Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Planning and Works Committee  
Minutes  

Tuesday, February 11, 2014  
9:08 a.m.  
Regional Council Chambers  
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener  


Members absent: R. Deutschmann and J. Haalboom  

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest Under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act  
None declared.  

J. Brewer advised that she had an item for discussion under Other Business.  

Delegations  
a) P-14-019, Walk Cycle Waterloo Region – Active Transportation Master Plan  
Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning, gave a presentation to the Committee; a copy is appended to the original minutes. Highlights of the presentation included the impact of the Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) on supporting the community vision, facilities for cyclists and pedestrians, outcomes of the public outreach campaign, setting a goal of 12% increase in public participation in active transportation, and the installation of segregated cycling lanes and multi-use trails.  

* K. Seiling joined the meeting at 9:11 a.m.  

She stated that better public education is required and that a multi-media campaign will be launched in June 2015. She summarized the need for improved winter maintenance and funding for implementation. She stated that the plan will be made available on the
Region’s website, that an implementation plan will be developed in 2014 and that a report will come back to Council in 2015.

The following individuals appeared before the Committee as delegations on this report:

Roger Suffling, Bicycling Advocacy Committee of Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Club; gave a presentation to the Committee; a copy is appended to original minutes. He stated that the Club is pleased that the ATMP integrates all transportation modes but is concerned about ridership projections, inadequate funding, lack of integration with city trails and Regional routes. He advised that the members are especially concerned with the guidelines for 1.25 metre cycling lanes, stating that this standard is unsafe and outdated and he proposed that cycling lanes in the Region be a minimum 1.5 metres wide. He outlined the concerns and challenges with narrow cycling lanes.

Mary Ann Wasilka summarized her concerns with pedestrian safety and shared videos of local intersections where the traffic light timing doesn’t allow for the safe crossing of pedestrians. She encouraged the Region to review the needs of pedestrians when planning reconstruction of intersections and roadways.

Michael Druker, Tri-Cities Transport Action Group (Tri-TAG), stated that he’s pleased that the Region is moving forward with the ATMP but he’s concerned about the active transportation participation goal since other studies show 43% increase during the period from 2006-2011. He outlined his concerns and suggestions; a copy of his submission is appended to the original minutes. Overall, he stated that education is not the sole solution and that redesign will have the biggest impact on improving active transportation in the Region.

J. Wideman offered a friendly amendment to the motion by suggesting that an additional clause be added directing staff to meet with Easy Riders and other groups to continue to address their issues as they develop.

Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services, advised that the ATMP is a living document that has been drafted with a great deal of public input and which takes public safety very seriously. He also stated that Area Municipalities were involved in the development of the Plan. He cautioned that there are significant costs associated with the Plan that are not included in a Regional budget but that staff is hopeful that funding may be available through senior levels of government or Area Municipalities.

P. Sawicki clarified that the minimum lane width is 1.25 metres but that in most of the report, the recommendation is for 1.5 metres, which includes .3 metres for gutters.

* R. Kelterborn left the meeting at 9:48 a.m.

Staff responded to Committee questions regarding cycling facilities in other municipalities, the timelines for implementation for some of the proposed measures and the installation of segregated cycling lanes. Additionally, staff responded to Committee questions regarding the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard and the installation of multi-use trails.
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* R. Kelterborn returned to the meeting at 9:58 a.m.

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, stated that staff can look at the option of multi-use trails in various projects but the installation must fit within the infrastructure; as projects are developed, staff can consider the potential installation of multi-use trails.

The Committee discussed the option of setting a policy of installing multi-use trails on major arterial roads in the Region with public safety as the priority outcome. Staff were directed to consider this option when developing future road reconstruction designs.

R. Horne responded to a Committee question about how the Plan will be used by staff and how revisions will be incorporated. The Committee discussed the need for public training and appropriate road design to encourage road-sharing and to improve safety at local roundabouts.

J. Wideman thanked J. Mitchell and G. Lorentz for their work on Regional committees dealing with active transportation.

Moved by J. Mitchell

Seconded by G. Lorentz

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action regarding Walk Cycle Waterloo Region, the final Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP), as described in Report No. P-14-019, dated February 11, 2014:

a) Receive the Active Transportation Master Plan, entitled Walk Cycle Waterloo Region, for information, and make the Plan available to the community, including posting it online in the Big Shift Tool Box;

b) Direct staff to develop, in conjunction with the Area Municipalities and other partners, an implementation plan for Walk Cycle Waterloo Region that includes network priorities and funding options;

c) Direct staff to continue to use Walk Cycle Waterloo Region as a guiding document for Regional transportation infrastructure planning and construction; and

d) Direct staff to meet with Easy Riders and other groups to continue to address issues as they develop.

Carried, as amended

* D. Craig, T. Galloway, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, S. Strickland and J. Mitchell left the meeting at 10:17 a.m.
b) E-14-007.1, Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road Reconstruction, Township of Wilmot

Ian Young, Project Manager, Design and Construction, Transportation Engineering, provided a presentation; a copy is appended to the original minutes. He outlined the proposed improvements and summarized the concerns and issues raised by residents and members of the public, including the installation of curbs and sidewalks, vehicular speeds, and parking arrangements. He provided an overview of the parking demand survey results.

* D. Craig, T. Galloway, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, J. Mitchell and S. Strickland returned to the meeting at 10:23 a.m.

I. Young provided the benefits of segregated cycling lanes and the results of a study regarding allowance for left-hand turns at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. He concluded his presentation by stating that construction will begin in 2016 and is estimated to cost is $5 million.

The following individuals appeared before the Committee as delegations on this report:

Stephanie Beach, a resident of Petersburg, stated that she was opposed to the current proposal and cited her concerns, including reduced parking, lane restrictions for farming vehicles, the installation of sidewalks and high curbs, winter maintenance issues for homeowners and potential traffic congestion in the village. A copy of her presentation is appended to the original minutes. She responded to questions from Committee members regarding the overall proposal and parking in front of the Lutheran Church.

T. Cowan provided details of the road reconstruction experience in Woolwich, stating that the final road design works despite initial pushback.

Bev Finnegan, Owner, The Blue Moon, stated that the proposal will significantly impact her business, specifically the reduced parking spaces, the high curbs and limited delivery access. She also outlined other concerns, including maintenance of the proposed sidewalks, drainage issues along the high curbs and the overall expense of the project.

The Committee discussed the results of the parking demand survey and noted that the survey results don’t align with feedback from the delegations. Staff reiterated the survey results, stating that the maximum number of cars parked simultaneously was nine (9).

* D. Craig left the meeting at 10:56 a.m.

Raul Do Rego, C.A.N.G. Enterprises Inc., expressed his concerns for the reduced availability of parking spaces and the maintenance of sidewalks. He noted that the 1 metre boulevards will be difficult to maintain as well.

J. Wideman informed the Committee that the staff recommendation within the report has been revised for technical reasons, indicating that the current rates of speed must
be removed from the by-law schedule to allow for the addition of the new, reduced rates of speed.

Staff responded to Committee questions about tree removal, post-construction landscaping plans, locations of roll-over and high curbs and parking spaces. The Committee discussed the safety issues related to the installation of sidewalks, parking at The Blue Moon and the legal restrictions for farming vehicles driving on roadways. Additionally, the Committee debated the merits of including grass boulevards that are 1 metre or less in width and a left-hand turning lane at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road in the design.

T. Schmidt stated that there is space to install sidewalks and that is the Region’s approach; installing cycling lanes is also a part of the Region’s policy. While staff understand the residents’ issues, the report addresses safe cycling and walking.

The Committee discussed options to the installation of grass boulevards that are 1 metre or less, including the elimination of these boulevards and the widening of sidewalks.

An amendment was proposed that the improvements should include the addition of a left-turning lane and the elimination of grassed boulevards that are 1 m or less in width.

