

## ACCAC – Built Environment and Facilities Sub-Committee (BEFSC)

# MEETING REPORT

Monday, July 11, 2016

Present: J. Sanders, F. DeLasa, M. Dawthorne, M. Cairns, L. Firby

Guest: Daryl Diegel (Facility Services)

Start: 7:00pm

### 1. Review, updates of Active items

#### a) Playground Survey:

- <https://www.london.ca/city-hall/accessibility/Pages/Accessible-Playground-Survey.aspx>
- Reported that participation/responses has been very poor to-date (3 total)
- Discussion with regards to how we can improve participation also showed little action in that both the City and our members have already contacted our available contacts. Optimistic suggestion was made that as school has only been out for a week, perhaps completed survey numbers will improve shortly.
- Further suggestion was made that the Communications Department may be able to provide further support for this project. (J. Sanders to follow up, and report back)

#### b) Accessible Cab Policy:

- No update (pending receipt of trip-summary usage report)

#### c) Accessible Pedestrian Signals:

- Received report from Sheila Dinnin, Paul Perna of CNIB with comments regarding several intersections they (on behalf of CNIB) have recognised as concerns  
Re: included as attachment to this report

#### Request for Motion 1:

That the attached review of intersections relative to the prioritization of audible pedestrian signals be received, and forwarded for implementation/consideration to Shane Maguire (Division Manager, Roadway Lighting and Traffic Control).

Continued,

## 2. FADS document Review (with Daryl Diegel)

- It was presented to us that the 2007 document is scheduled to be revised and republished with a release timeline of “early 2017”
- Although a draft version of the revisions is currently in circulation it is still considered an internal document as there are many departments that are required to provide input/support to this document. Note: there is some discussion for separation of indoor and outdoor spaces from it’s scope.
- From our position as Advisory Committee representatives for Accessibility, and our understanding of the document’s content and scope, we (ACCAC) have some notable concerns relative to recent discussions for changes to the FADS document.  
Re: Most notably discussions for separation or removal of Outdoor Spaces from it’s scope.

### Request for Motion 2:

- a) That Council review any proposed changes that are being considered for the FADS document with regards to it’s scope and/or our concerns (listed below) relative to either the inclusion, or separation, of Outdoor Space requirements in particular.
- b) That Council reviews the timeline expectation for completion of this document revision.

Our concerns include (but are not limited to) the following:

- i. That as the FADS definition of Facility includes “*buildings, structures, site improvement, complexes, equipment, roads, walks, passageways, parks, parking lots or other real or personal property located on a site*”, the document must then adequately address all spaces within. (re: outdoor spaces should not be removed, or left to stand alone as a separate document) Our rationale is that in the 2007 version (Clause 4.5.2) Outdoor Recreational Facilities have already been included with general design performance statements. Furthermore, these outdoor spaces were included within that version with the rationale that opportunities for recreation, leisure, and sport activities should be available to all members of the community.
- ii. As this document is used a comprehensive resource tool for many municipality’s beyond our City and that it is, by design, a user-friendly single-source compilation of several AODA reference documents (Re: O Reg 191/11, O Reg 413/12, CSA-Z614 Annex H, and O.B.C.), it is imperative (in our opinion) that it remain as a singular focused document for accessibility throughout all aspects of our City, whether indoors or outdoors.
- iii. With regards to outdoor spaces in particular, we see many design-requirement aspects of the existing FADS document that could be enhanced or improved-upon with an updated revision. In particular, our Advisory Committee has gone to great lengths since the 2007 version to address design concerns we’ve had with Parking, Sidewalks, Community Gardens, Playgrounds, and Recreational Trails and Pathways, simply because they had not yet been considered in detail within that version of FADS.
- iv. A recent concern that we have is with the expected timeline for completion (early 2017) becoming a restriction for this document to adequately address the complexity of design requirements for outdoor spaces. In that, if the scope of the revised document is to be expanded upon (to be more inclusive of outdoor spaces) as we suggest, and recognizing that the task of including the many details for outdoor spaces may be considerable, that the staff’s timeline may no longer be achievable.  
Re: our fear is that in an effort to achieve that timeline expectation, important design requirements of outdoor spaces may remain simply as-is with “general recommendations” only, which may then not be addressed again for many years.  
Suggest that if indeed outdoor spaces are to be included with focus and detail, the expected timeline for completion may need to be extended “as long as necessary” for staff to provide an effective document for our Committee review. (as per our 2016 Work Plan)

