

Thornbury West Reconstruction

Mayor, Deputy Mayor, council, and staff

Below are our comments to section D of the report CSOPS.22.010.

Many other property owners I have contacted in the area have similar comments to ours.

Staff report CSOPS.22.010 section D – our comments

1. Arborist Reports

1. As the report states under closer examination the reports are not that different.

2. Urban Canopy, loss of trees and options to retain trees

1. In the report staff have stated that, with various strategies, 60 trees could be retained of the 141 number suggested for removal. How many trees that will be removed are at the end of life and should be removed anyways? In phase 1A (bottom pg 9 in the report) of the 11 or 13 (whichever is correct) to be removed, really only 4 healthy trees are lost. I know I previously submitted photos of trees on Elma Street that are at end of life and have dangerous dead sections that could fall and cause damage. We had 2 incidents of damage recently, one on Louisa and the other on Elma where fallen trees blocked the road and downed hydro wires.

2. The 2nd sidewalk on Elma between Alice and Arthur (not Alfred as in the report) has been previously discussed at length and approved by a council decision. In my opinion it would be “ludicrous” in light of promoting active transportation and safety to **not** include sidewalks on both sides of Elma from Alice to Arthur, especially on the hill section!

3. I am pleased to see and agree with staff **not** recommending curb-faced sidewalks on Alice. Safety and snow storage are the 2 main obvious reasons.

3. Private plumbing

1. Work on private property will be the responsibility of the property owner. We can't ask the town for a new roof or new siding so why should we expect subsidies for new sewer lines on our property. We personally have been budgeting annually since 2016 for work on our property. I wish we could do the job in 2023 with our 2016 dollars. There may be real special cases that need review but owner pay should be the norm.

4. Parkettes

1. We fully support the concepts of both parkettes and look forward to providing input at the proposed public meetings. The proposed parkette on Beaver Street could be a great rest spot for seniors on their active transportation journey between the Campus of Care and the services of the coffee shops downtown, the TD Bank, the Pharmacy, LCBO, post office, or grocery store, etc. Alice Street west must have robust Active Transportation facilities to connect the Campus of Care to the core business district.

5. Traffic pattern changes for Louisa street
 1. I agree with staff that this is the best option for Thornbury. The only suggestion I have is that “back in angle parking” would be better for vehicle operators than parking tight against the bank or snow banks in the winter.
6. Changes to Beaver street and Foodland/LCBO entrance
 1. Agree with staff recommendations best option for Thornbury
7. Mountable curbs
 1. This is another topic that has been beat to death already! Council has received deputations and information on this, had discussions and decided on mountable curbs. Semi mountable was our original request but we are pleased with the mountable option. Beaver Street between Alice and Alfred is our example. We currently have a barrier curb in front of our house and when the snow plow hits it at 5am, as it would at every driveway entrance, the shock rattles our house.
8. Construction vibration
 1. Staff have responded in the report.

This project has been “on the books” for many years (since 2013?) and some parts of the project were originally approved in 2019 for construction. There have been many delays, combining of multiple projects, etc.

Enough!

Now is the time to **get on with it** instead of more talking about the project. More delays cost more money for the taxpayers, cost more money for property owners, and frustration for the residents directly affected by the Thornbury West reconstruction.

Yours respectfully

Bill and Sue Abbotts