

MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

16 JUNE 1999

1:45 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

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

REGRETS M. McGoldrick-Larsen

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 2 June 1999.**

CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING

1. KING EDWARD AVENUE AND ST. PATRICK STREET -  
SAFETY IMPROVEMENT  
- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 9 Jun 99

*Angie Todesco, King Edward Avenue Task Force (KEATF)* reiterated the concerns she raised with committee last month and was thankful the intersection will be considered as part of the Walking Security Index (WSI). She advised that while the proposed modification recognizes the need to separate potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, it does so at the expense of the pedestrian's time and the desire of the community to reclaim King Edward Avenue as its own and not part of the interprovincial highway system. She suggested the modification be delayed until the WSI is applied and it is known what pedestrians feel would be an appropriate environment and treatment. In the interim, she

---

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.  
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 23 June and 14 July 1999 in Transportation Committee Reports 41 and 42.

suggested a cost-effective solution would be to place several large planters in the curb lane on St. Patrick Street as it approaches King Edward Avenue. This traffic calming measure will enhance pedestrian safety and will result in a more squared-off intersection with a tighter turner radius on the northeast side. The Task Force recognizes that advance warning of this lane reduction would have to be given in order to avoid cars being channelled into the blocked lane. She suggested this change be done during the summer when traffic volumes are lower and motorists would have the opportunity to become familiar with it. Ms. Todesco believed their proposal had merit and hoped committee was supportive of postponing the modifications until the WSI is put in place and the pilot of this proposed traffic calming measure can be evaluated.

*Peggy Ducharme, Downtown Rideau BIA* agreed with the suggestions put forward by the KEATF and supported their position that modifications of this intersection not be randomly modified to further encourage and reinforce highway traffic treatment through residential and main street commercial areas.

To clarify the status of the WSI, Doug Brousseau, Director of Mobility Services advised this concept was presented by Professor Barry Wellar of the University of Ottawa and at this point in time, no methodology has been developed to test it. He confirmed it could take approximately 18 months before any work can begin on this assessment process. Councillor Legendre was surprised to hear this because he thought committee and Council had approved that more work be done, but D. Brousseau clarified that the original document did state it would be many months before it could be implemented and further, the Region does not yet have a valid contract with Dr. Wellar for him to undertake the work. Staff are currently involved in negotiations in this regard.

*Chris Bradshaw, Ottawalk* supported the proposal by the KEATF and emphasized the importance of improving conditions for everyone at this intersection. He made note of the community's willingness to tolerate the existing conditions for a little while and believed the traffic calming initiative proposed represents an opportunity for the Region to implement the green transportation hierarchy i.e. when there is a conflict between pedestrians and motor vehicles, it should be resolved in favour of the pedestrian. He suggested the committee may also want to consider examining the bus routes which service this area plus the employment nodes across the bridge into Hull, with a view to determining how the Region might reach employers to acquaint them with alternative travel modes.

Councillor Meilleur questioned how many public consultation sessions were held with the public to notify them about the most recent plans for the intersection. Staff advised there were initially two meetings, followed by a public open house which attracted between 50 and 80 people. The councillor therefore believed there had been full public consultation and agreed the implementation of a double right turn is necessary in order to improve safety, until such time as the road is rebuilt. She indicated that the community supports the staff recommendation and urged committee members to do likewise.

Councillor Doucet inquired whether the proposal put forward today by the Task Force was previously considered and Councillor Meilleur indicated it had not, but she reiterated the fact that residents do not want to delay this project any further. She indicated the Task Force had the opportunity to present their proposal during the public consultation process. Councillor Doucet believed their suggestion offers something that the staff recommendation does not, in that pedestrians do not have to walk as far to cross the street and it will make vehicular turn very clear to pedestrians. D. Brousseau advised that this is one of the most unpleasant intersections for pedestrians and the reason it rose on the safety priority list was because motorists were being injured, and therefore the modification must deal with vehicles as well. While he acknowledged the fact that the modification will not solve the problem, and will probably create queues and may even entice motorists to make a double right turn from the next lane over, the reality is that there is a serious problem and this is the compromise arrived at by staff, the ward councillor and the community.

Councillor Cantin questioned whether his previous suggestion about installing the right turn signal at eye level for motorists had been investigated and D. Brousseau confirmed this option was examined, but staff were concerned that motorists will see the green light when pedestrians are crossing and think it is for them. The councillor thought that if the signal was such that it was for motorists to see, there could be a green light through the intersection at King Edward with a red light for the equivalent of a pedestrian cross time and then the light could turn green. On the merits of such a proposal, D. Brousseau suggested staff could prepare a report and discuss it with the councillor or the committee but he did not think it would work because motorists will have a green signal and pedestrians will not wait. Hence, it would remove the control that would support the pedestrian i.e. when the straight through and right-turning movements are occurring at the same time, the pedestrian crossing to the island would be in conflict, thereby making it even more dangerous.

