

Cycling Advisory Committee

Report

The 4th Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee
February 19, 2020
Committee Room #4

Attendance PRESENT: J. Roberts (Chair), B. Cowie, C. DeGroot, R. Henderson, B. Hill, J. Jordan, C. Pollett, E. Raftis, O. Toth and D. Turner (Committee Clerk)

NOT PRESENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: G. Dales, A. Giesen, Sgt. S. Harding, P. Kavcic, T. MacDaniel, L. Maitland, A. Miller, A. Rosebrugh, and M. Stone

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 PM.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Scheduled Items

2.1 Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities (AODA) Orientation

That it BE NOTED that the presentation from M. Stone, Supervisor I, Municipal Policy (AODA), as appended to the agenda, with respect to 'Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities' customer service training, was received.

2.2 Dundas-TVP Connection

That it BE NOTED that the presentation from Z. Petch and S. Hayman, Representatives from IBI Group, as appended to the agenda, with respect to the planned Dundas - Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) connection, was received.

3. Consent

3.1 2nd Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the 2nd Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on January 15, 2020, was received.

3.2 Municipal Council Resolution - 11th and 1st Reports of the Cycling Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution from its meeting held on January 14, 2020, with respect to the 11th and 1st Reports of the Cycling Advisory Committee, was received.

3.3 Municipal Council Resolution - 2nd Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee

That, in light of the discussion-heavy format of the 2020 Ontario Bike Summit ('Share the Road') conference, the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020 Cycling Advisory Committee (CAC) Budget:

a) a second member of the CAC BE PERMITTED to attend the above-noted conference; and,

b) the expenditure of up to \$375.00 + tax from the 2020 CAC budget BE APPROVED to cover the conference fees for the additional attendee;

it being noted that the Municipal Council resolution from its meeting held on February 11, 2020, with respect to the 2nd Report of the CAC, was received.

3.4 Letter of Resignation - K. Brawn

That the City Clerk BE REQUESTED to fill the existing vacancies in the Cycling Advisory Committee (CAC) membership in order that the CAC meet its full potential given the breadth and depth of the committee's objectives, as espoused in its 2020 work plan;

it being noted that the CAC strongly supports a re-staffing process that emphasizes and results in an equitable committee composition, including (but not limited to) diversity in gender, accessibility, age, et cetera.

4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

4.1 2020 Work Plan Sub-Committee

That it BE NOTED that the committee held a general discussion with respect to its 2020 work plan;

it being further noted that discussion around item 5.3 on the agenda resulted in the removal of 'E-Bike Programs' from the committee's 2020 work plan.

4.2 Old East Village Bikeway Working Group

That the Municipal Council BE REQUESTED to forward the attached communications to Dillon Consulting and WSP, respectively, for their consideration;

it being noted that the above-noted communications were drafted by the Old East Village Bikeway Working Group and approved by the Cycling Advisory Committee in response to the developers' presentations and call for feedback at the CAC's December 18, 2019 meeting.

5. Items for Discussion

5.1 Development Charges - Discussion

That a more in-depth discussion with respect to development charges BE DEFERRED to the next meeting of the Cycling Advisory Committee;

it being noted that the committee held a brief, general discussion with respect to this matter.

5.2 Connected and Automated Vehicles - Progress Review

That it BE NOTED that the committee held a general discussion with respect to the Connected and Automated Vehicle (CAV) Strategic Plan; it being further noted that the committee made revisions to a draft letter that will eventually be forwarded to the Civic Administration in response to the call for feedback/input on the CAV Strategic Plan.

5.3 E-bike Programs - Preliminary Discussion

That it BE NOTED that the committee held a general discussion with respect to E-Bike usage, E-Bike classifications, and the difficulty of enforcing proper usage in the absence of concrete Provincial legislation and regulations.

5.4 City of London Commuter Survey

That it BE NOTED that the committee held a general discussion with respect to the City's recently completed 'Commuter Survey', including feedback on the survey's language/format and the survey's value in relation to the potential creation of Transportation Management Associations in London.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:38 PM.

February 13, 2020
Jamieson Roberts
Chair, Cycling Advisory Committee
City of London, Ontario
300 Dufferin Ave
London, ON N6B 1Z2

Mike Pletch
Dillon Consulting

Dear Mr. Pletch,

Thank you for attending the 12th meeting (2019) of the Cycling Advisory Committee, and presenting your ongoing work on regarding the Old East Village (OEV) Bikeway. The intent of this letter is to follow up with questions regarding the work, and to request further input on your ongoing projects. Written follow-up would be appreciated on or before March 31, 2020.

