition for this proposal from her community, Councillor Byrne referred to the nine public meetings she held from January 1998 to November 1999, plus the six meetings in the area of McKeown/Ambleside/New Orchard (the area to be serviced), noting the support was definitely there in that area. It was not until January of this year that a growing resistance became known and there was a shift in the numbers because of a petition from one building. She explained that the resistance is new and is not from within the community that will most benefit from this service.

The following Motions were brought forward:

Moved by J. Legendre

That the Ambleside Community/New Orchard bus stop concept design be approved and that the final design come back to the Transportation Committee for information.

Moved by L. Davis

That the New Orchard Avenue bus stops be deleted from further study and all concept design planning activity cease for that location.

Moved by W. Byrne

That the acceleration and deceleration lanes be eliminated from the design.

The committee received the following public delegations:

Earl Himes read from his brief dated 16 February 2000 and the more salient comments were as follows:

- this proposal will deface the Parkway and is objectionable not only to those who live in the area, but to those who drive along the roadway and those who use the recreational pathways;
- from 24 November 1998 to 23 November 1999 there were eight public meetings held and of the total people who attended (109), only 15 supported the proposal;
- taxpayers are strongly opposed to spending hundreds of thousands of dollars needed to construct these bus stops, but are even more strongly opposed to removing grass and trees to install the acceleration/deceleration lanes and to the noise that would be generated by buses starting and stopping at these stops.

Mr. Himes urged the committee to reject this proposal, or at least defer the matter for one month to provide those who object an opportunity to better voice their community's objections. He then read from submissions from a variety of community associations who also objected to the proposal; namely:

From the President of the Woodroffe North Community Association:

- Woodroffe North lies just east of the proposed bus stop, but residents will be unlikely to use them and will continue to use the service provided on Woodroffe and Richmond for all practical purposes;
- there is some question of the estimated 800 riders a day that are anticipated to use these stops and why OC Transpo would spend money to take people off existing routes;
- expected there will only be riders on nice days from late spring to early fall and did not believe women would use the stops after dark;
- the proposed plan is ill-conceived and inadequately researched; OC Transpo has concentrated its financial estimates on the cost of building the road allowances and shelter, however, that cost will be augmented by the necessary cost of altering the underpass at New Orchard to prevent spring flooding; the total initial cost will pale in time to the ongoing costs associated with maintaining the pathway in the winter;
- the Woodroffe North Community Association considers this proposal unnecessary, economically impractical and aesthetically displeasing.

From the President of the Whitehaven Community Association, concerns were outlined about the safety of these stops. As a woman, she was reluctant to use bus stations that are well lit but isolated at night. She did not believe it would be safe to get off a bus on the north side of

Parkway and cross the road under poorly lit conditions and she would not use the underpass at night for safety reasons.

From the President, Glabar Park Community Alliance:

- the Parkway was not created to be a transitway; the Region should look at getting the buses off the portion from Lincoln Fields to where it starts at Churchill Avenue;
- the location is not a good place for a bus stop; the river is known to flood the low lying areas, making the westbound access difficult; the wind coming from the northwest would require some kind of barrier to be built especially in the autumn and winter months.

Councillor Ron Kolbus, Britannia-Richmond Ward writes that this location cannot be compared to the Dominion Avenue bus stop because it is not on the Parkway and, for the most part, is hidden from view. Further, the Parkway is one of Ottawa's most attractive, beautiful features and everything must be done to preserve it for later generations; extra bus lanes could very well lead to the Parkway becoming a multi-lane speedway.