Councillor Legendre accepted staff's opinion that this is a compromise and while it may not be the best solution overall, perhaps it will be safer for pedestrians. On the other hand, however, he also recognized that the community believes the crossing will become wider and is therefore not a pedestrian-friendly modification. He recognized the need and the desire to see a revitalized King Edward Avenue and made note of the City of Ottawa's study to do just that, and yet there are no funds to implement that plan. He hoped Council would make long term decisions which would look at the health of the Region and its downtown. D. Brousseau confirmed an appropriate time for the revitalization plan to be brought back to committee would be at the same time the road is considered for reconstruction.

**Having held a public hearing, that Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the construction of the proposed modifications for the intersection of King Edward Avenue and St. Patrick Street identified in Annex A.**

CARRIED

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

2. TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL WARRANTS - RIVER ROAD  
AND TEMPORARY ACCESS TO SHORELINE DRIVE

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 27 May 99

Councillor Cantin questioned whether Shoreline Drive is the only entrance into the subdivision from River Road. Dale Philpotts, Director of Works, City of Gloucester, confirmed this, adding there is a temporary construction access off Armstrong, but it is not advertised as a routine access. The councillor questioned what the operating speed is on River Road and was advised it is 80 km/h. He agreed the committee had to consider the safety of pedestrians and while he did not think traffic signals would do a lot for traffic, he maintained they would enhance the safety of pedestrians crossing to the park on the other side of River Road. He made note of the fact the report mentions the City's interest in paying the full cost of signals and suggested the item be deferred to the next meeting to allow the local council an opportunity to reconsider paying those costs.

The Environment and Transportation Commissioner, Mike Sheflin indicated that in speaking with Gloucester staff prior to this meeting, he learned it was an oversight that the municipality had indicated they would pay for the annual maintenance and operating costs and suggested rather than deferring the item, if it is the wish of committee to approve signals at this location, that it be subject to the City of Gloucester agreeing to cover the cost of maintenance and installation. The councillor agreed to that suggestion and proposed it as an amendment.

Councillor Byrne questioned whether a pedestrian half signal would serve the same purpose and D. Brousseau advised that there are four pedestrians crossing per day, with as many as 20 during the weekend. He believed the installation of a pedestrian signal, as a compromise might be a better approach. The councillor questioned whether staff would have that same concern with a half signal i.e. that it would entrench behaviour that the Region does not want to encourage and Greg Kent, Operations Engineer, advised that a pedestrian signal might encourage travel at that location; however, staff would not prefer to see a half signal at the intersection because of the safety concerns associated with the posted speed limit. Further, if a pedestrian signal were to be installed, it would be best to locate the facility directly opposite the park, with sidewalks constructed to accommodate that installation.

Mr. Philpotts indicated that three years ago when Shoreline Drive was first constructed, the City, in consultation with Regional staff, agreed that the developer should be required to put in the duct work for future traffic control signals. He explained that there is a potential population of 5000 to 10,000 people north of Armstrong Road, who will require access across the road and it could be envisaged that there could be a permanent pedestrian signal at that location. And, while the City recognizes that the major intersection is Armstrong and River Road, it does see a need for improving the intersection of Shoreline and River now.

*Ron Hunt, resident* did not support the suggestion to install signals at Shoreline and River because he was interested in protecting the quality of life of residents in the southern part of the Region. He indicated that River Road is one of the major accesses into the south from Ottawa and is used extensively by commuters. He therefore did not want to see that situation degraded by the installation of an unnecessary traffic control signal. As detailed in his written comments, Mr. Hunt did not believe there was a traffic problem at the intersection and questioned why signals are necessary. Further, there is very little delay for Shoreline Drive residents getting onto River Road because the majority turn right and go towards Ottawa. In a personal review of the intersection between 8:00 a.m. and 8:30 a.m., Mr. Hunt recollected there was very little waiting time involved for motorists waiting to turn left or right (between 10 and 12 seconds maximum). Further, within the half-hour that he watched, there was a maximum of three vehicles stopped at any time. He indicated that during evening peak periods, there is a left-hand turn lane exclusively onto Shoreline Road so there is very little disruption of traffic flow in that direction.

Mr. Hunt opined that installing signals will create more of a traffic hazard along River Road because motorists will be driving 80 km/h and will be forced to come to a complete stop in all kinds of weather conditions. He stated there were no reportable accidents at that intersection and yet, at a Gloucester meeting, this was cited as one of the main justifications for installing a traffic signal. He considered it an expense to pay for the signals when they are not needed and while it may provide some convenience, that is not a good enough rationale for approving the signals. He urged committee to consider the rights and situations of all the people of the Region, not just the City of Gloucester and not just what the residents of River Road south want. He agreed that eventually there will be a need for pedestrian protection at Shoreline and River, but he believed people were capable of crossing the road at the present time given the gaps in traffic.

*Shawn Thomson, President, Riverside South Community Association* agreed this intersection will be signalized in the future, but stated the issue today is to arrive at a compromise and improve the current situation. He recalled there have been several near-misses at this intersection. He noted that when residents pull out of the development, they are faced with traffic coming the other way and he believed traffic signals will help to reduce the speed. He reiterated the fact already known that people cannot cross safely to access the park and pedestrian counts at this location are probably low because they tend to drive to the park rather than risk crossing this busy road. He realized that in a couple

of years there will be traffic signals at Armstrong and River and at that time, perhaps the access via Shoreline will be closed and the signals moved to that intersection permanently. He made reference to a petition with 300 names of people in favour of the signals, stating it is the only access south of Ottawa that is not signalized. While some residents may not like the progress that is occurring in the south, others deserve to have safety when they are travelling to and from their homes. He believed it was time to install signals now and to deal with the permanent intersection when the time comes.

Councillor Legendre questioned whether the delegation would feel comfortable if the signals were moved to the other intersection (Armstrong and River) to which Mr. Thomson advised he would, provided there is a pedestrian crossing at Shoreline. The councillor stated the preferred solution to the access problem is committing the funds to the other intersection now and staff advised that if the sidewalk is constructed by the municipality this summer, that would be the preferred location for signals, which would coincide with development.

Councillor Cantin did not think pedestrians would or should be expected to travel over 300 yards away from a direct point they want to cross at, in order to use signals to get across the road. D. Brousseau indicated that the best location for traffic signals is at Armstrong Road, noting the development will situate people past that intersection and there will be more people crossing at that location. The councillor questioned whether the signals would be pedestrian activated or would they detect the vehicles exiting from Shoreline Drive instead. D. Brousseau did not know if Gloucester's proposal included detection, but suggested if it is the committee's wish to install traffic signals, they should be traffic or pedestrian actuated.

Councillor Cantin proposed the following:

*That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve that a traffic control signal be installed on River Road (Regional Road 19) at the temporary access to Shoreline Drive as requested by the City of Gloucester, subject to the city providing capital costs for the installation and maintenance and operating costs for the signals and that the signal be converted to a pedestrian signal in the future.*

Councillor Byrne proposed the following:

*That a temporary traffic signal be installed to be converted to a pedestrian signal with the appropriate modifications (median, sidewalk) when the temporary access is closed, subject to the City of Gloucester absorbing the costs for installation, modification and maintenance.*

Councillor Byrne preferred that people be encouraged to walk to the park rather than driving and therefore saw the need to provide a protected crossing for them. She

acknowledged the fact these signals would be temporary until something permanent is installed and noted such installation should be subject to staff approval as to the best location and intersection design. In response to the latter comment, D. Brousseau advised that if committee wishes to install a temporary signal at Shoreline, he would recommend that upon its removal, according to the Motion, staff work with the City of Gloucester to determine the best location to put the pedestrian signal.

Councillor Kreling believed the two Motions were the same, although he understood Councillor Byrne's Motion to be more specific with respect to the outcome of the pedestrian crosswalk and while he felt it might be a necessary facility at this location, he did not know if that will be the same situation several years from now when the development is complete and the access is closed. Councillor Byrne clarified that her Motion suggests keeping the signal until the permanent one is installed.

It was suggested the phrase "converting to a pedestrian signal" be incorporated with Councillor Cantin's Motion to solve the problem of duplicate Motions. Councillor Byrne agreed to withdraw her Motion in favour of the Cantin Motion as amended to incorporate future pedestrian signal installation.

Moved by R. Cantin

**That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve that a traffic control signal be installed on River Road (Regional Road 19) at the temporary access to Shoreline Drive as requested by the City of Gloucester, subject to the city providing capital costs for the installation and maintenance and operating costs for the signals and that the signal be converted to a pedestrian signal in the future.**

CARRIED

### REGULAR ITEMS

#### 3. PARADE POLICY REVIEW

- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services *revised* report dated 17 May 99
- Downtown Rideau comments dated 10 Jun 99
- Rosebery Avenue Residents' Committee Inc. letter dated 14 Jun 99

The Director of Mobility Services referred committee to the new report which was recently distributed. He explained that for the most part the report is 99% unchanged; however, acting on Legal advice, staff amended the recommendation as well as some text so that specific parades were not named. However, and as detailed in the revised report, the three parades which have seniority should be permitted to use the time periods specified in the new recommendation. He confirmed this does not preclude another parades using the same time slot should one of the traditional parades drop out.

As part of his general overview of the report, he advised that of the 870 surveys sent out to businesses and BIA's, only 20% responded and, of those 20%, one third of those were not open on Saturday. Therefore, the survey was not particularly useful in helping staff arrive at a compromise solution. It was determined that limited closure is the best compromise with one parade for every four-month period being allowed to use Bank Street south of the Queensway. He cautioned however, that there may be exceptions and these would be determined in consultation with the ward councillor as well as area residents and businesses.

Councillor Legendre made reference to the revised report recommendation, and in particular, reference to "first come first served.." He questioned how this would be approved and by whom. D. Brousseau confirmed staff would use their delegated authority to make that determination. The councillor questioned that if one of the major parades opted to drop out, would it set up a "race" for others to get to staff first in order to secure that time spot and how would the community be notified of the empty spot and how is it determined who should get that time slot. Jerry Thomas, Special Events Coordinator advised that the existing policy already has a first-come-first-served component which applies to all special events on Regional roads. With respect to the "race" for an empty spot, he did not anticipate that being a problem seeing how there are already six major parades occurring in Ottawa-Carleton which are fairly well dispersed and he did not anticipate additional requests for annual parades to come forward.

Councillor Doucet was disappointed with the report and while he admitted his community can live with three parades a year, what the report does not solve is the sharing of the burden of parades across the Region. While he supported part (b) of the new recommendation, he believed it posed a long-term problem because it locks the Region into seniority i.e. whichever parade is there, gets it forever. He maintained that parades change and there should be a method by which groups can come forward and have an opportunity to use Bank Street for their parade route. He recommended that negotiations take place or perhaps a lottery be put in place at the beginning of each year with a view to asking organizers to come forward if they are interested in coming down Bank Street and then a process of selecting them, with perhaps priority given to parades with 20 years or more seniority.

Councillor Cantin made note of the fact that communities in the east end of the Region are more than happy to have parades, even when it means complete closure of a major road for several hours. The councillor inquired that if an organization decides to discontinue their parade, what methodology is in place to give that time slot to another. J. Thomas indicated it would be offered to the next group that came forward. In response to a further question posed by the councillor, he advised that if someone wants to have a parade on Bank Street, but the three major parades are already planned, staff would suggest using other routes.



*Noella Charles, Vice President, Ottawa Caribbean Festival* was seeking the committee's endorsement for their parade to begin at Lansdowne Park, travel down Bank Street through the Glebe, ending up at the Festival Plaza. She advised that all the merchants support the Fete Caribe and there are many people who come from out of town to see this event.

D. Brousseau confirmed that if committee approves the report, the organization will be able to proceed.

Councillor Doucet questioned whether they would be interested in using the Queen Elizabeth Driveway as their parade route but Mrs. Charles advised the Bank Street route was more visible to the community and the former route is harder to get to. The councillor understood the advantages to using Bank Street, but felt there were some advantages to be gained by using the Driveway as well because the parade can take as long as it wants since it would not be interrupting business. While Mrs. Charles acknowledged that in several years when people are more used to the Fete Caribe in Ottawa, perhaps it could use the Driveway, for the moment, their preference would be use Bank Street.

*Marion Steele, Chair, Pride Festival* made the following statements:

- the Pride Parade has been held in downtown Ottawa for the past 14 years and is the fastest growing festival in the Region;
- this event generates economic benefits to the Region (\$6.3M generated to businesses, tourist attractions and restaurants in 1997);
- their festival has outgrown its present set-up site at Glashan School on Arlington Street and since their parade route is north on Bank Street, it is only reasonable that Lansdowne Park become their marshalling grounds for next year;
- despite the fact that the information gathered by Brighton Research indicated little resistance to parades being held on a Sunday and a minority of being negatively affected by parades, staff still recommend limiting parades on Bank Street to those listed in the original staff report;
- there are many large festivals and parades that involve extensive closing of regional roads and bridges other than Bank Street e.g. Tulip Festival, Winterlude, Canada Day, et cetera, and yet staff do not recommend that these events be set three to five months apart;
- in a poll conducted with Glebe merchants, it was determined that a parade on Bank Street on a Sunday posed no concern to them.

In conclusion, Ms. Steele requested that the staff recommendation be reworded so as not to dismiss the existence of the Pride Festival parade; if it states clearly "Saturday" parades, it would leave the Sunday parade open for them. A copy of her written presentation is held on file.

Councillor Davis recalled that the Pride Festival used to use Elgin Street and questioned whether there was any preference between that route vs Bank Street. Ms. Steele advised that the businesses that support their community are situated along Bank Street and logistically, set-up sites are not available along Elgin Street. The councillor asked the ward councillor for his comment about the possibility of having this parade permitted because it would be an additional parade as well as the fact it is planned to be held on a Sunday. Chair Holmes further suggested that staff also comment. J. Thomas indicated the three time slots being recommended would be filled by parades which traditionally have all been held on Saturdays. D. Brousseau added that staff were trying to address the number of events that required road closures and the period of time this involved. Further, and as previously stated, it was difficult for staff to get a clear read from the survey of whether or not businesses supported Sundays more than Saturdays; half of the respondents are closed on Saturdays and/or Sundays and only half of those said that Sunday's would be preferable. With respect to the economic impact on the businesses on Saturdays vs Sundays, staff advised this would depend on the type of business and whether or not they are closed on Sundays.

Councillor Doucet explained that it is the economic impact that concerns businesses in the area, noting the grocery store on Bank Street in the Glebe estimates a loss of thousands of dollars every time a parade comes by their front door. He suggested amending part (b) of the staff recommendation to ensure a method of changing parades from year to year. Councillor Davis opined however, that the end result would still not solve the issue for the Pride Festival because the Motion suggests going into some sort of lottery system and there is no criteria to do that. She questioned what the effects would be on the established parades which are limited by time constraints to plan their event and D. Brousseau clarified that unless the Pride Festival organizers are asking to change their route for this years event, it is staff's understanding their application is to use Bank Street the same as last year, so this would be an issue for next year.

Ms. Steele was concerned about the comments made by Councillor Doucet, because they are the only other parade and it appears to be nothing more than discrimination. She explained they are a politically-active group of people and to have to come forward year after year to seek approval for their parade is not acceptable. She further believed that to stipulate that parades be three months apart is impossible. She emphasized that their event takes place on a Sunday and does not have the same concerns as the Saturday parades in the Glebe. Therefore, she was asking that committee add the word "Saturday" to the staff recommendation to allow parades to continue with Sundays the way they are.

Councillor Davis questioned whether they would consider using the Queen Elizabeth Driveway instead of Bank Street from Lansdowne Park but Ms. Steele advised that route had not been examined because it is owned by the National Capital Commission (NCC) and would be expensive to use. The councillor further suggested that perhaps staff can approach the NCC with respect to using their roads for future parade routes.

*Roy Isaacs, St. Patrick's Day Parade* did not feel that a lottery for parade routes was practical because some parades are associated with a particular date and it would be inappropriate to have, for example, the St. Patrick's Day parade in November. He believed they should at least be grandfathered so they do not have to keep coming back to committee to have their permit approved. He advised that in the past, their parade has been held on a Saturday and there have been no problems with traffic as a result of their coming through the community. He accepted the revised staff recommendation as proposed. When questioned whether they would have difficulty using the Queen Elizabeth Driveway, Mr. Isaacs advised they would prefer not to use that route because there are no sidewalks and no people. To clarify his comments about permit approvals, D. Brousseau advised that staff have the delegated authority to issue permits and the only reason this particular discussion is before committee is because of the issue of parade "routes".

*Jantine Van Kregten, Executive Director, Byward Market BIA* suggested that Regional roads that lead into the Byward Market should not be considered for special event road closures because there are only three access points into the area and if one is closed for a parade, the remaining two will be unable to handle the volumes directed at those points. She advised that the peak hours in the market are different than most (Saturday and Sunday), but the BIA encourages off-season events which do not fall within their peak periods. When a special event does occur, they work closely with those groups to ensure they contact the local businesses to determine any impact so problems can be solved in advance of the event. She explained they are happy with the co-operation they have had with staff on this issue and were glad to see the undertaking in the report that the BIA will be consulted.

*Gwen Toop, Somerset BIA* objected to the fact there is no limit to the number of parades north of the Queensway for Bank Street and Somerset. She also objected to the fact the applications do not seem to be following existing procedures because within the last month, she had received requests to allow two parades with only a couple of days notice before the event took place. She agreed there are similar problems on Bank Street in the Glebe, but the Somerset area faces similar problems because once Bank Street is blocked off, it eliminates one of the major entry routes to Somerset Street. She believed the Region needed to establish the fact that parades work on Sundays and can be just as successful if they are held in another municipality. Ms. Toop was particularly concerned about the fact the Somerset BIA received only one survey form to cover the 103 businesses and yet every business in the Glebe and along Elgin Street were distributed a survey. As a result, she presumed the numbers were skewed because it appeared the Glebe was suffering more than Somerset, when in fact they suffer just as much. To clarify

this point, D. Brousseau advised that since the Glebe and Elgin Street do not have BIA's, staff had to consult the individual businesses. He confirmed they did not consolidate the results and as shown in the report, they are presented separately. He also reiterated the fact that the survey of the individual businesses was not particularly helpful.

In response to her concerns about last-minute parade notices, Councillor Davis inquired how the policy addresses such requests and J. Thomas advised that while there is a 28-day advance notice requirement, there is also leeway within the policy to consider those requests if that requirement is not met. He confirmed the permits are issued in consultation with the affected BIA and if they are willing to accommodate the event, the permit is issued.

*Peggy Ducharme, Executive Director, Rideau Street BIA* made the following comments:

- she appreciated the fact that staff worked with her in addressing the fact that their original response was not included in the report and have distributed it along with the agenda for the committee's consideration; their comments have therefore not been compiled into the finished data in the report;
- in general, the Rideau Street BIA has been supportive of parades, but mostly on Sundays when there is less service industry happening in the core and generally less traffic;
- the BIA supports alternating routes for parades to ensure the burden is distributed as evenly as possible between communities;
- parades put strains on police resources and while the policy stipulates that these services be paid for by parade organizers, typically these resources are borrowed from the neighbouring community, leaving them vulnerable during these events;
- the BIA is more concerned about the number of protests and demonstrations and would like to ensure that the intersection of Rideau and Sussex does not become abused on a regular basis; it was understood there are measures that can be taken when an area does become excessively abused as a public space and she hoped these could be discussed and pursued;
- she believed it would have been helpful to have an analysis, in chart form, illustrating road closure requests over a one-year period and the locations where they are being requested; this would clearly show where the burden is being placed and to best determine how it can be better balanced;
- she stated there was nothing specific in the survey that asked whether the BIA preferred a Sunday or Saturday parade, so it was very vague and was left a little too general for the respondents to complete properly;

- the BIA requests an opportunity to resubmit their survey after circulating them to their members for responses in order that a true comparison to the Glebe and Elgin Street business communities may be presented and that the survey's conclusions and recommendations be amended to reflect the change of data;
- they further request that the Region seize this opportunity to pursue what measures are available to it to reduce excessive use of preferred protest demonstration locations and in this regard, a designated speaker's corner may be of assistance.

*Gerry Lepage, Bank Street BIA* agreed there has to be a balance between special events and where they are held in the city. He did not believe it would be realistic for the policy to stipulate that parades not occur on certain streets in anticipation that nothing else is going to come along. He believed that establishing time period when parades can be held is another form of social engineering. He did not believe the Queensway should be used as the dividing line between one end of Bank Street and the other because it is contrary to what the BIA is attempting to do downtown. He was somewhat confused about what the Region wants because on one hand it emphasizes the need to make a more vibrant downtown, but on the other hand, it is socially-engineering the way in which these things are accomplished. Having said that, however, he agreed there has to be managed growth, with some limitations, but he did not think this policy addresses that in any way. He supposed the survey is a good place to start because it has a diversity of answers that could not possibly be put forward in a single survey. However, a fundamental flaw of that survey is that it makes assumptions and he felt it would have been more appropriate to ask whether the BIA's would like to distribute it to its members or would they prefer to answer for them. He asked that the parades currently planned not be held up and that the Region should not try to limit the scope of the celebrations brought to the downtown; they should be embraced in a reasonable way that is good and acceptable for everybody, not just for eight city blocks.

*Peter Kennedy, Ottawa Firefighter and Chairman of the Help Santa Toy Parade* was of the opinion that parades reflect the community and cited the number and variety of these events and reasons they are put on. He empathized with the local business with regards to the disruption created by parades; however, when there are a substantial number of people downtown who would not normally be there, he felt there must be some benefit to be gained by the local businesses. He appreciated that a consensus be reached with the businesses on how best to have parades. While the policy may not be perfect, Mr. Kennedy could appreciate where it is coming from and the amount of work going into it. In closing, he reiterated that parades are an integral part of the community and its identity and therefore should be encouraged.

Councillor Doucet proposed the following:

*All organizations wishing to hold a parade on Bank Street between the Queensway and Lansdowne Park make application to the Region by January 1, and if there are more than three, a choice will be made by lottery.*

Councillor Davis proposed the following:

*The Pride Parade be allowed to use Lansdowne Park for its parade route for a Sunday parade beginning in the year 2000.*

In considering Councillor Doucet's Motion, Councillor Davis stated that to have to expect parade organizers to wait until January to see whether or not they get a slot for their parade is totally unacceptable. She emphasized the fact that there are established traditions in the community that should be maintained.

Councillor Byrne acknowledged the concerns from the ward councillors and stated there are areas where such events are welcome, and perhaps that component of this policy should be examined. She believed there is justification for grandfathering the three parades that currently exist and preferred the original recommendation that specifically identified those three events because the community seems to be more accepting of those parades. The Solicitor, Paul Hughs explained that the original recommendation was changed because it may have been seen as discriminatory and Council does not have the authority, by policy or by-law, to pass a resolution or by-law that would target specific organizations and grant those from a policy perspective. He further stated that the difference between the original recommendation and the revised report is that the grandfathering is done on a seniority basis; it is neutral and does not target specific groups for special status in any way.

Councillor Byrne indicated her concern would be that if it is left open, it leaves the opportunity open to increase the amount of parades through that area and if the Region is going to start allowing additional parades in regardless of the reason, it is just exactly what the community does not want. She believed that would be a risk with this new wording because its too vague and she did not feel it would resolve the problem that the community is facing. P. Hughes advised that the new recommendation would limit the parades to three and therefore place a restriction in that way; however, the by-law would permit other parades by way of the appeal mechanisms under the Regional Regulatory Code. Although she still had some concerns, the councillor indicated her support of the staff recommendation.

Councillor Legendre stated his preference to change the last paragraph which dealt with dealing with parades on a first-come-first-served basis. He believed that should one of the existing parades in the three time slots recommended decide to go a different route,

thereby leaving that slot open on a first-come-first-served basis, it would create problems because staff would have to deal with the organizations that will come forward vying for that spot. He further believed that not everyone will have a fair opportunity to deal with it and recommended that part (b) of the staff recommendation be amended to read “substitute events referred to in the Department’s recommendation be dealt with by the Transportation Committee following public advertising of the availability of a parade opportunity”.

In response, D. Brousseau explained there are very few parades which require full road closures and there are very few that will occur between November and March. He added that if the Region advertises then it may be attracting a parade that might not otherwise be there.

Councillor Cantin suggested there be a registry where groups who want to have parades indicate what time of the year they prefer and which route they want to use and whether or not they have a secondary route they might consider. He felt it would be simpler to have people show their intent, suggesting this could be part of the normal advertising policy. He believed that to offer a time-slot if one parade drops off would create false hopes and cause anguish for those groups who will fight for it.

With respect to his Motion, Councillor Doucet felt staff have done their best to balance off competing interests, which are not reconcilable. He noted that someone has to suffer a little because the interests are absolutely diametrically opposed. He was sensitive to the wishes of the community and the businesses along Bank Street because he did not want to lock in three parades forever and there should be some flexibility to change the parades. He wondered if committee would consider approving the first segment of the staff recommendation (a) and refer (b) back to staff. If committee is willing to split the recommendation, he opined, there would be no need for his Motion.

D. Brousseau explained that the intent of (b) is “first-come-first-served”, in consultation with the ward councillor, and if a vacancy does occur, staff would bring it to the attention of the ward councillor and the BIA’s. Councillor Davis did not believe this would be workable because the ward councillor may or may not want the parade. She questioned how staff would determine a “first-come-first-served” basis and D. Brousseau reiterated that this report deals only with the three major parades. He assured committee there are not a lot of problems and if it was to become a big issue he would bring it to their attention.

Councillor Doucet withdrew his Motion.

Moved by L. Davis

**The Pride Parade be allowed to use Lansdowne Park for its parade route for a Sunday parade beginning in the year 2000.**

CARRIED

YEAS: R. Cantin, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, H. Kreling, J. Legendre.....6  
NAYS: W. Byrne....1

Moved by J. Legendre

**That substitute events referred to in the Department's recommendation be dealt with by the Transportation Committee following public advertising of the availability of a parade opportunity.**

LOST

YEAS: L. Davis, J. Legendre....2  
NAYS: W. Byrne, R. Cantin, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, H. Kreling....5

D. Brousseau added that should any of the three major parades drop out they will lose their place in line for subsequent years.

**That the Transportation Committee recommend and Council approve: (a) the limiting of major parades and other special events that require complete road closures on Bank Street between the Queensway and Lansdowne Park to one between 1 January and 30 April, one between 1 May and 31 August and one between 1 September and 31 December each year; and (b) the administering of the application process on seniority unless the previous year's event does not re-occur, in which case any substitute event will be approved on a first come first served basis.**

CARRIED as amended

4. **REPORT ON THE NORTEL NETWORK'S "GREENCOMMUTE"  
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**  
- Planning and Development Approval Commissioner report dated 4 Jun 99

Geoff Noxon, Senior Project Manager, Policy Planning, explained that this is in response to the direction of Committee and Council that Nortel report back on a yearly basis on their transportation demand management (TDM) initiatives at their Carling and Moodie site. He stated this program is an excellent example of corporate commitment and the value of partnership. Staff appreciated this opportunity to present with Nortel, the first annual status report and acknowledged Nortel for the money, time, effort and corporate



profile they have put into this program. Details of his presentation are outlined in the staff report.

Sharon Lewinson, Nortel's GreenCommute Program Manager gave the committee a detailed overview of their program as outlined in the report entitled "Transportation Demand Management Program - Status Report 1.0", dated June 1999. A copy of the report is held on file. Committee member received a complimentary lunch bag containing information distributed to Nortel employees as part of their TDM program.

**That the Transportation Committee and Council receive this report for information.**

RECEIVED

5. GLEBE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION REQUEST FOR WELCOMING SIGNAGE ON BRONSON AVENUE

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 31 May 99

John Buck, Traffic Investigator and Survey Supervisor, provided a general overview of the matter as originally presented to committee on 5 May 1999. He was very enthusiastic about this traffic calming proposal and hoped other communities would follow suit because he believed it would be very successful. He extended his thanks to Bhat Boy, for creating and bringing forward this idea and to the Glebe Community Association for endorsing it. He believed this initiative could be put up on the web so that other communities could benefit. He hoped the Region's communications people would get behind this project in terms of media drive because it is a community initiative and would likely get more endorsement than simply erecting speed limit signs.

When questioned whether words conveying a message could be added to these colourful signs, Bhat Boy advised the poles are not wide enough to add anything and suggested the message is already clear and simple; the important thing is to remind motorists there are pedestrians on the street and there are schools in the area. He believed the figures of children at play will do just that.

Committee members were very enthusiastic about this initiative and it was suggested that staff might want to investigate the possibility of creating on its website, a page for "Innovation" where initiatives such as this one can be placed for all to see.

**That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of welcoming child figures and bilingual "Welcome to our Neighbourhood" signs on Bronson Avenue as proposed by the artist Bhat Boy and the Glebe Community Association.**

CARRIED

6. LIGHT RAIL PILOT PROJECT: PROGRESS REPORT NO. 5

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 1 Jun 99

In response to a question posed by Councillor Legendre about apparent cost-overruns, the Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner, Nick Tunnacliffe advised that staff are still negotiating with CPR. The councillor was surprised it was the railway company that is causing the price increase. Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure explained that CP was to come back to staff with a proposal based on the Memorandum of Understanding between CP and the Region and she confirmed they are responsible for the construction of the stations, which is part of the overall costs.

*Lois K. Smith* briefly highlighted the importance of consultation to ensure that when regular maintenance has to occur, it does not interfere with the running of the train.

In response to the earlier comments about cost, Councillor Doucet confirmed that as a member of the Steering Committee, he recognized that this project is running a bit over cost, but assured committee staff are working hard to get the costs down to as low as possible. By comparing the Region's system with the light rail system in Calgary, for example, he indicated their costs were \$4M/car, while in Ottawa-Carleton, it will cost only \$5M for 9 cars. Further, in speaking with people in Calgary, he has learned that \$16M is an extremely low amount for 8 km of track, nine cars and five stations. In closing, he believed CP has done as much as they can and while the costs may exceed the originally suggested \$16M, he thought it will be the lowest cost piece of transit infrastructure the Region will ever see.

