

Cycling Advisory Committee

Report

The 5th Meeting of the Cycling Advisory Committee
June 16, 2021

Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting - during the COVID-19 Emergency

Attendance PRESENT: J. Roberts (Chair), I. Chulkova, C. DeGroot, D. Doroshenko, B. Hill, J. Jordan, M. Mur, and O. Toth; A. Pascual (Committee Clerk).

ABSENT: E. Raftis and T. Wade.

ALSO PRESENT: J. Bos, J. Dann, K. Grabowski, D. Hall, S. Harding, L. Maitland, A. Miller, B. O'Hagan, C. Saunders, J. Skimming, J. Stanford, S. Wilson, and S. Wise.

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 PM; it being noted that the following Members were in remote attendance: I. Chulkova, C. DeGroot, D. Doroshenko, B. Hill, J. Jordan, M. Mur, J. Roberts, and O. Toth.

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 E-Scooters and Cargo E-bikes

That it BE NOTED that the presentation as appended to the agenda from A. Miller, Transportation Demand Management Coordinator, with respect to E-scooters and Cargo E-bikes, was received.

2.2 (ADDED) Fanshawe Park Road Cycling Lane Rehabilitation

That it BE NOTED that the presentation as appended to the added agenda from John Bos, Technologist II, with respect to the Fanshawe Park Road Cycling Lane Rehabilitation, was received.

3. Consent

3.1 4th Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the 4th Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on May 19, 2021, was received.

3.2 Municipal Council resolution from its meeting held on May 25, 2021, with respect to the 3rd Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council resolution from its meeting held on May 25, 2021, with respect to the 3rd Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee, was received.

3.3 Letter of Resignation - C. Pollett

That it BE NOTED that the letter of resignation from C. Pollett, was received; it being noted that the Cycling Advisory Committee expressed their thanks to C. Pollett for his contributions to the Committee and the community.

3.4 Notice of Public Information Centre for Downtown Loop (Rapid Transit), Phase 2 Construction

That it BE NOTED that the notice as appended to agenda from T. Koza, Division Manager, Major Projects, with respect to a Notice of Public Information Centre for Downtown Loop (Rapid Transit), Phase 2 Construction, was received.

3.5 Notice of Planning Application - Zoning By-law Amendment - 496 Dundas Street

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application, dated May 19, 2021, from I. de Ceuster, Planner I, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment, related to the property located at 496 Dundas Street, was received.

3.6 Notice of Revised Planning Application - Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments - 1453-1459 Oxford Street East and 648-656 Ayreswood Avenue

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Revised Planning Application, dated May 26, 2021, from C. Maton, Planner II, with respect to an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, related to the properties located at 1453-1459 Oxford Street East and 648-656 Ayreswood Avenue, was received.

3.7 Notice of Planning Application - Zoning By-law Amendment - 755-785 Wonderland Road South (Westmount Mall)

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application, dated May 27, 2021, from C. Parker, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment, related to the property located at 755-785 Wonderland Road South (Westmount Mall), was received.

3.8 Ferndale Avenue Bike Lane Barriers - D. Hall, Program Manager Active Transportation

That it BE NOTED that the memo dated June 16, 2021 from D. Hall, Program Manager Active Transportation, with respect to Ferndale Avenue Bike Lane Barriers, was received.

4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

4.1 Sub-Committee Report - Draft Masonville Secondary Plan

That the following actions be taken with respect to the Sub-Committee Report - Draft Masonville Secondary Plan:

- a) the attached document BE FORWARDED to Civic Administration for consideration; and,
- b) the above-noted Report BE RECEIVED.

5. Items for Discussion

5.1 Patricia Street Bike Path

That the communication from J. Lenardon, with respect to the Patricia Street Bike Path, BE RECEIVED.

6. (ADDED) Deferred Matters/Additional Business

6.1 (ADDED) Notice of Planning Application - Zoning By-law Amendment - 584 Commissioners Road West

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning Application, dated June 9, 2021, from B. Debbert, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment, related to the property located at 584 Commissioners Road West, was received.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:49 PM.