On behalf of residents of Park Place CCC#169, Margaret Baxter and Jeannine Levesque write:

- Park Place (1025 Richmond Road) is adjacent to and overlooks the Parkway and will be impacted by the intrusion of these bus stops; a petition with 149 signatures of residents objecting to this proposal is included in their brief;
- if the time taken to walk to and from the bus stops negates any travel time saved, it is unlikely that individuals will use these facilities and usage will be limited to a very small number of people who live in close proximity to the stops;
- there is currently excellent peak bus service on Richmond Road that serves the Ambleside community, linking to the transitway only a short distance away at Woodroffe and the Parkway;
- the construction of asphalt acceleration and deceleration lanes and bus stop platforms on the Parkway will ruin the beauty of the natural surroundings and destroy considerable greenspace, shrubs and trees;
- this particular section of the Parkway has one of the most spectacular panoramic views of the Ottawa River and Britannia Bay and residents purchased their condominium units

primarily for this reason, as well as for the parkland setting and peacefulness of the area; the bus stops threaten the enjoyment of their homes;

- Annex D of their submission illustrates the location of the bus stops as they appeared in the Community News on 13 January 2000; statistics obtained from the Region confirm that the 400 figure quoted in the illustration with respect to the number of residents surveyed, is inaccurate; as of 28 January 2000, the official figures are 239 responses received with 52% in favour and 48% opposed, and, with their petition of 149 signatures, it brings the total responses to 388 with 68% opposed and 32% in favour.

Jan Buchanan-Redden writes that there is no requirement for this defacing of the ever-shrinking greenspace and even officials at OC Transpo have stated there has been no public demand for it. Also, while the agreement between the NCC and the Region allows two or three transit stops on the Parkway, it appears this is an arbitrary proposal just because the agreement is in place and not because of public demand.

Suzanne Cohen writes that it is apparent due to weather, ice from water run-off at this point, wind and security, the stop would have little use.

Ingrid Kaulbars first concern is environmental degradation due to the magnitude of the bus stop as presently conceived. The dimensions of the planned construction appear to be out of proportion to the probably minimal use of the facility and unacceptable in the perspective of the damage to the greenspace involved.

Margaret Parlour writes that the proposed locations are isolated and certainly not conducive to use after dark even with lighting. Further, the locations are exposed in winter and safe access to them would be very difficult to maintain due to drifting snow and ice formation.

Barbara Lajeunesse believes that increased ridership seems to be an argument advanced by a number of politicians. She assumed that those interested in these stops are already using buses and probably do so from Richmond Road, which does not look to be any further away than the proposed stops.

In closing, Mr. Himes remarked that the bus stops would be 650 metres away from the apartment buildings and many of those residents are seniors who would not walk down the hill to the stops. Copies of his and the other submissions are held on file.

Councillor Davis questioned how Mr. Himes gathered these submissions and he indicated he became involved in this issue just three weeks ago and he called the community associations who then provided their briefs. Recognizing that this issue is not new, the councillor questioned what has taken so long for this opposition to come out. Mr. Himes advised that people told him

they did not receive any notices in the mail, but despite this, he believed there would be as many people objecting from Ambleside and McKeown as there are at Park Place. He confirmed he did not participate in the ward councillor's meetings; however, at a meeting held by the city councillor, Ron Kolbus, it became apparent that more people were opposed and he became involved shortly after that meeting. When questioned whether there had been any outreach to the NCC, Mr. Himes advised that he has made communication with Bob Louis and will be meeting with him shortly.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned whether Mr. Himes had an opportunity to attend any of the information sessions held during the public consultation period but he advised that where he lives (Westbourne Avenue) he probably would not have been informed of those meetings.

The councillor referred to the petition from Park Place and questioned how it was conducted. Mrs. Jeannine Levesque came forward from the audience to explain. She stated that tables were set up in the lobby of the building to obtain the views of residents; the signatures were achieved over the space of two days. She added that they had not reacted earlier because she had not known anything about it until she saw an article in *The News* in December 1999. She did not see the notices that were in the local papers. The councillor asked that when she was collecting signatures whether she provided residents information about the proposal. Mrs. Levesque stated she had, plus photographs of the location of the stops and the survey documentation she received from Councillor Byrne's office.

The councillor was shocked to learn that none of the residents had indicated their support for this proposal to which Mrs. Levesque responded that there were some people who said they might use it, but not in the winter time because of the distance. If someone had to walk that distance in inclement weather, they will not use it and therefore, if it obviates the time saved to get downtown, that is another argument not to support it.

