



Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital  
Alliance pour les espaces verts dans la capitale du Canada

Postal address: P.O. Box 55085, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1A1 ☐ Tel.: (613) 739-0727  
E-mail: [admin@greenspace-alliance.ca](mailto:admin@greenspace-alliance.ca) ☐ Web site: [www.greenspace-alliance.ca](http://www.greenspace-alliance.ca)

---

22 October 2013

Comment on the evaluation table on Fallowfield vs. Hope Side Road + Old Richmond Road

*General*

The evaluation matrix demonstrates a systemic bias against natural systems and in favour of widening transportation corridors through sensitive NCC lands. It fails to acknowledge the importance of directing traffic away from natural systems rather than through them. Further, the evaluation matrix relies on speculation unsupported by either OP policy or the PPS to dismiss the Fallowfield Corridor widening option.

Missing from the evaluation matrix is an assessment against the findings of the Joint Study to Assess Cumulative Effects of Transportation Infrastructures on the National Capital Greenbelt - Study Report (November 2012; City of Ottawa and NCC). The evaluation should compare the two options in the degree to which they mitigate the type and quantity of negative effects estimated in the Joint Study .

*Specific Comments on the Evaluation Matrix*

Re: **Does the solution address the identified needs:**

Level of Service and operations:

The Fallowfield option is no less capable of meeting the target level of service and operations than the Old Richmond-West Hunt Club Corridor Widening.

This being the prime, *sine qua non* criterion, the rest of the evaluation must be considered secondary factors where subjective and political weighting enter more easily.

Vehicle origin and destination

The O-D data gives counts on where people start and end their trips and of intermediate stops if any.

The O-D results show that drivers from Kanata-Stittsville are using Fallowfield for a variety of destinations which makes this route attractive for drivers to more destinations than does Old Richmond Road as well as attractive for destinations served by Old Richmond Road that include Merivale and Alta Vista.

Also, people looking for housing in Kanata-Stittsville will consider convenient travel routes for driving to their place of work as part of their decision making. This would alter the o-d statistics based on which corridor is chosen to be widened.

Consequently we would suggest the "X" needs to be changed to a **check mark** for this criterion as Fallowfield offers greater choice of destinations, hence is overall more attractive for new buyers considering to make Kanata-Stittsville their home.

#### Out of way travel

This criterion is measured incorrectly. For it to be meaningful, the calculation needs to be done under peak period travel volumes given the road widening rather than under free flow conditions. As well, the calculation needs to include more than a single destination.

**An overly simplistic "free flow" calculation will always favour the shortest route between two points** rather than taking actual and projected traffic volumes into account.

The single point to point distance calculation also makes the unsupported assumption that the end point (Hwy 416 at West Hunt Club) is the one the vast majority of drivers need to reach as the interim point on their travel route.

Further, the 4 minutes of travel time advantage in a free-flow scenario can hardly be called significant as a factor in most people's calculation of the optimal route and total travel time from origin to destination.

The community of Stonebridge in South Barrhaven provides an example of residents gladly traveling in the "wrong" direction at the start of their trip. Here residents drive south along Jockvale in order to get to Prince of Wales and then go north. Furthermore, a good number of commuters continue further south from Barrhaven through Manotick in order to more quickly go east and then north.

Re: **What are the PRELIMINARY identified impacts?**

#### Social - Land Use

We question how the Fallowfield corridor is not consistent with the OP that places a high value on sensitive lands such as Stony Swamp.

It is difficult to defend that the preferred option is consistent with the 2008 TMP as it identified a totally new transportation corridor for Hope Side Road to Hunt Club rather than widening Old Richmond Road-West Hunt Club or widening the Fallowfield corridor. In general terms, the TMP identified a problem and both the Fallowfield and old Richmond Road options represent a solution. So both options are "consistent" with the TMP as it was. (As expected, precisely the option preferred by staff is now found in the draft 2013 TMP.)

Arguing that widening Fallowfield may put pressure on the urban boundary and encourage urban sprawl adjacent to Fallowfield is spurious. The provincial and city policies protect prime agricultural land. Widening a road in rural Ottawa for the benefit of suburban Ottawa will NOT place added pressures on development. This statement should be removed from the evaluation table.

### Social - Archaeology and Heritage

Have the consultants provided evidence that the farms along Fallowfield road have official heritage status? Also, westbound "views" on the Richmond Plain will not be affected by widening Fallowfield.

Assigning the Fallowfield option an "x" for heritage suggests that the evaluation did not consider Stony Swamp as a major part of Ottawa's heritage.

### Economic

The evaluation table fails to identify the costs to purchase lands from the NCC for widening Old Richmond Road.

Also, it is highly questionable that an increase in user costs due to 4 minutes of out of way travel is significant if the full costs of travel are accounted. The consultants have made a statement without supporting evidence.

If full costs between the two options are assessed, the Fallowfield option may well come out cheaper, even without putting a price on the impact on Stony Swamp under the Richmond Road option.

### Biological

In the Old Richmond Road option, mitigation should involve more than compensation for lost wetland. The widening of the road would make for a greater barrier for the movement of wildlife. This would need to be mitigated as well.

### Transportation and Infrastructure:

The table appears to be plainly wrong here and is certainly incomplete. The map shown in the first Open House indicated, under the Fallowfield option, a need to widen Fallowfield only. To say now that this option "may require" other widenings as well is unprofessional: What does the traffic analysis say? What's needed here is a fact-based cost comparison of the two options against the base case. This table doesn't provide that.

Erwin Dreessen,

Co-Chair