

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 Area Speed Limit Program

- R. Henderson – indicating that there are other municipalities in Ontario that have thirty kilometer speed limits, Toronto's East York committee councillors voted unanimously to reduce the speeds on residential streets to thirty, Hamilton has neighbourhood projects (different neighborhoods have voted for thirty), Ottawa has voted in neighbourhoods for thirty, there are many examples across Ontario specifically that have voted neighbourhoods or for the entire neighborhoods and residential streets.
- D. Hall, London Cycle Link – stating that he had the privilege of attending the Ontario bike summit in April, and one of the keynote speakers was a Dutch mobility expert, and he came to speak to a room full of people who want to see more bikes; indicating that he asked the speaker what can be done in North America to improve cycling and encourage more people to cycle and the response was to reduce your speed limits to thirty km/h in neighborhoods; stating that this is one of the top priorities as London Cycle Link, because it really does change the game for encouraging people to share space; indicating that on a lot of our neighborhood streets we are not going to see protected bike lanes and it does not make sense in a lot of contexts; stating that when we reduce the speed of heavy vehicles, suddenly it feels like the right speed to bike alongside and it is the right speed to let our kids play outside in the front yard; noting that there are lots of reasons why this is an important thing; indicating that we have a Cycling Master Plan that wants five percent mode share of cycling trips and we are only at 1.7% right now; stating that we need to do things to be bold in getting there and this is one of those decisions that can be bold to help us get there; noting that, with respect to the survey, he thinks it was impressive that there was that many responses to the survey, however, when asking people if they agree with forty or below forty km/hr it is really important to know who we are asking; stating that, for the most part, people experience the neighbourhood street through the windshield or behind the windshield of their car and when you drive through neighbourhood streets you feel confident and in control at fifty km/h, and especially at forty km/h and it feels slow behind the wheel of a car, but if your vantage point is on the sidewalk or your vantage point is on a bike, suddenly that forty or fifty km/h feels really fast; that that when you are walking with your kid, it feels very different, that speed, when you are beside traffic verses 'I am traffic'; stating that he would just like to ensure everybody is being surveyed; indicating that he thinks this is an important point that we have a chance to make something truly transformational in London and that this is a decision that can change the game to make our streets safer, to make it more enjoyable to use our front yards; indicating that it will reduce noise in our neighborhoods and it will reduce your inbox complaints about all the speeding you hear about; noting that signage alone will not be the answer, we cannot just put up signs and sit back and watch everyone slow down, that is not going to happen; indicating that photo radar will help but we need to also supplement that with traffic calming, and he knows that it will be the really expensive part of this but he thinks to have the goal be thirty km/h is the really important part; indicating that to say that we want traffic to be slow but let's not worry about compliance or non-compliance, let's set the right goal, and to say we want safe streets, let's have that be the goal and work toward it; stating that we know how to do it, we know how to design a road to get people to drive thirty km/h; stating that it will take some re-working, re-design and possibly some more money; indicating that we should use this opportunity in front of us and make a bold decision to make our streets safer, to encourage cycling, to encourage walking; stating that we do not have to go all at once, say thirty km/h in our whole city, we could do pilot projects, we can do thirty km/h on bike routes, there are lots of ways to implement this and test and approve before we maybe make a sweeping city-wide decision.