Ken Wings, resident of Woodpark Community, Bay Ward spoke on behalf of the President of the Woodpark Community Association who was unable to attend. He explained that Mr. Himes had contacted the President of the association and asked whether they wanted to submit a letter in opposition to this proposal. In meeting with the other directors on the Association, Mr. Wings indicated they did not feel it was appropriate for them to send a letter, given that they did not have the full pulse of the community. There was also insufficient time to do a survey or any kind of poll. Mr. Wings believed the ward councillor gave their community every opportunity to discuss this matter and he had attended a few of the meetings and saw the notices in the paper. He advised that the Community Association does not have a position on this, although individual constituents very likely do have opinions.

He went on to state that the association was concerned that any community association would make a public statement of the kind he has heard today, unless and if they have made the

attempt to survey their constituents. He believed it was conceivable, therefore, that some of these associations, based on the motives of one or two directors, perhaps decided to write these letters. He indicated that the President of their community association did indicate to him that he was interested and desirous of the fact that their community is well served by the bus system.

Speaking on his own behalf, Mr. Wings submitted a brief dated 16 February 2000 and the following comments were highlighted:

- resented the fact that the issue has become politicized and been made a pawn of the upcoming municipal election campaign;
- believed there will be no additional traffic brought to the Parkway when these stops are installed; there are only two routes, both of which already use the Parkway, which would use this new bus stop; the Parkway has been seen as a commuter route for some time and would be the case even if there were no buses using it;
- the argument about loss of greenspace can be refuted by the simple question of how much greenspace might ultimately be saved if people could be convinced to use public transit instead of private automobiles;
- the people who complain that the bus stops will ruin the aesthetics of the Parkway are those who have, in essence, monopolized that very same view - if residents of the high-rise apartments and condominiums on the north side of Richmond Road complain about the intrusion of lights from two bus stops, so too could the residents of Woodpark, living south of Richmond Road, complain about those same buildings in the same light; also, were it not for these buildings, residents of Woodpark would have a greater and less obtrusive view of the Parkway;
- believed that the committee and those politicians that represent the part of the Region he lives in have an onus and a responsibility to pursue acceptable alternatives.

Cyril Winter, Chair, Britannia Park Coalition stated that their members hold by the principle of the preservation of greenspace. With respect to the issue of safety, he acknowledged this facility will not be a transit station, however, there have already been concerns voiced about the station at Lincoln Fields and by comparison, the New Orchard stops will be very isolated and the concerns voiced about it should be taken seriously. He agreed there are approximately 3000 people living in the immediate area, but many of them are seniors who would not use the stop. The Coalition believes Route 50 would probably serve people just as well and is a lot closer to residents along Richmond Road than the stops would be on the Parkway. Mr. Winter referred to the natural beauty along the Ottawa River with all the flora and fauna and believed

there will be some impact to the environment and therefore an impact analysis should be part of this process. He supported Councillor Davis' request to delete this proposal, not only for those living in the area, but for all users, including tourists, who come to the Region and see the Parkway.

Mary Hock, resident, Ambleside Drive stated that when she moved to Ottawa 30 years ago, the Ottawa River Parkway was one of the main attractions for them and she often uses the pathways for recreational purposes. However, she would not go towards the river to catch a bus and would instead choose the service on Richmond Road because it is safer and there are more people around. As an environmentalist, she believed the Region should determine a more acceptable means of getting people downtown, other than using that greenspace and using the Parkway.

Alex Cullen, resident, Esterlawn Avenue explained that this minimalized bus stop is not only good for the residents on Ambleside Drive, but it is also good for the surrounding communities because it takes traffic off local streets. He believed that bus stops along the Parkway will increase access to the river year round and because steps will be taken to eliminate the flooding along the pathway, that route will remain open for a longer period of time for cyclists and pedestrians. He agreed that the impact to the environment could be minimalized if the acceleration/deceleration lanes were removed, as suggested by Councillor Byrne. Mr. Cullen acknowledged that not all of the people in the area will use these stops, but many of them would. He noted that the Official Plan promotes transit, especially in concentrated areas of population; however, there are even fewer people living around Dominion Avenue than along Ambleside and yet there are stops at that location. He opined that the Region has a marvelous chance to advance its Official Plan and to provide access to people to use the transitway so they can get downtown with minimal impact. While he noted that the concerns raised by the community are valid, none of them are so compelling that this proposal should not proceed.