#### **4. Site Plan Review**

- Three site plans have been submitted this month to the Committee, and Sub-Committee, Chairs for review
- Suggestion was made that our Sub-Committee work on establishing a “best practice” protocol for both site plan submissions, and a general compliance checklist going forward

#### **5. Announcement: East Lions Community Centre**

<https://www.london.ca/residents/Recreation/announcements/Pages/New-East-Community-Centre.aspx>

#### **6. Next Meeting**

- Tuesday, August 2, 2016, 8:00-9:00 pm (note: both date and time change from typical)  
South London Community Centre, Wakefield Room A

Adjournment: 8:10 pm

## ACCAC – Built Environment and Facilities Sub-Committee (BEFSC)

### **NOTES and COMMENTS: Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS)**

as provided to our sub-committee, by request, from CNIB(Canadian National Institute for the Blind)

- 1) In general, intersections surrounding Hospitals, College and University access points should always be recognized as priorities.
- 2) Intersection of Baseline and Wellington (Int # 454, **APS Priority 39**, Peds 890)
  - Proximity to the CNIB office and support facility to/from transit routes
  - Pedestrian traffic to/from shopping mall
- 3) Intersection of Oxford and McNay (Int # 263, **APS Priority 170**, Peds 268)
  - Blind pedestrian recently struck while crossing the east side of the intersection at Oxford and McNay St (walking south to north). Evidently the vehicle was making a left turn (from McNay onto Oxford?) and crossing her path
  - An APS at this intersection would have audibly confirmed that the pedestrian was starting at the correct opportunity.
  - Pedestrian traffic to/from elementary school at that intersection
- 4) Intersection of Dufferin and Talbot (Int # 313, **APS Priority 127**, Peds 494)
  - In 2015 this intersection was under construction (not sure why they were not added at that time)
  - High pedestrian traffic to downtown, restaurants, Budweiser Gardens, Harris Park
- 5) Intersection of Hamilton and Elm (Int # 808, **APS Priority 15**, Peds 149)
  - Proximity to School, Maple Village group home
  - It is the only light between Highbury and Egerton  
Re: very long stretch of road with many small business on the south side
- 6) Intersection of Baseline and Wharncliffe (Int # 452, **APS Priority 34**, Peds 1,299)
  - Within the next few years there will be a housing development on Centre Street which has units set aside for a number of people who are Deaf/Blind and will be accessing the business and transit stops at this intersection
- 7) Intersection of Hamilton and Adelaide (Int # 374, **APS Priority 37**, Peds 1,245)
  - A busy intersection!
  - The angle of the intersection adds to the difficulty to maintain a straight line of travel
- 8) Intersection of Wonderland and Westmount Mall(Int # 148, **APS Priority 119**, Peds 556)
  - Question whether or not the current traffic light provides enough time for a pedestrian to cross Wonderland Road (suggest confirm 1 meter per second rule)
  - Curb configuration on east side of road causes a pedestrian to negotiate two curbs before reaching the roadway to crossover  
Re: creates unsteadiness and takes seconds longer for user to negotiate the cross-over
  - Numerous Apartment buildings on east side of road cross over this intersection for access to-from transit stops at mall entrance
- 9) General Concern: Sidewalk Patios
  - Concern is that once these are installed there may not be enough room to negotiate around them, users standing outside of them, and other items on the boulevard (such as trees, signage, bikes, bikes attached to signage, etc.)