- T. Young – indicating that he is against the changing proposal for forty and thirty km/h; stating that he believes that the city has many issues already with traffic, the train downtown, King Street, which has gone from three lanes to now one when buses are stopped, with the new BRT certain areas are actually blocking traffic as opposed to getting off and diverting or having some sort of enclave that they can get out of the way; indicating that he believes that the city needs to move faster and more efficiently and he believes that we have lost a chance of having a ring road, that was done twenty years ago; noting that traffic, as it is right now, is not moving as efficiently as it should, and the vast majority of people are still driving, especially in winter and bicycles are not on the road as much; indicating that he drives for a living as he is a paramedic, so he sees the people who get hurt in these accidents, but he also drives around these people, and, this is anecdotal, but the people being picked up on these calls, he hates to say, but it ends up being the cyclists fault; stating that he feels that maybe education towards these cyclists might help; noting that he knows people who cycle for a living and are a part of associations would know these rules, but there is a vast majority people that drive downtown and bike downtown that are actually causing major problems and he thinks maybe too much onus is put on these drivers when a lot of it could actually be put back on the people who were in the accident in the first place.
- S. Miller, 32 Upper Avenue – indicating that she is speaking on behalf of the Oxford Park Community Association where she lives; expressing appreciation for having this important and overdue discussion on reducing speed limits in London; indicating that, like all neighbourhoods across our city, indeed, our country, increasing levels of vehicles speeding and the associated rates of injury and death is a growing public health crisis but we seem to shrug our shoulders as if the dangers associated with our car-centric lives are simply collateral damage, not something that can be avoided by thoughtful public policy and collective responsibility; stating that, in April 2018, one London Free Press article noted that the city research states that about a third of drivers in neighbourhoods speed over the limit, and the poll associated with the article asked, “Do drivers speed in your neighborhood?” and more than 90% responded ‘often’ or ‘sometimes’; noting that was more than fifteen hundred respondents; indicating that her local community association did a survey last year and 55% of the respondents in the neighborhood of over three hundred houses listed neighbourhood speeding as their number one concern; stating that this confirmed a 2017 safety audit that was done where participants also had numerous concerns regarding speeding; indicating that, despite these findings, traffic engineering staff have told their community that, according to their studies, our neighborhood does not have a speeding problem, and so, therefore, traffic calming measures are not being considered; enquiring as to why there is such a disconnect; indicating that, perhaps because speed limits are already too high for residential neighborhoods, and our roads are designed to enable – indeed, encourage – speeding, even above and beyond those limits; stating that, according to their research, London currently has no designed speed standards in its transportation design manual below sixty kilometers an hour; stating that this means that traffic engineering staff who are designing roads for fifty kilometers speed limit posting, they know that people are going to drive sixty kilometers or even faster; noting that we do not even notice it as drivers because our brains tell us that the road is designed to go that fast and that it is safe for us, when in fact we are driving a dangerous speed for neighbourhood roads; indicating that her neighborhood, Oxford Park, is going to be undergoing a long anticipated infrastructure renewal, including the water mains, new sewers and new roads and they are excited about this opportunity as it is long overdue; stating that they are really excited about addressing the root problem of speeding, which is outdated, dangerous and car-centric street design; stating that they have offered to collaborate with engineering staff and consultants on designing our new streets using progressive, safe street design as championed by organizations like the National Association of City

- Transportation Officials, the Center for Active Transportation and Love30Canada; indicating that they have offered to serve as a pilot model neighbourhood for progressive street design best practices but, unfortunately, those offers and requests have been declined; stating that they have also asked city staff to make a general presentation to residents on safe street design, but that has also been declined; indicating that they are now going to be working with a professor, Jason Gilliland, at Western University, who is going to come and speak to their association and talk to the neighbours and help educate them on what they can and should ask for when they see the city's proposed street designs later this fall; stating that the Oxford Park Community Association strongly supports reduced speed limits in residential and school areas throughout the city and they urge the Committee to adopt thirty km/h limits with enforcement using photo radar and police; indicating that thirty km/h, as other people here this evening have said, is an acknowledged safe street standard in many progressive jurisdictions around the world and, in conjunction and arguably even more importantly, they urge councillors to work with staff to ensure that all relevant road design standards and policies are updated as quickly as possible to reflect safe street design best practices; noting that these updates can begin to make effective changes on road reconstruction projects in existing residential neighborhoods and in all new subdivisions; stating that the conventional '3 Es' approach of engineering, education, and enforcement does not provide the guidance we need to design 21st century transportation and we must look beyond traditional professional disciplines across conventional boundaries to make our streets safe for everyone; noting that the new 'Es' of ethics, equity, and empathy should guide every urban designer, engineer; stating that, as citizens involved in shaping our city, we must embrace these values if we are to change the status quo and create a transportation system that is safe, efficient, equitable and sustainable; indicating that we cannot justify designs for speed and increased vehicle capacity on one hand while promising to deliver vision zero with the other.
- G. Hopcroft – stating that he would like to urge the Committee and staff to reconsider, in particular, part one of the recommendation, and that is applying the forty kilometer default speed limit on local and collector streets and residential areas throughout the city; indicating that he is prepared to agree and, he thinks most people are, that forty km/h is an appropriate speed limit in some places, and in other cases much lower depending on the number of driveways, the amount of conflicts in terms of other traffic in the area, and so on; noting that, as he reads it, this would apply to areas without driveways as well as those with driveways and he will harken back to Mr. Maguire's comment earlier, which he has heard in this Chamber and other rooms in this building many times that there needs to be acceptance of whatever rules command, there needs to be a public consensus before people will willingly comply with whatever by-laws this Committee and Council see fit to pass; stating that applying a 'one size fits all' approach is not the appropriate way to approach this, and he does not think it is a way that most Londoners would accept as an appropriate way of dealing with it; noting that there are a lot of streets where the existing speed limit – "it ain't broke, so why fix it?", fix those where speeding is a problem and where the speed limit is a problem and he would differentiate between the two; stating that an issue dealing with the speed limit enforcement issue, and in his experience, many people complaining about speeding in our neighborhoods are not complaining about the speed limit – they are complaining about people that consistently exceed the speed limit on those streets; stating that he does not belittle the fact that in some cases the speed limit is as well too high, but it is the enforcement issue which has always been an issue and the photo radar is a solution in terms of those that do not see fit to comply for other reasons; noting that he thinks it would be a huge mistake to take a cookie cutter, one size fits all approach to the streets around this city, and that this should be done on a street by street basis; noting that it is hard work, but do we want compliance and do we want to

- address the real problems, or do we want to create a regulatory environment where most Londoners don't see fit to comply because they see so many cases where the regulations are excessive; indicating that we have seen, time and time again, when they get that sense, they are more likely not to comply, not just in those areas where they are not warranted in their view, but also in those areas that they may be unfamiliar with where it is warranted; stating that if we want to promote peoples compliance on a voluntary basis, he thinks that the street by street approach and the classification of those streets is the right way to go; noting that there is a lot of data in this report and he would like to ask a few questions in terms of that that data; stating that, first of all, there has been a lot of data in here about collision statistics but there is nothing about injuries or the severity of those injuries and tying that to the speed involved in the collision or the speed limit on that street; noting that he really does not find the collision data that helpful in terms of understanding what it is we are trying to fix; noting that the second issue is that he does not see any reference in the report, and he is assuming that is because there is no reference, there has not been any consultation with emergency services; noting that he would like at least one other person in this room have some experience in the provision of emergency services, and we all know that reduced speed limits reduce ambulance response times; enquiring as to whether EMS was consulted about this and what is the impact on response times in our community; indicating that another question he has is with respect to the London Transit Commission, and he knows that they are moving into an environment where they are trying to have better compliance with route schedules and on-time performance and he sees nothing in here that is going to help them maintain what they have, what is the cost to that, and what is the impact on the routes that would be affected by the regulations that are proposed here; stating that he urges the Committee to seek the answers to those questions and to take a considered approach to this, and addressing this where it needs to be addressed, rather than applying something across the city which may not be needed.
- L. Patricio, London Cycle Link – stating that he has a couple of comments; indicating that he heard two presentations, one from Ms. Henderson and she had social, economic and health arguments to support the thirty kilometers limit, and he heard another presentation, and the main argument there is that, because drivers will not obey this limit, this will be dangerous; stating that he heard some concerns, as well, on the sense that we need to make sure that whatever regulations we have, we do have people respecting those regulations, and he thinks this is inverse logic; stating that if you do not have respect, we should not keep the speed limits high; indicating that if we know that this is the safest approach, we should make sure that those people, they will be voluntarily following the limits because this is the way our roads are designed; noting that, interestingly, we did not hear an argument about the efficiency or the health benefits if you keep our limits at forty or fifty kilometers, because the people who understand what transportation and road design is, they know that this is not the case; stating that addressing the concerns about efficiency and health, the car in any city is the most inefficient mode of transportation; stating that if you create a city where we promote and encourage cycling and walking and transit, we will have a more efficient transportation system, and we will have less injuries and fatalities.
 - C. Linton – stating that he is speaking as a public citizen, not as Chair of the Cycling Advisory Committee; indicating that he would generally support the reduction of speed limits, as proposed by staff, or even to the thirty km/h as well; indicating that a couple of the points from the people who oppose this actually kind of make the case for people who are wanting to try cycling and they are riding on the sidewalk; noting that they will feel safer if they are riding on a street where the speed limit is posted lower and traffic speed is going lower, so they feel more safe so they are going to be off the sidewalk and where they should be on the road; stating that there were a couple of points that he took out of there that were actually reasons to lower the speed