Regarding the intersection at Dundas-Lyle-Elizabeth Streets. Generally speaking, the intersection is complex, unprotected for cyclists and pedestrians, and has three separate motor vehicle phases. It received the largest amount of discussion from the committee, and will receive the majority of the discussion in this follow-up as well. The committee has several concurrent concerns regarding this junction:

- The “jughandle” left turn onto northbound Elizabeth Street may not be wide enough, nor have sufficient turning radius, to accommodate cargo bikes, adaptive cycles, bikes with trailers (including double-wide children trailers), tag-a-longs, or other non-standard bicycles. How will the team ensure accommodation of para-cyclists, family cyclists, and other wheeled vehicles in this space?
- A “scramble” style crossing for pedestrians and cyclists was suggested in the committee discussion, and we re-emphasize here that this treatment may be better for all parties, rather than mixing motor traffic with vulnerable road users.
- Barring a scramble crossing, right-turn only may be preferred for motor vehicles, to decrease conflict between motorists and vulnerable road users. The unusual nature of the intersection suggests additional controls would be beneficial for all users.
- Would your team consider raised crosswalks and cycle crossings, particularly on Dundas crossing Lyle Street?
- Leading green pedestrian and cycling intervals would be beneficial for avoiding “right hook” turns from motor vehicles turning off Dundas.
- No right on red is essential in all directions to ensure all user safety. In the drawings we received, there is only no right on red from Lyle onto Dundas.
- Some members found it problematic that cyclist and pedestrian crossings were limited (e.g. English Street junction has no left turn for cyclists), yet motorists movements were prioritized at all junctions.
- We heard in the meeting that much of the above was considered, and that our suggestions would make the intersection safer (the suggestions of our group were similar to those provided by subcontractor Urban Systems). However, these ideas were not put into practice in the design because “the developers probably wouldn’t go for that.” What does this mean, exactly? Who is accountable/responsible for safe design of streets in our city?

Other more general comments

- What is the plan for snow removal in the corridor, particularly the narrow section between Adelaide and Elizabeth?
- How will the west end of the bikeway connect seamlessly with the next planned bikeway leg? This junction seems particularly well-suited to a protected intersection, given the high pedestrian and cycling volumes, and considerable extra space to accommodate additional safety features.
- As “salmon” riding (e.g. “wrong way cycling”) is common on King Street’s protected bike lane, where similar to this Dundas design, there are no westbound cycling facilities. What is being done to prevent this behaviour in the OEV?
- While not discussed in-meeting, a 30 km/h speed limit would be preferable, particularly in the “core” of the OEV from Adelaide to Ontario Streets, where substantial volumes of pedestrians are present.
- Short term bicycle parking in this area should be the standard “bike staple” design that is accessible to all types, shapes, and sizes of bike, both standard and non-standard as outlined above. Current post-and-ring design should be phased out, as this design is not as accessible as the tried-and-true bike staple. Decorative/artistic bike parking should only be included as public art, not as a component of regular required bike parking.
- Finally, we have included an infographic from Dutch cycling organization BYCS illustrating potential user groups of the OEV Bikeway. Could you please provide a brief overview (2-3 sentences for each) of how the OEV Bikeway serves, or does not serve, each type of cyclist.

Thank you for your time and consideration, we await your responses.

Sincerely,

Jamieson Roberts

On Behalf of the City of London Cycling Advisory Committee

cc:

Doug Macrae, City of London Director of Roads & Transportation

Peter Kavcic, City of London

Andrew Giesen, City of London

Daniel Turner, City of London

Councillor S. Lehman, Chair, City of London Civic Works Committee

Councillor M. Cassidy, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee

Councillor E. Peloza, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee

Councilor P. Van Meerbergen, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee

Councillor S. Lewis, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee

THE DUTCH CATEGORISE CYCLISTS INTO SIX GROUPS



THE EVERYDAY CYCLIST

Someone trying to get to work or school, taking a direct route & wishing to continue cycling undisturbed, wanting to stop as rarely as possible.



THE SPORTS CYCLIST

Someone doing cycling for sport, including mountain bikers, road racers & others. They tend to cycle in laps or for a long distance, moving very quickly, which can lead to conflict with other road users & even other cyclists!



THE RECREATIONAL CYCLIST

Someone cycling for the enjoyment of being on their bike and with others, stopping commonly for food, coffee or at other attractions.



THE ATTENTIVE CYCLIST

Someone who wants to be able to cycle safely, understands the traffic rules well and also wants to follow them. They want good sign posting, and clear intersections.



THE VULNERABLE CYCLIST

Someone who wants a traffic-safe, peaceful cycling environment, where they are not passed by other traffic and even other faster cyclists; infrastructure must be forgiving to allow for errors. They tend to be children, the elderly and disabled people.



THE COURIER CYCLIST

Someone who wants to get from A to B very quickly because they cycle under time pressure. They also often require more space. They represent a range of riders, some wearing large backpacks, others using three or four wheel cargo bikes.

Source: <https://safercycling.roadsafetyngos.org/best-practice-guide/> via https://twitter.com/cycling_embassy/status/1231609933726089216?s=21

February 13, 2020
Jamieson Roberts
Chair, Cycling Advisory Committee
City of London, Ontario
300 Dufferin Ave
London, ON N6B 1Z2

Stephen Tam and John Zunic
WSP Consulting

Dear Mr. Tam and Mr. Zunic,

Thank you for attending the 12th meeting (2019) of the Cycling Advisory Committee, and presenting your ongoing work on regarding the Dundas Street Bikeway. The intent of this letter is to follow up with questions regarding the work, and to request further input on your ongoing projects. Written follow-up would be appreciated on or before March 31, 2020.