Moved by D. Craig

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements in the Village of Petersburg, on Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12) from the Highway 7/8 interchange to the railway tracks at the north village limit, and on Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) from the east village limit to the west village limit:

i) Approve the proposed roadway improvements, including the addition of a left-turning lane on both the east and west legs of Snyder’s Road, and the elimination of any grassed boulevards that are 1 metre or less in width, as outlined in Report E-14-007.1

ii) Effective March 31, 2014 change the speed limit within the village limits of Petersburg to 50 km/h by amending Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended as follows:

a) Remove from Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 60 km/h Maximum Speed on Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road #12) from CNR Tracks to Highway 7/8;

b) Remove from Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 60 km/h Maximum Speed on Snyder’s Road East (Regional Road #6) from 310 metres west of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road #12) to 780 metres East of Notre Dame Drive;
c) Remove from Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 80 km/h Maximum Speed on Snyder’s Road East (Regional Road #6) from 780 metres east of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road #12) to 2760 metres east of Notre Dame Drive; and

d) Add to Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 80 km/h Maximum Speed on Snyder’s Road East (Regional Road #6) from 420 metres east of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road #12) to 2760 metres east of Notre Dame Drive.

Carried, as amended

Request To Remove Items From Consent Agenda

There were no items removed from the Consent agenda.

Motion To Approve Items Or Receive For Information

Moved by B. Halloran

Seconded by C. Zehr

That the following items be approved:

- That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with CIMA Canada Inc., to provide engineering services for detailed design and services during construction for the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Odour Control Upgrades in the City of Cambridge, at an upset fee limit of $426,745, plus applicable taxes. [E-14-011]

- That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with Walter Fedy to provide consulting engineering services for the Class Environmental Assessment (EA), Detailed Design, Construction Contract Administration and Inspection Services associated with Erb Street Improvements from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line at an upset fee limit of $486,870.00 plus applicable taxes for the Class EA and design phases, with construction contract administration and inspection services to be paid on a time basis, as outlined in report E-14-019, dated February 11, 2014.

And that the following items be received for information:

- P-14-017, Ainslie Street Terminal Design Concepts Public Information Centre Scheduled for February 27, 2014
- E-14-020, 2013 Annual Water Quality Report for the Region of Waterloo Rural and Integrated Water Systems

Carried
Reports – Planning, Housing and Community Service

Community Planning

a) P-14-020, The Cornerstone Standards Council’s Draft Responsible Aggregate Standards - Regional Comments

Staff responded to Committee questions regarding the Region’s support of the standards and any groundwater impact. R. Horne advised that the Region is supportive of the general direction of the draft standards and that a subsequent staff report will be forthcoming.

Moved by S. Strickland

Seconded by T. Galloway

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo submit Report P-14-020 dated February 11, 2014 as Regional Council’s comments regarding the January 6, 2014 Cornerstone Standards Council’s draft Responsible Aggregates Standards.

Carried

Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services

b) E-14-022, Sewer Use By-law Amendment 2013 Post PCC Report

Moved by R. Kelterborn

Seconded by C. Millar

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enact the amendments to the Sewer Use By-law, being By-law Number 1-90 of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, attached as Appendix A, pursuant to Report E-13-144 dated December 3, 2013.

Carried

c) E-14-023, Water Distribution By-law for the Townships of North Dumfries and Wellesley – Post Public Consultation Centres (PCC)

Moved by S. Strickland

Seconded by J. Millar

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enact the Water Distribution By-law for the Townships of North Dumfries and Wellesley, attached as Appendix A, pursuant to Report E-13-141, dated December 3, 2013, as described.

Carried
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Rapid Transit

d) CR-RS-14-001, Authorization To Expropriate Lands (1st report) In The Cities Of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo Designated As Phase V of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project Relating To Property And Interests Located At Various Locations Along The LRT Alignment Together With Lands That Are Necessary For Adapted Bus Rapid Transit

Moved by C. Zehr

Seconded by T. Galloway

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of lands in the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo for the construction of the Rapid Transit Project including light rail transit (“LRT”) and adapted bus rapid transit (“aBRT”) as detailed in Recommended Rapid Transit Implementation Option Report E-11-072 dated June 15, 2011:

A. Complete application(s) to the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as may be required from time to time, for approval to expropriate land, which is required for the Rapid Transit Project including LRT and aBRT and described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Takings:

LRT

1. Part of Block ‘C’ Plan 1434 and Part of Lot 8 G.C.T., being Parts 1, 2, & 3 on 58R18048, Part of PIN 22283-0265, City of Waterloo (Part of 550 King Street North, Waterloo ON N2L 5W6);

2. Part of Lot 9, G.C.T., being Part 1 on 58R18065, Part of PIN 22282-0157, City of Waterloo (Part of 600 King Street North, Waterloo ON N2V 2J5);

3. Part of Lot 11, G.C.T., being Part 8 on 58R18061, Part of PIN 22280-0145, City of Waterloo (Part of 125 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo ON N2L 6K4);

4. Part of Lot 11, G.C.T., being Parts 2, 3, 4 & 5 on 58R18059, Part of PIN 22280-0297, City of Waterloo (Part of 139 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo ON N2L 5A6);

5. Part of Lot 11, G.C.T., being Part 1 on 58R18059, Part of PIN 22280-0300, City of Waterloo (Part of 141 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo ON N2L 5A6);

6. Part of Lots 111 & 112, Plan 385, being Part 1 on 58R18002, Part of PIN 22422-0049, City of Kitchener (Part of 969 King Street West, Kitchener ON N2G 2N1);
7. Part of Lot 7 between Young and Ontario Streets, Plan 401, being Parts 1 and 2 on 58R18011, Part of PIN 22316-0217, City of Kitchener (Part of 56 Duke Street, Kitchener ON N2H 3W7);

8. Part of Lot 39, Plan 394, being Part 1 on 58R18012, Part of PIN 22501-0023, City of Kitchener (Part of 33 Benton Street, Kitchener ON N2G 3H1);

9. Part of Lots 8 and 20, Plan 364, Part of Lot 18, Plan 393 and Part of Lot 39, Plan 394, being Part 1 on 58R18056, Part of PIN 22501-0031, City of Kitchener (Part of 35 Charles Street East, Kitchener ON N2G 2P3);

10. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404, being Parts 1 and 2 on 58R18049, Part of PIN 22506-0233, City of Kitchener (Part of 50 Borden Avenue, Kitchener ON N2G 3R5);

11. Part of Lot 1, Plan 242, being Part 1 on 58R18004, Part of PIN 22505-0112, City of Kitchener (Part of 443 Courtland Avenue East, Kitchener ON N2G 2W5);

12. Part of Lot 77, Plan 242, being Part 2 on 58R18004, Part of PIN 22505-0111, City of Kitchener (Part of 246 Ottawa Street South, Kitchener ON N2G 3T6);

13. Part of Block 'F', Plan 1206 and Part of Block 'F', Plan 1221, being Parts 1, 2 and 3 on 58R18055, Part of PIN 22595-0095, City of Kitchener (Part of Courtland between Block Line and Hayward);

14. Part Lot 9, M.C.P. 791, being Part 4 on 58R18078, Part of PIN 22599-0069, City of Kitchener (Part of 39-51 Overland Drive, Kitchener, ON N2C 2B3);

15. Part Lot 9, M.C.P. 791, being Part 5 on 58R18078, Part of PIN 22599-0081, City of Kitchener (Part of 55 Overland Drive, Kitchener, ON N2C 2B3).

