

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING - Property located at 545 Fanshawe Park Road West (Z-8633)

- Scott Allen, MHBC, on behalf of the applicant - expressing support for the staff recommendation; pointing out that in light of the comprehensive staff report before the Committee and Mr. B. Turcotte, Senior Planner's detailed presentation, he will keep his initial comments very brief; indicating that they have recently met on a couple of occasions with AMICA representatives to better understand their concerns with the proposal; stating that, in their opinion, these discussions have generated positive dialogue and productive decisions; noting that through these discussions they have also clearly heard that residents safety is of paramount concern to AMICA residents and they fully agree; additionally, AMICA representatives have provided them with some recommendations on how they can improve the site design particularly with respect to pedestrian safety at the driveway entrances; pointing out that they intend to implement as many of these recommendations as is practical in an effort to minimize potential conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian traffic; advising the Committee that they continue to have dialogue with AMICA representatives on these matters; expressing appreciation to City staff for their diligence with respect to this application and their involvement with the consultation process.
- Father Greg Blonde, Chair, Residents Council of AMICA London - See attached communication.
- Michael Todesko, Todesko Engineering, on behalf of AMICA – indicating that he was asked to do a peer review of the Paradym Report; advising that there is not much disagreement as the Committee will see from his presentation; stating that they agree, as Mr. B. Turcotte, Senior Planner, mentioned there will be a capacity issue with making the outbound left turn from the York Development site to Fanshawe Park Road and Paradym has proposed a solution that is an acceptable way of prohibiting turns during the critical hours if it is to be implemented; pointing out that Paradym also looked at whether a traffic signal could be part of a solution for this; stating that, at the end of his presentation, he is going to be making a specific proposal to the Committee that the Committee include as a condition of approval; showing the Committee how he got there; reiterating that Paradym looked at whether or not a traffic signal was feasible or warranted; advising that there is not enough traffic coming from the York Developments site to justify a full traffic signal; suggesting perhaps a joint signal serving both AMICA's and York Development's traffic would be sufficient to warrant a signal but that is not the case; noting that a traffic signal to accommodate the traffic is not warranted but in the course of his research he came to realize that there is another type of signal that would be warranted in this circumstance and that is an intersection pedestrian signal or an IPS as they are called; advising that this is not a new thing to London, there are thirty-nine of them that have been installed and, in fact, the one that is most analogous to what they are looking for is on Gainsborough Road just west of Wonderland Road that serves a private driveway that the pedestrians and traffic on Gainsborough Road has stopped so that pedestrians can cross but the driveway also benefits from it; pointing out that the standards that London uses for assessing whether an intersection pedestrian signal is warranted is to look at the existing pedestrian volumes and if you look at the existing pedestrian volumes it is not that high and it is not that high because there is no crossing; advising that this is truly a case of if you build it, they will come; pointing out that on the south side there is an access to the open space; noting that there is a walkway and a bike way that the residents of AMICA and the residents of the future York Development will want to gain access to to get to that park system; indicating that an intersection pedestrian signal will facilitate that; advising that there is also transit, there is a bus stop on the north side but there is not one on the south side; noting that he has confirmed with the London Transit Commission that there is not a bus stop on the south side because there is not a safe way to cross the road; stating that if a pedestrian signal was installed in this location, he is confident that the London Transit Commission would see fit to install a bus stop so that the residents of AMICA and the York

