

Official Plan Rural Public Meeting

SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT

Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013



Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

FORWARD

The Manotick Village and Community Association (MVCA) has responded to the Federation of Citizens Association's call for a community based public consultative initiative to engage rural residents in providing feedback to Ottawa's 2013 Official Plan update.

Not being bound to City based standards for public consultations, the MVCA agreed to use a facilitated consultation methodology that is scalable and engages all participants respectfully in the conversation and a process that achieves written and detailed documented outputs in a short period of time. The meeting was concluded in less than 2 hours.

In every sense this consultative public meeting has been a success. Close to 100 residents participated and the process allowed for open and respectful dialogue in plenary and in table-groups of 8.

The MVCA is grateful to Mr. Pierre Viau, professional facilitator and volunteer board member and VP of the MVCA for his excellent facilitation skills, his dedication and hard work to make this public consultation such a success.

Klaus Beltzner, B.Sc., M.Math., M.B.A.
President, Manotick Village and Community Association

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

On Tuesday April 9, 2013 the Manotick Village and Community Association held a facilitated public meeting for the residents of Rideau-Goulbourn and Osgoode Wards to provide feedback on the rural impacts of the City of Ottawa's 2013 Official Plan Review proposed policy changes. The meeting, which was jointly sponsored by Councillors Scott Moffatt and Doug Thompson, was held at Manotick Arena from 7 pm to 9 pm and was attended by close to 100 people including residents from Ashton, Cumberland, Edwards, Gloucester, Greely, Kanata, Kars, Kemptville, Manotick, Metcalfe, Nepean, North Gower, Ottawa, Pakenham, and Richmond, and representatives from the following organizations:

Great Ashton Community Association
Ottawa Citizens Against Pollution by Sewage (OCAPS)
Emerald Links Estates Community Association
Greely Lions
Greely Sand & Gravel
Lakeland Estates Lot-Owners Association
Country Club Village Association
Beckett's Landing Community Association
Carleton Golf and Yacht Homeowners Association
Manotick Business Improvement Area
Manotick Culture, Parks and Recreation Association
Manotick News
Manotick Messenger
Nicolls Island Community Association
Rural Ottawa South Support Services
Vibration Studios
Watson's Mill Manotick Inc.
North Gower Recreation Association and North Gower & District Community Association
Osgoode Carleton Snowmobile Trail Club
Osgoode Village Community Association
Newcastle Developments
Richmond Village Community Association

Invited City of Ottawa staff included:

Adam Brown, Rural Affairs Office
Bruce Finlay, Official Plan
Colin Simpson, Transportation Master Plan (TMP)

Observers:

Councillor Scott Moffatt
Councillor Doug Thompson

Presenter: Klaus Beltzner

Facilitator: Pierre Viau

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

The format of the meeting consisted of two short presentations¹ summarizing the rural elements of City's proposed policy changes:

• **Rural Land Use**

- Rural Lots & Villages
- Employment Lands
- Agricultural Resources
- Mineral Resources

and

• **Transportation**

- Reduce Car Use
- Build Complete Streets
- Choose Walking and Cycling for Short Trips

Each presentation was followed by a breakout exercise, where participants, who were seated at tables of 8, were asked to provide feedback by identifying: what's working, what doesn't work, and what's missing with the City's proposed policy changes and write these down on Post-It stickies. Each breakout exercise was followed by a plenary session where some of the ideas identified were shared.

The themes that emerged were as follows:

Rural Land Use

1. What's Working with the City's Proposed Policy Changes:
 - Existing Village Boundaries
 - Rural Employment Lands
2. What Doesn't Work with the City's Proposed Policy Changes:
 - Intensification and Preserving Village Character
 - Country Lot Subdivision Moratorium
 - Lot Severances
 - Governance/City and OMB not Listening
3. What's Missing with the City's Proposed Policy Changes:
 - Recognition of what's Important to Rural Residents
 - Mechanism for Ongoing Input by Residents / Communities on Rural Issues, Concerns, Policies
 - Transparency in Developing Rural Policies

¹ See: PowerPoint presentation used at the meeting: www.manotickvca.org/officialplan.html

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

Transportation

1. What's Working with the City's Proposed Policy Changes:
 - Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policies