Concerns with the Draft Masonville Secondary Plan

Vision and Principles

We greatly appreciate the Vision and Principles underpinning the draft Masonville Secondary Plan. The idea of an “exceptionally designed” neighborhood balancing recreation and living spaces with shopping and working spaces is quite appealing and we greatly value convenient access to quality public transit. We are disappointed that the vision is not for “safe and convenient” access to public transit.

The most relevant principles for us are Principle 1: Build a connected community that encourages transit use and active transportation and Principle 3: Develop a pedestrian-oriented environment that is safe, comfortable, and animated at street level. We applaud the focus on—and prioritization of—active transportation and a pedestrian-oriented environment at street level. We are concerned about the lack of explicit mention that these principles extend to all users—regardless of age or ability—and that design features promote accessibility for all.

What we are most concerned about here is that we fail to see how these principles are actually providing guidance for the development of this draft Secondary Plan and the General Policies being offered through it. It is well-established—and this group has emphasized it many times—that a key element in prioritizing active transportation is designing road infrastructure around the concerns of the so-called Portland 60, the approximately 60% of road users who are “interested but concerned” about cycling within the urban environment. Their concerns are generally automotive density, speed, and proximity and they generally rate their comfort level and willingness to cycle according to the “weakest link” in their route. For example, a single, complicated and busy intersection where they are forced share the traffic flow with automobiles or are menaced by turning automobiles or being required to ride a single block along a busy, fast multilane street (or turn left off of) is often enough to dissuade them from riding at all regardless of how comfortable they are with the rest of the route.

The “gold standard” design that allows everyone regardless of age or ability to be comfortable cycling is a cycling track that is physically separated from non-cycling road users connecting them with their final destinations. Ideally, each of the major neighborhood destinations (transit hub, Farmers Market locations, primary retail spaces, and significant employers) would have such cycle tracks radiating outward from them. We, however, see no evidence of recommendations or plans for including such road infrastructure in any sections of this in the Masonville Secondary Plan. Indeed, it does not seem that there are any plans to provide streets prioritized in Schedule 5 of the Secondary Plan with painted bike lanes or signage. Given the benefits that cycling infrastructure has been shown to bring to retail districts, we want to emphasize the need to have physically protected, separated cycling infrastructure along with greatly decreased speed limits where such infrastructure cannot be built.

The prioritized streets in Schedule 5 also involved several complicated intersections crossing multiple-lane, high-speed streets with poor sightlines for automobile drivers and cyclists alike. There is no evidence of improvements such as cycling friendly signals or painted lanes through the intersections on Fanshawe or Richmond.

The absence of any real improvements to street infrastructure for cycling users is inconsistent with a prioritization of active transportation, an “exceptionally designed” environment, and valuing safe and accessible access for riders of all ages and abilities.

We also have some concerns with the planned use for private streets. In particular, we are unsure how private owners will be required to “implement the concepts of ‘complete streets’.” More information for how this would be handled and what timelines and resulting road infrastructure would be helpful. We would expect the results to be comparable to the road infrastructure and usability of the public roads. We are also concerned about how the enforcement of traffic laws (such as no parking/no stopping laws, especially where cyclists’ movements are impacted) will be conducted on private streets and the implications for incidents of road violence. We’ve seen at Dundas Place the issues that arise when new road or traffic regulations are placed without any plan for enforcement or educating drivers. We would like to hear more about this and the implications for cyclists being directed to use those streets as thoroughfares.

We are also hoping for clarification on the point that “sidewalks should be separated from the travelled portion of private streets by a buffer area comprised of landscaping, on-street parking areas and/or cycle lanes.” We hope that cycle lanes—and the cyclists who use them are not being looked at as a buffer between cars and pedestrians.

Though “on-street parking may be provided along public and private streets . . . where it does not conflict with pedestrian priority or constrain transit operation,” we are concerned that there is no mention of also prioritizing cyclist safety over on-street parking, especially considering the safety concerns that arise when cars need to cross over bike lanes to park and when car doors are being opened into bike lanes.