

To: Mayor Nelson Santos
Deputy Mayor Gord Queen
Kingsville Town Council Members
Town of Kingsville Engineer
Clerk, Town of Kingsville

From: Dr. Charles Morgan DDS, HBsC
163 Division St N
Kingsville Ontario

February 12, 2022

Dear Members of Council

I am writing in regards to the upcoming repaving project for Division St. N. As some of you may remember, I contacted a few Council members about a year ago with a proposal to do away with the turn/passing lane and returning the road to two lanes but with a bike lane on each side of the road. This would create a **Multi-modal Roadway**.

First, I must declare the following: I am a resident at 163 Division St North and have been since 1978. I have seen the traffic flow not only dramatically increase but also speed up ever since the road was made into a freeway.

I am also an avid cyclist, so yes, for these reasons I have a vested interest in what happens to Division St. N.

But I have also been a health care provider for all this time and my concern has always been about the health and safety of the people of Kingsville.

The Benefits of a multi-modal roadway are:

- 1. Slows traffic down, but does not impede flow, studies have shown this...**

“This undesirable impact (impeding flow) does not appear to apply to urban environments, however. In fact, the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual, the guide used to model highway capacity in the United

States, the most recent conclusive data suggests that lane widths from 3.0 m to 3.9 m (10 ft to 12.9 ft) have no impact on the capacity of streets where traffic flow is interrupted by intersections (TRB, 2010), as is the case for streets in an urban environment. Reducing lane width to 3.0 m in urban environments should therefore not lead to congestion”

The above statement is taken from this study. [https://www.ncchpp.ca/docs/](https://www.ncchpp.ca/docs/2014_EnvBati_LaneWidth_En.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0H5EHvcJp_LhFG_MVwFHSwj06OUn_g-M-kLSNBWu2ickHyKeL4ssZ4O0w)

2014_EnvBati_LaneWidth_En.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0H5EHvcJp_LhFG_MVwFHSwj06OUn_g-M-kLSNBWu2ickHyKeL4ssZ4O0w

2. Allows a proper place for cyclists, wheelers. Keeps adults off the sidewalk(against the law unless the Town has a specific bylaw that allows this)

3. Safety....besides slowing traffic, it separates cyclists from pedestrians who use the sidewalk...

4. Division St. N is 36 ft wide curb to curb, roughly 3 lanes of 12 ft....two bike lanes require a total of 6 ft. By removing the passing lane(because that is what it has become) and bringing the two driving lanes together, two bike lanes can be created WITHOUT having to change the curbs or widen the road, which would add more expense to the project.

5. This section of Division St N has more than adequate width to accommodate 2 bike lanes, and would still have wider than average width vehicular lanes.

“Another of the assumptions guiding traditional engineering practices is that wider traffic lanes are safer because they provide a greater margin for error and therefore help to prevent collisions (and the ensuing injuries) in the event of

minor deviations from course (Speck, 2012; Ewing & Dumbaugh, 2009). Reducing lane width would therefore tend to increase the number of collisions. However, the two most recent reviews of studies currently available on the subject, instead report a drop in collision risk or no changes to this risk in the majority of cases where lane widths of 3.6 m to 3.7 m have been narrowed to 3.4 m or even 3.0 m on streets with a posted speed limit under 60 km/h (Potts, Harwood & Richard, 2007; Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd, 2011). Contrary to traditional thinking, which is primarily founded on studies looking at rural roads, narrowing traffic lanes to 3.0 m in urban environments, where speeds are relatively low (under 60 km/h), should not increase the number of collisions; in fact, doing so may even reduce collisions”.

As was stated earlier, we have 12 ft(4.0 metre) wide lanes, so based on these studies, the collision argument is a non-starter.

Secondary Plan

I strongly request acceptance of the above plan to eliminate the turn/passing lane.

However, because there are existing 12 ft (4.0 metre) wide lanes, another option would be retain the passing lane. This would create 2 x 3 ft bike lanes and 3 x 10 ft vehicular lanes (3+10+10+10+3 = 36ft).

This plan is **inferior** to the plan of elimination of the passing lane. It does **not** improve the speeding issue or the noise issue. I live on this street, I am speaking with first hand experience. Ask yourself this; is the luxury of a few

precious seconds for off-street residents worth the trade off of excessive speed and noise experienced by Division St residents?

How is it that residents living on Heritage Rd and Seacliff Dr don't seem to need turn lanes?

But if calming down Division St N is too much to ask of Council, then this secondary plan can be considered.

Non-Desirable Options

1. **Paved Trail(Super Sidewalk)**

This section of Division St N is no place for a paved multi-use trail(super sidewalk).

It would function nothing like the Greenway does. There are far too many driveways crossing this section of Division St for an off-road trail to be safe for most cyclists. **Most cyclists ride between 18-32 km/hr.** This would be unsafe on such a facility crossing so many driveways and intersections.

It would require tree removal and ruin the aesthetic of the grassy boulevards along Division St.

There would be an increased cost added to the cost of just repaving the roadway.

2. **Adding edge lines**...this could be done but is a **very poor** compromise. It does not answer the speeding problem and is not as safe as a full bike lane.

Another good reference is from the city of Toronto...

https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/9986-ecs-specs-roaddg-Lane_Widths_Quick_Reference_Version_2.0_Jun2017.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0mXQToYeiYN5q_olgUfK_sXm7FiMr1r8g6rpBs5xo1LYsvGgsdVLayXzU

A request for reduction of the speed limit to 40km/hr would significantly improve traffic conditions on Division St N.

The sooner the Town gets onboard with multi-modal transportation the better, and acts on it, this will only help the Town prosper!

With a core population of about 6,000, there is no need for turn lanes for every side street...if drivers have to wait an extra few seconds for people to turn, it is an opportunity to listen to more of a song on the radio, finish a conversation or have a tiny bit more of private time!... people need to slow down and enjoy life!

I look forward to a discussion in front of Council.

Yours truly
Charles H. Morgan