

Holiday Inn, 601 Scottsdale Drive
January 14, 2008 7:00 p.m.

A meeting of Guelph City Council.

Present: Mayor Farbridge, Councillors Beard, Bell, Billings, Burcher, Farrelly, Findlay, Hofland, Kovach, Laidlaw (arrived at 7:10 p.m.) Piper, and Salisbury

Absent: Councillor Wettstein

Staff Present: Mr. J. Riddell, Director of Community Design and Development Services; Mr. R. Philips, Transportation Planning & Development Engineering Manager; Mr. R. Henry, City Engineer; Mr. G. Keyworth, Transportation Planner; Ms. J. McDowell, Transportation Demand Management Coordinator; Ms. T. Agnello, Deputy City Clerk; and Ms. D. Black, Assistant Council Committee Co-ordinator

DECLARATIONS UNDER MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

1. Moved by Councillor Billings
Seconded by Councillor Burcher

THAT persons wishing to address Council be permitted to do so at this time.

Carried

PRESENTATIONS

Mr. R. Philips, Transportation Planning & Development Engineering Manager was present and explained the purpose of the meeting. He advised that members of the Ministry of Transportation and Stantec were also present to hear what the delegations had to say. He stated that improvements to the Hanlon are necessary but staff recognize that there are significant concerns. He advised that the proposed Laird Road improvement is similar to the intersection at Wellington and is necessary for the development of the Hanlon Business Park. He then outlined the characteristics of the traffic flow along the Hanlon in this area and the correlating concerns. He reminded everyone that this proposal is a draft and more discussion will occur. He outlined the next stages of the process and stated the Ministry of Transportation timeframe would be to come back to Council in the springtime with a recommendation once public input is considered.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Ian Smith, on behalf of the Guelph Chamber of Commerce was present to state that most businesses within the City of Guelph support the changes. He raised the issue that the City is only a small portion of a much larger transportation system. He stated the Guelph Chamber of Commerce is convinced cyclists and pedestrians will be able to cross safely. They also believe the noise issue will improve because cars will not be starting and stopping, idling and using air brakes. He recognizes people will have to change driving patterns, but believes traffic on arterial roads will be worse if changes are not made. He suggested that a diamond configuration would make it difficult for large trucks to access and exit the Hanlon.

Mrs. Katherine Rodgers, a resident near the proposed Hanlon changes was present to express concerns. She stated that the preferred plan allows the MTO to buy their property outright rather than other options which allow the MTO to purchase both front and side portions of her property. She advised that her husband and herself believe in the process and are in favour of the preferred plan. She believes the environment, noise and traffic issues have been addressed. She stated the current status has a high probability of serious accidents because drivers do not expect traffic to come to a dead stop on a major expressway but this scenario repeats itself all along the corridor. She said that vehicular traffic consists of high speed, drivers running red lights, and crossing against turn lights. She believes the idling at the lights is unnecessary causing undue pollution and noise. She feels it is good for Guelph because it will move commerce, bring in tax dollars and will attract people to Guelph. She stated that a number of residents in the area are living in limbo and would just like a decision to be made so they can make any necessary future plans. At present, they are unable to sell their home on the open market due to uncertainty

Mr. Steve Barnhart on behalf of the West Hanlon Neighbourhood Group (WHNG) stated that the original project was a joint design between the City and the Province but changes have been made since. He then reviewed the 1974 Transportation Plan and 1975 Southview Planning District 8 Goals. He advised that those documents stated the Hanlon would be a major urban arterial road, and that Stone Road and Downey Road would be a major urban arterial road with access to the Hanlon. The need for pedestrian access across the Hanlon was also recognized at that time, as well as the need to resolve pedestrian access across Stone Road before further development occurs. He suggested that the speed be limited to 90 kph to make it a parkway and not a 400 series highway.

He believes the selection of criteria was done without any consultation and does not believe the major stakeholder issues and concerns have been addressed properly. He said that without any north/south link there will be traffic burdens on the community yet the Ministry of the Transportation of Ontario is willing to move forward anyway. He stated that the pedestrian connection at College and Gordon are recognized as a recreational connection and tunnels would be built and he does not feel this is a safe alternative. He also expressed concern that Kortright Road has no controlled pedestrian access and they would just have to wait for a break in traffic. He suggested a lower design speed and shorter ramp lengths.

