

Good evening, my name is Susanne Tristani and I have lived on Havendale Boulevard for 24 years. I am going to be addressing the community's concerns regarding traffic, health and safety, and parking. Many of the points I will be making are outlined in the Havendale Advisory Committee Position Paper, which was provided to all members of Council and is also included at the end of the Public Comments Section in the Staff Report.

Let's begin with traffic. Our committee has reviewed the Traffic Impact Study submitted by National Homes and do not agree with its conclusions, in particular the assessment of how little additional traffic will find its way onto Havendale Blvd. The traffic study indicates that 5 cars will enter or exit the new subdivision via Havendale Blvd during a peak hour. Considering the number of planned townhouse units, we consider the estimated numbers to be very low.

The traffic report indicates that a traffic signal will not be needed at the intersection of Brant St and Almonte Dr, even though it states that the intersection will have a Level of Service F, which is the lowest level. This level of service makes sense. Brant St has become extremely congested during peak periods due to additional building in Waterdown and the closure of Kerns Road southbound, so access onto Brant during rush hours from Almonte Drive will be difficult and result in congestion on the only through street in the subdivision. Many residents have indicated that the left turn lanes currently on Brant St., Havendale and Upper Middle are very narrow, making the wait to make the turn at these lights precarious, especially during periods when school crossing guards are directing pedestrians and traffic.

The traffic study concludes that the intersections in the area are operating very well, and that the additional approximately 450 vehicles owned by the new residents will not reduce the level of service on existing streets. We disagree with this finding.

We suggest that residents will become frustrated with the long wait to turn onto or from Brant St to or from Almonte during rush hours, during which the traffic study

very conservatively estimates 85 trips in an am peak hour and 93 trips in a pm peak hour, and will look for other options, including:

1. Using the traffic signal at Havendale Blvd and Brant Street;
2. Using the traffic signal at Upper Middle Road and Brant Street, accessed by using Havendale and Fairchild, or Havendale westbound along to Upper Middle.

Significantly more than 5 cars will spill onto Havendale.

In addition, several streets on the east side of Brant Street, Faversham, Cavendish and Dawlish, will take on some inevitable cut-through traffic by those trying to avoid the increased congestion on Brant St.

It is important to remember that in Section 3.3.1 of the Burlington Official Plan, the stated objective is to **reduce through traffic and to discourage excessive through traffic in residential neighbourhoods**. This is completely contrary to what will be happening in our neighbourhood under this current proposal.

None of these concerns or considerations has been captured in the traffic study.

The Havendale Advisory Committee previously requested in our Position Paper that the City undertake a Peer Review of the traffic study. This was not mentioned in the recent staff report, and we have not had any indication from the City that they are considering this request. We hope that, pending the input from Halton Region and Burlington Transportation Planning on the traffic study, this peer review will be undertaken.

The increase in local traffic will have health and safety impacts. Of primary concern is the safety of children in our area. Higher traffic levels and on-street parking will impact the ability of local children to play safely. We also have concerns about the safety of the many children who walk to Paul A. Fisher and St. Mark's schools along

Havendale, Upper Middle and Fairchild or catch their school buses at one of the many school bus stops along these local roads.

It should be noted that within the last few years, traffic calming measures, including the installation of a speed bump on Fairchild Blvd and reduction of the speed limit on Havendale Blvd have been implemented as a result of traffic and speed concerns. The additional traffic volume from the National Homes development that will inevitably use these streets to avoid delays on Brant Street will be counter-productive to these positive actions for enhancing the safety of children and pedestrians.

We also have concerns for the future residents of the 2100 Brant St. development, as the minimal setbacks from Brant St, and the lack of a noise reduction barrier, combined with increased traffic, will result in excessive noise pollution affecting the wellbeing of residents.

Aside from the increased traffic, we also have health and safety concerns with the layout of the subdivision as proposed. There has been a lack of clarity regarding plans for snow removal and garbage collection, particularly on the private roads. We have concerns about storage of ploughed snow and storage and pickup of garbage in the development, and how it would affect accessibility and safety along the narrow streets.

Another health and safety concern is the existing EMS Station on Brant Street near Havendale. With the large number of vehicles entering and exiting the proposed development both north and south of the station, the additional traffic could compromise the ability of the EMS workers to safely and rapidly access Brant Street, especially in the absence of a traffic signal at Almonte.

Lastly, I would like to discuss parking. While the number of parking spaces appears, on the surface, to be the minimum that the bylaw allows, we have some concerns that in this particular development, the number of spaces is inadequate. The two spaces required for each unit includes one space in the garage, which doesn't meet the definition in the City of Burlington Bylaw 2020 *Part 1, General Conditions and Provisions/2.0 General Provisions: 2.26 General Parking Provisions*, which reads,

Each parking space shall have a minimum width of 2.75 m and a minimum area of 16.5 m² and be ***readily accessible without obstructions at all times for parking and removal of a motor vehicle without the necessity of moving any other vehicle or obstruction.***

Thus, a car parked in a garage does not meet this bylaw standard if a second vehicle is parked in the driveway and the vehicle in the garage is blocked in.

We are concerned that many common vehicles will not fit on private driveways in certain new developments without obstructing either the sidewalk or the roadway. Members of the Havendale Advisory Committee had requested that the City provide us with additional information on parking policies in September, 2017, and we still have not received a response. Specifically, we would like to know if Burlington has a bylaw or guideline in place regarding the length of driveways, and the clearance required around sidewalks, whether on public or private roads. We also require further clarity on the front yard setbacks for all townhomes in the development.

The number of visitor parking spaces being proposed is also a concern. Again, the number is inadequate. There is no requirement for visitor parking for street townhouses, presumably because there is assumed to be parking available on the street. However, no parking is allowed on the private roads for fire safety reasons and thus the only street available for parking would be Almonte Dr. This will likely result in safety issues on this street, as well as inevitable spillover parking onto Havendale Blvd, Belgrave Dr and Fairchild Dr, as the space between driveways on Almonte is virtually too short to park any but the smallest of vehicles.

Committee of the Whole - April 3, 2018
PB-30-18, File: 505-03/17, 520-10/17, 510-02/17

In conclusion:

In light of our concerns as residents, and as Halton Region has reserved comment on the *Urban Transportation Considerations* study pending further information and revisions, and as Burlington Transportation Planning has likewise deferred its conclusions, we request the opportunity and adequate time to review these inputs carefully prior to a Council vote on this proposal. Thank you.