limit, not keep them where they are; indicating that, as a motorist, if we want to keep the city moving, the best thing for that is to get more people on bikes and on transit, because the fewer cars there are on the road to begin with, the better that traffic is going to flow.

- M. Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue – stating that there is a very over-arching issue here that has not been addressed with the reduction in the speed limit, on April 23rd, 2019, this Council adopted a climate emergency by-law - or motion, where you asked for tangible ways of battling greenhouse gases and our carbon footprints; stating that this speed limit, if it is reduced from fifty to thirty km/h, you are increasing greenhouse gases; noting that it is settled in un-controverted science from Virginia Tech and European studies; indicating that he understands where you are coming from with trying to do this, but reducing the speed limit is not going to slow people down from speeding; noting that enforcement is the only way; stating that he understands that you need community safety zones in order to put the automated speed enforcement stuff in place, but if you keep it at 50 km/h and ticket everybody who does fifty-two, someone like me is going to drive forty-five; stating that the person who is going to get that ticket is going to get it regardless whether it is thirty or fifty there; noting that the gentleman who is not here right now said that the report did not show much about the severity of injuries, and I do not want to put a price or anything on safety - safety is very important -but we really need the hard statistics for this; indicating that it is a solution looking for a problem; noting that he has said that before on other issues; indicating that, in this case, we have not even addressed this increased enforcement, absolutely; noting that, with respect to the ASE's, it is putting the cart ahead of the horse, it is putting the cart ahead of an unborn horse, being that the regulations in Ontario have not even been updated to allow for that yet; referencing a pilot project in Toronto, and, if he is assuming correctly, possibly other places; indicating that we do know what PC provincial governments like to do with what has come before them; stating that one other thing he did not see in here is when all the BRT discussion was going on, there was a value of time saved that was addressed in those; noting that, in this case here, there is nothing that shows value of time lost; stating that he knows it might be grasping at straws, possibly, but this will reduce peoples time; indicating that a by-law will not remove us from a car-centric culture and if that is the intention of the by-law, it is not going to work; stating that people are still going to need to use their vehicles; noting that the main, salient point he wants to bring across here is that we are actually doing less for the environment by reducing the speed limit in this zone, in this thirty to eighty zone; stating that, ideally, for a gas engine, the ideal for the least fuel consumption is between sixty and eighty km/h; stating that he is not saying that we should increase limits to sixty km/h, but we have not even looked at this issue here and he does not think this is going to push people to walk more, bike more.