In meetings with MPP, Liz Sandals, the neighbourhood group was advised of three options:

- College Avenue extension (not supported by WHNG)
- Service Road between Kortright Road and Stone Road (supported by WHNG)
- Collector Lanes south to Kortright to north of College (new information requires additional public consultation).

They were informed all options would have a financial impact on the City.

Mr. Barnhart then outlined recommendations from the West Hanlon Neighbourhood Group. They included:

- Separate EA into 2 parts (1) continue with South Section (Laird) and (2) Extend the planning and consultation for North Section (College, Stone, Kortright)
- City and MTO joint design should be reflective of the original intent of collaboration during 1969 functional planning process
- Adhere to previous city planning principles (Southview Planning District 8 Concept Plan 1975) and values of the West Hanlon Community.

Mr. Paul Muller, Chair of the West Hanlon Neighbourhood Group was present to express concerns with the proposed changes. He does not believe the proposals will be able to handle the level of traffic. He does not believe that one full and one partial interchange and blocking off College Avenue access to the Hanlon will improve the traffic situation. He believes the addition of six new elevated traffic lanes is excessive and will overpower the north Wagoners Trail residents with ramps and noise barriers almost as high as their roof lines. He requested the Ministry of Transportation to review the options again with more consideration given to the quality of life of the residents living on the west and east sides of the Hanlon.

Ms. Joan Agosta was present to express concern with the proposals. She does not feel it is a real consultation process and believes the Ministry of Transportation has already decided their course of action. She advised that she started a petition and now has over 1,300 signatures. She stated that in the City's Community Energy Plan, she saw that the City hopes to reduce greenhouse gases and emissions and believes this means we need to get people out of cars and not build more lanes and bigger interchanges. The petition states that the residents believe the MTO's preferred plan:

- will negatively impact health, safety and quality of life of the community through increases in noise levels, air quality deterioration, isolation of neighborhoods, environment threats, increased traffic and disruption of neighbourhoods
- that it is in conflict with the City's strategic plan to minimize reliance on the automobile, create walkable communities and protect our natural resources
- will destroy the enjoyment of life created by the communal growth of a stable cultural and social environment and destroying the investment scheme sold to people at the time of purchase; and
- will cost in excess of \$50 million, public money that could be better diverted to creating an efficient system of local rapid mass transit

She then advised that the petition requests:

- the City to officially oppose the preferred plan of the MTO
- the MTO deny approval of the preferred plan
- the creation of an adhoc working group with representation from the citizens of Guelph and City staff to develop recommendations for appropriate development of the Hanlon supporting Guelph's strategic plan.

Mr. K. Poirier, a resident in the area stated that stop lights on the Hanlon need to be removed, but does not believe it needs to be a 400 Series Highway. His property is located very close to the proposed highway and the MTO proposes to build a small berm or a raised buffer, which he considers to be inadequate. He believes the public have been only given partial information and he believes the proposed changes are excessive. He advised that the Ministry of Transportation is proposing changes for a 400 Series Highway, yet the Hanlon at Wellington does not meet those standards, thus, the Hanlon would still not meet the requirements. He expressed concern with the Ministry of Transportation's dismissal of other proposals. He also raised concern for the impact on the environment, particularly the wildlife that exists in the neighbourhood. He outlined the West Hanlon Neighbourhood Group's preferred plan of a Diamond Interchange and pointed out the positive aspects. He then stated that they would like to see the process slowed down to allow proper review of the various plans.

Mr. D. McAuley was not present.

Ms. Magee McGuire was present. She stated concern with the proposed preferred plan by the MTO. She believes too many railways have been removed and too much vehicular traffic is being used. She stated that the removal of the medians would result in water collecting. She advised that it was recommended that the Hanlon should be a four lane highway, not six lanes and she is concerned about the impact it will have on the groundwater. She listed several issues that have arisen since the overpass was built on Wellington and advised the new proposal for the Hanlon will result in the same detrimental effects on the east and west neighbourhoods. She does not believe there has been enough consideration to the effect on the recreational facilities, the displacement of wetlands, noise air pollution, and vista disturbances. She believes there is a need for an impact discussion paper with principles to eliminate adverse effects, monitoring landfill, financial compensation and timely project completion for whatever design this expressway takes and what alternatives can be explored.

Mr. Doug Gruber was present to express concern with respect to the proposal of the 400 Series changes. He is concerned that the 100km speed limit would prohibit the MTO from establishing the needed interchanges at College and Stone, and Kortright/Downey. If the speed limit were dropped to 80k/hr then there would be enough room for all three interchanges. He stated that if only one interchange, then communities west of the Hanlon will be cut off from the rest of Guelph. He raised concerns for students needing to get to Centennial, College Heights and several elementary schools, as well as the University if there were no interchange at College Avenue. He expressed the same concern at Kortright for people trying to get to the YMCA. He requested City Council to review evidence from other jurisdictions where speed limits are changed for volume of traffic and asked them to do whatever possible to ensure interchanges at College Avenue, Stone Road and Kortright/Downey Road.

Ms. Marva Wisdom, on behalf of the Guelph YMCA was present to express concerns with the proposed preferred plan. She provided some background information with respect to the YMCA. She advised that an average of two thousand vehicles per day traveling to and from north of the Kortright Road intersection and stated that the proposed changes would increase traffic volumes on local roads not designed to take the high volume due to reduced access from the Hanlon. In addition, the residential neighbourhood will bear the brunt of additional traffic. They are concerned about the impact on their business due to the difficulty people would have trying to access their property. She then requested that sufficient time be allowed for a full collaborative

process with all the various stakeholders; and requested the City of Guelph and the Ministry of Transportation to conduct a joint Environmental Assessment. She also recommended severing the north section from the existing Environmental Assessment to meet the scheduled construction of the interchange at Laird and the Hanlon. She would also like the City to develop a plan that retains the arterial access in the north study area; and form an ad hoc citizens group of stakeholders as part of their process.

Ms. Fran Bain was present to question the reasoning of spending more tax dollars and diverting traffic from an area with established Hanlon access through limited green space and residential subdivisions. She wanted to know why the MTO would plan to extend College Avenue through wetlands and conservation property despite opposition from the City of Guelph and local residents. She stated that restricting access at Kortright and College would result in increased traffic flow through the surrounding residential areas which would decrease safety. She also raised a concern with the increased speed limit on the Hanlon. She then stated the MTO wanted to select a plan that provides:

- safe operation
- accommodates local access to the area
- is cost effective and;
- minimizes natural, social and cultural environments.

She does not believe they would meet any of these goals with the proposed plan. She encouraged the City to reject the proposed plan.

Ms. J. Bistolas was present to state her opposition to the proposed plan. She believes the plan conflicts with community values and would create traffic problems on Woodland Glen Drive. She believes restricting access across Woodland Glen Drive would endanger wildlife in the Conservation area and Park; and that it would force residents into cars to access amenities by making the Stone Road interchange too dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. She then stated concern with the process and believes the MTO has not considered pedestrian and cycling access enough in their decision-making process. She then recommended the diamond interchange at Stone Road; a full interchange at Kortright/Downey; a service road or collector lanes, partial interchange at College Avenue; and scaling back the proposal.

Mr. Dirk Van Raalte was present to raise questions and concerns. He stated his issues revolved around the quality of life issues and advised that he is not against progress, however, he believes the proposal is excessive in nature. He feels the proposed project will not benefit the residents of the City of Guelph. He advised that with the population cap being approximately 150,000, then the City would not require such extensive changes. He advised that the Southview Planning District Study assured residents that the

Hanlon would serve as a major North/South Arterial route for the west area of Guelph as well as suitability intersecting with collector roads. He believes the MTO proposal negates the Southview Planning District Study. He stated that he believes the interchange at Stone Road too expensive, and the limitations on access to College Avenue, Kortright Road and Downey negatively impacts the residents. He also raised concerns regarding increased congestion on residential streets and feeder roads – including current cyclists and pedestrians that would need to start using vehicular traffic.

Mr. Dave Penny suggested they remove the northbound exit ramp on Kortright Road because he believes it would take away a large portion of the park, remove a grove of black walnut trees, cut off Shadybrook Crescent from emergency snow exit, cut off the off leash dog walking park, cut off access to city walking and bike trails at Preservation Park and the industrial park. He also believes the ramp will remove natural noise and visual barriers, the lights would be too close to the lights at Ironwood Road; and there would be a dangerous obstructed site line under the bridge. He also stated that there would be stop start issues on the grade on Kortright Hill, an increased danger of chemical spills, and salt usage could contaminate the well nearby. He believes it will increase the number of speeders shortcutting to the University. He also believes it would increase noise due to the proximity to homes and changes in vehicle velocity and direction. He suggested collector roads be in place, placing an easy commuter exit on proposed southbound Hanlon entrance ramp across from the YMCA; a southbound Hanlon exit loop ramp across from the YMCA, which he believes would allow for turn arounds at Stone and Laird exchanges and would keep much of the traffic off neighbourhood and collector roads.

Mr. John Syzmanski was present to express agreement with the proposal brought forward by the West Hanlon Neighbourhood Group. He expressed dissatisfaction with the process and he does not believe the concerns of the public are being heard. He expressed concern with the speed limit being set at 100 kph because it limits the design options for exit and entrance ramps. He also advised that concerns about pedestrian and cyclist access were to be addressed at previous public meetings, but he does not feel they have been. He stated that the neighbourhood group has yet to received a response to date from the MTO on a letter sent quite some time ago. He questioned how residents could be informed that their properties may be expropriated when they are in a consultation process.

Mr. Ken. Hare was not present

Mr. Mark Mostoccie was not present

Mr. Mike Chapman was present to express issues with traffic. He believes the reduction from three intersections to one will greatly increase the isolation of the residents in the vicinity. He was concerned about the high speed limit within a residential neighbourhood – especially with respect to safety issues for the children. He requested to see what ground level impact would be by using some type of model. He believes there needs to be more consideration given to the concerns and issues of the residents of the affected area and stated this will require more time.

Ms. Carol Lanfranchi was present to state her frustration with the plan changes since they bought their property. She advised that several years ago, when they applied for a building permit they were advised the MTO was to be involved due to proposed plans and those plans included expropriation of a portion of their property. A few years ago, when they applied for another building permit, they were advised the plans were off the table, yet they have been informed otherwise and told they are required to give up their entire property. She questioned whether the residents are being listened to or if a decision has already been made. She asked why residents could not get replacement value for their properties to enable them to continue with their current lifestyle. She would like to receive replacement compensation and not market value and requested access to any and all information on their future property. She requested an expedient final decision regarding the intersection to enable them to plan accordingly.

Ms. Linda Liddle has lived in the area even before the Hanlon was built and expressed concerns if the preferred plan is implemented for the Hanlon. She stated statistics provided within a report drafted by Stantec, however, she was unable to get information on the “peak hour” that was used, the length of time of the study or the time frame the information was gathered despite numerous requests to Stantec. She expressed concern about where all the traffic would go if all traffic would be getting off at Stone Road and changing from 2 to 4 lanes and expropriation of all the land. She believes that the interchange at Stone Road will cause many homeowners to lose their homes, and those that do remain will be detrimental to the quality of life due to noise, high intensity illumination for the ramps, air pollution and limited access.

Mr. Bruce MacEachern, speaking on behalf of Mr. Paul Rice and other neighbours south of Maltby Road was present to state that they do not feel there has been enough consideration to the preferred plan. Currently, the City proposes to extend Southgate Drive and have no specific plan to connect to Puslinch Township. The MTO plans to close Maltby Road and insist on the closure of Crawley Road. Presently Puslinch Township and Wellington County have no plans for changes south of Maltby except for changes being made by the MTO. Proposed Laird Road and new

midblock will be 2 principal entrances for the industrial park so he did not know how the City would access the interchange. They cannot go southward into wetlands, barrier to development and do not include buffers or linkages. He also questioned the status of Concession 7 where it currently intersects Maltby which is a critical linkage. He advised that if a flyover is constructed at Maltby the City will be cut off. He does not believe the proposed plan serves the best interests of the City or Puslinch Township.

Mr. Ben Bennett was present to express concern. In the age of high gas prices, global warming, he does not see how a highway of this magnitude could be responsibly sustained. He believes all the plans are based on business as usual scenarios. He does not see how the proposed changes will make life easier for Guelphites and he sees it as just another way of connecting Kitchener to Highway 401. He requests the City to encourage the Province to find more creative solutions to traffic issues.

