That, on the recommendation of the General Manager of Planning and Development and the General Manager of Environmental Services and City Engineer, the following actions BE TAKEN with respect to the adoption and implementation of a Bicycle Master Plan:

a) The proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on October 3rd, 2005 immediately following the joint meeting of the Planning Committee and Environment and Transportation Committee on September 26th, 2005, to amend the Section 19.2.2 of the Official Plan to add a new part "()" that would state "Bicycle Master Plan";

b) The proposed by-law attached hereto as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting on October 3rd, 2005 immediately following the joint meeting of the Planning Committee and Environment and Transportation Committee on September 26th, 2005, to amend the Official Plan to delete Sections 18.2.13.i) through 18.2.13.ii) and replace them with new Sections 18.2.13.i) through 18.2.13.xii) that are consistent with the strategic direction for recreational and commuting cycling advanced in the Bicycle Master Plan;

c) The proposed Bicycle Master Plan attached hereto as Appendix "A" BE ADOPTED at the Municipal Council Meeting on October 3rd, 2005 immediately following the joint meeting of the Planning Committee and Environment and Transportation Committee on September 26th, 2005, as a guideline document to the Official Plan, subject to Policy 19.2.2., to guide the development of a long-term, comprehensive, City-wide, on and off-road commuter and recreational bicycling network;

d) The proposed by-law attached as Appendix "C" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council Meeting of October 3rd, 2005 immediately following the joint meeting of the Planning Committee and Environment and Transportation Committee meeting of September 26th, 2005, to amend Section 4.19. of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law (in conformity with the Official Plan, as amended in part (a) and (b) above) to add a new Section "()" to establish bicycle parking requirements for residential and non-residential development;

e) The proposed by-law attached as Appendix "D" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting of October 3rd, 2005, immediately following the joint meeting of the Planning Committee and the Environment and Transportation Committee meeting of September 26th, 2005 to amend Schedule 1 of the Site Plan Control Area By-law by adding a new Section () (in conformity with the Official Plan and Z.-1 Zoning By-law, as amended in part (a), (b), and (d) above) to provide for the development of bicycle
parking facilities that are convenient, safe, secure and functional; and,

f) To begin implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan, $500,000 BE SUBMITTED for consideration in each of the 2006 through 2010 Capital budgets for the development of bicycle infrastructure through the "Kick Start" program, as described herein, and for the preparation and delivery of bicycle promotion, awareness and safety programming as described herein.

g) Staff BE DIRECTED to explore opportunities for funding of bicycle pathways and other cycling infrastructure, through partnerships with various organizations, including, but not limited to, the development and business communities.

RATIONALE

1. The proposed Official Plan Amendment to adopt the Bicycle Master Plan as a Guideline Document is consistent with Section 19.2.2. of the Official Plan which states that Council may adopt guideline documents to provide for detailed direction for the implementation of Official Plan policies;

2. The proposed guideline document is consistent with Section 19.2.13.j) of the Official Plan, as amended above, which states that Council shall prepare and implement a bicycle master plan for the development of a bicycle route system addressing such matters as location, design, signage, priority linkages or extensions, education and encouragement;

3. The proposed Official Plan amendment is consistent with the Transportation Objectives of Section 18.1. of the Official Plan which supports the planning and development of bicycle routes and bicycle parking facilities.

4. The proposed amendment to the Z.-1 Zoning By-law is consistent with the Official Plan, as amended above, which calls for the development of facility supportive amenities such as bicycle parking opportunities that are appropriately located and adequate for the uses they support.

5. The amendment to Schedule 1 of the Site Plan Control By-law is proposed in conjunction with the associated Z.-1 Zoning Amendments to introduce regulations requiring the provision of bicycle parking facilities.

6. The Bicycle Master Plan, and associated amendments, is supportive of Official Plan policy and the Transportation Master Plan which advocate measures to balance auto use with environmentally friendly and healthy modes of transportation.

7. The Bicycle Master Plan is consistent with the recommendations of the Creative City Task Force (#83 and 84 in particular) which calls for improvements to the City’s cycling infrastructure and a "...greater budgetary priority to cycling...".

BACKGROUND

In the first quarter of 2003, staff from the Planning Department and the Environmental Services Department met to prepare a series of first principles for the development of a draft Bicycle Master Plan. The first principles received the endorsement of the Bicycle Advisory Committee in July of 2003. The draft Bicycle Master Plan received endorsement from the Bicycle Advisory Committee in December of 2003.

At its meeting held on December 8th, 2003, the Planning Committee received a communication from the Transportation Plan Implementation Committee requesting the Planning Committee to further investigate bicycle parking as it relates to the Z.-1 Zoning By-law. The Planning Committee referred the communication to the General Manager of Planning and Development for inclusion in the City's new Bicycle Master Plan.
In January of 2004, the Environment and Transportation Committee referred the draft Bicycle Master Plan to Civic Administration for consideration.

In March of 2005, the General Manager of Planning and Development and the General Manager of Environmental and Engineering Services tabled a report with the Environment and Transportation Committee recommending public circulation of the draft Bicycle Master Plan and associated amendments.

In April of 2005, Municipal Council resolved that, on the recommendation of the General Manager of Planning and Development and the General Manager of Environmental and Engineering Services, the proposed amendments to the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Site Plan Control Area By-law to implement the draft Bicycle Master Plan be circulated for public review and comment; it being noted that following such circulation, a joint public participation meeting to review the Master Plan and associated amendments will be scheduled with the Planning Committee and the Environment and Transportation Committee.

The draft Bicycle Master Plan, and associated amendments, was circulated to specifically identified groups and organizations on April 12th, 2005. Recipients of notice included: the London Development Institute; the London Chamber of Commerce; the Urban League; the London and Area Planning Consultants; TREA; the Thames Talbot Land Trust; Fanshawe College and the University of Western Ontario; the London and District School Board and the Thames Valley District School Board; and, the London Cycling Club. Notice of the proposed Bicycle Master Plan, associated amendments, and a call for comments, was posted to the City's web page on April 28th, 2005. Notice of the suite of proposed amendments was circulated to stakeholders on May 4th, 2005 and carried in the May 7th edition of the London Free Press. Notice of intent to hold a Public Meeting was sent by letter on September 9th, 2005 and posted to the Free Press on September 10th.

THE BICYCLE MASTER PLAN AS TABLED

- The Transportation policies of the Official Plan underscore Council's commitment to the development of a balanced, safe and efficient transportation system. To promote increased cycling, the Official Plan states that Council shall prepare and implement a master plan for the development of a bicycle route network consisting of an on and an off-road system.

- The planning and development of the on and off-road system currently rests with the Transportation Division of the Environmental Services Department and the Parks Planning and Design Section of the Planning Department respectively.

- The adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan, and associated amendments, will serve to coordinate and focus the efforts and resources of the Environmental Services Department and the Planning Department in the development of a comprehensive long-term bicycle vision for the City of London.

The Proposed Bicycle Master Plan:

- The purpose of the Bicycle Master Plan is to guide the development of a long-term, comprehensive, City-wide, on and off-road commuter and recreational bicycling network. The Plan makes special note of the long-term focus of the City's new cycling initiative recognizing that portions of the system may include existing or previously planned infrastructure pending the development of a new facility standard that will be integrated into the system as new roadways (or pathways) are built, existing roadways (or pathways) are resurfaced and/or reconstructed, and lands are acquired.

- The Master Plan advances a series of on and off-road routes that cater to the recreational and commuting cyclist noting the distinct operational and design needs of the specific user. London's new bicycle network therefore will consist of two distinct and readily identifiable systems - a commuter route system and a recreational route system.
It is important to note that the Master Plan is a guideline document and that identified routes may be altered with the introduction of new or improved information. The principles relating to the selection of routes will guide such alterations.

It is also important to note that temporary routes may be established outside of the long-term routes identified in the Master Plan. These temporary routes will provide a practical alternative until such time as a long-term capital project is completed to upgrade a road to include a bicycle facility.

Functioning as a high speed, destination oriented facility, the Commuter Route Network will cater to cyclists with moderate to high levels of experience and skill. The Recreational Route System, on the other hand, will serve to provide cyclists of all skill levels inter and intra neighbourhood connections to a variety of recreational amenities.

Both the Commuter and the Recreational Cycling Network will consist of a Primary and a Secondary Network. Primary Networks will function as the spine of the respective system whereas Secondary Networks will serve the purpose of collecting, directing and connecting the cyclist to the spine.

The Master Plan advances a modified "tool kit" for the development of commuter and recreational facilities. While endorsing the continued development of multi-use pathways and shared on-road facilities on low order streets, the Plan recommends that the current City practice of constructing in-boulevard bicycle paths along primary and arterial roadways be replaced with delineated on-road bicycle lanes along specifically identified roadways. London's new Bicycle Network will therefore be developed according to those guidelines detailed on Table 1.

### TABLE 1 – NETWORK GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORK</th>
<th>DESIGN GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Commuter Network</td>
<td>a) Located on high order roadways between major origins and destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Delineated on-road bicycle lanes within a widened curb lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Signed to facilitate way finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Commuter Network</td>
<td>a) Located on high order roads to collect, direct and distribute commuter traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) On-road bicycle routes (no specifically identified bicycle lane or widened curb lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Signed to facilitate way finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Recreational Network</td>
<td>a) Located in the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Multi-Use Pathway facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Signed to facilitate way finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Recreational Network</td>
<td>a) Located on low order roads to collect, direct and distribute recreational cyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) On-road bicycle routes (no specifically identified bicycle lane or widened curb lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Signed to facilitate way finding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bicycle Master Plan advances a blueprint for the long-term development of a commuting and recreational cycling network. In the short-term, implementation strategies are proposed to direct the development of as much bicycle infrastructure as physically and financially possible. The goal is to promote cycling opportunities early in the planning period by maximizing routes, linkages and connections. The Master Plan proposes that critical corridors between major origins and destinations be analyzed to determine cost-effective facility design (signage and lane stripping) and safe routes that can be established on an interim basis. These routes would be temporary until major constraints on the Primary and Secondary Routes are removed.

Infrastructure alone is not sufficient to promote and encourage safe and viable cycling. Programming is equally important and constitutes a separate, yet critical, "soft" component of London’s new bicycle initiative. It is expected that the City’s Environmental Programs and Customer Relations Division, Transportation and Design Division and/or
the Transportation Advisory Committee and other community groups will develop promotional and educational initiatives to encourage increased cycling including, but not limited to: programs to increase awareness of the bicycle network; and, programs to educate the motorist and cyclist alike on what the cycling lane is, how it is intended to work, how to use it, and how to interface with it in your vehicle.

**Bicycle Parking Requirements and Site Plan Design Standards:**

- Every cycling trip has two basic components: the route used by the cyclist and the end-of-trip facilities at the destination. When the end-of-trip facility does not meet the needs of the cyclist, the user will seek another means of transportation.

- Section 18.2.13 states that Council shall require, as a condition of approval of development or redevelopment, the provision of adequate, sheltered and secure bicycle parking facilities.

- Bicycle parking standards have been prepared that specify a threshold number of vehicular parking spaces after which the provisions requiring bicycle parking would be mandated; include specific exemptions for certain land uses that would not typically attract the cyclist; and, establish a separate parking rate for residential and non-residential development.

---

**REPORT FORMAT**

On March 21st, 2005, the General Manager of Planning and Development and the General Manager of Environmental Services and City Engineer tabled a report with the Environment and Transportation Committee recommending the circulation of the proposed Master Plan, and associated amendments, for review and comment.

The following report addresses issues raised as a result of the public consultation process. Part 1 of this report details a business case for a new five year capital program to provide for the short term implementation measures detailed in the Plan. Issues generic to the Bicycle Master Plan are addressed in Part 2. Policy and regulatory concerns specific to the proposed Official Plan, Zoning and Site Plan Control Area By-laws have been addressed under Part 3. The Bicycle Master Plan, and associated amendments, have been attached as Appendix "A" through "D". Correspondence received in response to the call for public comment has been attached under Appendix Ea) through Ey).

---

**PART 1 – THE BICYCLE MASTER PLAN AND THE AND THE PROPOSED “KICK START” PROGRAM**

What are the financial implications in adopting the proposed Bicycle Master Plan and how may the new vision be funded?

The Bicycle Master Plan provides a long-range strategy for the provision of bicycle infrastructure to support recreationally and commuter cycling in London. The Plan notes that London's current bicycle infrastructure is inadequate from a number of perspectives and requires a significant public infrastructure investment over the long-term to create a cycling network that is functional and effective.

While the long-term development of the commuter cycling network will require significant resources and must be addressed through long-term capital projects associated with roads, there are many actions that could be taken in the short-term to bolster the commuter cycling, and transportation demand management, efforts in London. The City needs to begin setting the stage for cycling, from an infrastructure perspective, in high employment and residential nodes.
The Bicycle Master Plan identifies such nodes and establishes that mid-term infrastructure investments are necessary to facilitate cycling between these nodes until the larger capital projects are completed over the long-term which will develop full bicycle lanes within widened road corridors. Gas tax funds could be used to take such mid-term actions such as:

- Identifying key roads that can serve as mid-term alternative connections between activity nodes to support commuter cycling;
- Re-paving existing roadways to provide for safe cycling conditions on curb lanes;
- Adopting intersection treatments that would facilitate the movement of cyclists through the intersection;
- Where appropriate, striping the cycling corridors to create dedicated cycling lanes within existing widened curb lanes;
- Erecting bicycle signage to identify cycling lanes and inform automobile drivers to take caution of cyclists;
- Erecting bicycle signage on collector/feeder routes identified in the Bicycle Master Plan that would serve to inform motorists that these routes are dedicated for cyclists and that caution should be exercised;
- Where appropriate, developing cycling-supportive facilities on public property including such amenities as bicycle parking infrastructure; and,
- Developing promotional and educational initiatives on what the bicycle network is and how to interface with it safely.

Similarly, recreational cycling infrastructure requires funding to develop the longer-term cycling network identified on the Bicycle Master Plan. Key links are missing which disturb the continuity of the network and make recreational cycling less attractive and safe for inexperienced riders in the City. New and additional signage is required to dedicate collector and feeder routes within neighbourhoods that lead to these recreational cycling routes. Remembering that such feeder routes will carry inexperienced cyclists wanting to access the recreational spine identified within the Bicycle Master Plan, such signage and appropriate traffic control measures (e.g. crosswalks) will be critical to making the recreational network both safe and usable.

In support of the above, the Environmental and Engineering Services Department has prepared a business case for a new five year capital program for bicycle lanes, signage and promotion. The details of the “Kick Start” initiative would include consideration for short term implementation measures to capitalize on the public excitement generated by the Plan. The business case, as presented below, has been broken down into an infrastructure component and a promotion, awareness and safety component.

A Business Case for the “Kick Start” Program

Preamble:

The Transportation Master Plan recommends bicycle lanes as one of the eight components in a capacity enhancement strategy (pg. 42). The Draft Bicycle Master Plan provides further details on routes, changes to planning criteria to accommodate bicycles and an implementation strategy. As a sustainable transportation initiative, consideration should be given to funding bicycle lanes from fuel tax revenues. This program applies to retrofit routes. Major road widening projects will incorporate bicycle lanes in their design. The “Kick Start” Program is consistent with City strategic objectives to have a sustainable environment and a caring city that works.

Problem Definition:

The problem to resolve is how to accelerate the creation of a functional on-road bicycle network. Without a safe network of routes and companion signage, promotional and safety programming,
a culture change in transportation modes will not be possible.

**Recommendations:**

The Bicycle Master Plan sets a strategic goal as part of Short Term Implementation to develop "...as much bicycle infrastructure as physically and financially possible..." The goal is to promote cycling opportunities early in the planning period by maximizing routes, linkages and connections. With a present program budget of $20,000 per year, progress will be too slow to create enough infrastructure necessary to promote cycling as an alternative to the private automobile.

The recommended solution is to give the proposed cycling route network a "Kick Start". The opportunity to do this presents itself with the availability of fuel tax revenues. Kick Start meets the Federal Government's objectives for supporting sustainable infrastructure. It is proposed to invest $500,000 per year for five years for a total Kick Start of $2.5 million. The funds would be spent in accordance with the Short Term Implementation Strategy described above, including safety and promotional programs (as detailed below).

**Promotion, Awareness and Safety Program:**

Dedicated funding for cycling promotion, awareness and safety is needed to change attitudes and behaviours and result in an increase in the numbers of Londoners of all ages that cycle and the frequency of their cycling trips. Members of the City's Environmental Programs and Customer Relations Division, Planning Division, Transportation Planning and Design Division, the Transportation Advisory Committee, the London Transit Commission and other community partners play a key role in developing promotional and educational initiatives.

The proposed Cycling Promotion, Awareness and Safety Program will focus on two major themes, Bike More and Share the Road.

The Bike More theme will engage Londoners in developing cycling opportunities that meet their needs. More Londoners will be encouraged to cycle for more trips. Initiatives and promotion will encourage new cyclists to consider a bicycle as a method of transportation, and encourage novice and experienced cyclists alike to ride for more trips. A number of these concepts will be explored and/or piloted in the One Tonne Challenge neighbourhoods in 2005 and 2006.

The Share the Road theme will foster awareness and respect between cyclists and drivers. Specifically, cyclists and drivers need to understand that bicycles are vehicles and that they belong on the road. Many drivers are also cyclists and can be encouraged to ride more often. Organizing specific campaigns under a Share the Road theme will bring consistency to messaging as on-road bicycle lanes come on line and can serve to provide information about good cycling and driving practices in a non-threatening context.

The new route network provides a standard of infrastructure which is highly visible and predictable. Cyclists may choose to use the new routes but in practice are not limited to them. Cyclists can ride on any roadway where bicycles are permitted. A key component of this theme will also emphasize that riding on sidewalks is dangerous and illegal.

