

MAIL paula.lombardi@siskinds.com

FILE NO. 15041

Delivered by Email to the Cathy Saunders, City Clerk (csaunders@london.ca)

August 20, 2020

Mayor and Members of Council
The Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London ON N6A 4L9

Cathy Saunders
City Clerk
The Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London ON N6A 4L9

Your Worship and Members of Council:

Re: **Reconsideration Request – Second Sidewalk
Silverleaf Chase and Silver Creek Crescent – City of London**

We have been retained by several property owners residing along Silverleaf Chase and Silver Creek Crescent, City of London ("Clients"). On August 10, 2020, our Clients appeared before the City of London's Planning Environment Committee ("PEC") to seek a reconsideration of City Council's decision of July 21, 2020 denying their request that City Council stop the installation of the sidewalk on the east side of Silverleaf Chase and the inside portion of Silver Creek Crescent ("Subject Area"). Our Clients requested that the PEC reconsider its decision to require the installation of the second sidewalk in the Subject Area. On August 10, 2020 PEC denied our Clients request for reconsideration.

The existing road width in the Subject Area is approximately 6 m (edge of curb to edge of curb) in a 20 m standard road right-of-way and surprisingly 1.5 m concrete sidewalks have been proposed on both sides of the road.

Our Clients are formally requesting that a motion be brought forward by City Council to reconsider its decision as it relates to the installation of the second sidewalk based on the new information provided by our Clients including but not limited to the Baird I AE architecture + engineering report dated August 18, 2020 ("Baird Report"). Our Clients retained Baird I AE architecture + engineering as an independent third party to complete an independent third party review of the Subject Area.

DIRECT
TELEPHONE (519) 860-7878
FACSIMILE (519) 860-7879

HEAD OFFICE
TELEPHONE (519) 872-2121
FACSIMILE (519) 872-8085

4375628

With Council's reconsideration of its decision, our Clients request that the City amend the existing requirements set out in the Subdivision Agreement or any other development agreement for the Subject Area to remove the requirement for the installation of the second sidewalk.

BAIRD REPORT

The Baird Report concludes that the current design of the road, including the second sidewalk in the Subject Area, creates problems in the Subject Area from a traffic, congestion and safety perspective. The Baird Report notes numerous developments in the City of London situated outside of the Subject Area have utilized a paved parking lane in the boulevard instead of requiring a second sidewalk specifically to avoid the safety issues being created by this requirement in the Subject Area.

The professional opinion set out in the Baird Report confirms that the use of a parking lane creates space for on street parking, reduces congestions on the road, provides room for garbage trucks and school buses while ensuring that no safety issues / concerns arise due to the inability of emergency vehicles to effectively access the Subject Area.

The Baird Report appropriately notes that the current design of road including the installation of 1.5 m concrete sidewalks on both sides of the road results in significant safety concerns in the Subject Area.

We note that the City in its "City Wide Urban Design Manual" recommends a roadway width of 8.0 m to create pedestrian-friendly and walkable neighbourhoods in both greenfield and infill contexts. There is no requirement that the existing road width in the Subject Area is necessary or required to improve the pedestrian and living experience. The City does not have any specific design standards supporting the requirement of the 6.0 m road with sidewalks on both sides.

The Baird Report recommends a simple solution to these concerns being the removal of the proposed second sidewalk to benefit the current parking situation and allow existing residents to park additional vehicles in their driveway reducing the requirement for on street parking. The elimination of the second sidewalk in the Subject Area will also mitigate our Client's safety concerns.

SAFETY CONCERNS / RESTRICTIONS

The issues currently being experienced in the Subject Area as a result of the 6.0 roadway are caused by day-to-day traffic generated by people coming to visit residents in the area, service vehicles and deliveries. At this time the subdivision is approximately 40% complete and the situation has become untenable in the Subject Area. The issues and concerns will only be exacerbated and continue to get worse with the build out of the subdivision.

The streets in the Subject Area are significantly less than the 8.0 m recommended in the City Wide Urban Design Manual, being approximately 6.0 m. The narrow width of the streets results in significant

traffic concerns, creates unsafe conditions for pedestrians, and results in significant restrictions for emergency vehicles requiring access to the Subject Area.