In response to some of his comments, Councillor Davis stated that letters have been received from several community associations who are opposed to the stop, although Mr. Cullen reports otherwise. He explained that he did not believe the opposition being reported reflects the community. The councillor stated however, that the consensus can and has changed and therefore the committee should listen to the majority. She also wanted to clarify the statement made about the little use of the stops at Dominion Avenue, noting that more than 3000 people live and work in its catchment area; it accesses Westboro Beach, 2100 Scott Street, 445 Richmond Road (a seniors building), a condominium at 465 Dominion et cetera.

Cynthia Martin, resident, Ambleside Drive, spoke to the issue of security. She did not believe she would use the bus stops after dark because there are not a lot of people in the area then and crimes such as purse snatchings are always occurring at the station at Lincoln Fields and she was afraid it might happen to her at these isolated stops. If these stop are approved,

the Region should be responsible if anything should happen to a pedestrian going to and from the stops. The issues of safety are a real concern and should be taken into consideration. She stated there is already good bus service along Richmond Road and did not see any reason to have to put more buses on the Parkway. She was concerned that OC Transpo will cut the service along Richmond Road once the stops are installed.

In response to her last comment, Dr. Gault advised that there is no intention to cut the local service; Route 50 might be adjusted for a lot of people using the transitway but OC Transpo is well aware of the demographics of the area and will continue to provide service.

Councillor Legendre referred to the similarity between acceleration/deceleration lanes and bus-bays. D. Brousseau advised that his staff are very concerned about not providing these lanes in this proposal because there will be motorists swerving to avoid a bus if it stops in the traveled lane, creating the potential for collision. He reminded committee that staff are strong proponents of not having bus bays because they are a detriment to transit. It was also his understanding that the NCC wants the acceleration/deceleration lanes.

Councillor Byrne referred to the survey distributed to the community and asked staff to explain where and how it was distributed. M. Richards advised that the first survey was a mail drop through Canada Post to the area bounded by Woodroffe, the Parkway, Lincoln Fields and south of Byron. He confirmed there had been responses from 1025 Park Place. With respect to the petition that was conducted at that building, the councillor questioned whether staff provided any of the designs or a history of this item for display purposes. M. Richards confirmed he had not sent anything.

Councillor Davis stated that people have a right to change their mind and the numbers before committee clearly show the majority are opposed to the project. Further, community associations have a democratic process and she believed what they said when they say residents are opposed. The majority of delegations who have spoken before committee today are overwhelmingly opposed to this proposal and she believed the committee should support their views.

Councillor Legendre stated that the arguments put forward with respect to the impact on the greenspace is not valid because of the minimalist design being proposed. Also, it would be more unreasonable and would not make environmental sense to utilize the road at less than its most efficient capacity. He could not support deletion of the acceleration lanes because they will offer protection on this high-speed roadway. Also, since this road does not belong to the Region, he recognized that the NCC would not approve a design without the safety of those lanes. He strongly urged committee members to support his Motion.

Councillor Byrne commented on the survey sent out in June 1998 by staff to every door in the community from Cleary Avenue to the Parkway to Carling Avenue, noting that responses were received from many of the associations who had spoken here today. She indicated that a copy of the survey was also published in September 1998 and February/March 1999 in the West End Chronicle and in February 1999 in the Clarion, which is circulated to her constituents in Nepean. Therefore, the entire ward had some publication sent to them with regards to this particular issue. Further, the issue was discussed at several of her ward council meetings over the last few years and the minutes of those meetings were distributed to the community associations.