Mrs. Laura Murr was present on behalf of the Kortright Hills Community Association to raise issues. She advised the association is in support for northbound access onto the Hanlon via a service road between Kortright and Stone but do not support the college Avenue Extension. She advised they have serious concerns with respect to the environment and requested the following be included in the Natural Environment Criteria:

- source water protection
- protection of the Downey Well & any proposed new wells near Stone Road
- risk assessment and containment plans for catastrophic spills and fugitive road contaminants (salt, heavy metals, etc.)
- flood risk and accurate mapping of the one zone floodlines
- protection of fish habitat
- air, noise and light pollution; and
- existing Pm10 and PM 2.5 levels and estimations of future levels for 50,000 vehicles and more per day

She raised concerns with respect to impacts on the Hanlon Creek PSW and Creek; the Downey Well, impacts on neighbourhood traffic, safety issues, noise and air pollution and advised there is not enough information yet to make an informed, wise decision that will stand the test of time. She advised they have also received no responses to date from the MTO and requested a full written extension date from the MTO for written comments on the proposed plan.

Mrs. Laura Murr, also spoke on behalf of Mr. Dennis Murr. He expressed concern with the increase of shortcutting that will likely

occur as a result of the proposed changes to the Hanlon and believe there will be an increased need for traffic calming measures that the taxpayers will have to pay for on top of the changes to the Hanlon. He requested the City and the MTO to address noise levels, and environmental and traffic issues before approving any changes on the Hanlon. It was suggested that air quality along the Hanlon during typical peak daily traffic conditions should be done to address issues before any changes are made. He believes there is not enough information to know the impact on Guelph and does not believe the highway expansions being proposed by the MTO are “complementary improvements”. He would also like to see “Externality costs” be added to the Hanlon weighted evaluation criteria. He also recommended developing a plan for climate change and take into account global warming. Mr. Murr would also like to see the public comment period formally extended in writing by the MTO.

Ms. Bev Wozniak lives in the area and expressed concern with the proposed interchanges for the Hanlon. She raised the concern that because two separate MTO regional offices are reviewing the changes to the Hanlon Expressway, they may be looking at things piece meal and not looking at the whole picture. She raised the concern that with the changes that will have to occur on Concession 7 and Wellington County Road #34 and the construction of a flyover at the Hanlon, vehicles using County Road #34 will no longer be able to directly access the Hanlon or Highway #401. She was concerned that the interchange on Concession #7 would be built right on top of the Paris Moraine. She does not believe the MTO has taken into consideration the growth and major changes which have occurred within the City of Guelph and Puslinch Township. She also stated that it would be very difficult to protect the features and functions of the Paris Moraine and watershed. She stated that the proposed changes would cause a great deal of confusion and frustration for rerouted drivers. She also raised concerns with respect to emergency services and referred to a letter from the Fire Chief of Puslinch Township.

Ms. Elizabeth Quintanar was present to express concern with respect to pedestrian traffic. She would like Council to consider all people when reviewing the proposal and not just vehicular traffic. She was concerned with the safety of pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross the Hanlon.

Mr. Bruce Baily, a nearby resident was present to express concern with the preferred plan. He stated that it was difficult to comment without knowing about the City’s preferred plan. He believes that the assumptions should be challenged and examined and people want to know the rationale for the decision making process. He believes there is a conflicting use of the property and this will be a

good test for the Places to Grow legislation. He does not believe the preferred plans can be taken in isolation and need to look at the big picture. He advised that the preferred plan does not address the complications to local traffic patterns and there are several issues that need to be further examined before a decision should be made. He believes this issue is a “test case” for the conflicts of Provincial Places to Grow objectives and local planning issues and he encouraged all parties to find new, creative approaches to reconcile the opposing interests into one plan.

Mr. Bill Mullin was present to address environmental impact issues – in particular pollution. He stated his neighbourhood has experienced a significant increase in noise levels over the past five years. He stated that they would like Council to conduct actual sound measurements; examine increase in noise levels since community was built and demand that the MTO meet the same noise guidelines as private sector.

Ms. Jennifer Duncan was not present.

Mr. Rob de Loe advised he did not need to speak because previous delegations addressed his concerns.

The Mayor advised everyone again of the process. The City will move into more consultation and more input and seek a more collaborative input. Mayor Farbridge directed staff to follow the same collaborative process as the York Lands Study.

Staff was directed to contact the MTO to formally request them to change the public input date in writing and would like this information back to Council as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 o’clock p.m.

.....
Mayor

.....
Deputy Clerk