Currently, City of London garbage trucks and paratransit services are having difficulty accessing the Subject Area making it difficult and unsafe for children in the area. On numerous occasions the City's garbage trucks were unable to pick up the garbage on schedule as they were unable to maneuver the garbage truck through the Subject Area due to the size of the roads.

Recently the London Fire Department attended the Subject Area and confirmed their concerns with the existing width of the street in the Subject Area. The London Fire Department was unable to get through the Subject Area without coming to a complete stop and needing someone to come out and move their parked vehicle. When our Clients spoke to the fire person they confirmed that the road in the Subject Area is a problem. We note that this occurred when the London Fire Department was not trying to access the Subject Area to respond to an emergency situation.

CONCLUSION

Our Clients are respectfully requesting that the City proceed with the reconsideration request based on the new information received from the London Fire Department and set out in the Baird Report.

The City has been advised by the residents of the safety concerns in the Subject Area including but not limited to the restrictions on the ability of emergency vehicles to maneuver and easily access the Subject Area. The City needs to look at this situation on a case by case basis and take the appropriate steps to ensure the safety of the residents in the Subject Area.

Our Clients are formally putting the City on notice of their safety concerns should the City choose to proceed with the requirement for the installation of the second sidewalk.

We are formally requesting that we be provided with notification of any and all meetings, open houses and consultations relating to the above noted matter.

We are available to discuss if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Yours truly,

Siskinds LLP



Per:

Paula Lombardi
Partner

Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Ave.
London, ON
N6A4L9

August 18, 2020

Dear Mayor and Council

SUBJECT: Silverleaf Subdivision On-Street Parking Concerns

Baird AE has been retained by residents of the Silverleaf Subdivision to review the design of the road network created for this development. Baird is an award-winning engineering design firm with multiple offices in southwestern Ontario and specializes in the creation of subdivision developments from an urban planning, traffic engineering, civil engineering and architectural perspective. Our firm has been created to specifically optimize the overall design strategy and to improve the experience of residents living there.

Baird has visited the Silverleaf site, and has reviewed the following documents in relation to the development:

1. Planning Justification Report, Dated June 2018, MHBC
2. Phase 1 Issued for Construction Drawings, August 29, 2017, Stantec
3. City Wide Urban Design Manual, January, 2015
4. City of London Development Manual, 2019

Upon review of the background information for this development it was determined the existing road width is approximately 6m (edge of curb to edge of curb) in a standard 20m standard road right of way. No on street parking has been provided. Moreover, 1.5m concrete sidewalks have been proposed on both sides of the road.

In our professional opinion, the current design creates problems from a traffic, congestion, and safety perspective. For instance, in neighbouring roads in the City of London (Settlement Trail etc) a paved parking lane in the boulevard has been utilized. This parking lane creates space for on street parking, reduces congestion on the road, providing room for garbage trucks and school buses, and doesn't create a safety problem by blocking emergency vehicles.

Moreover, in the current 'City Wide Urban Design Manual' a diagram is shown for subdivisions which provides a roadway width of 8.0m for "Creating pedestrian-friendly and walkable neighbourhoods in both greenfield and infill contexts". Hence, a roadway width of 8m can still be 'walkable' and 'pedestrian friendly'. Therefore, the existing 6m road width isn't required to improve the experience for residents.



27 Princess St.
Unit 102
Leamington, ON
N8H 2X8
519.326.6161
1.844.842.9188

bairdAE.ca

Recommendations:

We have considered two options for improving the current situation for the existing and future residents of this neighbourhood:

1. Remove the proposed sidewalk from one side of the street. This will benefit the current parking situation and will allow existing residents to park another car length in their driveway reducing the need for on street parking.
2. Move the proposed sidewalk to the back of curb. This is common practice in reconstruction of older neighbourhoods where sidewalks were never installed originally. Unfortunately, this does not create enough length in the driveways to place another car and therefore does not improve the situation.

Therefore, in our professional opinion, the only viable solution to the problem is the elimination of the proposed sidewalk on one side of the street.

Trusting you will find the above satisfactory; however, if you have any questions please contact the undersigned, I remain.

All of which is respectfully submitted,



Matthew J. Baird, P.Eng. PMP SCPM
President
BAIRD AE