Much of the committee's discussion centred on intersection design and connectivity with other routes.

- In the opinion of this committee, most of the cross streets in this section warrant a protected intersection to create a comfortable all-ages-and-abilities bikeway. Particularly Wellington, Waterloo, Colborne, William, and Adelaide need protected crossings for children, seniors, and other vulnerable cyclists to use the facilities.
- Setback crossings and adjacent crossings may be used contextually. Middle bicycle lanes or shared crossings should never be used in all-ages-and-abilities context.
- Protected intersections are preferable to two-stage-queue boxes. The "Ontario Bike Box" design used on Colborne (e.g. OTM Book 18 Figure 4.50) should never be used in any context. It is not all-ages-and-abilities friendly in any sense, and we could not find another jurisdiction with high rates of cycling that has used this design.
- How will the west end of the bikeway connect seamlessly with Dundas Place?
- How will the east end of the bikeway connect seamlessly with the OEV bikeway in both directions (e.g. how do on-road cyclists traveling westbound from the OEV toward downtown join the protected bikeway)?

Other more general comments and answers from your presentation

- Transit islands are greatly preferred to designs that require passengers boarding a bus to wait in the bike lane, or to step blindly off the bus into the bike lane. Lesson from King Street: the transit islands/timing points under Citi Plaza work reasonably well.
- Raised cycletrack, with raised crossings are preferable to at-grade crossings with precast concrete curbs.
- Widths of cycling facilities need to accommodate adaptive cycles, recumbents, trikes, double-wide child trailers, cargo bikes, and other non-standard cycling equipment. Standard Dutch design allows for two-up riding on standard bicycles with a child beside a parent, which we as a committee think sounds great. Lesson from Colborne Street: Colborne does *not* work for most non-standard bicycles.
- While not discussed in-meeting, a 30 km/h speed limit would be preferable, as this stretch of Dundas is a connector between two slower speed areas, the Old East Village, and Dundas Place, while passing two high schools and many residential/hotel properties. Consistency of speed limits

through the whole section from Ridout to Ontario Street would also assist in maintaining driver compliance, and would boost safety for all road users. Currently much of this stretch is over-wide, and feels like riding on a highway. Narrowing and slowing wherever possible would be greatly appreciated.

- Bollard placement and height was discussed in-meeting. High, closely-spaced flexi-posts as are currently deployed on King Street make children and sport cyclists in drop-bar position nearly invisible. Are there better standards or materials that could effectively protect cyclists while allowing them to be visible, too?
- Short term bicycle parking in this area should be the standard “bike staple” design that is accessible to all types, shapes, and sizes of bike, both standard and non-standard as outlined above. Current post-and-ring design should be phased out, as this design is not as accessible as the tried-and-true bike staple. Decorative/artistic bike parking should only be included as public art, not as a component of regular required bike parking.
- Finally, we have included an infographic from Dutch cycling organization BYCS illustrating potential user groups of the Dundas Street Bikeway. Could you please provide a brief overview (2-3 sentences for each) of how the Dundas Street Bikeway serves, or does not serve, each type of cyclist.

Thank you for your time and consideration, we await your responses.

Sincerely,

Jamieson Roberts
On Behalf of the City of London Cycling Advisory Committee

cc:

Doug Macrae, City of London Director of Roads & Transportation
Peter Kavcic, City of London
Andrew Giesen, City of London
Daniel Turner, City of London
Councillor S. Lehman, Chair, City of London Civic Works Committee
Councillor M. Cassidy, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee
Councillor E. Peloza, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee
Councilor P. Van Meerbergen, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee
Councillor S. Lewis, Member, City of London Civic Works Committee

THE DUTCH CATEGORISE CYCLISTS INTO SIX GROUPS



THE EVERYDAY CYCLIST

Someone trying to get to work or school, taking a direct route & wishing to continue cycling undisturbed, wanting to stop as rarely as possible.



THE SPORTS CYCLIST

Someone doing cycling for sport, including mountain bikers, road racers & others. They tend to cycle in laps or for a long distance, moving very quickly, which can lead to conflict with other road users & even other cyclists!



THE RECREATIONAL CYCLIST

Someone cycling for the enjoyment of being on their bike and with others, stopping commonly for food, coffee or at other attractions.



THE ATTENTIVE CYCLIST

Someone who wants to be able to cycle safely, understands the traffic rules well and also wants to follow them. They want good sign posting, and clear intersections.



THE VULNERABLE CYCLIST

Someone who wants a traffic-safe, peaceful cycling environment, where they are not passed by other traffic and even other faster cyclists; infrastructure must be forgiving to allow for errors. They tend to be children, the elderly and disabled people.



THE COURIER CYCLIST

Someone who wants to get from A to B very quickly because they cycle under time pressure. They also often require more space. They represent a range of riders, some wearing large backpacks, others using three or four wheel cargo bikes.

Source: <https://safercycling.roadsafetyngos.org/best-practice-guide/> via https://twitter.com/cycling_embassy/status/1231609933726089216?s=21