Easements

1. Part of Lot 11, G.C.T., being Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 on 58R18061, Part of PIN 22280-0145, City of Waterloo (Part of 125 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo ON N2L 6K4);
2. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404, being Part 3 on 58R18049, Part of PIN 22506-0233, City of Kitchener (Part of 50 Borden Avenue, Kitchener ON N2G 3R5);

3. Part of Lots 3 and 4, M.C.P., Plan 962, being Part 1 on 58R18060, Part of PIN 22593-0262, City of Kitchener (Part of 310 Fairway Road South, Kitchener ON N2C 1X3);

4. Part of Block ‘F’, Plan 1206 and Part of Block ‘F’, Plan 1221, being Parts 4, 5 and 6 on 58R18055, Part of PIN 22595-0095, City of Kitchener (Part of Courtland between Block Line and Hayward);

B. Serve notices of the above application(s) required by the Expropriations Act (the “Act”);

C. Forward to the Chief Inquiry Officer any requests for a hearing that may be received within the time prescribed by the Act;

D. Attend, with appropriate Regional staff, at any hearing that may be scheduled;

E. Discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete a transaction whereby the required interests in the lands are conveyed or if otherwise deemed expedient in the opinion of Regional staff; and

F. Do all things necessary and proper to be done, and report thereon to Regional Council in due course. [CR-RS-14-001]

Carried

e) CR-RS-14-002, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) Designated as Phase 3 of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project Relating to Property and Interests from Borden Avenue South and Ottawa Street South to Courtland Avenue East in Kitchener and from King Street North and Northfield Drive to King Street South and John Street in Waterloo

Moved by J. Mitchell

Seconded by S. Strickland

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the construction of Phase 3 of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project being comprised of
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properties commencing at Borden Avenue South and Ottawa Street South to Courtland Avenue East in the City of Kitchener, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and from King Street North and Northfield Drive to King Street South and John Street in the City of Waterloo, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo as further detailed in Report CR-RS-13-036 dated April 30, 2013 and listed below:

**Fee Simple Partial Taking:**

1. Part of Lots 19 and 20, Plan 404 being Part 1 on 58R-17382, Part PIN 22505-0061, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 321 Courtland Avenue E., Kitchener)
2. Part Lots 6 and 7, Plan 1230 being Part 6 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0072, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 53-55 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
3. Part Lot 8, GCT being Part 7 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0071, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 565 Conestogo Road, Waterloo)
4. Part Lot 2, Plan 1230 being Part 2 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0101, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 29 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
5. Part Lot 1, Plan 1230 being Part 1 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0100, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 25 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
6. Part Lot 3, Plan 1230 being Part 3 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0102, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 35 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
7. Part Lot 4, Plan 1230 being Part 4 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0103, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 39 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
8. Part Lots 5 and 6, Plan 1230 being Part 5 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0104, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 45 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
9. Part Lot 2, Plan 757 being Parts 1 and 2 on 58R-17384, Part PINs 22595-0094 and 22595-0110, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part of 130 Hayward Avenue, Kitchener)

**Fee Simple Full Taking:**
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10. Part Lot 16, Plan 384, PIN 22599-0047, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (451 Mill Street, Kitchener)

And that staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation with respect to the said properties, or such lesser portions of any of the said properties as may be determined through the preliminary design process, within three months of the granting of approval to expropriate said properties, in accordance with the “Expropriations Act” (Ontario) (the “Act”);

And that the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession with respect to the said properties after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;

And that if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of applicable properties in the amount of the market value of the interests in such lands as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Act;

And further that the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings with respect to any above-referenced lands in the event that the Region is able to otherwise obtain registered title to such lands. [CR-RS-14-002]

Carried

f) E-14-017, Stage 1 Light Rail Project - Municipal Hydro Utilities Cost Sharing

Moved by T. Galloway

Seconded by J. Brewer

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into formal cost sharing agreements with Kitchener Wilmot Hydro and Waterloo North Hydro for relocation of hydro infrastructure to accommodate the Light Rail Project, in form and content satisfactory to the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor at an estimated cost of $12,765,784 exclusive of HST as outlined in Report E-14-017 dated February 11, 2014.

Carried

g) E-14-027/F-14-016, ION Funding Model and Request for Proposals Evaluation Process was received for information.

Information/Correspondence

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List was received for information.
Other Business

J. Brewer expressed concerns about the bus route impacts to senior residents on Westgate Avenue in Cambridge. She requested that staff review the situation and consider options to accommodate residents. R. Horne advised that staff will look at what types of refinements can be implemented and will report back to the Committee. D. Craig indicated that he’s received similar feedback from Hespeler-area residents and that he’s encouraged them to contact the City Clerk so that comments and suggestions can be taken back to Regional staff.

Next Meeting – March 4, 2014

Adjourn

Moved by G. Lorentz
Seconded by J. Mitchell

That the meeting adjourn at 11:37 a.m.

Carried

Committee Chair, J. Wideman
Committee Clerk, S. Natolochny
Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP)

The Vision, the Plan,

Public Consultation, and

Next Steps
Supporting the Community Vision

• Economic prosperity
• Compact growth
• Social well-being
• Urban design excellence
• Protection of natural environment
• Protection of agricultural lands

A multi-modal transportation system is essential to realize this vision
The Key Elements of the Plan

- Strategic Signage Action Plan
- Behavioural Shift Action Plan
- Additional Policy Direction
- Network Action Plan
- Winter Network Action Plan
- Performance Monitoring Action Plan
- Design Guidelines
Building on our system's success
Public Outreach - over 2 years

Twitter - 180 followers
Facebook - 151 likes
E-mail - 3,227 subscribers
8 Public events
What We Heard
"Let's Get on With Building the Full Network"
"Aim for higher mode share"

Almost double the # of people walking

Over six times the # of people cycling
"More dedicated space for cyclists"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Lane</th>
<th>ATMP Measurement</th>
<th>Bike Lane 1.25 m</th>
<th>Gutter 0.3 m</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book 18 Measurement</td>
<td>Bike Lane 1.55 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-use Trail
"Need better education"
"Improve winter maintenance"
ATMP Requires Substantial Funding

- **Roads Capital Program (10 Year TCP)**
  - New AT projects: $20.4M

- **Gaps / Infill**
  - Additional AT tasks on existing projects: $27.5M

- **Special Projects**
  - 10 Year Projects: $6.5M

- **Fix-it List and Signage**
  - 10 Year Program: $1.2M

**10 Year Costs for ATMP Network**

- In Capital Program today: $42.5M
- New 10-Year Network Costs: $55.5M

ATMP Requires Substantial Funding
We continue to invest:

Ira Needles Boulevard

University Ave.

Bishop Street

Spragues Road
Proposed Next Steps

Next Steps:

• Make Plan available to community
  – including online in the Big Shift Tool Box;

• Continue to use ATMP as a guiding document

• Develop Implementation Plan
  – Funding strategy, project timing, & resources
  – Work with stakeholders (Area Municipalities, GRAAC)
  – Report to Council in 2015
Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Club  
C/O City of Kitchener  
Downtown Community Centre  
35-B Weber St. W.  
Kitchener, ON  
N2H 3Z1

Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee  
Regional Council Office  
1st Floor, 150 Frederick Street  
Kitchener  
ON N2G 4J3

Feb 11th 2014

Re: Walk Cycle Waterloo Region/Active Transport Management Plan request for public input on draft released Feb 7th

Dear Committee Members,

Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Club is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Plan draft released last Friday for the Committee meeting on Tuesday 11th.

First, we congratulate the Region on compiling a master plan on active transportation. This is very welcome and appropriate to our times. We are particularly pleased with:

1. The Winter Network Action Plan  
2. How the Plan borrows ideas from around the world  
3. The Fix It List  
4. Performance monitoring including monitoring of accidents

However we do find the plan deficient in a number of basic areas, namely:

1) The plan does not advocate for substantial, realistic and appropriate public funds to support active transportation, and this is regrettable for safety, amenity, traffic congestion and climate change amelioration.

2) The plan should go further in addressing active transport links through the cycling “pinch points” that include crossings of rail lines and expressways.

3) The plan totally underestimates future growth in cycling, so that the importance of active transport in the Region will thus be downplayed in future decisions.

4) The Plan should pay more attention to links between other modes of public transport and cycling/walking.

5) Some statements about on-road cycle lanes are alarming!
We very much wish to comment on all of the above in detail but, as the Plan was only made public 3.5 days ago, this is impossible (just as in September 2013!). In light of this we have reluctantly restricted our detailed comments to the bike lane issue that is of great concern to our membership.

The minimum on-road cycle lane width in the draft Plan has been set at 1.25m. As we pointed out in our Oct 24th 2013 submission, this is inadequate, scary, dangerous and out of date. In our October submission regarding Regional road lanes, as well as in our April 9th 2013 submission to the Committee, we demonstrated that the graphic used to support the standard is inaccurate and misleading. We remind the committee that we have demonstrated:

1. using a rider and equipment, that the space occupied by a cyclist is not 60cm width as on the graphic, but much greater. Many handlebars alone range up to 70 cm!
2. that most other jurisdictions use a 1.5m minimum on-road bike lane width - here in Canada, in the US, in Australasia and in Europe. It is standard.
3. that any obstruction like a grating or pothole in a 1.25m lane immediately forces the rider out of lane with potentially deadly consequences.
4. Riders do not and cannot use the gutter (see p44 section 3-11)

As the ATMP pointed out, its survey demonstrated that ridership is inhibited by people’s fear of the proximity of automobiles. Further, cycling on sidewalks is a known issue that is exacerbated by lack of on-road lanes and, we suspect and observe, by excessively narrow on-road lanes. Thus the success of Regional biking policies of the Region hinges on adoption of a realistic minimum lane width.

Presumably the minimum lane width standard stems from the AASHTO (2012) standard cited in the plan. The committee should be aware that these standards are under continual attack as inadequate, and not just from bikers. Further, law suits resulting, in part from rigid adherence to the standards, have caused municipalities much legal grief (e.g. See the Donna Laird case in Boston). The blind adoption of an official standard does not, in and of itself, justify a municipality, nor does it excuse it from moral responsibility to do the right thing. Neither does it mean that engineers and planners have necessarily fulfilled the ethical responsibilities laid out by their governing bodies.

We repeat, as we have for the last year, that the 1.25 minimum lane standard is inadequate, unsafe, scary and outdated. Please change it.

In light of the above, we once more strongly recommend the widely adopted 1.5m on-road cycle lane-width minimum standard.

Please add Easy Riders to the list of organisations on the table on page 159.

Finally, we cordially and formally extend to all members of the Committee, as well as to engineering and planning staff, the opportunity to ride with our members on Regional Roads that have 1.2m bike lanes. If we cannot persuade you by letter, perhaps riding in traffic will be more effective!
Sincerely,

David Cain
President
Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Club.

Cited in text of letter:
GUIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF BICYCLE FACILITIES. 4TH EDITION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (AASHTO), 2012

Cc. The Record, CBC Radio, Tritag
February 11, 2014

Re: P-14-019, Walk Cycle Waterloo Region – Active Transportation Master Plan

Planning & Works Committee

Region of Waterloo

Members of Committee,

TriTAG, the Tri-Cities Transport Action Group, believes that walking and cycling can play a much bigger role in Waterloo Region's transportation system, and that our community would be better for it.

We are pleased to see the Region moving forward with an Active Transportation Master Plan, and one which makes steps towards better system usability, including a winter network, route signage, and segregated cycling infrastructure. We are supportive of the increased focus on multi-use paths as a practical way to make arterial roads with few driveways more bikeable. Perhaps most importantly, the document has a focus on ongoing measurement of infrastructure use.

Unfortunately, this revision has not addressed some of our concerns. There has not been much time for review of this draft, so it is not clear to us what, precisely, has changed since last October.

The target of increasing the active transportation modal share from 8% to 12% by 2031 is not useful, in our opinion. Walking and biking is increasing across North America, due in part to shifting demographics and culture, and it will be growing even more here due to the increased density in core areas. Reurbanization policies together with LRT are spurring increased population and jobs in existing walkable areas, helping to increase active transportation. Further, the Transportation Tomorrow Survey already showed a 43% increase in cycling in Kitchener just between 2006 and 2011. An increase from 8% to 12% of trips by active modes could very well be less than the baseline increase, and would not reflect the role of better active transportation infrastructure and policy. We believe the Region should be aiming substantially higher, and making the corresponding decisions about funding and infrastructure that can achieve those targets.

We continue to disagree that it is reasonable to count a gutter as part of a bike lane for measurement purposes. Gutters aren't counted as part of car lane widths, so why is there a different standard for bikes?
TriTAG does not believe people on bikes should be relegated to the gutter. The plan before you continues a predominant focus on these bike lanes, which we do not believe are good enough infrastructure on high-speed roads, as they afford neither sufficient subjective nor objective safety to their users. There are some proposed protected bike lanes in the plan, but we believe there should be many more. As one example, the current King Street redesign in Waterloo offers such an opportunity.

One way to increase the role of protected bike lanes is through pilot projects – temporary installations using pavement markings, planters, cones, or interlocking tiles that can help demarcate and demonstrate a different use of street space. Try protected bike infrastructure before deciding it's infeasible. Try it, and you may find the public support that will motivate it being made permanent.

As shown by Paula Hutchinson's presentation in October and the staff response, the Region's roundabouts are hazardous places for cycling, where rules for proper usage are at odds with what feels safe to the person on a bike. We believe that roundabouts in the Region can be adjusted to do a much better job of welcoming pedestrians and cyclists, instead of treating them as secondary users; we are happy to provide our more detailed feedback on roundabout design to staff and council.

Finally, the Special Study Areas listed represent some of the biggest individual needs and opportunities in the network. We look forward to seeing the implementation details and to seeing the funding come through for those areas and the rest of the Walk Cycle Waterloo Region plan.

Regards,

Michael Druker,
on behalf of TriTAG
Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road Reconstruction, Petersburg
The Project Area

Notre Dame Drive

Snyder's Road
Why Are We Doing This Project?

- Deteriorated road condition
- Poor drainage causing ponding
- High speeds through the village
- Lack of pedestrian or cycling facilities
Proposed Improvements

• Replace deteriorated pavement

• Add curb, gutter and new storm sewers

• Install sidewalks

• Add segregated cycling lanes behind roll-over curb
Proposed Improvements (cont'd)

- Provide on-road parking spaces at select locations, landscaped boulevards elsewhere
- Construct centre islands at the entrances to the village
- Reduce the speed limit to 50 kph
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 1 - Curb and Sidewalk not required or desired – Keep paved shoulders

- Curb and gutters needed to address drainage problems
- Sidewalks are more comfortable for pedestrians
- School board supports sidewalks
- Sidewalks are part of the Region's Active Transportation objectives
- Sidewalks to be shovelled by fronting owners
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 2 - Reduce Speeds

• The Project Team recommends the following to encourage slower speeds;
  – Narrower asphalt surface with segregated cycling lanes behind roll-over curb
  – Raised centre islands at all four village entrances
  – Reduction in speed limit as of March 31, 2014
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 3 - Concerns with proposed parking arrangements

- Two parking demand surveys completed show limited use
- Currently unrestricted parking, space for >200 vehicles on paved shoulder
- Parking proposed for 40 vehicles
Parking Demand Survey Results

Parking demand surveys completed on both weekday and weekend in February and July 2012

### Notre Dame Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day Total</th>
<th>Simultaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of Snyder's Rd</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Snyder's Rd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Snyder's Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day Total</th>
<th>Simultaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of Notre Dame Dr</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Notre Dame Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blue Moon Restaurant Parking

- Proposed curbed entrances define entry/exit points
- 16 new parking spaces on the road allowance
- Space reserved for delivery parking
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 4 - Cycling Lanes Not Required

• Township of Wilmot requested consideration of cycling facilities to and through all villages

• Region's Draft Active Transportation Master Plan designates Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road as planned cycle routes

• Rural road approaches into Petersburg have or will have cycling lanes

• Segregated cycling lanes help lower speeds
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 5 - Concern about intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule and Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design and Property Acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Segregated Cycling Lane Examples