The councillor touched on the variety of concerns raised during those meetings, similar to those raised today, stating these have been addressed, many of which to the improvement of the Parkway. One of her biggest concerns as well as of the community, is the impact on the greenspace and while she understood the high speeds being traveled on the Parkway, she did not believe there was a requirement to install acceleration/deceleration lanes. The entire proposal should be a minimalist intrusion. She recognized that the Region's plans to promote transit will be met with this proposal. She reiterated the fact that people had plenty of opportunity to respond and up until December 1999, 55% were in favour and the majority of those people live in the community that is going to be serviced.

Councillor Byrne explained that the proposal for this bus stop came as a result of requests from that community for improved transit service. She reaffirmed her position to represent the majority, despite the fact that the opposition has now changed as a result of a recent petition. She urged committee members to support her Motion because she felt those lanes would be an unnecessary intrusion into the Parkway. She believed staff have worked hard to keep this intrusion to a minimum and have been sensitive to the needs of the community and worked with them to come up with acceptable solutions.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen explained that she is familiar with the area and has used the Parkway as a transit user, as a commuter in a car, and for recreational purposes. She appreciated the concerns that have been raised with respect to the environmental and visual impact of this facility, and was pleased that the Motion stipulates that the design be brought back to the committee once again. To this end, she encouraged staff to work with residents to address the issues discussed i.e. lighting, security and the style of the shelter. She supported the proposal to delete the deceleration/acceleration lanes, noting the curve in the road would provide enough visibility for motorists when the bus is stopped. From a recreational perspective, she acknowledged that there may be some people who cannot avail themselves to the Parkway, but a bus stop will allow them that access.

From a transportation plan perspective, the councillor acknowledged that the committee must consider the objectives set out in the TMP and increase ridership on transit because there are

no funds to put into road infrastructure to address the growth of the Region. She recognized that if more investment is not put into the transit system, it will only lead to greater congestion. Given this opportunity and the Region's investment in the Official Plan, the councillor believed that, in the most minimal way possible, transit use should be provided in this area.

Councillor Doucet concurred wholeheartedly with the comments presented by Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen.

In a closing statement, the Committee Chair expressed the view that there has been a lot of discussion about distribution of flyers, notification of meetings and issues and she recognized that there will always be people who do not receive the information or do not read it when it is distributed. She believed this is an issue of trading off the greenspace vs the quality of air being reduced because of vehicle emissions and she strongly stated that this is why the Region has to put more money into transit. She advised that she was making her decision based on the goals and objectives set out in the Official Plan and the TMP and while there will be some loss of greenspace, if more people are not encouraged to ride on transit, they may be faced with more road widenings leading to more cars and more pollution.

Committee members noted that should the Motion put forward by Councillor Legendre be approved, the other two Motion would become redundant.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the Ambleside Community/New Orchard bus stop concept design be approved and that the final design come back to the Transportation Committee for information.

CARRIED

YEAS: C. Doucet, D. Holmes, J. Legendre, M. McGoldrick-Larsen...4

NAYS: W. Byrne, L. Davis...2

5. **WEST TRANSITWAY (LEBRETON FLATS) - FUNCTIONAL DESIGN**
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 25 Jan 00

Lois Smith referred to figure 6 in the report which detailed the joint bus/rail alignments. She expressed some concern about the proposal to reduce the width of the bus lanes to accommodate the rail lines which would be running parallel. If the buses have to cross the railway tracks, she suggested that perhaps there should be platforms on top of the rails to ensure the buses cross safely.

Chair Holmes advised that the matter would be investigated in the next phase where the possibility of taking the light rail project further east would occur.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

1. **Approve the West Transitway (LeBreton Flats) Functional Design;**
2. **Authorize staff to proceed to the next step of preliminary and detailed design of the West Transitway (LeBreton Flats).**

CARRIED

TRAFFIC/PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS

6. PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON MEADOWLANDS DRIVE - EAST SIDE OF PERRY STREET

- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 28 Jan 00
- St. Gregory School submission dated 15 Feb 00

Moved by R. Cantin

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of an intersection pedestrian signal on Meadowlands Drive on the east side of Perry Street, subject to the City of Nepean;

