

**- ADDENDUM -**  
**- GUELPH CITY COUNCIL MEETING -**  
**- September 28, 2009 -**

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>DELEGATIONS</b>
--------------------

- a) Elizabeth Street Pavement Markings (Clause 3 of the Emergency Services, Community Services & Operations Committee 6<sup>th</sup> Consent Report):
  - Rob Hingston
  - Cosmo Carere on behalf of the Cycling Action Committee
  
- b) Farmers' Market By-law Operational Review (Clause 2 of the Emergency Services, Community Services & Operations Committee 6<sup>th</sup> Consent Report):
  - Diane Hurst on behalf of Friends of the Farmers' Market

***"THAT By-law Numbers (2009)-18852 to (2009)-18873, inclusive, are hereby passed."***

<b>BY-LAWS</b>
----------------

By-law Number (2009)-18870 A by-law to dedicate certain lands known as 1 foot Reserve No. 2, Plan 681, City of Guelph, as part of Auden Road.	To dedicate land as part of Auden Rd.
By-law Number (2009)-18871 A by-law to authorize the execution of an Agreement between The Corporation of the City of Guelph and Verly Construction Group Inc. (Contract No. 2-0923 for the servicing and road construction of Wyndham St. from Wellington St. to Farquhar St.)	To execute Contract No. 2-0923 for the servicing and road construction of Wyndham St. from Wellington St. to Farquhar St.

<p>By-law Number (2009)-18872 A by-law to provide for the temporary closure of a portion of Wyndham Street, from Wellington Street to Farquhar Street during Wyndham Street reconstruction. (Contract No. 2-0923)</p>	<p>Temporary closure of a portion of Wyndham Street during the street reconstruction.</p>
<p>By-law Number (2009)-18873 A by-law to confirm the proceedings of meetings of Guelph City Council held September 8 and 28, 2009.</p>	<p>To confirm the proceedings of meetings of City Council held September 8 and 28, 2009.</p>

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 28 2009

REGARDING BICYCLE LANE MARKINGS ON ELIZABETH ST

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

My wife and I bought our house on Elizabeth St in November of 1988, some 21 years ago.

We did not initially consider purchasing this property as it has a shared driveway with the neighboring house. Therefore there was no provision for visitor parking in the lane which is further complicated by the fact that the lane is a right of way to the railway tracks to the rear of our property. Since there seemed to be sufficient on street parking, we decided that it would be okay and purchased our home.

Imagine my surprise when a letter from City Hall arrived suggesting that the city wanted to remove our on street parking and paint bicycle lanes as it fit's the city's "Official Plan" and if we wouldn't mind returning the survey of directly affected residents with our opinions.. Of course I returned the survey and noted my opposition to the removal of on street parking. I had spoken with several of my neighbors and they stated their opposition to this idea as well.

A few weeks passed, and another letter arrived from city hall dated Friday Sept 11, 2009 stating that since our on street parking is being under utilized and that the city wants bike lanes (since it is a part of the "Official Plan") and that there have been 2 bike-vehicle collisions during the last 5 years, regardless of the fact that 78% of directly affected respondents surveyed are opposed. It also stated that if I wished to speak at the committee meeting on the subject I would have to get on the list by 4PM Wednesday Sept 16, 2009. This irritates me. Staff says that we have 5 days to act, but realistically since we received the letter late Monday Sept 14 2009 we were left with only 2 days to gather our thoughts and reply.

At any rate I was able to attend the committee meeting and was shocked at what I heard.

There has never been any public discussion as far as I am aware regarding these changes on Elizabeth St, so what I heard at last Monday's committee meeting is all that I know about why these changes are deemed necessary.

I am writing this on Sunday Sept 27, 2009 and as of yet the minutes of that meeting are not posted online, so I will try to fill you in to the best of my recollection.

-Elizabeth St is considered an arterial street, however a very light one at only 8 thousand vehicles per day

-Staff can not say how many cyclists use Elizabeth St as a count has never been done and they won't predict how many cyclists will use Elizabeth St if bike lanes are implemented.