Sherbourne Street
Toronto

Stone Road
Guelph
Public Consultation

- Meeting with owner of Petro Canada (April 2012)
- Meetings with owners of Blue Moon (April 2012, January 2013, and December 2013)
- Public Consultation Centre # 1 (May 2012)
- Informal Community Meeting (May 2012)
- Received public petition (December 2012)
- Public Consultation Centre # 2 (February 2013)
- Public Input Meeting (June 2013)
- Received public petition (July 2013)
Proposed Parking arrangements
Blue Moon Restaurant Parking

- Current uncontrolled access to parking lot
Blue Moon Restaurant Parking

- 4 parking spaces on Snyder's Road frontage
- 2 accessible parking spaces near accessible entrance
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 6 - Insufficient Road Width for Farm Vehicles

• Equipment manufacturers and farmers were consulted about standard farm vehicle sizes
• Minimum 4.95m (16.2 ft) available width including cycling lane will accommodate farm equipment
• Segregated cycling lane will not be designated as a reserved lane, therefore oversize farm vehicles can legally travel on it
Other Parking Areas

Post Office

- Surveys showed maximum of 2 vehicles using paved shoulder at any one time
- Total of 8 parking spaces proposed at Post Office, as well as additional lighting

Emmanuel Lutheran Church

- 1 additional parking space provided
Main Issues Raised by Public

Issue # 5- Concern about Intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road

- Updated traffic study in October 2013 confirmed no turn lanes are required

- Lane will widen at intersection to allow traffic to "slip around" left turn queues
Good Morning Council, Chair

My name is Stephanie Beach and I am a resident of Petersburg. My immediate and extended family own over half a dozen properties within Petersburg and have been here for over 3 generations.

I am here today in opposition of the current road proposal and I represent many of the residents of Petersburg who were unable to attend this morning’s meeting.

Petersburg is officially recognized by the Region as an urban town but Petersburg is not a normal urban neighbourhood. It has a population of approximately 300 and is located within the protected countryside for this reason and because the Region prohibits communal septic systems there is little potential for growth. Within its boundaries there are not only residences and businesses but numerous farms for agriculture and livestock. It also has a diverse amount of vehicular traffic ranging from extra wide farm equipment, horse and buggies, snow mobiles, double axil transport trucks, dump trucks, service trucks, trucks towing large trailers. These vehicles not only use Petersburg as a conduit to and from different locations but as a rest location for refueling and food. These varying infrastructures and vehicles lead to some of the main concerns with the cookie cutter urban plan.

The main problems with the project proposal are that without a shoulder residents and businesses will not have adequate parking for daily or yearly events; therefore, leading to a loss of income or visitors. The design team has increased the number of on road parking spots but these still do not meet the varying needs as mentioned above. Further, the lane restriction and lack of shoulder will create a driving hazard for large farm equipment that would be far wider than the driving and cycle surface. I’ve spoken with local farmers and have been advised that the width required for some of their farm equipment to safely travel through Petersburg is approximately 5.5m which exceeds the proposed lane and cycle width. Also, since a diverse and increasing amount of vehicles travel through Petersburg daily it is believed that the 2 proposed truck parking spots on Notre Dame may not be capable of providing adequate space for even one of the extra-long trucks, let alone two that are traveling in the same direction and wish to stop. This same premise will also apply at other areas of Petersburg where an extra-long vehicle may need to stop and there is only a single parking space available. Over the next few years Wilmot township is supposed to be one of the fastest growing areas within Waterloo Region and because of this and the fact that many trucks exit or enter the hwy via Petersburg in order to bypass the roundabouts on Ire Needles Road, there is often a back log of traffic at the main intersection. In the current proposal there are no plans to adapt the intersection to alleviate this congestion but instead we have been informed by the project team that the number of vehicles traveling through Petersburg does not even warrant us to have the turn lane on Snyder’s Road East bound and it will now be eliminated.

Another issue with the proposal is the segregated sidewalks separated by a 1m boulevard. There is limited foot traffic in Petersburg and there are no plans for an increase in population or infrastructure. It is also believed that vehicles will continue to park at the side of the road because sometimes there may be no other option; therefore, causing damage to the boulevard which will need to be repaired. Also, with the addition of the cycle lane, sidewalks and parking spaces the paved
portions of Petersburg will be even closer to some of the residents and business, some coming as close at 8 feet.

Last year a town meeting was held by the residents of Petersburg and approximately 90 people attended. 95% of the resident and businesses surveyed indicated that they were not happy with the proposed plan but stated they would be satisfied with a roll over curb with a paved section for walking, cycling and parking. This same type of paved surface can be found in neighbouring towns of St. Agatha and Wellesley. Sidewalks immediately adjacent to the roadway can be seen along Bridge Street near University Avenue.

The roll over curb would not only help to signify to drivers that they are entering a town but also create a distinction between the driving and cycling lane and help with drainage problems in some portions of Petersburg. This roll over curb and cycle lane would further create a buffer zone for the connected asphalt sidewalk or a stopping and parking area for vehicles. The extra wide single paved area with corresponding lines indicating where the cycle and pedestrian lanes starts would be used by residential and business vehicles needing a place to stop or wait for vehicles to pass so that they can safely turn into their driveways. It would be used by service vehicles such as garbage and recycle trucks in order to prevent congestion on our very busy roads. It would be used by larger business vehicles needing a location to stop but unable to fit in a corresponding driveway, such as at the gas station or at buildings needing their septic tanks emptied or gas and hydro maintained. It would be used for additional parking for events at the church, cemetery, park and other charity events run by local businesses.

Over the last year I’ve spent numerous hours reviewing and rereading many of the Region’s documents to try and better understand why the changes to Petersburg are being forced upon the residents and businesses. During this research I found two quotes that encompass not only the Regions view point but many of the residents. They show that even though we stand in opposition to one another there is hope to work together and come to a resolution that will meet everyone’s needs and expectations.

The Region has a vision “for a sustainable and liveable Waterloo Region” and the Regional Official Plan states the Region wants “[to be] an inclusive, thriving, and sustainable community committed to maintaining harmony between rural and urban areas and fostering opportunities for current and future generations” and “[to] plan and manage integrated, accessible and safe multi-modal transportation systems that provide transportation choice, and promote sustainability, a healthy population and the effective movement of goods”.

From these quotes I believe that it is possible for the Region to work more closely with the residents of Petersburg to develop a less urban plan which would be more suitable for our rural community.

The residents of Petersburg are not against cycle or pedestrian facilities just how they are being applied. A new plan is needed to help promote a thriving and sustainable community and one that will grow with the increase in the expected vehicular traffic of Wilmot township.
The proposed plan will not only change the infrastructure of Petersburg but also the rural atmosphere. The residents aren't necessarily upset over the inclusion of a curb, cycle lane and sidewalks but about the impracticality of them being introduced onto Petersburg. The elimination of the shoulder is not just an elimination of parking for residents and businesses but creates havoc in many different ways such as

## 24 hour Traffic Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Trucks (under 13m)</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks (over 13 m)</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2012</td>
<td>5386</td>
<td>3827</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Notre dame dr btwn snyders and deerfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 2012</td>
<td>7130</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Synders rd e west of notre dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24, 2012</td>
<td>6372</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Snyders Rd E btwn trussler and notre dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 4, 2012</td>
<td>7742</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Notre Dame Dr between snyders and reinhart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Posted Unit</th>
<th>85th Percentile</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2012</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Notre dame dr btwn snyders and deerfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 2012</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Synders rd e west of notre dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24, 2012</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Snyders Rd E btwn trussler and notre dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 4, 2012</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Notre Dame Dr between snyders and reinhart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
creating congestions, driving hazards and inconveniences. The project team has tried to accommodate residents and businesses by adding parking along the road way which will help to alleviate some of the daily parking issues but will not address the numerous more spots needed during large church events, funerals at the cemetery and when multiple large trucks want to stop at the gas station.

Won’t work

Lane reductions/no shoulder

1. Farm equipment can’t fit down street
   a. Combine
2. Snow mobiles won’t have a travel section
3. Horse and buggies in area
4. Major route for traffic which needs to flow smoothly
   a. Report states that
5. Parking:
   a. Will hurt local businesses by reducing customers able to park
      i. Bluemoon
      ii. Gas station- large trucks
      iii. Overflow for church
      iv. Post Office- larger vehicles usually park on shoulder instead of driveway because of the limited turning radius in driveway. No parking before post office, only after, 2 spots and a 3rd a house away.
   b. Need parking for active cemetery
   c. Will hurt residences not close to any residential side streets.
Purpose of Cycle lanes

To increase cycling within Petersburg or through Petersburg.

Outside the construction area is gravel shoulder. Don’t believe the limited distance of cycle lanes would increase the number of cyclists through Petersburg because of the poor road survey (gravel shoulder) going into Petersburg. A majority of the bicycles in Petersburg are hardcore cyclists going through Petersburg. No one surveyed in Petersburg stated that they need or want a specific bike lane.

Parking spots

Will hinder traffic by making cars have to parallel park on a high traffic roadway where many large trucks travel through. Cars will have to come to a complete stop in active roadway in order to parallel park. A shoulder offers safety to vehicles pulling off the road into their personal driveways or business driveways.

Truck Parking spots

Dependent on the size of the truck, double trucks? Is it wide enough for dump trucks.

New construction restricts entrances and exits to local businesses

Gas Station- Diesel and Gas trucks often park at gas station to fill up station and they often take up a lot of the driving space within the parking lot. The reduction of the entrance and parking lot will hinder traffic entering and exiting and the usable parking space for vehicles.

Where do post boxes start?

Is the city prepared to shovel the sidewalks? What is the drainage and snow like on sidewalk down hill to park?
Chapter 2: Waterloo region; shaping urban areas

The policies in this Chapter seek to alter this trend by promoting a more balanced approach to growth. This also means building more compact, vibrant and complete communities in Urban and Township Designated Greenfield Areas, with walkable neighbourhoods.

Implementing these measures will, among other benefits, promote efficient development patterns and reduce the need to expand roads, watermains and wastewater collection systems.

Communities that focus on moving people and goods primarily by trucks and automobiles generally create a dispersed, auto-oriented urban form. By contrast, communities that focus Transit Oriented Development around a balanced network of roads, railways, sidewalks, cycling paths and transit routes help create a more compact and pedestrian-friendly urban environment. The policies in this Chapter seek to implement this important objective and promote the development of a more sustainable and liveable regional community.

NOTE: As of January 24, 2011, this Plan in its entirety, is currently under appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). Before using this document, care should be taken to check the updated status of the appeal process on the Region of Waterloo’s website.

2.5 Anticipate and plan for growth in Urban and Township Designated Greenfield Areas and the Countryside/Future Urban Expansion Area other areas within the Countryside Line as appropriate to ensure sufficient lands are available for future residential, employment and other needs.

2.5 Anticipate and plan for growth in Urban and Township Designated Greenfield Areas and the Countryside/Future Urban Expansion Area other areas within the Countryside Line as appropriate to ensure sufficient lands are available for future residential, employment and other needs.

2.A.1 The Region and Area Municipalities will use the population and employment forecasts shown on Table 1 as the basis for planning and growth management, determining future transportation requirements, calculating water and wastewater servicing needs, and planning for the delivery of a wide variety of public services and programs.

This Plan seeks to implement a Planned Community Structure based on a system of nodes, corridors and other development areas connected by a network of roads, transit routes, cycling paths and pedestrian connections. The components of the Planned Community Structure include the Urban
Area, Township Urban Areas, Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Reurbanization Corridors, Major Local Nodes, pg 11

This Planned Community Structure reflects the intent of the Regional Growth Management Strategy and provides a framework for decision-making on a wide range of issues, including land use and transportation planning, environmental protection, cultural heritage, economic development and priorities for strategic infrastructure investments.

Focal points for reurbanization include Urban Growth Centres, Township Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Reurbanization Corridors and Major Local Nodes. These focal points will make better use of existing urbanized land and infrastructure and reduce development pressure on farmlands and sensitive natural areas. pg 12

Most of the Built-Up Area consists of established residential neighbourhoods where the majority of buildings are not expected to change significantly in use or form during the planning horizon of this Plan. These neighbourhoods vary in age and style and contribute to the region’s vitality and quality of life. Any future development within or adjacent to these neighbourhoods will need to respect the existing physical character of the area. Major Urban Greenlands represent an important element of the Planned Community Structure. These public greenlands contribute to the beauty of local communities and provide many health and environmental benefits. This Plan seeks to strengthen and, wherever possible, enhance the unique qualities of these areas and ensure balance between the built and natural environments.

Future development in these areas will contribute to the creation of complete communities with a greater mix of land uses and development patterns that support trips by walking, cycling and, where available, transit services.

Regional transportation

Residents have significantly shifted their attitudes regarding the widening or construction of new roads. Nearly half (47%) of residents in 2007 felt construction of new roadways was essential/very important to the transportation system pg

Project report response:

Sidewalk is anticipated to encourage more walking as an active mode of transportation and provide a safer environment for pedestrians.
- Only walk to gas station and restaurant and park
Walk cycle waterloo region
The Transportation Master Plan already sets the framework with a vision for transportation:

**Optimize the Transportation System:** Make the most of what exists: preserve and maximize the use of facilities and services – avoid or defer the need for new infrastructure that does not support the other goals

**As per, states that**

<1% **Strong & Experienced**
Will ride regardless of facilities. Trip distance is not an issue.

7% **Enthused & Confident**
Comfortable in traffic with appropriate facilities. Prefer shorter trip distances.

60% **Interested but Concerned**
Not comfortable in mixed traffic. Not attracted by bike lanes on busy streets. Will ride in low-traffic, low-speed conditions (boulevards, off-street).

33% **No Way, No How** Not interested in cycling at all ■

Petersburg will continue to be a high traffic area, meaning no matter what type of facilities are built for bikers only the more experienced, less then 8%, will be comfortable.

Segregated bike lane: Recommended where the density of driveways and side-street intersection is low (>1 per 300m)
In Petersburg along snyders the bike route will be 500 m there are over 26 driveways that intersect.
Notre damem 900m, over 38 driveways and side streets

Leading up to Petersburg in all directions will be a rural bike lane (paved shoulder)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>recommended</th>
<th>future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural bike lane</td>
<td>168km</td>
<td>255km</td>
<td>423km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated bike</td>
<td>16km</td>
<td>16km</td>
<td>16km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating a safe, efficient, and reliable transportation system

• Balancing and integrating transportation choice
Section 5
Decision making process
It is the intention of this document that it be used
as a reference text to inform the process and to direct
discussions.

5.1.1 Updates
Flexibility to respond to site specific conditions is built into
the guidelines and recommendations of this document.
This flexibility allows the design team / project designer
to accommodate a variety of streetscape and boulevard
conditions for each classification type. If additional flexibility
is required or if additional guidelines are to be added, a
formal review and approval of those amendments would be
required.

Part B Physical Context
Built Form
What is the character of existing built form?
Are there cultural heritage resources and listed properties and structures?
What is the character and vision for planned built form? (eg. scale, density, architectural character)
Do your objectives answer the following questions?
What mode of movement is the priority?
How are other modes integrated?
What is the functional role from a transportation perspective?
What is or should be the character and aesthetics of the street?
Consider that the objectives may vary over the length of the street.

Start with all of the Elements and Preferred Criteria. Make adjustments by deleting Elements and/or using minimum Criteria.
‘Necessary’ elements should be considered a given within the street right-of-way. They are the elements that MUST be included.
‘Important’ elements should be considered next to ‘Necessary’ elements and are elements that SHOULD be included.
‘Optional’ elements are features that WOULD BE GOOD to include should space be available.

Step 4C Neighbourhood Connector: Main Street
Part A - Determine the Boulevard Elements
# ELEMENT PREFERRED RANGE WIDTH COMMENTS
1 Pedestrian
Clearway
(Necessary) 2.5 m 1.5 - 2.5 m
2a Landscaping and
Site Furnishing
Zone (with trees)
(Important)
3.0 m 2.0 - 3.0 m
2b Landscaping and
Site Furnishing
Zone (without
trees)
(Important)
2.0 m 1.0 - 2.0 m
3 Buffer zone
(Important) 0.50 m n/a

4 Land-Use Transition Zone
(Important) 1.0 m varies
Range varies by land-use type.

5 Transit Facilities
(Necessary) To be placed within Landscape and Site Furnishing Zone

6 Decorative Lighting
(Optional) To be building mounted or free standing

7 Site Furnishings
(Important) To be placed within Landscape and Site Furnishing Zone

8 Utilities
(Necessary) Coordination will be required between the various authorities

9 Multi-Use Trail
(n/a)

10 Landscape Buffer Zone
(n/a) n/a n/a

4C
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Part B - Determine the Roadway Elements

# ELEMENT PREFERRED RANGE WIDTH COMMENTS
1 Transit Priority Lanes
(Important) 4.0 m 3.65 - 4.0 m
2 Cycling Facilities
(Important) 1.25 m 1.0 - 1.5 m
3 Travel Lanes - Curb / Shoulder
(Necessary) 3.25 m 3.05 - 3.5 m
3a Additional width for Travel Lanes - curb shoulder w/o cycling lanes only
(Optional) 0.65 m n/a
4 Travel Lanes - Curb Lane with Buggy Traffic
(n/a)
n/a n/a
5 Travel Lanes -
Passing
(Important) 3.25 m 3.25-3.35 m
6 Turning Lanes
- Right
(Important) 3.25 m n/a
7 Turning Lanes
- Left
(Important) 3.25 m 3.0 - 3.35 m
8 Turning Lanes
- Dual Left
(n/a) n/a n/a
Avoid use where possible.
9 Turning Lanes
- Receiving Dual
Left
(n/a)
n/a n/a

4C
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Part B - Determine the Roadway Elements
Part C - RETURN TO PAGE ONE OF THE URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD: MAIN STREET CONNECTOR WORKBOOK
Compile Recommendations 4C - Page 1
# ELEMENT RECOM RANGE WIDTH COMMENTS
10 Median for Safety and Separation
(n/a) n/a n/a
11 Median for Access Control
(n/a) n/a n/a
12 Mid-Block Median for Refuge
(n/a) n/a n/a
13 Median for Infrastructure
(n/a) n/a n/a
14 Parallel Parking
(Optional)
2.4 m 2.0 - 2.4 m
15 Curb
(Necessary)
0.50 m 0.21 - 0.5 m
Coordination required between various authorities.
16 Shoulder
## Step 4F Rural Village - Main Street Connector

### Part A - Determine the Boulevard Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>PREFERRED RANGE</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pedestrian Clearway</td>
<td>(Necessary) 2.1 m</td>
<td>1.5 - 2.1 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Landscaping and Site Furnishing Zone (with trees)</td>
<td>(Optional) 3.0 m</td>
<td>2.0 - 3.0 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Landscaping and Site Furnishing Zone (without trees)</td>
<td>(Optional) 2.0 m</td>
<td>1.0 - 2.0 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buffer zone</td>
<td>(Optional) 0.5 m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land-Use Transition Zone</td>
<td>(Optional) 1.0 m</td>
<td>varies by land-use type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transit Facilities</td>
<td>(Necessary where required)</td>
<td>To be placed within Landscape and Site Furnishing Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Decorative Lighting</td>
<td>(Optional)</td>
<td>To be building mounted or free standing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Site Furnishings</td>
<td>(Optional)</td>
<td>To be placed within Landscape and Site Furnishing Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>(Necessary)</td>
<td>Coordination will be required between the various authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Multi-Use Trail</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Landscape Buffer Zone</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines

Part B - Determine the Roadway Elements

# ELEMENT PREFERRED RANGE WIDTH COMMENTS

1 Transit Priority
   Lanes
   (Optional) 4.0 m 3.65 - 4.0 m

2 Cycling Facilities
   (Important) 1.25 m 1.0 - 1.5 m

3 Travel Lanes -
   Curb / Shoulder
   (Necessary) 3.25 m 3.05 - 3.5 m

3a Additional width
   for Travel Lanes -
   curb shoulder w/o
cycling lanes only
   (Optional)
   1.0 m n/a

4 Travel Lanes
   - Curb Lane with
     Buggy Traffic
   (Important) 4.85 m 4.0 - 4.85 m

5 Travel Lanes -
   Passing
   (Important) 3.25 m 3.25 - 3.35 m

6 Turning Lanes
   - Right
   (Important) 3.25 m n/a

7 Turning Lanes
   - Left
   (Important) 3.25 m 3.0 - 3.35 m

8 Turning Lanes
   - Dual Left
   (n/a) n/a n/a
   Avoid use where possible.

9 Turning Lanes
   - Receiving Dual
     Left
   (n/a)
   n/a n/a
Rural Village - Main Street CONNECTOR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>RECOMM</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Median for Safety and Separation</td>
<td>(Optional) 3.0 m</td>
<td>1.75 - 5.0 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Median for Access Control</td>
<td>(Optional) 3.0 m</td>
<td>3.0 - 4.75 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mid-Block Median for Refuge</td>
<td>(Optional) 3.0 m</td>
<td>1.75 - 5.0 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Median for Infrastructure</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Parallel Parking</td>
<td>(Optional) 2.4 m</td>
<td>2.0 - 2.4 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Curb</td>
<td>(Necessary) 0.5 m</td>
<td>0.21 - 0.5 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination required between various authorities.

16 Shoulder

ROP

What does 'sustainable' mean?

Sustainability involves balancing the needs of current and future generations. The ROP contains policies that will help to balance the cultural, economic, environmental and social needs of Waterloo Region by:

- Protecting and enhancing the natural environment;
- Fostering a strong sense of place and community by keeping elements of the past and providing new opportunities for cultural expression; and
- Providing the infrastructure and services needed to support a diverse and growing economy.

For caste an increase of traffic as new hamburg and Baden grow. Traffic has already been redirected this way bc of trussler round abouts.
Garbage trucks congestion.

Gas station entrances - delivery trucks, and veh pulling trailers. Vehs parked for propane. Gas truck filling up tanks.
To set up and state one’s claim

The majority of the residents of the village of Petersburg would like main streets of Petersburg resurfaced and are not in opposition to the addition of a safe location to walk and cycle; however, they are against the elimination of the shoulder, the reduction of lanes sizes, the removal of the turning lanes at the intersection, and the addition of segregated bike lanes, boulevards, sidewalks and center medians throughout Petersburg.

are not in opposition to the addition of a safe location to walk and cycle;

however, they are against the elimination of the shoulder,
-problems with
Traffic congestion

/not all of the vehicles will fit down the road

the reduction of lanes sizes,

the removal of the turning lanes at the intersection,

and the addition of segregated bike lanes,

boulevards,

sidewalks

and center medians throughout Petersburg.

Make your introductory paragraph interesting. How can you draw your readers in?
The vision for Wilmot township states that “Wilmot is a cohesive, vibrant and welcoming countryside community.

What background information, if any, do we need to know in order to understand your claim?
The main intersection of Petersburg is made up of two regional roads.

If you’re arguing about an issue or theory – provide brief explanation or your of issue/theory.

BACKGROUND PARAGRAPH
1-2 paragraphs tops; Optional (can omit for some papers). Also, sometimes
this info is incorporated into the introduction paragraph (see above).

o PURPOSE: Lays the foundation for proving your argument.

o Will often include:
  - Summary of works being discussed
  - Definition of key terms
  - Explanation of key theories

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE PARAGRAPH #1

o PURPOSE: To prove your argument. Usually is one paragraph but it can be longer.

o Topic Sentence: What is one item, fact, detail, or example you can tell your readers that will help them better understand your claim/paper topic? Your answer should be the topic sentence for this paragraph.

o Explain Topic Sentence: Do you need to explain your topic sentence? If so, do so here.

o Introduce Evidence: Introduce your evidence either in a few words (As Dr. Brown states —-[[]]) or in a full sentence (—To understand this issue we first need to look at statistics).

o State Evidence: What supporting evidence (reasons, examples, facts, statistics, and/or quotations) can you include to prove/support/explain your topic sentence?

o Explain Evidence: How should we read or interpret the evidence you are providing us? How does this evidence prove the point you are trying to make in this paragraph? Can be opinion based and is often at least 1-3 sentences.

o Concluding Sentence: End your paragraph with a concluding sentence that reasserts how the topic sentence of this paragraph helps up better understand and/or prove your paper’s overall claim. Page 2 of 3

Courtesy the Odegaard Writing & Research Center
http://www.depts.washington.edu/owrc

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE PARAGRAPH #2, 3, 4 etc.

o Repeat above

COUNTERARGUMENT PARAGRAPH

o PURPOSE: To anticipate your reader’s objections; make yourself sound more objective and reasonable.

o Optional; usually 1-2 paragraphs tops

o What possible argument might your reader pose against your argument and/or some aspect of your reasoning? Insert one or more of those arguments here and refute them.

o End paragraph with a concluding sentence that reasserts your paper’s claim as a whole.

CONCLUSION PART 1: SUM UP PARAGRAPH

o PURPOSE: Remind readers of your argument and supporting evidence.

o Conclusion you were most likely taught to write in High School

o Restates your paper’s overall claim and supporting evidence

CONCLUSION PART 2: YOUR “SO WHAT” PARAGRAPH

o PURPOSE: To illustrate to your instructor that you have thought critically and analytically about this issue.

o Your conclusion should not simply restate your intro paragraph. If your conclusion says almost the exact same thing as your introduction, it may indicate that you have not done enough critical thinking during the course of your essay (since you ended up right where you started).

o Your conclusion should tell us why we should care about your paper. What is the significance of your claim? Why is it important to you as the writer or to me as the reader? What information should you or I take away from this?
Your conclusion should create a sense of movement to a more complex understanding of the subject of your paper. By the end of your essay, you should have worked through your ideas enough so that your reader understands what you have argued and is ready to hear the larger point (i.e. the "so what") you want to make about your topic.

Your conclusion should serve as the climax of your paper. So, save your strongest analytical points for the end of your essay, and use them to drive your conclusion.

Vivid, concrete language is as important in a conclusion as it is elsewhere--perhaps more essential, since the conclusion determines the reader's final impression of your essay. Do not leave them with the impression that your argument was vague or unsure.

WARNING: It's fine to introduce new information or quotations in your conclusions, as long as the new points grow from your argument. New points might be more general, answering the "so what" question; they might be quite specific. Just avoid making new claims that need lots of additional support. Page 3 of 3
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OUTLINE WORKSHOP
INTRODUCTION
BACKGROUND
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE #1
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE #2
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE #3
COUNTERARGUMENT
SUM UP CONCLUSION
  Sum up claim + supporting evidence statements
SO WHAT CONCLUSION

Lane restrictions
Prevent proper flow of traffic
5000 vehicles travel down each road for a total of 10,000 through intersection each day. By reducing lane size it will create greater congestion. Residents have seen more vehicles are passing through Petersburg since the reconstruction of trussler rd and the addition of the roundabouts. Also, Wilmot’s forecasted population growth is supposed to be... With the greater proportion forecasted to move to Baden and New Hamburg because they have the capacity for greater growth. Which means more vehicles will be traveling through Petersburg as a corridor to Kitchener and Waterloo. Petersburg is surrounded by not only farms but also industries that depend in large vehicles to transport to and from. On north end, south end and east...... The farm equipment that is driven by Petersburg residents through Petersburg will not fit down the street and they have been told they have to drive over the curb.

Elimination of shoulder
Creates an unsafe driving situation. There are over 10,000 vehicles traveling through Petersburg in a day and the average speed of these vehicles is approx 60 km an hour. An above average number if vehicles are large and weigh more than. Preppie use the shoulders in order to slow down to an appropriate speed prior to turning into a driveway directly off the regional road. By eliminating the shoulder it will cause vehicles to slow down significantly which will further slow down traffic.

Elimination of parking substituted for On street parking
Bc the proposal states to remove the shoulder which will cause problems for local residents and businesses. They have proposed on street parking. The problems with this is the locations of the parking spots don't necessary match the needs and these parking spots create a driving safety concern. Some of these parking spots will cause vehicles to come to a complete stop on an active regional highway in order to parallel park or pull into the parking spot. Also, the parking spots were designated based on the location where vehicles were seen by the persons conducting the parking study on two deprecate days. The issues with this is that those two days are not representative of what we're traffic actually. Parks in Petersburg and doesn't reflect the needs of the whole population of Petersburg. The shoulder in Petersburg does not only assist with parking but also reduces congestion by allowing service vehicles to pull off in the shoulder and come to a complete stop such as recycle, garbage, green bin collection and hydro vehicles.

Elimination of shoulder
Overflow parking for park, cemetery, church, local businesses and residences.

In the second proposal the shoulder was redrawn in around the park

The cemetery is still currently active and does not have a parking lot so during times of burials the attendees not only use the parking lot belonging to the blue moon but also park along the shoulders throughout Petersburg. The new proposal only allows for 2 vehicles to park at the cemetery which is obviously not enough.

The gas station at the corner of Notre Dame and Snyders road not only provides the residents with gas and good but also those drivers passing by. Many times the vehicles being driven are dump trucks, tractor trailers, farm equipment, service vehicles, or vehicles pulling trailers which are either unable to pull into the gas station evaluate of theirs size or the driver does not feel comfortable enough. By eliminating the shoulder which gives these drivers the opportunity to stop.

Other vehicles that use shoulder are snowmobiles, horse and buggies
Also, with the increasing population of Wilmot and Waterloo regions priority on green transportation the
likelyhood in there is a good posibility that within the next several years of a transit bus passing through Petersburg to get to Baden, new hamburg, new Dundee or saint agatha. If this happens and the bus makes any stops it would reduce traffic congestion if there was a shoulder for the bus to pull off on to.

Segregated bike
As per wall cycle report, forcaste for distance is 16kg for whole of waterloo. Not a high priority. Only going to be 500m along Snyders and 900m along Notre dame. Then both directions will end in a gravel shoulder. There is the potential that these roads will be tedine and a bike lane will be paved as per walk cycle report.
The majority of people that cycle in Petersburg are experienced cyclists who travel through in order go get to another location. As per wall cycle these types of cycles account for less then 8% of the population. As per walk cycle it reports that even if segregated bike lanes are installed because of the speed, amount and size if vehicles traveling along Notre dame and Snyders road people who are..... Cyclists still will not be comfortable cycling. The jump from gravel shoulder to segregated bike lane and not a simple segregated bike Kane but one where the cyclist now has to bike over a mountable curb, us not only dangerous but overkill. Dangerous because the cyclists who will most likely be cycling through Petersburg might choose to ignore the segregated bike lane because if the rounded curb and therefore hinder traffic by causing vehicles to drive into oncoming traffic to get around cyclist bc the lanes have been reduced in size and because the type if cyclist that wound be using this route are more likely to bike in various weather conditions and seasons and snow or rain puddles might camaflouge the curb and cause the cyclist to loss balance.

Elimination of right turn lanes.
There is already traffic congestion at the lights and during rush hour there are times when u can't get through the intersection. Residents hoped for help at the intersection However the new plan states that they will be eliminating the two right turn lanes that we have bc they believe they are not needed. Meanwhile extra turn lanes should be added especially southbound note more dame bc people often cut throug the gas station.
With the highway being so close people often come from all directions to get to the highway or turn off the highway.

If sidewalks aren't warranted in Baden next to a school why would they be needed on both sides of the road at 1.5m for 7 houses
By the transportation master plan a pedestrian area is messed dart but it does not say sidewalks. Also, it states that a shoulder I'd ideal