- a. **paying the total cost of the signal installation;**
- b. **paying the annual maintenance and operating costs, and;**
- c. **executing a legal agreement with respect to a. and b.**

CARRIED

7. 1998 / 1999 TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL PROGRAMMES

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 4 Feb 00

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

1. **that intersections listed in Annex A that meet 75% of the warrant requirement, be further reviewed in the year 2000 Traffic Control Signal Programme;**

2. **that intersections listed in Annex A that failed to meet 75% of the warrant requirement, not be reviewed in the year 2000 Traffic Control Signal Programme unless requested by the ward Councillor, and;**
3. **initiation of the public consultation process to install traffic control signals at the following locations;**
 - a. **Holland Avenue at Spencer Street;**
 - b. **Baseline Road at Monterey Drive;**
 - c. **Orleans Boulevard at Forest Valley Drive;**
 - d. **Fisher Avenue at Prince of Wales Drive, and;**
 - e. **Champlain Street at Regional Road 174 (westbound exit ramp/Park and Ride lot).**

CARRIED

8. 1998 / 1999 PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL PROGRAMMES
 - Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 4 Feb 00
 - RCAG comments dated 15 Feb 00

Councillor Davis asked that the intersection of Athlone and Richmond Road be added to the list for review.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

1. **that the pedestrian crossing locations listed in Annex A that meet 75% but not 100% of the warrant requirement, be further reviewed in the year 2000 Pedestrian Signal Programme;**
2. **that the pedestrian crossing locations listed in Annex A that fail to meet 75% of the warrant requirement, not be reviewed in the year 2000 Pedestrian Signal Programme unless requested by the ward Councillor, and;**
3. **that a public consultation process be initiated for the proposed roadway modifications for the intersection of Bank Street and McLeod Street (Annex D), where the proposed modifications are in lieu of a warranted pedestrian signal.**

CARRIED

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

9. TRANSPORTATION AND CLIMATE CHANGE OPTIONS PAPER -
TRANSPORTATION CLIMATE CHANGE TABLE
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 31 Jan 00

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Endorse the general direction of the Transportation Climate Change Table;**
- 2. Forward this report to the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC).**

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

Alta Vista/Smyth Road Planning Study
- City of Ottawa memo dated 15 Feb 00

Councillor Hume had requested that committee consider the following direction to staff:

That staff prepare a response, for approval by the Transportation Committee at the first meeting in April, to the City of Ottawa request, and;

Further, that the report include a review of the transportation recommendations of the Alta Vista/Smyth Road Study and the cost of infrastructure requested, and;

Further, that the ward councillor and city staff be invited to committee to justify the city's request.

The Environment and Transportation Commissioner stated that any activity not included in the budget, is subject to a briefing to Council next week by legal staff, and would therefore not be in order at this time.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the following be forwarded as direction to staff:

That staff prepare a response, for approval by the Transportation Committee at the first meeting in April, to the City of Ottawa request, and;

Further, that the report include a review of the transportation recommendations of the Alta Vista/Smyth Road Study and the cost of infrastructure requested, and;

Further, that the ward councillor and city staff be invited to committee to justify the city's request.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Accident Statistics

Councillor Doucet requested a report on the number of accidents on Bank Street between Riverside Drive and Walkley Road for the last five years.

Design of Four-laned Roadways

Councillor Cantin referred to a recent request to staff to examine the possibility of installing a left-turn arrow at Innes Road (westbound) and Anderson Road. There have been a number of collisions and fatalities at this intersection over the past several years and he believed something should be done to increase safety. In this regard, he expressed a serious concern about the Region's design of new four-laned roadways in that they are separated by a boulevard and it is difficult for motorists to see beyond a safe distance to make the turn. While he acknowledged the argument that a turn arrow would interrupt traffic flow in the opposite direction, he wanted to bring to staff's attention that the small delay is a small price to pay for increased safety for all concerned.

Schedule for Rehabilitation of King Edward Avenue

Councillor Meilleur asked that staff provide to her in writing, the schedule for the rehabilitation of King Edward Avenue i.e. when will the environmental assessment take place, public consultation dates, et cetera.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR