

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
CHAMPLAIN ROOM
6 AUGUST 1997
1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: R. Cantin

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Councillor Legendre suggested clarification of his statement in Item 9 with respect to the conveyance of land for a bicycle lane. He indicated the proposed wording should read as follows: "He indicated that in an earlier discussion with the developer, they had agreed to convey land over to the Region for a bicycle lane *and that such conveyance was to cover the full length of the contact zone from Caldwell Avenue south, to the end of the property along Merivale Road.*

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 2 July 1997.

CARRIED as amended

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 10 September 1997 in Transportation Committee Report 59.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. HAWTHORNE ROAD RECONSTRUCTION - RUSSELL ROAD TO HUNT CLUB ROAD - PUBLIC HEARING

—
- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 22 Jul 97

Councillor Beamish indicated he had a business along this road and to avoid any conflict of interest, did not participate in discussion of the item or voting for any Motion or recommendation.

The Committee acknowledged receipt of a letter dated 31 July 1997 from Joan O'Neill which stated that while she did not object to the reconstruction of Hawthorne Road, she suggested the Region explore the possibility of constructing Conroy Road before Hawthorne Road.

Councillor Legendre was particularly concerned about the high sound levels anticipated following construction, (72 dBA-74 dBA) even though Council policy states that when the Region is contemplating reconstruction it would do nothing unless the future day-time outdoor sound level is higher than 55 dBA or the future "do nothing" ambient. He was particularly concerned that nothing would be done unless there was a significant increase over the future "do nothing" ambient, the latter being already extremely high. Following a brief discussion about sound levels taken inside of and in front of the sound fencing along a similar road, the councillor explained he was simply flagging these overly high levels allowable along Regional roads for possible future discussion.

In relation to the above discussion, in which staff advised there was very little difference between sound in front of and behind a noise fence they studied, Councillor Meilleur questioned the need for such attenuation if noise levels between the two were so minimal. In relation to this project, the Environment and Transportation Commissioner confirmed the fencing was part of the subdivision agreement and is beneficial where there are no front entrances to break the continuity of the fence. The councillor did not believe the Region had to review its policy if it is just to have the developer incur the cost for something that is not needed or to give comfort to the people buying those properties. The Commissioner indicated the proper time to consider the need for sound attenuation fencing, especially in newly developing areas, is during subdivision design. He confirmed that once there is an existing ambient noise level, there is not very much that can be done.

Councillor Legendre noted reference in the report to an "unacceptable" level of service (LOS) "E" at intersections along this reconstruction, although the new Regional Official Plan states that LOS is now "acceptable". The Commissioner confirmed this fact and agreed this would not appear in future reports to the contrary. The councillor further noted that the alternative to this upgrading referenced in the report, which would entail extending Hunt Club Road to Highway 417 and constructing a new interchange, proved to

be too costly and “may” have greater natural environmental impacts. He was concerned about this language because in an assessment of alternatives staff ought to know whether there will be greater or lesser environmental impacts. Staff explained that a flora and fauna analysis had been undertaken and the results concluded there are significant environmental natural habitat areas; however, it was because the cost was anticipated to be three times that of reconstructing Hawthorne Road, that this alternative was not pursued any further. Staff also confirmed that if an option was being seriously considered, they would know whether or not there would be significant environmental impacts.

Councillor Legendre made note of the fact that sidewalks would not be provided along Hawthorne Road since the City of Ottawa has advised they are not warranted at this time. However, the City’s Official Plan states that where there is transit service, sidewalks will be provided and since transit service is provided along this section of the road, he believed a sidewalk should be incorporated with the design. The committee noted the bus service is during peak hours only and serves the business park.

Ray Van Bregt, Purolator Courier stated his business employs approximately 300 people and has a fleet of approximately 140 vehicles for a total of approximately 750 trips in and out of their site each day. He explained that traffic volumes are already so high it is difficult to make left-turns from their lot and with the proposed widening to three lanes, he was very concerned about movement to and from the property, especially for some of the larger tractor-trailer style vehicles which are heading towards Highway 417. He believed the answer was to install traffic signals at the entrance. The Commissioner indicated that signals are not warranted and where they are requested, the cost would be borne by the proponent because it is a private entrance. In a brief discussion of the difficulties encountered by this company, committee asked that staff advise them prior to the item rising to Council, what the per centage of warrants are at this intersection.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Meilleur, Mr. Van Bregt indicated Purolator agrees totally with the proposed improvements to the road, but their concern is accessibility; he maintained that the reconstruction will attract more traffic to Hawthorne Road which will only worsen an already bad situation. The councillor was particularly concerned about safety and suggested the only available options were to install signals or to prohibit vehicles from turning left out of this site. The Committee Chair suggested staff speak with Purolator to advise them what is involved to make that entrance a safe access/egress. With respect to the issue of not providing a sidewalk as part of the design, Mr. Van Bregt pointed out the transit service does not come as far as their property and they do have employees who walk to work and therefore a sidewalk should be provided. He was informed that although sidewalks are the responsibility of the local municipality, there would be, as part of the reconstruction, a one-metre wide maintenance strip installed on the side the road which would provide a place for pedestrians to walk along.

Don Burke, the solicitor representing Mr. and Mrs. Frank Kropp of 3323 Hawthorne Road, indicated that sound attenuation barriers appear to be totally impractical in front of this property and would not protect enjoyment of their residence which they have

occupied for nearly 50 years. As outlined in the report, the Kropp's are requesting that the Region purchase their home (built in the 1800's). When questioned how close the reconstruction will bring the road to this house, staff advised it would move it to within approximately 5 metres from the front face of their home. They agreed that noise barriers were impractical in this instance. With respect to a question raised about relocating the building, staff confirmed this was possible; however, since the Kropp's have expressed an interest in having the Region purchase the property outright, staff would then dispose of the surplus land. He confirmed the property was large enough that the building could be relocated further back onto the property; however, it was pointed out that any time a building is moved, it requires a fair amount of investigation to determine whether it can withstand the move et cetera. Councillor Legendre indicated his support of the preservation of the structure and noted that if it is the Region's desire to acquire the property, suggested staff investigate whether or not it merits preservation and moving it from the present site.

Upon learning that there is enough room within the minimum right-of-way to build a sidewalk, Councillor Legendre proposed that the Region construct a sidewalk as part of this reconstruction, between Hunt Club Road and Russell Road at this time. He agreed staff could decide on which side to build it. Councillor Holmes proposed an amendment to the Motion that the cost for the sidewalk be borne by the City of Ottawa, although it would not be conditional on the sidewalk being constructed.

Councillor Cullen agreed the City should be billed for the cost of the sidewalk, especially since it will be cheaper now rather than waiting three or four years to put one in and as this area develops he believed there would be more pressure to put in a sidewalk. He pointed out, however, that the Regional Official Plan supports the inclusion of sidewalks on Regional roads, at least on one side of the road, where transit service is provided.

Councillor Kreling indicated he would want to see by way of direction, either the Committee Chair or the Commissioner forward formal correspondence to the City as well, indicating the Committee's dissatisfaction with their attitude toward their responsibility and the lack of commitment to their own Official Plan. The Commissioner indicated staff do co-operate with the City of Ottawa on the rebuilding of their streets and he believed it was a rather modest request to ask them to pay for it.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Motion be amended to include “and that the construction cost for the sidewalk be recovered from the City of Ottawa”.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That a sidewalk be incorporated in the Hawthorne Road reconstruction from Hunt Club Road to Russell Road at this time and that the construction cost for the sidewalk be recovered from the City of Ottawa.

CARRIED

The Committee directed staff to come to a resolution with respect to what is to be done with the property at 3323 Hawthorne Road. Councillor Holmes indicated something in writing should be forwarded to the City of Ottawa to determine whether the building comes up to heritage specifications. Staff advised that the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC) determined it was not warranted to be designated a heritage structure, but was unsure of what the staff recommendation was to that body. Councillor Holmes expressed an interest in revisiting this because although it may not be appropriate to maintain the building as a residence, it could remain in its present location and be utilized for other uses such as a business or a restaurant. The Commissioner acknowledged that should the home be purchased by the Region, staff would come forward with a report to address the comments raised by committee members. With respect to the safety concern expressed by the representative from Purolator, the Commissioner advised staff will examine his concerns and was confident an appropriate solution can be found.

Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve the preliminary design for the Hawthorne Road Reconstruction from Russell Road to Hunt Club Road as illustrated on presentation drawing R-2095.**
- 2. Approve the installation of traffic control signals at the intersections of both Hawthorne Road/Stevenage Drive and Hawthorne Road/Hunt Club Road.**
- 3. Authorize the relocation of the utilities as shown on presentation drawing R-2095.**

4. **Authorize the initiation of expropriation proceedings and proceed with the acquisition of property, as shown on presentation drawing R-2095-A.**

CARRIED as amended

MOTION

2. PEDESTRIAN-ACTIVATED TRAFFIC SIGNAL - CORKSTOWN ROAD AND CARLING AVENUE

—
- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 23 Jul 97

Staff indicated signals are not recommended at this intersection because they are only 26% warranted at this time. The study carried out to determine pedestrian crossing volumes was conducted in July 1996, with an additional study conducted during the school year, the latter of which revealed an even lower volume of pedestrians crossing the roadway. During particularly inclement weather, the Committee Chair questioned whether staff would reschedule a study of pedestrian counts to a better day, in order to obtain a more accurate crossing count. Staff agreed to follow-up with the Chair's inquiry.

There were a number of residents of Riverpark Place who attended to speak to this item but upon an invitation from the Committee Chair, the majority agreed to allow the representatives from the building to put forward their concerns and their support for a traffic signal at this intersection.

Michael Tate, Managing Partner of Riverpark Place informed committee that this two-year old retirement home houses seniors whose average age is 85 years old. They do not dispute the findings of the Department, however, they feel the measuring system used to determine the warrants is inappropriate, based on the age and mobility of the residents. They encourage independence of the tenants and many are able to get out and about and for some this includes a trip to Andrew Haydon Park which is directly across Carling Avenue. For most of the elderly, this crossing is difficult because many rely on walkers, canes or electric wheelchairs and as such, crossing times are usually longer than for someone somewhat younger. As a result, Mr. Tate believed the Region was grading the risk factor of the warrants in an inappropriate way (2 points are allocated for seniors) and believed the system does not work in this unique situation because they do not take into account the type of residents who use this intersection.

Joan Bradley, Administrator of Riverpark Place noted there will be as many as 185 seniors in the building when it is fully occupied (currently there are 172). She indicated that of particular concern to them is the fact the warrants will most likely never be met for signals because most residents are afraid to cross the street, thereby producing extremely low counts. In addition, the proposed expansion of Nortel at Carling and Moodie (less

than five minutes away from Riverpark Place) and the anticipated increased traffic flow along Carling must be considered with this request.

Helen Adams, Activities Co-ordinator, Riverpark Place explained that she takes residents to the park herself or by driving them in the bus provided by the retirement home. As a worker at the Assisted Living Centre, she also takes people out daily to and from the park, although she is limited to no more than four at a time because they do not listen all the time and their movements are somewhat difficult given their age and mobility status. She stressed that the staff at Riverpark Place value the safety of its residents and want a safe crossing for them at this intersection.

Councillor Kreling questioned whether any thought had been given to how the residents of the facility would cross the road during site plan approval, and whether the owners of the building would be receptive to paying for the installation of a pedestrian-activated signal. Mr. Tate acknowledged the use of the park was missed in the site plan and was not a requirement of the local or regional municipality; it came to the fore once the facility was in operation and the owners realized that the level of willingness to cross the road was far more than they expected. Now, it is at the stage where they have seen incidences occur where residents have crossed when they should not have and this has forced them to deal with the issue of safety. With respect to the owners of the building paying the full cost for signals, Mr. Tate did not believe they would be interested in spending the money initially, given that they could always organize trips to the park, although this is not in the best interests of residents since they promote their independence.

Councillor Merv Sullivan, City of Nepean whose letter dated 1 August 1997 expressed support for traffic signals at this location, indicated that as councillor for and a resident of this ward, he indicated this stretch of road is posted at 60 km/h, although most motorists are probably driving faster and when they see the seniors crossing they have to slow down or stop for them. He noted there is an average of one car every three or four seconds, but when there appears to be a large gap, it is only because vehicles are stopped at the lights at Acres Road and some seniors might perceive this to be enough time to cross, even though this flow will be upon them soon enough. He stressed that a factor that should be taken into consideration with respect to the warrants is that over 50% of pedestrians crossing at this location are seniors and their limited agility will not permit them to travel the 300 metres to Acres Road to cross.

The Committee Chair questioned whether the City of Nepean had explored the option of shared funding between itself, the Region and owners of the building. Councillor Sullivan indicated Nepean has not discussed this, but was willing to take the suggestion back for consideration. Councillor Sullivan added that even if signals were part of site plan approval, they would not have met the requirements for signals at that point in time.

Lt. Col. Albert Stocks, resident, Riverpark Place informed the Committee that those who have crossed this busy road have taken their life in their hands, adding that many residents

refuse to cross because it is too dangerous. He explained that the best part of the park just so happens to be directly opposite their building and sports beautiful shade trees so people can sit and admire the artificial lake with its fountain and is also close to facilities. He stated that to cross at Acres Road or by using the tunnel, gets them nowhere in the park that they want to be. Mr. Stocks went on to explain that because of the age of most of the residents, crossing Carling Avenue at Corkstown Road is pretty much their limit, after they leave their apartments and travel down to the corner. He believed if a safe crossing was provided, many more people would cross at this intersection.

Ruth Campbell, resident, Riverpark Place gave a compelling description of the enjoyment she felt going to Andrew Haydon Park, emphasizing the serenity of the park and how it was greatly enjoyed by her and other residents. She drew to the committee's attention how handicapped the residents of Riverpark Place truly are because of limited transportation and satisfactory means to get across the road.

Councillor Cullen pointed out that signals at this location would serve more than just the residents of Riverpark Place because students and teachers of Lakeview Public School, which is just up the road, currently use the tunnel to the park and would probably use a signalized crossing instead because the tunnel is only accessible during good, dry weather. He emphasized that the tunnel is not an option for seniors because it is only accessible by a roughly paved sloping pathway and is not conducive to those with limited walking abilities. In addition, the Lakeview community, immediately to the south of Corkstown Road, would also benefit greatly by this crossing. He reiterated the comments made previously about increased traffic as a result of the expansion of Nortel, noting the volumes would increase further with the future widening of Carling Avenue (from Moodie to Kanata) and the construction of the Britannia cinema complex. The councillor maintained that if this issue is not addressed now, it will have to be addressed in the future and although this is a unique situation, urged committee members to consider these compelling arguments supporting his recommendation.

Councillor Waddell proposed an amendment to the recommendation to read as follows: "That a pedestrian-activated traffic signal be installed at Corkstown Road and Carling Avenue *subject to costs being paid by the City of Nepean and/or the seniors' building owner.*" The Committee Chair inquired whether there was funding available from the Region to participate as well and the Commissioner advised that the current policy is that where an area municipality wants to install signals, they pay for it themselves or obtain the funds from other parties. Councillor Cullen understood the sentiment to get contributions from other parties, however, he believed the signals would be a Regional facility serving a Regional need and stressed there was an argument for a Regional contribution. He believed it is too onerous an amount for the owners of the retirement home to shoulder and maintained his support for his original recommendation.

Councillor Meilleur could not support the recommendation that the Region pay all costs for a signal that is only 26% warranted, but was open to the suggestion that the Region

contribute a portion of the funds necessary for the signals. Councillor Waddell modified her amendment to reflect equal contributions by all three parties.

When questioned whether the owners of Riverpark Place could accommodate shared funding, Mr. Tate indicated they would contribute their share towards the signals because the lives of the residents are worth it. He expressed some hesitancy with respect to the amendment including three parties because it then puts the onus on the City of Nepean and he questioned what would happen if they were to reject a shared contribution. Committee members eased his concern by emphasizing the facts: Corkstown Road is a local road exiting onto a Regional road; two of the three funding partners are committed; and, the signals would be used by people wishing to reach a City facility.

Moved by V. Waddell

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of a pedestrian-activated traffic signal at the intersection of Corkstown Road and Carling Avenue subject to costs being shared equally by the City of Nepean, the owners of Riverpark Place and the RMO.

CARRIED as amended
(D. Beamish dissented)

Councillor Legendre made reference to a Motion he wanted the Committee to consider that asks staff to report back in October on current warrants for intersection signalization and the rationale for the warrant norms. He suggested the report also consider when the warrant system is still appropriate in view of the recently approved Transportation Master Plan. He believed staff would be able to report back on whether or not there is a change in how warrants used to be assigned, compared to the newly adopted Transportation Master Plan. Staff confirmed they could provide the existing warrant information to committee by the fall, but his suggestion with respect to how warrants are viewed in light of the new TMP, required a longer period of time in order to fully explore this issue. Councillor Holmes suggested and Councillor Legendre agreed, to amend the date to January 1998.

Moved by J. Legendre

That staff bring forward a report/briefing in January 1998 on current warrants for intersection signalization including the rationale for the warrant norms. The report would also consider whether the existing warrant system is still appropriate in view of the new Transportation Master Plan.

CARRIED

ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS

3. MODIFICATIONS TO HUNT CLUB ROAD AND MERIVALE ROAD TO SERVE THE CROSSROADS HOME CENTRE

- Director, Mobility Services & Corporate Fleet Services report dated 18 Jul 97

Councillor Beamish questioned whether the modifications to the islands at the Merivale/Hunt Club intersection, would eliminate a deceleration lane for eastbound traffic moving south onto Merivale Road. Staff confirmed these arrangements, explaining that the volume of eastbound right-turning traffic is very low and to incorporate a deceleration lane would require property from the developer. In response to an additional question posed by the councillor, staff confirmed the right turn lane had been built originally because at that time traffic volumes were anticipated to be higher. The Commissioner added that if the volume increases in the future, the requirements of this intersection will have to be reassessed.

Councillor Holmes questioned why the development was planned to be built at the road instead of away from the road with parking in front. Keith McLean, McLean Transportation Engineering Consultants indicated the City of Nepean commissioned a study of this area by planning and architectural consultants and developed a planning concept for this quadrant of the intersection and determined that there should be some buildings along the Hunt Club/Merivale frontage as well as to the rear of the property and for that reason in approving the plan for the development they required that buildings be shown essentially as detailed in the plan.

Councillor Legendre noted the similarities between this intersection and the Bank and Cahill intersection which was recently dealt with by committee and Council and based on the recommendations for that modification, he questioned why this design did not reflect the earlier debate with respect to right-turn channelization. B. Jolliffe, Design Review Coordinator indicated staff had addressed this by proposing the removal of a portion of the north/east quadrant islands and confirmed there will be no channelization at this quadrant. Making reference to the earlier example, the councillor noted that moving the right-turn channelization, they did not increase the pedestrian exposure. B. Jolliffe responded by

stating this is a case where some of the heaviest trucks had to be accommodated on this particular roadway i.e. a large tank farm on Merivale Road with large vehicle traffic heading towards Highway 416. They will turn right from Merivale to Hunt Club and from Hunt Club to Merivale heading north.

Mr. McLean added that they had examined removal of all the right-turn channelization but the pedestrians would have difficulty crossing within the signal timing safely. On the north side of the intersection if a pedestrian crosses east to west they have to cross three lanes on the northbound traffic, four lanes for southbound plus the additional southbound lane that will be extended and that distance was excessive for a pedestrian to cross and provide adequate time. The channelization island gave some opportunity for minimizing that time and providing a refuge area. In addition, there are very few pedestrians that actually cross that this intersection given the type of businesses in the area e.g. Price Club, Beaver Lumber and a diner. Given that, in the best interest of the pedestrians it was to retain some of the channelizing islands. The Commissioner noted that in fact, pedestrian refuges will encourage pedestrians to walk because they are there to help them.

Councillor Meilleur questioned whether there is a community close enough to walk to the businesses in this area and was informed the nearest community is Tanglewood to the north of the side. The councillor questioned whether the concerns expressed about difficulties for pedestrians were well-founded. Staff confirmed there was no community in the immediate area and that the closest community (Tanglewood) is situated well away from this intersection. The councillor then inquired whether there was any objection from the community to this proposal. Mr. McLean advised their major concern was with respect to the park and community centre development which the City of Nepean is currently dealing with.

Councillor Kreling noted there was existing traffic control at the intersections and requested clarification the only signals the developer was requested to pay was for the installation and maintenance of the signals to the driveway of the development. The Commissioner confirmed this was what was being requested.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve the installation of traffic control signals at West Hunt Club Road and the existing Beaver Lumber Access/Proposed Crossroads and the construction of the associated roadway modifications along Merivale Road and West Hunt Club Road as illustrated in Annexes D and E, subject to the owner, 1204325 Ontario Limited:**
 - a. funding the total cost of the proposed road works 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 the above;**
- 2. Authorize the initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the Ontario Municipal Act.**

CARRIED

The Committee made note of the fact that since there will not be a Council meeting on 13 August, when this report would normally rise, the advertisement of this item would commence following this meeting with a public hearing, if required, being held on 3 September 1997 and the final report being submitted to Council on 10 September 1997.

4. MODIFICATIONS TO INNES ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 30) BETWEEN CYRVILLE ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 128) AND STONEHENGE CRESCENT (WEST) TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROPOSED TRINITY PLAZA

- Director, Mobility Services & Corporate Fleet Services report dated 23 Jul 97

Councillor Holmes stated that since the Region's Official Plan encourages buildings to be fronted on roads with parking lots in the rear, why is this development was not encouraged to have the building on the road. B. Jolliffe, Design Review Co-ordinator advised the developer feels that would not attract people to the site. The councillor recognized that developers want parking in the front, but stated it is the Region's role to encourage what is best for the Region as a whole, not just for the developer. With respect to any staff influence in this regard, the Commissioner advised they are site plan issues and staff can certainly ask those questions but it is the local municipality that sets and approves the site plans.

Bill Holzman, representing the Trinity Development Group indicated that based on the size of this development (approximately 50,000 square feet on a four-acre site) flexibility is very limited and it would be very difficult to have parking in the rear and not be accessing the building through the back door. Also, if the parking is in the back, it must also be kept in mind that there has to be access for loading and garbage pick-up. He maintained that parking in the front is more friendly as well

Councillor Meilleur was concerned that if committee is going to interpret this matter in the Region's Official Plan without any distinction because she agreed that in the downtown the buildings are right up at the road. In this situation, however, for security purposes, she did not think people would be as apt to use the facility if parking were only provided behind the building due to the lack of visibility from the road. She wanted to see a distinction between whether the development is situated downtown or in the suburbs. Further, she indicated she has been very active with the Women's Association for Safety

and shrubbery and parking in the rear of a building are all against their policies. She indicated the Association has advised municipalities these types of developments are unacceptable. She believed that if some people feel parking in the back is safer the women's community would have to be convinced of that fact. They want their visibility to be clear and to be seen from the street because it feels safer. She acknowledged it would be somewhat different in a very busy location where there is a constant movement of pedestrians to and from the facility.

Councillor Legendre believed it would be safer for everyone if parking was available in the back, where other customers might be heading toward their cars also rather than driving by along a busy roadway perhaps not noticing anything. He believed that would provide more visibility. Further, the influence that buildings with a presence on the road have on the traffic. He noted there are existing sidewalks on both sides of the street even though pedestrian volumes are low; he attributed this to the somewhat "hostile" environment that exists there and further development will only serve to worsen the situation. The Committee noted these concerns are really site plan issues and are not part of the roadway modifications being considered today. Further to these comments, Councillor Legendre noted the widening of the eastbound curb lane on Innes Road and with this widening, he believed the potential exists to make it a separate bike lane and not a shared-use lane for motorists and cyclists. B. Jolliffe indicated that currently no bike lanes exist on Innes Road; staff are anticipating a shared-use lane of approximately 4.5 metres, although they are not adverse to providing a 1.5 - 2 metre bicycle lane along the frontage of this property. He confirmed Innes Road is part of the Regional Cycling Network. Councillor Legendre proposed that a signed separate 1.5 metre bicycle lane be provided. The Committee Chair suggested direction to staff that if the Motion is approved, that when the next piece comes along that the bicycle lane be connected to Blair Road.

Mr. Holzman was frustrated that discussion has taken place with regards to speeding and yet the Region is proposing to widen this road and add additional lanes, which will only encourage faster driving motorists. He was not opposed to the improvement to the road situation however, because he recognized the need. He maintained that the plaza will have very minimal impact on Innes Road and some modest road improvements were suggested to correct that impact. He pointed out that the land owner will be going through the proper channels to request consideration of a credit against his development charges because from their research, an upgrade of Innes Road is included in the Region's development charges work plan as one of the facilities (three lanes eastbound) and while they recognize the need to build that, and if the Region cannot afford the improvement, Trinity will reluctantly agree to pay for it because it would be a benefit to them. On the other hand, the Development Charges Act is very clear that it cannot make the developer provide the service and to have to pay the full charge. Trinity truly believes that based on the small scale of the development he is willing to put in some major improvements, and while recognizing the benefits, such improvements will solve a situation that presently exists. With respect to the Motion for a separate bicycle lane, he believed a shared lane

would be appropriate especially since there is no othe bike lane within several hundred metres of this site.

Moved by J. Legendre

That a separate 1.5 metre bicycle lane be incorporated in the modifications to Innes Road between Cyrville Road and Stonehenge Crescent (west).

CARRIED

Councillor Holmes proposed the following Motion: “That the site plan be returned to the City of Gloucester to reverse the building and the parking.” She did not understand why the Region should continue with this type of planning which has driven people to a car-based society which is hostile to pedestrians. She recognized it was not the Committee’s mandate to approve or reject the site plan, but she was not prepared to see these types of developments coming forward. Safety on the street is important and eyes on the street are important. She proposed an additional Motion: “That the Women’s Action Centre be requested to hold a symposium on planning sites with parking lots in conjunction with the Planning and Transportation Departments regarding the safety of women.” She believed it would be very useful to have that seminar where the planning department of both the municipalities and the Region to discuss the type of planning that should be done for small or large sites to try and benefit pedestrians, transit users and cyclists - the whole basis of the Region’s new Official Plan.

The Committee Chair questioned whether it is within the committee’s power to return a site plan and the Solicitor advised the Committee did not have that mandate. The Solicitor advised it was not within the Committee’s mandate; it can only provide comments under the Planning Act. Consequently, the Committee Chair ruled the Motion Out of Order because it is not within the committee’s role.

Councillor Kreling acknowledged that there are Regional roads which are appropriate for commercial uses, where pedestrians would not normally walk to. He believed this is one of those areas which will attract people in motor vehicles because it is geared to traffic use and the Region must be open to these types of developments.

Councillor Legendre was not in favour of the report because the way the Region allows development to occur affects what happens on the roads e.g. speed. He accepted that some businesses are car oriented just by the very nature of their business i.e. bulk selling however, in this instance, there is a residential community across the road and this is essentially a strip mall which would attract pedestrian traffic.

Councillor Beamish questioned what happens if this report is rejected by Committee. Legal staff advised it would go as a negative report to Council. If Council approves the staff recommendations the public hearing process would then be initiated. The councillor

understood his colleagues concerns about site plans but urged them not to penalize the developer of this site because of the way the area municipality allows site plans to go forward. He suggested if there is a disagreement with this, staff should be directed to talk to the area municipalities about it, with the reminder that they have an obligation to ensure site plans conform to the Region's new Official Plan.