A five year program will be designed to match the proposed timeline for the capital funding request. In year one, $50,000 is required with half of the funding to be spent on start up costs and expenditures that will be used over the five year program. This would include developing a cycling safety website and creating promotional materials such as posters, advertisements and maps. The four subsequent years will require $25,000 to go towards ongoing education and promotional efforts and maintenance of signage and pavement markings. The following Table details the activities for education and promotion and their approximate costs.
Table 1 – Proposed Budget for Promotion, Awareness and Safety Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development of five One-Stop Cycling Kiosks for use at strategic locations along bicycle paths</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background research, needs assessment, testing of concepts, pre-design and development of education and promotional opportunities (i.e. website, posters, flyers, advertisements, and the establishment of community partnerships)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing promotion, awareness, and education initiatives for five years</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 4 and 5</td>
<td>Ongoing promotion, awareness and education initiatives</td>
<td>$25,000 per year</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total (for five years)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection Criteria:**

The options for resolving the problem were evaluated based on:

- Financial efficiency and effectiveness (will it meet public expectations, and meet the goals effectively?);
- Sustainability of the economic environment (will it produce both short and long term benefits?);
- Stewardship of the natural environment (are public health and natural environment benefits possible?);
- Safety of employees and the public (how are risks managed?);
- Service to the customer (are there tangible benefits for others, or intangible benefits of value to them?);

**Alternatives:**

The following options were analyzed to select the preferred option:

- Accept the present level of funding of $20,000 per year (do nothing);
- Increase the investment level after planning and designing are complete (plan but delay implementation);
- Increase the investment level immediately with concurrent routes being planned, designed and built ("Kick Start").

**Analysis of Alternatives (Non-financial issues):**

The "do nothing" approach does not allow the City to meet public expectations effectively for multi-modal options after the approval of the Bicycle Master Plan.

The "plan but delay implementation" option will defer the benefits associated with this program, missing an important opportunity in the cultural change process.

"Kick Start" will result in the establishment of a functional network of cycling routes that can provide the opportunity for Londoners to safely use this alternative mode of transportation.
Analysis of Issues (Financial Issues):

The present level of funding inherent for new bicycle lanes in the "do nothing" option will not meet short or long-term goals for a financially sustainable transportation road network because options to vehicle usage will not be readily available.

The "plan but delay implementation" option will risk the cultural change necessary to produce measurable trip reductions over the next five years. Change is critical to future road construction forecast costs; the twenty year forecast for road works assumes no changes in vehicle usage; a worst case scenario.

"Kick Start" represents a long-term investment in sustainable transportation. The Transportation Master Plan Strategy for road construction assumed no changes in transit use, auto occupancy and peak period travel. Although a payback for this program alone cannot be calculated independent of other Transportation Demand Management Strategies, of which cycling is a component, the value of reduction in road capital expansion is reported to be $4 million per year over twenty years.

Implementation and Follow Up:

The Transportation Master Plan recommends that household travel survey information be updated in five years. This includes travel mode data for change analysis.

Risk Assessment:

Risks that could mitigate the success of this program include:

- Effectiveness of education and promotion programs;
- Lack of coordination with other modes of transportation and projects.

Proving Your Conclusions:

The Transportation Master Plan accepted by Council provides two strategies to meet the needs of Londoners. The "Kick Start" program will provide infrastructure for a healthy mode of transportation.

What is the status of the Bicycle Master Plan?

The Bicycle Master Plan is to be adopted as a guideline document pursuant to the policies of Section 19.2 of the Official Plan. Development proposals and City initiated capital works projects shall be reviewed to determine conformity with the provisions of the Bicycle Master Plan.

It is important to note that the Master Plan is intended to function as a guideline rather than a legal standard. Council may allow for modifications to the provisions of the Master Plan if it is of the opinion that such a modification is warranted and the general intent of the Official Plan is maintained. Examples of such modifications may include the establishment of temporary routes or alternative facility design to address localized physical constraints in the right-of-way (i.e. road widths, vehicular parking, traffic volumes, etc.).

A concern has been raised that the Master Plan lacks specific detail in regards to the design treatment of the on-road bicycle lane, particularly at intersections. It is important to note that the Bicycle Master Plan is not intended to advance specific design standards. The design guidelines and best practices detailed in Section 6 of the Master Plan provide a general overview of the network hierarchy and a description of how specific components of the network are intended to function. Recognizing the importance of intersection treatments however, the proposed Official Plan amendment states that the City shall develop specific design guidelines for the creation of
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delineated on-road bicycle lanes and routes having particular consideration for intersections and lane delineation.

**How does the City's Bike Map differ from the Bicycle Master Plan?**

The Bike Map and the Bicycle Master Plan differ in respect to their purpose, the nature of the information conveyed and the user to whom the information is directed.

Since 1993, City staff, in conjunction with the Bicycle Advisory Committee, have prepared and produced the London Bike Map. The Bike Map depicts existing signed and un-signed road routes, in-boulevard pathways, and the Thames Valley Parkway. The map, which is distributed publicly and posted to the City's home page, is intended to inform the cyclist of existing cycling opportunities.

The Bicycle Master Plan has been prepared as an internal guideline document to direct and coordinate the efforts of City staff in the development of a long-term, comprehensive, on and off-road cycling network. While the Master Plan depicts both existing and proposed on and off-road routes, it is not intended to function as a facility guide for public distribution. To clarify this distinction, schedules to the Master Plan depict proposed routes in a broken line and include text referring the reader to the City's BIKE MAP for existing routes.

**Why has the City chosen to adopt a modified "tool kit" for facility development (See Appendix E)?**

The Master Plan recommends that the current City practice of constructing in-boulevard pathways be replaced with on-road bicycle lanes along specifically identified routes. This recommendation has garnered near unanimous support from local cyclists. A concern has been raised from one individual however; regarding the proposed facility alternative to the in-boulevard pathway. This individual has expressed support for a widened curb lane facility rather than the proposed on-road bicycle lane (see issue summary Appendix E).

The widened curb lane option was given consideration in the preparation of the Master Plan. To many experienced cyclists, wide curb lanes are a preferred facility type because they integrate bicycle and vehicular traffic and force recognition and awareness on the part of the motorist. Lacking specific markings or lane treatments, however, wide curb lanes are generally not sufficient to provide for the degree of comfort required by the inexperienced or less skilled commuter cyclist. The tendency of a widened curb lane to lead to increased vehicular speed is a further cause for concern.

Offering a designated and visible space for cyclists, on-road bicycle lanes are attractive to both the experienced and moderately skilled cyclist and have been shown to encourage increased bicycle use. Given the tendency of a widened curb lane to cater almost exclusively to the experienced cyclist, and the stated vision of the Master Plan to promote and encourage cycling, the Guideline has recommended that the City pursue the development of on-road bicycle lanes for commuter cyclists.

Infrastructure alone, however, is not sufficient to promote and encourage safe and viable cycling. Programming is equally important and constitutes a separate, yet critical, soft component of London's new bicycle initiative. With a focus on safety, programs will be developed to both promote the network and educate the cyclist (and motorist) on what the on-road bicycle lane is, how it is intended to function, and how to interface with it with your vehicle.

**The Bicycle Master Plan depicts routes over privately held property. Is this appropriate (see Appendix E)?**

The Schedule depicting the Primary and Secondary Recreational Route Network includes reference to cycling corridors that may, in certain instances, traverse lands that are currently held in private ownership. The depiction of such corridors anticipates the public acquisition of lands through the community planning or development review process.

For the purpose of the Bicycle Master Plan, the alignments depicted are conceptual in nature and are intended to illustrate possible alignments and connections (the proposed corridors are
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shown with a dashed line). The alignment of the proposed routes is to be regarded as an approximation of their future alignment. Final alignments and right-of-way requirements would be determined on the basis of further study at the time of acquisition. Such studies may address, but not be limited to, land ownership, impact on existing land uses or natural features, and engineering studies. This has been clarified in the revised maps included in the Bicycle Master Plan which show dashed lines for proposed routes.

Do current road works anticipate the provision of the on-road bicycle lanes (see Appendix Eg, En and Ep)?

Approved capital road projects, both planned and currently under construction (i.e. Oxford Street and Sarnia Road), do not anticipate the installation of the recommended on-road bicycle lane. With the adoption of the Plan, however, all City-initiated capital transportation projects (and the development review process) shall incorporate bicycle facilities as directed by the Master Plan. To this end, the prescribed facility shall be incorporated into the Environmental Assessment and budgeting process as required.

It is to be noted that the Bicycle Master Plan advances a “blueprint” for the long-term development of a commuting (and recreational) cycling network. Recommended commuter routes would be confirmed through a feasibility review assessment. The assessment would have consideration for the recommended route selection criteria, roadway data (i.e. volumes, widths, on-street parking, etc.), involve field surveys, and detail implementation costs. The assessment review process would serve to confirm the conceptual route alignment, as advanced by way of the Master Plan, or recommend alternatives in light of identified constraints (i.e. design options and/or alignments).

In the short-term, critical corridors shall be analyzed to determine cost effective design and interim routing options. These routes would be temporary until major constraints to identified alignments are removed.

What consideration has the Master Plan given to the issue of facility maintenance (see Appendix Eg and El)?

Facility maintenance is critical in encouraging safe and viable cycling in London. As such, maintenance has been addressed from a policy perspective in the proposed Official Plan amendment.

The proposed Official Plan amendment states that on-going road maintenance and new road construction shall have consideration for the bicycle in the design and placement of intersection treatments, sewer grates, manhole covers, etc. Further, the Official Plan states that all of the maintenance requirements for roadways extend and apply to on-road bicycle lanes including the maintenance of the lane delineation, pavement stencilling, and the maintenance and/or replacement of signage.

It is important to note that the “care” of the new on-road facility shall mirror Council’s approved Summer and Winter road maintenance schedule, including provisions for snow removal, street sweeping, and surface repairs the majority of the time. There will be occasions, for example, when the street has been plowed and part of the snow bank may tumble back into the bike lane or the pass has not completely opened up the bicycle lane. This would not be corrected at the time but rather in a day or two when a second pass would push back the remaining snow. It is further noted that the London Bike Map to existing cycling paths and routes contains reporting information whereby users of the existing bicycle system may report surface hazards like broken glass, gravel and potholes such that hazards may be brought to the City’s immediate attention and addressed accordingly.

The Master Plan should place a greater emphasis on the local street system as a safe and convenient facility to use bicycles (see Appendix Eb)?

The Bicycle Master Plan recognizes the importance of the local street as a safe and convenient facility for the movement of bicycles. The Master Plan proposes the use of local streets for the
purpose of collecting, directing and distributing the cyclist to the Primary Commuter and Recreational Route Networks. Local streets form an integral part of the overall network as Secondary Commuter and Recreational Route facilities and will be signed accordingly to provide for way finding. Local streets are not appropriate, however, for high speed commuter cycling.

**The Master Plan has not addressed the issue of sidewalks as a possible facility for bicycle travel (see Appendix E1).**

The laws governing travel on public roads, including bicycle and pedestrian travel, fall under provincial jurisdiction in Canada. They aim to ensure that all road users have adequate space on public right-of-ways and that traffic is safe and efficient. Under traffic laws, bicycles are vehicles. Cyclists are therefore required to comply with the general road traffic and safety rules governing all road users including stop signs and right-of-way rules at intersections. Provincial traffic laws also include provisions aimed specifically at cyclists. Cyclists, for example, must ride single file in the same direction as traffic, and cannot use the sidewalk.

The use of the sidewalk within the City of London is regulated by the Streets By-law. Under the By-law, the sidewalk is defined as any municipal walkway or road works for the accommodation of pedestrians on that portion of the street between the curb line and the street line which is located outside of a roadway. Section 2.12 of the By-law states that “…no person shall, without lawful authority, operate a motor vehicle or bicycle along a sidewalk except that:

1. a motorized wheelchair shall be permitted;
2. a motor vehicle or bicycle may be operated across that portion of a sidewalk which intersects a lawful private entrance; and,
3. a cyclist may use that portion of the sidewalk which connects a bicycle path with a roadway.

With minor exceptions, the Streets By-law prohibits the use of the sidewalk for bicycle travel. Lacking a distinct and delineated on-road facility, the sidewalk may appear to be a safe and viable alternative for the inexperienced cyclist. A Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Collision Study conducted for the City of Toronto in 2003 however determined that “…in almost 30% of all [reported] collisions, the cyclists were riding on the sidewalk prior to the collision….” The study also determined that over 50% of these collisions involved children less than 18 years of age. While the use of the sidewalk may appear to be a safe alternative, it is more perception than reality. As such, the Master Plan has chosen to preclude the use of the sidewalk as a facility alternative.

**The multi-use pathway is a significant commuter facility providing access to the core and should be expanded to recognize this function (see Appendix E6).**

The Master Plan has been developed recognizing the distinct operational and design needs of the commuter and recreational cyclist. Commuter Routes link major nodes with a mind to minimizing delays and maximizing safety and operating speed. Principle considerations in the development of the Recreational Route Network would include such factors as aesthetics, safety and access.

The Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) is not intended to function as the Primary Commuter Route network. Given this vision, capital improvements to facilitate its use for commuting purposes are not anticipated. The general design of the TVP, increasing use, and the multi-purpose nature of the facility will, over time, serve to diminish the use of the pathway for commuting purposes. Noting the above, the Bicycle Master Plan anticipates the development of multiple commuter access points to the core.

**Will the City be pursuing a bike rack policy for buses see Appendix E6)?**

The issue of mode integration has been identified as a development initiative in the London Transit Commission's (LTC's) Transit Demand Management Program. Looking to improved integration, the LTC will be reviewing the concept of bike racks on buses with various
stakeholders in 2006. City staff will be a party to the review process.

PART 3 – THE PROPOSED SUITE OF IMPLEMENTING AMENDMENTS, ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

The proposed Official Plan Amendment provides limited reference to the student population at the University of Western Ontario or Fanshawe College where the bicycle is, and can be, a significant means of transportation (see Appendix Eb).

The intent of the proposed Official Plan Amendment is to initiate on and off-road improvements that would enhance cycling by providing recreational and commuter linkages to major activity centres and employment nodes. Whereas this is explicitly stated in existing policy, the proposed Official Plan Amendment should be amended to reflect the nodal focus of the bicycle network system. The amendment should state that portions of the system will be aligned along existing roads to provide linkages to major activity centres, such as the University of Western Ontario, Fanshawe College and the Downtown. The Amendment should also note that portions of the system will be located within the public open space network such as the Thames River Valley so that the safety and enjoyment of its users will be enhanced.

Portions of the Recreational Route System have been shown to provide bicycle access to Natural Heritage Areas designated as Open Space. Is this appropriate (see Appendix Ed, Ef, and Eg)?

The Open Space land use designation is comprised of public and private open space; flood plain lands; and natural heritage areas which are desirable for open space use or preservation in a natural state. Uses permitted in Natural Heritage Areas designated as Open Space would include, but not be limited to, passive recreational uses including community pathways provided that such trails are designed, constructed and managed to minimize their impact on the natural heritage area.

Section 5.4 of the Parks and Recreation By-law prohibits the use of "...a vehicle, bicycle or motorized snow mobile within the boundaries of an ESA [Environmentally Significant Area] or a natural park unless signs are posted specifically allowing such activity...". Exceptions providing for bicycle access would be determined through a detailed design process or the preparation of a Conservation Master Plan. A Conservation Master Plan functions as a guideline document for the purpose of defining the boundaries, and providing direction on the management, of the ESA, including formalized pathway systems.

It is noted that the current London Bike Map lists the City’s Environmentally Significant Areas and where (and under what circumstances) cycling is permitted. The proposed Official Plan Amendment should, however, preclude the expansion of facilities where such facilities may adversely impact significant environmental features or functions.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment should not include bicycle parking exemptions from the mandated standard (see Appendix Eb, Eg, Eh, El and Ek).

A number of respondents have requested that proposed bicycle parking exemptions for certain forms of non-residential development be removed from the tabled Zoning By-law Amendment. These individuals would argue that spaces should be provided regardless of the use, or intensity, of the site.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment envisions the development of a comprehensive on and off-road bicycle network linking major activity nodes and employment centres. The use of the word “major” and or “centre” would imply the preclusion of less intense land uses in the consideration of bicycle parking facilities. For this reason, the by-law proposes that land uses requiring less than 10 vehicular parking spaces be exempt from providing bicycle parking spaces. The proposed exemption has consideration for small businesses that may be unnecessarily encumbered by additional regulation.
The proposed Zoning By-law has also been developed with consideration for the contemplated use. Certain land uses, given the nature of the service or product offered or manufactured, location or clientele, for example, may not lend themselves to bicycle traffic (i.e. agricultural or resource based land uses). As such, it would be inappropriate to mandate the provision of bicycle parking facilities. Detractors would argue that this position fails to have consideration for those cyclists who, for reasons of necessity or choice, would ride to the destination regardless.

Nothing in the proposed Zoning By-law would preclude a business owner, otherwise exempt from the mandated standard, from providing bicycle parking facilities. The provision of such facilities would in fact be encouraged through the Site Plan Review process. As the new standard gains acceptance, and a local cycling culture takes hold, it is anticipated that all property owners would see the inherent benefits in the provision of such facilities. In the interim, the incremental implementation of the new standard would appear prudent.

The proposed Zoning By-law also contemplates parking exemptions for certain forms of residential development (i.e. multi-unit structures containing less than 5 dwelling units). Converted dwellings, triplexes and fourplexes generally lack the centralized common areas (i.e. laundry rooms and storage lockers) characteristic of purpose design apartment buildings. It would seem both onerous and impractical to mandate a bicycle parking standard given the built characteristics typically associated with these housing forms - much as it would be for single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings in which storage may be facilitated in a garage, for example, or an outdoor accessory structure.

Residential parking exemptions were also contemplated for facilities offering specialized care (i.e. nursing homes, continuum-of-care facilities, etc.). While recognizing the unique circumstances of the client or tenant, the by-law failed to have consideration for employees of the facility who may choose to bicycle to work. As it would be inappropriate to hold these particular land uses to the same standard contemplated for apartments, staff would recommend that bicycle parking be provided at a rate equivalent to 7% of the required vehicular parking. It is noted that the required spaces would be of a short term nature.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment should not include bicycle parking exemptions for the conversion of existing buildings for residential or non-residential uses in the Downtown or Business District Commercial Area 1 and 2 Zones (see Appendix E1).

The Downtown Area 1 and 2 Zones provide for and regulate the City's most dominant and intensive commercial business area. The Business District Commercial 1 and 2 Zones provide for and regulate a mix of commercial, retail, office and residential uses located along business districts in older parts of the City (i.e. Richmond Street, Wortley Road and Byron).

The nature of the built form in these older areas, and the size of the building footprint relative to the lot, is such that available floor space and/or outdoor space is generally limited and would preclude (and make onerous the provision of) an internal or external bicycle parking facility. As such, the conversion or adaptive re-use of an existing building should not trigger the requirement for the provision of on-site bicycle parking areas. Major redevelopment involving property consolidation and new construction would, under the proposed Zoning By-law amendment, be required to provide for bicycle parking facilities at the mandated rate. The proposed Z-1 Zoning By-law amendment has been modified to clarify that new development in these zones would require the provision of bicycle parking facilities at the mandated standard.