-Because of the re-construction of Elizabeth St between Stevenson St and Victoria Road includes bike lanes and paths then naturally the part of Elizabeth St in question should naturally include bike lanes especially since it is identified within the city's "Official Plan".

-In Mr. McCaughan's opinion, even though an over whelming majority of directly affected residents (some 78%) are opposed to these changes, only 18% of affected residents replied at all, that there is no need to consider the outcome of the survey and press ahead with the bike lanes anyways.

-That the on street parking on Elizabeth St is under utilized. I was embarrassed for the poor man from City staff who claimed the determination was arrived at by a few staff members driving around at various time of the day and thought it to be underutilized (Though no real numbers were ever discussed)

This summarizes what I learned at the committee meeting- in fact nothing at all.

As a twenty one year resident on the street I can say with some certainty that there has never been many cyclist traffic on the street. I have been watching closer since this summer and actually counted 14 cyclists on one beautiful Sunday afternoon. Of these 14, 3 rode on the sidewalk, 2 were riding on the yellow line, and most had I-pods or some other listening device attached to their ears and only 1 was wearing a helmet.

As far as the on street parking is concerned, city staff haven't observed any underutilization on a Friday or Saturday evening or during the Christmas banquet season, when the Italian Canadian Club seems to have more chairs for people than parking for their cars.

The report mentions 2 vehicle -cyclist collisions in the past 5 years . One involved a cyclist riding on the sidewalk where the driver was not charged and the other collision resulted in the driver being charged. The circumstances surrounding the collision were not mentioned. Was the driver impaired? Was he perhaps reversing from a driveway in front of the cyclist? I guess what I'm saying is, would clearly marked bike lanes have prevented either of these collisions?

Mr. McCaughan's remarks about the survey, especially the number of the respondents infuriated me.

You are an elected councilor that governs the City of Guelph which is a part of a great country that is proudly world renown as fiercely democratic. You are aware that voter turnout has been at historically low levels for several years. You also know that if only 3 people vote out of a registered 1,000 voters , and 2 of those 3 put a check mark beside your name on the ballot- you would claim victory. When this survey was sent out , it was during peak summer vacation times which had several of my neighbors away enjoying their summer vacation . I am sure that more people would have replied at a different time of the year, but I am also confident that the percentage of respondents opposed would be similar. I also question the numbers related to the amount of surveys handed out. On a recent walk down my street, I counted only 60 homes that currently enjoy on street parking in front of their homes. The homes between Huron and Arthur St do not have any on street parking, so the implementation of bike lanes really only means a couple more lines on the road for them and no real loss of any privilege. Therefore I feel that the committee and council are being misled by the numbers presented by staff as a true gauge of the direct affect on the residents

So bearing in mind the fact that we are a democratic city, any remarks about the number of respondents must be ignored, remembering that it only takes 2 out of 3 votes to make a majority.

So why is it really that the city wants to remove the privilege of on street parking from us taxpaying shareholders of this city to implement bike lanes?

I have never been told why and have certainly never seen any facts or statistics to show if there is firstly a need for bike lanes or if a bike lane has any significant safety value and yes, I have looked for these statistics.

I can assure you that there isn't much bicycle traffic on Elizabeth St and I think that is because Elizabeth St does not start or end in either direction at any place of significance. Some people say that cyclists must ride their bikes downtown. I doubt this, especially on a Thurs, Friday or Saturday evening dressed in club wear or to attend work at the office after a perspiring ride on a bike. To the other direction is York Road, practically the furthestmost Eastern edge of the city. Remember that this is the east side of Guelph where there are essentially no entertainment or shopping destinations-really nowhere to ride a bike to. I doubt many cyclists would ride along Elizabeth St and turn north to face the hill on Victoria Road and to turn south on Victoria Rd has already taken them out of their way, since there are many shortcuts to the bicycle path along the Eramosa River, which is a preferred route anyways.