development do not have to walk almost 400 metres to get to Wonderland Road to get to the nearest bus stop; suggesting that the pedestrian crossing would straddle the property line between AMICA and York Developments and the traffic on Fanshawe Park Road would be stopped in the westbound direction just east of AMICA and in the eastbound direction just west of the York access; pointing out that that would assist both AMICA and York's traffic getting to and from Fanshawe Park Road safely just as the pedestrian signal on Gainsborough Road works to facilitate traffic coming to and from the mall; suggesting that when the Committee approves this development, the Committee approve it conditional upon York installing a pedestrian intersection signal which is beneficial, not only to his client, but to the future residents; indicating that there is a bit of an issue that London's warrants for pedestrian signals require it to be based on existing numbers; asking the Committee to ask staff when they study the feasibility of this proposal to take into consideration future pedestrian volumes that would exist if the signal was there; noting that today the transit usage is paltry because there is no safe crossing and every transit trip, whether coming from or going to, involves, if they started on the north side they return on the south side and if they started on the south side they return on the north side so every transit trip involves crossing the road one way or another; stating that it has been suggested that the holding provision be dealt with at the site plan and approval stage and now he is getting outside of his area of expertise but it is his knowledge from the past that a third party such as AMICA is not party to that site plan approval process and they would not have any input in terms of the access issues if they are relegated today to some future date when the site plan is being considered; asking the Committee to consider this today and to make, as a condition of the Committee's approval, that this proposal be required of the applicant; showing the Committee the other signal at Gainsborough Road and the mall access; noting that this intersection is physically wider by approximately ten metres than what they are proposing; *(Councillor Squire enquires how the crosswalk will affect traffic going east and west on Fanshawe Park Road in terms of that flow of traffic having a pedestrian crosswalk there.);* responding that it will stop traffic for a relatively short period of time if it is triggered by a pedestrian and it will be for the length of time that it takes the pedestrian to cross the road, if it is triggered by a car wanting to make a left turn out from either AMICA or York it would be for a much shorter period; assuring the Committee that it will be less time than traffic is stopped at Wonderland Road so it is not going to impose a larger amount of signal green time at this location than they are already stopped at Wonderland Road; indicating that, subject to further detailed study, traffic will be able to maintain whatever signal progression there is; *(Councillor Squire understands what he is saying but wondering if he did any studies or anything like that because it is a busy road and he wonders what the effect of approving something like this would be on that traffic flow.);* indicating that that has not been done, he is measuring the traffic flow as they speak from AMICA but what he has asked the Committee to do as a condition of approval is to approve a pedestrian intersection signal subject to City staff confirming its feasibility in terms of the traffic flow and the number of pedestrians crossing and that he has asked the Committee to allow them to look at future pedestrian flows; expressing confidence that it is not going to significantly degrade the signal progression along Fanshawe Park Road; *(Councillor Helmer commenting that you were in some discussions with the London Transit Commission about the stops that they have on the south side of Fanshawe Park Road. There is one that is to the west of where they are talking about, approximately 300 metres. What did the London Transit Commission say about the possibility of locating a stop anywhere near this place where you would like to have a pedestrian crossing.);* responding that there is not that many people that use the stop on the north side today and it is not a surprise because you cannot safely get across the road or you have to walk a far distance and what they also said is that there is not a stop on the south side today because there is not a safe crossing and if and when there is a safe crossing, they will consider, at that time, putting a stop and he expects that they would consider it favourably; the key takeaway from his discussion today is that they have confirmed that there is no stop there because there is no safe crossing; *(Councillor Turner recognizing the extension of the pathway goes underneath the bridge at Fanshawe Park Road and Medway Creek to the east of AMICA with the addition of this building is there any plans to create a connection to that pathway to the recreational pathway system perhaps in behind the two buildings so that that connection could be made without having to cross over Fanshawe*

Park Road.); Mr. A. Macpherson, Manager, Environmental and Parks Planning, responding that that is something that they could take a look at, he is very pleased to hear that the pathway system is well received and well used; they could look at a connection if AMICA is that interested in a connection; it is a fairly steep slope from Fanshawe Park Road down to the river there with 15% plus grades which they do not normally encourage but from the back part of AMICA's property it is likely only half of that and it is a 50 metre length so if it is a key issue for them perhaps they could connect a pathway at their cost to the pathway system at the bottom there from their back amenity area that would directly solve this problem that they are speaking to; the other option is to have some kind of interconnection between these two sites near the back of the property as he heard from York's proposal they are connected into the storm pond to the north which connects to the next adjacent street which has a safe entrance to the Environmentally Significant Area so if cooperatively they could come up with some kind of an easement for public access both communities could connect either directly to the east or around to the back and connect another entrance into the Environmentally Significant Area and they would be happy to work with them; anticipating the question of can they get down to the path from their side he has a photograph that shows that it is not physically feasible for a connection to be made from AMICA to the pathway system on the north side because it is too steep; noting that is on the north side of Fanshawe Park Road. See attached photographs.

- Ajay Srivastava, 525 Sundance Place – expressing concern with the left turn signal; enquiring as to whether or not there have been shadow studies done in terms of how the shadow will impact the residences behind and how that will get the sunlight out of their houses for a long time; relating to the crosswalk, as you are coming down Fanshawe Park Road there is a fifteen percent grade and when cars are rushing down that and you can see from the video that cars are rushing down quite fast are we going to have more accidents in that area because of the crosswalk; Mr. B. Turcotte, Senior Planner, indicating that there was a shadow study done at the time of the first application and Mr. S. Allen, MHBC, can speak to that; Mr. S. Allen, MHBC, indicating that when they revised the design the shadow study was updated and the shadow impacts were essentially the same as what the original plan was; advising that he is not necessarily sure where the gentleman lives but if he lives north of the site, there are no shadow impacts on any of the residences in that area identified.