2. What Doesn't Work with the City's Proposed Policy Changes:
 - One Size Policies for All
 - Reduce Car Use Policies / Use-of-Road Charges
 - 3-hr. Peak Period Metrics
 - Cycling and Walking in Rural Ottawa
 - Truck Thru Traffic
 - Road Maintenance
 - Public Transit

3. What's Missing with the City's Proposed Policy Changes:
 - A Transportation Strategy for Rural Ottawa
 - Commuter trains / effective / appropriate transit
 - Rural cycling lanes / paved shoulders
 - Pedestrian crosswalks
 - Solution to heavy truck traffic through village core
 - Safe, well maintained roads

What follows are the *verbatim* points written by participants. These points have been subsequently grouped and themed (and sub-themed) in order to facilitate ease of reading and understanding, however the original participant points remain unchanged.

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

Rural Land Use

What's Working with the City's Proposed Policy Changes

EXISTING VILLAGE BOUNDARIES (Theme)

- Keep existing boundaries
- Present boundaries
- Keep existing boundaries
- Maintenance of village boundaries

RURAL EMPLOYMENT LANDS (Theme)

- No conversion of employment lands to residential
- Rural employment lands No Servicing
- No conversion of employment lands to residential
- 400 series interchanges as future employment lands
- Protect 400 interchanges for employment lands
- No conversion of employment lands to residential

OTHER

- The process seems to work for developers
- Country lot subdivision moratorium to be permanent
- Nothing
- Urban sprawl seems to be working very well, whether we like it or not, it is virtually a “biological” process
- Additional severances % of a rural development is reasonable
- Number of rural lot severance increases
- In support of number of lots for severance to be increased
- Still a democracy
- Minto getting 1600 lots based on large pipe – we paranoid citizens were right!

What Doesn't Work with the City's Proposed Policy Changes

INTENSIFICATION and PRESERVING VILLAGE CHARACTER (Theme)

- Rezoning in rural areas
- Policy of directing growth to villages is good for obvious reasons but will not work as intended in Richmond. With a large developer developing the available land it will simply be marketed to liquidate the available inventory a.s.a.p. so the developed can recoup costs. Another sea of vinyl siding will be the result... sold to city residents as a cheaper alternative than inner city living... all simply working

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

against the larger goals of preserving the nature of rural villages and avoiding sprawl.

- Flawed rationale to consider “potential lots” in villages. A consideration should be given to where the land is in the process and what the owner intends.
- Number of lots in Manotick appears to be based on all of Minto land, yet only approved for 250 lots at the moment
- Incomplete understanding of how capacity is determined for new servicing
- Inability to expand size of medium size villages if current landowners are not developing we should consider expansion
- Requirement for services to expand mid-sized or small villages
- .75 jobs/household precondition for future growth not sustainable “/household – present & future?
- Village commute – jobs only get created on services
- Many people move to villages because of their unique character, less busy lifestyle and more living space. Most of us do not appreciate the city building urban style subdivisions in our midst essentially destroying the whole ambiance and style of quiet rural village life that we have worked so hard to find, and for many of use build and maintain.
- No new malls in villages that are not in character
- Making rural villages into urban towns
- Growing population density within villages
- Currently, there are 4 – 6 small developers who are using a lot size favoured by young families moving to Richmond. Big developer wants much smaller lots. To maintain village atmosphere – lot sizes should be size small developers are using.
- Who and how was it decided that we “need” 6,700 lots?
- Big difference between 6,700 lots “available” and 10,000 “needed” – by whom?
- Are villages subject to the same intensification targets / policy, as within urban boundary? Why so?
- Insist on same residential lot sizes (intensification) in rural villages as in urban areas. People who move to villages want larger lot sizes.

COUNTRY LOT SUBDIVISION MORATORIUM (Theme)

- Conservation subdivision lots
- Moratorium lifted on land (20 acres) surrounded by homes
- Moratorium on rural estate subdivisions
- Discouraging scattered rural lots. There is interest by some in living in lower density areas
- Limited development of scattered rural lots
- There’s a 90-lot sub-division (grandfathered) being built on First Line, Manotick. This should be stopped. The land is already being bulldozed and ditches cleared.
- Subdivision moratorium: no land to build on for the small guy
- Country lot subdivision; moratorium stays, hard to find lots
- Changing sub-division approval requirements that penalize existing property owners
- Subdivision moratorium – no land to build on for arriving people
- Country lot subdivision too restrictive

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- Country lot subdivision moratorium should be discontinued; retained portion of 25 acres (approx) should be removed
- High cost of new subdivision development

LOT SEVERANCES (Theme)

- Rural lots – 2 acre lots too big to sever; other townships have 1 acre
- Size of retained parcel for severance
- 10 hectare requirement for severance not fair to owners of 10 hectare farms. This is too arbitrary. Needs individual consideration for severances depending on circumstances
- Severance of lots in villages land large enough to support wells and septic system can only be sold if access can be approved to the nearest road (Hwy). How is this possible (approval obtained) from City
- Severance lots should be choice of farmer/land owner to sever lot, especially for family members!
- Why can't I not sever a couple of 2 acre lots off a 100 acre parcel?
- Lot severances should be looked. # of lots to be severed be restricted but perhaps a percentage would be a better # especially for those without agricultural zoning
- More than 2 lots for larger parcels

GOVERNANCE/CITY and OMB NOT LISTENING (Theme)

- Conservation authorities need common sense direction
- Need coordination between City of Ottawa and RVCA
- One policy for both City and country, e.g. bus bylaws
- OMB
- Official village plans are not followed by the city
- Transparency in City decision making
- Loss of input over proposed changes
- Villages needs to be heard before/while city makes its decisions
- This planning is not productive as developers are winning their case at the OMB no matter what the "Official Plan" states
- What is the connection between the OMB and Minto? How are OMB members selected? Do the OMB members get paid by Minto?
- City planning staff do not listen to what the villagers want – they listen to developers and their needs. The perception is that the City planning staff rule, not the councilors
- Listen to what the villages want and don't just impose, i.e. putting in larger pipes than needed so that the OMB will support greater development than the villagers want
- No trust of City planners representing taxpayers rather than development industry
- What's the point of planning when Provincial policy requires that planning is limited to the capacity of installed services. I do not believe that citizens can control capacity of central services
- CDP process – Mattamy paid for Richmond's CDP. Consequently, Mattamy had disproportionate input in CDP

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- When are we going to be part of Manotick on the Osgoode side?
- Why is the OP review silent on land use of its natural features? What about the rural natural areas (ANSIs, woodlots, etc.)?
- What plans are in the works to supply water and sewer to properties in village of Manotick on Bankfield Rd. What year? How are these costs to be calculated?
- Why is Rideau Forest all EP3?

OTHER

- Waste water infrastructure – City engineers want to pipe it to Green’s Creek. City engineers refuse to examine / evaluate / consider newer waste-water technology.
- Small business growth vs commercial
- Non-serviced rural employment lands might make a heavy drain on ground water availability?
- The new policies and criteria for agricultural and rural resources need to be defined in order to make informed opinions.
- What will be the effect of expanding sand extraction on ground water supply and quality? Will the extraction be on recharge areas?

OTHER – Public Consultation Process

- I find it impossible to comment intelligently on rural land use because of vague, dictated criteria and quotas from the City
- This process is so flawed it is impossible to imagine anything worthwhile coming from it. We haven’t enough information to give useful cogent feedback.
- Sense of frustration that this process, like the gutting of Manotick’s Secondary Plan, is completely meaningless
- Why are we not reviewing the secondary plan for our village (Manotick) rather than macro decisions (# lots, distribution of development lots etc.) over which we have no control?
- Consultation that is meaningful, before the City has made key policy decisions?
- Total lack of substantive info on which to provide feedback
- View that feedback in this forum will be of any use against staff input
- Very little explanation – should have maps and definitions... Ottawa staff should present
- Why are we going through this exercise? The developers get what they want anyway from the OMB
- Provide data on land use that is reflective of actual availability
- A flawed process – too many disparate views from different villages and too little hard data to back up process

OTHER – Suggestions Offered

- Let’s build roads or think first before housing starts
- Park size: City says park size should be uniform. Park size should be larger in rural areas

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- Agricultural land – Walton Developers have bought up prime farm land for development. Walton should only be able to develop on non-agriculture land.
- Too much control given to Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
- Too much money spent on consultants rather than getting work completed
- Waste water system
- Unique – yet until the Ontario government changes OMB and who sits on their Board, justification will not happen – must not have “construction owners” like Minto on Board.

What’s Missing with the City’s Proposed Policy Changes

RECOGNITION OF WHAT’S IMPORTANT TO RURAL RESIDENTS (Theme)

- City listening to residents
- Lack of formal recognition of village desires. We do not want to be part of urban Ottawa
- A wildlife policy that is protective of the natural world
- The major rural issues concerning land use for City waste disposal of sewage on farm fields and GMO crops and chemicals vs organic crops
- Increase severances to three lots with existing requirements for retained lot
- More availability / support for small businesses
- Too many vacant, overpriced commercial buildings
- Adapting severances according to land use in same area, ex. One side of street has lots severed. Why not permit owners on the other side? Road and hydro already exist.
- What is missing is a boundary solution to Manotick and Osgoode
- Ability to pay for services
- Country lots and village lots, no land for small business
- Common sense, i.e. below 10 hectares not allowed
- A method to preserve the character and history of villages

MECHANISM for ONGOING INPUT by RESIDENTS / COMMUNITIES on RURAL ISSUES, CONCERNS, POLICIES (Theme)

- Rural democracy
- Residents have no say whatsoever on development
- Our rural councils that used to listen to us and act on our concerns
- Community involvement in decision making / in interpretation / in regulations
- Sense to villagers that they have control or input into design of village
- Creative ideas on making the villages more appealing
- All context in terms of what this means
- Where is vision for rural
- There should be procedures in place re: special circumstances re: lot severances
- No conversion of residential lands to employment lands that have no servicing for large villages

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

TRANSPARENCY in DEVELOPING RURAL POLICIES (Theme)

- What happens after 5 years?
- Currently available lots
- Info for small villages <1000 residents
- Where is vision for rural
- Context for .75 jobs/household in rural context
- No explanation that City calculation of rural lots considered: water supply for wells
- How are services going to be expanded to the rest of Manotick
- How can someone get the zoning changed?
- More talk / research / ideas for a more sustainable method(s) for sewage... Ottawa is already over capacity...
- Proper mapping of actual lots
- Growth based on historical number of 9% yet demographic growth will decrease by 20% in 20 years
- How do you direct employment to rural?
- Richmond's CDP was written by City staff and a Mattamy consultant in 2010 and approved by City council unanimously – w/4 items to be completed. However Richmond's CDP is not on table for this OP, why?
- What are the new policies for aggregates, mineral resources, etc.? They are not explained!
- Question: What is the exact number of lots that are available today to be built on in North Gower, Richmond, Manotick and Stittsville areas? (email shouldice1@bell.net)
- Question: Would the City of Ottawa lobby the Province to allow building lot severances based on poor pocket soil, infilling and retirement lots for farmers? (email shouldice1@bell.net)
- Describe how the severance lot policy is relaxed so it is understood, clearly what is being proposed?
- What is the supply timeline for rural employment lands given no servicing?
- What are the new policies on rehabilitating areas?
- Any finite limits to growth in rural areas (not even a suggestion that we cannot keep on keeping on)
- What are the new policies on rehabilitating areas?

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

Transportation

What's Working with the City's Proposed Policy Changes

COMPLETE STREETS and ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICIES (Theme)

- Design streets for walking, cycling
- Extend sidewalks on busy streets (? not necessarily on quiet areas)
- “Complete Streets” in the rural villages to make walking and cycling possible and safe within the village
- Increased infrastructure for complete streets but only if it is applied to villages as well
- When imposed, addition of walking, cycling paths with road re-construction.
- Complete streets.
- Design cycling network within and between villages and to “downtown”
- Commitment to develop cycling routes village and rural.
- Improved connectivity of trail networks

EXAMPLES:

- Sides of 4th Line Rd was paved; excellent for bikes, instead of gravel, pave more sides for this purpose.
- Osgoode multi path
- Park & share lots along the 416 for those who can.
- Paved shoulders in rural areas for cycling clubs.
- For good walking / cycling design in an urban residential setting look at Hilton Head, SC
- Increasing park n ride spaces, BUT do not increase costs.
- Osgoode pathway with shared usage.

OTHER

- This section as speaker provided more context and interpretation.

What Doesn't Work with the City's Proposed Policy Changes

ONE SIZE POLICIES FOR ALL (Theme)

- The proposed transportation policy does not work for rural areas.
- Transportation policies: it is hard to believe this presentation is realistic for villagers!
- A policy that does not differentiate between rural and urban.
- One plan for rural / sub-urban / urban.
- Limiting lot subdivision conflicts with providing funds (taxes) for transportation improvements.

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- New transportation costs will discourage young families from moving to rural areas.
- One size fits all transportation policy will not work for rural areas.
- Can't have "one size fits all" transportation policy. Can't be same for urban and rural.
- One size does not fit all.
- Increased costs for rural residences in all areas with decreased services.

REDUCE CAR USE POLICIES / USE-OF-ROAD CHARGES (Theme)

- Reduce / discourage use of private vehicles – building more and wider roads
- Reduce /Discourage use of private vehicles:
 - Don't penalize people with use-of-road charges, etc.
 - Gridlock discourages use of private vehicles, therefore put resources into public transit, not wider roads
- Hard to reduce car use in rural area (2x)
- Reducing the use of the automobile in rural areas is just a pipe dream.
- Discouraging automobiles; e.g. a person in Hillside Gardens can't walk to the general store.
- You cannot isolate rural residents by restricting private vehicle use – unless adequate transit is made available to rural areas
- Extra road charges for distance? UNFAIR!! Will non city residents also be charged?
- Tax on car use based on km driven; taxes on registration vehicle is car is necessity, but if hardly used, this would be unfair
- Concept of additional charges to rural residents who drive because they have to; incomplete absence of any public transportation.
- Rural residents depend on use of private vehicles, not buses (which are not wanted), or rail.
- Cannot reduce vehicle use in rural areas other than in village cores – there are no alternatives; let's be realistic!
- Rural Ottawa South Support Services (ROSSS)
 - Use of road charges would impact our meals on wheels program
 - All transportation programs
 - 2012 meals on wheels: 7,000 – 8,000 trips
 - Transport: over 11,000 trips
- Use-of-road charges has very significant socio-economic implications, negative. This idea will not work in rural areas!
- Cannot penalize rural village businesses by having their truck suppliers pay more to get goods in and out.
- Don't burden rural residents with transportation taxes when much of their travel may never enter city center. Reward car poolers from rural with reduced parking charges instead.
- Urban parking metrics / rules do not reflect rural needs, i.e. one needs a car to get to work because of lack of public transportation.
- Impacts to reduce use of cars: higher transportation costs to operate businesses in rural areas. City needs to make up its mind: You can't have your cake and eat it too, as the saying goes!

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- A car is vital to rural dwellers. It is not possible for the city to provide their transportation needs. To penalize them as proposed is unjust and unworkable. Gasoline taxes already discourage rural commuting
- Rural living usually imposes additional costs – travel, well / septic maintenance, etc. Imposing road penalties would simply be unjust.

3-HR PEAK PERIOD METRICS (Theme)

- 3-hr peak period in rural areas: If driveway abuts rural major arterial, speed limit is 80 km/hr. By using 3 hr peak period residents on major arterials need significant time to safely get out of driveway.
- 3-hr peak period is of significant benefit to rural developers, since peak traffic period is likely near 1hr average of 3 hrs – no problem.
- Assess roads for 3 hr peak – not everyone has flex hrs and cannot use buses
- 3 hr peak for traffic cannot be applied to Minto development. Backdoor for 1600 houses.
- I think what does not work is the assumption that the jargon used by City staff is not understood well enough to make reasoned comment.
- The proposed 3-hr peak period metric is not suitable for rural roads and villages.
- 3 hr metric unacceptable for future development in Richmond... studies to date for development have been based on 1 hr... developers need to respect the 1 hr measure.
- 3 hr peak is in conflict with safe biking
- 3 hour peak period.
- Will a 3hr traffic metric simply allow developers to argue for even greater density... where is the “livable community” in this?

CYCLING and WALKING in RURAL OTTAWA (Theme)

- Transportation goal of encouraging walking / cycling
- Insistence on rural villages walking, cycling, receiving transit, distances may be too great
- Cycling/walking – great but we have winter. Need better roads
- Proposed transportation policies: facilitate walking / cycling in whatever ways possible, safety is paramount
- In rural areas walking is for exercise / recreation. It is not feasible for most people to shop / go to school – church– etc. on foot or bikes.
- Promises re: cycling and sidewalks sounds great, but where’s the \$ to come from? Remember the “Rural Pathways” report linking villages!!
- Cycling and walking won’t work to get an aging rural population to other parts of the city
- Maximize cycling, but we have winter!
- To connect villages for cycling have in OP c/w timeline; do sooner than later.
- Bicycles don’t work in the winter time
- An aging rural population will not be cycling and walking everywhere!
- It is unreasonable to try to get more people to walk in the villages:
 - In winter the roads and paths are too slippery and narrow

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- It is too dark and cars go too fast
- The distances are too far
- There are limited or no sidewalks
- Inter village cycling will never work,
- Cycling is great and sustainable but who will actually cycle into downtown every day for work on an annual / reg. basis, therefore need better alternative with car use. OK public transit
- Cyclists need to accept some of the costs for increased bike paths.
- You cannot now say cycle and walk more when road infrastructure cannot support it!
- City considering the MUP sufficient for commuter cycling so not paving road shoulders in rural areas.
- Poor safety for cycling on road in order to commute – no paved shoulders.
- Bike lanes ineffective over winter and for aging population

TRUCK THRU TRAFFIC (Theme)

- Truck traffic thru centre of villages (Manotick)
- Trucks on Bridge St. vs Strandherd Bridge.
- Traffic flow via residential areas – Manotick – re: speed, weight, hours off limit to heavy truck vehicles; need solution now!
- Transportation policies: where does heavy truck traffic via village and Bankfield Rd. appear under this heading? Don't see any references to this problem.
- Traffic signage: need no passing signs on Bankfield Rd.
- Address current excess truck and car through traffic at Manotick Bridge and Main!
- Traffic studies must be consistent methodology with those done prior to Minto being approved.
- Stop Bridge St. being used as a ring road and truck route. If you want people to walk and cycle, get the trucks off the major village roads.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (Theme)

- Roads need repair
- Rural road maintenance
- Rural road maintenance – many far rural roads have grass growing in damaged areas.
- Maintenance and upgrading of road systems
- Deep gravel dumped on the shoulders of Rideau Valley Dr. during cycling season
- The grader keeps making a hell of a mess on the shoulders on River Rd. Keep it in the garage and save the money. It makes walking very difficult.
- Road upgrades
- Pave side roads: policy should plan for more hard top; little townships in Northern Ontario see the benefit for cost savings and safety.

PUBLIC TRANSIT (Theme)

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- Discourage use of public transportation e.g. Kanata 417 widening, therefore put resources into better public transportation, e.g. use of VIA Rail track for “GO Train”
- Rural transportation, i.e. OC Transpo, Para Transpo
- It is unreasonable for us to use Park n Ride – the odd time I try to use the Park n Ride in Barrhaven, it has been filled.
- We still have to drive to the Park n Ride lots.
- Any charge for rural residents to use their card is ridiculous! We don’t have bus service
- No buses, but “use of road” charges being proposed.
- Light rail within villages does not make sense. Light rail operating in rural areas is only to connect the villages to the city. Makes sense when a rural village becomes a bedroom community.
- Bring the O-Train to Osgoode! And all rural villages / communities

OTHER

- Amalgamation
- Transportation: communication back to rural villages.
- Narrowing streets and intersections is dangerous for traffic and snow removal
- If there are only 2 roads out of a village, there will be terrible congestion, morning and afternoon, 3 hr extensions or not. If you do major alterations, there’s expense, and soon the village is an urban centre – town???
- Suggestion for mid size villages: Develop small “van” pickup routes to take villages to nearest large bus terminal to city, i.e. phone for pick up
- Use existing funding better, no new fees

What’s Missing with the City’s Proposed Policy Changes

A TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY for RURAL OTTAWA (Theme)

- Commuter Trains / Effective / Appropriate Transit (Sub-Theme)
 - Bring the O-Train to rural villages, not everyone: walks / bikes / drives
 - Lack of light rail
 - Light rail:
 - Limit cars on road
 - Limit “one stop shopping” on the way to and from work, therefore people will buy more locally at local businesses
 - Train station in the core of the village will be surrounded by local shops (room for park and ride?)
 - The use of Pembroke line from Kanata
 - For rural areas: have shuttles to bus stations (on call) to supplement commuter service
 - O-Train to Richmond

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- Planning rapid transit corridors needed to be kept and planned with neighbouring municipalities; example: use of abandoned railway lines.
- Transportation (bus) from park n ride, 416 & Bankfield, Brophy
- Plan for encouraging park n ride for rural residents, instead of penalizing rural cars.

- Rural Cycling Lanes / Paved Shoulders (Sub-Theme)
 - North-South cycling lanes along River Road and Rideau Valley Drive
 - East- West cycling lanes along Mitch Owens and Barnsdale, connective villages and links to urban centre
 - Lack of safe cycling routes between villages
 - Safer cycling in rural areas. Paved shoulders or paths
 - Park n ride closed to the city so I can park my car and ride my bike to work (on the Greenbelt area would be great); park n ride for cyclists
 - Paved shoulders from Manotick to Kars (Rideau Valley Dr.)
 - We need more paths and provisions for cycling.
 - Paved shoulders for biking.
 - Create conduits to other rural neighbours and the city

- Pedestrian Crosswalks (Sub-Theme)
 - Allowing villages to have “X-walks” and better intersections times to get across.
 - Pedestrian cross-walks needed on Manotick Main Street.
 - No crosswalks on Manotick Main Street
 - Lack of cross walks on main arterials in Richmond

- Solution to Heavy Truck Traffic Through Village Core (Sub-Theme)
 - Re-routing trucks and transport around villages not through
 - Improved roads for public (? Not available yet?) and private transport; delivery of health, fire, police services
 - Methods to control speeding within villages, i.e. speed limit in Richmond is 60 km/hr. Since it is 80 km/hr outside village limits, thru traffic usually goes 80 km/hr through the village
 - Proposal to re-direct large transportation vehicles away from Bridge & Main route to Earl-Armstrong Bridge?!?
 - Get Strandherd bridge finished! to get traffic excess out of Manotick.
 - Cannot double the population of large rural villages without expanding ability of roads to carry new traffic volumes.
 - Manotick needs more public parking throughout the village.
 - Roundabouts to ease congestion
 - Manotick needs better signage to/from public parking areas and lit pathways.

OTHER

- Maintenance and upgrading of current roads

Rural Public Meeting
SUMMARY & AS-IT-WAS-HEARD REPORT
Manotick Arena – April 9, 2013

- Would “use of road charges” exempt community service organizations like ROSSS for meals on wheels, rural transportation, etc.?
- .Richmond’s CDP traffic study done in 2009 in the summer, i.e. low traffic period. The major developer still wants to use this study. What are they allowed to use out of date data?
- .Missing: It’s hidden that the main advantage of a 3-hr traffic metric would be to developers much easier to meet development traffic requirements.
- No recognition of Manotick traffic issue.
- .Car pool lanes (hwy?) and park n rides (as applied in some rural areas outside Toronto)
- Seasonality issues for rural winter!!!!
- Reducing car dependency means no zoning of “big box store” developments which are completely non-pedestrian and non-cycling friendly.
- Village growth is an issue that has been studied in other villages in Ontario, Canada and around the world. Solutions have been tried and some are successful. Are those being considered for this planning?
- Honesty! A politician who will actually listen.
- City cannot go ahead with its rural plans, and try to placate it villages at the same time. A decision has to be made, one way or the other (Toronto or rural villages) and then bite the bullet and inform rural residents.
- No money needed for transportation infrastructure; no money for municipal water; no money for needed upgrades for sewer infrastructure; seems to me – it’s the developer who makes all the money, then leaves the area. Why are they not being charged more to have these areas / needed covered?
- Separate policy for rural residents is imperative for transportation.
- Archaic traffic metrics. Use existing cell phone signals, IBM does it!!!
- A transportation strategy for rural.
- Access to river for boats