The new bike lanes along the reconstructed portion of Elizabeth St seem like they will work fine. Although I doubt that many cyclists will use them as that section of the street contains primarily businesses that cater to the automobile. Two gas stations, a transmission shop, two autobody shops, an auto parts store and a radiator shop.

During the committee meeting I heard that bike lanes have been recognized as a part of this city's sustainable transportation initiative. Please understand that I am pro-automotive, but certainly not anti-bicycle. I have a difficult time understanding how any person can convince himself that a bicycle is a feasible alternative form of transportation given our difficult winter climate and a bicycle's inability to carry larger heavier loads. In my neighbourhood there aren't many retail services that you could easily access by bike to do your shopping even if you wanted to, so you have to realize that a bicycle can never be considered as practical primary transportation.

Councilors Laidlaw and Bell would have to admit this as well, considering that they both attended the bike summit in KW last Monday and they used Councilor's Bell car to get there. I find it strange that both these councilors would ride anywhere in a car considering their support of the bicycle community.

I have several other concerns regarding the proposed bike lanes besides losing my beloved on street parking.

Elizabeth St is a 24 hour truck route. When the reconstruction was done in the late 1990's was it done with bike lanes in mind? I would say not. I am a cabinetmaker by trade and by no means educated in road construction, but it appears to me that there is a crown in the road that runs the length of the street that creates 2/3 of the street to the north and the remaining 1/3 on the south. In other words 2 lanes traveling west and one lane traveling east. If I am correct, will this not cause some winter driving concerns as a bike lane will shift traffic 5 feet off the curb and have vehicles straddling the crown causing traction issues.

Also, with the traveling lanes shifted 5 feet off the curb, it appears to me that the majority of the metal man hole covers are situated exactly where the tires on vehicles will travel. These man hole covers are not exactly flush to the traveled surface of the road and tires passing over them will create a lot of noise. Being a truck and bus route, remember that means that probably 9 tires from each truck and 3 or 4 from each bus will bounce over each manhole cover at all hours of the day and night. This is an older working class street, which means that most homes don't have central air so many of us sleep with our

windows open. Would this constant noise be acceptable to you and your neighbours? Also on the subject of manhole covers, is it safe to have large vehicles driving over these thin metal lids constantly without fear of them becoming dislodged or will they have to be welded shut?

As a licensed driver I am fully aware that the provisions for cyclists are already within the highway traffic act which allow cyclists the space they need to navigate any street and most roads in the province.

Historically there have not been significant problems between cyclists and motorists on Elizabeth Street. It appears as though somebody is trying to repair something that is not broken. City staff have not seemed to have done the typical leg work to bring to council facts and statistics to support the need for bicycle lanes. The directly affected residents on Elizabeth St do not oppose bike lanes, but we do not want to relinquish our on street parking privileges.

For me the two most important aspects of bicycle lanes on Elizabeth St for you to consider are:

One- At the end of the day, decorating our street with two new lines will not offer the cycling community any more rights than they already have to safely navigate this street, yet we, the taxpaying shareholders of the city of Guelph will have a privilege that has been enjoyed probably since the street was first paved removed from us which will directly affect both our quality of life and our property values in a negative way.

Two- And probably most importantly. Is the fact that as directly affected residents, we were asked through a survey for our opinions and we responded with a resounding 78% of us opposed, remembering that we are directly affected by these changes. Yet we find ourselves firmly stuck on the anti-bicycle side of the line drawn in the sand by some members of this city on the pro bicycle side without any practical solution to erase the line and cohabitate.

In a democratic country such as ours, why were we asked to respond to a survey only to find that democracy does not rule in Guelph?

So you must ask yourself if you can support this request for bike lanes even though you have not received any information that would justify the expense as well as having the understanding that we directly affected residents will be forced to surrender both quality of life and loss in property values, In the end even the cycling community, who don't appear to accept responsibility for their own safety in general through their lack of wearing of helmets and disregard for the highway traffic act, gain nothing more than two little white lines on the road.

Thank You  
Rob Hingston.