

Dear Cynthia Block and all Councillors:

No councillor at the April 6 Transportation Meeting actually focused on whether it was necessary or made sense to tear up Victoria Avenue again! The street was repaved and curbed last summer!

The Buena Vista neighborhood is one of the safest and most bike friendly neighborhoods in the city! Now bikers have a choice of biking down Victoria, Melrose, Eastlake or McPherson! All of the adjoining residential streets are quiet and easy to bike on as well! Victoria is used by bikers with backpacks who seem to be on a mission to get somewhere quickly! They have the added benefit of slowing down traffic on the street and making drivers more wary! Bicycling families with one, two or three kids prefer the quieter streets and Melrose, Eastlake or McPherson which are wide, quiet and have no median! They can stop and regroup every block or two without obstructing pedestrians or cars! Perfect. Why not choose Option 6 (\$49,500) and leave well enough alone! People can bike leisurely or fast and no on all these routes. They are suitable for all ages and varying abilities! You can hardly improve on that! An idea would be to decrease the speed limit to make the street safer for all.

Option 1 (\$750,234) eliminates residential parking on the west side of the street for about 25 to 28 houses (64 parking spots). It proposes a bidirectional bike path in place of the parking. Kira Judge spoke in favour of a bike lane but later on in the meeting suggested that the bidirectional model presented some difficulties for bikers transitioning from the one way bike lanes from the Victoria Bridge to Eight St.. All bikers would have to cross to the west side of the street at the Victoria stoplight. No such

problem exists now! She also pointed out that a bidirectional bike lane can be more dangerous! Collisions could occur. People may be biking quickly! Families biking with young kids might find this challenging. Especially if one of the kids goes into the wrong lane! A parent pulling a baby carrier with two young kids biking in front or behind would not be able to use the bike lane! Now they use the residential sidewalks or go down Melrose, Eastlake, or McPherson! These are the preferred routes for biking families with young kids who can be excitable and erratic. Again why not save \$750,234 and do nothing! Option 6! Why fix it if it isn't broken!

Option 4 was the choice of the Bike Committee after consultation with the community. No one wanted to lose parking in front of their house! It provided safer bike lanes on each side of the street and no loss of parking. But the trees on the center median would have to go! Sigh. But the trees are not mature and are not well cared for. The cost for Option 4 was \$6,297,570.

The Transportation Committee rejected this option as too expensive! Why not preserve the median and residential parking and do nothing. Option 6! As it is now, biking in the area is varied and accommodates all bikers and families as it is! And we do not need to have part of Victoria Avenue torn up for a second time.

The Transportation Committee seems to want nothing to stand in the way of their Triple AAA transportation bike plan. They seem upset with any suggestion of bikers going over to Melrose or Eastlake as they do now! What's wrong with a biker making a turn, the bidirectional lane has bikers making turns anyway. In fact most bikers go down Melrose, go through Buena Vista Park and then onto Victoria. No reason to fix anything here.

It's working.

Scant attention was paid to the homeowners who would lose their residential parking with Option 1. They seemed to feel that they had done their duty at "only" having 25-28 residences in this predicament! No one answered the question about how they would feel if they suddenly lost access to the front of their homes. Their attitude was that we saved money and little thought was given to the lost parking on Victoria! Any loss of access to homes would be completely disruptive to the residents. Would any councillor like give up access to the front of their home? The transportation committee needs to outline how residents will access maintain and service their homes. These need to be answered before making any changes.

Let me enumerate some of the concerns:

1. I am 75 years old and I am losing parking in front of my house! I am fit now but may need disability access parking in the future in front of my house! How will that work?
2. Pre pandemic I was used to leaving the house and going for coffee, and then to the gym! Then coming home and parking out front! I have lunch and head out again to do errands to or get groceries! I won't be able to that under Option 1
3. We have a garage in back but during snowstorms and spring melt we leave our cars in front of the house so that we can get out and about.
4. We need front access parking for visitors! Six to eight people for dinner happens once a month! Their ages range from in their twenties to those in their 80s and even 90s. How close and accessible will parking be for them? Once a year we invite 30 to 40

people to a party? How far away will they have to park?

5. We need front access parking for services ; yard and lawn care, cleaners, plumbers, electricians and home repair workers! Where do they park? Not for long in the back alley! Workers had to stop working on the front of our house in early October. The road was being repaved in front and they could not get their scaffolding through the garage. And one can't park in the back alley for long without blocking someone
6. How do take-out food deliveries get dropped off easily if there is no parking? How are FedEx or UPS packages to be delivered if there is no parking? As well as our daily newspapers.
7. As far as I know very few residential areas in Saskatoon have completely lost all parking in front of their houses? Does the city think this is a good idea! Access should never be removed from residences ever. There are always other solutions.
8. What does the elimination of front house parking have on the value of our house. We are phoning a real estate agent to find out.
9. Is it legal for the city to totally eliminate front of residence parking? Street access parking is protected and respected in most areas of the city. Residents around the University of Saskatchewan and City Park have one to two hour parking limits in front of their houses to help make street parking accessible to homeowners! They are also given street parking permits. Everyone in Buena Vista has parking in front of their homes. Why not us! The city actually spends money to protect parking in these neighbourhoods, while they are spending money to remove our parking. This is not fair.
10. As well, an online petition objecting to any proposal that eliminated parking on Victoria Avenue (with over 350 supporters) was not discussed! We thought this petition would represent the area.

Unfortunately it was not even discussed that so many residents are against the bike lanes and removal of parking. This is a lot of people to reach during COVID with no personal contact. Councillors should not be ignoring petitions. Petitions speak for many people. If any signatories knew this, they would have written their own letter. A petition must be seen as coming from all signers of the petition.

11. The increased density of residential homes supported and promoted by the city has led to an increased use of streets and street parking. It is very unfair to increase the need for services while also decreasing the services offered. This is very detrimental to the neighbourhood and shows little forethought on the part of the city. It's unreasonable to think that more residents can live with less infrastructure. It makes no sense.

I thought that the Transportation Committee addressed none of these issues. It seemed very important for them to have a bike lane on Victoria Avenue. I am not opposed to a bike lane as long as no parking on either side of Victoria Avenue is lost. I hope that we can find a solution to this problem that satisfies all the residents that live on Victoria Avenue. I would be happy with Option 4 or Option 6! Option 4 is expensive but it satisfies the needs of the residents as well as the bikers!

Sincerely, Paul Clancy