The Committee Chair suggested he send a letter to the City of Gloucester expressing the committee's concerns about the type of site plans they are sending to the Region. The Commissioner suggested it be a general letter to all municipalities with an outline that in future, site plans coming forward that do not conform to the spirit of the Regional Official Plan stand the possibility that they will not be sent forward and that they should so advise developers before sending the plans to staff for review. Councillor Beamish agreed that was much reasonable than turning down and penalizing this developer simply because the committee disagrees with what the local municipality is doing.

Councillor Davis questioned how staff ensure that if it hasn't gone to the Planning Department staff for review, should there not be something included in the report appraising them of what staff have said. The Commissioner advised there is a central approvals section that site plans are circulated to and Environment and Transportation Department staff have been working with the Planning Department and part of this problem comes in the scheduling and the amount of time between meetings at this particular time of year in order to get it to a September meeting. What has happened in the past, he explained, is that site plans are the purview of the local municipality and are forwarded to the Planning Department staff for comment, with the final decision being made by the area municipality and from this discussion, he understood the committee wanted to become more actively involved and to send a signal to municipalities that they not put developers through all of this without them realizing that that is what is going to happen with future reports that come forward.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve the installation of traffic control signals at Innes Road and Stonehenge Crescent (west intersection) and the construction of the associated roadway modifications along Innes Road as illustrated in Annex B, subject to the owner, Trinity Development Group;**
 - a. funding the total cost of the proposed road works 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 approve 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 as amended

YEAS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, H. Kreling, M. Meilleur, V. Waddell....5

NAYS: L. Davis, D. Holmes, J. Legendre....3

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Commissioners of Environment and Transportation and Planning write to all local municipalities requesting that proposed developments meet the new Regional Official Plan.

CARRIED

With respect to Councillor Holmes' Motion about the symposium, Councillor Beamish suggested it be amended to say "the Planning Departments of the RMOC and the area municipalities". The Committee Chair suggested the wording "and that local municipalities be encouraged to participate" and the Councillor agreed with the wording.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Women's Action Centre be requested to hold a symposium on planning sites with parking lots in conjunction with the Planning Department and the Environment and Transportation Department regarding the safety of women, and that local municipalities be encouraged to participate.

CARRIED

The Committee made note of the fact that since there will not be a Council meeting on 13 August, when this report would normally rise, the advertisement of this item would commence following this meeting with a public hearing, if required, being held on 3 September 1997 and the final report being submitted to Council on 10 September 1997.

ADDITIONAL ITEM

5. MERIVALE ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 63) ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS
AND TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS FOR CENTRAL PARK SUBDIVISION -
PUBLIC HEARING

- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 6 Aug 97

The Committee received a written submission from Lois K. Smith who was unable to attend the meeting. Miss Smith was not opposed to the modifications, however, she was opposed to approval of the additional portion of the northbound left-turn lane now because it implies present approval of the third entrance which she felt would not be appropriate for this busy roadway.

Staff advised the proposal will construct a continuous left-turn lane along the frontage of the site and Miss Smith's concern is with respect to the third lane that will be eventually provided opposite McCooey Lane. Dave Hatton, Cumming Cockburn and Associates, indicated the access in question is to a professional development of approximately 12 units and is of relatively low usage ie. during afternoon peak periods there were only two northbound left-turning vehicles into the site and ten vehicles exiting from the site during that period. Staff had agreed this could be an all-movements intersection with the idea there will be professional offices at the frontage with residential units at the back of the site. In consultation with the City of Ottawa, the consultant noted the municipality is satisfied the volumes are low enough at this access and would not present a problem as an all-movements access. When questioned how many units are planned for this development, he responded by stating there are 1100 units. Councillor Davis inquired whether there had been a downstream impact study done on increased traffic on neighbouring communities and Mr. Hatton indicated that the original study carried out in 1991 focused on the issues related to the adjacent arterials and the outcome of that was that there were certain modifications required to the arterial network. A more recent study this year examined the new development proposed and checked out what the new traffic generation would be and its about 25% down from the original proposal. That study also reviewed the trends in traffic on the adjacent arterials and on Baseline Road at Merivale Road the traffic is down by approximately 10% between 1991 and 1996. Taking all those factors into account, it was agreed that with the two proposed intersections and the configuration of Merivale Road that the impacts would be addressed. He confirmed that Parkdale Avenue will be one of the main routes used to get to downtown from this site.

Councillor Legendre noted Miss Smith's concerns about the future third entrance although he could not ascertain specifically why she was so opposed. The Committee Chair believed that since this is a heavily-travelled area she perceives some problems also she may not realize that only a portion of the traffic that might go into the professional building during peak hours especially, the choice exit would be at the signalized intersections which are the two entrances proposed today. He further confirmed with the

consultant that although there will be separate buildings they will all share the parking lots so they can work internally to the side streets to go to those signalized intersections.

Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

1, approve the drawing prepared by Cumming Cockburn Consulting Engineers as shown in Annex B, illustrating the proposed Merivale Road widening and construction of two intersections with traffic control signal installations subject to the developer:

- a. funding the total cost of the proposed works;
- b. executing a legal agreement with respect to (1) above.

2. That as part of the legal agreement between the proponent and the Region for the construction of a northerly access as shown in Annex C, the transfer of sufficient land along the easterly edge of the property to the northerly limit of the parcel as shown in Annex A be included to permit the construction of a bicycle lane.*

CARRIED
(L. Davis dissented)

* *This Motion was approved by Council during its consideration of the item on 9 July 1997.*

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. Highway Transfers

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner memo dated 7 Jul 97

Councillor Legendre questioned whether the figure of 37.65 (total estimated distance in linear kilometres) was from the amount already being transferred (1766 kilometres) or from the total of what has already been transferred (1766) and what will be transferred (3400). The Commissioner indicated this is the Region's portion of the additional 3400 kilometres that will be transferred province-wide. Councillor Legendre asked staff to follow-up with him the total number under these two transfer programs will be to the Region and Mr. Sheflin advised that staff are in the process of preparing a detailed report which will examine the financial implications, the per centage increase to the Regional system, et cetera and this should be available in September.

2. Refuse Receptacles Along Highway 17

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner memo dated 16 Jul 97

Councillor Kreling clarified that his request to have the refuse containers reinstated along Highway 17 should have included replacement of those removed from bus stop locations. The Commissioner indicated that in cases where you are far out on a highway system and you can't just drop the litter, there is a problem. However, sometimes these refuse containers actually attract more litter in the area because people do not put their trash in the receptacle. They (receptacles) may actually increase the amount of litter rather than decreasing it just by the very nature of them being there and staff were going to do some testing to determine if in fact that is the case. The councillor indicated the only locations he meant to reference were the bus shelters, acknowledging the need for these bins during the winter time also. The Commissioner confirmed staff would be addressing this as it gets closer to budget time.

INQUIRIES

Traffic Calming Studies

Councillor Davis made note of the traffic calming studies for Island Park/Kirkwood/Churchill and the Parkdale study and questioned whether the joint staff between the City of Ottawa and the Region had been prepared and will be brought forward in September. Staff advised this is planned to be brought forward at the second meeting in September. The councillor made reference to the NCC's decision to allow one year for the Outaouais and the Region to resolve issues surrounding the Champlain Bridge and she questioned there would be any staff recommendations coming forward in terms of how to deal with this; she hoped to have something brought forward by September. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner advised he would bring her inquiry to the attention of the Planning Commissioner since he is responsible for transportation planning issues.

Street Signs

Councillor Legendre made reference to a letter he received from a constituent complaining about the lack of road signs at intersections and questioned whether it was the Region's practice to have road signs at every intersection of a Regional road. The Commissioner advised staff have undertaken a major intersection overhead signing (at Regional roads) and all other street-name signs are the responsibility of the local municipality. In principle, both intersecting roads should be signed, but where the Regional road intersects a local road it is the responsibility of the municipality to sign it (except where it is signalized).

Street Vendors

Councillor Legendre referenced a letter from staff he was copied to which explained the conditions organizations/individuals must adhere to when they are soliciting/collecting donations from motorists on a Regional road. In view of the somewhat restrictive nature of those conditions, he questioned whether the Region's expectations were reasonable because it would appear some of these conditions were not being adhered to i.e. one condition states they cannot enter the roadway to collect donations, although by the very nature of their activity they have to enter the road to approach motorists. The Commissioner advised the councillor that the conditions work and if there are problems perhaps it can be revisited. He maintained those individuals carry out their activity in a safe manner and are cognisant of the conditions.

Refuse Containers at Bus Shelters

Councillor Legendre had another request from a constituent that refuse containers at bus shelters should be placed outside the shelter and he urged this be carried out. The Committee Chair made reference to the fact that something will be brought forward in September in conjunction with OC Transpo Commission going out for requests for bus stop seats which incorporate a waste receptacle and would also require the owners of the seats to be responsible for removal of the trash.

Future Reports - Inclusion of Transportation Master Plan Supportive Sections

Councillor Legendre indicated that in an attempt to adhere to the newly adopted Transportation Master Plan and Regional Official Plan, a section should be included in future reports that make reference to supportive statements from these two documents in favour of the staff recommendation(s) being brought forward.

Moved by J. Legendre

That staff include a section in future reports which cite the appropriate sections of the Transportation Master Plan and Official Plan (if appropriate) supportive of the staff recommendations.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR