

April 11, 2008

Rob MacIsaac Chair Metrolinx 20 Bay Street, Suite 901 Toronto, Ontario M5J 2N8

Dear Mr. MacIsaac:

On behalf of the Ontario Professional Planners Institute, I would like to thank you and your staff for meeting with OPPI representatives on Wednesday, March 26th, 2008. We appreciated the opportunity to discuss policy issues of common interest and to provide you with an update on our *Healthy Communities*, *Sustainable Communities* activities.

Established in 1986, the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI) is the recognized voice of the Province's planning profession and provides vision and leadership on key planning issues. Our 2,700 practising planners are employed by government, private industry, agencies, and academic institutions. Members work in a wide variety of fields including urban and rural community development, urban design, environment, transportation, health and social services, housing, and economic development.

Further to the meeting, please find attached our comments on the recently released Green Papers:

- 1) We think there is a synergy between our *Healthy Communities*, *Sustainable Communities* initiative and your program and are pleased to be able to work in a supportive manner.
- 2) With respect to OPPI's recommendations on transportation modeling we encourage you to research the work of Dr. Eric Miller of the University of Toronto and adopt his analyses, wherever possible, in order to achieve a better balancing of vehicular and public transit, cycling and walking, especially as these modes can support each other in your proposed mobility centres. Further, we recommend you consult past research done by the Toronto Transit Commission and former Metro Toronto. Apparently, surveys were undertaken recoding patron walking distances from residential and office uses to surface bus routes (various frequencies of service) and streetcars and use it where appropriate. In addition, work has been done in California by Peter Calthorpe and others on the relationships between density, land use and transportation designs and transit usage. This may be of assistance to you as a means of benchmarking the design of inter-related land use and transportation plans at mobility centres throughout the hierarchy of centres proposed.

- 3) All of the good work you are undertaking may come to nought if co-ordination isn't undertake with Environmental Assessment Act requirements, especially where these assessments rely on traffic modeling and design which adopts current vehicular planning concepts which don't provide for shared space and treatment of the right of way as a resource, especially in the way these projects are characterized within the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment project schedules. We believe that some consideration should be given to exempting some aspects of the plan from the requirements of the Act, especially where newer design measures are applied to implement these important innovations or the Municipal Class Assessment should be redrafted to better address the concept of shared space and a more balanced modal split between transit, walking, cycling and the automobile.
- 4) In your reports, you refer to "shared space". We agree with this concept and would like to see this idea pursued further. We believe you should consider right-of-ways as a resource which can be used for many purposes. Current transportation impact assessment, even Environmental Assessment processes ignore transit. It is time to set operating levels (persons on transit per hour) that enable transit to secure adequate space in critical corridors. Other corridors may have to serve bicycle demands while others may still retain preference for the automobile. The allocation of modes must be balanced. York Region has recognized this approach by creating policies that implement transit priorities as ridership increases.
- 5) Our technology, especially with respect to automobiles is changing as the cost of oil increases. These may change our mobility patterns especially with respect to the travel characteristics. Have you undertaken any work to predict how these changes may affect mobility and can you offer any observations as to how these changes may affect your plans?
- 6) We believe it would be helpful to provide a generic vision of how your transportation and land use scenarios would look especially at the mobility centres. We recommend you conduct a design charrette and adopt a suitable design(s) which can be presented together with your recommendations as you proceed through your work program. We believe it would assist you and those who will implement your plans to have a vision of what it is you wish to create.
- 7) In terms of implementation, especially where land use is concerned around mobility centres, there are several options, in our opinion. These include the following: a Provincial Policy Statement either as an addition to the PPS 2005 or as a stand alone document; a Provincial Plan either with separate legislation or under the Ontario Planning and Development Act; and/or have a Ministry delegated to address each mobility centre as a matter of Provincial interest under the Planning Act. We don't have a preference but in our view these approaches are predicated upon new money being available and a central body being responsible for the allocation of these resources to the implementation of the transportation master plan. If the plan and resources are adopted, a Provincial interest is evident to see the plan implemented, in our opinion. As your work program progresses, we will address this issue in further depth.

Thank you again for meeting with us. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Loretta Ryan, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Policy & Communications, OPPI at 416-483-1873, ex. 226.

Sincerely,

George McKibbon, MCIP, RPP

Chair, Policy Development Committee

Conge Malabon

Ontario Professional Planners Institute

Copy: Loretta Ryan, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Policy & Communications, OPPI