Why draw the distinction between short and long-term bicycle parking only to limit long-term parking requirements to residential uses (see Appendix E2)?

Long-term bicycle parking generally refers to a facility designed to safely store bicycles for several hours or days at a time. These facilities are typically protected from the weather and are enclosed in a secure space such as a storage room, fenced area or locker. Long-term bicycle parking facilities are usually associated with multi-unit residential development. Short-term parking is typically associated with non-residential land uses and generally consists of a rack where the frame and the wheels can be secured with a user supplied lock. Short-term facilities should be highly visible to discourage theft and vandalism.

Municipalities surveyed in the preparation of this report have, in a number of instances, chosen to draw the distinction between long and short-term parking in both a residential and non-
residential development scenario. Typically, retail, institutional and recreational type uses would require 10 to 30% of parking be of a long-term nature. Noting the difficulties in monitoring the provision of these facilities, and wishing to build an acceptance for bicycle parking incrementally, it has been recommended that the provision of long-term bicycle parking be restricted to multi-unit apartment buildings.

The intent and purpose of the proposed zoning by-law amendment is to regulate the required number of bicycle parking spaces in a residential and non-residential development scenario. Proposed amendments to the Site Plan Control Area By-law have been advanced to provide direction in respect to the actual design considerations (i.e. long or short-term infrastructure) of the facility itself. To assist in the interpretation and implementation of regulation, amendments to the proposed By-laws (as originally tabled) have been instituted to define long and short-term parking and clearly distinguish when facilities of a long or short-term nature would be required.

**Part 6 of the proposed Zoning By-law amendment provides for bicycle parking incentives beyond those mandated by the by-law. The By-law is unclear however in respect to the number of bicycle parking spaces to be provided under an incentive scenario.**

The intent of part 6 of the proposed Zoning By-law is to provide an incentive for the provision of additional bicycle parking spaces above and beyond the prescribed minimum standard in a non-residential development scenario. The proposed by-law states that the number of required motor vehicle parking spaces may be reduced to provide for additional bicycle parking spaces beyond the mandated standard. The by-law is unclear however as to the number of bicycles that should be provided for favour of the vehicular parking space. Staff has modified the proposed Zoning By-law to require the provision of five bicycle parking spaces per vehicular parking stall in an incentive scenario.

The provision of change rooms and shower facilities at major employment centres would serve to encourage employees to consider the bicycle as an alternative mode of transportation. The intent and purpose of the provisions detailed in the Z-1 Zoning By-law however are to regulate not encourage. Unless Council choose to mandate the provision of such amenities, staff would recommend consistency with the vehicular protocol such that portions of a required bicycle space equate to a whole space.

**Appendix C, subsection "5)" of the proposed Z-1 Zoning By-law amendment states that the City shall "encourage" the provision of change rooms and shower facilities to facilitate bicycle use for commuting purposes. Is this appropriate (see Appendix Ee)?**

The provision of change rooms and shower facilities for land uses that would require less than 70 vehicular parking spaces, they note that further clarification is required "...on [specific] land use[s] being considered for bicycle parking facilities" (see Appendix Ee).

Staff would agree that the Zoning By-law, as previously tabled, requires further clarification. The By-law mandates an independent parking standard for both residential and non-residential development. Having established this standard, the By-law proceeds to forward a series of residential and non-residential development exemptions for which the imposition of the
regulation would be inappropriate. Given the sheer number of defined uses in the Z-1 Zoning By-law, and the number of exemptions currently proposed, clarity would be better served in detailing specific exemptions rather than the uses for which parking would be mandated.

The residential exemption does, however, require modification in-as-much-as it fails to itemize certain forms of residential development that (given built form, the nature of the facility or the clientele served) should have been listed.

The non-residential development exemption also requires modification in light of new uses that have been added to the Z-1 Zoning By-law and in anticipation of the comprehensive set of amendments recommended in the annexed area zoning report.

While taking no issue with the proposed ratio for bicycle parking spaces for individual commercial uses (7% of the required vehicular parking spaces), the LDI has stated that clarification is required in the case of malls and cluster development where the total number of vehicle spaces may warrant spatial distribution of the bicycle spaces as opposed to "one large lot" (see Appendix E6).

The design considerations detailed in Appendix D, Table 60 serve to provide direction in respect to the provision of bicycle parking spaces. Appreciating that development comes in many forms; a fair measure of flexibility has been incorporated into the regulations. Parking, for example, may be accommodated in any of a number of prescribed locations including a compound internal to the structure, an exterior space (covered or uncovered), or an accessory building. The by-law, as proposed, would not preclude the spatial distribution of mandated spaces over a number of locations. For reasons of clarity, however, the proposed amendment should be modified to specifically provide for the disbursement of parking facilities in large scale development scenarios (i.e. malls).

The LDI has expressed concern over the bicycle parking rate for new apartment buildings noting that the proposed standard would have significant design considerations in a large-scale development scenario (see Appendix E6).

The residential bicycle parking standard, as currently proposed, requires 1 long-term bicycle parking space per unit in an apartment building. In advancing this standard, staff would note that few models exist upon which to base local standards. Recently, however, the City of Toronto completed a master plan that recommended a ratio of 0.75 long-term bicycle parking spaces per residential unit. In advancing this standard, the City had consideration for guidelines developed by other major metropolitan areas across Canada and the United States.

Noting the above, and having consideration for the comments of the development industry, staff would recommend that the previously advanced standard be adjusted to require 0.75 long-term bicycle parking spaces per residential unit. The modified standard would maintain the intent and purpose of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law in-as-much as long-term parking would continue to be mandated (albeit at a slightly reduced rate). The reduced rate notwithstanding, it is anticipated that as the bicycle becomes increasingly viewed as a viable form of transportation, tenants will increasingly demand such amenities, and the development community would respond to that increased demand by providing these amenities at a rate in excess of the minimum standard.

The LDI has commented that additional clarification is required in respect to the number of mandated bicycle parking spaces that would be provided in municipally owned parking lots in the downtown and the City's Business District Commercial Areas (see Appendix E6).

The proposed Amendments to the Z-1 Zoning By-law are silent in respect to the required number of bicycle parking spaces to be provided in a municipally owned parking lot or structure in the Downtown Area zones or an identified Business District Commercial zone. Staff would recommend that the proposed zoning by-law amendment be modified and that a 7% factor be utilized in the determination of the required number of bicycle parking spaces. The total number of bicycle parking spaces should be a function, not of the required number of vehicular parking spaces to be provided for the land use (i.e. parking lot), but rather a ratio of the vehicular spaces the parking lot contains. A municipally owned parking lot with spaces for 100 vehicles, for example, would be required to provide 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces.
The Bicycle Master Plan provides a progressive, long-term vision for the development of on and off-road bicycle infrastructure. The implementing amendments to the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Site Plan Control Area By-law will assist in the realization of this vision. The recommended five year "Kick Start" program will build on the public excitement generated through the planning process to ensure the Plan's relevancy as the bicycle becomes increasingly viewed as a viable mode of transportation.
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1. Introduction:

The transportation policies of the Official Plan underscore Council’s commitment to the development of a transportation system that will provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods within and through the City. The Official Plan further recognizes the bicycle as a viable mode of transportation that is not only environmentally sound but supportive of active healthy lifestyles. To this end, the Official Plan states that Council shall promote and initiate improvements to enhance bicycling as a means of transportation.

To promote increased bicycling, Section 18.2.13 of the Official Plan states that Council “...shall prepare and implement a [bicycle] master plan...” for the development of a bicycle route system which would address such matters as location, priority linkages and extensions, and signage. The Official Plan anticipates that portions of this system will be located within the open space network such that the safety and enjoyment of its users will be enhanced. The Official Plan also contemplates an on road component to the network providing linkages to major activity centers and employment nodes.

2. Purpose:

The City of London has made a significant investment in the development of on and off-road facilities for the commuter and recreational bicyclist. Historically, as is the case today, the Environmental and Engineering Services Department is responsible for the planning and provision of bicycle facilities within the arterial and collector road right-of-way. The Planning Department is charged with the responsibility of developing off-road facilities within the City's open space network.

While both the on and off-road components of the bicycle system are essential to the development of a functional commuter/recreational network, the lack thus far of a “long term vision” to facility development has been a cause for concern to participants to the development review process. Lacking a long term vision, the exercise of securing lands for the extension of both commuter and recreational routes has, at times, been onerous and subject to criticism.

The purpose of the Bicycle Master Plan is to guide the development of a long term, comprehensive, City-wide, on and off-road commuter and recreational bicycling network. Generally, the Guideline shall serve to:

- advance a vision for cycling;
- detail a series of first principles to implement this vision;
- define a strategic approach for the commuter and recreational cyclist that recognizes the distinct operational and design needs of the specific user;
- depict existing and proposed on and off-road facilities;
- advance design guidelines for facility development; and,
- recommend mechanisms for implementation.
Specifically, the Plan shall serve to:

- provide guidance in the development and coordination of on and off-road infrastructure projects to ensure that opportunities to add to the existing City-wide system are not lost;
- inform all parties to the development review process of Council's long-term vision for on and off-road bicycling facilities;
- assist in the review of area plans, plans of subdivision, development applications and consents where the inclusion of on and off-road facilities contributes to the development of linkages and extensions to existing routes;
- provide guidance for the planning of various City-initiated capital transportation projects which will fill "gaps", provide extensions to the bicycle network, or meet interim term needs in an alternate fashion;
- advance a guideline for the development of on and off-road bicycle facilities;
- provide guidance for the timing and prioritization of bicycle route signage;
- support the Transportation Demand Management Strategy in the 2004 Transportation Master Plan and to support the reduction of auto usage, the reduction of green house gases, and increase the general health of all Londoners; and,
- support the recommendations of the Creative City Task Force.

3. A Vision for Bicycling:

The transportation policies of the Official Plan clearly express what the City is attempting to achieve with cycling, and provides the policy framework to undertake the preparation and adoption of a Master Plan.

Cycling in London is recognized as playing an important role in achieving a balanced transportation system. In this regard, the cycling vision for London, as articulated in the Official Plan, calls for the development of an on and off-road system that:

- promotes and encourages cycling;
- is visible, safe and convenient;
- provides linkages and connections to activity nodes and employment centers;
- facilitates effective commuting opportunities by recognizing the unique operational and design needs of the user; and,
- provide for safe and enjoyable recreational experiences.

4. First Principles for the Cycling Network:

Given the policies of the Official Plan and the vision articulated for cycling, the following first principles shall be used to guide the development and design of London's on and off-road bicycle network:
4.1. First Principles - Cycling Routes

- Diverse Experience – the cycling network should provide for a variety of experiences for a diversity of users;
- Visible – the cycling network should be a visible component of the larger transportation system;
- Convenient – the cycling network should be conveniently accessed from all neighborhoods within the City;
- Linked – the cycling network should be a connected, continuous system providing access to major activity centers, employment nodes, neighborhoods, recreational amenities and schools;
- Hierarchy – the cycling network should consist of a primary and secondary network hierarchy that serves to "collect" and direct the user to the desired facility;
- Scenic Experiences – the cycling network should take advantage of attractive and scenic areas, views and vistas while having consideration for environmentally significant features and functions;
- Public lands – the cycling network should be situated on public lands or roads;
- Existing and Planned Infrastructure – the cycling network should have consideration for, and take advantage of, existing and planned cycling facilities; and,
- New Road Projects – new right-of-ways should be designed to accommodate cycling.

4.2. First Principles - Route Design

- Users – the cycling network should be designed to appeal to all cycling abilities and interests;
- Variety of types – the cycling network should consist of a variety of on and off-road facilities;
- Safety – the cycling network should be designed to recognize the distinct operational and design needs of the on and off-road cyclist to maximize the safety of all users and minimize vehicular/bicycle/pedestrian conflict points;
- Wayfinding – wayfinding to and along the cycling network should be readily visible and clear; and,
- Supportive facilities – cycling supportive facilities should be established along cycling routes and at major destinations.

5. A Three Pronged Cycling Strategy:

London’s cycling strategy is based on the defining vision of the Official Plan and the first principles detailed above. The strategy has been developed to provide for the commuter and recreational cyclist recognizing the distinct operational and design needs of the specific user. To this end, the City of London shall pursue a three pronged cycling strategy consisting of:

- A bicycle network of on and off-road routes that cater to the commuter and recreational cyclist. This network would consist of three distinct facilities including on-road bicycle lanes, multi-use pathways and signed on-road bicycle routes;
A distinct bicycle network hierarchy of primary and secondary routes for (i) commuters; and (ii) recreational users; and,

Facility supportive amenities to promote and enhance the use of the bicycle network.

5.1. Strategy #1 – The Existing Bicycle Network:

One of the goals of a truly multimodal transportation network plan is to encourage more people to ride bicycles for short-distance personal, business, social, and recreational trips. To realize this increase in use, the City of London has historically provided for the bicycle through the development of:

- Shared On-road Road Signed Bicycle Routes – on-road routes identified by signs (with no bicycle lane demarcation). The bicycle route is signed because it provides continuity and linkage with other cycling facilities or because it is a preferred route through a busy corridor;

- A Multi-use Pathway (the Thames Valley Parkway) – a separate and distinct multi-use facility designed for a variety of user groups (including cyclists, pedestrians and roller bladders) from which all motorized traffic is excluded. Given user, maintenance, and design considerations, this facility typically caters to the recreational cyclist; and,

- In Boulevard Bicycle Paths (IBBP’s) – exclusive bicycle pathways located within specified arterial road right-of-ways (typically between the sidewalk and the curb lane of the traveled portion of the road).

5.1.1. Issues Associated with In-Boulevard Bicycle Paths:

While endorsing the continued development of the City’s multi-use pathway and signed on-road facilities, the Bicycle Master Plan advocates a departure from the current City practice of providing for IBBP’s along arterial corridors.

When properly situated, IBBP’s can serve as significant generators of bicycle use, providing for enjoyable recreational opportunities (especially for the less skilled cyclist) as well as desirable commuter routes. Appropriate applications of an IBBP would include:

- Where an uninterrupted right-of-way is available to provide for long, continuous routes for commuting or recreational trips; or,

- Within an independent right-of-way such as an abandoned railway corridor, utility corridor, along a river, through a linear park or a greenbelt.

According to the Ministry of Transportation, bicycle paths may be located within the right-of-way of major roads as long as they are located beyond what is used as the clear hazard zone for such facilities. In such instances, the Ministry recommends a separation distance of 10 to 15 metres. When IBBP’s are located immediately adjacent to an arterial roadway, however, many operational problems can occur as the motorist and cyclist interface. Cyclists using the in-boulevard pathway, for example, are generally required to stop or yield at all cross streets and driveways to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Furthermore, unless diligence is exercised in regular pathway maintenance, the accumulation of sand, debris, and eroded materials on the IBBP can lead to crashes that do not involve another vehicle or cyclist. For reasons noted above, there is a "... higher incidence of bicycle crashes associated with off-street, rather than on-street, facilities, particularly in commercial areas... (Ontario Bikeways, Planning and Design Guidelines, Ministry of Transportation).
5.1.2. Alternatives to IBBP's:

The Bicycle Master Plan has given consideration to two facility alternatives to arterial IBBP's including the:

- **Widened Curb Lane** — a right-hand lane of a shared roadway that is typically 4 to 5 metres wide to better accommodate both bicycles and motor vehicles in the same lane. The width of the lane would be a function of traffic volume and speed with a wider lane required as volume and speed increased; and,

- **On-Road Bicycle Lane** — a portion of the roadway within the right-hand lane that has been designated by striping, signing and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists. This is a requirement on high traffic roads.

In considering these two facility alternatives, special attention has been given to London's cycling vision which calls for the development of a visible, safe and convenient system that promotes and encourages cycling.

5.1.2.a) The Widened Curb Lane:

Widened curb lane facilities are designed to:

- Better accommodate both bicycles and motor vehicles on streets with moderate levels of traffic by providing additional operating room;

- Maintain the motor vehicle capacity of the road when it is also used by cyclists;

- Increase the roadway capacity by the number of cyclists capable of being accommodated;

- Allow motor vehicles to pass bicycles without having to change lanes; and,

- Minimize both the real and perceived operating conflicts between bicycles and motor vehicles.

Wide curb lanes are generally selected in urban areas where:

- A significant demand for commuting exists;

- Traffic volume is less than 20,000 AADT;

- There is insufficient room to accommodate a separate bicycle lane; and,

- Many residential or commercial driveways intersect a roadway.

To many experienced riders, wide curb lanes are a preferred facility type because they integrate bicycle and vehicular traffic and force recognition and awareness on the part of the motorist. **Lacking specific markings or lane treatments however, wide curb lanes are generally not sufficient to provide for the degree of comfort and safety required by the inexperienced or less skilled cyclist.**
5.1.2.b) On-Road Bicycle Lanes:

Whereas a widened curb lane on an arterial may accommodate bicycle use, designated on-road bicycle lanes have been shown to encourage increased bicycle use. On-street bicycle lanes offer a designated and visible space for cyclists and can be a significant factor in route choice.

On-road bicycle lanes are typically developed with a mind to:

- Improve the conditions for cyclists of all abilities within a given corridor;
- Encourage increased bicycle use by providing a greater degree of comfort and perceived safety for less skilled cyclists;
- Provide for more predictable turning movements by cyclists and motorists; and
- Establish an overall channeling effect and promote an orderly traffic flow.

Appropriate applications for the implementation of an on-road bicycle facility would include:

- When a municipality wants a ‘host’ facility to promote and encourage safe bicycle use;
- Where motor vehicle traffic poses a threat to cyclists (volumes in excess of 20,000 AADT);
- Where the facility crosses numerous road intersections; and,
- Where the route is anticipated to serve a number of experienced and less experienced riders.

5.1.2.c) A New On-Road Facility Design for London:

Given the operational (and potential risk management) issues associated with IBBP’s, the Bicycle Master Plan Guideline recommends that the City no longer pursue their development. While it is recognized that portions of the system may currently and/or temporarily include existing, or previously planned and approved infrastructure, all new City-initiated capital transportation projects will not provide for the development of IBBP’s.

Given the tendency of a widened curb lane to cater exclusively to the experienced cyclist, and the stated vision of a visible and safe network that promotes and encourages cycling, the Bicycle Infrastructure Guideline recommends that the City henceforth pursue the development of on-road bicycle lanes on specified arterial routes previously identified for IBBP’s.

5.2. Strategy #2 - A Network Hierarchy:

The proposed commuter and recreational networks shall consist of primary and secondary sub networks.

5.2.1. The Primary Commuter Network:

The proposed Primary Commuter Network will function as the spine of London’s commuting network providing direct connections between major origins and destinations across the City. The Primary Commuter Network will consist of a grid of north-south and east-west routes traversing the City.

The Primary Commuter Network is intended to ultimately be composed of properly designed on-road bicycle lanes beside the vehicle curb lane. However, given existing infrastructure and
funding realities, it is recognized that this is a long term goal. The Primary Commuter Network may, in the interim, include signed on-road routes or in-boulevard pathways until an on-road bicycle lane can be developed to serve the same connectivity function. This will occur as roads are re-built and widened.

The Primary Commuter Network is intended and expected to accommodate:

- high speed cycling;
- high cycling volumes;
- cycling that is destination oriented to locations such as major employment centers and activity nodes;
- cyclists with a moderate to high level of experience and skill.

The proposed Primary Commuter Network is identified as a dashed line on Map 1. Principle routing considerations in the development of the Primary Commuter Route Network have been detailed in Section 5.2.5. It is important to note that the network of Primary Commuter Routes is conceptual in nature and may be subject to change based on further study and/or new information.

The Thames Valley Parkway has not been included in the Primary Commuter Route Network recognizing the stated cycling vision, the distinct operational needs of the commuter cyclist, and the multi-use nature of this facility.

5.2.2. The Secondary Commuter Network:

The proposed Secondary Commuter Network will serve the purpose of directing and linking neighborhood connections to the larger Primary Commuter and/or Recreational network. In this regard, the Secondary Commuter Network is intended to be composed of signed on-road routes.

The Secondary Commuter Network is intended and expected to accommodate:

- medium to high cycling volumes;
- cycling that may be commuting and/or recreationally oriented recognizing that this network will provide direct connections to both the Primary Commuting Network and the Primary Recreational Network; and,
- cyclists with a moderate to high level of experience and expertise.

The proposed Secondary Commuter Network is identified on as a dashed line on Map 1. Principle routing considerations in the development of the Secondary Commuter Route Network have been detailed in Section 5.2.5. It is important to note that the network of Secondary Commuter Routes is conceptual in nature and may be subject to change based on further study and/or new information.

5.2.3. The Primary Recreational Network:

The proposed Primary Recreational Network will be the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP). Situated on publicly owned lands, the Thames Valley Parkway is the City’s multi-use pathway system which follows the Thames River Corridor through London. The current network is approximately 32 kilometers long with several bridge crossings of the Thames River.
The Primary Recreational Network is intended to ultimately be composed of a continuous multi-use pathway system contiguous with the Thames Valley Corridor. At the present time however there are several "gaps" in the system. In the interim, the Primary Recreational Network may be required to make use of signed on-road routes where no public parkland route is presently available or feasible. Future extensions to the Thames Valley Parkway will occur as lands along the branches of the Thames River are developed.

The Primary Recreation Network is intended and expected to accommodate:

- high cycling volumes that is destination oriented to the Thames Valley Parkway;
- cyclists with a low to high level of experience and skill; and,
- multiple use of pathways for cycling and other recreational uses.

The proposed Primary Recreational Network is identified on Map 2 as a dashed line. Principle routing considerations in the development of the Primary Recreational Route Network have been detailed in Section 5.2.5. It is important to note that the network of Primary Recreational Routes is conceptual in nature and may be subject to change based on further study and/or new information.

5.2.4. The Secondary Recreational Network:

The proposed Secondary Recreational Network will provide for neighborhood connections to the Primary Recreational Network. The Secondary Recreational Network will also serve to provide safe and convenient inter and intra neighborhood connections to other recreational amenities and opportunities including neighborhood parks, district parks, natural areas and community facilities. The Secondary Recreational Network is intended to ultimately be composed of signed on-road routes that would lend themselves to the skill and experience level of the user (primarily local and secondary collector roads). The Secondary Recreational Network is intended and expected to accommodate:

- medium to high cycling volumes;
- the cyclist seeking an enjoyable and leisurely cycling experience wherein the destination is of secondary importance; and, cyclists with a low to high level of experience and skill.

The proposed Secondary Recreational Network is identified on Map 2 as a dashed line. Principle routing considerations in the development of the Secondary Recreational Route Network have been detailed in Section 5.2.5. It is important to note that the network of Secondary Recreational Routes is conceptual in nature and may be subject to change based on further study and/or new information.

5.2.5. Route Selection Criteria:

Several principle factors have been given consideration in determining the proper location for the various components of the bicycle network (see Table 1) Directness, for example, may be determinant factor in the consideration of a possible commuter route alignment. Aesthetics, on the other hand, may be the primary consideration for a recreational route. In other instances, the consideration of the several criteria may be equally important to both the commuter and recreational cyclist. The relative importance of these factors may vary from route to route depending on local situations and existing conditions. It is important to note that safety is of primary importance in the evaluation of possible routing options.
### B. Turcotte

#### Route Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Access*</th>
<th>Aesthetics*</th>
<th>Connectivity*</th>
<th>Delays*</th>
<th>Destinations*</th>
<th>Directness*</th>
<th>Road Width*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Commuter</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Commuter</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Recreational</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Recreational</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where:

- **Access** – the facility should be located having consideration to the provision of adequate access;
- **Aesthetics** – scenic value is important along a bikeway intended for recreational purposes;
- **Connectivity** – should provide for connections to other routes and areas of interest;
- **Delays** – route should minimize impedances to travel (stop signs, traffic signals, topography);
- **Destinations** – facility should be located to maximize usage;
- **Directness** – facility should serve activity centres along a direct course;
- **Road allowance** – of sufficient width to accommodate user.

### 5.3. Strategy #3 – Facility Supportive Amenities:

Developing and maintaining a comprehensive network of on and off-road bicycle routes does not automatically mean that cyclists will use the network. The network must be promoted, the users must view the facility as safe, and there must be facility supportive amenities.

For the commuting cyclist, such amenities may be seen to include:

- an adequate number of safe and secure bicycle parking facilities at major employment centres and activity nodes;
- wayfinding and route signage; and,
- shower and change room facilities at these destination points for employees wishing to ride their bicycle to work.

For the recreational cyclist, such amenities may be seen to include:

- washrooms and drinking fountains;
wayfinding and route signage;

- rest stops, lookouts and benches; and,

- bicycle parking facilities.

To enhance and promote the use of the bicycle for commuting and recreational purposes, the City shall lead by example by requiring the provision of secure parking facilities for bicycles at all municipally owned and operated facilities. Council shall also require, as a condition of approval of development or redevelopment, the provision of bicycle parking facilities at major activity centres and employment nodes.

To further enhance the recreational cycling experience, the City shall continue to provide for those on-route recreational amenities detailed above. For the most part, these amenities will be located along the Primary Recreational Network. Where deemed appropriate, such amenities may also be provided for along the Secondary Recreational Network.

Finally, the City shall initiate a bicycle network awareness program to promote the use of the commuter and recreational network systems.

6. Design Considerations and Best Practices:

The construction of London's bicycle network shall be designed to both promote the system and enhance the safety of the user. Section 6 advances a series of general design guidelines for the construction of the bicycle network focusing specifically on on-road bicycle lanes, multi-use pathways and signed on-road routes. The design guidelines are based on accepted standards and best practices advocated by a number of professional associations and governmental agencies including:

- The Canadian Institute of Planners;

- The American Planning Association;

- The Transportation Association of Canada; and,

- The Ministry of Transportation of Ontario.

The recommended on and off-road facilities will be integrated into the commuter and recreational network as new roadways (or pathways) are built, existing roadways (or pathways) are resurfaced and/or reconstructed, and lands are acquired. However, these facilities may not be immediately implemented given existing infrastructure, funding realities or physical constraints.

Figures depicting on and off-road facilities in Section 6 are intended to conceptually illustrate what the facility may look like. Preferred lane widths may vary based on local circumstances and physical constraints.

6.1. On-Road Bicycle Lanes:

London's cycling network will consist of a series of on-road bicycle lanes (Figure 1) that will primarily cater to the commuting cyclist with a moderate to high level of expertise and skill. On-road bicycle lanes are depicted on Map 1.

On-road bicycle lanes have several advantages over wide shared lanes including the delineation of exclusive space and the perception of a higher level of safety. Bicycle lanes are therefore attractive to both the experienced and moderately skilled cyclist and may encourage more people to cycle. Where feasible, on-road bicycle lane facilities should:
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- Be one directional with the flow of traffic;
- Be located along both sides of an identified on-road route;
- Be located between the edge of the vehicular lane and the curb;
- Be placed between the parking lane and the adjacent travel lane in those instances where on-street parking is provided;
- Be delineated by a painted line on the pavement;
- Be 1.5 m in width;
- Be identified by signs along the route and/or bicycle symbols painted on the bicycle lane; and,
- Include specific lane markings to denote potential conflict points and routing options.

**Figure 1, On-Road Bicycle Lane**

6.2. Multi-Use Pathways:

London's multi-use pathway system (see Figure 2) will be designed to accommodate a variety of user groups including recreational cyclists, pedestrians and roller bladders. Multi-use bicycle pathways are depicted on Map 2. Being a multi-use pathway primarily located within the City's Open Space system, safety, aesthetics and environmental considerations carry as much value as technical considerations in determining design requirements and routing options. The ultimate pathway cross section therefore will vary depending on the trails location and the anticipated number of users.

Where feasible, the Multi-use pathway should:

- Be a separate and distinct facility from which all motorized traffic is excluded;
- Vary in width from 3 to 6 m depending on anticipated use, abutting infrastructure and natural features, topography, etc.;
- Provide connecting pathways to local neighborhoods to ensure convenient access for users and to the on-road bicycle network;

- Include access and exit points that provide visibility from an adjacent street every 500 m. This may require small park block frontages and/or widened walkway blocks to ensure safety for users of the system;

- View existing vegetation and topography as an asset as they provide buffers between users and adjacent land uses. A minimum setback to adjacent land uses for retro-fit/improvement areas shall be determined based on detailed design. Typical setbacks for the pathway in newly developing areas shall be 6 to 10 m with appropriate screening;

- Be a smooth asphalt treatment;

- Provide for two-way traffic with the appropriate line marking, directional indicators, and hazard signage;

- Be designed such that they do not parallel roadways thus avoiding conflicts with traffic turning movements; and,

- Be designed to ensure positive drainage and accessibility requirements.

**Figure 2, Multi-Use Pathway**

6.3. Signed On-Road Facility:

Signed on-road cycling routes (see Figure 3) will constitute a sizable portion of London's bicycle network. These facilities serve a secondary connection function linking neighborhoods to the larger commuter and recreational network. Signed on-street cycling routes are depicted on Maps 1 and 2 (secondary commuter and secondary recreational routes).

Where feasible, on-road signed facilities should:

- Be located on a local or collector road where wide curb lanes of a minimum width of 4 m exist or can be provided (a greater curb lane width may be required having consideration for vehicle parking, truck and vehicle volumes and speeds, drainage grates, etc.); and,
7. Supportive Programming:

The Bicycle Master Plan has been prepared to guide the development of a comprehensive, long term, commuter and recreational bicycle network. The guideline has purposely focused on a strategic approach to facility development highlighting existing and proposed routes, design guidelines and facility supportive amenities.

Infrastructure alone, however, is not sufficient to promote and encourage safe and viable cycling in London. Programming is equally important and constitutes a separate, yet critical, "soft" component of London's new bicycle initiative.

It is expected that the City's Environmental Programs and Customer Relations Division, Transportation Planning and Design Division and/or the Transportation Advisory Committee and other community groups will develop promotional and educational (as funding permits) initiatives to encourage increased cycling in London including, but not limited to:

- Programs to increase awareness of the bicycle network (mapping);
- Program(s) promoting bicycle awareness. These programs can be aimed at the cyclist, motorist, or both. They could vary from simple “Share the Road” bumper stickers and billboard signs to blitz campaigns tied in with specific events;
- Programs to educate the cyclist and motorist alike on what the cycling lane is, how it is intended to work, how to use it, how to interface with it in your vehicle, etc.;
- Programs to provide incentives for bicycling commuting;
- Programs that work towards creating a position of mutual understanding and positive attitudes between motorists and cyclists;
- Programs to develop the tourism potential of the bicycle network.
8. Implementation:

This Bicycle Master Plan will be implemented in various ways so that it effectively shapes the future of London’s bicycle infrastructure over the long term and promotes this alternative mode of transportation in the short term. The following describes these implementation strategies:

**Long-Term Implementation:**

Long term goals will be achieved by setting the vision with a Council endorsed long term planning approach. The Official Plan for the City of London will be amended to include a policy which recognizes this Bicycle Master Plan (in both Chapter 18 and 19) and will give clear direction for the following:

- All City-initiated capital transportation projects will have consideration for bicycle facilities as directed in this guideline. Such facilities will be incorporated into the Environmental Assessment process and budgeting process as required.
- Care of on-road bicycle facilities shall mirror Council’s approved summer and winter road maintenance schedule, including provisions for snow removal, street sweeping and surface repairs.
- Ongoing road maintenance and new road construction shall have consideration for the bicycle in the placement and design of sewer grates, manhole covers and railway crossings treatments.
- All of the maintenance requirements for roadways shall apply to on-road bicycle lane facilities as well including the maintenance of the lane delineation and pavement stenciling and the maintenance and/or replacement of signage.
- All City-initiated capital open space, parks and recreation projects will incorporate bike facilities as directed in this guideline. Such facilities will be incorporated into the Environmental Assessment process and budgeting process as required.
- A bicycle route signage program shall be developed. Regulatory, warning and information signs for on road facilities will be developed in accordance with the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Bikeway Traffic Control Guidelines.
- All facilities operated by the City will incorporate appropriate bicycle facilities consistent with their location relative to the bicycle plan and in order to lead by example in promoting the usage of cycling in London.
- All area plans will incorporate bicycle infrastructure as provided for in this guideline.
- All development applications, including, but not limited to, plans of subdivision, severances, plans of condominium, Official Plan amendments, zoning amendments, site plans, and Conservation Master Plans will be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with, and implement, this guideline document.
- The City will develop a specific implementation guideline for the creation of delineated on-road bicycle lanes, having particular consideration for intersection treatments.
- Bicycle parking regulations shall be prepared and incorporated into the City’s Z-1 Zoning By-law to ensure that the parking needs of cyclists are met.
Short Term Implementation:

The Bicycle Master Plan advances a "blueprint" for the long-term development of a commuting and recreational cycling network. A short term strategy is also directed to orchestrate the development of as much bicycle infrastructure as physically and financially possible. The goal is to promote cycling opportunities early in the planning period by maximizing routes, linkages and connections. To do this, a number of strategic approaches will be followed:

- Critical corridors between major destinations will be analyzed to determine cost effective facility design (signage and stripping) and safe routes that can be established on an interim basis. These routes would be temporary until major constraints on the long-term Primary and secondary Routes are removed. The City presently funds a "Traffic Study" capital program that can support this initiative.

- Coordination of these corridors shall be with annual capital works programs, the SHIFT Alternatives Program, traffic calming studies and projects and road maintenance plans.

- Alternative design guidelines shall be employed that respond to road traffic and available road cross-sections such that opportunities to expand signed routes are maximized.

Implementation Programming:

A number of promotional and educational initiatives are currently being planned by various City Divisions, Boards and community groups for 2005 and 2006 that will benefit the Bicycle Master Plan and the current and future role of cycling in London (see chart below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project and Timing</th>
<th>Focus for the Bicycle Master Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIFT Alternatives Public Consultation (Spring 2005 through Winter 2006)</td>
<td>Actively promote</td>
<td>The purpose of the public consultation is to develop a SHIFT Alternatives Program that meets the needs and expectations of Londoners. Residents, businesses and community groups will be asked to share their travel experiences and what support is needed to encourage them to use more travel options. The Bicycle Master Plan will be part of the TDM toolbox presented to Londoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Bike Racks and Rings (Spring 2005)</td>
<td>Actively promote</td>
<td>Bike racks and rings will be installed at those community centres, arenas and libraries where there is a demonstrated need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tonne Challenge – Short Trip Challenge Spring – Fall 2005</td>
<td>Raise Awareness</td>
<td>A &quot;Short Trips Challenge&quot; will be promoted as part of the OTC demonstration. Participants will be encouraged to cycle and walk to destinations within 3 kms. Participants will be given motivational tools such as pedometers, maps, bike rentals, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tonne Challenge – Commuter Challenge Spring 2005 to Spring 2006</td>
<td>Raise Awareness</td>
<td>Challenge participants to find transportation alternatives to work and school in the national, week-long event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-wide Commuter Challenge June 2005</td>
<td>Raise Awareness</td>
<td>The Commuter Challenge is a friendly competition (on-line registration) between Canadian communities to encourage as many people as possible to use sustainable modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Festival June 2005</td>
<td>Actively promote</td>
<td>London's annual Bicycle Festival encourages Londoners to bike for transportation, fitness and fun. The festival promotes events to educate people about safety, maintenance, local trails and to advocate bike use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM for Business June 2005 – November 2006</td>
<td>Raise Awareness</td>
<td>Enhance the capacity of local small-to-medium sized enterprises and large businesses to take action on climate change by increasing the use of environmentally-friendly forms of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIFT Website Fall 2005 to Winter 2006</td>
<td>Actively promote</td>
<td>A TDM website will be launched to inform individuals and employers of the benefits of TDM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary and Secondary Commuter Route Network

Primary and Secondary Recreational Route Network
THE PROPOSED OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT
Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)
2005

By-law No. C.P.-1284 (inserted by Clerk's Office)

A by-law to amend the Official Plan for the City of London, 1989 relating to the adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan as a guideline document to the Official Plan pursuant to Section 19.2.2. The Official Plan Amendment will also serve to update existing transportation policy pertaining to Council's stated intent to prepare a Bicycle Master Plan.

The Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. Amendment No. (to be inserted by Clerk's Office) to the Official Plan for the City of London Planning Area – 1989, as contained in the text attached hereto and forming part of this by-law, is adopted.

2. This by-law shall come into effect in accordance with subsection 17(38) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13.

PASSED in Open Council on October 3rd, 2005

Anne Marie DeCicco
Mayor

Kevin Bain
City Clerk

First Reading – October 3rd, 2005
Second Reading – October 3rd, 2005
Third Reading – October 3rd, 2005
AMENDMENT NO.

to the

OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE CITY OF LONDON

A. PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT

The purpose of this amendment is to adopt the Bicycle Master Plan as a guideline document to the Official Plan. The amendment will also serve to update existing transportation policy pertaining to Council's stated intent to prepare a Bicycle Master Plan.

B. LOCATION OF THIS AMENDMENT

This amendment is to be applied on a City-wide basis.

C. BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

The Transportation policies of the Official Plan underscore Council's commitment to the development of a balanced, safe and efficient transportation system that integrates all modes of travel and minimizes the conflicts among these modes. To this end, the Official Plan states that Council shall promote and initiate improvements to enhance bicycling as a means of transportation.

To promote increased bicycling, Section 18.2.13 of the Official Plan states that Council shall prepare and implement a master plan for the development of a bicycle route system which would address such matters as location, priority linkages and extensions, and signage. The Official Plan anticipates an off-road component to this system that will be located within the open space network such that the safety and enjoyment of its users will be enhanced. The Official Plan also contemplates an on-road component to the network providing recreational and commuting linkages to major activity centres and employment nodes.

D. THE AMENDMENT

The Official Plan for the City of London is hereby amended by:

1) deleting the Section 18.2.13.i) - 18.2.13.vi) and replacing it with a new Section 18.2.13.i) - 18.2.13.xiii) as follows:

**Bicycle Master Plan**

Council shall prepare and adopt a Bicycle Master Plan to guide the development and implementation of a long-term, comprehensive, on and off-road commuter and recreational bicycling network. Portions of the system will be aligned along existing roads to provide linkages to major activity centres and employment nodes such as, but not limited to, the University of Western Ontario, Fanshawe College and the Downtown. Portions of the system will also be located within the public open space network such as the Thames River Valley so that the safety and enjoyment of its users will be enhanced.

The Master Plan shall serve to: advance a vision for cycling; detail a series
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of first principles to implement the London's cycling vision; define a strategic approach for the development of a primary and secondary commuter and recreational network that recognizes the distinct operational and design needs of the user; depict existing and proposed on and off-road facilities; advance minimum design standards for facility development; detail facility supportive amenities; and recommend mechanisms for implementation.

City-initiated Capital Transportation Projects ii) All City-initiated capital transportation projects shall incorporate bicycle facilities as directed by the Bicycle Master Plan. The prescribed facility shall be incorporated into the Environmental Assessment and budgeting process as required.

City-Initiated Capital Open Space and Parks Projects iii) All City-initiated capital open space, parks and recreation projects will incorporate bicycle facilities as directed by the Bicycle Master Plan. The prescribed facility shall be incorporated into the Environmental Assessment process and budgeting process as required. Council shall support the expansion of off-road facilities through river valleys and parklands where such facilities will not adversely impact significant environmental features or functions.

Area Plans iv) All area plans shall incorporate bicycle infrastructure as provided for in the Bicycle Master Plan.

Development Applications v) All development applications, including, but not limited to, plans of subdivision, severances, plans of condominium, Official Plan Amendments, zoning by-law amendments, site plans, and Conservation Master Plans shall be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with, and implement, the Bicycle Master Plan.

Signage Program vi) A bicycle route signage program for existing roadways will be budgeted for and prioritized. Signage for identified commuter and recreational routes will be developed in accordance with recognized standards and best practices.

Ongoing Road Maintenance and New Road Construction vii) Ongoing road maintenance and new road construction and associated infrastructure shall have consideration for the bicycle in the design and placement of intersection treatments, sewer grates, manhole covers, signage and railway crossings.

Maintenance Requirements for Roadways viii) All of the maintenance requirements for roadways shall extend and apply to on-road bicycle lanes facilities as well including the maintenance of the lane delineation, pavement stencilling, and the maintenance and/or replacement of signage.

Maintenance Schedules ix) Care of on-road bicycle facilities shall mirror Council’s approved summer and winter road maintenance schedule including provisions for snow removal, street sweeping and surface repairs.

Lead by Example x) Council shall provide accessible and sufficient bicycle parking facilities at all municipally owned and operated facilities in order to promote the use of the bicycle as an alternative mode of transportation.

Bicycle Parking Standards xi) Bicycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Z-1 Zoning By-law. Council shall also encourage facilities such as showers and change rooms in places of employment to enhance the use of the bicycle for work-based travel.

Intersection Treatments and facility design xii) The City shall develop design and implementation guidelines for the creation of delineated on-road bicycle lanes and on-road bicycle routes having particular consideration for intersection treatments.
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Supportive Programming (xiii)

The City shall develop educational programming to promote and encourage safe and viable cycling in London.

2) Amend Section 19.2.2. to add a new part "( )" that would state "Bicycle Master Plan".
Appendix C

THE PROPOSED ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT
Appendix "C"

Bill No. (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)
2005

By-law No. Z.-1-05 (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office)

A by-law to amend By-law No. Z.-1 to add a new section "(0)" to Section 4.19. of the General Provisions to provide for the regulation of bicycle parking standards.

WHEREAS the City of London has initiated an amendment to the General Provisions of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law, as set out below;

AND WHEREAS this rezoning conforms to the Official Plan;

AND WHEREAS upon approval of Official Plan Amendment Number (number to be inserted by Clerk's Office) this rezoning will conform to the Official Plan;

THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

Section 4.19 to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by adding a new Section "(0)" to the General Provisions.

This By-law shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with subsection 34(21) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, either upon the date of the passage of this by-law or as otherwise provided by the said subsection.

PASSED in Open Council on October 3rd, 2005.

Anne Marie DeCicco
Mayor

Kevin Bain
City Clerk

First Reading - October 3rd, 2005
Second Reading - October 3rd, 2005
Third Reading - October 3rd, 2005
Appendix C
Proposed Amendments to the Z.-1 Zoning By-law

1) Section 4.19. of the General Provisions to By-law No. Z.-1 is amended by adding a new section "( )" as follows:

( ) Bicycle Parking Requirements:

All required bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at the time of the erection of a building or addition thereto, expansion of a use, or when there is a change of use of a lot or a building. Bicycle parking spaces shall be maintained exclusively for the use for which they are required for as long as the use is in operation.

Where part of a bicycle parking space is required in accordance with this By-law, such part shall be considered one parking space for the purpose of calculating the total bicycle parking requirement for the use.

( ) Design Characteristics for Bicycle Parking:

For the purpose of this By-law, associated design elements shall be provided in accordance with those provisions set forth under Section ( ) of the City's Site Plan Control By-law.

( ) Number of Bicycle Parking Spaces:

1) Residential Development:

Apartment buildings and lodging houses (with five or more residential units) shall be required to provide 0.75 long-term bicycle parking space per residential unit.

2) Residential Care Facilities:

Short-term bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at a rate of 7% of the required number of automobile parking spaces, as specified in the Zoning By-law, for the following residential care facilities:

(a) senior citizen apartment buildings
(b) nursing homes;
(c) rest homes;
(d) retirement lodges;
(e) retirement homes;
(f) handicapped persons apartment buildings;
(g) continuum-of-care facility;
(h) chronic care facility;
(i) foster homes;
(j) group home type 1 and type 2;
(k) supervised residence;
(l) correctional and detention centre;
(m) emergency care establishment.

3) Residential Development Exemptions:
   Notwithstanding clause "(k)" to the contrary, bicycle parking shall not be required for:
   (a) Conversions of existing space to residential units;
   (b) Single detached dwellings; semi-detached dwellings; duplex dwellings; triplex dwellings; fourplex dwellings; townhouse dwellings; stacked townhouse dwellings; street townhouses; cluster townhouses; farm dwellings.

4) Non-Residential Development:
   Short-term bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at a rate of 7% of the required number of automobile parking spaces, as specified in the Zoning By-law, for all non-residential development except as specified below:

5) Non-Residential Development Exemptions:
   (a) where the required number of automobile parking spaces specified in the Zoning By-law is 9 or fewer spaces, no bicycle parking is required;
   (b) No bicycle parking requirement applies for the following uses specified in the Zoning By-law:
       Abattoir; aggregate reprocessing; aggregate storage area; agricultural service establishment; agricultural supply establishment; agricultural use; agricultural use, intensive; agricultural use, non-intensive; agriculturally related commercial use; agriculturally related industrial use; batching plant, asphalt; batching plant, concrete; channel composting facility; construction and demolition recycling facility; crushing plant; driving range; drive-through facility; farm; farm cluster; farm equipment sales and service; farm foods and products market; farm market; feedlot; forestry use; grain elevator; greenhouse, commercial; in-vessel composting facility; kennel; landing strip; livestock; livestock facilities; managed woodlot; manure storage facilities; pit; propane transfer facility; quarry; resource excavation; residential and other source recycling facility; resource extraction operation; salvage yard; specialized recycling facility; stockpiling; travel plaza/truck stop; truck stop; theatre, drive-in; wayside pit or wayside quarry; windrow composting facility.

   (c) No bicycle parking requirement will apply to the conversion of existing buildings for residential or non-residential uses in all Downtown Area 1 and 2 Zones. Major redevelopment involving property consolidation and new construction is required to provide for bicycle parking facilities at the mandated standard.

   (d) No bicycle parking requirement will apply to the conversion of existing buildings for residential or non-residential uses in all Business District Commercial 1 and 2 Zones. Major redevelopment involving property consolidation and new construction is required to provide for bicycle parking facilities at the mandated standard.
parking facilities at the mandated standard.

6) Municipally-owned Parking lots and structures

Municipally-owned parking lots in the Downtown Area zones and defined Business District Commercial Area zones shall provide for short-term bicycle parking facilities equal to 7% of the total vehicular parking spaces provided.

7) Bicycle Parking Incentives:

Notwithstanding Section 4.19 of this By-law to the contrary, the required number of motor vehicle parking spaces for non-residential uses may be reduced to provide for additional short or long-term bicycle parking spaces beyond those mandated by this by-law provided, however, the reduction in motor vehicle parking spaces shall not exceed 10% of the required motor vehicle parking spaces. Individual vehicular parking stalls shall be required to provide for a minimum of five bicycle parking spaces.
Appendix D

THE PROPOSED SITE PLAN
CONTROL AREA BY-LAW
AMENDMENT
Bill No.
2005

By-law No.
A by-law to amend By-law No. C.P.-1213-340 entitled "A by-law to designate a site plan control area and to delegate Council's power under section 40 of the Planning Act, 1983".

The Municipal Council of the Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. By-law No.-1213-340 is hereby amended by adding a new Section () Bicycle Parking Facilities to Schedule 1 of the Site Plan Control Area By-law, as follows:

(). Bicycle Parking Facilities
(a) Objectives:

To encourage the use of bicycles as an alternative means of transportation, bicycle parking facilities shall be provided at the residential base and at destination locations such as the workplace, convenience and destination and commercial and institutional facilities. Bicycle parking shall be provided in facilities that are convenient, safe, secure and functional for the intended use.

(b) Number of Bicycle Parking Spaces:

To be provided in accordance with the regulations set out in the current Zoning By-law.

(c) Design Characteristics

When required in association with a development, bicycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the design characteristics as set out in Table 6.10.

(d) Long and Short-term Bicycle Parking Facilities:

Long-term bicycle parking is required for apartment buildings and lodging houses with five or more residential units to store bicycles for several hours or days at a time. The facility must be protected from the weather and should be enclosed within a secure space.

Subject to the provisions of the Z.-1 Zoning By-law, short-term bicycle parking is required for all non-residential development requiring 10 or more vehicular parking spaces. Short-term bicycle parking spaces should be as accessible as possible and should be visible to discourage theft.
Short-term bicycle parking facilities typically consist of a rack or a post where the frame and wheels of the bicycle can be secured by a user supplied lock.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Characteristics for Bicycle Parking Facilities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Bicycle Parking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment buildings and lodging houses (with five or more residential units) shall be required to provide for long-term bicycle parking opportunities in an accessible, secure and weather protected area. Subject to the design characteristics set out below, long-term bicycle parking spaces may be provided in the following locations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) in a bicycle room or bicycle compound located within a building or motor vehicle parking structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) within a building or motor vehicle parking structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) within an individual bicycle locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) within a building or motor vehicle parking structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the purpose of this By-law, long-term bicycle parking shall not be provided within a dwelling unit or a balcony thereof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Bicycle Parking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term bicycle parking spaces may be provided within an exterior space (covered or uncovered) designated for the parking of bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale developments may spatially disperse the required number of short-term bicycle parking spaces throughout the site in accordance with the locational considerations detailed under 4, 5, 6, and 7 noted below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Size of a Bicycle Parking Space</th>
<th>Minimum horizontal dimensions of 0.6 metres by 1.5 metres and a height of at least 1.9 metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Aisle Width</td>
<td>Where more than one row of bicycle parking spaces is provided, a minimum aisle width of 1.5 metres shall be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Location for Accessibility</td>
<td>Less than 15 metres from the entrance used by cyclists or if located within a building in a location easily accessible to bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should not be farther from the entrance than the closest motor vehicle parking space (excluding parking spaces for the physically challenged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In a separately designated area that does not impede the movement of pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In an easy to find location directly visible from the entrance used by cyclists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agenda Item 

#### 2. Location for Natural Surveillance

- Location for Natural Surveillance
  - Located within constant visual range of persons within the adjacent building or within well traveled pedestrian areas
  - Within unobstructed view from the adjacent municipal roadway

#### 5. Security Lighting

- Night lighting shall be provided in a manner to ensure that the entire bicycle parking area is well lit

#### 7. Covered Bicycle Parking

- If covered motor vehicle parking is provided, the required bicycle parking shall also be covered.

---

(d) Change Room and Shower Facilities: Change room and shower facilities for cyclists are encouraged to enhance the use of bicycles for work based travel.

---

2. This By-law comes into force and effect on October 3rd, 2005.

PASSED in Open Council on October 3rd, 2005.

Anne Marie DeCicco
Mayor

Kevin Bain
City Clerk

First Reading – October 3rd, 2005
Second Reading – October 3rd, 2005
Third Reading – October 3rd, 2005
Appendix E

CORRESPONDENCE AND SUBMISSIONS
April 25th, 2005

Corporation of the City of London
c/o Brian Turcotte, Senior Planner - Policy
300 Dufferin Avenue
P.O. Box 5035
London, ON N6A 4L9

Re: Bicycle Master Plan

Dear Mr. Turcotte,

Thank you for requesting comments from the University Students’ Council (USC) regarding the Bicycle Master Plan. It is always positive to see effective communication between the Municipal Government and the Student Government at UWO. Following our review of the Draft Bicycle Master Plan Guideline Document, the USC supports the changes to the Official Plan, Z-1 Zoning Bi-law and Site Plan Control By-law to integrate the proposed Bicycle Master Plan. The USC believes that these changes would benefit the undergraduate population at the University of Western Ontario for a number of reasons.

The Commuter Network consisting of on-road lanes and signage, for instance, will create a safer environment for students, while the Recreational Network will provide a much needed alternative to traditional forms of physical activity. Moreover, the long-term plan to integrate lockers or storage rooms is a significant benefit to students, especially on a campus where bicycle theft continues to be an annual problem. Promoting the use of bicycles in the plan also reinforces our recently adopted Environmental Sustainability Policy. These are just a few examples of how the Bicycle Master Plan would benefit students and cyclists alike.

To conclude, a large number of undergraduate students rely on bicycles as their primary choice of transportation due to the costs associated with purchasing and owning an automobile, not to mention high tuition fees and other costs associated with student life. Implementing such a plan will truly assist students and show them that the City of London is interested in their concerns.

Sincerely,

Nick Staubitz
President and Chairman
University Students’ Council

To enhance the educational experience and quality of life for all undergraduate students at the University of Western Ontario

G.F.
A.C.
R.G.
E.K.
O.T.

May 9, 2005

Dear Mr. Turcotte,:  

A Bicycle Infrastructure Guideline for London

Thank you for the opportunity to review the report, recommendations and draft master plan for cycling in the City of London. This is an excellent initiative by the City to improve the quality of life "using a creative" approach.

These comments are submitted based on my experience as a commuting and recreational cyclist in the City of London for over ten years. As a land use planner the comments are intended to assist in the implementation of the policies regulations and guidelines.

The following comments are provided to each of the recommendations in the report:

1. I would increase the number of exempt spaces to 15 or fewer vehicle spaces, requires 0 bicycle spaces. The rate of parking spaces should be relative to the number of vehicle spaces.

2. I do not support an exemption from any use. Parking is required for customers, staff and tenants who may not need to carry bulk materials to or from the site. Bicycle parking should be provided for each site.

3. While I agree with 7% bicycle parking as a ratio of vehicular parking I would recommend a rate of 1 bicycle space for each 15 vehicle spaces or part thereof as a simpler rate and easier to calculate. 7% is really 1.05 spaces per 15 vehicle spaces and could be rounded up to 1/15.

4. See #3 above.

5. I agree that spaces should be provided for 5 units or greater but that no exemption be provided.

6. I strongly support the substitution of bicycle for vehicle spaces. I suggest the rate of 5 bicycle spaces for every vehicle space to a maximum of 10%.

7. No distinction should be made between short and long term. We don't regulate vehicles this way and should not regulate bicycles. This is also very difficult to monitor and will be sorted out practically by users and owners.

350 Oxford Street West, Suite 203, London, Ontario N6H 1T3 Canada (519) 472-7328 FAX (519) 472-9554
CCL (Cumming Cockburn Limited) is a division of IBI Group.
I agree, public vehicle parking is provided by the City on the street and bicycle parking should be afforded the same or a preferential treatment.

I agree parking should be made available by the City at municipally managed locations.

Bonusing should be available for the provision of these facilities.

With respect to the multi-use pathways, these should be recognized as significant commuter pathways leading to the core area. The paths flow to and from the core area as significant commuter routes and should be expanded to recognize this function.

Greater emphasis should be placed on the local street system as a safe convenient place to use bicycles.

The Official Plan policies should amend the descriptions of arterial, primary collector and secondary collector roads to include the cycling function these roads should provide to the community. Cycling should be integrated into the community process.

The report provides limited reference to the student population at Western and Fanshawe where bicycles are can be a significant means of transportation. Improvements should be concentrated in these locations.

With respect to the zoning by-law amendments, I would recommend adding definitions/regulations for bicycle parking areas; locations; and access. The bicycle parking area must be clearly regulated similar to vehicle parking spaces in order to have weight in the by-law.

Congratulations to the City for moving forward with this Bicycle Master Plan. This is a significant contribution to making the City of London an environmentally friendly and active community.