**That the Transportation Committee and Council receive this report for information.**

RECEIVED

ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS

7. MODIFICATIONS TO INNES ROAD AND TENTH LINE ROAD TO  
ACCOMMODATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRINITY  
COMMONS SHOPPING CENTRE

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 27 May 99

**That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:**

1. **The installation of traffic control signals on Innes Road (Regional Road 30) at the proposed site access approximately 220 m east of Tenth Line Road (Regional Road 47), and the construction of associated roadway modifications along Innes Road and Tenth Line Road as illustrated in Annex**

**B and C, subject to the owner, RIOTRIN Properties (Cumberland) Incorporated:**

- a. **funding the total cost of the proposed road works and traffic control signal installation which would include paying the annual maintenance costs for the traffic control signals until such time as they meet the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario installation warrants and Council approves the assumption of the costs;**
  - b. **executing a Legal agreement with respect to (a) above, and;**
2. **Authorize the initiation of the public hearing process as required by Section 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act*.**

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR'S ITEMS

8. OTTAWA BOTANICAL GARDEN SOCIETY - REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR A TRAFFIC AND PARKING STUDY  
- Councillor D. Holmes' report dated 2 Jun 99

*Ian Efford, Ottawa Botanical Garden Society (OBGS)* informed committee that the federal government is calling for proposals for alternative uses of the non-core areas of the Central Experimental Farm (CEF). The Botanical Garden Association has a vision of what should be done with one part of the Farm which lies along Prince of Wales Drive and that study is underway. However, some of the work that will have to be done outside of the group is the traffic and parking study. He advised that the results of the study will allow them to do costing of changes which would be required by the Region in terms of traffic. He clarified that two of their major projects are on Carling Avenue at Preston Street and not on the CEF and the issue is how people will drive to those sites and where the parking will be situated. He believed the issue is not just their problem, but everyone's in that area and they need the Region to examine and define the parameters of the problem so they can find the solution.

Councillor Legendre noted these lands are owned by the federal government and stated that when a site plan is brought forward, the landowner in question is the one who does the traffic and parking study. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner confirmed this fact, adding it would be inappropriate for the Region to do the site plan and then comment on it.

Mr. Efford responded by stating the federal government is asking for proposals but because they do not want to bias the decision-making process, do not want to fund the

preparation of the proposals before they come in. Therefore, as a non-profit organization, the OBGS are in a situation where they are carrying the costs of preparing the proposal but these are costs which are outside their jurisdiction. The OBGS view this issue from the point of a major cultural and economic development in the area and the Region could assist with the process by funding one small part of the proposal.

Chair Holmes noted that usually the developer would do the parking study and in this case, it is a non-profit organization that is asking the Region for a grant to do it; she agreed the Region should not do the study if it has to comment on it. The Commissioner believed it was inappropriate for the Region to give such a grant and if it is seen as an economic development issue, it would rightly fall under that category for funding and would therefore be considered by the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee.

*Eric Moore, President, Friends of the Central Experimental Farm (FCEF)* recommended that committee reject this proposal. By way of background, he advised that the FCEF was formed over 10 years ago in response to the risk of the federal government selling off parts of the Farm. At that time, there were also severe cut-backs on groundskeeping staff and the FCEF do their best to fill in following these staff reductions. Without this voluntary work, many areas of the Farm would be in a worse state than it is already. He emphasized that FCEF are not opposed to botanical gardens, but they are very much against the proposal to build one on the CEF. The key reason for their concern is because a year ago the CEF was designated a national historic site and a cultural heritage landscape and if any element is changed significantly, the whole of it is changed.

Mr. Moore further advised that another reason they are concerned about the plan to put a botanical garden on the CEF is the fact that they were there first and have been working most of that territory for nearly 11 years. Their goal is to “establish on the CEF an arboretum and botanical garden of national and international prominence which will be representative of all native and naturalized trees and shrubs of Canada, together with appropriate hedges, flowers, herbs and grasses”. In his closing remarks, he indicated that the results of a poll made last year reported that 70% of the citizens of the National Capital Region did not want the CEF to change at all.

*Lois K. Smith* emphasized the importance of maintaining a stable environment. In this vein, she indicated that the purpose of the CEF was to do agricultural research for the whole of Canada and it should be reserved for that purpose and the government should not start taking away from it. She recognized it cannot be preserved identically as it was originally, and realized there does have to be some leeway for change. It was her intent to examine the OBGS’s proposal very closely before giving her support to it.

Councillor Doucet advised members that the changes to the CEF is of great concern to the citizens of Dows Lake and Ottawa South. He recognized that something has to be done about the arboretum and discussions are underway at the federal and local level in this

regard. While he did not believe there was any clear indication of what will be done, he believed the proposal brought forward today is inappropriate and he asked committee not to support the recommendation put forward.

**That Transportation Committee direct staff to bring forward a report in response to the Ottawa Botanical Garden Society's request for financial support to conduct a traffic and parking study of the proposed botanic garden at the Central Experimental Farm.**

LOST

YEAS: D. Holmes....1

NAYS: M. Bellemare, C. Doucet, H. Kreling, J. Legendre....4

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

---

CO-ORDINATOR

---

CHAIR