Please provide notice on any future reports or public meetings. If you have any questions, please contact me at this office.

Yours truly,

CCL/IB Group

William Pol, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning

May 3, 2005
April 25, 2005

Brian Turcotte  
Senior Planner  
Planning and Development Office  
City of London  
300 Dufferin Avenue  
London, ON N6A 4L9

Re: Bicycle Master Plan

Dear Mr. Turcotte,

Thank you very much for providing me with a copy of the Bicycle Master Plan. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to offer my comments regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment to adopt the Bicycle Master Plan as part of the Official Plan.

I am highly supportive of the proposed expansion of the bicycle path network from the current system to a two bicycle path system network that recognizes the distinct differences between the recreational and the commuter cyclist.

As a frequent user of the recreational bicycle path network, I would like to compliment the City of London on the extensive development of the recreational path network which has occurred over the past several years. As president of the London Cycling Club, I can assure you that the recreational path network is heavily utilized by our membership for both recreational and commuter cycling.

I am also very aware of the inherent conflict between the recreational and the commuter cyclist and the resultant strain on the capacity of the recreational cycle path network. The development of a commuter path network, which encompasses both delineated on-road bicycle lanes and signed on-road bicycle routes, would greatly enhance the safety of the commuter cyclist. While cycling contributes to a healthier lifestyle and positively promotes a sustained environment, I cannot over-emphasize the cyclists’ desire to arrive alive. It is for this primary reason, the safety of the cyclist, that I endorse the proposed Commuter Network for cyclists.
The development of a two tier Commuter Network, in my opinion, is a worthwhile long-term goal for the City of London. In the interim, we should continue to utilize the current secondary recreational network as much as possible. Efforts could be undertaken to improve signage for on-road routes and to provide additional education in order to enhance motorist awareness of these designated on-road cycle routes.

I would also like to express my support for the plan’s recommendation to terminate any future construction of in-boulevard bicycle paths. In-boulevard bicycle paths, that contain multiple commuter access points, are extremely dangerous to the cyclist. While well intentioned in their development, these paths unfortunately compromise the safety of the commuter cyclist. Motorists continually ignore the edge of the cycle path and proceed to drive in front of oncoming cyclists. I can speak for many members of the London Cycling Club who will absolutely not ride on some of the in-boulevard bicycle paths, as they fear for their own safety should they ride on these paths.

Once again, thank you for providing me with the opportunity to comment on the new Master Bicycle Plan.

Sincerely,

Tom Jolliffe, President
London Cycling Club
519-472-0736
tom.jolliffe@sympatico.ca
March 24, 2005

Dear Mayor Anne Marie DeCicco and Council:

Re: Bicycle Master Plan

This letter is in reference to the Bicycle Master Plan recently circulated to the Environment and Transportation Committee by the City for review on March 21, 2005. The Thames Talbot Land Trust is the landowner of the Meadowlily Nature Preserve located at 17 Meadowlily Road. We are specifically concerned with the inclusion of our property on the Recreational Bicycle Routes found at page #78 of Agenda Item #8.

The Trust does not support or endorse bicycle trails on this property. Their use is not consistent with our objectives for the Meadowlily Nature Preserve. The City did not seek our permission to endorse this route from the Trust. Our concerns are heightened by the fact that there is no indication on this map that the proposal is in draft form. We are requesting that the City immediately withdraw the map from circulation and public distribution in order to exclude the property located at 17 Meadowlily Road. Further, we suggest that the City ensure the entire proposal, and in particular the maps, are replaced with versions that clearly indicate they are in draft form.

The Trust supports the efforts of the City with respect to the development of a Bicycle Master Plan in principle, but as a landowner with specific restoration objectives, we cannot endorse the inclusion of the Meadowlily Nature Preserve as a part of the Recreational Bike Route. We respectfully request that the Thames Talbot Land Trust be provided with notice of any public meetings dealing with the Bicycle Master Plan.

Sincerely,

Shelley Kaufman, Vice-President
Thames Talbot Land Trust

cc: R. Panzer, General Manager of Planning and Development
P. Steblin, General Manager of Environmental Services and City Engineer

P.O. Box 25054, 395 Wellington Road, London, Ontario N6C 6A8
Dear Mr. Turcotte:

As a general comment, LDI supports the concept of a Bicycle Master Plan and its ultimate implementation to serve the City of London. Much of the Master Plan will affect the design and development of the City's Road Transportation System. From the standpoint of specific application to development proposals, it would be implemented primarily through amendments to zoning and site plan control by-laws. From our review, the key recommendations being proposed in this Report are either new zoning regulations or site plan control guidelines, and we have some comments to offer in this regard.

1. Recommendation #1 "Amendments to the Zoning By-law would preclude consideration of bicycle parking spaces for land uses requiring 9 or fewer vehicular parking spaces. Uses requiring 10 or more vehicular parking spaces would be required to provide for bicycle parking as mandated in the Zoning By-law." While we agree with this distinction, more clarification is needed on the land use being considered for bicycle parking facilities. For example: would an applicant have to provide separate bicycle parking facilities in a townhouse condominium plan with 10 or more units? In such situations, bicycle storage would most likely always occur at the individual units and not at a centralized parking area.

2. Recommendation #2 "The Z by-law should include specific exemptions for certain land uses that would not typically attract the cyclist." As in the previous comment, uses such as single-detached condo/townhouse developments, such developments should be exempt as it would be more practical and reasonable to assume that a cyclist would go directly to the home destination unit.

3. Recommendations #3 & 4 "Bicycle parking standards should be based on a percentage of the total vehicular parking requirement for the anticipated use." This policy recommendation appears to focus on non-residential land uses, and a 7% factor is recommended by staff. On this basis, for a commercial land use requiring 100 vehicular parking spaces, the developer would be required...
to provide 7 bicycle parking spaces. While this standard is reasonable for individual commercial uses, clarification is needed in the case of malls and cluster development where the total number of vehicle spaces may warrant spatial distribution of the bicycle spaces as opposed to a single "large lot".

4. Recommendation # 5 "Planning staff recommend the adoption of a regulation that would require the provision of 1 bicycle parking space for every unit in an apartment building containing 5 or more residential units. The By-law should also include exemptions for specific types of multi-family development that, given tenancy and other considerations, would not be expected to generate significant bicycle use". Clearly this recommendation would permit relaxation in the case of a senior citizen or retirement home where extensive bicycle use would not be expected. However in standard large scale residential developments this standard would be a very significant design factor. For example: a 160 unit apartment building would be required to provide 160 bicycle parking spaces and a separate room or storage facility would likely be required with a vehicle separated at-grade access, as opposed to ramps to lower levels. This could be a major design factor and consideration should be given to testing this recommendation against specific land use examples.

5. Recommendation # 6 This recommendation would relax the vehicle parking space requirements through the provision of bicycle spaces. While this would appear to be a reasonable adjustment it would not resolve the vehicle parking at maximum demand times such as Christmas with a snow storm. This is a case where testing the policy needs to be done before full scale application occurs.

6. Recommendation # 7 "For reasons of climate, long-term bicycle parking should be required for all residential apartment buildings. The provision of long-term bicycle parking facilities should also be encouraged at the site plan review stage for major office and industrial developments to accommodate employees". We note that staff consider long-term facilities as those that are protected from weather and located indoors and may include lockers and storage rooms with restricted access. Short-term bicycle parking would refer to conveniently located outdoor bicycle racks. As a general policy this appears as a workable and reasonable proposition.

7. Recommendations # 8 & 9 "Adequate bicycle parking facilities are to be provided in municipally-owned lots in the commercial areas." This is a reasonable policy but for the City's purposes needs to be better defined.

8. Recommendation # 10 This recommendation needs to be fully explored before it is implemented further. Provision of such facilities in major activity centres... developing and planning for a strong London.

630 Colborne Street  Phone: (519) 642-4331
Suite 203  Fax: (519) 642-7203
London, ON  N6B 2V2  email:shjanes@whiteng.ca
and employment nodes would require the development of a fully secured and supervised system. How would this be accommodated in a multiple tenant situation where all parties lease the facilities? More study is needed on this recommendation.

Please let me know if you require clarification of any of the above points.

Yours very truly,
London Development Institute.

cc J. Fleming, R. Panzer, P. Steblin
LDI/LHBA
June 1, 2005

From: EEPAC Subcommittee on the Bicycle Master Plan
Stephen Turner

To: Members of EEPAC

RE: Review of Bicycle Master Plan Draft

EEPAC would like to recognize the hard work and dedication of those who worked to author this comprehensive strategy for the recognition, integration and promotion of the bicycle as an important method of transportation in London.

Concepts of note included in the master plan:

- Recognition of the need for distinction between commuter and recreational routes
- Mapping of commuter and recreational routes
- Advocacy of zoning requirements for bicycle parking facilities in new developments

Recommendations:

- This initiative would be a prime opportunity to underscore the need for linkage between all modes of transport. The inclusion of ‘terminal center’ in the Non-Residential Exemption for bicycle parking requirements might defeat that purpose. Allowing those who might cycle to a mass-transit station to have facilities to safely park their bikes over a longer term would further encourage alternative means of transport to the automobile.
  - This would also be a good time to endorse bicycle carriage racks on the front of LTC buses as a linkage between bicycle commuting and public transport to increase the potential range a bicycle commuter would consider.

- Recognize and include the duty of bicycle users to adhere to the Highway Traffic Act to reduce conflict between cyclists and both automobiles and pedestrians.

- If In-boulevard Pathways are to be abandoned, consider means to protect cyclists on dedicated on-road bicycle lanes such as cement parking blocks.
  - Would increasing paved road width not be more expensive than in-boulevard pathways and therefore less likely to be developed?

- Include large, posted maps (with 'You Are Here' dots) in the signage so that domestic and visiting cyclists will be able to best plan their commuting and recreational routes through the city.

- Promote the use of roads and pathways and discourage the use of unpaved trails in environmentally sensitive lands such as the Medway Forest. Also recognize the requirement for increased enforcement and protection of these sensitive areas.
The TDM working group of the Transportation Advisory Committee has reviewed the Draft Bicycle Master Plan and the proposed amendments to the Official Plan, to the Z-1 Zoning By-law and to the Site Plan Control By-law.

The TDM working group of the Transportation Advisory Committee agrees in principle with the Draft Bicycle Master Plan but recommends that the implementation of the Official Plan amendments, the Z-1 Zoning By-law amendments and the Site Plan Control By-law be reviewed within two years to determine their effectiveness in achieving the goals of the Bicycle Master Plan.

The TDM working group of the Transportation Advisory Committee recommends that the last line of Section 18.2.13.v of the PROPOSED Official Plan amendment be changed to read:

All development applications, including, but not limited to, plans of subdivision, severance, plans of condominium, Official Plan Amendments, zoning by-law amendments, site plans, ESA management plans, and park management plans shall be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with, and implement, the Bicycle Master Plan, except if they would adversely impact significant environmental features or functions in river valleys and park lands.

The TDM working group of the Transportation Advisory Committee recommends that Section 18.2.13.x of the proposed Official Plan amendment be changed to read;

Council shall provide accessible and sufficient bicycle parking areas at all municipally owned and operated facilities in order to promote the use of bicycles as an alternative to motor vehicles.

The TDM working group of the Transportation Advisory Committee recommends that the proposed amendments to the Z-1 Zoning By-law be changed as follows.

Section 1.1 Residential Development. The existing text be part a) and that a part b) be added to read;

Apartment buildings and lodging houses (with less than five residential units) shall be required to provide 1 bicycle parking space per residential unit or a bicycle parking rack in an accessible, secure area suitable for long term parking.

Section 1.2 Residential Development Exceptions subsection d) be changed to read;

Single detached; semi-detached; duplex; triplex.

Section 1.3 Non-Residential Development be changed to read;

Bicycle parking spaces in an accessible, secure, weather protected area suitable for long term parking shall be provided at a rate of 7% of the required number of automobile parking spaces, as specified in the Zoning By-law, for all non-residential development as specified below:
Section 1.4 Non-Residential Development Exceptions, sub sections c) and d) be deleted.

Provision of bicycle parking facilities would seem to be an ideal match for residential conversions of existing buildings, especially in the downtown area. These building types would more likely attract younger residents who would be more likely to use bicycles. Provision of bicycle parking facilities would encourage the use of bicycles as an alternate form of transportation.

The TDM working group of the Transportation Advisory Committee recommends that consideration be given to utilizing the present Samia Road project as a demonstration of the effectiveness of delineated on-road bicycle lanes. This area has a high volume of cycle traffic and the Samia Road Western Road intersection is suitable for testing intersection treatments as required by 18.2.13.xii. Samia Road is a major arterial and is a primary commuter route in the proposed Bicycle Master Plan. Delineated on-road bicycle lane could be evaluated with respect to level of usage, maintenance, and bicycle-pedestrian-motor vehicle interaction through monitoring police reports and by observations from time to time by the Traffic Division.
Dear Brian,

I am forwarding these comments on behalf of TREA (written by Gosse Van Oosten).

Peter

We have some comments about the draft bicycle master plan. A lot of good work and research was done by Brian Turcotte and company.

First in the application to amend the official plan, zoning by-law and site plan control by-law. The stated purpose is to balance modes of travel, to integrate modes of travel and to minimize conflicts between modes of travel. Since modes of travel heavily favours the private automobile, it is necessary to enhance cycling, walking, transit and carpool. I believe that more can be done than is proposed in these documents.

Zoning by-law amendment:
1. Number of bicycle parking spaces under residential exemptions allows exemption (a) for converting existing space to residential units. I disagree. There should be no exemption there. Under (b) nursing homes, rest homes and retirement lodges. There should at least be parking for visitors and employees. (c) handicapped persons do ride special bikes. (d) other rental housing should have provision for parking bikes. What developer would not want to provide spaces for car parking? Should not the city require bike parking if they are serious about promoting cycling? The non residential exemption is a huge list. Again employers should encourage cycling to work amongst their employees. How can we encourage tourism by bicycle if not requiring bike parking for guests of motels, and hotels. Under (c) downtown conversions to residential or commercial uses are exempted from bicycle parking provision. I disagree. There should not be an exemption. If this was the case before Central Library was built conversion from retail space there would not be a requirement for parking at the new central library.

Comments to the draft bicycle master Plan:
3. A vision for bicycling: bulit 3 add: to promote intermodal travel. for example bus racks, park and ride spaces at bus stops at strategic locations, parking at train stations, airport and intercity bus terminal, and encourage intercity rail services to provide convenient bicycle transport. All trains should be required to carry bicycles as checked luggage or in the passenger car. See guide to best practices Pedestrian and bicycle planning Todd Litman et al. 2000 - 11 work with transit agencies to integrate bicycling into the local transit system, including bicycle racks on buses, bicycle lockers and racks at park and ride lots and bus terminals.

bulit 4. facilitates effective commuting opportunities... add: to revise existing subdivision design standards and conditions to ensure that subdivisions are designed with direct bicycle and pedestrian access, and 2. to recommend changes to municipal policies to encourage non motorized transportation including roadway design and maintenance.
standards municipal traffic and law enforcement. eg. It is more important to have safe traffic than fast traffic and traffic calming should be built into road design, not just as four way stops. For example narrow turning radii at intersections.

Under section 4.1 linked - add connected to other transportation modes, ie transit, intercity rail and bus.

Under 5.1.2.b why the insistence on lined on road bike lanes when in the words of the draft bicycle master plan they only offer "perceived safety for less skilled cyclists"

On road lined bicycle lanes have the same problems of conflicts with motor vehicles as do in boulevard bicycle paths. They intersect with turning traffic lanes at intersections and provide no safety. Money could better be spent on signage, education and enforcement.

5.3 Strategy 3: Facility Supportive Amenities for recreational cyclist include but not limited to add signs directing cyclists to off path facilities, restaurants, bike shops and signs to be treated with surface that discourages grafitti.

Add: promote the use of bicycles by providing bicycle racks on buses at least during the 8 months that cycling is most popular. (Windsor has included bike racks on buses in their bicycle master plan.

Section 5 Facilities supportive amenities to promote and enhance the use of the bicycle network. example parking at other transportation nodes and bus racks

6.1 on road bicycle lanes. Be delineated by a painted line on pavement. Will motorists take this to mean that cyclists can no longer use other parts of the road? This would discourage safe turning maneuvers by cyclists. Could the money for paint not be better spent on signage, education and enforcement. Further 1.5 meters from the edge of the pavement is minimal, but 1.6 meters from the edge of the parking lane would not provide safety from opening car doors.

Specific lane markings to denote conflict points and specific routing options. (such as moving into a left or right turn lane or a through lane which is not on the right side of the road. Safe lane markings have not yet been designed and cities routinely mark bike lanes but then leave cyclists and motorists guessing when they come to intersections.

7. Supportive programs.
Add Continuously available CANBIKE courses for the cycling public, as well as courses for motorists that show poor attitudes towards cyclists, mandated by the police.

Work with local groups to provide these courses where they are not currently available, and to promote where already available.

Long term.
New subdivision plans and site plans that promote walking, cycling and transit in the design of streets, siting of buildings, business and services and encourage compact, mixed use residential, and ideally to provide some auto lite and auto free living. Within the city. Traffic calming is as important a longterm goal, reducing turn radii and reducing lane width, thereby lowering speeds, and changing intersections to roundabouts for some examples.
Turcotte, Brian

London Bicycle Master Plan Rebuttal:

Agenda 8- Page 44 "... the Master Plan recommends that the current City practice of constructing in-boulevard bicycle paths along primary and arterial roadways be replaced with delineated on-road bicycle lanes.

I completely agree in the abandoning of the in boulevard bicycle paths, but disagree strongly with them being replaced by another dangerous facility—lined on-street bike lanes. I also question the plans to rehabilitate the current in boulevard bicycle paths. There are very large solid grey bus benches built across the entire path, regular bus benches, poles, permanent garbage recepticles, broken pavement, gravel, glass and debris up to 3 inches thick.

There is also the liability issue that, at every intersection, which is where destination channelization is crucial—due to more than 60% of car-bicycle accidents occur, cyclists are forced out to the pedestrian crosswalk, which is an illegal facility for riding a bicycle.

Agenda 8- Page 45 "Consistent standards shall be used in the design of both the commuter and recreational networks with a mind to promote the system and enhance the safety of the user."

In my opinion and with much supporting documentation, initiating vehicular channelization instead of destination channelization (a basic principle of traffic engineering) does NOT show consistent standards and decreases the safety to all users. All road users should have common vehicular standards and there should not be special rules or designations that may confuse motorists or cyclists and put the users at risk.

Agenda 8- Page 45 "Bicycle Parking Requirements and Site Plan Design Standards:"

There should be specific requirements for distance from a main entrance, as well as line of sight. I recommend that bike racks should be placed with 10 metres of a main entrance and within clear line of sight. Out of the way locations give bike thieves time and obscurity to work on the lock.

Agenda 8- Page 47 "... the Master Plan recommends that the current City practice of constructing in-boulevard paths along all primary collector and arterial roads be replaced with on-road bicycle lanes along specifically identified arterials."

Disagree. Should be wider curbside lanes with no markings.

Agenda 8- Page 47 Table 1 - "Bicycle Facility Standards Bicycle Lane 1.5 metres bike lane commuters"
Exclusive bicycle lanes are useful where the traffic volume and speed make it hazardous for bicycles to share the road. The bicycle lane should be curbside and a minimum 1.5 metre wide. Where bicycle traffic is heavy, the lane should be 3.0 metres wide. "Bicycle lanes should be wider. The Ministry of Transportation book: Cycling Skills recommends that cyclists ride a minimum of one metre from the edge of the driven portion of the road/lane, but they keep a straight lane to avoid on road hazards such as potholes, sewer gartings, road debris, etc. The proposed bike lane puts cyclist right into that hazard zone. Also car drivers should pass with a minimum of one metre passing distance, but the average passing distance narrows to 8 inches when there is a lined on-road bicycle lane. This allows narrower the manoeuvrability for both car drivers and cyclists from one metre either side to inches. The city is choosing to create a new facility that has minimal standards for safety with regard to width.

Agenda 8- Page 48 "The implementation of standards in a consistent fashion serves not only to promote the system but enhance the safety of the user. While the generalized standards recommended by way of the Bicycle Master Plan are based on best practices advocated by a number of professional associations, it is recommended that the City develop a specific design guideline to assist in the implementation of on-road bicycle lanes. The design guideline would have specific consideration for established engineering practices (particularly intersection treatments) to minimize any liability risk to the municipality."

The city is adopting bike lanes that are a minimal facility rather than widened curbside lanes that are a safer facility so they may be increasing liability. By creating bicycle lanes, less experienced cyclist may be less safe, due to increased hazards.

Agenda 8- Page 63 4. First Principles for the Cycling Network

4.2. "First Principles - Route Design - Safety - the cycling network should be designed to recognize the distinct operational and design needs of the on and off-road cyclist to maximize the safety of all users and minimize vehicular/bicycle/pedestrian conflict points;" Utilizing bike lanes increases potential conflicts, especially at intersections, where 60-75% of all car/bike accidents occur. "Canadian Institute of Planners Community Cycling Manual (CIP-CCM) Facilities Design 25 20.3 Bicycle Lanes "Bicycle Lanes are very appealing to cyclists who are nervous from driving with other road users. Cyclists should be aware, however, that unless barriers are used, the lanes provide no actual security from motorized vehicles. Unfortunately, there are many problems with bicycle lanes. Car drivers often forget or ignore cyclists. Serious problems can occur at intersections when cars attempt to turn right and bicycles attempt to drive straight through."

"Supportive facilities - cycling supportive facilities should be established along cycling routes and at major destinations".
There needs to be an effort to replace faded bicycle maps, clean graffiti, etc.

5.1.1. Issues Associated with In-Boulevard Bicycle Paths:

While endorsing the continued development of the City's multi-use pathway and signed on-road facilities, the Bicycle Master Plan advocates a departure from the current City practice of providing for IBBP's along arterial corridors. When IBBP's are located immediately adjacent to an arterial roadway, however, many operational problems can occur as the motorist and cyclist interface. Cyclists using the in-boulevard pathway, for example, are generally required to stop or yield at all cross streets and driveways to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Furthermore, unless diligence is exercised in regular pathway maintenance, the accumulation of sand, debris, and eroded materials on the IBBP can lead to crashes that do not involve another vehicle or cyclist. For reasons noted above, there is a higher incidence of bicycle crashes associated with off-street, rather than on-street, facilities, particularly in commercial areas. (Ontario Bikeways, Planning and Design)

Will there be improvement to the facility? (i.e. removal of bus benches, garbage cans, poles, etc. Will there be reflective material attached to known hazards and the directional markings re-painted?)

Agenda 8- Page 65 “On-road bicycle lanes are typically developed with a mind to:

- Improve the conditions for cyclists of all abilities within a given corridor;
- Encourage increased bicycle use by providing a greater degree of comfort and perceived safety for less skilled cyclists;
- Provide for more predictable turning movements by cyclists and motorists; and
- Establish an overall channeling effect and promote an orderly traffic flow.

Appropriate applications for the implementation of an on-road bicycle facility would include:

- When a municipality wants a "host" facility to promote and encourage safe bicycle use;
- Where motor vehicle traffic poses a threat to cyclists (volumes in excess of 20,000 AADT);
- Where the facility crosses numerous road intersections; and,
- Where the route is anticipated to serve a number of experienced and less experienced riders.”

It is my contention that it reduces actual safety while giving the pretense of 'perceived safety'. 60-75% of all car/bicycle accidents occur at intersections, yet we abandon the cyclist after shunting the vehicle through a facility that is against the engineer principle of destination channelization. Inexperienced cyclists are being encouraged to utilize a more dangerous facility that is narrower for reasons that do not increase safety, and may worsen it for most circumstances (see debris, slippery surfaces, passing distances, and intersection problems stated elsewhere. If the road is that busy, the space for the cyclist should not be narrowed and confined, especially for less experienced cyclists.

5.1.2.c) A New On-Road Facility Design for London:

Given the operational (and potential risk management) issues
associated with IBBPs, the Bicycle Master Plan Guideline recommends that the City no longer pursue their development. While it is recognized that portions of the system may currently temporarily include existing, or previously planned and approved infrastructure, all new City-initiated capital transportation projects will not provide for the development of IBBPs.

Given the tendency of a widened curb lane to cater exclusively to the experienced cyclist, and the stated vision of a visible and safe network that promotes and encourages cycling, the Bicycle Infrastructure Guideline recommends that the City henceforth pursue the development of on-road bicycle lanes on specified arterial routes previously identified for IBBPs."

See above and other areas for commentary.

Agenda 8- Page 69 “Route Selection Criteria”

SAFETY should be listed as a main criteria

Agenda 8 - Page 69 5.3. Strategy §3

“Facility Supportive Amenities:.. For the recreational cyclist, such amenities may be seen to include: washrooms and drinking fountains; wayfinding and route signage; rest stops, lookout and benches; and bicycle parking facilities”

East London has a definite lack of such amenities as well as wayfinding and route signage.

Agenda 8 - Page 70

6.7. "On-Road Bicycle Lanes:
London’s cycling network will consist of a series of on-road bicycle lanes (Figure 1) that will primarily cater to the commuting cyclist with a moderate to high level of expertise and skill. On-road bicycle lanes are depicted on Map I as a solid red line. On-road bicycle lanes have several advantages over wide shared lanes including the delineation of exclusive space and the perception of a higher level of safety. Bicycle lanes are therefore attractive to both the experienced and moderately skilled cyclist and may encourage more people to cycle."

See previous discussions on problems with bicycle lanes.

6.3.”Signed On-Road Facility:
Signed on-road cycling routes (see Figure 3) will constitute a sizable portion of London’s bicycle network. Incorporate distinct sign route markers (i.e. commuter vs. recreational connector) and minimize and/or identify hazards to bicycle travel.“

What will be the standards for frequency of signs. Current frequency is so distant between signs as to be useless. The signs in north west London are twisted, with no directional arrows, making following the route impossible.

Agenda 8 - Page 73

7. “Supportive Programming:“

It is important that the principles of vehicular cycling be reinforced in all education. There should be an adequate budget for proper education of
both motorists and cyclists. Also, persons creating education materials and programs should be experienced and informed cyclists. (ideally a minimum of 5,000 km per year of on-road transporational cycling for a minimum of 5 years)

Appendix 2 Proposed Amendments to the 2.1 Zoning By-law

2) Residential Development Exemptions:
Not withstanding clause xx to the contrary, bicycle parking shall not be required for:
(a) Conversions of existing space to residential units;
(b) Senior citizen apartment buildings, nursing homes, rest homes and retirement lodges;
(c) Handicapped persons apartment buildings;
(d) Single detached; semi-detached; duplex; triplex; apartment (less than 5 units).

These exceptions make the false assumptions that converted residents, seniors or handicapped people do not cycle, and do not receive visitors or staff supports who cycle.
There should not be exemptions for these facilities. Myself and other cyclists do use these facilities.

3) Non-Residential Development:
Bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at a rate of 7% of the required number of automobile parking spaces, as specified in the Zoning By-law, for all non-residential development except as specified below:

4) Non-Residential Development Exemptions:
(a) Where the required number of automobile parking spaces specified in the Zoning By-law is 9 or fewer spaces, no bicycle parking is required
(b) No bicycle parking requirement ... Abattoir; agricultural service establishment; agricultural supply establishment; animal hospital; veterinary clinic; auction establishment; automobile body shop; automobile rental establishment; automobile rental garage; automobile sales ancillary to automobile repair garage; automobile sales and service establishment; automobile service station; automobile supply store; brewing on premises establishment; building supply outlet; bulk beverage outlet; bulk sales; car wash; caterer's establishment; driving range (golf); duplicating shop; funeral home; gas bar: golf course; hardware store; home and auto supply store; home appliance store; home furnishings store; home improvement store; hotel; household appliances sales and service; industrial and equipment sales and service; kennel: motel; nursery and garden store; open storage; public use: repair and rental establishment; resource extraction operation; retail warehousing; salvage yard; service and repair establishment; service industrial use; service trade; taxi establishment; terminal centre; vehicle sales and service establishment; warehouse establishment; and, wholesale establishment;

These exceptions make the false assumptions that customers do not cycle and that these businesses do not receive visitors or need staff supports who cycle.
There should not be exemptions for these facilities. Myself and other cyclists do use these facilities. I can give specific examples - if necessary.

"No bicycle parking requirement will apply to the conversion of existing buildings for residential or non-residential uses in all Downtown Area 1 and 2 Zones.
No bicycle parking requirement will apply to the conversion of existing buildings for residential or non-residential
uses in all Business District Commercial Z and 2 Zones."

Downtown districts are some of the best areas for people to utilize bicycles, so as to not have to pay for short-term or long-term vehicle parking. The distances to needed resources, which makes even inexperienced and infirm cyclists able to use the bike a transportation. Often the type of downtown housing makes getting a bicycle into individual living spaces much more difficult. Facilities are more crucial than in the suburbs, where indoor and outdoor space is less vertical and more available.
Turcotte, Brian

From: Susan Campbell [pageofbook@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2005 10:30 AM
To: Turcotte, Brian
Subject: bike paths

Brian,

I read your report and you seem to have the right idea.

I have lived all over the country and have bike toured in Canada and US and the US has my vote hands down for cycling no matter which state we were in for bikes and as far as commuting to work, this is the worst city I have ever lived in for bike commuting.

The pretty little biked path along the river is great for the sunday stroll but for commuting it is the pits. People walking often think they own it, there are little kids and roller bladers and even worse people with Dogs on leashes that don't lease in their dogs when a biker comes close. I've have a couple near crashes because of Dogs.

For the record I thinks it's great for all of the above but their needs to be seperate routes for commuting.

Note: I am not a crazy youth, but a 45 year old women who would like to bike safely to work for exercise and to dispute the cost of gas. Also, I have young teenagers who would like to ride road bike for exercise and I refuse to even think about letting them. There is NOWHERE in this city to SAFELY ride a road bike for exercise, believe me I've tried all kinds of routes.

Let's hope changes come before I retire. I've been here 7 years and not seen anything worth advertising to businesses to encourage. When my husbands work moved to London, one of the brags was the biking paths. What a false lead that was. At a recent biking competition in Barrie someone from the Toronto area commented before I had a chance to add my 2 cents, "oh London, I've heard their cycling sucks!"

Susan Campbell

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com
Hello Brian,

Please accept my personal comments regarding the draft Bicycle Master Plan. Sorry that I didn’t send these to you earlier.

Peter Marks
Sherwin-Williams Automotive Canada
ph (519) 472-1311 ext223

First, I would like to say that the Bicycle Master Plan and Official Plan amendments are very positive steps in the right direction. Expressed in terms of miles per gallon, the bicycle attains an unmatched figure of about 1,000 mpg. A city bus would have to average near 140 riders at all times to come close to the efficiency of a bicycle. You have mentioned the additional personal and environmental benefits of cycling. The promotion of cycling for commuting needs to be taken up to a higher level; it simply makes so much sense.

I live east of Adelaide, and I cycle to my job in Hyde Park year round. I was at the TDM presentation at the Wolfe Hall in January 2004, and the bicycle plan presentation at city hall this June. I am very interested in transportation issues. Here are a few comments and ideas:

- Why so many non-residential exemptions for bicycle parking? I work at an automobile supply store and I ride to work!
- I don’t agree that aesthetics is not important on primary and secondary commuter routes. I am thinking mainly of trees. I prefer to ride on tree-lined streets. Don’t trees have a traffic calming effect? They would add beauty to a budding creative city like London! I was in Kansas City recently; many of the streets were very beautiful. Only Paris, France has more boulevards.
- Why are budget restrictions mentioned so much when cycling is the most efficient mode of transportation? We seem to be able to afford to accommodate more SOV’s even though the TDM presentation showed no new infrastructure was needed if certain alternative strategies were followed.
- If you built it, will they come? Some obstacles to using the Primary Commuter Network: too noisy, too much vehicle exhaust, too much salt spray in winter, lack of trees
- One reason that people don’t cycle is because gasoline is so cheap. The price of a litre in 1950 was 70 cents in today’s dollars. The average fuel economy of vehicles has risen by 50% since 1950. Therefore, it is cheaper on average to travel a kilometre today than it was in 1950. When fuel becomes more expensive, we might see a pronounced shift in the public attitude regarding cycling and mass transit.
- Why limit the reduction of vehicular parking spaces? Business and residence owners should be able to apply for further reductions of vehicular parking spaces if a serious commitment to cycling can be shown.
- City buses now have special rights. In airspace, hot-air balloons and gliders have special rights over powered aircraft. Can we use the same logic for bicycles? We should be able to enact some laws and bylaws to encourage cycling by giving the cyclist more rights-of-way over automobiles. Right-of-way at four-way stops perhaps. Cyclists should be allowed on sidewalks with certain restrictions (i.e., must have a bell, only at a walking pace near pedestrians, etc). Portland, Oregon is one city that allows this, and they were twice voted the best city in America to bicycle in. A person riding a bicycle on a sidewalk takes up less room than a person walking a bicycle on a sidewalk.
- Discourage vehicular “through” traffic on Secondary Commuter Routes – make them local traffic only, add

2005-06-28
many four-way stops, etc.
Hello Brian
Recently there has been a lot of information as to where one can ride their Bicycle's. Sidewalks are not a place to ride on, so I understand by law we are not allowed to do so. I know in parts of the city there are Paths for Bicycle's which I use. Where there is not in alot of streets in London that have Bike Paths. When you look at a lot of them there are not too many pedestrian's using them as well. So basically what I'm trying to say is where there isn't any bike path provided why can we not have one side for the walkers and the other for Bike's. This would provide a safer place the ride. It would be a good solution and save the city money by not having to provide more by paths.
I am 65 yrs old, and love to ride my bike as much as I can. I do not like to ride on the street. Cars really come too close that it scares the heck out of me. So I ride on the sidewalks but I try to be curtious to people when they are walking. When I am downtown it scare's me but I try to ride on the street.
I hope that you could consider this, it would get more seniors out on their Bike's.
Regards
Dave Delaney
1409-585 Proudfoot Lane
London, Ontario

2005-06-13
N6h 4R6
519-471-4730
I read through the proposed plan and found it quite interesting even though some suggestions are being
rehashed but that is not the reason for writing. I think that there was two areas that were never mentioned in the
report:

1. Traffic lights. The existing traffic light system does nothing to enhance cycling in the city. I do not know how
many corners are vehicle controlled where a cyclist can not change the lights unless they want to become
pedestrians.

2. Bikes on Buses: The trend in most cities now is to have racks on the front of the buses to allow a person to
take his bike with him, get off and then ride. In going along with this they also have a park and ride system.

Thank you. I am Tom Clinton 434-7476
Monday, May 23, 2005

Brian Turcotte
Senior Planner
300 Dufferin Ave.
P.O. Box 5035
London, Ont
N6A 4L9

Brian Liebusch
256 Exmouth Circle
London, Ont
N5V 5G6

File: OZS-6910
Bicycle Master Plan – Secondary Recreational Route System

Consideration for creating a secondary bike path from the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) to Kiwanis Park (See attached map).

Reasoning: No on road alternatives exist to provide a link between the two.

Results: 1) It would provide a large area of the residential population, access to the TVP.

2) Add another scenic section between Hamilton and Trafalgar as an extension off the TVP.

3) Add another waterpark, playground, baseball diamond and soccer fields to the TVP network.

Thank you for your consideration,

Brian Liebusch
455-0269
During widening of Airport Road, request a widened curb lane or in Boulevard bicycle path.

Reasoning: Provide commuter bicycle traffic a secondary spine route from the highly residential on the west side of Airport Road, to the industrial areas to the east.

I think an updated survey would show a very high portion of population presently commuting by car. As this way is a very short distance, I think there would be a large number of persons converting to commuting via bicycle.

Thank you for your consideration,

Brian Liebusch
455-0269
Date: 2005-07-06
To: Brian Turcotte
Cc: Katherine Turner, Leslie Rockwell, Joni Baechler
From: Jack Lorimer
1625 Hillside Dr. London, N6G 2R1
Tel. 434-1944
e-mail: lorimer@uwo.ca
Re: File #OZ-6910 Bicycle Master Plan: “A Bicycle Infrastructure Guideline for London”

Please accept my apologies for not replying more promptly to the request for comments on this OP Amendment. I am replying on behalf of the McIlwraith Field Naturalists. My comments follow.

1. I was astonished to find no evidence of consultation with relevant sources from The Netherlands, where civic officials have had extensive experience with bicycles as an important mode of transport for almost 100 years. This experience probably exceeds that in any other country. While it is many decades ago that I spent two years making use of the extensive bicycle paths in The Netherlands, I believe that the design standards in use at that time (and I believe still in use) deserve to be examined carefully. These include extensive use of dedicated, paved paths well separated from automobile traffic, which accommodate, at times, hundreds to thousands of bicyclists in a safe way.

2. I consider the claim in your report (Appendix 1, p. 4) that “the accumulation of sand,...on the IBBP can lead to crashes” is a complete red herring. Bicycle paths must be subject to regular maintenance just as roadways are currently maintained to remove broken glass, roadkill, etc.

3. There are also simple solutions to traffic right-of-way at cross-streets. One method would use three-way STOP signs, or special traffic signals where necessary. Here the Dutch experience could be of great value in design.

4. In brief, I believe that on-street bicycle lanes can only produce disastrous consequences. One must assume that both motorists and cyclists are irresponsible, and it is the task of good design to minimize the effects of this irresponsibility. On-road bicycle lanes does not constitute good design.

5. I was also surprised that there is no mention of the necessity to choose routes for bicycle paths of any type such that parking can be prohibited for all motor vehicles, including service and delivery vehicles. Emergency vehicles are, of course, exceptions, but their location is usually well identified. Service and delivery vehicles are frequently a hazard to automobile traffic on downtown London streets, and it is important to keep them well away from bicycle paths.
Hello Brian,

I’ve been reading the Bicycle Master Plan with particular interest in the route maps. Is it possible to gain access to versions of the maps that are higher resolution? It is difficult to make out smaller detail in the pdf document. Who would I contact to request this info?

Also, other than general public input, are there any specific user groups that the City consults with regarding input into the Master Plan? Who sits on the Bicycle Advisory Committee? Is that an organization internal to the City?

I’ve just recently made the pleasant discovery that a new section of multi-use pathway has been completed between Huron St (near Adelaide) and the London North Sports Fields. Hopefully this section will be added to the City Interactive Map in the near future. It might be worth considering the idea of colouring new sections with a different colour so that they are more easily identified. I’d like to commend the City on a job well done. It’s a great addition to the pathway system. Who specifically looks after planning, design, and construction of specific new sections of pathway?

Thanks for any assistance you may be able to provide. I look forward to hearing from you.

George Malota
709 Grosvenor St
London ON

2005-06-29
Dear Mr. Turcotte,

I had the pleasure of attending the public meeting on June 8 regarding the proposed Bicycle Master Plan. As a commuter cyclist, motorist, and pedestrian, I find there is much in the document to like.

In particular, I am impressed with the following points:

- Categorization of bicycle routes as recreational or commuter
- 1.5-m on-road bicycle lanes that are kept clear of snow, debris, and other hazards
- End-of-trip facilities, e.g. parking

These are very forward-thinking elements of the plan, which I think will go a long way toward increasing bicycle ridership in this city. The vision in this document is exceptional.

I would like to offer some tweaks to the plan that can make it even better. If this is not the correct forum to offer such suggestions, then please let me know what is, as I am very interested in seeing them implemented.

The first, and major, suggestion is to change the definition of what a bicycle lane is. In Table 1 of the Bicycle Master Plan, an “On-Road Bicycle Lane” is defined as:

- “A portion of the roadway within the right-hand lane that has been designated for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists.”

I recommend this be changed to:

- “A lane of the roadway that has been designated for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists.”

The important distinction is that the bicycle lane is not a part of some other lane; rather, like a bus lane, it is a reserved lane unto itself. It is easy to neglect “a portion of the roadway within the right-hand lane”; much less easy to ignore “a lane of the roadway”. A “lane of the roadway” would naturally be cleared of snow and debris, a “lane of the roadway” would be given full consideration when intersection treatments were being
developed, and a “lane of the roadway” would not be created more narrow than a certain minimum standard.

One of your colleagues at the meeting—I’m afraid I did not record any of the names—presented on the traffic management aspects of the plan. He indicated that wide curb lanes, which are generally promoted by bicycle advocates, actually serve as an enticement to drivers to drive faster, thus making them paradoxically less safe for cyclists, and therefore that the lanes should be divided by adding a bicycle lane within them. He also indicated that these bicycle lanes would range from 1.2m to 1.8m in width, thus potentially failing to meet the 1.5m minimum width required by the plan.

I found the first part of the argument—that wider lanes lead to faster driving and greater danger—compelling. However, I think it is disingenuous to use bicycle lanes as a traffic calming measure. This is one example where vocabulary makes a difference: “a portion of the roadway within the right-hand lane” might be set aside solely for the purpose of making said right-hand lane more narrow; a “lane of the roadway” would not. “A portion of the roadway within the right-hand lane” might be of any width; a “lane of the roadway” must meet some minimum standard.

The second suggestion follows directly from the first. If the bicycle lanes are similar to other lanes on the road, then they should be demarcated with dashed lines, not solid ones. This would make it clear to all road users that cyclists are not limited to the reserved lanes, and can use all the other lanes of the roadway as well—for instance, to make a left turn, to avoid parked cars, or to get by a slower-travelling cyclist.

A minor point about this is that it also addresses bicycle advocates’ concerns that the lane marking paint may be slippery when wet: A dashed line provides a safer footing than does a solid line.

This leads to the third suggestion. If a bicycle lane is “a lane of the roadway”, then it can be made to merge with other lanes of the roadway. For instance, one could have the second lane (i.e. the right-most lane of motorized traffic) merge into the bicycle lane prior to an intersection. To my knowledge, this has not been considered anywhere else, but it really seems to solve the “intersection problem”. Diagrams of some current and proposed intersection treatments that use this idea are shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram: Two lane road (right lane only shown)" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram: Two lane road (right lane only shown)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Two lane road (right lane only shown)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram: Four lane road (right lanes only shown)" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram: Four lane road (right lanes only shown)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Four lane road (right lanes only shown)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram: Four lane road with turning lane (right lanes only shown)" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram: Four lane road with turning lane (right lanes only shown)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Four lane road with turning lane (right lanes only shown)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth suggestion is separate, but follows on the same concept of increasing bicycle usage. In Ottawa, a very bicycle-friendly city, there are a great number of bicycle-specific road signs. This helps for three reasons:

- It improves traffic flow
- It gives cyclists the ability to do things drivers of motorized vehicles cannot, thus providing a psychological reward for cycling
- It raises general awareness about the presence and legitimacy of bicycles in the traffic system

Many opportunities in London exist. Some examples:

- At the intersection of Piccadilly Street and Kenneth Ave., no through traffic is allowed on Piccadilly. Bicycles could be excepted.
- At the intersection of Empress Ave. and Rathnally Street, no through traffic is allowed on either street. Bicycles could be excepted.
- At the intersection of Huron and William Streets, a sign indicates no left turn is allowed off William. A recreational bicycle path meets the roadway at this intersection, so bicycles could be excepted.
- On Horton St., between Thames St. and Ridout St., there is a short break in the Thames Valley Parkway. The sidewalk in that area is wide enough that a portion of it could be marked and signed as a mixed bicycle/pedestrian/rollerblade/etc. route.

Mr. Turcotte, thank you for reading this submission. I would be pleased to discuss any aspect of it with you or your staff.

Yours truly,

Jeremiah Kivi Shapiro
697-5484
kivi_s@yahoo.com
Brian, I would like to add my words of support for the Bicycle plan - particularly those plans related to increasing commuter cycling.

I have cycled in almost every major Canadian city and every US city along the Great Lakes shoreline. As well I finished cycling from Miami to Boston this summer. I have seen commuter cycling arrangements in many cities.

London needs to adopt this plan soon and begin road construction to include cycling lanes as soon as possible. London motorists need to see signs reminding them the bikes have a right the road and that we all need to "share the road".

Vancouver has a neat idea of having bike racks on the front of the city buses for one-way commuters. Montreal has made amazing accommodations for cyclists while Halifax (like London) just seems to ignore them. Chicago even has bike lanes going the OPPOSITE direction to traffic on one-way streets. Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York all have bike lanes on the streets.

Commuter cyclists need access to all roads and the bike lanes will provide them with a reasonable surface to maintain high speed cycling.

Oh yes! Do you ever suppose the road repair crews would ever consider cyclists and NOT replace pot-holes with speed-bumps??

If there is anything I can do to support this, please ask

Tom de Gryp
39 Cheviot Place
London Ontario
N6C 4Z1
519-685-5974
Presently we have fines for riding on the sidewalks. A very large percentage of the city sidewalks are not used by pedestrians.

Instead of having a complete ban of bicycles on sidewalks, have a hefty fine for those who ride amongst pedestrians. I have seen far too many times that a cyclist's safety is at risk amongst the "looney toons" that drive our streets and the sidewalk has no-one on it.

Dan Walton
#22@26 Gammage St.
London Ont.
(519) 659-8835
Good Morning Brian Turcotte,

My name is Cheryl Milliken and I am an avid cyclist and I fully support the decision to start enforcing strict rules to uphold the safety of all cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists throughout the city of London. I graduated this spring from the Recreation and Leisure Services program from Fanshawe College. I am very interested in getting in on this change and I would like to become part of your team developing and implementing guidelines for London’s Bike paths.

Safety for Londoner’s is the main focus. I would appreciate a chance to meet with you to show you how my energy and experience will be an asset to your team.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Milliken
Hi Pat,

By way of this email I am forwarding your comments about cycling to Brian Turcotte. He is the Senior Planner at the City who has been spearheading the Bicycle Master Plan process and collecting comments.

Sincerely,

Allison
Coordinator, TDM
Environmental Programs and Customer Relations
Environmental and Engineering Services Department
300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035
London, ON N6A 4L9
New Phone Number: (519) 661-2500 (x5389)
Fax: (519) 661-2354
www.london.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: O'Reilly [mailto:donandpat@sympatico.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2005 1:15 PM
To: Cook, Allison
Subject: Re: Bike Path

Hi Allison

Yesterday I tried biking to the river from my home by another route, (taking Southdale then Pond Mills, usually takes about 45 minutes in heavy traffic even at slower times of the day) So I took Southdale going west to Verulam, ( had to walk my bike about 3 blocks here as Southdale was too busy) North 3 blocks to Eden, W. Then North on Upper Queen street that turns into Rideout st, (_these streets are bike routes on the bike map_) now I don’t know who designated these streets for the bike routes, but it is apparent to me that they have never done any biking in that area, (Narrow streets, cracked and heaved pavement, buses going by and parked cars to maneuver around. In other words a death trap.

I tried going over to Wortley rd, (another bike route on the map) and it wasn’t any better, it was an hour before I reached the river

Your *Bicycle Master Plan* doesn’t take any of this into account, and it looks like there will not be any change in my area.

Could you give me a phone number so I can make my concerns heard.

Sincerely

Patricia O'Reilly
Dear Brian,

I am forwarding these comments on behalf of TREA (written by Gosse Van Oosten)...

Peter.

******************************************************************************

We have some comments about the draft bicycle master plan. A lot of good work and research was done by Brian Turcotte and company.

First in the application to amend the official plan, zoning by-law and site plan control by-law. The stated purpose is to balance modes of travel, to integrate modes of travel and to minimize conflicts between modes of travel. Since modes of travel heavily favours the private automobile, it is necessary to enhance cycling, walking, transit and carpool. I believe that more can be done than is proposed in these documents.

Zoning by-law amendment:
1. Number of bicycle parking spaces under residential exemptions allows exemption (a) for converting existing space to residential units. I disagree. There should be no exemption there. Under (b) nursing homes, rest homes and retirement lodges. There should at least be parking for visitors and employees. (c) handicapped persons do ride special bikes. (d) other rental housing should have provision for parking bikes. What developer would not want to provide spaces for car parking? Should not the city require bike parking if they are serious about promoting cycling? The non residential exemption is a huge list. Again employers should encourage cycling to work amongst their employees. How can we encourage tourism by bicycle if not requiring bike parking for guests of motels, and hotels. Under (c) downtown conversions to residential or commercial uses are exempted from bicycle parking provision. I disagree. There should not be an exemption. If this was the case before Central Library was built conversion from retail space there would not be a requirement for parking at the new central library.

Comments to the draft bicycle master Plan:
3. A vision for bicycling: bullit 3 add: to promote intermodal travel. for example bus racks, park and ride spaces at bus stops at strategic locations, parking at train stations, airport and intercity bus terminal, and encourage intercity rail services to provide convenient bicycle transport. All trains should be required to carry bicycles as checked luggage or in the passenger car. See guide to best practices Pedestrian and bicycle planning Todd Litman et al. 2000 - "It work with transit agencies to integrate bicycling into the local transit system, including bicycle racks on buses, bicycle lockers and racks at park and ride lots and bus terminals.

bullit 4. facilitates effective commuting opportunities... add. to revise existing subdivision design standards and conditions to ensure that subdivisions are designed with direct bicycle and pedestrian access. and 2. to recommend changes to municipal policies to encourage non motorized transportation including roadway design and maintenance
standards municipal traffic and law enforcement. eg. It is more important to have safe traffic than fast traffic and traffic calming should be built into road design, not just as four way stops. For example narrow turning radii at intersections.

Under section 4.1 linked - add connected to other transportation modes. ie transit, intercity rail and bus.

Under 5.1.2.b why the insistence on lined on road bike lanes when in the words of the draft bicycle master plan they only offer “perceived safety for less skilled cyclists”

On road lined bicycle lanes have the same problems of conflicts with motor vehicles as do in boulevard bicycle paths. They intersect with turning traffic lanes at intersections and provide no safety. Money could better be spent on signage, education and enforcement.

5.3 Strategy 3:; Facility Supportive Amenities for recreational cyclist include but not limited to add. signs directing cyclists to off path facilities, restaurants, bike shops and signs to be treated with surface that discourages grafitti.
Add: promote the use of bicycles by providing bicycle racks on buses at least during the 8 months that cycling is most popular. ( Windsor has included bike racks on buses in their bicycle master plan.

Section 5 Facilities supportive amenities to promote and enhance the use of the bicycle network. example parking at other transportation modes and bus racks

6.1 on road bicycle lanes. Be delineated by a painted line on pavement. Will motorists take this to mean that cyclists can no longer use other parts of the road?
This would discourage safe turning maneuvers by cyclists. Could the money for paint not be better spent on signage, education and enforcement. Further 1.5 meters from the edge of the pavement is minimal, but 1.6 meters from the edge of the parking lane would not provide safety from opening car doors.
Specific lane markings to denote conflict points and specific routing options. (such as moving into a left or right turn lane or a through lane which is not on the right side of the road. Safe lane markings have not yet been designed and cities routinely mark bike lanes but then leave cyclists and motorists guessing when they come to intersections.

7. supportive programs.
Add Continuously available CANBIKE courses for the cycling public, as well as courses for motorists that show poor attitudes towards cyclists, mandated by the police.
Work with local groups to provide these courses where they are not currently available, and to promote where already available.

Long term.
New subdivision plans and site plans that promote walking, cycling and transit in the design of streets, siting of buildings, business and services and encourage compact,mixed use residential, and ideally to provide some auto lite and auto free living. within the city. Traffic calming is as important a longterm goal, reducing turn radii and reducing lane width, thereby lowering speeds, and changing intersections to roundabouts for some examples.
Turcotte, Brian

From: George [gmalota@mail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2005 2:50 PM
To: Turcotte, Brian
Subject: London Bicycle Master Plan Inquiry

Hello Brian,

I've been reading the Bicycle Master Plan with particular interest in the route maps. Is it possible to gain access to versions of the maps that are higher resolution? It is difficult to make out smaller detail in the pdf document. Who would I contact to request this info?

Also, other than general public input, are there any specific user groups that the City consults with regarding input into the Master Plan? Who sits on the Bicycle Advisory Committee? Is that an organization internal to the City?

I've just recently made the pleasant discovery that a new section of multi-use pathway has been completed between Huron St (near Adelaide) and the London North Sports Fields. Hopefully this section will be added to the City Interactive Map in the near future. It might be worth considering the idea of colouring new sections with a different colour so that they are more easily identified. I'd like to commend the City on a job well done. It's a great addition to the pathway system. Who specifically looks after planning, design, and construction of specific new sections of pathway?

Thanks for any assistance you may be able to provide. I look forward to hearing from you.

George Malota
709 Grosvenor St
London ON
Hi Brian and Doug,

I have responded to the message below, directing Ms. Reid to the online Bicycle Master Plan. Thought I'd share her thoughts with you. Maybe it will inspire your presentations on Wednesday!

Allison

-----Original Message-----
From: Pamela Reid [mailto:pamela_reid1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 04, 2005 9:07 PM
To: Cook, Allison
Subject: Options for Cyclists

Dear Allison Cook,

We met earlier this year at a workshop at Althouse College on Health and the Changing Climate. I remember speaking with you about bus transit issues and getting excited about other environmental issues. After hearing about how the London Police Department will begin to enforce bicycle laws, an important issue was raised with my friends and members of the London North Centre Green Party. Safety. I ride my bicycle on the street when it is safe. But we all know areas of roads and avenues where this is impossible. For example, my husband was almost squished by a bus when riding south on Wellington past York under the train.

The suggestion that keeps coming up is, why are there no painted lanes on every street in London? In Victoria, most busy streets have a yellow lane painted with bicycle icons that allow "real space" for cyclists. It provides a visual reminder for drivers that this space really exists. If there are no cyclists occupying this lane, then cars can use this space. The yellow lane tries to accommodate risky spots like pot holes or grates.

What would the cost be for the City of London? This would create some temporary work for some Londoners. And of course, everyone must renew their driver's license and get an update on the rights of cyclists. Perhaps even licensing young (youth) cyclists as to ensure proper cycle training.

This is a three way partnership. First - the City of London - as hired citizens that work for the betterment of the citizenry, second - vehicular drivers and their attitudes toward cyclists and third - cyclists knowing their responsibilities and rights. When an accident occurs - we all suffer.

If you are the correct person to make these suggestions to, please let me know. I'm sure thousands of Londoners would see yellow cyclist lanes as a positive move with great insight.

Thanks you for your time,

Pamela Reid
UWO mature student
Green Party member
365 Grey St.,
London, ON
N6B 1G8
675-1636

2005-06-13
Do You Yahoo!
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com
Hi Jay:

Can you please advise me as to whom I should be contacting re: bicycle riding on the sidewalk matter.

Thanks.

Harold

-----Original Message-----
From: Me [mailto:cestmoetoo@sympatico.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2005 12:37 PM
To: Usher, Harold
Subject: Re: Pedal bike bylaw,...

Re: I should have mentioned that my son is hearing impaired. Wears two hearing aids and can’t hear cars coming from behind very well if at all. Shame on this city.
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