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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Overview

The City of Hamilton completed its Transportation Master Plan for the Downtown Area in 2001. At that time, the Master Plan was a key piece in the ongoing revitalization of Hamilton’s central core area. The study was undertaken as part of a set of initiatives, referred to as Putting People First: Downtown Land Use and Transportation. “Putting People First” was an integrated land use and transportation planning exercise that examined the downtown as an overall system as opposed to a number of separate components.

The Master Plan provided a number of recommendations addressing all aspects of the transportation system including road networks, bicycle networks, pedestrian facilities, transit and parking. One of the corner stone elements of the plan was the recommendation to convert several major and minor streets from one-way to two-way operation.

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment rules require a review of Master Plans every 5 years to determine need for detailed reviews and/or updates. This report summarizes that review, and includes recommendations for outstanding projects. In order to review the Master Plan and determine if there have been any changes that would trigger a more detailed review, the review takes the following approach:

• Compare data used in the original study with current data and assess any impacts on the validity of the 2001 recommendations;

• Revisit assumptions and recommendations for schedule B and C projects that are yet to be implemented to ensure they are still valid in the current context;

• Suggest a more detailed review of the 2001 recommendations if current conditions warrant it; and

• Allow planned Schedule B projects beyond 2006 to proceed and enable Schedule C projects to proceed with Phase 3 and 4 of the EA process.

The review found some key changes since 2001, identified as follows:

• Greater emphasis on environment, including air quality and climate change;

• Downtown Hamilton is now designated as an Urban Growth Centre by the Province of Ontario;

• Funding opportunities for rapid transit have arisen;

• Increased aspirations for pedestrian improvements (e.g. Pedestrian Charter);

• Commitment to improve street façade (e.g. Farmers’ Market/Library, Art Gallery);

• Major developments are now taking place;

• No significant change in traffic volumes in the study area;
Increase in parking occupancy throughout study area; and

Increased transit ridership evident from HSR data.

The 2001 problem statement was found to be generally still valid, except that issues around excess parking have lessened as parking supply has remained largely unchanged and occupancy has increased.

The 2001 preferred solution is therefore considered still valid, except:

- There is now a greater desire for pedestrian improvements
- Potential for rapid transit is more immediate, impacting James Street, Main Street and King Street

Study Recommendations

As a result of the five-year review of the Master Plan, the following outstanding projects are recommended for implementation (See Exhibit ES.1).

**Recommended for design and implementation as soon as budget allows:**

**Two-way conversions:**

- York Boulevard/Wilson Street two-way conversion
- Park Street two-way conversion
- MacNab Street two-way conversion
- Hughson Street two-way conversion
- Hess Street two-way conversion
- King William two-way conversion
- Rebecca two-way conversion

**Pedestrian improvements:**

- Jackson Street
- Queen Street
- Catharine Street
- Mary Street
- George Street
- Gore Park (King Street South Leg)

**Cycling improvements:**

- Hunter Street bicycle lanes
- York Boulevard bicycle lanes

**Implement pending outcome of Rapid Transit and Gore Park studies:**
- King Street two-way conversion
- Main Street pedestrian improvements

Projects not included in original Master Plan to be implemented:

- Caroline Street two-way conversion
- Gore Park Pedestrianization Pilot projects – proceed with more detailed urban design studies and potential weekend closures (pilot projects)

It is recommended that the two-way conversion of Bay Street in the study area not proceed at this time. This project should only be considered if monitoring after two-way conversion of York Boulevard indicates benefits would result from conversion of Bay Street.

Exhibit ES.1: Recommended Transportation Network Plan (2008)
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The City of Hamilton completed its Transportation Master Plan for the Downtown Area in 2001. At that time, the Downtown Transportation Master Plan (DTMP) was a key piece in the ongoing revitalization of Hamilton’s central core area. The study was undertaken as part of a set of initiatives, referred to as Putting People First: Downtown Land Use and Transportation. “Putting People First” was an integrated land use and transportation planning exercise that examined the downtown as an overall system as opposed to a number of separate components. A parallel land use plan was also developed.

The DTMP provided a number of recommendations addressing all aspects of the transportation system including road networks, bicycle networks, pedestrian facilities, transit and parking. One of the cornerstone elements of the plan was the recommendation to convert several major and minor streets from one-way to two-way operation. Exhibit 1-1 provides an overview of the recommended Downtown Transportation Network Plan as identified in 2001, including the proposed one-way to two-way conversions.

Exhibit 1-1: Recommended Transportation Network for Downtown Hamilton (2001 Plan)

Note: Above map illustrates the Transportation Master Plan Recommendations as of 2001. See Exhibit 10.1 for revised map based on Five-Year EA Review
1.2 Reason for Review

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment rules require a review of Master Plans every 5 years to determine need for detailed reviews and/or updates.

Changes that may trigger need for detailed review of Master Plans include:

- Major changes to original assumptions
- Major changes to components of the Master Plan
- Significant new environmental effects
- Major changes in proposed timing of projects within the Master Plan

In order to review the Master Plan and determine if there have been any changes that would trigger a more detailed review, the review takes the following approach:

- Compare data used in the original study with current data and assess any impacts on the validity of the 2001 recommendations;
- Revisit assumptions and recommendations for schedule B and C projects that are yet to be implemented to ensure they are still valid in the current context;
- Suggest a more detailed review of the 2001 recommendations if current conditions warrant it; and
- Allow planned Schedule B projects beyond 2006 to proceed and enable Schedule C projects to proceed with Phase 3 to 5 of the EA process.
2. DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Several projects from the DTMP as shown earlier on Exhibit 1-1 have been completed, while others are currently outstanding. Exhibit 2-1 below shows the target date and implementation date for major projects contained in the 2001 DTMP. The following sections describe the status of DTMP projects in more detail.

The purpose of this five-year review is to provide a review of outstanding projects. A general review of changes that may have affected the baseline assumptions in the original DTMP is contained in Section 5 of this report. A more detailed systematic review of outstanding projects is contained in Section 7 of this report, but the following sections provide a brief overview of the implemented and outstanding projects.

### Exhibit 2-1: Implementation of DTMP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Target Implementation</th>
<th>Actual Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Road Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James/John Two-way Conversion (Phase 1)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James/John Two-way Conversion (Full)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King/York/Wilson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>beyond 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion (optional)</td>
<td>beyond 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street Conversion</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to designated streets as budget/needs justification permits.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St/Canada St Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Contra-flow lane</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Terminal at MacNab</td>
<td>beyond 2006</td>
<td>EA on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recommendations have been modified by other studies

2.1 Implemented Projects

As noted above, several of the projects recommended in the DTMP have now been implemented including:

- Conversion of James Street and John Street to two-way operations, initially consisting of the north sections in Fall 2002, followed by the remaining southern sections in Fall 2005;
• Streetscaping improvements on Bay Street, Ferguson Avenue, Hughson Street, and King William Street;

• Development of a King William Street Streetscape Master Plan; and,

• Starting an Environmental Assessment for the proposed Downtown Transit Terminal, for which the preferred location is to be selected in 2008.

2.2 Outstanding Projects

2.2.1 PRIMARY STREETS

A number of major projects recommended in the DTMP are still outstanding. The most significant recommendations that have yet to be implemented are the conversion of King Street and York Boulevard/Wilson Street to two-way operation, which were originally identified as changes that would take place beyond 2006. Conversion of Bay Street (currently one-way northbound from Aberdeen Avenue to Cannon Street) was listed as an optional project, and has not been implemented.

The DTMP clearly stated that in order for the remaining two-way conversions to occur, there would need to be a measurable mode shift to non-automobile alternatives prior to implementation. The alternative would be diversion of existing traffic volumes after conversion occurs. Accordingly, this review examines trends in traffic volumes and transit ridership through the downtown to provide an assessment of whether or not any mode shift has occurred since 2001. A review of the impacts of the James/John two-way conversion has also been carried out to provide insights into the impacts and public perceptions related to the two-way conversions.

2.2.2 SECONDARY STREETS

All of the recommended two-way conversions on secondary streets are outstanding. Hunter Street has undergone some review as part of the Corktown Neighbourhood Traffic Management Plan, where it became evident that adding two-way traffic and bicycle lanes could not be achieved without removing on-street parking.

While not a project listed in the DTMP, Caroline Street was converted from one-way to two-way traffic operation from Herkimer Street to Main Street as part of the Durand Neighbourhood Traffic Management Plan.

2.2.3 PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

Pedestrian improvements in the form of streetscaping improvements have been completed on a number of streets as noted in Section 2.1 above, but remain outstanding on Main Street, Catharine Street, Jackson Street, Mary Street, York Street, George Street and Napier Street.

2.2.4 CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

Outstanding cycling network improvements include bike lanes on Hunter Street/Canada Street and York Street, and a contra-flow bike lane Caroline Street.

A bicycle lane has been created on a number of sections of Ferguson Street as part of the streetscaping project, by providing a contrasting pavement surface.
As noted above, a two-way traffic conversion was carried out on Caroline Street from Herkimer Street to Main Street, removing the need for a contra-flow bicycle lane in that section.
3. OTHER STUDIES IMPACTING THE DTMP

Other major initiatives that impact the 2001 DTMP recommendations are the GRIDS Plan and City-wide Transportation Master Plan. The following sections describe these plans, and other initiatives that have impacts on outstanding projects recommended in the DTMP.

3.1 GRIDS

The GRIDS plan identifies the Downtown as a major node, consistent with the Provincial Growth Plan, and with this a requirement for intensification. The GRIDS study also provides the overall land use framework, including population and employment forecasts. This will have impacts on the Downtown transportation network performance and needs.

3.2 Citywide Transportation Master Plan

The City-wide Transportation Master Plan identifies the need for an east-west and a north-south Rapid Transit corridor through the Downtown. Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan completed in May 2007 provided an overall policy and infrastructure framework for the transportation system, including rapid transit, over the next 20-30 years. The primary corridors for rapid transit that would impact the downtown were identified as follows:

- A lower east-west corridor on King Street/Main Street/Queenston Road
- A Central north-south corridor on James Street and Upper James via Mohawk College

The potential options for transit from the City-wide TMP are shown on Exhibit 3-1 below.

Rapid Transit alignments through the Downtown were not being planned at the time the 2001 DTMP was prepared, and so were not considered in the original DTMP.

It is noted that at the time of this report a Rapid Transit Feasibility study was being prepared by the City. Specific alignments will be determined through the Environmental Assessment process and through consultation with the HSR, the public and other stakeholders. Outstanding projects in the DTMP must therefore be considered in light of the new policy direction for Rapid Transit in Downtown Hamilton.

3.3 City-wide and Downtown Parking and Loading Study

The 2001 DTMP included several recommendations on parking focused on reducing the extent of surface parking and increasing the cost of commuter parking. Since 2001, the City has also undertaken a major parking review. The recommendations of this review are generally consistent with the directions set out in the 2001 DTMP, including a recommendation that lower parking standards be applied across the Downtown. The study also suggests that “The role of the municipality in the Downtown setting would be to assure that sufficient short-term parking is provided and maintained to ensure the economic viability and vitality of the Downtown. The provision of employee parking would be a secondary role. This aligns with the principle of providing short-term business parking spaces, while discouraging long-term parking, as mandated in the Downtown Transportation Master Plan.”
3.4 Other Relevant Studies

At the Downtown level, there are several studies and documents that have a bearing on the recommendations of the 2001 DTMP including:

- The Hamilton Downtown Mobility Street Master Plan prepared in 2003;
- Setting Sail (The West Harbour Secondary Plan);
- The Environmental Assessment of Downtown Transit Terminal Options;
- The Hamilton VIA Rail Station Feasibility Study
- Recommendations and implemented projects from Neighbourhood Traffic Management Studies in Durand, Corktown, and the North End;
- The upcoming Strathcona Neighbourhood Secondary Plan; and,
- The Market Precinct Plan.

All of the above studies have been considered in the baseline review and the detailed review of outstanding projects.
4. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

To guide the review of outstanding projects, a review of the impacts of the completed two-way conversions on James Street and John Street was carried out. In general, the two-way conversions were intended to slow traffic, provide increased accessibility to properties, but had the potential to increase collision exposure and increase congestion and travel times. The following review attempts to quantify as much as possible the actual impacts arising from the implementation of two-way traffic on James Street and John Street.

4.1 Traffic Volumes

A review of traffic volumes before and after the two-way conversions was carried out to determine the extent of traffic diverting from the corridor, which had been anticipated as a possible side effect of two-way conversion. Exhibit 4-1 and Exhibit 4-2 below show peak hour volumes on the selected streets before and after two-way conversion. Peak hour is taken as the highest of the AM or PM peak hour volume in the most recent year, and compared to the same period in the previous year. Where a new movement was created, the volume comparison includes the total southbound traffic carried on James Street and John Street as stacked bars in the charts.

Exhibit 4-1: Traffic Volume Comparison on James Street and John Streets (Peak Hour)
The above exhibit indicates that while traffic volumes have decreased in the peak direction on James Street and John Street, the volume decrease appears to have transferred from James Street to John Street for southbound traffic, and from John Street to James Street for northbound traffic. That is, the pre-conversion volumes appear to have been maintained within the James/John corridor.
Exhibit 4-2: Traffic Volume Comparison on Adjacent North-South Streets (Peak Hour)

The above exhibit indicates steady traffic volumes on Queen Street, but a decrease in southbound traffic volume on Wellington Street, and a minor increase in northbound traffic volume on Victoria Street following the two-way conversion of James and John Streets.
The above data indicates that two-way conversion of James Street and John Street has not shifted traffic volumes to adjacent streets, nor does it appear to have increased or decreased traffic volumes in the Downtown significantly.

### 4.2 Collisions

A review of the City’s collision data was carried out to determine if any traffic safety impacts arising from previous two-way conversions could be observed. The review focused on James Street and John Street, splitting the review into two sections to review the impacts of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions.

The Phase 1 conversion of James Street and John Street was completed in October 2002, and a review of collision data for a period of three years before and three years after was possible. Since
the Phase 2 conversion was completed in November 2005, comparison of a three year period before and after the Phase 2 conversion was not possible. At the time that the analysis was carried out for this report, only one full year of collision data was available following the Phase 2 conversion, but the data has been included for illustrative purposes.

Data from 2004 and later was adjusted upwards to account for decrease in collision reporting that was documented in the City of Hamilton Collision Report of 2005-2006. The City’s Collision Report states:

As a result of the introduction of self-reporting, there has been a significant decrease in total number of collisions reported by Police officers, and the statistics in this report reflect this. This is to be expected, as the onus for reporting minor collisions was shifted from the police officers to the general public. However, a parallel decrease in injury collisions was also noted in our statistics. This change was unexpected as all injury collisions are still categorized as requiring police reports. There are no obvious background factors which we can identify as causing a year-to-year reduction in injury collisions. We must, therefore, conclude that the change to reporting centres is also responsible for the statistical change in injury collisions.

4.2.1 PHASE 1 CONVERSION OF JAMES AND JOHN STREETS

Analysis of reported collisions on the northern sections of James Street (north of Main Street) and John Street (north of King Street) was carried out. Data for the conversion year (October 2002-October 2003) was excluded from the comparison to ensure that short-term impacts from drivers becoming familiar with the new two-way configuration did not skew the comparison of before and after conditions. Exhibit 4-4 below shows the differences in the reported number of different types of collisions on James Street North.

Exhibit 4-4: Change in frequency of different collision types on James Street North
Exhibit 4-4 above shows an apparent increase in the number of 90-degree angle intersection collisions, but either shows no significant increase or a decrease in all other collision types. Based on the above data, it appears that the conversion of James Street North to two-way traffic operation did not result in any significant increases in reported collisions.

As for James Street above, the frequency of different collision types on John Street North was reviewed before and after the Phase 1 two-way conversion. Exhibit 4-5 below shows the results of the comparison for John Street.

Exhibit 4-5: Change in frequency of different collision types on John Street North

As is the case for James Street, the above comparison on John Street indicates either no significant increase or a decrease in most collision types, although an increase in the frequency of pedestrian-vehicle collisions appears to have occurred.

While not shown in the charts above, the collision record indicates an increase in collisions during the year of conversion. The year of conversion was removed from the above chart as it is considered to represent a time of transition in which people may have been adjusting to different traffic patterns.

4.2.2 PHASE 2 CONVERSION OF JAMES AND JOHN STREETS

For the two-way conversion of the south sections of James and John Streets in November 2005, only one complete year of data immediately following the conversion was available. Since three years of collision data before and after the conversion is not available for the Phase 2 conversion, before and after comparison of collision data for the Phase 2 conversion cannot be done in the same way as for the Phase 1 conversion. As noted above, the collision record for James Street and John Street North indicated an increase in collisions for the year immediately following the two-way conversion, which did not represent the collision frequency for the following years. The same
is expected to apply for the Phase 2 conversion, but the data is included in this report for illustrative purposes.

In particular, on James Street, there were 10 left turn collisions in 3 months at the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive. The collision record for James Street South is shown on Exhibit 4-6 below. Intersection improvements at the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive were made to change signal timing and phasing, and this change appears to have addressed the collision issue since no left turn collisions were reported from February 2006 to June 2007.

![Exhibit 4-6: Change in frequency of different collision types on James Street South](image)

The collision record for John Street South is shown on Exhibit 4-7 below.
The collision data for John Street south indicates a decrease for most types of collision, with the exception of left turn collisions with oncoming traffic, and right turn collisions. However, since collision data is not available for a three year period after the Phase 2 conversion, it is premature to draw conclusions on the impact of the Phase 2 conversion on the rate of collisions on James Street and John Street. Such conclusions could be drawn after a 3-year period.

### 4.2.3 SUMMARY OF COLLISIONS ON JAMES AND JOHN STREETS

Data indicates an overall reduction in collisions following the Phase 1 two-way conversion (excluding the conversion year Oct 2002-03). The annual rate of collisions on James Street and John Street is shown in Exhibit 4-8 below. For the Phase 2 conversion, the comment made in Section 4.2.2 above applies again here; a comparison of collision records before and after the Phase 2 conversion is not informative due to the lack of data following the conversion. However, the exhibit below includes the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions for illustrative purposes.
Exhibit 4-8: Total collisions per year before and after Phase 1 and 2 conversions

With the exception of the Phase 2 conversion of James Street South (where three years of collision data following the conversion is not available, and results may not be representative of long-term trends), reported collisions have either stayed the same or decreased following the two-way conversion.

4.3 Travel Times

Part of the rationale for introducing two-way traffic on Hamilton’s downtown streets was to reduce traffic speeds and improve conditions for pedestrians. It was therefore anticipated that travel times would increase on the roads converted to two-way traffic. To measure the change in travel time due to two-way conversion, travel time surveys were carried out on James Street and John Street before the Phase 1 conversion, and after the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions. Exhibit 4-9 below shows the travel times measured on the north sections of James Street and John Street before and after the conversions. The travel times are for travel in the direction of travel on James Street and John Street prior to the two-way conversion, i.e. southbound on James Street and northbound on John Street.
Exhibit 4-9: Travel time on James Street and John Street North before and after Phase 1 and 2 conversions

The travel times above shown as 2002 represent peak hour travel times before the Phase 1 conversion in 2002, and are for travel on James Street between Burlington Street and King Street. The travel times shown as 2003 and 2007 represent peak hour travel times after the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions respectively. As can be seen in Exhibit 4-9 above, the southbound travel time on James Street North in the p.m. peak hour has increased by approximately one minute.

Travel times on the southern sections of James Street and John Street before and after the Phase 2 two-way conversion are shown on Exhibit 4-10 below.
Exhibit 4-10: Travel time on James Street and John Street South before and after Phase 1 and 2 conversions

The travel times above shown as 2004 represent peak hour travel times before the Phase 2 conversion in 2002, and are for travel on James Street and John Street between King Street and St Joseph’s Drive. The travel times shown as 2007 represent peak hour travel times after the Phase 2 conversion. As can be seen in Exhibit 4-10 above, the southbound travel time on James Street South in the p.m. peak hour has increased by approximately one minute following the Phase 2 conversion. The northbound travel time on northbound John Street from St Joseph’s Drive to King Street has also increased by approximately one minute following the Phase 2 conversion.

The above data indicates that increased travel time has resulted from the two-way conversion of James Street and John Street.

4.4 Business Survey

On Wednesday, July 18th and Friday, July 20th, 2007 selected businesses along James Street and John Street were interviewed to get feedback on downtown transportation issues and, in particular, reactions to the two-way conversion of these streets. The purpose of these interviews was to obtain a snapshot of perspectives on changes to the transportation system that have been implemented since 2001, as well as general thoughts on transportation issues. Overall, 26 business were surveyed in person, as listed in Exhibit 4-11. Details of the survey questionnaire and a summary of responses are contained in Appendix B. Businesses were selected randomly, but with a focus on gathering information from a cross-section of businesses types (e.g., small retailer, restaurant, personal services store, etc.) that had been in place, since before the two-way conversion.
Exhibit 4-11: Businesses Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Street</th>
<th>John Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Linens and Gifts</td>
<td>Adam's Marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Jewellery</td>
<td>Botanica Floral Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Media</td>
<td>Embellish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenstern's</td>
<td>Go Physio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutri Source</td>
<td>House of Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricca's Furniture</td>
<td>Kohler's Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taj Mahal Grocery</td>
<td>Mercedes Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Orchid</td>
<td>Royal Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TD Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmasave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey consisted of nine questions as listed below:

- Has the introduction of two-way traffic on James Street and John Street affected access for customers arriving by car? If so, how?
- Has two-way traffic affected the ability for customers to find parking on the street? If so, how?
- Has access for couriers and other service vehicles been affected?
- How has the two-way conversion affected the pedestrian environment? (probe questions: What about walking on the sidewalk? Is it easier or harder to cross the street?)
- Do you think traffic speeds have changed with two-way traffic? Is this positive or negative? Please explain.
- What is your perception of how traffic safety has changed?
- Would you recommend that the City consider implementing two-way traffic on other major streets, namely King Street and York/Wilson Street? What advice do you have in guiding this implementation?
- Are there any major changes to the transportation system you would like to see implemented? (note: could be related to transit, walking, cycling, parking, etc.)
- Are there any other comments you would like to provide?

4.4.1 RESULTS

General Results

Overall reactions to key questions are summarized in Exhibit 4-12 below. As shown, opinions regarding the effect of the two-way conversions and the direction of further two-way conversion are
quite varied. Overall attitudes towards the conversion of John Street and James Street to two-way traffic are split almost evenly between those in favour, those in opposition, and those with no strong opinion. However, almost 80% of businesses agree that traffic safety has been degraded. This is partly due to the motorist confusion and resulting accidents in the period immediately following the conversions. In particular, the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive experienced a number of accidents before signage and signals were improved.

The overall results also indicate that businesses do not view the two-way conversion to have been successful in improving conditions for pedestrians. Almost 60% of surveyed businesses report that pedestrian conditions (e.g., pleasantness of walking environment, pedestrian safety, etc.) have degraded since the two-way conversion.

Given the mixed reactions to the two-way conversions, it is not surprising, that support for potential two-way conversion of York/Wilson Street and King Street in the downtown is also split. Almost 40% support the conversions, while over 50% oppose such initiatives. This indicates that a strong communication strategy will be required to build support for future two-way conversions should the City go ahead with them. Differences in business attitudes between north and south sections of James Street and John Street, as discussed below, provide insight on factors influencing the success of two-way conversion projects.
Exhibit 4-12: Summary of Reactions to Key Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy with 2-way Conversion</th>
<th>Traffic Safety Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 23%</td>
<td>Neutral 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 39%</td>
<td>Yes 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 38%</td>
<td>No 79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Environment Improved</th>
<th>Support 2-way Conversion on King St. and York/Wilson St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 32%</td>
<td>Neutral 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 9%</td>
<td>Yes 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 59%</td>
<td>No 54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results are for illustrative purposes only; interpret results with caution given small sample size.

North vs. South

While the overall results presented above indicate that there is yet work to be done in improving traffic safety and the pedestrian environment along converted sections of James Street and John Street, interviews indicated that two-way conversions have been more successful in some areas than in others. Exhibit 4-13 illustrates differences in responses to key survey questions between north and south sections of James Street and John Street. As indicated, businesses in the north section appear happier with the two-way conversion and a majority of surveyed businesses (almost 70%) in the north section feel that pedestrian conditions have been improved since the two-way
conversion. As a result, approximately half of these businesses support future two-way conversions vs. less than 30% in the south section of James Street and John Street.

**Exhibit 4-13: Differences in Business Opinions between James St./John St. North vs. James St./John St. South**

![Chart showing differences in business opinions between north and south sections of James St. and John St.]

Note: Results are for illustrative purposes only; interpret results with caution given small sample size.

Five key factors have been identified that could account for the differences observed above:

- **Adjustment time**: Conversion of the north sections to two-way traffic occurred three years before the south sections, so that businesses, pedestrians, and motorists have had more time to adjust in this area. Thus, they are more comfortable with, and supportive of, two-way traffic.

- **Function in the road network**: John St S and James St S act as key accesses to the downtown for traffic coming from the Mountain. As such, they have more lanes, higher traffic volumes, and average traffic speeds along these sections are much higher than in the north.

- **On-street parking**: Related to the above point, there is more on-street parking in the north sections, particularly along James Street North, which slows down traffic and provides a buffer between pedestrians and moving vehicles. In comparison, conversion of James Street S to two-way traffic actually required some on-street spaces to be removed.
• **Sidewalks**: Sidewalks along the south sections of James St. and John St. are narrow and, when combined with fast-moving traffic and no on-street parking in certain areas, make for unpleasant walking conditions. Converting traffic from one-way to two-way flow may reduce average speeds, but it does not necessarily improve pedestrian conditions. Given slower traffic and more on-street parking in the north sections of James Street and John Street, sidewalks provide for a more pleasant and secure pedestrian environment, in general.

• **Surrounding demographics**: There is a high proportion of elderly residents surrounding James St. S and John St. S who are well served by nearby many medical centres and pharmacies, and the St Joseph’s Hospital. Elderly pedestrian are less agile and less adaptable to change. As such, the change to two-way traffic may pose more challenging to pedestrians in this area. The north section of James Street, on the other hand, is experiencing somewhat of a revival led by younger artists who may be more comfortable crossing a street with two-way traffic.

### 4.4.2 SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Specific comments received during the business interviews are summarized according to positive feedback, negative feedback, potential downtown improvements, and guidance for future two-way conversions. These comments are taken directly from the businesses.

**Positive Feedback on Two-way Conversions**

Conversion of traffic from one-way to two-way traffic has:

- Improved James Street North very much and helped to spark development;
- Improved street life;
- Reduced traffic speeds and increased visibility for businesses;
- Increased the numbers of customers to my business on James Street North;
- Made it easier for visitors to navigate street network; and
- Made it easier for deliveries to reach my store.

**Negative Feedback on Two-way Conversions**

Conversion of traffic from one-way to two-way traffic has:

- Made for dangerous driving conditions (e.g., unexpected turns), since many people are still not used to the changes;
- Reduced safety for less agile pedestrians (e.g., seniors, adults with children), since there is more multi-directional and turning traffic, which is more difficult for to navigate;
- Made loading more difficult for businesses with only front door access and blocks traffic;
- Made parking more difficult for customers;
- Reduced lanes widths significantly in places; and
• Not reduce traffic speeds significantly on John Street South.

**General Suggestions on Improving the Downtown**

• Increase residential development and the number of residents downtown;

• Increase funding to the Residential Loan Program;

• Provide property tax breaks to encourage business to open downtown;

• Increase parking for customers of downtown businesses;

• Provide bus routes in both directions on James Street;

• Add more bike lanes;

• Streetscape, signage, and building improvements should be coordinated and have a consistent look;

• More police are required to make customers feel safer; and

• Ban inappropriate uses downtown (e.g., warehouses on James St N); and

• Two-way conversions are a good thing, but need to be implemented as part of a vision for downtown and coordinated with other improvements

**Suggestions by Businesses for Future 2-way Conversions**

• More effort is required in education/marketing the value of two-way conversions to businesses and the public;

• Better signage is required to alert and remind people of two-way traffic;

• Two-way traffic needs to be phased in carefully; and

• Desire for a compensation fund for affected businesses (e.g., short-term taxation relief in expectation of future land value/tax increase).

### 4.5 Additional Stakeholder Consultation for Project Review

To further review the impacts of the two-way conversion of James Street and John Street, some stakeholders with a particular interest in traffic operations on James Street and John Street were consulted. The results are summarized below.

**St Joseph’s Hospital**

The following comments were made from the Hospital’s perspective:

• Easier for visitors to get to hospital with two-way conversion;

• Easier to exit staff parking lot onto St Joseph’s Drive with two-way conversion;

• Lots of minor collisions at Herkimer Street/James Street intersection; and
• Major issues with exit from visitors parking on James Street south of St Joseph’s Drive during rush hour (not related to two-way conversion).

Hamilton EMS

The following comments were made from the Hamilton EMS’s perspective:

• Traffic on James Street is congested and there is limited opportunity to take alternate lanes;

• Particular areas of congestion were reported as James from Barton to York, in the vicinity of Gore Park, and from Augusta to Herkimer;

• While no data from EMS is available, anecdotal evidence suggests ambulance trips now take longer with two-way conversion; and

• Noted that driver confusion seems to occur at Herkimer Street/James Street intersection, especially when ambulances have lights and sirens on.

GO Transit

The following comments were made from GO Transit’s perspective and relate to operations during peak hours of traffic in the morning and afternoon:

• Significant delays can occur to GO buses exiting onto John Street due to the northbound queue extending from Hunter Street/John Street traffic signal;

• Impact of congestion caused by two-way conversion is estimated by GO Transit to be an additional 7 minutes for peak hour trips; and

• GO Transit believe problems could be resolved by changes to signal phasing at the intersection of Hunter Street and John Street.

BIA Survey

A questionnaire was emailed to the James Street District, King West BIA, Downtown BIA, James North Business Association, and International Village BIA on August 15th, 2007. Questions related to prioritization of objectives and potential changes, impact of two-way conversions, and general opinions on required changes. Limited responses were received to the survey.

Additional public consultation was carried out at Public Information Centres (PICs) held during the project and summarized in Section 9 of this report.
5. BASELINE REVIEW

5.1 Review of Previous and On-going Studies

Since the Downtown Master Plan was completed, there has been a considerable amount of work completed at the City-wide and Downtown level. Most significantly, Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan completed in May 2007 provide an overall policy and infrastructure framework for the transportation system over the next 20-30 years and recommended rapid transit on James Street and Main Street or King Street to form a key corridors within a future rapid transit network for the city. Similarly, the GRIDS study provides the overall land use framework, including population and employment forecasts.

At the Downtown level, there are several studies and documents that have a bearing on the recommendations of the 2001 DTMP including:

- The Hamilton Downtown Mobility Street Master Plan, based on five key downtown streets, Bay Street, James Street, John Street, Hunter Street and Cannon Street, prepared in 2003;
- The Setting Sail Secondary Plan and the West Harbour Transportation Master Plan, contained a number of policies intended to promote a balanced transportation network, promote and support public transit, and to review traffic impacts of proposed developments in the West Harbour area;
- The Shifting Gears bicycle plan included a number of citywide initiatives, including enhanced connections between the waterfront recreation trails and the rest of the City;
- The Functional Assessment of Downtown Transit Terminal Options;
- Neighbourhood Traffic Management Studies in Durand, Corktown, and the North End;
- The upcoming Strathcona Neighbourhood Secondary Plan;
- The Market Precinct Plan; and,
- The Rapid Transit Feasibility Study.
- Hamilton VIA Rail Station Feasibility Study and subsequent identification of LIUNA station as a future GO Transit stop.

The key findings and recommendations from these studies were compared to the conditions that existed at the time when the 2001 DTMP was completed.

5.2 Planned and Implemented Capital Works

The City’s capital projects forecast from 2008-2017 shows a considerable number of improvement projects for the Downtown area. A copy of the current Capital Plan is contained in Appendix C of this document. Of particular relevance to this review are

Master plan and pedestrian/streetscaping projects for:
Bay Street, Cannon Street, Caroline Street, Catharine Street, Gore Park, Hamilton Market, Hess Street, Jackson Street, King Street, MacNab Street, Main Street, Market Street, Mary Street, Napier Street, Park Street, Queen Street, Rebecca Street, Wellington Street, York Boulevard and Wilson Street

**Cycling** projects for:

Hunter Street and York Boulevard

and **two-way conversion** projects for:

Hess Street, Hughson Street, King Street, King William Street, Park Street, Rebecca Street and York Boulevard/Wilson Street.

While Hunter Street is listed in the Capital Plan with an entry for two-way conversion, it is understood that that amount has been reallocated to provision of bicycle lanes on Hunter Street.

### 5.3 Review of Land-use Assumptions

As mentioned previously, the 2001 DTMP was completed prior to GRIDS and prior to the adoption of the Provincial Growth Plan, so a comparison of the population and employment forecasts by traffic zone was carried out to determine if there are any major differences between the previous and current forecasts.

A review of the population changes evident from Census data in 2001 and 2006 was also carried out and is shown in **Exhibit 5-1** below.
The above exhibit indicates a population increase in three of the six census tracts covering the Downtown study area, while the population decreased in the remaining three tracts. Overall, the total downtown population has remained at approximately 14,500 people from 2001 to 2006.

The population forecast was obtained from the City of Hamilton’s Community Planning and Design Division. Exhibit 5-2 below shows the population forecast for the extended downtown study area bounded by Highway 403 to the west, the escarpment to the south, the harbour to the north, and Victoria Street to the east. The exhibit shows a higher growth forecast from the GRIDS process, based on increased density in response to Places to Grow.
The downtown employment forecast was also reviewed, and is shown on Exhibit 5-3 below, which indicates an increasing trend to 2021.

Another indicator of Downtown investment and activity is the number of building permits issued by the City. There have been 890 residential units issued building permits over the past six years within the Downtown Hamilton Community Improvement Project Area. The construction value arising from building permits issued for residential and non-residential development is shown on Exhibit 5-4 below.
5.4 Review of Travel Patterns

One of the key tasks for the 5-year review will be to examine how traffic volumes and traffic patterns in the Downtown have changed since the previous study. This will be initially examined at the screenline level by assembling turning movement counts for signalized intersections.

5.4.1 TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Traffic volumes in the downtown area were initially examined at the screenline level by assembling turning movement counts for signalized intersections. In addition, a comparison was made of current traffic volumes on individual corridors that were forecast in the 2001 study. Specifically, an examination of the traffic volumes on James Street and John Street was used to review the previous forecasts of the traffic impacts of the one-way to two-way conversion. Changes in traffic volumes specific to the two-way conversion of James Street and John Street were discussed earlier in Section 4.1.

Exhibit 5-5 and Exhibit 5-6 below show the change in traffic volumes for north-south streets and east-west streets respectively.
Exhibit 5-5: Changes in Peak Hour North-South Traffic Volumes

Legend
- James Street SB volumes
- John Street NB volumes
Exhibit 5-6: Changes in Peak Hour East-West Traffic Volumes

The above traffic volume data does not indicate any significant changes in traffic volumes in the Downtown study area during peak hours.

5.4.2 PARKING DEMANDS

A review of parking supply and demand was carried out to determine changes in parking, using the parking assessment carried out for the DTMP in 1999, and the Citywide and Downtown Parking and Loading Study carried out in 2003. The overall supply of public parking spaces appears largely unchanged from 1999 to 2003.

The DTMP parking survey in 1999 found high off-street parking demands (above 80% occupied) close to the intersection of James Street and King Street, and in the vicinity of the GO Station on Hunter Street. Outside of those high demand areas, the average occupancy of parking lots was approximately 65%.

The 2003 Downtown Parking and Loading Study found high off-street parking demands (above 90%) close to the intersection of Bay Street and King Street, and John Street and York Boulevard. Outside of those high demand areas, the average occupancy of parking lots was approximately 65%.
5.4.3 HSR TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

In addition to traffic volumes and parking demands, another indicator of change in downtown transportation patterns is data on transit usage. HSR cordon count data was reviewed to determine changes in ridership to and from the downtown area.

Transit ridership data was obtained from HSR based on ridership surveys conducted during a single weekday in 2002, 2004, and 2005. While some routes appear to be missing from the screen lines, the data still provides a good comparison of transit ridership. Ridership for the AM peak, PM peak, and daily total for each year is summarized in Exhibit 5-7 for trips into the downtown, out of the downtown, total downtown trips, and total trips in the service area. Overall transit ridership has grown approximately 15% in the 2002-2005 period, while transit trips to and from the downtown have increased by approximately 12%.

**Exhibit 5-7: Change in Transit Ridership from 2002 to 2005**

The following observations are of particular interest:

- Trips into/out of the downtown account for more than 50% of all HSR ridership; and
- James St. Route (#4) experienced 27% ridership growth from 2002 to 2005 based on count data at Murray St stop

These findings are consistent with the assumptions of the original DTMP that predicted increasing levels of transit ridership.

5.4.4 TRAVEL DEMAND MODELLING

The 2001 DTMP included an extensive modelling exercise. The basic process was to use the City-wide EMME/2 Model to develop macro-level forecasts for a refined zone system and transportation network in the Downtown. The resulting sub-matrix was then imported into a micro-simulation...
model developed in CORSIM. This was an extensive and time-consuming process and has not been carried out for the five year review.

The approach used in this five-year review was to first look at the baseline assumptions used in the previous analysis to make a determination on whether the overall conclusions on traffic patterns and traffic volumes are still valid. This included a comparison of trip generation, based on the new population and employment forecasts, comparison of modal share assumptions and comparison of overall network assumptions. The previous modelling work accounted for the Red Hill Valley Parkway and did not assume that the Hamilton Perimeter Road would be constructed.

The current City of Hamilton EMME/2 Model developed for the City-wide Transportation Master Plan was used to prepare overall forecasts for trips to and from the Downtown and to estimate volumes on major links.

Since there are no major apparent differences in the assumptions between the previous work and current conditions, detailed modelling was not carried out as part of the five-year review. Based on the above review, there do not appear to be any significant changes to baseline travel patterns in the downtown area.
6. BASELINE REVIEW CONCLUSIONS

Based on the above review described in Sections 3 to 5 above, the original problem statement and preferred solution were reviewed as described below. Key changes since 2001 have been identified as follows:

- Greater emphasis on environment, including air quality and climate change;
- Increase in fuel prices and energy supply uncertainties;
- Downtown Hamilton is now designated as an Urban Growth Centre by the Province of Ontario;
- Funding opportunities for rapid transit have arisen;
- Increased aspirations for pedestrian improvements (e.g. Pedestrian Charter);
- Commitment to improve street façade (e.g. Farmers’ Market/Library, Art Gallery);
- Major developments are now taking place;
- No significant change in traffic volumes in the study area;
- Increase in parking occupancy throughout study area; and
- Increased transit ridership evident from HSR data.

6.1 Validation of Problem Statement and Preferred Solution

Exhibit 6-1 below shows results of the review of the original problem and opportunity statement identified in the 2001 DTMP.
Exhibit 6-1: Review of Problem Statement from 2001 DTMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Still Valid?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular travel</td>
<td>• One-way streets require circuitous travel</td>
<td>• Extra capacity can be converted to other modes</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Environment</td>
<td>• High traffic speeds</td>
<td>• Re-allocate road space for wider sidewalks, streetlighting, bump-outs to reduce crossing distances, bus stops/shelters, etc</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wide streets difficult to cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inward looking buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surface lots are a barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Environment</td>
<td>• High traffic volumes/speeds</td>
<td>• Excess road space can be reallocated to bicycle lanes in some areas</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of continuous routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One-way streets require circuitous travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>• Low mode split</td>
<td>• Residential intensification</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buses in Gore Park</td>
<td>• Relocated transit terminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One-way streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>• Abundance of low cost commuter parking</td>
<td>• Pricing measures</td>
<td>PARTIALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shortage of on-street parking</td>
<td>• Reallocate road space to on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2001 problem statement is generally valid, except that issues around excess parking have lessened as parking supply has remained largely unchanged and occupancy has increased. This does not negate the directions of the Downtown Secondary Plan which states that “Implementing the parking strategy from the Downtown Transportation Plan will be the first major step towards addressing the downtown parking issues and working to take underutilized land to its highest and best use.”

The 2001 preferred solution included the following:

- Changes to the street network, including one-way to two-way conversions;
- Changes to the walking environment and cycling network, primarily consisting of changes to lane designations and pavement widths;
- Changes to the transit system, specifically the location of the downtown transit terminal; and
- Changes to parking policies

The 2001 preferred solution is therefore considered still valid, except:

- There is now a greater desire for pedestrian improvements
- Potential for rapid transit is more immediate, impacting James Street, Main Street and King Street
Since the problem statement and preferred solution area considered valid, the remaining uncompleted projects from the 2001 DTMP were evaluated using evaluation criteria contained in the following section.

6.2 Evaluation Criteria

Transportation criteria are shown in Exhibit 6-2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Need to Consider in DTMP Update</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety</td>
<td>Estimated degree of change in pedestrian safety</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling safety</td>
<td>Estimated degree of change in bicycle safety</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit efficiency</td>
<td>Estimated degree of reduction or increase in transit travel time</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit connectivity</td>
<td>Estimated degree of reduction or increase in transit connectivity</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Evaluated in 2001 DTP and shown to improve under recommended plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular level of service</td>
<td>Average change in travel time per vehicle trip in downtown study area (min/km)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Using Simplified Methods; for major changes only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average change in travel time for through trips (min)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Using Simplified Methods, for major changes only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through trips in downtown</td>
<td>Change in through trips (%)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Largely dependent on Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular safety</td>
<td>Estimated degree of reduction or increase in collisions or injuries</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Experience with James/John Conversion suggests two-way streets, when designed properly, do not increase collisions significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation accessibility</td>
<td>Estimated degree of reduction or increase in clarity and convenience of routing</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Evaluated in 2001 DTP and shown to improve under recommended plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-economic criteria are shown in Exhibit 6-3 below.
### Exhibit 6-3: Socio-economic Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Need to Consider in DTMP Update</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood traffic infiltration</td>
<td>Change in number of trips on secondary streets</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Evaluated in 2001 DTP and shown to improve under recommended plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle emissions</td>
<td>Percent Change in NOx Emissions (grams/km)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>External Assessment and Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business impacts</td>
<td>Change in Number of On-Street Parking Spaces</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts on on-street loading</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian environment</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of degree to which pedestrians perceive street environment as safe, comfortable, convenient</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Average Speeds on Downtown Core Streets (%)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Evaluated in 2001 DTP and shown to improve under recommended plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary plan objectives</td>
<td>Estimated degree to which proposed secondary plan objectives are achieved*</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Capital costs</td>
<td>Estimated capital cost of improvements (over and above status quo)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Not appropriate for confirming validity of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Front Access</td>
<td>Estimated degree to which Harbourfront access would be improved</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Mainly related to James and John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The objectives of the secondary plan include calming downtown traffic, balancing infrastructure between vehicles and other modes, enhancing public spaces, creating linkages to other parts of the city and converting streets to two-way, while facilitating through trips.

### 6.3 Assessment of Uncompleted Projects

To guide the systematic review of the previous recommendations from the original DTMP, an assessment of uncompleted projects was made using the evaluation criteria described above, and is shown on Exhibit 6-4 below.
## Exhibit 6-4: Assessment of Uncompleted Projects from 2001 DTMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Road Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King/York/Wilson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More detailed review justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion (optional)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More detailed review justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/MacNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No longer feasible (see Hunter Street Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion (Main to King)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential new project not identified in 2001 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs more detailed review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St/Canada St Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs more detailed review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Contra-flow lane**</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No longer feasible (see Cycling Improvements Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs more detailed review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Terminal at Mac Nab</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Options being evaluated under separate study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- Large positive impact
- Large negative impact
- Minor impact or no impact
As a result of the above assessment, outstanding projects from the 2001 Master Plan were identified as either needing further review, or ready for implementation without significant impacts.

6.3.1 IMPLEMENT: NO NEW SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following projects are considered to have no new significant impacts and are therefore recommended for implementation without further detailed review.

Two-way conversions:
- Park Street
- MacNab Street two-way conversion
- Hughson Street two-way conversion
- Hess Street two-way conversion
- King William two-way conversion
- Rebecca two-way conversion

Pedestrian improvements:
- Jackson Street
- Queen Street
- Catharine Street
- Mary Street
- George Street

Cycling improvements:
- Ferguson Avenue bike lanes (mostly completed)

Implementation of an employee trip reduction program and a long term parking rate increase were also recommended to support the other changes.

6.3.2 FURTHER DETAILED REVIEW: POTENTIAL FOR NEW IMPACTS

The following projects were recommended for further detailed review due to changes in baseline conditions.
- King/York/Wilson two-way conversion and tradeoffs with rapid transit
- Bay Street two-way conversion
- Main Street pedestrian improvements
- Hunter Street two-way conversion and bicycle lanes
• York Boulevard bicycle lanes
• Caroline Street two-way conversion (New since 2001)
• Gore Park pedestrianization (see Chapter 8)

The location of a new transit terminal is being investigated under a separate study. Alternatives are:

• Expanded MacNab Street Terminal
• MacNab Street on street in combination with Hunter Street

While the study is yet to be completed, the preferred alternative was identified was MacNab Street on-street in combination with Hunter Street. However, the expanded MacNab Street Terminal can be reviewed in the longer term.
7. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Primary Road Network Changes

The 2001 DTMP recommended a staged approach to the introduction of two-way conversions on the primary street network – recommending that the impacts of the conversions of James Street and John Street be reviewed before conversions were carried out for York Boulevard and King Street. The outstanding changes to the primary road network are shown on Exhibit 7-1 below.

Exhibit 7-1: Uncompleted Primary Road Network Projects

As part of the 2001 Plan, several different network concepts were evaluated including:

- Do Nothing (One-way)
- Road Space Reallocation (One-way with reduced road widths)
- James/John Partial (Two-way) James/John Full (Two-way)
• James/John & Cannon/York/Wilson (Two-way)
• James/John/Bay & Cannon/York/Wilson/King/Main (Two-way)
• James/John/Bay & York/Wilson/King (Two-way)

The recommended plan sought to maintain access for commercial vehicles and through traffic on Main Street and Cannon Street while slowing traffic on King Street and York Boulevard/Wilson Street.

The review conducted in this study indicated that in some cases, not all of the desired elements could be accommodated on all streets while providing minimum acceptable lane widths. The desire to add two-way traffic must be considered against the ability to add bicycle lanes and to either maintain or add on-street parking/loading. Generally, to achieve the objectives of the original DTMP, it is considered that the order of preference for primary streets should be:

1. The introduction of two-way traffic;
2. Provision of bicycle lanes; and
3. Provision of on-street parking and loading.

It is noted that the above priorities may vary by street and by location on each street.

7.1.1 YORK/WILSON TWO-WAY CONVERSION

The 2001 Master Plan identified York Boulevard as a priority for two-way traffic and bike lanes (where possible). In order to confirm the feasibility of providing two-way traffic on York Boulevard/Wilson Street, a functional plan was prepared at that time. An extract from this functional plan is shown on Exhibit 7-2. As shown, this plan maintains two continuous eastbound traffic lanes between Bay Street and James Street. Bike lanes were not included on this section in the 2001 plan.
Exhibit 7-2: Functional Plan for York Boulevard Two-way Conversion (2001)
More recently a need for wider sidewalks, parking and amenity space has been identified to support the Market Precinct. A key challenge is how to allocate available road space to accommodate these competing needs while maintaining reasonable vehicular access.

A number of alternatives were considered in the review of the DTMP’s recommendations. Exhibit 7-3 below shows some potential ways to allocate road space on York Boulevard.
Exhibit 7-3: Alternatives for York Boulevard/Wilson Street

- Maximizes auto capacity
- Maximizes on-street parking
- No improvements for pedestrians or cyclists
- Limits potential for two-way King Street

- Eliminates parking on one side
- Reduces traffic speeds, but long queues will form in peak hours
- Providing bike lanes would mean that travelled lanes would be sub-standard
- Increases emergency response times

- Maintains parking on both sides, with opportunities for shared pedestrian space
- Maintains current traffic capacity, but may not reduce vehicle speeds
- Eastbound bike lane can be provided (Westbound lane could be provided on Cannon)
- Limits potential for two-way King Street

- Eliminates parking on both sides
- Reduces traffic speeds, but long queues will form in peak hours
- No bicycle lanes provided
- Widened sidewalk on south side of York Boulevard outside Farmers Market allows for expansion of Library and Farmers Market

Note: Above cross-sections are intended to show how space could be allocated within the existing pavement width in order to evaluate the impact of two-way traffic. It should be acknowledged that
allocation of space could vary along the corridor. For example parking may be exchanged for wider sidewalks or bike lanes.

Key issues that must be considered in the proposed conversion of York Boulevard from one-way to two-way traffic include:

- A commitment has been made by the City for pedestrian improvements around the Farmers’ Market and Library;
- A Streetscape Master Plan (urban design study) for York Boulevard between Bay Street and James Street is currently under way;
- Current eastbound traffic volumes on one-way York Boulevard in the vicinity of James Street may exceed the capacity of a two-way street, and traffic diversion will need to occur (see discussion below);
- If vehicle capacity on York Boulevard is reduced, other techniques for improving the pedestrian environment on Main Street that do not reduce vehicle capacity on Main Street may be required; and
- Impacts of two-way traffic on transit speeds and integration with future Rapid Transit need to be considered.

**Implications of Two-way Traffic on York Boulevard**

York Boulevard currently experiences heavy traffic volumes in the morning and afternoon peak hours. In the AM peak hour east of Bay Street, traffic volumes exceed 2000 vehicles per hour, which is approaching the capacity of the three lane cross-section.

The exhibit below illustrates the theoretical capacity of different lane allocation assumptions in relation to existing traffic volumes. It is assumed that one travelled lane would have a capacity of 700 vehicles per hour under the one-way scenario and 600 vehicles per hour under the two-way scenarios. A slightly higher capacity of 800 vehicles per hour is assumed for the two-way case with one lane plus a centre turn lane option since the centre lane will eliminate left turning traffic from the through lane.

Based on these nominal capacities, it can be expected that up to 800 vehicles would need to be diverted to other routes under the scenario with two eastbound lanes and two-way traffic and some 1000-1200 vehicles under the scenario with one lane in each direction with a centre turn lane).

Some of the above diversion could take place with drivers switching to alternative routes or by using alternate modes such as transit or cycling, or by changing the time of the trip to avoid peak hour conditions. Furthermore, analysis using an updated EMME/2 transportation model indicates a large number of trips on York Boulevard are long distance trips with origins and destinations outside the downtown, as shown on **Exhibit 7-5** below. A significant proportion of traffic on York Boulevard appears to have origins on Highway 403, and destinations on Burlington Street. Based on the above analysis, a significant portion of York Boulevard traffic could use alternative routes, take transit (HSR or GO Transit) or cycle.
**Exhibit 7-4: Estimated traffic diversion for two-way traffic on York Boulevard**

| Peak Capacity (vehicles/hr) | Eastbound capacity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with THREE lanes (Existing one-way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with TWO lanes (one-way option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with TWO lanes plus turning lane (two-way option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with ONE lane plus turning lane (two-way option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Peak Hour Volume (at peak point - East of bay)

- Required traffic diversion to other streets/modes

- Origins and Destinations of Traffic on York Boulevard/Wilson Street
Even assuming significant diversions to other modes, it is inevitable that some residual traffic currently using York Boulevard will need to be diverted to other streets.

Traffic on York Boulevard really only has two alternatives to be diverted to - Barton and Main Street. At present, Main Street has sufficient capacity to handle some additional traffic. There is approximately 3,100 eastbound vehicles on Main Street at Bay Street whereas the capacity of the five lane cross-section (assuming 700 vehicles per hour per lane) is at least 3,500, and likely closer to 4,000. Currently, the intersection of Main Street and Bay Street is operating at Level of Service A, based on Synchro Model. The constraint is that for traffic to divert to Main Street, it has to do so via the 403 ramp, Queen Street or Dundurn Street. This is an issue in that the latter streets typically experience congestion already, in particular at the intersections of Queen Street and Dundurn Street at King Street.

Barton Street would be able to handle some additional traffic, but this would have impacts on the residents along this street. Residents have already expressed concern about the current impacts of traffic on Barton Street.

It is therefore suggested that if two-way traffic is considered for York/Wilson, that a minimum of two eastbound lanes be maintained. A detailed analysis of the level of service for key intersections along York Boulevard (documented separately), indicates that even assuming minimal diversion of traffic, most intersections would be operating at LOS C or better.

**Recommendations for York Boulevard/Wilson Street**

Considering the above analysis, the following recommendation is made for York Boulevard/Wilson Street;

- Convert to two-way traffic as recommended in the 2001 Master Plan between Bay Street and Wellington Street; and

- Proceed with preliminary design to refine the cross-sections by individual block, balancing the needs of providing parking and wider sidewalks, while accommodating bike lanes where possible.

The rationale for converting York Boulevard/Wilson Street to two-way traffic is as follows:

- Conversion of York Boulevard/Wilson Street to two-way traffic will reduce traffic speeds on York Boulevard/Wilson Street through the study area, with benefits in terms of an improved pedestrian environment;

- Conversion of York Boulevard/Wilson Street to two-way traffic will reduce circuitous travel to and from properties in the downtown; and

- Conversion of York Boulevard/Wilson Street to two-way traffic provides for greater flexibility for changing King Street (i.e. provision of additional westbound capacity through the core of the study area could offset any potential loss of westbound traffic capacity on King Street).

While the conversion would provide the above benefits, there are issues with the implementation of two-way traffic on York Boulevard/Wilson Street that will need to be considered:

- Two-way conversion may require removal of parking in some locations;

- Two-way conversion reduces traffic speeds, but significant queues may form in peak hours unless diversion occurs;
• Narrow lane widths in some locations will be close to the lowest acceptable lane widths;

• Two-way conversion of York Boulevard/Wilson Street reduces capacity for eastbound traffic and requires diversion to alternate routes/modes;

• A reduction in travel speeds may increase emergency response times; and

• Two-way conversion will introduce opposing movements and affect access to properties such as the York Parkade.

One issue that should be looked at in the detailed design is the possibility of consolidating some of the driveways for properties on the north side of York Boulevard between Bay Street and James Street, in order to improve traffic flow and reduce left turn movements.

In addition, options to provide dedicated bike lanes on York Boulevard between Dundurn Street and Bay Street will need to be looked in the next stage of design. For the segment between Hess Street and Bay Street, there may be an option to dedicate one of the five existing lanes to two-way bike lane. Under the new EA process for Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, this type of lane re-allocation may be classified as a schedule A+ project and only require notifying the public.

7.1.2 KING STREET TWO-WAY CONVERSION

The 2001 Master Plan proposed that King Street be converted to two-way traffic to reduce traffic speeds and improve way-finding. In 2005, a Streetscaping Master Plan was completed for King Street assuming two-way traffic.

The review of conditions specific to King Street found that traffic volumes had either decreased or stayed the same in the period from 1997 to 2005. A high demand for on-street parking is also evident, especially on the eastern sections of King Street.

Recently, King Street has been identified as a potential rapid transit route. Ultimately, the location and type of rapid transit system selected may dictate the future configuration for King Street. At the time of this report, a separate Rapid Transit Feasibility Study was underway to look at alternative configurations for rapid transit in the east-west and north-south corridors. Preliminary recommendations suggest that in order to accommodate dedicated rapid transit lanes on King Street, it may not be possible to also accommodate two-way traffic flow. However, feedback from the public has indicated a strong preference for two-way transit, on either King Street or Main Street, as opposed to splitting the east-west rapid transit service.

In addition to proposals for Rapid Transit, an investigation of alternatives to improve pedestrian conditions on King Street at Gore Park has been initiated by the Mayor. A discussion of alternatives and evaluation of their impacts is contained in Appendix A of this report.

A number of alternatives for King Street were considered in the review of the DTMP’s recommendations. Exhibit 7-6 below shows some potential ways to allocate road space on King Street.
Exhibit 7-6: Alternatives for King Street

- Maximizes auto capacity
- Maximizes potential for on-street parking
- No improvements for pedestrians or cyclists
- Limits potential for two-way York/Wilson
- Enables dedicated rapid transit lanes

Note: Curb lanes could be used for parking during off-peak

- Reduces traffic speeds
- Lack of dedicated left turn lanes will result in queue at major access points
- Lane widths will be sub-standard in some areas
- Allows for future rapid transit to operate in single corridor
- Increases existing bus travel times
- Increases emergency response times
- All cars stopped when buses stop (if parking in curb lane)

- Similar to existing King Street east of John St
- Opportunities for streetscaping and widened sidewalks (bump-outs)
- Reduces vehicle speeds
- Limits potential for two-way rapid transit

Key issues that must be considered in the proposed conversion of King Street from one-way to two-way traffic include:

- Need to maintain access to parking and loading facilities for Jackson Square and other properties;
• Detailed analysis of lane widths and impact on parking/loading/transit would be required in the event of conversion to two-way traffic; and

• Impacts of two-way traffic on transit speeds and integration with future Rapid Transit need to be considered.

Considering the above analysis, two-way traffic appears to remain a viable option for King Street, depending on the outcomes of EA studies for the Rapid Transit and Gore Park pedestrianization. The following recommendation is made for King Street:

• Two-way traffic as recommended in the 2001 Master Plan is still desirable; and

• Proceed with preliminary design only after Environmental Assessment studies for Rapid Transit are completed and decision is made on Gore Park pedestrianization.

The rationale for the above recommendation for King Street is as follows:

• Further Environmental Assessment studies are required to confirm preferred routing and design concepts for Rapid Transit and related terminal facilities;

• A significant change from previous assumptions has occurred due to future rapid transit on King Street or Main Street and the concept of a Gore Park pedestrian plaza; and

• Proceeding with two-way conversion before transit and Gore Park issues are resolved may be premature.

While the two-way conversion of King Street may provide some benefits, there are issues with the implementation of two-way traffic on King Street that will need to be considered:

• Narrow lane widths in some locations will be close to the lowest acceptable lane widths;

• Implementing two-way traffic on King Street may reduce speeds of future rapid transit or limit options for providing RT;

• A reduction in travel speeds may increase emergency response times; and

• Two-way conversion will introduce opposing movements and affect access to properties.

7.1.3 BAY STREET TWO-WAY CONVERSION (OPTIONAL)

The conversion of Bay Street from one-way to two-way operation was an optional consideration in the 2001 DTMP that was not included in the recommended long-term transportation plan or in the Capital Plan. Conversion could take place from Cannon Street to Main Street, and potentially as far south as Hunter Street.

Bay Street currently serves as an important link to carry westbound traffic from King Street up to Cannon Street and then on to York Boulevard to access Highway 403. North of Cannon Street, Bay Street provides two-way access to Bayfront Park and into the North End Neighbourhood, terminating at the waterfront at Guise Street.

The proposed two-way conversion of York Boulevard/Wilson Street would continue as far west as Bay Street, relying on the use of Bay Street from York Boulevard to Cannon Street to carry westbound traffic to Cannon Street. Under this scenario, Bay Street from York Boulevard to
Cannon Street will have to carry additional traffic volumes, with the predominant movement requiring changing lanes in order to continue west on Cannon Street. Retaining the current street cross section and one-way northbound traffic would likely assist in accommodating the additional traffic volumes. In the event of closure of King Street at Gore Park as discussed in Section 0, Bay Street between Hunter Street and Cannon Street may see an increase in traffic volume due to diversion of westbound traffic around the downtown core.

Two-way conversion of Bay Street may be considered if monitoring after the implementation of two-way traffic on York Boulevard indicates that benefits would result from the conversion. It is recommended that the two-way conversion of Bay Street in the study area not proceed at this time.

7.2 Secondary Road Network Changes

To support and work with the conversion of the primary streets, the 2001 DTMP recommended the conversion of a number of secondary streets in the study area from one-way to two-way operation. The intent of these conversions was to reduce speeds and “out of way” travel.

Recent two-way conversions of Hess Street and Caroline Street in the Durand Neighbourhood have been well received and are considered to have addressed the issues that their conversion was intended to address. The outstanding changes to the secondary road network are shown on Exhibit 7-7 below.
Exhibit 7-7: Uncompleted Primary Road Network Projects

As with the primary road network conversions, not all of the desired elements may be accommodated on all secondary roads while providing minimum acceptable lane widths. The desire to add two-way traffic must be considered against the ability to add bicycle lanes and to either maintain or add on-street parking. Generally, to achieve the objectives of the original DTMP, it is considered that the order of preference for secondary streets should be:

1. Retention or provision of on-street parking;
2. Provision of bicycle lanes; and
3. The introduction of two-way traffic.

Following the baseline review discussed in Section 5 and summarized in Section 6.3.1, it was determined that no significant changes had occurred that would change the original evaluation of the two-way conversions of Secondary Roads. The following Secondary Road conversions are recommended for implementation without further review.
Park/MacNab two-way conversion

Conversion of MacNab Street from one-way to two-way operation from York Boulevard would provide additional access to the Farmers’ Market from the north. The two-way connection could also allow an extension of the Farmers’ Market Precinct north of York Boulevard.

While the DTMP study area extends only as far north as Barton Street, the North End Traffic Study recommends two-way conversion on the northern section of MacNab Street between the railway corridor and the waterfront.

No issues have been identified with the conversion of Park Street to two-way operations.

Hess Street two-way conversion

The conversion of the southern portion of Hess Street in the Durand neighbourhood took place in 2004 and has been well received in the neighbourhood. Conversion of the remaining section north of York Street would provide a connection between Cannon Street and York Boulevard, and also to King Street and Main Street.

Hughson Street

Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert Hughson Street north of Wilson Street to two-way operation.

King William two-way conversion

Conversion of King William Street was recommended between John Street and Mary Street. Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert King William Street to two-way operation.

Rebecca two-way conversion

Conversion of Rebecca Street was recommended between John Street and Wellington Street. Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert Rebecca Street to two-way operation.

7.2.1 HUNTER STREET CONVERSION

Another outstanding project that was proposed as part of the 2001 DTMP was the conversion of Hunter Street to two-way operation in conjunction with the addition of bicycle lanes. Since 2001, this recommendation as been revisited on several occasions, for example as part of the Corktown Neighbourhood Traffic Plan, and it has determined that accommodating two-way traffic as well as bike lanes and retaining on-street parking would be problematic. Another key consideration for Hunter Street is the Hamilton GO Centre between James Street and John Street, and the pick-up, drop-off, taxi and pedestrian activity generated by passengers. In addition, the north side of Hunter Street is being reviewed as part of the Downtown Transit Terminal Study. In order for the north side of the road to be used as part of the Transit Terminal the on street parking would have to be removed and used as bus bays. However, if the bus bays can be accommodated with the GO Transit facility then the on street parking spaces would remain.

Accommodating two-way traffic, parking and bicycle lanes on Hunter Street is difficult without road widening. In the Corktown Neighbourhood Traffic Management Study, residents indicated a preference for bike lanes and on-street parking more than two-way traffic. A concept that maintains
Hunter Street as one-way, but provides for two-way bike lanes, has been proposed. The preferred alternative is shown as Alternative B on Exhibit 7-8 below.

### Exhibit 7-8: Alternatives for Hunter Street

- **Alternative A**
  - Restricts space for parking
  - Reduces traffic speeds
  - Most common configuration for bike lanes
  - Reduces traffic capacity around GO Station

- **Alternative B**
  - Maintains on-street parking
  - Allows for two-way bike travel
  - Bikes adjacent to cars travel in same direction
  - Preferred design for Hunter Street

- **Alternative C**
  - Maintains on-street parking
  - Allows for two-way bike travel
  - Greatest potential for bike-vehicle conflicts

#### 7.2.2 CAROLINE STREET TWO-WAY CONVERSION

The 2001 Master Plan recommended providing a contraflow bicycle lane on Caroline Street from York Boulevard to Herkimer Street. Subsequently, Caroline Street south of Main Street has been converted to two-way traffic, which does not allow the provision of adding bike lanes in that section without removal of parking. However, the two-way conversion has provided a lower speed environment and allows northbound movement by bicycles and other vehicles. Bike lanes could be installed on Caroline Street between York Boulevard and Main Street, but the lanes would not connect to other routes.

To determine the most appropriate option for Caroline Street, a number of alternatives were investigated as shown on Exhibit 7-9. Converting Caroline Street to two-way operations between Main Street and York Street would help to reduce speeds, and improve access to residences, businesses and parking on Caroline Street. This alternative would create similar conditions to those on Caroline Street south of Main Street, and is recommended for implementation.
Exhibit 7-9: Alternatives for Caroline Street

- Maximizes Auto capacity
- Maximizes potential for on-street parking
- Least attractive for pedestrians and cyclists

- Maintains on-street parking
- Reduces traffic capacity and speeds
- Bike lanes would not connect to other routes
- Non-standard bike lane design

- Maintains on-street parking
- Reduces traffic speeds
- Improves access
- Preferred Design for Caroline Street

7.3 Pedestrian Improvements

As stated in Section 6.3, the baseline review has concluded that the majority of pedestrian improvements can be implemented as originally planned in the 2001 DTMP, and do not require further detailed investigation.

However, the pedestrian improvements on Main Street may impact lane capacity and hence the ability to accommodate rapid transit if Main Street is selected as a route for rapid transit. Any streetscape improvements carried out on Main Street prior to the decision on east-west rapid transit should not reduce lane capacity in a manner that would preclude rapid transit on Main Street.

It is recommended that the streetscaping projects be implemented with input from the public on a street by street basis. Exhibit 7-10 shows the areas for pedestrian improvements. While the Gore Park area is highlighted in the exhibit, alternatives for Gore Park are discussed in Appendix A of this report.
Exhibit 7-10: Areas for Pedestrian Improvements

The above exhibit includes reference to streetscape improvements recommended as part of the Downtown Mobility Street Master Plan. Streetscape improvements on Cannon Street in particular could provide a traffic calming effect as well as improve landscaping and urban design features.

7.4 Cycling Improvements

The 2001 Plan recognized the need for improved east-west bike connections. Two-way streets will improve conditions, but further improvements are required. The following cycling network improvements are considered for further review.
7.4.1 HUNTER STREET BIKE LANES

Through the public information centres and other community consultation carried out in the Corktown study, it was determined that provision of a bicycle lane and retention of parking should take precedence over introduction of two-way traffic. The concept for the bicycle lanes is shown on Exhibit 7-8 above. The bicycle lanes would operate in a contraflow manner on the south side of Hunter Street, allowing on-street parking to be maintained on the north side of Hunter Street. On the section of Hunter Street outside the Hamilton GO Centre, shared lanes are proposed (See Section 7.2.1).

Shared bike lanes require cyclists to mix with vehicle traffic and offer questionable safety benefits. However, in the case of Hunter Street between James Street and John Street, shared lanes are considered the only alternative given the existing roadway width and the pick-up and drop-off activity that occurs on both the north and south sides of Hunter Street. Furthermore, if the use of the GO Transit facility does not occur for the proposed Transit Terminal then the use of the north side of Hunter Street would be used for bus bays and the parking stalls would be removed.

7.4.2 CAROLINE STREET CONTRA-FLOW LANE

As discussed in Section 7.2.2 above, the 2001 Master Plan recommended providing a contraflow bicycle lane on Caroline Street from York Boulevard to Herkimer Street. Subsequently, Caroline Street south of Main has been converted to two-way traffic, which precludes the option of adding bike lanes.

Converting Caroline Street to two-way operations between Main Street and York Street would help to reduce speeds, and improve access to residences, businesses and parking on Caroline Street. The contraflow bicycle lane on Caroline Street originally recommended in the 2001 Master Plan is not recommended for implementation.

7.4.3 YORK BOULEVARD BIKE LANES

On York Boulevard east of Bay Street, provision of dedicated bike lanes and two-way traffic will impact the ability to accommodate vehicular traffic and parking. On-street parking and provisions for informal loading and pick-up/drop-off is considered essential by the BIAs and residents.

Accordingly, dedicated bicycle lanes are recommended on York Boulevard from Queen Street at the western edge of the study area to Bay Street. East of Bay Street, shared lanes are proposed.

Exhibit 7-11 below shows the recommended cycling network improvements.
Exhibit 7-11: Areas for Cycling Network Improvements

Note: Solid lines indicate dedicated on-street bicycle lanes; dashed lines indicate potential shared lanes.

In addition, the location where the Ferguson Avenue bicycle/pedestrian route crosses Main Street is recommended for traffic signal control in order to provide a safer crossing at what is currently an uncontrolled crossing point across four lanes of arterial traffic.
8. TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS FOR KING STREET/GORE PARK

In October, 2007, Mayor Fred Eisenberger made a presentation to the Public Works Committee that called for an investigation of pedestrianizing the Gore by closing it off to through traffic and creating a public plaza. The Gore area generally refers to the Gore Park area on King Street between James Street and John Street, extending east to Catharine Street, although Mayor Eisenberger referred to an area from James Street potentially extending as far east as Wellington Street. Mayor Eisenberger noted that the idea was becoming more desirable given that the downtown transit terminal is likely to be moved from Gore Park, the City is more focussed on promoting more sustainable forms of transportation, and the development of a rapid transit system through the downtown is being planned.

Mayor Eisenberger’s presentation suggested several options to achieve the objective of pedestrianizing the Gore:

- Closing off one or both legs of King Street through Gore Park
- Continuing to allow only public transit and delivery vehicles to pass through
- Seasonal or time of day closures

The Public Works Committee forwarded the pedestrianization proposal to staff for further review and evaluation in conjunction with the review of the DTMP. Accordingly, the following sections provide an investigation and analysis of alternatives for the closure of King Street related to the pedestrianization of Gore Park.

The focus of this section is on the transportation impacts of potential closure options. A supplemental discussion of urban design options for Gore Park is provided in Appendix A. The purpose of this supplemental exercise was to start a discussion on the potential options for Gore Park, largely to give a context to the examination of physical closure options. Materials in Appendix A are to be considered preliminary, as Gore Park has been identified as a cultural heritage landscape, and neither the transportation assessment nor the development of urban design options has involved relevant stakeholders.

8.1 Traffic Impacts of King Street Closure

There is a wide range of potential scenarios for the re-design of King Street including temporary closures, partial closures in the area of Gore Park only, or more extensive permanent closures, including closing King Street between James Street and Wellington Street. One of the key tasks of this study was to investigate the traffic impacts of potential closures. To do this, three basic scenarios were developed and tested to reflect the range of potential options.

Each of these scenarios could involve:

- Introducing Rapid Transit on King Street;
- Accommodating delivery vehicles;
- Temporary closures only (e.g. on weekends);
- Provisions for bicycles; and
• Shared space design.

8.1.1 OPTIONS FOR INVESTIGATION OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS

The following options were investigated using EMME/2 software to predict network-wide effects of road closures, and using Synchro software to review the impacts on specific intersections in terms of delays and queuing.

Scenario 1

• Close both sides of King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and Wellington Street;

• All other primary mobility streets remain as is; and

• All north-south streets remain open to traffic.

Scenario 2

• Close both sides of King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and John Street;

• All other primary mobility streets remain as is; and

• James Street and John Street remain open to north-south traffic.

Scenario 3

• Close King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and Wellington Street;

• York Boulevard/Wilson Street and King Street (James to Queen) converted to two-way traffic; and

• All north-south streets remain open to traffic.

A fourth scenario involving the closure of the south leg of King Street was found to have minimal traffic impacts and is not reported on in detail in this report.
8.1.2 TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

The study area for the analysis defined as the area bounded by Barton Street to the north, Queen Street to the west, Hunter Street to the south, and Victoria Avenue to the east. A review and collection of the existing traffic volumes, signal timing and other relevant information within the study area road network was conducted. In total, there are 72 signalized intersections within the Study Area and 38 of these were included in the detailed traffic operations assessment. These 38 intersections include all of the major signalized intersections, and are those for which traffic counts were available.

Traffic Diversion Due to Closure

To determine the scope of traffic diversion that could occur if portions of King Street were closed to traffic, existing traffic patterns were evaluated using the EMME/2 transportation model for Hamilton. The origins and destinations of traffic using King Street through the Downtown are illustrated in Exhibit 8-1 below, with the thickness of the lines indicating the relative proportion of trips on each road.

Exhibit 8-1: Modelled Origins and Destinations of Traffic Using King Street

The above exhibit indicates a large proportion of traffic using King Street in the Downtown area originate from the east and southeast areas of Hamilton, and are destined to the north/northwest on Highway 403, and to Dundas. It is conceivable that some of this traffic could be diverted to other
routes such as Cannon Street or other street outside of study network, or even the QEW in the case of traffic coming from the far east.

Using the EMME/2 model, closures of King Street were modelled, resulting in a prediction of network-wide changes in travel patterns as shown in Exhibit 8-2 below.

Exhibit 8-2: Modelled Diversion of King Street Traffic due to Closure

The change in traffic volumes on selected streets in the Downtown study area due to the predicted diversion is shown in Exhibit 8-3 below.
Exhibit 8-3: Impact of Diverted King Street Traffic on Selected Streets

*Analysis Results*

Synchro 6.0 was used to estimate the traffic level of service for the various road network scenarios. For the Synchro analysis, the redistribution of trips under King Street closure scenarios was carried out by hand, using EMME/2 volumes as approximate control totals. The trip distributions derived from the EMME/2 model for different scenarios were then applied to the existing traffic volumes in order to obtain the future traffic volumes for the King Street closure scenarios. Some general assumptions that were applied included:

- Vehicles entering and exiting at mid-block locations and parking lots were not changed; and,
- Phasing of intersections was been modified to accommodate the new turning movements.

A summary of the study area network and some key traffic performance statistics is provided in Exhibit 8-4 below. As shown, the three analyses scenarios can be expected to produce significantly different impacts on the major arterials within the study area road network.
Exhibit 8-4: Network Traffic Performance Results for Alternative Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Scenarios</th>
<th>Total Delay/ Veh (seconds)</th>
<th>Total Delay (hr)</th>
<th>Average Speed (km/hr)</th>
<th>Total Travel Time (hrs)</th>
<th>Fuel Used(l)</th>
<th>CO Emissions (gms/hr)</th>
<th>NOx Emissions (gms/hr)</th>
<th>VOC Emissions (gms/hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Weekday PM</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>6479</td>
<td>120.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>7063</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>6972</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>7160</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Percent Change Compared to Existing Conditions.
2. Includes Wilson Street / York Boulevard westbound direction values.

Closing King Street between James and Wellington (i.e. Scenario 1) will adversely impact the road network with an overall 15% increase in total delay per vehicle with corresponding increases in vehicle emissions. Impacts in terms of volume to capacity ratios at some intersections on Cannon Street and John Street are projected to increase by 18%.

When compared to Scenario 1, the closure of King Street between James Street and John Street (Scenario 2) will have fewer negative impacts on traffic conditions in the downtown street network. However, several intersections on John Street and James Street will require signal timing adjustments with minor road improvements at key intersections, and total delay and emission would increase in the order of 8% to 18% for the Scenario 2 traffic operations.

Scenario 3 with the longer closure of King Street between James Street and Wellington Street has much larger impacts on network wide delay and travel times. Rush hour traffic volume may be reduced on Cannon Street due to the addition of westbound lanes on Wilson Street with the two-way conversion. However, addition of westbound lanes on Wilson Street will increase the total network wide travel times and delays.

**Overall Evaluation**

Based on the above analysis, the options are evaluated as shown on Exhibit 8-5 below. As noted previously, Gore Park has been identified as a cultural heritage landscape, and neither the transportation assessment nor the development of urban design options has involved relevant stakeholders. The evaluation here is intended to highlight the advantages and disadvantages of closure options from a technical perspective.
Exhibit 8-5: Evaluation of Closures of King Street – Technical Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact of King Street Closure (1)</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Cycling</td>
<td>- Reduced traffic noise and visual presence of cars</td>
<td>- At times the closed street may have few pedestrians and feel vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>- Closure would likely be complemented with investments in</td>
<td>- Under full pedestrian option, cyclists may be delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street furniture, landscaping and other pedestrian and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cycling amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>- Street closure may be stimulus for investment in Downtown</td>
<td>- Businesses that depend on automobile traffic and parking will be affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrian traffic will increase</td>
<td>- Will take time to build pedestrian levels necessary to support business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Vehicle</td>
<td>- Reduced pedestrian-vehicle conflicts in closed sections</td>
<td>- Adjacent streets will become busier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Diversions from King Street will result in more “turning” traffic movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and may increase potential for collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Level of Service</td>
<td>- Rapid transit could be a key feature of King Street</td>
<td>- Transit running times will be affected at transition points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduced level of private vehicle service will make transit</td>
<td>- North-south transit times may increase as a result of east-west traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more attractive</td>
<td>congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Level of Service</td>
<td>- Could serve to shift longer distance vehicle trips to</td>
<td>- Delays on parallel streets and at transition points will be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transit, with widespread improvements in level of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For this evaluation, a King Street closure is assumed to be any closure that would restrict vehicle capacity on King Street in favour of pedestrians. The degree of advantages and disadvantages would depend on the length, time period and operational rules for the closure.

8.1.3 SUMMARY

Detailed traffic modelling was undertaken to estimate the impacts of closing King Street. Assuming current travel behaviour:

- All alternatives result in increased vehicle travel times, decreased speeds and increased emissions.
- A scenario with King Street closed between James Street and John Street has the least negative traffic impacts in the east-west direction.
- It currently takes approximately 5 minutes to drive from Wellington to Bay Street on King Street in the rush hour. This same trip may take 2-3 minutes longer via Cannon Street under the King Street closure scenarios.
- Overall, fuel use for travel in the analysis area is expected to increase by up to 15% as a result of congestion.

All of these impacts would be reduced if some drivers shift to other modes (i.e. transit, bicycle, walking) or making the trip outside of the peak periods. The planned rapid transit network will facilitate this shift.
8.2 Next Steps for Gore Park

From a pure traffic perspective, the option that has the least negative impacts would be to keep King Street open. However, there are several other combinations that could be considered to improve the pedestrian environment while maintaining a reasonable level of service for both private vehicles and transit. For example, closing the south leg of King Street is unlikely to have significant impacts on east-west traffic flow. Of the options involving the closure of the North Leg of King Street, closing (or restricting) only the portion of King Street between James Street and John Street would have the least traffic impacts while allowing for the pedestrianization of Gore Park in the area of most significance.

Ultimately, any closure of King Street must be approached cautiously to avoid significant negative impacts to businesses and transportation accessibility. Designing a great street will require thoughtful coordination with other planning initiatives and considerable involvement from citizens, local retailers, the City, and other stakeholders, particularly children. Changes to any existing streets will inevitably be very disruptive, but if the process is done effectively, it can provide an opportunity for meaningful civic engagement provided a clear framework for communication is established early. It will take time and hard work, but the results will be longer lasting. A potential strategy for moving forward with pedestrian improvements to Gore Park/King Street might be as follows:

8.2.1 PLANNING / PREPARATION

- Articulate a clear vision for Gore Park that will provide a framework for strong leadership and creative communication that is free to challenge existing conventions while reflecting local culture and values.

- Finalize the rapid transit feasibility studies to move forward in coordinating Gore Park re-design initiatives with these results.

- Finalize the transit terminal options to begin the process of rationalizing bus traffic around Gore Park and open the possibility for a Gore Park pedestrianization project to link with the MacNab Street and Hunter Street transit terminals.

8.2.2 FIRST STEPS

- Pilot test varying degrees of temporary street closures on weekends and for special events to explore public opinions under these conditions, the traffic impacts of the closure, and generate public interest.

- Implement the necessary changes to relevant zoning by-laws, city regulations, and planning policy to enable supportive land use and programming.

- Establish an online forum for announcing project updates and upcoming events as well as facilitating a creative exchange of ideas amongst interested parties.

- Identify and refine viable design options for the space, based on site constraints, followed by a series of Gore Park design charrettes to further build public interest and provide space for public involvement in refining the alternatives and settling on final design options.
9. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Public consultation for this project included public information centres, supplemented by interviews and surveys of selected stakeholders.

9.1 Public Information Centres

In accordance with EA requirements, a public information centre (PIC) was held on October 3, 2007 to present the findings of the five year review and to receive feedback on the conclusions and recommendations. Additional issues such as the potential pedestrianization of Gore Park were raised just prior to the October 3 PIC, and could not be addressed adequately at that PIC. Accordingly, a second PIC was held on March 18, 2008 to present the technically preferred plan and present alternatives for Gore Park. A summary of the feedback received at each of the PICs is contained in the sections below.

9.1.1 PIC #1

The information presented at the October 3, 2007 PIC, and the comments received from the public are contained in Appendix C. A summary of the PIC is included below.

Several alternative solutions were presented at the October 3, 2007 PIC:

- York Boulevard two-way conversion;
- King Street two-way conversion;
- Hunter Street bicycle lanes;
- Caroline Street bicycle lane extension;
- Pedestrian network improvements;
- Cycling network improvements; and
- Transit network improvements.

A summary of some of the key comments received after the PIC is included below:

- General support for two-way conversions;
- Desire for bicycle lanes and transit improvements;
- Desire to keep momentum and/or increase pace of changes;
- Desire for rapid transit on King or Main;
- Desire to make changes on Cannon Street; and
- Need to improve conditions for pedestrians on Main Street.
9.1.2 PIC #2

The March 18, 2008 PIC was attended by approximately 150 people, and contained recommendations for the outstanding projects. The information presented at the PIC, and the comments received from the public, are attached in Appendix D. A summary of the key comments received is included below.

- Mixed opinions on the desirability of converting York Boulevard to two-way traffic with those in favour citing reasons of improving the pedestrian environment and slowing traffic and those against citing reasons relating to traffic safety and the need to keep traffic in the downtown flowing at a reasonable pace;

- Concerns that Cannon Street will remain a thoroughfare for traffic and trucks, and that proposals for Gore Park and King Street may exacerbate problems;

- Limited consensus on options for King Street with suggestions ranging from Do Nothing to converting King Street to two-way for its entire length;

- General support for proposed two-way conversions on secondary streets and recognition that this will slow traffic;

- General support for pedestrian improvements;

- Strong support for bike lanes, and suggestions to separate bike lanes from traffic lanes;

- No major concerns about closing the south leg of King Street to traffic, but some people stated that this should be a complete closure and parked cars should not be allowed;

- Varying opinions on the desirability of closing both legs of King Street, with those in favour stating that transit and cycling access must be retained; and,

- Support for weekend closures;

- Recognition that options for Gore Park must be part of a larger plan to change surrounding land uses.

Compared to the first PIC, there were several people who attended the meeting or provided follow-up comments in opposition to the two-way conversions. However, many of these comments were based on concerns about slower travel times for trips “through” the downtown.

9.2 Selected Stakeholder Consultation

In addition to the formal PIC, two additional methods were used to engage/inform stakeholders during the study:

- In person interviews with selected business owners: IBI Group staff conducted interviews with selected businesses on James Street and John Street to obtain a snapshot of perspectives on changes to the transportation system that have been implemented since 2001 as well as general thoughts on current transportation issues. Interviews were carried out on foot, using a clipboard type approach. Businesses were selected at random, but with a focus on gathering information from a cross-section of businesses (e.g. small retailer, restaurant, office, personal services store, etc.). The results of the survey were described earlier in Section 4.4 of this report.
• A survey was sent out by email to Downtown BIA representatives on transportation and parking issues and needs. Limited responses were received as described in Section 4.5.

Consultation with key stakeholders affected by the two-way conversion of James and John Streets was also carried out and was described earlier in Section 4.5 of this report.
10. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the five-year review of the Master Plan, the following outstanding projects are recommended for implementation (See Exhibit 10.1).

Recommended for design and implementation as soon as budget allows:

Two-way conversions:

- York Boulevard/Wilson Street two-way conversion
- Park Street two-way conversion
- MacNab Street two-way conversion
- Hughson Street two-way conversion
- Hess Street two-way conversion
- King William two-way conversion
- Rebecca two-way conversion

Pedestrian improvements:

- Jackson Street
- Queen Street
- Catharine Street
- Mary Street
- George Street
- Gore Park (King Street South Leg)

Cycling improvements:

- Hunter Street bicycle lanes (dedicated lanes)
- York Boulevard bicycle lanes (dedicated/shared lanes)

Implement pending outcome of Rapid Transit and Gore Park studies:

- King Street two-way conversion
- Main Street pedestrian improvements

Projects not included in original Master Plan to be implemented:

- Caroline Street two-way conversion
- Gore Park Pedestrianization Pilot projects – proceed with more detailed urban design studies and potential weekend closures (pilot projects)

It is recommended that the two-way conversion of Bay Street in the study area not proceed at this time. This project should only be considered if monitoring after two-way conversion of York Boulevard indicates benefits would result from conversion of Bay Street.
Exhibit 10.1: Recommended Transportation Network Plan (2008)
11. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

11.1 Status of Projects under Class EA

The Class EA includes a framework to assist proponents in understanding the status of various projects. Projects are categorized into Schedules A, A+, B, and C with reference to their magnitude of environmental impact, Schedule 'A' projects having the least impact and Schedule 'C' projects having the most impact.

As per the Class EA, projects identified as Schedule 'A' are typically minor in scope and are automatically approved. For example, all interim road resurfacing projects and reconstruction projects retaining the existing number of lanes are Schedule 'A' projects. Similarly, schedule A+ projects are pre-approved, however, the public is to be advised prior to project implementation.

All Schedule 'B' projects will be approved for construction following a minimum 30-day public review of this Master Plan (assuming there are no issues that can not be resolved).

Schedule 'C' projects need to fulfill the additional requirements of Phases 3, 4, and 5 and require consideration of site specific issues that are beyond the scope of this study. None of the projects in the Master Plan are considered to be Schedule 'C' projects.

Prior to 2007, most of the projects recommended by the Master Plan were Schedule B projects. However, revisions to the EA process have classified the following types of projects as A+ projects:

- Full and Partial road closures
- Two-way conversions
- Bike lanes in road right-of-way

Traffic calming is now exempt from the EA process.

11.2 Implementation Schedule

Exhibit 11-1 shows the proposed implementation schedule for the outstanding recommendations of the 2001 Master Plan and proposed additional projects. Also shown are the Environmental Assessment requirements for each project.

The schedule is based on proceeding with the two-way conversion of York Boulevard following a period of detailed design to identify and address access and other issues that may result from the two-way conversion. Depending on the outcome of the Rapid Transit and Gore Park pedestrianization studies, detailed design of a two-way conversion (if still deemed to be feasible following those studies) could follow in 2010. In the meantime, detailed design of secondary street conversions on Park, MacNab, Hughson and Hess could begin.

Pedestrian and cycling improvements are largely unaffected by the Rapid Transit and Gore Park studies (with the exception of projects on King Street and Main Street) and should proceed as soon as budget allows.
Exhibit 11-1: Proposed Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Estimated Start Year of Implementation</th>
<th>EA Schedule</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Road Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York/Wilson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>In conjunction with Farmers’ Market Precinct Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Pending Rapid Transit Feasibility Study Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Subject to further monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacNab Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street Conversion</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Two-way conversion costs no longer required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion (Main to King)*</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>New project not included in Capital Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Streetscaping</td>
<td>Can implement**</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td>Streetscaping projects not part of another project and &gt;$2.2 million fall under Schedule B; typically streetscaping projects are done in conjunction with other roadworks or underground servicing improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street South Leg Closure</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Contra-flow lane*</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td>Could be A+ if no road widening required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Terminals at MacNab and Hunter</td>
<td>Pending EA approval***</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore Park Pedestrianization (Full)</td>
<td>Proceed to further study/pilot projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Streetscaping projects &gt;$2.2 million fall under Schedule B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Caroline Street subsequently converted to two-way, contraflow lane no longer required/feasible
** Subject to and in conjunction with Farmers Market Precinct Project
*** As part of separate study
APPENDIX A

EXPLORING CONCEPTS FOR GORE PARK AND REVIEWING EXPERIENCES FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS
ADDRESSING THE PEDESTRIAN REALM AT GORE PARK

“Several poor cities such as Barcelona, Lyon and Copenhagen have used the strategy of improving public spaces as a way to give spirit and civic pride to its citizens and ‘brand’ the city internationally”

(Jan Gehl, quoted in the Ottawa Citizen - Cook, 2008, p. A5)

The purpose of this supplemental exercise was to start a discussion on the potential options for Gore Park, largely to give a context to the examination of physical closure options. Materials in this section are to be considered preliminary, as Gore Park has been identified as a cultural heritage landscape, and neither the transportation assessment nor the development of urban design options has involved relevant stakeholders. Gore Park is considered to be of cultural heritage value and any interest and any future plans, developments or alternations for this area should recognize the conservation of this heritage property as a key guiding principle.

The possibility of potentially closing King Street to traffic through Gore Park offers interesting opportunities for the revitalization of Hamilton’s downtown core, but also entails several constraints, which are discussed toward the end of this section.

Presently, Gore Park sits beside four lanes of fast moving, heavy, and noisy vehicle traffic which bisect the park from retail uses along the north side of King Street. A fence running the length of the park’s northern edge further reinforces this division. The northern leg of King also handles most of the area’s bus and pedestrian traffic. Not surprisingly, it is also home to the busier retail shops. There is considerably less pedestrian traffic on King Street’s southern leg, which also sees significantly more shade not only because it is north facing, but also due to a taller built form. Most pedestrians in this area are idly waiting for buses. This southern leg also handles very little vehicle traffic, thus it does not pose a significant barrier for pedestrians. Some of the more prominent constraints and opportunities for the site are summarized in Exhibit A.1.
Exhibit A.1 – Summary of the constraints and opportunities in pedestrianizing Gore Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gore Park is an important symbolic location to the City. It cannot be completely re-written and, in particular, the pre-existing mature trees, monuments, and memorials will have to be incorporated into the new design.</td>
<td>Although Gore Park has suffered in recent years, the area is still holds significant potential to meet the needs of a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Amplifying and expanding the park’s assets beyond its current boundaries may be the preferred option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRAINTS</td>
<td>OPPORTUNITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is quite wide and unlikely to function as a typical pedestrian street, but rather more like a public square or piazza.</td>
<td>With careful programming and design Gore Park itself could provide an important intermediary link between the opposite retail strips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many buildings adjacent to the site (and some inside the site itself) are currently unoccupied. At night, there are few activities in the area and without many retail stores on adjacent streets, lighting is poor and the streets relatively devoid of people, making it feel somewhat unsafe.</td>
<td>With the lack of development pressures, the area's beautiful architecture remains and offers tremendous potential for revitalizing the core as a historic centre, provided the buildings can be reused. Such a re-marketing of the city centre and possibly an important tourist destination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Constraints

- The park is not well anchored, with very few grand or symbolic pedestrian-friendly land uses on either end.

### Opportunities

- Beyond transit, Hamilton City Centre generates significant pedestrian activity and could serve as important anchors for Gore Park provided they are well connected to it. As well, there is tremendous potential for infill development and historic preservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The park is not well anchored, with very few grand or symbolic pedestrian-friendly land uses on either end.</td>
<td>Beyond transit, Hamilton City Centre generates significant pedestrian activity and could serve as important anchors for Gore Park provided they are well connected to it. As well, there is tremendous potential for infill development and historic preservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of the new transit hub can have a dramatic impact on the feasibility of pedestrianizing Gore Park.

The area is full of bus stops and with the potential for a new transit hub and rapid transit corridor nearby, transit can continue to play a major role in generating pedestrian activity in the park, particularly after dark.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are considerable densities immediately adjacent to the park, but</td>
<td>The dense pre-existing office uses guarantee busy daytime pedestrian activity and parking lots provide excellent opportunities for development of other land uses, particularly residential, should property and rental values rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most are only daytime uses and beyond these taller buildings there are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many cheap surface parking lots, which will make it difficult to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage alternative modes of transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are very few downtown parks and recreational spaces for Gore Park</td>
<td>The lack of recreational space downtown can be seen as further justification for the importance of expanding Gore Park to provide much needed downtown space for recreational activities which would hopefully encourage further such public investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to connect with. Gore Park is also in Ward 2 which is the second most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deficient ward for Neighbourhood and Community Parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no bike lanes in the area and only four usable bike parking posts in the park, making cycling an unrealistic alternative. In conjunction with initiatives to improve the pedestrian realm, it would not take much to improve support for cycling and thus diversify the viable alternatives to automobile travel to and from this central location. Work on a Cycling Master Plan will start this spring.

Being at the heart of Hamilton, any changes to Gore Park will require careful consideration of all available options and close public involvement.

Exploring the Options for Gore Park

In reaction to the increasing popularity of shopping centres in the 1960s and 1970s, and the resulting loss of market share for downtown retailers, many mid-sized North American cities attempted to revitalize their urban centres through pedestrianization projects. The contemporary justification for improving the pedestrian realm is more likely rooted in arguments for sustainable transportation, where a pedestrian mall might play a broader symbolic and political role aimed at transforming a city’s image and catalyzing a city-wide shift in public policy. Whatever the justification, any effort to expand the pedestrian realm will inevitably reduce the role of the street as a corridor for movement that mostly addresses the needs of vehicles and expand its role as a public place, where all types of people can more comfortably, safely and conveniently walk, sit, relax, shop, or enjoy a patio beer with friends. In other words, less concern for facilitating mobility and more interest in facilitating a location’s identity and meaning. These two approaches are often in conflict, but this dichotomy ought not to undervalue the complexity of the issue and the diversity of potential approaches.

Pedestrianization is not a black and white issue as there can be a wide variety in designs, never mind the differences in physical, political, economic, cultural, and social contexts such a project can operate within. Some designs, such as transit malls, might still allow transit vehicles or taxis while others might only support temporary closures, such as during summer months or during working hours. The specific pedestrian amenities can also vary widely, which, as shown by William H. Whyte (1980), can have a dramatic impact on the quality of public space. In terms of construction costs alone, pedestrianization projects in North America have varied by as much as $1 to $6 million per block (see Exhibit A.2).¹

¹ Based on Rubenstein’s (1992) 24 case studies, with the construction costs converted to 2007 dollars based on inflation.
Pedestrian Malls & Transit Malls / Car-Free Zones

A pedestrian mall is totally closed off to traffic, whereas a transit mall would permit bus, light rail, or taxi access. Both are car-free. The typical pedestrian amenities added to such spaces might include special paving stones & patterns, street trees, fountains, pedestrian-scale lighting, street furniture, public art, seating, clocks, kiosks, and restaurant patios. Pedestrian malls are well established across Europe, sometimes covering entire city centres, and they even enjoy relative success in Australia, but there remain only scattered examples in North America.
It is challenging to analyze the North American pedestrian mall successes and failures due to a broad confluence of economic, social and cultural influences. As mentioned, the 1960s and 1970s saw a rising popularity in shopping centres that occurred in conjunction with growing auto-dependence and “white flight”, which brought increasing abandonment and blight to North American inner-city neighbourhoods, particularly in the U.S. The reaction of many mid-sized municipalities was to push for pedestrianization of their main retail streets in an attempt to revitalize their downtowns and compete with shopping centres by essentially mimicking their safe pedestrian environments. The philosophy behind these initial projects (e.g. Fresno, CA) was to ban as much vehicle traffic as possible and complement this with enhanced landscaping.

In the majority of such North American projects, however, they do not appear to have been the catalysts of change that was hoped for. Many point to the geometry of typical North American streets as being ill-suited for pedestrian activity.

While dense European cities with narrow streets could successfully implement pedestrian streets, most U.S. shopping streets are too wide to result in a comfortably scaled space and lack a vital urban context to support them. … slow-moving local traffic in fact contributed a degree of life and convenience to the street. (Southworth, 2005, p. 163)

Even in the U.S., the world’s most auto-orientated nation, most pedestrian malls do increase the amount of pedestrian traffic, however, they still often lack the density of pedestrians to support local retail (Rubenstein, 1992). Exhibit A.6 plainly illustrates the change in pedestrian density that a simple doubling of the street width might represent.
It is difficult to say what would have happened to these streets had they not been pedestrianized. For those pedestrian malls that did not survive, would the economic decline have been even sharper given that most were already in fading downtown centres? A broad analysis by Rubenstein in 1992 provides many accounts of pedestrian and transit malls still in existence at the time of publication, which informs much of this report. Following Rubenstein’s publication, however, the predominant trends have taken a turn, with the popularity of shopping centres now apparently in decline and gentrification turning the demographics of many historic North American city centres on their head. Thus Rubenstein’s assessments of economic success may be out of sync with the current reality. Nevertheless, interesting lessons can be learned from these experiences in other cities.

Examining evidence from Germany and the U.K., Hass-Klau (1993) concludes that across the board there tends to be a difficult 1-2 year transition period where trade may drop slightly as residents and retailers adapt to their new context. The effects of pedestrianization projects are generally positive and market rents tend to rise, with the most successful retail shops being those inside the project’s boundaries, while shops on the fringe can sometimes end up worse off. Although even in the U.K. and Germany retailers initially resist implementing pedestrianization and traffic calming, Hass-Klau’s experience suggests that they rarely campaign for the removal of such treatments and are usually the first to suggest its expansion. It would appear the North American experience is somewhat different in this regard. Hass-Klau also points out that pedestrian malls can result in a 20-40% increase in pedestrian traffic, but how much spending they bring to the area is more difficult to analyze (Hass-Klau, 1993).

Since the initial flurry of pedestrian mall installations in the 1960s and 1970s, pedestrianization efforts are now more commonly in the form of transit malls, which generally have a slightly better track record than pure pedestrian malls (Rubenstein, 1992). A transit corridor is said to give a pedestrian mall its spine, which can help to bring more people to the area. In both cases, the more successful pedestrian and transit malls tend to be those where there is a pre-existing diverse mix of uses with offices or university/college students nearby. Exploring feasibility beyond these simple

---

Exhibit A.6: The pedestrian density effects of doubling street width

It is difficult to say what would have happened to these streets had they not been pedestrianized. For those pedestrian malls that did not survive, would the economic decline have been even sharper given that most were already in fading downtown centres? A broad analysis by Rubenstein in 1992 provides many accounts of pedestrian and transit malls still in existence at the time of publication, which informs much of this report. Following Rubenstein’s publication, however, the predominant trends have taken a turn, with the popularity of shopping centres now apparently in decline and gentrification turning the demographics of many historic North American city centres on their head. Thus Rubenstein’s assessments of economic success may be out of sync with the current reality. Nevertheless, interesting lessons can be learned from these experiences in other cities.

Examining evidence from Germany and the U.K., Hass-Klau (1993) concludes that across the board there tends to be a difficult 1-2 year transition period where trade may drop slightly as residents and retailers adapt to their new context. The effects of pedestrianization projects are generally positive and market rents tend to rise, with the most successful retail shops being those inside the project’s boundaries, while shops on the fringe can sometimes end up worse off. Although even in the U.K. and Germany retailers initially resist implementing pedestrianization and traffic calming, Hass-Klau’s experience suggests that they rarely campaign for the removal of such treatments and are usually the first to suggest its expansion. It would appear the North American experience is somewhat different in this regard. Hass-Klau also points out that pedestrian malls can result in a 20-40% increase in pedestrian traffic, but how much spending they bring to the area is more difficult to analyze (Hass-Klau, 1993).

Since the initial flurry of pedestrian mall installations in the 1960s and 1970s, pedestrianization efforts are now more commonly in the form of transit malls, which generally have a slightly better track record than pure pedestrian malls (Rubenstein, 1992). A transit corridor is said to give a pedestrian mall its spine, which can help to bring more people to the area. In both cases, the more successful pedestrian and transit malls tend to be those where there is a pre-existing diverse mix of uses with offices or university/college students nearby. Exploring feasibility beyond these simple

---

generalizations can be very complicated, requiring careful consideration of many factors including the availability of parking and funding, zoning constraints, prevailing driving culture, transit provision, existing nearby land uses, pre-existing pedestrian circulation patterns, public support, catchment area market analysis, costs, etc. (Rubenstein, 1992). A good place to start is by looking at the experiences of others.

16th Street Mall – Denver, CO

- Year Completed: 1982
- Type: Transit Mall
- Length: 16 blocks (approx. 1300m)
- Right-of-way width: 24m
- Cost of Construction: $65.4 million (in 2007 dollars)
- Cost per km: $50 million (in 2007 dollars)
- Overhaul/Extension(s): 2002

As was often the case, interest in pedestrianizing Denver’s 16th Street, a 24m right-of-way, grew from the downtown retailers’ struggle to compete with the growing popularity of suburban shopping centres. By the 1970s, the street had a number of “dead spots” and some deteriorating store fronts, which prompted several studies. Prior to the pedestrianization, the area catered primarily to office uses and their corresponding ancillary retail, thus there was very little activity outside of the regular 9 to 5 working hours. Given the length of the retail strip and the City’s need to relieve downtown bus congestion, the municipality chose to include a free shuttle service running the length of the new transit mall, with transfer stations at either end, rather than completely barring all motorized traffic. Now, the street enjoys a more diverse mix of land uses, including residential, which has meant there is more street activity throughout the day. This is particularly true around the street’s many tourist destinations. Daily maintenance and cleaning is funded by the downtown Business Improvement District, who also recently funded the installation of WiFi to service the area. According to Rubenstein (1992), local business leaders credit the mall for many recent mixed-use developments. The success of the street prompted a 4 block extension in 2001-2002 to connect with nearby Union Station.
Sparks Street, Ottawa

Year Completed: 1967  
Type: Pedestrian Mall  
Length: 3 blocks (approx. 900m)  
Right-of-way width: 18m  
Cost of Construction: $4.0 million (in 2007 dollars)  
Cost per km: $4.5 million (in 2007 dollars)  
Overhaul/Extension: Late 1980s & six-year renovation presently in the works

The implementation of the Sparks Street pedestrian mall came on the heels of the removal of the street’s streetcar line in 1959. During the summer of 1960, the City implemented a temporary mall on Sparks Street to test the idea. After three successful summers, the concept had public support and City Hall, also motivated by declining property tax revenues, included the full pedestrianization project in its 1965-1966 capital budget.

The street is centrally located and connects with Confederation Square to the east but has no anchor to the west, although Parliament Hill is only one block to the north and the World Exchange Plaza two blocks to the south. The lack of a good anchor was recently identified as one of the street’s key weaknesses (Price Waterhouse Coopers, 2003). Sparks Street includes the usual pedestrian amenities such as fountains, sculptures, kiosks, lighting, planters and seating areas, although the tree canopy is sparse. Given the street’s central location in Ottawa, it is not surprising that it would be home to several heritage buildings and has become an important tourist attraction. Although property taxes on Rideau are among the highest in Ottawa and assessed rental values have also increased, the street has only been moderately successful at attracting activity throughout the day, with its busiest hours during lunch time as it caters to public sector employees who comprise approximately 50% of the street’s pedestrians (Price Waterhouse Coopers, 2003). Outside of business hours, the street can be rather vacant. In the 1970s, the federal government began purchasing significant amounts of property along the street, which some feel is a major contributor to the street’s difficulties: short-term leases discourage merchants from investing in the street, some buildings are closed to the public due to security concerns, tall office buildings block sunlight, and ground floors without retail or restaurant uses create several “dead spaces” along the street. Despite its problems, in a recent survey a resounding 90% of visitors to Sparks Street indicated that they wished for it to remain pedestrian-only. Determining how to attract pedestrians to the street throughout the day, without turning it into a theme park, is one of the central issues of an upcoming six-year renovation plan. Some preliminary ideas include installing a library, a YMCA, or space for one of the local universities or community colleges. The lack of nearby residential uses is also a problem, but there have been initiatives to improve downtown residential densities such as through the LeBreton Flats development. It remains to be seen how successful these recent revitalization efforts will be. (Cook, 2008)
Granville Street – Vancouver, BC

Year Completed: 1974 (Phase 1), 1976 (Phase 2)
Type: Transit Mall
Length: 6 blocks (approx. 930m)
Right-of-way width: 25m
Cost of Construction: $13.6 million (in 2007 dollars)
Cost per km: $14.6 million (in 2007 dollars)

As with the setting of most pedestrianization projects of the era, Granville street was once a vibrant commercial strip with theatres, banks, miscellaneous shops and department stores. By the 1960s, the street was rapidly deteriorating and increasingly abandoned. Thus pedestrianizing the street grew from an interest in revitalizing the area and local merchants petitioning the City to that effect.

Prior to becoming a transit mall, Granville Street was accommodating 1200 vehicles per hour over 6 traffic lanes. Now the street is only open to buses and taxis, with sidewalks reaching up to 10.5 meters. The project also entailed significant zoning and regulation changes. To limit the dead space often associated with non-retail uses, banks, for example, were limited to 25 feet of frontage along Granville. Massage parlours were also controlled by designating them conditional use areas which thus must be approved by the development permit board. The city prepared guidelines to encourage sidewalk cafes and street vendor kiosks were installed while their corresponding permits were issued with particular attention to encouraging variety.

Economically, the Granville transit mall has been moderately successful. Business tax revenue and rental values did increase immediately following construction and the block that was experiencing the most decay saw rental values increase as high as 50% (on par with some of the downtown’s more prestigious blocks). However, from 1987 to 1992 increases in property and rental values were modest, with little change in retail sales. In 1988, vehicle traffic was again permitted in the southeastern most block.

More recently, the street’s character has begun to change rapidly. With Vancouver hosting the upcoming 2010 Olympics, the area’s regional transportation body is installing a new Skytrain station underneath the transit mall. The construction work has resulted in all traffic being banned from 3 of the street’s 6 blocks, but the remaining three are now open to all vehicles. This project is being coordinated with the City’s plans to redesign the mall in time for the Olympics. The street, famous for its gritty character, is becoming home to a number of night clubs and is developing an unfortunate association with recent violence.
Main Street Mall, Charlottesville, Virginia

Year Completed: 1974  
Type: Pedestrian Mall  
Length: 8 blocks (approx. 490m)  
Right-of-way width: 19.5m  
Cost of Construction: $9.2 million (in 2007 dollars)  
Cost per km: $26.4 million (in 2007 dollars)  
Overhaul/Extension: 1980, 1985

In the interest of protecting its tax base in the CBD, the Town of Charlottesville took on the controversial project of designing a pedestrian mall along Main Street, where it was anchored by an open space plaza to the west and City Hall’s plaza to the east. Through public consultation the Town developed a set of core goals which aspired to revitalize the area’s historic character, that amenities must at least meet shopping centre standards, to include cultural and recreational features (sculpture, music, theatre, etc), and to institute design control and review provisions.

Several of the typical pedestrian amenities were added to the streetscape including lighting, fountains, kiosks, and plantings. Particularly interesting was the addition of moveable benches. Furthermore, pedestrian improvements to the street design were also extended into 12 side streets. The space along the street was organized into a “series of outdoor rooms”, delineated by trees, which de-emphasized its linear quality and these spaces provide room for an important variety of activities. Recently an indoor skating rink, theatre multiplex, and new coffee houses and art galleries were added to the list of recreational activities available along the street.

This project is considered to be one of the more successful in North America. Since installation, retail sales, property values, and assessed rental value have all increased and many new businesses have located downtown. Approximately $13 million in private renovation took place from 1976 to 1982, believed to be the result of the town’s investment in pedestrianizing Main Street. It appears that, from more recent informal accounts, the street’s success continues.
Main Street, Buffalo, NY

Year Completed: 1986
Type: Transit Mall
Length: 9 blocks (approx. 1900m)
Right-of-way width: 27m
Cost of Construction: $78.3 million (in 2007 dollars)
Cost per km: $40.6 million (in 2007 dollars)

Buffalo’s main street was always home to dense pedestrian activity. The idea of pedestrianizing the street had been around for a long time and when a proposal for a light rail demonstration project surfaced, the two ideas were married and construction began in the early 1980s.

Results to date have been mixed. The street’s transit service has done an excellent job of providing the much needed capacity for a dense downtown and it is well suited for CBD’s linear bias. The street serves as a major draw for nearby office workers, but maintaining high levels of activity into the evenings, and on weekends and holidays has been a challenge. The street’s large 27m right-of-way requires huge amounts of pedestrian activity in order to achieve the necessary critical mass and feels empty during off-peak hours. The street has worked well for special events such as the Taste of Buffalo, but such events do not require that the street be permanently pedestrianized.

From 1987 to 2001, private property values and retail space declined by 48% and 47% respectively, resulting in underutilized ground floors. In 2001, downtown retail employment is half what it was in 1998 and vacancies are up by 27% since 1987.

The mall and rail trackbed are due for repair, which has prompted the City to open the debate of allowing cars access to the street given its difficulties.
Pedestrian/Transit Mall Options for Gore Park

Based on the above case studies, the following options for Gore Park could be considered.

- Through trip motorized vehicles are not permitted but delivery vehicles can access the space during restricted hours. A transit corridor passes through the northern edge but all idle time is spent off the site. Parking may or may not be permitted on the south leg.
- Gore Park’s existing trees are kept, but more are added to expand the park’s boundaries.
- The central area is dedicated to passive activity with kiosks, movable seating, cafes, and space for event programming. This new space for activities both preserves and frames the existing iconic monuments and fountain.
- The existing sidewalks adjacent to retail are removed and use the same new paving as the rest of the space. These, now wider, linear corridors still support most east/west movement.

Temporary Closures

In some cases, temporary street closures may be the preferred option. They at least provide a means for trying out street closures in terms of traffic impact and general public interest, which, if they work well, can help to build public and retailer support. However, the more long-term goals of pedestrianization will remain elusive, such as encouraging development, improved identity and changes in travel behaviour.

Pedestrian Sundays in Kensington Market, Toronto

In 2004, local residents and community groups called on the City of Toronto to ban vehicle traffic from the bustling Kensington Market. The city agreed to allow closures over a summer trial period of seven consecutive Sundays. Since then the street closures have continued every summer, one Sunday per month, and community groups have in fact relented on pressuring the City to pedestrianize the space for fear of accelerating gentrification of the area.

Although programming the closures is mostly coordinated by a community group, P.S. Kensington, street activities (such as electric sitar playing and salsa workshops) have a uniquely informal and unpolished flavour, characteristic of the neighbourhood.

The program has been so successful that other business districts, namely Baldwin St. and Mirvish Village, organized their own Pedestrian Sundays in 2007 with the help of P.S. Kensington.
Shared Space

The concept of shared road space dates back to a 1963 English report, *Traffic in Towns*, by Sir Colin Buchanan. The U.K.’s Ministry of Transportation assigned Buchanan the task of “improving urban transport”, which the ministry felt ought to entail providing efficient traffic flow while preserving existing architecture (Ben-Joseph, 1995, p. 505). To deal with this conundrum, Buchanan’s team came up with the novel idea of quantifying a road’s “environmental capacity” based on measures of noise, pollution, social activity, pedestrianization, and visual aesthetics. By allowing these capacities to determine road standards, Britain was turning conventional wisdom on its head, which had always operated the other way around. Despite Buchanan being well known for insisting pedestrians and motorists ought to be separated, this report led to the notion that certain environmental capacities could safely permit mixed use of road space. The report was not initially well received by the British Government but did, however, inspire adoption of such ideas in Europe (Ben-Joseph, 1995).

In the late 1960s, Nick de Boer and his student Joost Váhl began promoting an alternative approach to road design in the Netherlands. It embraced the possibility of both motorists and pedestrians sharing space, but only on protected residential streets. The idea was coined Woonerf, meaning “living yard” in Dutch, and it represented a radical departure from the overriding priority ubiquitously granted to motorized vehicles during a period of increasing auto-dependence. Desperate for more child play areas, the low-income neighbourhoods of Delft saw the first implementation. Shortly after the Dutch legally endorsed the Woonerf in 1976, Germany, England, Sweden, Denmark, France, Japan, Israel, Switzerland and Spain followed suit. The Netherlands have been the fastest to embrace the concept and as of 1997 they had developed 6,500 official Woonerf schemes (Children’s Play Council, 1997 cited by Biddulph, 2003).

Although the British were among the early countries to legally embrace shared streets, the concept’s popularity has only recently blossomed in the U.K. Termed “Home Zones”, they were sanctioned by the British Government in 1992 through its revised Design Bulletin 32 where it stated that Home Zone schemes were “highly regarded by residents... [and] no accidents at all had been recorded on shared surface roads” (Department of the Environment & Department of Transport, 1992 cited by Biddulph, 2003). With the Labour Party’s heightened interest in transportation and the strong support of the Child Accident Prevention Trust, Transport 2000, and the Children’s Play Council (CPC), the British Government launched a £30 million Home Zone pilot program in 1997, which was expected to support 100 Home Zone schemes (Biddulph, 2003). As of April 2004, there were 60 such schemes either complete or under development (Hamilton-Baillie, 2004).3

As Biddulph illustrates in Exhibit A.21, some of the typical design elements of Woonerven or Home Zone streets include special surface treatments and patterns, a narrow carriageway with horizontal realignments, adjacent built form that reinforces entrancesways, bollards to prevent parking in certain areas, and street trees. Pedestrian-scale lighting, public art and street furniture are also common. Clear entrancesways marked with gateway elements or a change in the surface treatment are vital to signal to both drivers and pedestrians that their driving context has changed.

3 However, Biddulph notes that some of the pilots are just ad-hoc traffic calming schemes which boast “very few of the qualities that a Home Zone should contain” (Biddulph, 2003, p. 238).
The most striking feature of Woonerven is the intentional ambiguity of the boundaries between pedestrian, vehicle and cyclist space, which purports to naturally impart an elevated sense of responsibility on these users. Risk compensation theory is often cited in shared space literature because it implies that we will behave less cautiously where we perceive less risk (in other words, we adapt our behaviour when we perceive changes in risk). For example, Walker (2007) found that in the U.K., motorists drove an average of 3.35 inches closer to him when he wore a helmet compared to when he did not. Following the study, Walker also re-analyzed his data and found that 23% more vehicles passed him within the one meter “danger zone” when he wore a helmet (Swaminathan, 2007). London’s Department for Transport also reports on exponential increases in average vehicle speed with increasing road width or forward visibility (York, Bradbury, Reid, Ewings, & Paradise, 2007). This theory would also suggest that some minor accidents may be valuable as they reinforce risk perception and thus reduce the number of more serious accidents. Thus, there is an important dialectic where, on the one hand, as drivers are less able to perceive hazards, the potential for accidents increases, but on the other hand, drivers will react by slowing down and thus decrease required reaction times and potential accident severity. The question of determining the safest street design is not as straightforward as it may seem.

**Exhibit A.21: Biddulph’s rendition of the design elements of a home zone scheme. (Biddulph, 2003, p. 221)**
Donald Appleyard was a strong advocate for the kinds of traffic limiting designs seen in Woonerf streets. In his study, which looked at three San Francisco streets with distinct traffic loads (light, medium and heavy), he found that residents on light streets had more friends and two times as many acquaintances as those on heavy streets. More interesting and profound was his evidence for a negative correlation between traffic and sense of personal space. He hypothesized these were related as having fewer friends was the result of a shrunken home territory (exchange space) for social interaction (Appleyard, 1980).

Aside from traffic volume, a sharp reduction in vehicle speed is also of paramount importance to pedestrians safely sharing space with motorists. The British Department of Transport found that the risk of death when pedestrians are struck by vehicles rises from 5% for a vehicle travelling at 32km/h to 45% at 48km/h and 85% at 64km/h (Surface Transportation Policy Project, 1997). There is also significant qualitative research suggesting that pedestrian and cyclist discomfort quickly rises adjacent to traffic traveling faster than 32km/h (Hamilton-Baillie, 2004). As a result, most Woonerf schemes depend on very low speed limits (usually 30km/h).

There remains surprisingly little peer-reviewed research on these shared streets. Perhaps because many of their benefits are challenging to quantify or perhaps such research exists, but has not yet been translated to English. An older 1981 survey of residents living on Woonerven streets suggests that 70 percent were satisfied and 25 percent disliked the design, with one of the biggest complaints being speeding mopeds (Bosselmann, 1991). Eubank-Ahrens’ (1987) basic study looks at two streets which were converted into Home Zones. The study concludes that residents, especially unsupervised children, spent more time in the converted street. This result is significantly stronger for the denser of the two neighbourhoods. She also notes behavioural changes: children’s play became more complex and more time was spent on vehicle maintenance by single adults. Although interesting, and not terribly surprising, Eubank-Ahrens’ research is only based on observation over a short period. She therefore cannot control for self-selection nor long-term changes in behaviour as residents grow accustomed to the Home Zone.

**Applicability to non-residential neighbourhoods**

In recent years, a contemporary spin on the Woonerf design principles has received substantial media attention. Not surprisingly, it too began in the Netherlands with the late Hans Monderman often credited as the concept’s pioneer. In an effort to improve safety at busy intersections in the province of Friesland, Monderman borrowed many of the Woonerf principles and applied them to busier thoroughfares. The most striking addition to the toolbox of design elements was the removal of all street signage and markings from these intersections. The media has taken to calling these designs "naked streets" for their significant reduction in clutter. Monderman argued that they were redundant and that if a street were properly designed then driver behaviour would respond to the social and physical context. In other words,

---

These reported results are suspect since Bosselmann also reported that 16 percent were indifferent. This adds up to 111 percent yet one would expect these three options to be mutually exclusive.
road signs and markings promote less engagement with the environment by encouraging drivers to ignore the background and focus on a well defined, simple, and consistent set of indicators for safe (more or less) travel. The theory suggests that removing traffic signs and markings tends to make a street no longer feel like a space designed for driving. The resulting ambiguity of priorities encourages drivers to engage with their surroundings and a heightened sense of caution is automatic. Removing a street’s centre-line, for example, has been shown to have significant effects on driving speeds and collision rates. Where there are other road users, eye contact and gestures become a primary means of negotiating movement through pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. The design’s ambiguity thus hinges on an informal legibility of the landscape. This approach to safe road design represents a radical departure from that of heavily regulating behaviour and is very much in keeping with the risk compensation theory embedded in the Woonerf design principles.

There are already many North American examples of spaces that exhibit many of the characteristics of a shared space: people often resolve ambiguity at four-way stops through eye contact, parking lots have minimal signage and markings but serious accidents are uncommon, and on many university campus streets pedestrians are informally understood to have priority. Hamilton’s own Hess Village is also good example, with George Street’s wall-to-wall brick paving, intimate lighting, and lack of curbs. The area’s archway also serves as an important gateway marking the entrance to a different type of street.

The point is not to calm traffic, but rather to emphasize “place”, which requires calming traffic. Slow speeds and forced interaction give time for one’s sense of place to absorb the landscape (in the phenomenological sense of landscape). Improved safety, efficiency and engagement of drivers are all inherent side effects of the larger goal of expanding and enhancing the social realm within streets. Hence measures of safety and efficiency are only a few of the tools needed to gauge the success of such a design – or any street design which aspires to do more than move vehicles. Since eye contact and body language are particularly important to the quality of public space, it appears that speed may be a factor in the quality of our urban environments beyond simple safety and accident reduction.
Much attention has been given to the redesign of an intersection called the Laweiplein in Drachten, Friesland, which was completed in 2003 and handles approximately 1,845 vehicles per hour during the afternoon peak period (Euser, 2006). Essentially, it is an unconventional roundabout that uses many of the shared space principles, although space is still somewhat demarcated. It has resulted in slower speeds but also dramatic reductions in accidents and wait times. Studies of other shared space projects anecdotally suggest that these new designs have improved overall efficiency of travel. Cars do not reach the speeds they used to, however, they rarely have to stop so wait times are reduced and average trip times may even decrease slightly. An analysis conducted before and after the redesign of Laweiplein also suggests that the local residents greatly appreciated the project’s improvements to the quality of space (Euser, 2006).

Similarly, many other examples of shared space streets that handle large volumes of traffic are in fact redesigns of intersections. For example, de Brinkgood in the Netherlands, Christiansfeld in Denmark, or Skvallertorget Square in Sweden. Main street redesigns, on the other hand, seem to often follow a sort of hybrid approach, such as London’s Kensington High Street, Haren Street in the Netherlands or Haderslev in Denmark. Beyond the Laweiplein, the small town of Drachten has many other interesting examples of shared space on its main streets (see images below).
Unfortunately, existing implementations of these ideas are young and thus it is too early to explore their long-term effects on place making. As many of these streets are in Scandinavia, language is also a barrier to sharing research. Generally it seems that the more clutter-free schemes are the most effective and the costs saved by not installing the traditional traffic engineering devices has allowed more resources to be devoted to higher quality and durable materials (Hamilton-Baillie & Jones, 2005).

Exhibit A.26: Oosterwolde, The Netherlands

Exhibit A.27: Haderslev, Denmark

Exhibit A.28: Norrköping, Sweden

Exhibit A.29: Lund city centre, Sweden
Shared Space Options for Gore Park

Based on the above case studies, the following options for Gore Park could be considered.

- All traffic signs and roadway markings are removed, as well as the curbs, with a relatively consistent surface treatment covering the entire right-of-way, possibility with interesting patterns.

- Gore Park’s existing trees are kept, but more are added to expand the boundaries of the park. Trees are added to Hughson to introduce pinch points, further encouraging traffic to slow down.

- Motorized vehicles are permitted, but a 30 km/h speed limit and the site design strongly discourage fast driving.

- King Street’s northern leg hosts a transit-priority corridor, with all vehicle parking space located in the southern leg.

- During special events, the area could be completely closed to traffic.
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APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS SURVEY
Company name:________________________________________________
Address:_____________________________ Date:_____________________
Person:______________________________ Phone:___________________

As you know, the City of Hamilton completed the conversion of James Street and John Street to two-way traffic, initially consisting of the north sections in Fall 2002, followed by the remaining southern sections in Fall 2005. The City is currently conducting a review of the Downtown Transportation network to review the impacts of previous changes, in order to decide on future changes.

We are conducting a random survey of businesses along James Street and John Street to get their feedback on transportation issues.

Do you mind if we ask you a few questions?

1) Has the introduction of two-way traffic on James Street and John Street affected access for customers arriving by car? If so, how?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

1a) Has two-way traffic affected the ability for customers to find parking on the street? If so, how?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
1b) Has access for couriers and other service vehicles been affected?

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

2) How has the two-way conversion affected the pedestrian environment? (probe questions: What about walking on the sidewalk? Is it easier or harder to cross the street?)

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

3) Do you think traffic speeds have changed with two-way traffic? Is this positive or negative? Please explain.

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

4) What is your perception of how traffic safety has changed?

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
5) Would you recommend that the City consider implementing two-way traffic on other major streets, namely King Street and York/Wilson Street? What advice do you have in guiding this implementation?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

6) Are there any major changes to the transportation system you would like to see implemented? (note: could be related to transit, walking, cycling, parking, etc.)

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

7) Are there any other comments you would like to provide?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

8) Do you mind if we contact you in the future if we have further questions?

______________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time.
BUSINESS SURVEY

METHOD

On Wednesday, July 18th and Friday, July 20th, 2007 selected businesses along James Street and John Street were interviewed to get feedback on downtown transportation issues and, in particular, reactions to the two-way conversion of these streets. The purpose of these interviews was to obtain a snapshot of perspectives on changes to the transportation system that have been implemented since 2001, as well as general thoughts on transportation issues. Overall, 26 businesses were surveyed in person, as listed in Exhibit 1. Businesses were selected randomly, but with a focus on gathering information from a cross-section of businesses types (e.g., small retailer, restaurant, personal services store, etc.) that had been in place, since before the two-way conversion.

Exhibit 1: Businesses Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James Street</th>
<th>John Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Linens and Gifts</td>
<td>Adam's Marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Jewellery</td>
<td>Botanica Floral Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Media</td>
<td>Embellish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenstern's</td>
<td>Go Physio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutri Source</td>
<td>House of Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricca's Furniture</td>
<td>Kohler's Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taj Mahal Grocery</td>
<td>Mercedes Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Orchid</td>
<td>Royal Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TD Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmasave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey consisted of nine questions as listed below:

- Has the introduction of two-way traffic on James Street and John Street affected access for customers arriving by car? If so, how?
- Has two-way traffic affected the ability for customers to find parking on the street? If so, how?
- Has access for couriers and other service vehicles been affected?
- How has the two-way conversion affected the pedestrian environment? (probe questions: What about walking on the sidewalk? Is it easier or harder to cross the street?)
- Do you think traffic speeds have changed with two-way traffic? Is this positive or negative? Please explain.
- What is your perception of how traffic safety has changed?
- Would you recommend that the City consider implementing two-way traffic on other major streets, namely King Street and York/Wilson Street? What advice do you have in guiding this implementation?
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- Are there any major changes to the transportation system you would like to see implemented? (note: could be related to transit, walking, cycling, parking, etc.)

- Are there any other comments you would like to provide?

RESULTS

GENERAL RESULTS

Overall reactions to key questions are summarized in Exhibit 2. As shown, opinions regarding the effect of the two-way conversions and the direction of further two-way conversion are quite varied. Overall attitudes towards the conversion of John Street and James Street to two-way traffic are split almost evenly between those in favour, those in opposition, and those with no strong opinion. However, almost 80% of businesses agree that traffic safety has been degraded. This is partly due to the motorist confusion and resulting accidents in the period immediately following the conversions. In particular, the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive experienced a number of accidents before signage and signals were improved.

The overall results also indicate that businesses do not view the two-way conversion to have been successful in improving conditions for pedestrians. Almost 60% of surveyed businesses report that pedestrian conditions (e.g., pleasantness of walking environment, pedestrian safety, etc.) have degraded since the two-way conversion.

Given the mixed reactions to the two-way conversions, it is not surprising, that support for potential two-way conversion of York/Wilson Street and King Street in the downtown is also split. Almost 40% support the conversions, while over 50% oppose such initiatives. This indicates that a strong communication strategy will be required to build support for future two-way conversions should the City go ahead with them. Differences in business attitudes between north and south sections of James Street and John Street, as discussed below, provide insight on factors influencing the success of two-way conversion projects.
Exhibit 2: Summary of Reactions to Key Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy with 2-way Conversion</th>
<th>Traffic Safety Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Environment Improved</th>
<th>Support 2-way Conversion on King St. and York/Wilson St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Interpret results with caution given small sample size. Illustrative purposes only

NORTH VS. SOUTH

While the overall results presented above indicate that there is yet work to be done in improving traffic safety and the pedestrian environment along converted sections of James Street and John Street, interviews indicated that two-way conversions have been more successful in some areas than in others. Exhibit 3 illustrates differences in responses to key survey questions between north and south sections of James Street and John Street. As indicated, businesses in the north section are much happier with the two-way conversion and a majority of surveyed businesses (almost 70%) in the north section feel that pedestrian conditions have been improved since the two-way conversion. As a result, approximately half of these businesses support future two-way conversions vs. less than 30% in the south section of James Street and John Street.
What can account for these differences? Five key factors have been identified:

- **Adjustment time**: Conversion of the north sections to two-way traffic occurred three years before the south sections, so that businesses, pedestrians, and motorists have had more time to adjust in this area. Thus, they are more comfortable with, and supportive of, two-way traffic.

- **Function in the road network**: John St S and James St S act as key accesses to the downtown for traffic coming from the Mountain. As such, they have more lanes, higher traffic volumes, and average traffic speeds along these sections are much higher than in the north. As such, two-way conversion in the south section must be combined with appropriate changes to traffic signals and pedestrian improvements to ensure that traffic safety and the pedestrian environment are improved or at least maintained.

- **On-street parking**: Related to the above point, there is more on-street parking in the north sections, particularly along James Street North, which slows down traffic and provides a buffer between pedestrians and moving vehicles. In comparison, conversion of James Street S to two-way traffic actually required some on-street spaces to be removed. On-street parking’s role as a buffer for pedestrians is even more important in the south sections given that traffic travels at a higher average speed.
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- **Sidewalks**: Sidewalks along the south sections of James St. and John St. are narrow and, when combined with fast-moving traffic and no on-street parking in certain areas, make for unpleasant walking conditions. Converting traffic from one-way to two-way flow may reduce average speeds, but it does not necessarily improve pedestrian conditions. Given slower traffic and more on-street parking in the north sections of James Street and John Street, sidewalks provide for a more pleasant and secure pedestrian environment, in general.

- **Surrounding demographics**: There is a high proportion of elderly residents surrounding James St. S and John St. S who are well served by nearby many medical centres and pharmacies, and the St Joseph’s Hospital. Elderly pedestrian are less agile and less adaptable to change. As such, two-way traffic may pose more of a hazard to pedestrians in this area. The north section of James Street, on the other hand, is experiencing somewhat of a revival of younger artists who more comfortable crossing a street with two-way traffic.

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

Specific comments received during the business interviews are summarized according to positive feedback, negative feedback, potential downtown improvements, and guidance for future two-way conversions.

**Positive Feedback on Two-Way Conversions**

Conversion of traffic from one-way to two-way traffic has:

- Improved James Street North very much and helped to spark development;
- Improved street life;
- Reduced traffic speeds and increased visibility for businesses;
- Increased the numbers of customers to my business on James Street North;
- Made it easier for visitors to navigate street network; and
- Made it easier for deliveries to reach my store.

**NEGATIVE FEEDBACK ON TWO-WAY CONVERSIONS**

Conversion of traffic from one-way to two-way traffic has:

- Made for dangerous driving conditions (e.g., unexpected turns), since many people are still not used to the changes;
- Reduced safety for less agile pedestrians (e.g., seniors, adults with children), since there is more multi-directional and turning traffic, which is more difficult for to navigate;
- Made loading more difficult for businesses with only front door access and blocks traffic;
- Made parking more difficult for customers;
- Reduced lanes widths significantly in places; and
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- Not reduce traffic speeds significantly on John Street North.

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS ON IMPROVING THE DOWNTOWN

- Increase residential development and the number of residents downtown;
- Increase funding to the Residential Loan Program;
- Provide property tax breaks to encourage business to open downtown;
- Increase parking for customers of downtown businesses;
- Provide bus routes in both directions on James Street;
- Add more bike lanes;
- Streetscape, signage, and building improvements should be coordinated and have a consistent look;
- More police are required to make customers feel safer; and
- Ban inappropriate uses downtown (e.g., warehouses on James St N); and
- Two-way conversions are a good thing, but need to be implemented as part of a vision for downtown and coordinated with other improvements

GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE 2-WAY CONVERSIONS

- More effort is required in education/marketing the value of two-way conversions to businesses and the public;
- Better signage is required to alert and remind people of two-way traffic;
- Two-way traffic needs to be phased in carefully; and
- Provide a compensation fund for affected businesses (e.g., short-term taxation relief in expectation of future land value/tax increase).
APPENDIX C

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE 1: PRESENTATION MATERIALS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS
Downtown Transportation Master Plan: 5 Year EA Review

Welcome to the Open House

1) Please sign in.

2) Staff from the City and consulting team will be glad to speak with you regarding your questions or comments.

3) We also invite you to fill out a comment sheet so that we can ensure that your ideas are recorded.
Study Purpose

In 2001, The City of Hamilton completed a comprehensive Transportation Master Plan for Downtown Hamilton.

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process requires a review of Master Plans every 5 years to determine need for detailed reviews and/or updates.

Changes that may trigger need for detailed review of Master Plans include:
- Major changes to original assumptions
- Major changes to components of the Master Plan
- Significant new environmental effects
- Major changes in proposed timing of projects within the Master Plan

The purpose of this meeting is to present the results of the 5 year EA Review and to receive feedback on the conclusions and recommendations.
The Downtown Transportation Master Plan was completed as part of the “Putting People First” exercise, an integrated land use and transportation study. Key recommendations of the study included a phased plan for the conversion of several major streets from one-way to two-way operation, plans for pedestrian and cycling improvements and a parking strategy. Several projects identified in the 2001 Plan have now been completed.

Completed Projects:

- James Street and John Street North Two-way conversion (Phase 1)
- James Street and John Street South Two-way conversion (Phase 2)
- Bay Street Pedestrian Improvements
- Hughson Street Pedestrian Improvements
- King William Street Pedestrian Improvements

Projects yet to be completed include:

- King/York/Wilson two-way conversion
- Park/MacNab, Hughson/Hess and other two-way conversions
- Hunter Street, York Boulevard and Ferguson Avenue Bike Lanes
- Various pedestrian improvements
Impacts of Two-way Conversions

Stable Traffic Volumes…
Two-way conversions have neither increased nor decreased traffic volumes in the downtown significantly.

Varied Impacts on Travel times…
Afternoon rush hour trip times on James Street southbound have increased by about one minute since 2002. Morning rush hour travel times on John Street northbound have improved.

Isolated increases in collisions…
With the exception of James Street South reported collisions have either stayed the same or decreased following the two-way conversions.

Mixed Business Opinions…
Business opinions on the impact of two-way conversions are mixed, but generally positive.

Businesses on the north sections of James and John are more supportive of the two-way conversion.
Recent and On-going Projects and 
Initiatives

What has changed since 2001?

- The number of dwelling units has increased, but total population has remained at about 14,500 people.
- Several new buildings have been constructed, including the Federal Building on Bay Street.
- Transit trips into and out of the Downtown have increased by 12% compared to 14% for the whole City.
- Parking supply has been reduced while parking demand has increased. Currently 75% of the parking supply is occupied on a typical day compared to 65% in 2001.
## Confirmation of Problem Statement

### Original Problem and Opportunity Statement Identified in 2001 Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Still Valid?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular travel</td>
<td>One-way streets require circuitous travel</td>
<td>Extra capacity can be converted to other modes</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>High traffic speeds</td>
<td>Re-allocate road space for wider sidewalks,</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Wide streets difficult to cross</td>
<td>streetlighting, bump-outs to reduce crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inward looking buildings</td>
<td>distances, bus stops/shelters, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>High traffic volumes/speeds</td>
<td>Excess road space can be reallocated to bicycle</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Lack of continuous routes</td>
<td>lanes in some areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-way streets require circuitous travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Low mode split</td>
<td>Residential intensification</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buses in Gore Park</td>
<td>Relocated transit terminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Abundance of low cost commuter parking</td>
<td>Pricing measures</td>
<td>PARTIALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage of on-street parking</td>
<td>Reallocation road space to on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Considerations since 2001

- Greater emphasis on environment, including air quality and climate change
- Downtown Hamilton is designated an Urban Growth Centre by Province
- Funding opportunities for rapid transit
- Increased aspirations for pedestrian improvements (i.e. Pedestrian charter)
- Commitment to improve street façade (e.g. farmers market/library, Art Gallery)
- Major developments are now taking place
- Crime has been reduced

---

The identification of Downtown Hamilton as an Urban Growth Centre in the Provincial Growth Plan is a major change since 2001. Under the plan, Growth Centres are to be the focal points for investment in region wide services and be planned to accommodate major transit infrastructure.
## Review of Outstanding Projects

A role of the 5 year review is to revisit issues and opportunities for key projects. A qualitative approach was adopted to help determine whether outstanding projects can still be implemented without large impacts or whether a more detailed review is required.

### Primary Road Network Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Pedestrian safety</th>
<th>Cycling safety</th>
<th>Road efficiency</th>
<th>Public Service Accessibility</th>
<th>Transportation Accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian Environment</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King/York/Wilson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>More detailed review justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion (optional)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>More detailed review justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/MacNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Main to King)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secondary Street Network Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Pedestrian safety</th>
<th>Cycling safety</th>
<th>Road efficiency</th>
<th>Public Service Accessibility</th>
<th>Transportation Accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian Environment</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park/MacNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Main to King)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Pedestrian safety</th>
<th>Cycling safety</th>
<th>Road efficiency</th>
<th>Public Service Accessibility</th>
<th>Transportation Accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian Environment</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Needs more detailed review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cycling Network Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Pedestrian safety</th>
<th>Cycling safety</th>
<th>Road efficiency</th>
<th>Public Service Accessibility</th>
<th>Transportation Accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian Environment</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St/Canada St Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Needs more detailed review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Contra-flow lane**</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>No longer feasible (see Cycling Improvements Board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Pedestrian safety</th>
<th>Cycling safety</th>
<th>Road efficiency</th>
<th>Public Service Accessibility</th>
<th>Transportation Accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian Environment</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Terminal at MacNab</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Options being evaluated under separate study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No major concerns/changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

- Large positive impact
- Large negative impact
- Minor impact or no impact
As part of the 2001 Plan, several different network concepts were evaluated including:

- Do Nothing (One-way)
- Road Space Reallocation (One-way with reduced road widths)
- James/John Partial (Two-way)
- James/John Full (Two-way)
- James/John & Cannon/York/Wilson (Two-way)
- James/John/Bay & Cannon/York/Wilson/King/Main (Two-way)
- James/John/Bay & York/Wilson/King (Two-way)

The recommended plan sought to maintain access for commercial vehicles and through traffic on Main Street and Cannon Street while slowing traffic on King Street and York Blvd/Wilson St.

- Commitment for Pedestrian Improvements around Farmers Market
- Need to maintain access to parking and loading facilities for Jackson Square
- Impacts of Two-way traffic on transit speeds and integration with future Rapid Transit
- Current traffic volumes exceed the capacity of a two-way street; traffic diversion will need to occur
- Other techniques for improving the pedestrian environment on Main Street are required

Proposed Primary Street Two-way conversions (2001)
Potential Considerations for York Boulevard/Wilson Street

The 2001 Master Plan identified York Boulevard as a priority for two-way traffic and bike lanes. More recently a need for wider sidewalks, parking and amenity space has been identified to support the Market Precinct. A key challenge is how to allocate available road space to accommodate these competing needs while maintaining reasonable vehicular access.

Potential ways to allocate road space on York Boulevard/Wilson Street

- Maximizes auto capacity
- Maximizes on-street parking
- No improvements for pedestrians or cyclists
- Limits potential for two-way King Street

- Eliminates parking on one side
- Reduces traffic speeds, but long queues will form in peak hours
- Bike lanes can be provided
- Lane widths will be sub-standard
- Reduces emergency response times

- Maintains parking on both sides, with opportunities for shared pedestrian space
- Maintains current traffic capacity, but may not reduce vehicle speeds
- Eastbound bike lane can be provided (Westbound lane could be provided on Cannon)
- Limits potential for two-way King Street

What is your Vision for York Boulevard?
Potential Considerations for King Street

The 2001 Master Plan proposed that King Street be converted to two-way traffic to reduce traffic speeds and improve way-finding. In 2005, a streetscaping master plan was completed for King Street assuming two-way traffic (see below).

Recently, King Street has been identified as a potential rapid transit route. Ultimately, the location and type of rapid transit system selected may dictate the future configuration for King Street.

Potential ways to allocate road space on King Street

- Maximizes auto capacity
- Maximizes potential for on-street parking
- No improvements for pedestrians or cyclists
- Limits potential for two-way York/Wilson
- Reduces traffic speeds
- Lack of dedicated left turn lanes will result in queue at major access points
- Lane widths will be sub-standard in some areas
- Allows for future rapid transit to operate in single corridor (see Transit Network Board)
- Reduces existing bus travel times
- Reduces emergency response times
- All cars stopped when buses stop
- Similar to existing King Street east of John St
- Opportunities for streetscaping and widened sidewalks (bump-outs)
- Reduces vehicle speeds
- Limits potential for two-way rapid transit

What is your Vision for King Street?

King Street West Streetscape Master Plan Preferred Concept
Secondary Street Network Changes
Issues and Opportunities

The 2001 Plan recommended conversion of several secondary streets to two-way operation.

The intent of these conversions was to reduce speeds and “out of way” travel.

Recent two-way conversions of Hess Street and Caroline Street in Durand Neighbourhood have been well received.

- Caroline Street is a candidate for two-way conversion as contra-flow bicycle lane no longer feasible
- Accommodating bicycle lanes and two-way traffic while maintaining parking is difficult
- Need to allow for Pick-up and drop-off at GO Station
- MacNab Street could act as an extension to the Farmers Market Precinct
- North End Traffic Study Recommends two-way conversion to the north

Proposed Secondary Street
Two-way conversions (2001)
Potential Considerations for Hunter Street

Accommodating two-way traffic, parking and bicycle lanes on Hunter Street is difficult without road widening. In the Corktown Neighbourhood Traffic Management Study, residents indicated a preference for bike lanes and on-street parking more than two-way traffic. A concept that maintains Hunter Street as one-way, but provides for two-way bike lanes has been proposed.

Alternatives for Bicycle Lanes on Hunter Street

- Restricts space for parking
- Reduces traffic speeds
- Most common configuration for bike lanes
- Reduces traffic capacity around GO Station

- Maintains on-street parking
- Allows for two-way bike travel
- Bikes adjacent to cars travel in same direction
- Preferred design for Hunter Street

- Maintains on-street parking
- Allows for two-way bike travel
- Greatest potential for bike-vehicle conflicts

Do you agree with the recommendation for Hunter Street?

Proposed Alternative for Hunter Street
Potential Considerations for Caroline Street

The 2001 Master Plan recommended providing a contraflow bicycle lane on Caroline Street from York Boulevard to Herkimer Street. Subsequently, Caroline Street south of Main has been converted to two-way traffic, which precludes the option of adding bike lanes.

Converting Caroline Street to two-way operations between Main Street and York Street would help to reduce speeds, and improve access to residences, businesses and parking on Caroline Street.

Alternatives for Caroline Street

- Maximizes Auto capacity
- Maximizes potential for on-street parking
- Least attractive for pedestrians and cyclists

Maintains on-street parking
- Reduces traffic capacity and speeds
- Bike lanes would not connect to other routes
- Non-standard bike lane design

Maintains on-street parking
- Reduces traffic speeds
- Improves access
- Preferred Design for Caroline Street

Do you agree that Caroline Street should be made two-way?
Areas for Pedestrian Improvement
Issues and Opportunities

The 2001 Plan placed a high emphasis on streetscaping improvements on both primary and secondary streets.

Several of these projects have now been completed.

The City will continue to implement these projects with input from the public on a street by street basis.
Potential Cycling Network Improvements
Issues and Opportunities

The 2001 Plan recognized the need for improved east-west bike connections

Two-way streets will improve conditions, but further improvements are required

Implementing dedicated bicycle lanes in the Downtown is not without challenges

- Two-way traffic eliminates need/feasibility for contraflow bike lane
- Provision of dedicated bike lanes and two-way traffic will impact ability to accommodate vehicular traffic and parking. On-street parking is considered essential by the BIAs and residents
- Solutions are required to ensure safe crossing of Main Street

Markland Street Contra-flow bike lane (Durand Neighbourhood)
Transit Network and Facilities
Issues and Opportunities

The 2001 Downtown Transportation Plan did not include recommendations on rapid transit.

The need for Rapid Transit has been highlighted in the new City-wide Transportation Master Plan, which examined three potential routing options:

- Maintain current BLine routing (King Street & Main Street)
- Implement rapid transit in a contraflow lane on Main Street
- Focus rapid transit on King Street, in conjunction with two-way traffic

Further Environmental Assessment studies are required to confirm preferred routing and design concepts for Rapid Transit and related terminal facilities

Higher Order Transit Concept
(City-wide Transportation Master Plan, 2007)
Next Steps

- Listen to comments by the public and stakeholders
- Conduct further evaluation of alternatives for King Street and York Boulevard, taking into account future options for Rapid Transit
- Hold a second public open house in late 2007 to present final recommendations for major infrastructure changes
- Prepare master plan review report including results of consultation
- Prepare addendum to the Environmental Study Report
- Final public review and comment
- Allocate funding in capital budgets

We Want to Hear From You!

These panels outline possible directions for the Downtown. We would like to know what you think about the ideas presented here. There are four ways to participate:

- Speak to a representative at this public information centre
- Complete one of our feedback forms here today
- Visit our website at www.hamilton.ca
- Arrange a meeting with City staff
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

Many of the information boards are blatantly contradictory. For instance, how can anyone talk about pedestrian/cyclist safety in the same breath as making Main and King Streets into “drag strips.” All the safety issues recommended in “Putting People First” are being ignored in favour of vehicular traffic.

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

- develop policies and enforcement practices for pedestrian safety.
- eliminate the many surface parking lots and build parkades. strategic points to reduce congestion in the downtown core.
- offer incentives to eliminate brownfield sites and build housing for people with a variety of disabilities on limited income (current incentives are not for these vulnerable people)

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

The downtown has been studied to death, and the money spent could have probably completed the “urban transline” on King Street from James to Bay. The inability for injuries to people with mobility and/or vision limitations could be hazardous, and unexcusable in terms of delay and cost.

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

None of the presentations showed reference to the Vision 2020 progress team recommendations to have traffic go around the “enterprise zone” instead of through it. Money was wasted redoing the bicycle lanes of the mid-90s. No effort has been put into establishing a pedestrian crossing protocol in other communities. Obviously the timing of crossing signals should be adapted to people who use a variety of assistive devices, rather than the inconvenience to drivers. H&R drivers should automatically lower ramps for people with mobility problems, instead of having to be asked.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1920 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

Not enough mention of curtailing auto-capacity especially east west on Main and King in conjunction with safer cycling alternatives and improved transit infrastructure. Overall glad to see.

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to see implemented as soon as possible?

Potential Consideration for King Street

Potential Cycling Network Improvements, however would also like dedicated bike lanes on Main and King.

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

Potential Considerations for Caroline could be left untapped, Main and King the priority.

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

Buses travelling south from downtown to mountain routes, split half and half on Spadina as well as Queens South. Interested in hearing about BRT and possible light rail.

More importantly feel that safer cycling alternatives are needed, specifically dedicated lanes marked well with possible barriers and or posts.

Name: 

Address: 

E-mail

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

HSR SHOULD EXTEND ALL MOUNTAIN BUSES ROUTES EAST/WEST OUT TO ANGELA/STEAD AT END OF ANGELA/STEAD NOT AT MOUNTAIN ROAD/ UPPER PARADISES STOPS AT HEADLINGS/DOWNTOWN ANGELA ETC.

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

EAST/WEST MOUNTAIN BUSES SHOULD STOP AT INTERSECTING STREETS NORTH/SOUTH BUSES SUCH AS UPPER OTTAWA REDUCE WAIT TIMES AT END OF ROUTE

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

BUSSES SHOULD GO "OUT OF SERVICE" AT HSR BUS GARAGE NEAR MOUNT HORE AIRPORT/NOT AT GORE PARK - VERY IRRITATING TO SEE AN EMPTY BUS GO PAST YOU IN THE WINTER WHEN THE OUTSIDE TEMPERATURE IS 10° FARENHEIT OUTSIDE AND YOU WANT A BUS RIDE UP THE HILL.

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

HSR EVALUATION

(1) EMPLOYEES/DRIVERS - EXCELLENT
(2) SAFETY & MAINTENANCE - EXCELLENT
(3) PRICE PEAK $ (12) - EXCELLENT
(4) TRAVEL TIME - MEDIUM/GOOD ARE
A TOUCH COMPETITIVE.

(5) REDUCE MINIMIZE TRANSFER TIMES BETWEEN BUS ROUTES & THER TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: esplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario MSV 1V6
Ph. 416-596-1930 ext. 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
CASE 2: Trolley Car (a) with no train tracks in streets
(b) with poles connecting to overhead wires

BAD - Trolley Car can only go on routes with overhead wires
BAD - Trolley cars had electrical poles stopping connecting to overhead wires that disconnected and stopped the bus in the middle of street/driver had to get out and re-connect poles
BAD - Overhead wires not attractive/problems with icing/winter storms

CASE 3: Existing 2007 diesel buses/flexible can be used (BEST) on any route in the city

Re-integrated TH&B/Go Station

ALL BUSES (Go & HSR)  ALL TRAINS (Go/VIA)  ALL CARS  FAMILY CARS

GOOD
All bike located in one station to allow quick transfers by commuting passengers.
Commuter going from house to work to house only have to walk up or down a few stairs to transfer quickly from cars to buses to trains

BAD
Women with baby carriages/handicap with wheelchairs/people with heavy suitcases don't have to travel long distances ie three or four blocks to get between bus - train - car (transportation services/extra travel time/extra taxi costs if trains at TH&B Hunter St & Bus Station at Rebecca St - Bad

GOOD
TH&B/GO - 95% of HSR buses go past TH&B now Sept/Oct station - close to downtown 50 apartment buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2000 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains</td>
<td>200 passengers</td>
<td>1000 passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain:

Yes, great idea to add 2 way bicycle lanes.
Reduce to 3 lanes & maintain parking in most design plans. Great for King to become 2 way. York best to become a way to reduce traffic.

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

Hess - Reduced lane, added bike lane & maintain parking
King - Become a way but extend a way to King St. E.

If you would be in with King as a way.

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

Maintaining Cannon Westward as a throughway
Better to remove a lane for cycling & add longer walkway with flowers etc. May decrease transport travel. Using Cannon corridor for cyclists lane should also be a way cycling direction.

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

Hess St - Why not extend 2 way from Barton to King St. W.
Hess St - School - York/Cannon/Queen/Kess St not designed for pedestrian/student safety. Very big mess & concern for parents, teachers & students. Please put at improving time to install flashing signs for schools & main arteries. Would help in high traffic areas.
Queen - James N
King - Barton 3 area

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

[Signature]

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1900 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0444
Email: bhollingworth@ibi-group.com
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

[Signature]

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?


Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

[Signature]

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

[Signature]

Name: ___________________________
Address: _________________________
E-mail: __________________________

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: nplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
New Projects:

1. Control flow rapid transit on Main St. (ie. make a decision to have 2-way transit on Main St., and remove King St. from RT options).

2. Move NB HSR service north of downtown to James St. so HSR 2-way on one street. (Move it off of MacNab & Barton Streets)
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

[Handwritten response]

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

[Handwritten response]

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

[Handwritten response]

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

[Handwritten response]

Name:
Address:

E-mail:

☑ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: gplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@bigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *Please Print*

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

NO

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

2 WAY OUT LANE BIKE ROUTE

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

2 WAY CONVERSIONS

NO NEEDED

CAROLINE COULD BE 2 WAYED BECAUSE IT IS OUT OF THE DOWNTOWN CORE

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

BUILD INCLINE RAILWAY

BUILD COVERED BRIDGE OVER VALLEY RD.

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
E-mail: [redacted]

I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: splanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario MSV 1B6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibi-group.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

I agree with the 2-way conversion of James and John. It makes it safer for pedestrians.

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

Cannon should be made 2-way.

MacNab should stay 1-way.

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

Hunter St E should be 2-way to parking. Alternative A.

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

- The HSR bus on North or MacNab blv
  Cannon + Balsam. No one gets on/bot
  The Bayfront bus on MacNab
  James St should run North along

- Barton blv Wellington + James needs attention. It is an unsafe area for pedestrians to walk along.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario MSV 1V8
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
October 3, 2007

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

**YES. FOCUS SHOULD REMAIN ON 'PEOPLE CAPACITY' OF DOWNTOWN w/ MANY OPTIONS.**

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

MORE CONVERSION OF ONE WAY TO TWO WAY MACNAB ST N

MOVE BAYFRONT HSR OFF MACNAB N ON TO JAMES

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?


Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

DEDICATED BIKE LANE ON BUSY STREETS - NOT REALLY NEEDED ON CAROLINE BUT NEEDED ON CANNON!! **(SMALL STREET w/ LOW TRAFFIC)**

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

☑ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: sp@planning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review  
City of Hamilton  
Public Information Centre  
October 3, 2007  

**COMMENT SHEET**  

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *(Please Print)*

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

**YES. As long as there are ways to negotiate the downtown area by car, there has to be more emphasis on pollution and cycling conditions, along with expedited transit service.**

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

**Walter Street Korridor with single, two-way cycle lane. I don't believe street space on Hunter should be devoted to a transit corridor. I don't believe too many vehicles should be restricted on Hunter if cyclists can be accommodated.**

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?

**ALL.**

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

**Two-way traffic on King west of Queen considering plan for increased transit service & High T Ridge. Need to provide space for other traffic and for possible pedestrianization. Also need to keep the entire leg for that matter, though I like the idea of a pedestrianized street leg.**

Name:  
Address:  

Email:  

☑ I would like to be added to the project mailing list  

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

**Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager**  
Environmental Planning  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 302  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3  
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101  
Fax: 905-546-4435  
Email: splanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth  
IBI Group  
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto  
Ontario M5V 1V8  
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414  
Fax: 416-596-0644  
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfil Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Dear Brian and Natasha,

Thank you for answering my questions at tonight's information session. Here are some more detailed comments.

Responses to questions on comment sheet:

1. Yes, I agree that the transportation network should be rebalanced to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.

The current (1950s!) network was designed with only the interests of motorists in mind, and has made the streets uncomfortable (and sometimes dangerous) for other street users. The emphasize on high speed through traffic has also been a factor in the decline of downtown as a commercial centre.

2. Overall, I am disappointed at the very slow pace of implementation of the 2001 plan. Apparently, only three projects have actually been implemented. In order of priority, I would propose:

(i) two way conversion of as many downtown streets as possible
(ii) implementation of all proposed bike lanes
(iii) relocation of the buses from Gore park and pedestrianizing the south side King St in Gore park

3. Given the success of the two-way conversion of James N, I would urge the City to investigate two-way conversion of more streets in addition to those considered in the 2001 plan.

4. The downtown plan must consider light rail (i.e. modern streetcars) as part of the future transportation network.

Although they have high initial capital costs, modern streetcar systems have much lower operating costs and much higher capacities than bus rapid transit. Streetcars are also the best way of drastically increasing transit use (Hamilton's official plan calls for doubling per capita transit use).

Finally, in cities such as Portland and Houston streetcar lines have been shown to attract many times their capital costs in new investment.

The fact that the province has proposed $300 million dollars in funding for rapid transit (light rail) in Hamilton means the City
I was unable to attend the meeting on 3 Oct. but one of my friends was there and gave me the comment sheet. I have reviewed the master plan and would like to submit some comments as follows:

I agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 plan. There continues to be a great need to make the area safer and more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. This is not just for appearance but as an essential element to encourage more physical activity and reduce the environmental impact of so many vehicles. In other words, to benefit the health and welfare of our citizens.

The element of the 2001 plan that I would like to see have a priority are the completion of all two way conversions of streets, a reduction in the number and width of lanes on King and Main Streets so as to create separate bicycle lanes and give more separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles and the removal of all through traffic of heavy trucks.

My observation over the past 5 years is that the changes so far have been positive but we still are apparently dominated by the view that the car (or truck) is King and must have the final priority.

As mentioned above, more reduction of traffic lanes on King and Main and removal of heavy truck through traffic in the city core would go a long way to make the core much more attractive, healthy and livable. Giving priority to public transit (such as advance green lights for buses as is done successfully in many other jurisdictions) can be managed and need not be costly. Slowing the speed of traffic would also reduce pollution, increase safety and discourage the idea that the one way streets that we have are useful speedways.

Please put me on your mailing list for future news about the project. The address is as follows:
Go Ms. D'Souza and Mr. Hollingworth,

attended the information centre this evening and have a few comments which I would ask that you please take into account in the course of your EA review.

am generally happy with the direction and implementation of the 2001 Plan, and certainly feel that major gains have been made. The steps to return to two-way streets, along with various traffic calming measures in the core, have had a huge impact on several key commercial areas, and there can be no question that James Streets North and South in particular have reaped the benefits of these changes.

The major deficiency of the 2001 Plan, in my view, was the decision to leave out Cannon Street as a target for major change. My hope and expectation is that with the gains elsewhere over the past several years the spotlight may now be shone upon this street, which (along with the already-targeted York and Wilson Streets) poses a major obstacle to commercial and residential redevelopment of a massive portion of our downtown core.

The portion of Cannon Street East which approaches James Street North is essentially a four-lane highway with a disproportionate amount of heavy truck traffic. My concern is not with respect to the presence of trucks per se, but the fact that trucks are able to travel at high speed and along stretches containing recessed catchbasins and other surface irregularities, creating a noisy, rumbling, uncomfortable environment. It is most inhospitable for pedestrians, and the prospects for storefront or residential development along Cannon itself are very poor. The effect extends beyond the street itself: Cannon has become a boundary which separates psychologically as well as physically the neighbourhoods and commercial districts to its north and south.

am concerned that greater attention has not been paid to Cannon Street in the context of the Master Plan process, as it strikes me (as a layperson) that some relatively inexpensive and uncontroversial measures could be taken immediately to improve matters. Nothing as dramatic as a two-way conversion is necessary, though this would seem like an obvious ultimate goal. Given the relatively low volume of traffic on Cannon (i.e. on a per lane basis), even during peak times, I would suggest that study would confirm that one or two lanes could be converted to street parking or otherwise limited to through traffic (eg. using bumptouts). Further, there would seem to be little downside (to be confirmed by study) to adjusting intersection signals to disrupt the high-speed flow of traffic. Such changes could be effected, I would think, in an incremental fashion which would minimize disruption.

Dealing with the pathology of Cannon Street cannot, in my view, be left behind, perhaps with the mindset that downtown traffic patterns will have to be reevaluated after other changes are made to Hamilton’s transportation system. I thus urge you to consider adding Cannon Street (within the Master Plan boundaries) to the roads under consideration for fundamental change.

Thank you for considering my thoughts on this matter,
Hi Christine - I wasn't able to make it to the open house tonight regarding the TMP review for Downtown, but would like to know what I missed and have an opportunity to comment. Will there be something posted on the web site? How can I find out more?

Thanks for all your good work,
Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.

Yes BUT let’s get at it! We must make downtown WELCOMING & COMFORTABLE for pedestrians & cyclists. The majority of vehicles are just going thru.

What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?
- 2-way streets; move buses away from Gore Park
- King, William could be done right away
- It’s already part & part

Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?
- Move faster, we need to provide the environment that will foster the rejuvenation of Downtown

Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 Plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?

- Pedestrian mall on at least the south arm of King
- Let’s de-synchronize some of the main/5 lights as soon as the Red Hill Expressway is finished, remove through trucks from downtown

Name:
Address:
E-mail
☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before October 19th, 2007) to:

Natalia D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: uo@planning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
From: D'Souza, Natasha  
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2007 4:57 PM  
To: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner  
Subject: FW: Downtown Transportation Master Plan review

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bholling@ibigroup.com]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2007 4:26 PM
To: D'Souza, Natasha
Cc: D'Souza, Natasha
Subject: RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan review

Thanks for these useful comments. We agree that something should be done to improve Cannon Street from a pedestrian perspective.

One thing you may or may not be aware of is that the City has completed a Streetscape Master Plan for mobility streets, including Cannon. You can access this plan at http://www.myhamilton.ca/myhamilton/cityandgovernment/citydepartments/planningecdev/development/urbandesign/pastprojects/mot-streets.htm

Brian Hollingworth.

-----Original Message-----
From: eplanning@hamilton.ca; bhollingworth@ibigroup.com
Sent: October 3, 2007 9:58 PM
To: eplanning@hamilton.ca; bhollingworth@ibigroup.com
Cc: Bob Bratina
Subject: Downtown Transportation Master Plan review

To Ms. D’Souza and Mr. Hollingworth,

I attended the information centre this evening and have a few comments which I would ask that you please take into account in the course of your EA review.

I am generally happy with the direction and implementation of the 2001 Plan, and certainly feel that major gains have been made. The steps to return to two-way streets, along with various traffic calming measures in the core, have had a huge impact on several key commercial areas, and there can be no question that James Streets North and South in particular have reaped the benefits of these changes.

The major deficiency of the 2001 Plan, in my view, was the decision to leave out Cannon Street as a target for major change. My hope and expectation is that with the gains elsewhere over the past several years the spotlight may now be shone upon this street, which (along with the already-targeted York and Wilson Streets) poses a major obstacle to commercial and residential redevelopment of a massive portion of our downtown core.

The portion of Cannon Street East which approaches James Street North is essentially a four-lane highway with a disproportionate amount of heavy truck traffic. My concern is not with respect to the presence of trucks per se, but the fact that trucks are able to travel at high speed and along stretches containing recessed catchbasins and other surface irregularities, creating a noisy, rumbling, uncomfortable environment. It is most inhospitable for pedestrians, and the prospects for storefront or residential development along Cannon itself are very poor. The effect extends beyond the street itself: Cannon has become a boundary which separates (psychologically as well as physically) the neighbourhoods and commercial districts to its north and south.

I am concerned that greater attention has not been paid to Cannon Street in the context of the Master Plan process, as it strikes me (as a layperson) that some relatively inexpensive and uncontroversial measures could be taken immediately to improve matters. Nothing as dramatic as a two-way conversion is necessary, though this would seem like an obvious ultimate goal. Given the relatively low volume of traffic on Cannon (i.e. on a per lane basis), even during peak times, I would suggest that study would confirm that one or two lanes could be converted to street parking or otherwise limited to through traffic (eg.
using bumpouts). Further, there would seem to be little downside (to be confirmed by further study) to adjusting intersection signals to disrupt the high-speed flow of traffic. Some changes could be effected, I would think, in an incremental fashion which would minimize disruption.

Dealing with the pathology of Cannon Street cannot, in my view, be left behind, perhaps with the mindset that downtown traffic patterns will have to be reevaluated after other changes are made to Hamilton's transportation system. I thus urge you to consider adding Cannon Street (within the Master Plan boundaries) to the roads under consideration for fundamental change.

Thank you for considering my thoughts on this matter,
APPENDIX D

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE 2: PRESENTATION MATERIALS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS
Downtown Transportation Master Plan:
5 Year EA Review

Welcome to the Open House

1. Please sign in.
2. Staff from the City and consulting team will be
glad to speak with you regarding your questions
or comments.
3. We also invite you to fill out a comment sheet so
that we can ensure that your ideas are recorded.
Purpose of Meeting

The original Downtown Transportation Master Plan was approved in 2001.

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process requires a review of Master Plans every 5 years to determine need for detailed reviews and/or updates.

The purpose of this Public Information Centre is to:

- Summarize existing problems and opportunities for the Downtown transportation system
- Present results of the 5 year EA Review and Technically Preferred Plan
- Receive your input regarding the plan
- Outline how the plan will be achieved
The Downtown Transportation Master Plan was completed as part of the “Putting People First” exercise, an integrated land use and transportation study. Key recommendations of the study included a phased plan for the conversion of several major streets from one-way to two-way operation, plans for pedestrian and cycling improvements and a parking strategy. Several projects identified in the 2001 Plan have now been completed.

Completed Projects:
- James Street and John Street North Two-way conversion (Phase 1)
- James Street and John Street South Two-way conversion (Phase 2)
- Bay Street Pedestrian Improvements
- Hughson Street Pedestrian Improvements
- King William Street Pedestrian Improvements

Projects in Master Plan but yet to be completed include:
- King/York/Wilson two-way conversion
- Park/MacNab, Hughson/Hess and other two-way conversions
- Hunter Street, York Boulevard and Ferguson Avenue Bike Lanes
- Various pedestrian and cycling improvements
Summary of October Public Open House

Original Problem and Opportunity Statement Identified in 2001 Plan was reviewed and found to be still valid.

At the October 3, 2007 Public Information Centre, several alternative solutions were presented:

- York Boulevard two-way conversion
- King Street two-way conversion
- Hunter Street bicycle lanes
- Caroline Street bicycle lane extension
- Pedestrian network improvements
- Cycling network improvements
- Transit network improvements

What the public said about these alternatives:

- General support for two-way conversions
- Desire for bicycle lanes and transit improvements
- Desire to keep momentum and/or increase pace of changes
- Desire for rapid transit on King or Main
- Desire to make changes on Cannon Street
- Need to improve conditions for pedestrians on Main Street

There is strong support for recent improvements to the Downtown streetscape… but more work is required to achieve a greater balance for the entire street network.
# Review of Outstanding Projects

At the October, 2007 public information centre, outstanding projects from the 2001 Master Plan were identified as either needing further review, or ready for implementation without significant impacts.

## No new significant impacts:

### Two-way conversions:
- Park/MacNab two-way conversion
- Hughson/Hess two-way conversion
- King William two-way conversion
- Rebecca two-way conversion

### Pedestrian improvements:
- Jackson Street, Queen Street, Catharine Street, Mary Street, George Street

### Cycling improvements:
- Ferguson Avenue bike lanes

## Recommended for further detailed review (see following boards):

- King/York/Wilson two-way conversion and tradeoffs with rapid transit
- Bay Street two-way conversion
- Main Street pedestrian improvements
- Hunter Street bicycle lanes
- York Boulevard bicycle lanes
- Caroline Street Two-way (New since 2001)
- Gore Park pedestrianization (see separate boards)

The location of a new transit terminal is being investigated under a separate study.

- Expanded MacNab Street Terminal
- MacNab Street on street in combination with Hunter Street
- Hunter Street

Implementation of an employee trip reduction program and a long term parking rate increase was also recommended to support the other changes.
Recommendation for York Boulevard/Wilson Street

**Recommendations:**
Convert to two-way traffic as recommended in the 2001 Master Plan.
Proceed with preliminary design to determine how best to accommodate bicycle lanes and parking.

**Issues:**
- Eliminates parking on one side
- Reduces traffic speeds, but long queues may form in peak hours
- Narrow lane widths
- Reduces capacity for eastbound traffic and requires diversion to alternate routes/modes
- May reduce emergency response times
- Affects inbound access to York Parkade

**Rationale:**
- Reduces traffic speeds
- Reduces circuitous travel
- Provides for greater flexibility for changing King Street

**Extent of two-way conversion:**
- Two-way conversion of York/Wilson between Bay Street and Wellington Street and potential provisions for cyclists
- Opportunities for dedicated bike lanes

Note: Streetscape Master Plan (urban design study) for York Boulevard between Bay Street and James Street currently under way
Impacts of two-way traffic on York Boulevard/Wilson Street

Basic analysis indicates some existing trips along York Boulevard would have to divert following a two-way conversion.

This diversion could be to other streets or, more importantly, to other modes such as transit, car sharing, or cycling, provided that these alternatives are well supported.

Analysis using an updated transportation model indicates a large number of trips on York Boulevard are long distance trips with origins and destinations outside the downtown.

Thus, a significant portion of York Boulevard traffic could use alternative routes, take transit (HSR or GO Transit) or cycle.
Recommendation for King Street

Recommendations:
Two-way traffic as recommended in the 2001 Master Plan is still desirable
Proceed with preliminary design only after Environmental Assessment studies for Rapid Transit are completed and decision is made on Gore Park pedestrianization

Rationale:
- Further Environmental Assessment studies are required to confirm preferred routing and design concepts for Rapid Transit and related terminal facilities
- Significant change from previous assumptions due to future rapid transit on King or Main and concept of Gore Park pedestrian plaza
- Proceeding with two-way conversion before transit and Gore Park issues are resolved may be premature

Issues:
- Narrow lane widths
- Implementing two-way traffic on King Street may reduce speeds of future rapid transit or limit options for providing RT
- May increase emergency response times
- Affects parking lot access
Secondary Street Network Changes
Implement as proposed in 2001

Recommendation:
Implement as proposed in 2001, excluding Hunter Street two-way

Rationale:
- The intent of these conversions was to reduce speeds and “out of way” travel.
- Recent two-way conversions of Hess Street and Caroline Street in Durand Neighbourhood have been well received.
- Hunter Street cannot accommodate bicycle lanes and on-street parking if converted to two-way traffic.
Recommendations for Pedestrian Improvements

Recommendation:
Continue to implement streetscaping projects with input from the public on a street by street basis.

Rationale:
- Streetscaping projects are integral part of master plan to improve conditions for pedestrians

Issues:
- Improvements including lane reductions impact roadway capacity

Various options exist to reallocate some vehicle capacity on Main Street to pedestrians. Options must allow for potential future rapid transit.

New Ferguson Avenue Bridge will provide continuous corridor to waterfront for walking and cycling.

Implement options to improve landscaping and urban design of Cannon Street, while calming traffic (See below left).

Propsed Areas for Pedestrian Improvement (2001)

Extend forecourt of City Hall into Main Street
See separate boards for Gore Park

Streetscape projects recommended in Downtown Mobility Street Master Plan

Projects Completed Since 1990

Vision for Cannon Street as presented in Downtown Mobility Street Master Plan (2003)
Recommendations for Cycling Network Improvements

Recommendation:
Provide improved east-west bike connections as per 2001 plan on Hunter Street and York Boulevard

Rationale:
- Improved cycling connections required to improve safety and promote this sustainable mode of transportation

Issues:
- Shared bike lanes require cyclists to mix with vehicle traffic and offer questionable safety benefits
- On-street bike lanes may either reduce automobile capacity or require removal of on-street parking

Preferred Design for Hunter Street

Provide dedicated bicycle lanes on York Blvd

Potential for share lanes, but with minimal separation for cyclists

Shared lanes are necessary near GO Station to allow for drop-off

Add traffic signal to ensure safe crossing of Main Street

Proposed Dedicated Lanes
Proposed Shared Lanes
Gore Park Pedestrianization

Gore Park today…an important pedestrian space

The 2001 Master Plan proposed that King Street be converted to two-way traffic to reduce traffic speeds and improve way-finding. Recently, King Street has been identified as a potential rapid transit route and it has also been suggested that the street be reconfigured to better support pedestrian traffic.

Different ways of moving people...

- 40 people in cars
- 40 people in a bus
- 40 people walking and cycling
King Street – Potential Closure Scenarios

There is a wide range of potential scenarios for the redesign of King Street including temporary closures, partial closures in the area of Gore Park only, or more extensive permanent closures.

One of the key tasks of this study was to investigate the traffic impacts of potential closures. To do this, three basic scenarios were developed and tested to reflect a range of potential options.

Each of these scenarios could involve:

- Introducing Rapid Transit on King Street
- Accommodating delivery vehicles
- Temporary closures only (e.g. on weekends)
- Provisions for bicycles
- Shared space design (see separate boards)

Options developed to investigate mobility impacts

**Scenario 1**
- Close King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and Wellington Street.
- All other primary mobility streets remain as is.
- All north-south streets remain open to traffic except Hughson Street

**Scenario 2**
- Close both sides of King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and John Street.
- All other primary mobility streets remain as is.
- James Street and John Street remain open to north-south traffic

**Scenario 3**
- Close King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and Wellington Street.
- York Boulevard/Wilson Street and King Street (James to Queen) converted to two-way traffic
- All north-south streets remain open to traffic

A fourth scenario involving the closure of the south leg of King Street was found to have minimal traffic impacts.
Transportation Impacts of Street Closures

Preliminary traffic analysis results

Detailed traffic modelling was undertaken to estimate the impacts of closing King Street. Assuming current travel behavior:

- All alternatives result in increased vehicle travel times, decreased speeds and increased emissions.

- A scenario with King Street closed between James and John has least negative traffic impacts in the east-west direction.

- It currently takes approximately 5 minutes to drive from Wellington to Bay Street on King Street in the rush hour. This same trip may take 2-3 minutes longer via Cannon Street under the King Street closure scenarios.

- Overall, fuel use for travel in the analysis area (see right) is expected to increase by up to 15% as a result of congestion.

All of these impacts would be reduced if some drivers shift to other modes (i.e. transit, bicycle, walking) or other time periods. The planned rapid transit network will facilitate this shift.

Where will the traffic go?

Model projections of changes in traffic patterns resulting from King Street closure between Wellington and James Street, with York/Wilson two-way
## Considering Options for King Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact of King Street Closure (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Cycling</td>
<td>▪ Reduced traffic noise and visual presence of cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>▪ Closure would likely be complemented with investments in street furniture, landscaping and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other pedestrian and cycling amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>▪ Street closure may be stimulus for investment in Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Pedestrian traffic will increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Vehicle</td>
<td>▪ Reduced pedestrian-vehicle conflicts in closed sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Level of Service</td>
<td>▪ Rapid transit could be a key feature of King Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reduced level of private vehicle service will make transit more attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Level of Service</td>
<td>▪ Could serve to shift longer distance vehicle trips to transit, with widespread improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in level of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For this preliminary evaluation, a King Street closure is assumed to be any closure that would restrict vehicle capacity on King Street in favour of pedestrians. The degree of advantages and disadvantages would depend on the length, time period and operational rules for the closure.
Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Options: Civic Square

The Civic Square Concept

Prohibit vehicle access while simultaneously investing in significant improvements to the pedestrian realm.

Pedestrian amenities might include benches, public art, an extensive tree canopy and other landscaping features, pedestrian-scale lighting, connections to public transit, and water features.

If possible, delivery vehicle access can be diverted to back alleys, or limited to morning or evening hours, as is common practice in Europe and Australia.

There are several examples of success facilitated by simultaneous investment in other sustainable modes of transportation such as cycling and public transit.

Will it work?

Research says, it depends…

- Mixed success on wide North American main streets, consistently designed to accommodate vehicles first and foremost
- Narrow streets in dense European cities generally more appropriately scaled for pedestrian activity
- Generally positive effects on retail, with those inside the pedestrian zone benefitting most
- The more extensive schemes generate more positive impacts

- Transit malls are generally more successful
- Based on experience in Germany and the UK, if well designed, pedestrian traffic can increase from 20 - 40%
- Often a difficult 1-2 year transition period, where trade may even drop as the area adjusts
- Even in Europe, retailers almost always resist pedestrianization and traffic calming projects. However, once in place, they are usually the main proponents for expanding the project’s boundaries.

Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Options: Shared Space

The Shared Space Plaza

- Allow auto access, but with strict pedestrian priority.
- Encourage all traffic to mix by removing the boundaries between different users.

Until recently the concept was not taken seriously in North America, despite having been practised for decades in countries like Holland, Germany, England, Japan, Israel, and Spain.

Taking the concept even further, some cities in the Netherlands began applying a similar design philosophy to higher capacity streets by removing all traffic signs and roadway markings. Without signs regulating behaviour, those using the street purportedly pay more attention to their surroundings and look to make eye contact more often. Almost counter intuitively, this lack of traffic control has resulted in fewer severe accidents, thus challenging our traditional approaches to safe street design.

▲ Shared streets are typically narrow; lack curbs and clear sightlines; and have obvious gateways, very low speed limits, street trees, community gardens, street furniture, and varied surface treatments.

▲ The prize-winning Skvallertorget Square re-design in Sweden, free of traffic signs.

◄ There are already many North American examples of spaces that share many of the characteristics of a shared space. Hamilton’s own Hess Village is a particularly good example. As well, we often resolve ambiguity at four-way stops through eye contact, parking lots rarely have signs but we seem to manage, and on many university campus streets pedestrians are informally understood to have priority.
Pedestrian Sundays

In 2004, local residents and community groups in Toronto called on the city to ban vehicle traffic from the bustling Kensington market. The city agreed to allow closures over a summer trial period of seven consecutive Sundays. Since then the street closures have continued through every summer, one Sunday per month.

Although programming the closures is mostly coordinated by a community group, P.S. Kensington, street activities (such as electric sitar playing and salsa workshops) have a uniquely informal and unpolished flavour, characteristic of the neighbourhood.

The program has been so successful that other business districts, namely Baldwin St. and Mirvish Village, organized their own Pedestrian Sundays in 2007 with the help of P.S. Kensington.
## Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Concepts: Examples in other cities

### 16th Street Mall – Denver, Colorado
- **1982 – 13 blocks**
- **1992 – extended 3 blocks**
- **$5.0 million / block**
- Interest in pedestrianization grew as retailers struggled to compete with growing popularity of suburban shopping centres.
- Previously the area served mostly office uses and corresponding ancillary retail, thus very little street activity outside of working hours.
- A diverse mix of land uses, including residential, encourage activity throughout the day, particularly the many tourist destinations.

### Granville Street – Vancouver, BC
- **1974 – 6 blocks**
- **1988 – reduced by 1 block**
- **$1.9 million / block**
- Prior to 1974, Granville Street was 6 lanes wide, handled 1200 vehicles per hour, and was in rapid economic decline.
- Now, with sidewalks reaching 10.5m in width, only 2 lanes grant access to buses and taxis.
- New amenities include large trees, additional lighting, seating, and bus shelters.
- Significant zoning changes were introduced, e.g. banks limited to 25’ frontages.

**Note:** All costs in 2007 dollars.
Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Concepts: Examples in other cities

Main Street – Buffalo, NY

- Converted to pedestrian mall with LRT in 1986
- After two decades of operation as a transit mall, results are mixed

What works:
- Transit provides needed capacity, well suited for linear downtown
- Main Street works well for special events

What doesn't work
- At 30m wide, Main Street is too wide for pedestrian comfort
- Main Street seems empty during off-peak hours without auto activity
- Main Street retail space has declined 47% since 1987
- Main Street vacancy up 24% since 1987

Main Street Mall – Charlottesville, VA

- New amenities include moveable benches, paving, lighting, fountains, kiosks, plantings
- Revitalization focused on historic character and provisions established for design controls and review
- Retail sales, property values, and assessed rental value have all increased. Many new businesses have located downtown since the mall was completed
- Approximately $13 million in private renovation took place 1976-1982

1986 – 9 blocks $8.7 million / block
1974 – 5 blocks $1.6 million / block (avg.)
1980 – extended 2 blocks
1985 – extended 1 blocks

Note: All costs in 2007 dollars
Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Options:
Civic Square Ideas

Characteristics:
- Motorized vehicles not permitted but delivery vehicles allowed during restricted hours
- Central area dedicated to passive activity, while the margins support east/west movement
- New space for activities while preserving and framing existing iconic monuments
Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Options:
Pedestrian / Transit Mall Precedents

Montreal, Quebec

Victoria, British Columbia

Denver, Colorado

Den Haag, The Netherlands

Charlottesville, Virginia
Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Options: Shared Space Ideas

Characteristics:
- Motorized vehicles are permitted, but not given priority
- South leg still accessible for parking and deliveries
- Transit vehicles receive priority
- During special events, street could be completely closed to traffic
Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza Options: Shared Space Precedents

- Oosterwolde, The Netherlands
- De Brinkgood, The Netherlands
- Drachten, The Netherlands
- Lund, Sweden
- Sweden
- Sweden
- Sweden
A Potential Strategy for Gore Park

Any closure of King Street must be approached cautiously, to avoid significant negative impacts to businesses and overall transportation network operations, including both vehicular and transit level of service. The final strategy should depend on PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK.

A potential strategy for the pedestrianization of Gore Park/King Street might be as follows:

**Planning/Preparation**
- Finalize transit terminal options to clear way for removal of buses from Gore Park
- Finalize rapid transit feasibility studies
- Hold series of Charrettes to finalize design concepts for Gore Park

**Building Blocks**
- Pilot test varying degrees of street closures on weekends and for special events
- Implement changes planning documents to enable supporting land use
- Measure public opinion, traffic impacts and retailers’ opinions

**Implementation**
- Implement east-west rapid transit
- Implement changes to other streets to accommodate diverted traffic
- Implement street closure or shared street concept
## Implementation Schedule

### Proposed schedule for implementation of projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Tasks and Steps</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Beyond 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Road Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York/Wilson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to designated streets as budget/needs justification permits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Transit Terminal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gore Park Transformation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complementary Travel Demand Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**

- Completion of Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review
- Detailed Design and Budget Approvals
- Recommended Implementation Timeframe

* Subject to Rapid Transit and Gore Park studies
Next Steps

- Listen to comments by the public and stakeholders
- Finalize master plan review report including results of consultation
- Prepare addendum to the Environmental Study Report
- Allocate funding in capital budgets

We Want to Hear From You!

These panels outline possible directions for the Downtown. We would like to know what you think about the ideas presented here. There are four ways to participate:

😊 Speak to a representative at this public information centre

📝 Complete one of our feedback forms here today

💻 Visit our website at [www.hamilton.ca](http://www.hamilton.ca)

📞 Arrange a meeting with City staff
Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>I like this very much!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue) * Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative</td>
<td>I agree with this. Downtown Hamilton needs to be rebalanced with less priority on the automobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes • Park/McNab Two-way Conversion • Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion • King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion • Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>I agree with all of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements • Main Street • Cannon Street • Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td>I am fully supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements • Hunter Street • York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td>We need to drastically improve the cycling network in Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

i agree that the south leg of king should be fully closed to vehicular traffic. the north leg could be reserved to all but transit + cycling. the park should be redesigned with moveable furniture.

Name: 
Address: 
E-mail: 

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: epplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario MSV 1V6
Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria | only 2 lanes for bus and small busways 
| Avenue)                                                                            | bike lane for cyclists                        |
| * Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative |                                               |
| King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)        |                                               |
| * Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative |                                               |
| Secondary Street network changes                                                  |                                               |
| • Park/McNab Two-way Conversion                                                    |                                               |
| • Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion                                                  |                                               |
| • King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion                                          |                                               |
| • Caroline Street Two-way Conversion                                               |                                               |
| Pedestrian Improvements                                                            |                                               |
| • Main Street                                                                      |                                               |
| • Cannon Street                                                                    |                                               |
| • Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street         |                                               |
| Cycling Improvements                                                              |                                               |
| • Hunter Street                                                                    |                                               |
| • York Boulevard, West of Bay Street                                               |                                               |

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a “Pedestrian Square”, a “Shared Street Concept” or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

park site at #aeua - free bus in March after
Welling (open Charles to Flannery) (Charles includes
hospital employees) what do you think

Name: ____________________________________________________________________________
Address: _________________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _________________________________________________________________________
☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax 905-546-4435
Email: op@planning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibi-group.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
For Your information and guidance, this document outlines the recommended changes to the downtown transportation system. Please provide your feedback on the changes and any other suggestions you may have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>-Great idea -- reduced need to 'allow' pedestrian movement between the core and Fruit Belt districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>-Hard to see 2-way the whole length, will be interesting to see how it performs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrian initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td>-Probably not good idea for the length -- for the most part, these areas are already 'calm', pedestrian friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>-The pedestrian improves on Cannon are greatly insufficient to address the Cannon Street problem. Should meet the needs of Cannon and westward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td>-York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

```
I would like to... (please describe)
```

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
**Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review**  
**City of Hamilton**  
**Public Information Centre**  
**March 18, 2008**

**COMMENT SHEET**

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *(Please Print)*

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Strongly dislike! I have already been displaced from John James due to increased travel time and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>OK Vehicles need priority in the external core around the central core.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secondary Street network changes | - Park/McNab Two-way Conversion  
- Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion  
- King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion  
- Caroline Street Two-way Conversion |
| Pedestrian Improvements | - Main Street  
- Cannon Street  
- Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street |
| Cycling Improvements | - Hunter Street  
- York Boulevard, West of Bay Street |

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

* Rebuild the James Street Incline or something modern equivalent. There is no pedestrian or cyclist friendly route currently.  
* Stairs are not safe for pedestrians & too hard for me and bike.  
* Cycling will take too long.  
* Would like to cycle to top of upper James & use transit to lower level (not want for Office)*

Name: [Redacted]  
Address: [Redacted]  
E-mail: [Redacted]

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

**Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager**  
**Environmental Planning**  
**City of Hamilton**  
**77 James Street North, Suite 302**  
**Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3**  
**Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101**  
**Fax: 905-546-4435**  
**Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca**

**Brian Hollingworth**  
**IBI Group**  
**230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto**  
**Ontario M5V 1V6**  
**Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414**  
**Fax: 416-596-0644**  
**Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com**

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review  
City of Hamilton  
Public Information Centre  
March 18, 2008  

COMMENT SHEET  

Your comments are important to the planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)  

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>- Major streets should not be converted into 2-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>- Please see Toronto’s example with Spadina. A major has been turned into a one-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street network changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>- Great, small roads can cause unnecessary traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Please be cognizant of our travel patterns. In 12 months, in southern ON, only 4 real good months to cycle. Is it worth the 8 months non-use?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a “Pedestrian Square”, a “Shared Street Concept” or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse i if necessary):  
- Shared street and temporary closures are great ideas  
- Unilaterally, all examples I used were not very good (i.e., Montreal, Granville, Vancouver, Buffalo, (Are you serious?))  
- Better examples would have been Old Port Montreal  
- Also should look at Queen Ave, Miami and any outdoor market areas in Asia, particularly Korea  
- Also, please look at Dundas and Yonge in Toronto, great use  

Name:  
Address:  
E-mail:  

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list  

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:  

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager  
Environmental Planning  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 302  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3  
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101  
Fax: 905-546-4435  
Email: splanning@hamilton.ca  

Brian Hollingworth  
IBI Group  
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto  
Ontario M5V 1V6  
Ph. 416-596-1932 ext 414  
Fax: 416-596-0644  
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com  

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
**Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review**
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

**COMMENT SHEET**

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *(Please Print)*

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Vehicle speeds slowed, with strong pedestrian focus. Safe crossings. Separation for cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue) <em>Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative</em></td>
<td>Concurrency loss at parking lot. Any proposal to closing King, other than extends wonderful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a “Pedestrian Square”, a “Shared Street Concept” or temporary closures. Please tell us what your vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

Bus parking/rolling being necessary to Hunter Street, be necessary on other King changes.
Consider King closed to vehicles, Williington across only
LRT perhaps best on King

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: epplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
# Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review

City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

## COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *(Please Print)*

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Would make it more pedestrian-friendly. Kind of scary now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td><em>Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td>Make the area a more normal, slow traffic pedestrian friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>All of this goes to make Hamilton a people friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street, Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td>Not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

- [ ] Bike
- [ ] Car
- [ ] Pedestrian
- [ ] Environment

```

```

Name:
Address:
E-mail

[ ] I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

- Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
  Environmental Planning
  City of Hamilton
  77 James Street North, Suite 302
  Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
  Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
  Fax: 905-546-4435
  Email: epplanning@hamilton.ca

- Brian Hollingworth
  IBI Group
  230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
  Ontario M5V 1V6
  Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414
  Fax: 416-596-0644
  Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>THE BAY ST INTERSECTION WOULD BE A HOT SPOT FOR COLLISIONS. WOULD NOT HAPPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>NO ++ ADD BIKE LANES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>YES — HESS/WILLIAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>YES — REBECCA OK — KING WILLIAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>YES — HALF/HALF NOW WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a “Pedestrian Square”, a “Shared Street Concept” or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

- Eliminate street parking — Too Many
- Remove lots already
- Add bike lane
- Keep one way downtown to keep flow
- Masking between King & Main — Fix
- Turn on wrong side of road

Name:
Address:
E-mail

☑ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: epplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
### Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review

**City of Hamilton**

**Public Information Centre**

**March 18, 2008**

### COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *(Please Print)*

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Like all the proposed conversions from one way, this will be far more attractive for pedestrians. The increased maneuverability generates more air pollution, thereby creating more noise and congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion <em>(Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</em>** Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative</td>
<td>I live in the downtown area &amp; as such, it’s less safe, noxious, generates air pollution... and... on and on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td>Opposed - everything is wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Park/McNab Two-way Conversion  
- Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion  
- King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion  
- Caroline Street Two-way Conversion | |
| Pedestrian Improvements | Keep the streets one-way! There’s the biggest street improvement! |
| - Main Street  
- Cannon Street  
- Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street | |
| Cycling Improvements | As long as they’re off the sidewalk! Some of us are pedestrians! |
| - Hunter Street  
- York Boulevard, West of Bay Street | |

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what your **Vision** for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

Leave it alone. Best idea: have parking lots outside the downtown area. Charge for parking and issue a FREE bus pass for a FREE ride downtown. That way you get more downtown circulation and zoos to transit. Improve transit downtown. You could have some or all buses run on King Street or Queen Park.

But, whatever you do, don’t worry about increasing amount of self-egregiousness. You’re just going to have to re-ass in a couple of years anyway. And why — speaking in general — worry about the environment? This is a planned town-off. Let’s just pave it over and keep Hamilton Hamilton.

---

**Name:**

**Address:**

**Email:**

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

**Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager**

**Environmental Planning**

**City of Hamilton**

**77 James Street North, Suite 302**

**Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3**

**Ph.: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101**

**Fax: 905-546-4435**

**Email: eplanning@hamilton.ca**

**Brian Hollingworth**

**IBI Group**

**230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto**

**Ontario M5V 1V6**

**Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414**

**Fax: 416-596-0644**

**Email: bhollingworth@ibi.group**

---

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td><strong>GOOD IDEA - PLEASE GET GONE ON THIS OTHER 2-WAY CONVERSION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td><strong>OK, BUT WHY NOT MAINTAIN ONE WAY ON THE SAME SECTION. MAIN STREET IS TOO WIDE TO FAST.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td><strong>YES, DO IT, SLOWER SPEEDS ARE A GOOD THING. MAKE NORTHBOUND LESS FEAT AHEAD.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>OFF MAXABN onto SAME STREET IS NOW 2-WAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>YES, DO THIS ASAP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>YES, ESPECIALLY YORK - BUT WHY NOT CANNON STREET AS AN ALTERNATIVE?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bay Street, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street, Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

**MULTI-USE SHARED BETWEEN TRANSIT & OTHER MODES, KING WILLIAM WOULD BE AN IDEAL PEDESTRIAN ONLY STREET. PLEASE DO NOT MOVE TRANSIT OUT OF GORE PARK.**

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. *(Please Print)*

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion</td>
<td><strong>Dislike the lack of balance for on-way traffic.</strong> <strong>Dislike the potential result of an even greater backlog of traffic especially at rush hour.</strong> <strong>Backlog of buses like there now is on James &amp; John.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion <em>(Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</em></td>
<td><strong>Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park pedestrianization initiative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td><strong>Good idea but parking needs to be changed as well.</strong> <strong>When Caroline (part of it) was converted to two-way, I had difficulty trying to pull out across the street due to parked cars.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td><strong>Great ideas so that cyclists are more visible.</strong> <strong>Ps: Maybe you should make cyclists that don't obey street laws more accountable (i.e. online fines) to make everyone safer.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling improvements</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what your vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

I have been to many of the cities studied, including Montreal, Greenville, Staten Island, New York, and the Netherlands. In the case of Hamilton, I strongly believe in either shared street concept or to leave Gore Park remain intact. I think that free parking and cleaning up places like the Bay Street and dollar street will bring more people to the higher property value to the core. This "Pedestrian Square" concept is a concept that will bring more pedestrian to an already busy area at rush hour than ever before."

Name:  
Address:  
E-mail:  

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Since 2 way traffic is used, makes it safer for pedestrians &amp; cyclist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Subject to rapid transit feasibility study. Gore Park pedestrianization initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>• Cars drive slower. Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main Street</td>
<td>Pedestrian Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td>Would like some type of separation between cyclist &amp; car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a “Pedestrian Square”, a “Shared Street Concept” or temporary closures. Please tell us what Your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

- Scenario #3
- Civic Square Idea

Name: 

Address: 

E-mail: 

e I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: epplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have few comments about the changes I have listed. The changes to the network of streets are needed to accommodate the growth of the city. However, I am concerned about the impact on traffic and parking. The changes to the streets will increase the traffic congestion in the area.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008).

Natasha D'Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 302
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Ph: 905-546-2404 ext. 5101
Fax: 905-546-4436
Email: splanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth
IBI Group
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5V 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1930 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0644
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion</td>
<td>Probably a good idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion</td>
<td>Depends on rapid transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Why not Victoria Square at Gore Park?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Subject to rapid transit feasibility study Gore Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Pedestrianization initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* King William/Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Caroline Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cannon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Jackson Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hunter Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* York Boulevard, West of Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a “Pedestrian Square”, a “Shared Street Concept” or temporary closures. Please tell us your Vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

☑ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager  
Environmental Planning  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 302  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3  
Ph. 905-546-2424 ext. 5101  
Fax: 905-546-4435  
Email: ejplanning@hamilton.ca

Brian Hollingworth  
IBI Group  
230 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto  
Ontario M5V 1V6  
Ph. 416-596-1930 ext 414  
Fax: 416-596-0644  
Email: bhollingworth@ibigroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
Dear Brian,

I attended the PIC for the Downtown Transportation Master Plan last night at the Hamilton Convention Centre.

Rather than try to hand write my comments into the Comment Sheet, I would like to provide them electronically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>Personal Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Blvd/Wilson two-way conversion.</td>
<td>While I support the conversion of King St. to two-way, I worry about the implications this may have for Cannon St. When I talked with one of the consultants present at the PIC, it became clear to me that little attention had been paid to Cannon, other than to maintain the status quo – namely a one-way thoroughfare. When I enquired about where traffic would be re-routed should Gore Park be fully pedestrianized, I was told that it had not been decided, but likely would be Cannon. I am concerned that increased passenger vehicle traffic along Cannon will not mix well with the large, heavy-load, often double-trailer trucks that use Cannon all day long, at speeds that at least appear to be well above the posted limit. My support, therefore, would be based on whether or not the industrial traffic was made to use the QEW to go east, and the Red Hill Expressway to go west, as promised when the expressway was approved. Trucks of this size and payload should not be traveling through the city any longer. In fact, I would suggest that we consider making Cannon two-way as well. Otherwise, I fear that with all of these other proposed changes, Cannon will be doomed to being Hamilton’s latest urban highway. We have real highways that serve this purpose. City streets should not be competing with high-capacity roads that were built for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St. two-way conversion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Street network changes.</td>
<td>I fully support these conversions. As a resident of downtown, and as a business owner on James North, I believe that the tow-way conversions that have been implemented already, have served to improve the health of the streets – for pedestrians, cyclists, retailers and visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>The pedestrian improvements are a bonus. I would say, however, that improvements to the pedestrian experience will be enhanced greatly through two-way conversion. Therefore, given obvious budget limitations, I suggest we invest what money we do have now in more two-way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/20/2008
conversions as our primary goal, and enhance the streetscape as budget permits.

| Cycling Improvements | Bike lanes are a plus, but to be a meaningful change, they must be more than painted lines on the road. Physical and psychological barriers between cyclists and motorists have proven to be one of the key factors in level of usage of bike lanes. Let's be sure to reflect these findings in the design of any proposed bike lanes. |

Vision for Gore Park

The exampled offered at the PIC is certainly interesting. Personally, I am more in favour of pedestrianizing the south side and in keeping the north side (King) open to traffic, but converted to two-way. A fully-pedestrianized 'square' is I believe better in concept than reality. Vehicular traffic has, in my opinion, a psychological affect on people that is not entirely negative, particularly when you can 'watch the world go by' before your eyes sitting at a café or on a park bench. Two-way is slower and therefore seems safer. For me, this is one of the reasons that benches should face the street and not storefronts. People feel as if they have their backs to the street when forced to stare into a storefront versus traffic (both vehicular and pedestrian) as it moves by in front of them, including on the opposite side of the street. Further, I do not think that we should include street parking on the south side of Gore Park. It's either pedestrianized or it's not! Middle ground is middlebrow. I understand the need for service vehicles (deliveries, fire, EMS, etc.) but not for private vehicles. I suggest that we add more metered street parking on nearby streets such as John, Hughson, Main, etc. Also, while I like the idea of a water feature (presumably which features the existing historic fountain) that doubles as a skating rink in winter months, I do not want to support this at the expense of the primary/secondary civic square in front of City Hall being abandoned, as it has been for several decades. We need to invest as much creativity in ensuring that this key civic space is vibrant, just as it is in most cities of any size anywhere in the world! We need to look beyond the obvious and beyond what has been and re-envision a vibrant city space in and around our City Hall. I realize that this is beyond the scope of this brief, but I think that we need to keep in mind the bigger picture of downtown vibrancy and public use so that we build-in connectivity and don’t end up having to force-fit ideas that are, by definition, afterthoughts.

Name: [redacted]

Yes, I would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Thanks for providing a forum that permits this level of input by citizens. Well done!
I have just seen something on the local cable station 14 about potential plans to re-allocate one way streets in Hamilton. I then did further research on the myhamilton.ca website and read The Downtown Transportation Master Plan study. I was shocked and upset with the plans to convert one way streets to two ways.

I am a professional that recently moved to Hamilton with the last 4 years. I am a home owner that not only lives, but also works within the Hamilton downtown core. I love to tell people about how great Hamilton is. Many people in Ontario never get to see how beautiful Hamilton is when you come in via the 403. When I have visitors they usually take one of the two major sets of one ways in and out of town to get to the 403. They always remark on how beautiful it is and how easy is it to get from one side of downtown to the other.

I have lived in many cities around southern Ontario and I love the one way street systems in Hamilton. I believe that they are the most efficient means of moving large amounts of people from one side of town to the other. At any given time I can get from one side of Hamilton to the other within 10-15 minutes no matter the time of day. Hamilton’s one way streets are a model for how other congested cities should operate.

I have experienced the frustration of not being able to get around cities like Toronto and Mississauga, due to the lack of planning, through streets and general congestion. Toronto is a perfect example of what I don’t want Hamilton to become. Mississauga has a number of wide two way streets that get clogged up at every major intersection. Please don’t allow plans for urban renewal of the downtown to be clouded by short sighted thinking that will lead to the inability to get through the downtown core.

In Hamilton there are many ways to get around, the two major sets of one ways on either side of the downtown ensure that getting from point A to point B is never too difficult. The oneway streets enable general traffic, transit, cyclists, community construction and emergency vehicles to co-exist without substantial havoc if a lane is blocked or delayed; in other cities this creates chaos and significant delays.

If you need a place to rebuild the downtown and make Hamilton the world class city it deserves to be, continue to reclaim the waterfront. The single biggest problem with Hamilton is the view of the factories that make us look like ‘Gotham City’ when people see when going over the Skyway. Barton and James Street areas should be the focus for pedestrian friendly downtown shopping districts like Queen Street or Yonge and Dundas Square in Toronto. Pittsburgh PA is a great example of a city that has been able to reclaim the downtown and the waterfront, while maintaining much of the cities character, cleaning up the pollution and encouraging life after an industrial hangover.

Save Our One Way Streets!

regards,
Hi

The last day for public comments is April 1/08. An electronic copy of the comment sheet is available on the project website: www.hamilton.ca/DowntownTMP
Shortly after the comment period concludes, we will develop a comment/response table summarizing the comments received.

If you send me your full address, I can add you to our mailing list.

We look forward to hearing from you,

Natasha

Natasha D'Souza, MES
Project Manager - Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation Division
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
P: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
F: 905-546-4435
E: ndsouza@hamilton.ca

--------Original Message--------
From: 
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 1:18 PM
To: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: GRIDS - downtown transportation review

HI - what is the deadline for comments on the downtown transportation master plan review?

Thanks for all your good work!
Thank you!

Natasha

-----Original Message-----
From: ndsouza@hamilton.ca
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2008 10:32 AM
To: D'Souza, Natasha
Subject: RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan

Thank you Natasha,

My full address is below. You can call me Nadine.

Sincerely,

--- "D'Souza, Natasha" <ndsouza@hamilton.ca> wrote:

> Thank you for your comments, Shortly after the comment
> period concludes on April 1, we will develop a comment/response table
> summarizing the comments received. It will be available on the project
> website: www.hamilton.ca/DowntownTMP
> Please provide me with your full address and I will add you to our mailing list.
> Regards,
> Natasha
> Natasha D'Souza, M.E.S
> Project Manager - Environmental Planning
> Capital Planning and Implementation Division
> Public Works Department
> City of Hamilton
> P: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
> F: 905-546-4435
> E: ndsouza@hamilton.ca
Dear Ms. D'Souza,

I have reviewed the Downtown Transportation Master Plan and am very pleased to see all the great work that has gone into it thus far.

With regard to the "King Street - Potential Closure Scenarios", I think that Scenario #2 is the best option, since the area between John and Wellington is already doing very well without closure and is relatively pedestrian friendly.

I only have two major concerns I would like to mention.

The first is that the plan to make York/Wilson two-way doesn't seem to include the area beside Sir John A. MacDonald school (between Queen St. and Bay St.). If Cannon were also made to be two way then this could remove some of the burden of traffic from Wilson Street at rush hour (eastbound), as well as improving the quality of life on Cannon.

The second concern is that I think that the "Gore Park - Pedestrian Plaza Options: Shared Space Ideas" should entertain another possibility - namely, that the leg of Gore Park should have no parking and indeed, no public transit or vehicular traffic whatsoever, with the possible exception of delivery trucks and Darts transportation. This way, restaurants and public spaces could be better developed in this area. Possibly an open air bazaar or festivals in the summer? A winter festival would be fun too - especially with the proposed skating rink! I think the north leg of the "Gore Park - Pedestrian Plaza Options: Shared Space Ideas" is fine the way it is.

I hope my comments and input are useful and still timely. Thanks for your excellent work - keep it up!

Sincerely,

P.S. Please add me to your email list to receive updates if possible.
Re: Downtown TMP 5 year review.

----- Original Message ----- 

From: _______________________
To: Stephen, Jillian
Subject: Re: Missing Link

Jill,

Thank you for making the correction.

I hope you well in the next round of planning exercises. I would note that much of the plan in this document was unfortunately not accomplished although I believe that it would have contributed greatly to the Planning Principles as stated. The liveability of the downtown would have been greatly enhanced had the changes all been accomplished already with the desired projected areas underway currently.

Stephen, Jillian wrote:

   Good morning,

   Thank you for advising us of a problem with the link to the Downtown Transportation Master Plan executive summary on the City of Hamilton's website. The link has now been fixed.

   Should you encounter additional problems accessing the document, please contact me by email or at 905-546-2424 x 6392.

   Thank you,

   Jill Stephen

Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.

Albert Einstein
Project-manager environmental planning
City of Hamilton

References downtown transportation master plan

In Toronto one-way streets are used extensively to control traffic in a residential
district, and in downtown core tow away zones are enforced strictly, resulting in
people being forced to go on high priced parking lots, the end result is booming
business, the reason is people today do not want to waste time on the road. And
unless they can drive fast into a parking lot and do their business, they will find
somewhere else.

If Hamilton downtown business has to survive. They have to provide more, off
street parking, there must be a total ban on stopping on the streets except busses,
the traffic must be speeded up by increasing the speed limit to 70 km an hour on
main streets and John and James Street must be one way again.
The higher-speed will reduce air pollution by 50% in the downtown core and
reduce fuel consumption.
Because people in Hamilton do not like to pay for parking it would be necessary
to have parking free
My recommendation is based on years of research knowledge as a former
businessman in Denmark and the extensive knowledge in defensive driving in
traffic safety this can only be a short-term solution as the world population is
growing very fast. And by the turn-of-the-century there would be no room for
green spaces or historical places therefore we need a brand-new planning based
on the future, all land North of Cannon Street, must be zoned Industrial
I'm enclosing some material showing you how the higher speed reduced
accidents in Denmark and showing you how global warming will pretty soon be
replaced by global cooling.
I'm very disappointed city of Hamilton police not enforce the five most common
causes of accidents. Neither do they go after bike riders, which do not go by the
law. Therefore I believe a total ban on bikes inside the city limits is in order
It appears that the European Union members are going 130 km speed limit on
the highway and 70 in the city based on safety and pollution.

sincerely

[Signature]
Fewer traffic deaths despite road safety cutbacks

21. juli 2005 10:15 English

Since first taking office in 2001, the centre-right government has saved more than 100 million kroner a year on road safety.

This morning, the vice-chairman of the so-called Road Safety Commission said that the cutbacks gave cause for concern, but nonetheless the number of road fatalities has dropped drastically in recent years.

Last year, there were 369 road deaths, the lowest number since 1950, and in the first six months of this year the number of road fatalities has dropped another 9 percent.

Foto: DR, © DR

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.

http://www.dr.dk/pubs/nyheder/template/printarticle.jhtml?sectionID=43&articleID=265... 25/07/2005
New cycle paths lead to more accidents

22. August 2005 10:35 English

A new survey by Åbo Akademi University has drawn the dramatic conclusion that when new cycle paths are built, the number of accidents rises by 35 percent and the number of deaths and injuries by 30 percent.

The researchers have looked at the development on 40 stretches of road in Jutland and on Fyn where new cycle paths were constructed between 1989 and 2000.

44 percent of the accidents occur at cross roads. According to one of the researchers, the results are due to the fact that Danish towns are not designed to tackle the increase in traffic and cyclists and pedestrians are particularly affected.

Last year 53 cyclists died in traffic accidents.

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.

http://www.dr.dk/pubs/nyheder/template/printarticle.jhtml?sectionID=43&articleID=270... 23/08/2005
New speed limit on motorways (30 april 2004 - 09 33)

As of midnight, Danes have been allowed to do 130 km/h on some motorway sections.

The new speed limit will allow drivers to cut ten minutes off the 300 kilometre-trip from the capital, Copenhagen, to Denmark's second city, Aarhus.

The Danish Road Safety Council is hoping, however, that new and better signposting will make more Danes observe the speed limits on the motorway, regardless of whether is the old 110 km/h limit or the new 130 km/h speed limit.
April 3, 2008

Natasha D’Souza,  
Project Manager-Capital Planning and Implementation  
City of Hamilton  
77 James St. N.  
Suite 320  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

RE: YORK BLVD./WILSON ST. CONVERSION TO 2-WAY STREETS

Dear Miss D’Sousa:

By creating this intricate critical maze bottleneck you are forcing some everyday users to find other ways to go east and west and even north and south. The rest would go through the bottleneck and leaving behind lots of filthy polluted air. By over-doing one-way to two-way, back to one-way, you are going to create an atmosphere to the opposite of your intention. Remember, you can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make it drink.

There are people that come from the Mountain, West Hamilton, etc. to the Farmer’s Market. Do not make this stop-and-go one-way, two-way back to one-way maze or they will stop coming for good, and so many others (the City core will be a real Ghost core).

I can see from my window during the rush hours heavy traffic on York Blvd. in and out of the City with a decent flow. Do not hold it back with the idea of two-way York Blvd./Wilson St. from Bay St. to Wellington St.4 When there is an event at Copps Coliseum, Hamilton Place, Convention Centre, Art Gallery or other places, traffic in or out of York Blvd. is bumper to bumper. Parking will be less and more difficult to find. Do not force working people to lose time and use more gas to reach their destination.

Hoping you understand my vision (point of view), it’s just common sense with no strings attached. I have been living in Hamilton around this area since I immigrated from Italy. It is working good, don’t ruin it.

Safety is a concern and there are many other disadvantages.

Thank you for your consideration.

A Concerned Citizen,
Member with the Hamilton Safety Council for thirty-eight years and with the co-operation of the Hamilton Automobile Club. we managed to promote the one-way streets which have moved traffic efficiently for many, many years,

Dreaming up two-way on James and John cost the taxpayer millions, perhaps it assisted business in the area to a small degree, BUT...created confusion, accidents, problems for the motorists and pedestrians.

Hamilton is not conducive to transit rail systems........

Open your eyes and look at the big picture.

Leave the bus service on the south side of the Gore.- If moved people will not go downtown.

Reduce the fares if you want to increase ridership. All the increases only reduce ridership.

LEAVE THE TWO WAY STREETS ALONE....THEY WORK.

"SAFETY IS EVERYONE'S BUSINESS * MAKE IT YOURS"
Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year EA Review
City of Hamilton
Public Information Centre
March 18, 2008

COMMENT SHEET

Your comments are important to this planning process. We ask that you answer the following questions about what you consider to be important for the future transportation system in Downtown Hamilton. (Please Print)

Several major changes to the Downtown street network were proposed in 2001 and re-confirmed in the 5-year review. Please explain what you like or dislike about any of these proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>What do you like or dislike about this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard/Wilson Street one-way to two-way conversion (Bay Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Does not increase flow, makes transit downtown traffic easier, if not, makes getting around easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street one-way to two-way conversion (Queen Street to Victoria Avenue)</td>
<td>Change Main St to Lake fo! It looks just right! Present new ideas. Think King.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secondary Street network changes  
- ParkMcIntosh Two-Way Conversion  
- Hodgson/Hess Two-Way Conversion  
- King William/Rebecca Two-Way Conversion  
- Caroline Street Two-Way Conversion | May be considered. Need to be their length of street - and strongly in favour. |
| Pedestrian Improvements  
- Main Street  
- Cannon Street  
- Bay Street N, Queen Street, Catherine Street, Mary Street Jackson Street | Must do! |
| Cycling Improvements  
- Hunter Street  
- York Boulevard, West of Bay Street | Must be like houses - must own in appropriate design. |

Ideas on how to enhance the pedestrian environment around Gore Park and along King Street are being looked at. Ideas include a "Pedestrian Square", a "Shared Street Concept" or temporary closures. Please tell us what your vision for Gore Park and King Street would include (use reverse if necessary):

Downtown suffers greatly from excessive long distance trips going through not. Horrible truck traffic on Main and Cannon in particular must be addressed.

Name:
Address:
E-mail

☐ I would like to be added to the project mailing list

Please leave your completed Comment Sheet in the drop box provided or mail (before April 1, 2008) to:

Natasha Desouza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 202
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2A3
Ph: 905-546-2024 ext. 3161
Fax: 905-546-4346
Email: planning@hamilton.ca

Brian Holingworth
Bl Group
320 Richmond Street West, 5th Floor, Toronto
Ontario M5Y 1V6
Ph: 416-596-1600 ext 414
Fax: 416-596-0344
Email: bholingworth@blgroup.com

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this study and may include them in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record.
We have many out of town visitors to our B&B. A large percentage comment negatively on the one way streets. Finding their way around downtown is severely hampered by the one way system.

I suggest that any city information released stresses that the cost of work done with the traffic projects is only partially due with 2 way conversion, and be sure to emphasize the pedestrian and infrastructure benefits.

We need to move on this. James & John were non issues.

There will be fuel reductions for people travelling within downtown - less distance because direct for cars, also more comfortable 
& safer to walk or cycle
Project-manager environmental planning
City of Hamilton

References downtown transportation master plan

In Toronto one-way streets are used extensively to control traffic in a residential district, and in downtown core tow away zones are enforced strictly, resulting in people being forced to go on high priced parking lots, the end result is booming business, the reason is people today do not want to waste time on the road. And unless they can drive fast into a parking lot and do their business, they will find somewhere else.

If Hamilton downtown business has to survive. They have to provide more, off street parking, there must be a total ban on stopping on the streets except buses, the traffic must be speeded up by increasing the speed limit to 70 km an hour on main streets and John and James Street must be one way again.

The higher-speed will reduce air pollution by 50% in the downtown core and reduce fuel consumption.

Because people in Hamilton do not like to pay for parking it would be necessary to have parking free.

My recommendation is based on years of research knowledge as a former businessman in Denmark and the extensive knowledge in defensive driving in traffic safety this can only be a short-term solution as the world population is growing very fast. And by the turn-of-the-century there would be no room for green spaces or historical places therefore we need a brand-new planning based on the future, all land North of Cannon Street, must be zoned Industrial.

I'm enclosing some material showing you how the higher speed reduced accidents in Denmark and showing you how global warming will pretty soon be replaced by global cooling.

I'm very disappointed city of Hamilton police not enforce the five most common causes of accidents. Neither do they go after bike riders, which do not go by the law. Therefore I believe a total ban on bikes inside the city limits is in order.

It appears that the European Union members are going 130 km speed limit on the highway and 70 in the city based on safety and pollution.

sincerely

[Signature]
Fewer traffic deaths despite road safety cutbacks

21. juli 2005 10:15 English

Since first taking office in 2001, the centre-right government has saved more than 100 million kroner a year on road safety.

This morning, the vice-chairman of the so-called Road Safety Commission said that the cutbacks gave cause for concern, but nonetheless the number of road fatalities has dropped drastically in recent years.

Last year, there were 369 road deaths, the lowest number since 1950, and in the first six months of this year the number of road fatalities has dropped another 9 percent.

Foto: DR, © DR

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.
New cycle paths lead to more accidents

22. august 2005 10:35 English

A new survey by Ålborg University has drawn the dramatic conclusion that when new cycle paths are built, the number of accidents rises by 35 percent and the number of deaths and injuries by 30 percent.

The researchers have looked at the development on 40 stretches of road in Jutland and on Fyn where new cycle paths were constructed between 1989 and 2000.

44 percent of the accidents occur at cross roads. According to one of the researchers, the results are due to the fact that Danish towns are not designed to tackle the increase in traffic and cyclists and pedestrians are particularly affected.

Last year 53 cyclists died in traffic accidents.

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af rettigheder som ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttedes.
New speed limit on motorways  (30 april 2004 - 09 33)

As of midnight, Danes have been allowed to do 130 km/h on some motorway sections.

The new speed limit will allow drivers to cut ten minutes off the 300 kilometre-trip from the capital, Copenhagen, to Denmark's second city, Aarhus.

The Danish Road Safety Council is hoping, however, that new and better signposting will make more Danes observe the speed limits on the motorway, regardless of whether is the old 110 km/h limit or the new 130 km/h speed limit.
Speed limit went up - speed dropped

Increasing the speed limits on certain stretches of Danish motorways has been a huge success.

The combination of increasing the speed limit from 110km per hour to 130 and introducing stricter penalties for speeding has resulted in the greatest change in traffic culture on Danish motorways in many years.

The National Road Directorate reported that in the month of May the average speed driven on the 110km stretches dropped by 6 km to 118 km per hour.

The number of drivers doing more than 140 km per hour has also dropped by two thirds.

On the stretches of motorway where the limit is now 130km per hour the average speed has also dropped.

A spokesperson from the Road Directorate said that Danish drivers have not driven so slowly on motorways for 8-10 years.
Less road fatalities in Denmark

29. april 2005 09:12 English

Less and less people are killed in traffic accidents in Denmark.

Last year, 369 people were killed in traffic accidents, and that is the lowest number of road fatalities since 1950.

According to the Danish Road Safety Council, there is currently a strong focus on careful driving in Denmark and that appears to have had a positive effect on drivers.

Also the new and more flexible speed limits on Danish motorways may have reduced speeding, the council said.

Foto: DR, © DR

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.
Denmark: Lowest number of fatal accidents

18. november 2004 10:30 English

In the past year, Denmark recorded the lowest number of fatal road accidents since 1947, according to preliminary figures released yesterday.

During the 12 month period ending October 2004, 389 people were killed on Danish roads, the lowest since 1947, the Danish Road Directorate said.

The statistics were compared to full-year figures for 2002 and 2003 when 463 and 432 people, respectively, were killed in road accidents.

No reason for the decline was given. In March, the speed limit was raised on half of Denmark’s highways from 110 kph to 130 kph.

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR. 
er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.
Record-low number of road deaths

26. september 2004 09:15 English

Less and less people are killed in road accidents in Denmark.

"One has to go back to the Second World War to find a period with less fatal road accidents," one official told Danish media.

In 2003, there were 432 road fatalities in Denmark and it is estimated that some 400 people will be killed in road accidents in 2004.

In the beginning of the seventies, however, the toll of the roads was approximately 1,200 people a year although there were fewer cars on the road back then.

"I cannot think of other reasons for this than the fact that Danes drive more carefully. Heavy fines, new speed limits and police controls have made Danes more well-behaved on the roads," the traffic official said.

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttet.
More young people banned from driving

3. november 2004 16:54 English

More and more newly qualified drivers are having their licenses confiscated and being sent back to driving school.

In the first nine months of this year, 859 drivers have received driving bans against 823 in 2003.

Most of the bans come as a result of drunk driving or speeding and, according to Vice Police Inspector Asger Lund Christensen from the National Police, most bans go to young people between 18 and 19 years old.

Foto: DR. © DR

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR. er beskyttet af rettelser om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.
Record number of drivers will lose their license

Denmark recently raised the speed limit on some stretches of motorway to 130 kmph, and at the same time increased the penalties speeders receive, causing the Danish police to predict an increase in the number of drivers losing their license this year.

The police predict that up to 1500 drivers will have the license invoked, after 210 drivers have already lost their licenses in the first two months since the new law took effect. Before the speed limit was raised to 130 kmph drivers could drive up to 187 kmph before risking their license, today the limit is only 160 kmph.
Companies stress good road safety behaviour

3. december 2004 16:27 English

Many large companies in Denmark are canvassing for improved road safety behaviour and implementing policies for their employees on how to behave on the roads.

Danish Shell have just implemented the country's most restrictive traffic rules and have forbidden all their employees to talk on mobile phones, even hands-free phones, whilst driving.

Failure to follow the rules could lead to dismissal.

The Danish Road Safety Councils' Vice Chairman Karsten Kolding puts the companies' interest in the area down to three things: they are concerned for their employees' safety; there are financial considerations in following traffic rules and the fact that they send a clear signal to their customers that they are responsible organisations.

Artiklen, billeder, grafik og øvrige illustrationer, der er på denne side, stammer fra DR, er beskyttet af regler om ophavsret, og må ikke kopieres eller videreudnyttes.
Fra i dag og 400.000 år tilbage
Global temperatures 'to decrease'

By Roger Harrabin
BBC News environment analyst

Global temperatures for 2008 will be slightly cooler than last year as a result of the cold La Nina current in the Pacific, UN meteorologists have said.

The World Meteorological Organization's secretary-general, Michel Jarraud, told the BBC it was likely that La Nina would continue into the summer.

But this year's temperatures would still be way above the average - and we would soon exceed the record year of 1998 because of global warming induced by greenhouse gases.

The WMO points out that the decade from 1998 to 2007 was the warmest on record. Since the beginning of the 20th Century, the global average surface temperature has risen by 0.74°C.

While Nasa, the US space agency, cites 2005 as the warmest year, the UK's Hadley Centre lists it as second to 1998.

Researchers say the uncertainty in the observed value for any particular year is larger than these small temperature differences. What matters, they say, is the long-term upward trend.

Rises 'stalled'

La Nina and El Nino are two great natural Pacific currents whose effects are so huge they resonate round the world.

El Nino warms the planet when it happens; La Nina cools it. This year, the Pacific is in the grip of a powerful La Nina.

It has contributed to torrential rains in Australia and to some of the coldest temperatures in memory in snow-bound parts of China.

Mr Jarraud told the BBC that the effect was likely to continue into the summer, depressing temperatures globally by a fraction of a degree.

This would mean that temperatures have not risen globally since 1998 when El Nino warmed the world.

Watching trends

A minority of scientists question whether this means global warming has peaked and argue the Earth has proved more resilient to greenhouse gases than predicted.
Animation of El Nino and La Nina effects

But Mr Jarraud insisted this was not the case and noted that 2008 temperatures would still be well above average for the century.

"When you look at climate change you should not look at any particular year," he said. "You should look at trends over a pretty long period and the trend of temperature globally is still very much indicative of warming.

"La Nina is part of what we call 'variability'. There has always been and there will always be cooler and warmer years, but what is important for climate change is that the trend is up; the climate on average is warming even if there is a temporary cooling because of La Nina."

China suffered from heavy snow in January

Adam Scaife, lead scientist for Modelling Climate Variability at the Hadley Centre in Exeter, UK, said their best estimate for 2008 was about 0.4C above the 1961-1990 average, and higher than this if you compared it with further back in the 20th Century.

Mr Scaife told the BBC: "What's happened now is that La Nina has come along and depressed temperatures slightly but these changes are very small compared to the long-term climate change signal, and in a few years time we are confident that the current record temperature of 1998 will be beaten when the La Nina has ended."
Drilling into a climate hotspot

By Martin Redfern
BBC Radio Science

Scientists from the British Antarctic Survey have just returned from one of the most ambitious projects of the season: to drill an ice core from the top of a mountain high on the Antarctic Peninsula.

"The Peninsula is the fastest warming place in Antarctica and one of the three fastest-warming in the world," explained team leader Dr Robert Mulvaney.

"Over the last 50 years, it has probably warmed about 2.5°C, which is spectacular," he told Discovery on the BBC World Service.

From the broad 1,630m summit of Mount Haddington, the highest point on James Ross Island near the northern tip of the Antarctic Peninsula, you get a spectacular view.

Far to the west are high ice cliffs, 1,000m high, leading up to the mountains of the mainland peninsula.

Had you been standing there in 1916, you might have seen the remnants of Ernest Shackleton's party drifting past on sea-ice following the loss of HMS Endurance.

The latest vessel to bear that name, which carried us and the scientists, was able to sail right into the channel that separates James Ross Island from the mainland.

Twenty years ago that channel was permanently blocked by ice.

Different views

Fifty kilometres to the south, there used to be the vast Larsen B ice shelf which broke up spectacularly in 2002 over the space of a few weeks.

Now, the Wilkins ice shelf on the other side of the peninsula appears to be disintegrating.

All these changes would seem to be signs of global warming, but are they just a recent phenomenon or part of a natural cycle?

There is controversial evidence from sediment cores drilled from
where the Larsen B Ice Shelf used to be that suggest it may have broken up previously.

"Marine sediments tell us that an ice shelf break-up happened around 5,000 years ago as well. This core will tell us for certain if it got warmer then, too," Dr Mulvaney said.

It should also tell him about how the great Antarctic ice sheets began to retreat at the end of the last ice age.

"I have drilled two cores in the region; this one and on Berkner Island, 1,500km to the south," he explained.

"These were both part of the western Antarctic ice sheet in the last ice age, but that retreated rapidly as the ice age came to an end.

"That gives some feeling for how fast the ice sheets can actually retreat. So, it gives clues about how the ice sheet might retreat from other areas if they warm in the future."

**To the base**

To complete this borehole, helicopters from HMS Endurance had to transport 20 tonnes of supplies and equipment to the mountaintop.

A team of seven scientists lived there in tents for 50 days, working in shifts so that they could continue drilling 16 hours a day.

The main working tent itself had to have a slot in the roof and trench in the floor to accommodate the tall drill, and enable it to swing to the horizontal to extract the ice core.

At intervals in the ice, there are grey bands of volcanic ash. James Ross Island and some of its neighbours are volcanic, though there is no sign of activity there today.

After some initial bad weather and snow drifting over and even into their tents, the drill team made good progress and, by mid February, had reached a depth of 363m. It was Robert Mulvaney's turn to work the drill.

"I got 20cm into my run (normally you try and drill 1.5m on each run). I got just 22cm and the drill got stuck. Of course, my colleagues said, you're rubbish at drilling, let me take over," he recalled.

"But we brought the drill back to the surface and we knew straight away that we had got to the bottom. You can't go further than that."

The team managed to drill a small amount of the frozen clay and rock fragments from beneath the ice. This should enable the researchers to date when ice first covered the region.

**'Night life'**

Completion of core saw a small celebration.

"Next day, two Twin Otter planes took out the ice cores and left empty the ice cave in which we had stored them. So we set it up with Tilly lamps and candles and we sat around on food boxes and partied well into the next night.

"We called it 'The Pit' - the most exclusive nightclub venue in the region," said Dr Mulvaney.

Now, the ice cores are on their way back to the UK for analysis.

Trapped within the ice are tiny bubbles of ancient air which should reveal atmospheric composition -
and in particular carbon dioxide concentrations - well back into the last ice age, possibly 30,000 years ago.

The proportions of different types, or isotopes, of oxygen in the ice should give the team the sea temperature at the time to an accuracy better than one degree. When the sea is warmer, a greater proportion of the heavier oxygen isotope evaporates to leave its signature in the ice.

There are also tiny traces of other chemicals in the ice layers.

The amount of some of them, notably sea salt, should show if there was open sea nearby at the time the layers formed. If there is very little salt, then there were probably extensive ice shelves preventing it getting blown onto the island.

The helicopters from HMS Endurance eventually returned to retrieve the "Antarctic night-clubbers". Everything was shipped out. Nothing but clean white snow drifts across the summit of Mount Haddington.

"When we leave the site, we take everything with us," said Dr Mulvaney.

"We've left nothing in the hole, nothing on the surface. Everything goes out. That's very important to us."

You can listen live to Discovery on the BBC World Service at 1230 GMT on Wednesdays. Follow the link to the website to listen again.
Wood burning stoves pollute more than cars and lorries

12. august 2005 09:47 English

Wood burning stoves have become increasingly popular in Denmark and now account for almost 50 percent of particle pollution in the country.

That is more than cars and trucks, and things are likely to get worse as spiralling oil prices are making more and more Danes invest in a stove.

According to the National Environmental Research Institute, particle pollution from wood burning stoves in private homes is costing the state more than one billion kroner a year in increased health expenditures.

Foto: DR, © DR
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APPENDIX E

STAKEHOLDER CORRESPONDENCE
Dear Ms D'Souza and Mr Hollingworth,

On behalf of the Durand Neighbourhood Association, I would like to provide comments on the 5-year review of the Downtown Transportation Master Plan.

The DNA strongly supports the general objectives of the Plan:

- Promoting slower traffic speeds and improved understandability of the street network by implementing one-way to two-way conversions
- Improving conditions for walking, cycling and other forms of non-motorized transportation
- Making transit a viable option to single occupant vehicles

We believe that achieving these objectives will improve the liveability and sustainability of the downtown neighbourhoods, as well as promote economic development and the provision of a full range of shops and services downtown. We have already seen improvements on James and John Streets thanks to the two-way conversion. These streets are now much more pedestrian friendly, and have seen an upsurge in development (especially the new shops and galleries on James N). Further two-way conversion will help bring commercial and residential life back to downtown.

The DNA also recognizes the importance of fairness in street design. As pointed out by Gil Penalosa in his keynote address at the Upwind-Downwind conference, even in the richest neighbourhoods 30% of residents cannot drive. This percentage is likely to be much higher downtown. The current 1950s style high-speed one-way layout has not only destroyed the commercial heart of the City, it is also dangerous and inequitable for non-motorists (and everyone is a pedestrian some of the time!).

In the Durand we have seen the benefits of two-way conversion of Caroline and Hess Streets. These streets are more pedestrian friendly, and the conversion has eliminated the street racing that used to take place on Hess late at night! Clearly, such small residential streets should never have been one-way in the first place.

The DNA is, however, concerned and disappointed by the slow rate of
progress in two-way conversion. Back in the 1950s the entire one-way system was implemented overnight, but the two-way conversions proposed in 2001 are proceeding at a snail's pace and are still not complete. We should be actively planning the next wave of conversions, not thinking whether to implement what was proposed seven years ago!

The multiple benefits of two-way conversion are now abundantly clear: there is no need for further studies or delays. With the completion of the Red Hill Valley Parkway there is no longer any justification for a high-speed shortcut through downtown. We encourage the City to proceed to convert the remaining one-way streets Downtown, and in the adjacent neighbourhoods, as a top priority.

Regarding the conversion of the Gore Park section of King St, we support the "shared pedestrian space concept."

We would be happy to provide any further input or comments.

Yours sincerely,
Hi Kathy,

It was nice to see you again last week. We value the input of the Downtown BIA for the Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 yr review and the Gore Park Pedestrianization Study.

Should the BIA wish to submit any correspondence on this project, I would appreciate hearing from you by April 30.

Here is the link to the project website: [www.hamilton.ca/DowntownTMP](http://www.hamilton.ca/DowntownTMP)

Regards,

**Natasha D'Souza, MES**  
Project Manager - Environmental Planning  
Capital Planning and Implementation Division  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
P: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101  
F: 905-546-4435  
E: ndsouza@hamilton.ca
can you add this to DTMP public correspondence. Did I already ask you to do this?

-----Original Message-----

From: Kathy Drewitt [mailto:kathydrewitt@downtownhamilton.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2008 11:03 AM
To: D'Souza, Natasha
Subject: RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan/Gore Park

Many of my members do not have internet. I would appreciate if the city would pick this up for us. I do not have a budget for this item.

Kathy

Kathy G. Drewitt, Executive Director
Downtown Hamilton Business Improvement Area
20 Hughson Street South, Suite 807
Hamilton, Ontario L8N 2A1
(905) 523-1646 Fax (905) 523-5433
info@downtownhamilton.org
www.downtownhamilton.org

From: D'Souza, Natasha [mailto:ndsouza@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Friday, April 04, 2008 4:42 PM
To: kathydrewitt@downtownhamilton.org
Subject: RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan/Gore Park

Hi Kathy,

The brochures are available on the project website: www.hamilton.ca/DowntownTMP
if you're still interested in 650 hard copies, I will have to confirm with Finance to get back to you with a cost quote.

Let me know,

Natasha

Natasha D'Souza, MES
Project Manager - Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation Division
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
: 905-546-4435
: ndsouza@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----

/11/2008
Hi Natasha,

In preparation for the BIA’s response to the Downtown Transportation review we are preparing a survey to be sent out to our membership. I am hopeful that you will be able to supply me with 650 summary brochures to include in the survey envelope so that people can see what you are proposing and go to the website for further information. Is this possible to get within the next week?

Thanks

Kathy

Kathy G. Drewitt, Executive Director
Downtown Hamilton Business Improvement Area
20 Hughson Street South, Suite 807
Hamilton, Ontario L8N 2A1
(905) 523-1646  Fax (905) 523-5433
info@downtownhamilton.org
www.downtownhamilton.org

---

Hi Kathy,

It was nice to see you again last week. We value the input of the Downtown BIA for the Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 yr review and the Gore Park Pedestrianization Study.

Should the BIA wish to submit any correspondence on this project, I would appreciate hearing from you by April 30.

Here is the link to the project website: www.hamilton.ca/DowntownTMP

Regards,

Natasha D'Souza, MES
Project Manager - Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation Division
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
P: 905-546-2424 ext. 5101
F: 905-546-4435
E: ndsouza@hamilton.ca

11/2008
February 15, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: Environmental Assessment and Federal Coordination Standards
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada – Ontario Region

The Ontario Region of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) has a 30 calendar day standard for responding to environmental assessment notifications, including federal coordination requests (FCRs) under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, as well as other environmental assessment correspondence relating to provincial and municipal undertakings. However, correspondence being directed to people who are no longer with the Department or who occupy a different position as well as misdirected mail can cause significant delays in this response time.

To resolve this issue, INAC has established a new procedure that we request your organization adopt when sending environmental assessment correspondence. All unsolicited correspondence concerning environmental assessment requests and notifications that are taking place within the Province of Ontario should be directed to:

Environment Unit
Re: Environmental Assessment Coordination
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
25 St. Clair Avenue East, 8th Floor
Toronto, Ontario, M4T 1M2

INAC has also created a centralized email address where we accept FCRs and other environmental assessment notifications. This address is EACoordination_ON@inac-ainc.gc.ca.

Please keep in mind that just one letter should be sent to the Department regardless of geographical location of the project and that his letter should be addressed to the appropriate recipient mentioned above.

Also, please ensure that notifications are sent within a practicable time frame, particularly when involving invitation to public consultation events.
Questions or comments can be directed to Daniel Johnson at 416-973-5899 or via email at johnsonda@inac.gc.ca.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Daniel Johnson
Environmental Officer
Environment Unit
INAC - Ontario Region
25 St. Clair Avenue E. 8th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M4T 1M2

Canadá
April 10, 2008

Natasha D’Souza
Project Manager, Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 330
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Mr. Elliot:

RE: Provincial Environmental Assessment Notification
Downtown Transportation Master Plan – 5 Year Review Study

Thank you for your correspondence received March 1, 2008 regarding the invitation to the open house for the environmental assessment 5-year review of the downtown transportation master plan. For this project, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada will not be providing a review of the proposed project; however, it is important to contact all potentially interested First Nation communities directly to invite them to participate in this review.

To assist with identifying First Nations and other Aboriginal groups within the vicinity of a specific proposed project, INAC Ontario Region - Environment can provide the following information sources:

- The Chiefs of Ontario website (http://www.chiefs-of-ontario.org) provides a directory of contact information for all First Nations and Chiefs, as well as a map of the locations of all Ontario First Nations.

- Natural Resources Canada produced provincial maps, showing all First Nation reserve lands, are available for purchase at:
  http://cccminrcan.ge.ca/english/canada_lands_index_e.asp

- Natural Resources Canada’s online Historical Indian Treaties map, showing historical First Nation treaties across Canada, is available at:
  http://atlas.nrcan.ge.ca/site/english/maps/historical/indiantreaties/historicaltreaties
• A search by place name at the Canadian Geographical Names database
  (http://geonames.nrcan.gc.ca/search/search_e.php) will generate a map which shows any
  nearby Indian reserve lands in grey.

• The Métis Nation of Ontario (http://www.metisnation.org/) may be able to provide
  information regarding Métis interests with respect to a particular project.

• The Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres website provides a list of all
  friendship centres in Ontario, at:
  http://www.ofic.org/centres/OfficeList.asp?Region='ON'

For any enquiries regarding land claims in within the project area, please contact the Director
General of the Comprehensive Claims Branch at (819) 994-7521, the Director General of
Specific Claims Branch at (819) 994-2323 and the Director General of Litigation Management
and Resolution Branch at (819) 997-3582.

Also, please review the *Environmental Assessment and Federal Coordination Standards*
document included with this letter for the revised policy and standards associated with both
provincial and federal environmental assessments.

Sincerely,

Daniel Johnson
Environmental Officer
Environment Unit
INAC - Ontario Region
25 St. Clair Avenue E. 8th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M4T 1M2

cc: Urmas Madiso, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

This letter has been distributed electronically. If you require a signed copy, please contact the author at the address provided above.
Thank you for your letter regarding the above referenced environmental assessment.

> We have reviewed the information, and note the following:

> Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, which prohibits the construction or placement of any works in navigable waters without first obtaining approval. If any of the related project elements or activities related to this Master Planning process cross or affect a potentially navigable waterway, you are requested to prepare and submit an application in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the attached Application Guide. Any questions about the NWPA application process should be directed to Suzanne Shea, NWP Officer at (519) 383-1866.

> Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Railway Safety Act to ensure the safe operation of railways. The Act addresses the construction and alteration of railway works, the operation and maintenance of railway equipment and certain non-railway operations affecting railway safety. Pursuant to the Notice of Railway Works Regulations, the project proponent will be required to give notice of the proposed project to the following persons: the railway whose line is to be crossed, the municipality in which the crossing works are to be located and the authority having responsibility for the road in question. An approval may be required for certain railway works that depart from engineering standards set under the regulations or where an objection has been filed against the work. Any questions about the Railway Safety Act and the Notice of Railway Works Regulations should be directed to Luciano Martin, Manager of Engineering, at (416) 973-2326.

> You may also wish to review the Act and Regulations by accessing the following Internet sites:


> Please note that certain approvals under the Navigable Waters Protection Act or Railway Safety Act trigger the requirement for a federal environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. You may therefore wish to consider incorporating CEAA requirements into your Master Planning process.
D'Souza, Natasha

From: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 1:37 PM
To: D'Souza, Natasha
Subject: FW: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

FYI
-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bholling@ibigroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 9:36 AM
To: Mike Sone
Cc: Stuart Anderson; Ken Armstrong; John Womersley; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: RE: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

Thanks Mike,

We have spoken to GO about the impacts of the conversion of James and John which took place in 2005 and will take these comments into account in evaluating future conversions.

Brian.

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Sone [mailto:Mike.Sone@gotransit.com]
Sent: October 23, 2007 10:13 AM
To: bholling@ibigroup.com
Cc: eplanning@hamilton.ca; John Womersley; Ken Armstrong
Subject: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

Hi Brian.

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn slower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetcoping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Cheers,
Mike

T. Michael Sone, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner
GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600

10/24/2007
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563
TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner

From: Miranda Lesperance [lesperancem@inac-ainc.gc.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 8:06 AM
To: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Cc: bholling@ibigroup.com
Subject: Hamilton Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review

TORONTO-#19145

7-v1-Hamilton_D..esperance.vcf (299 B)

Good Morning,

Please find attached Indian and Northern Affairs Canada’s response to your letter of September 17, 2007 regarding the Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.

Should you require a signed copy of the response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

Miranda Lesperance
Environment Officer
Environment Unit
INAC - Ontario Region
25 St. Clair Ave E 8th Floor
Toronto, ON M4T 1M2
Phone (416) 973-5899
Fax (416) 954-4328
October 24, 2007

Natasha D’Souza, MES
Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
320-77 James Street North
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. D’Souza:

**RE:** Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class EA Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

Thank you for your letter of September 17, 2007 regarding the above project.

For all provincial and/or municipal undertakings, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada requests that the proponent of such projects make efforts directly from the initiation of a project to identify and notify all potentially interested First Nation communities. It is recommended that this identification and notification occur at the earliest planning stages of the undertaking and if requested by any First Nation(s), maintain communication with such communities. To assist with identifying First Nations and other Aboriginal groups within the vicinity of a specific proposed project, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada can provide the following information sources:

- The Chiefs of Ontario website (http://www.chiefs-of-ontario.org) provides a directory of contact information for all First Nations and Chiefs, as well as a map of the locations of all Ontario First Nations.

- Natural Resources Canada produced provincial maps, showing all First Nation reserve lands, are available for purchase at: http://cccm.nrcan.gc.ca/english/canada_land_index_e.asp

- Natural Resources Canada’s online *Historical Indian Treaties* map, showing historical First Nation treaties across Canada, is available at: http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/site/english/maps/historical/indiantreaties/historicaltreaties
• A search by place name at the Canadian Geographical Names database (http://geonames.nrcan.gc.ca/search/search_e.php) will generate a map which shows any nearby Indian reserve lands in grey.

• The Métis Nation of Ontario (http://www.metisnation.org/) may be able to provide information regarding Métis interests with respect to a particular project.

• The Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres website provides a list of all friendship centres in Ontario, at: http://www.ofific.org/Centres/OfficeList.asp?Region=ON'

• For enquiries regarding land claims in Ontario, please contact the Director General of the Comprehensive Claims Branch at (819) 994-7521, the Director General of Specific Claims Branch at (819) 994-2323 and the Director General of Litigation Management and Resolution Branch at (819) 997-3582.

If, however, the proponent believes that the proposed project is likely to also trigger a requirement for a federal environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA), we advise that the proponent contact the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency early in the planning process, and provide a project description to them. The Agency will notify federal agencies, including INAC, of the proposed project as appropriate, in accordance with the requirements of the Regulations Respecting the Coordination by Federal Authorities of Environmental Assessment Procedures and Requirements. INAC will, in turn, provide input to the Agency regarding our interest in the project and/or First Nation contact information wherever warranted.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Miranda Lesperance
Environment Officer
Environment Unit
INAC - Ontario Region
25 St. Clair Avenue E.  8th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M4T 1M2
lesperancem@inac.gc.ca

cc:    Mr. Brian Hollingworth, IBI Group

This letter has been distributed electronically. If you require a signed copy, please contact the author at the address provided above.
Hi Brian.

I have a couple of additional comments to make as brought up by our Bus Operations:

1) The two-way conversion of John Street has not worked out for us as it’s increased our travel time by 4-6 minutes. I realize this is not in the scope of your review but I would like it noted.

2) If the efficiency of the left turn movement from John to King is significantly compromised, we may consider using York Blvd to reach Hwy 403 instead.

Thanks,
Mike

---

Hi Brian.

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn slower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetscaping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Cheers,
Mike

---

G. Michael Sone, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner

GO Transit
10 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563

0/23/2007
D'Souza, Natasha

From: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2007 10:27 AM
To: D'Souza, Natasha
Subject: FW: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

FYI
-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Sone [mailto:Mike.Sone@gotransit.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2007 10:13 AM
To: bholling@ibigroup.com
Cc: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner; John Womersley; Ken Armstrong
Subject: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

Hi Brian.

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn slower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetscaping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Cheers,
Mike

T. Michael Sone, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner

GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563

10/23/2007
Hi Brian.

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn slower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetscaping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Cheers,

Mike

T. Michael Sone, M.Sc. Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner

GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563
Dear Ms. R D'Souza;

Please find our response on the subject MCEA.
Should you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Charles S. Esendal, P.Eng.
Sustainment Manager
Tx Lines Info Systems & Programs

Hydro One Networks, Inc.
483 Bay Street,
TCT15-A11, North Tower
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2P5

☎: (416) 345-5931
✉ charles.esendal@HydroOne.com
In our initial review, we have confirmed as listed below that there may be potential impacts on Hydro One Transmission Facilities within the area of the study:

- Hydro One Elgin TS located near the intersection of Elgin and Wilson streets as well as the 115kV transmission line corridor running along sections of Head, Napier, Cannon, Mary, Wilson and Hess Streets may be affected by proposed changes in the EA to the transportation system in Downtown Hamilton.

Please allow appropriate lead-time in your project schedule for in-depth assessment and evaluation in the event that consideration is given for relocation, modifications and/or outages for our facilities, which may not be feasible and/or readily available.

Potential impacts on any Hydro One Distribution facilities are usually of a lesser degree and these will be managed through our field offices which are listed on the attachment for your convenience.

In planning, please note that the development should not be directly located within the Hydro One transmission lines rights of way, encroach transmission structures, reduce line clearances and limit our access to the facilities at any one time. All construction activities must maintain the required electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective voltage rating. The integrity of the structure foundations for lines must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. There must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the line supporting structures.

Note that existing rights-of-way may have provisions for future lines or already contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, water mains, parking, etc). Please take this into consideration in your planning.

Once details are known and it is established that the development will affect Hydro One Transmission Line facilities and the associated rights of way, please submit detailed plans that are going to impact affected Hydro One facilities to:

Bob Evans, Hydro One Real Estate Management
185 Clegg Road, Markham L6G 1B7
Phone: (905) 946-6250
Fax: (905) 946-6287
Email: bob.evans@HydroOne.com

Please note that the proponent will be responsible for costs associated with potential modifications to, or relocations of Hydro One facilities as well as any added costs that may be incurred due to increased efforts as a result for maintenance of Hydro One facilities.

Please be advised that this is only a preliminary assessment based on current information. Upon receipt of more detailed plans Hydro One Networks Inc. will provide additional comments.

If you have any further questions or concerns regarding specific clearances or Hydro One right of way situations, please feel free to contact me.

Charles Esendal, P.Eng.
Sustainment Manager
Lines Information Systems & Programs
Hydro One Networks, Inc.
483 Bay St. Toronto M5G 2P5
Phone: (416) 345-5931
charles.esendal@HydroOne.com
October 16, 2007

Ms. Natasha D'Souza
Project Manager, Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste 320
HAMILTON, ON  L8R 2K3

RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

Dear Ms. D’Souza,

I am responding to your notification sent to the Comprehensive Claims Branch, by mail, on September 17, 2007.

We can confirm that there are no comprehensive claims in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. We cannot make any comments regarding potential or future claims, or claims filed under other departmental policies. This includes claims under Canada’s Specific Claims Policy or legal action by the First Nation against the Crown. For more information, I suggest you contact the Director General of Specific Claims Branch at (819) 994-2323 and the Director General of Litigation Management and Resolution Branch at (819) 997-3582.

INAC- Comprehensive Claims Branch does not have any specific interest in the project and would request to be taken out of the mailing list.

Yours truly,

Kevin Clement, Acting Director for
Lynn Bernard, Director General
Comprehensive Claims Branch

Cc: Brian Hollingworth, IBI Group

DISCLAIMER: In this Disclaimer, "Canada" means Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and their servants and agents. Canada does not warrant or assume
October 16, 2007

Ms. Natasha D’Souza  
Project Manager, Environmental Planning  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Ste 320  
HAMILTON, ON  L8R 2K3

RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment  
Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

Dear Ms. D’Souza,

I am responding to your notification sent to the Comprehensive Claims Branch, by mail, on September 17, 2007.

We can confirm that there are no comprehensive claims in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. We cannot make any comments regarding potential or future claims, or claims filed under other departmental policies. This includes claims under Canada’s Specific Claims Policy or legal action by the First Nation against the Crown. For more information, I suggest you contact the Director General of Specific Claims Branch at (819) 994-2323 and the Director General of Litigation Management and Resolution Branch at (819) 997-3582.

INAC- Comprehensive Claims Branch does not have any specific interest in the project and would request to be taken out of the mailing list.

Yours truly,

Kevin Clement, Acting Director for  
Lynn Bernard, Director General  
Comprehensive Claims Branch

Cc: Brian Hollingworth, IBI Group

DISCLAIMER: In this Disclaimer, “Canada” means Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and their servants and agents. Canada does not warrant or assume
any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any data or information disclosed with this correspondence or for any actions in reliance upon such data or information or on any statement contained in this correspondence. Data and information is based on information in departmental records and is disclosed for convenience of reference only. In accordance with the provisions of the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act, confidential information has not been disclosed. Canada does not act as a representative for any Aboriginal group for the purpose of any claim. Information from other government sources and private sources (including Aboriginal groups) should be sought, to ensure that the information you have is accurate and complete.
Attacked is a letter we received from Ted Arnold.

Arnold_Memo.pdf
(52 KB)
To: Natasha D'Souza, MES
   Project Manager, Environmental Planning
   Public Works

From: Ted Arnold, CET
      Manager, Parking Operations & Maintenance
      Planning & Economic Development Department

Phone: 905-546-2424, Ext. 6006
       Fax: 905-540-6001

Date: October 9, 2007

Subject: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review

Natasha:

In response to your letter of September 17, 2007, regarding the above, the Hamilton Municipal Parking System (HMPS) wishes to advise that we have concerns relating to the conversion of both York Boulevard and King Street to two way operation. As noted in your letter, we suggest that “more detailed review/analysis of the 2001 recommendations is warranted”.

Our concerns relate to access to two parking facilities that we operate; the York Boulevard Parkade and Convention Centre Parking Garage. Based on the discussions that have been held over the past four months, during the progress meetings convened by IBI Group, there appears to be potential capacity issues on these two roadways should they go to two way operation.

Under current conditions, the majority of users of these two parking facilities access the buildings by way of left turns off of York and King. Our concern relates to the potential need to prohibit all directional access (left turns) from these roadways with a two way operation. Should this occur there will be severe impacts on accessibility to these two parking structures.

The alternative access points to these two parking garages currently experience periodic, long delays for patrons entering these two facilities. The reduction of accessibility at the York and King entrances will only aggravate an existing poor condition.

For this reason, we again, believe that “a more detailed review/analysis of the 2001 recommendations is warranted”, as it relates to the two way conversion of York and King.

/TA

Ted
October 1, 2007

Natasha D’Souza, MES
Project Manager, Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste 320
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. D’Souza

Re: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class EA-Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

The Six Nations of the Grand River (Six Nations) has received notification of the Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class EA-Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre for the City of Hamilton.

Six Nations’ cultural, sustenance and other rights are recognized by the Province of Ontario by way of the 1701 Treaty of Fort Albany. Six Nations’ rights and interests in relation to lands six miles either side of the Grand River (the Grand River Tract) was also confirmed by way of treaty, through the Haldimand Proclamation. Although the subject lands described in this application are not located within the Haldimand Tract, Six Nations remains concerned about the overall pace and scope of development within the Grand River Tract and region. We are of the view that the cumulative effect of this development has and is increasingly infringing our Treaty rights and impacting our claims and interests.

At this time Six Nations has no concerns specifically regarding the Proposed Amendment 58. For further information, please do not hesitate to contact Lonny Bomberry, Director of Six Nations Lands and Resources, 519-753-0665 ext 12. We thank the City of Hamilton for providing notification of this project.

Respectfully yours,

Councillor George Montour, Chair
Six Nations Lands and Resources Committee
SIX NATIONS OF THE GRAND RIVER

CC: Mr. Lonny Bomberry, Director: Six Nations Lands and Resources
Mr. Leroy Hill, Secretary: Confederacy Council of the Grand River
Minister David Ramsay, Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and Natural Resources
Minister Chuck Strahl, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

This letter is without prejudice to the positions that Six Nations has and may take in respect to its claims and litigation in relation to the Six Nations Tract/ Haldimand Proclamation Lands.
To: Natasha D'Souza, City of Hamilton
From: Darren Kenny

Fax: 905-548-4435
Phone: 905-648-4427 Ext 131

Phone: Date: September 27, 2007

Re: HCA Comments on Downtown Transportation
Pages: 2

Master Plan

5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

File: CEA-MUN/07-13

☐ Urgent ☑ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle

Please find attached our comments on the above noted file.

Yours truly,

Darren Kenny
Watershed Officer
By Fax and Mail (905) 546-4435

September 27, 2007

Ms. Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 320
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. D’Souza,

Re: HCA Comments on Downtown Transportation Master Plan
5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

The Hamilton Conservation Authority is in receipt of your Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre for the 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for the Downtown Transportation Master Plan.

Given that the study area encompassing the Master Plan is located entirely within the limits of the downtown core and does not involve outlying rural areas and their associated natural heritage features, it is not anticipated that our office will have any concerns with the outcome of the review process. We do however, request that our office be included on future circulations regarding the 5 year review.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact Darren Kenny, Watershed Officer at ext. 131 or Nora Jamieson, Watershed Planner at ext 132.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Katherine J. Menyes
Director of Watershed Planning and Engineering
DK/

Healthy Streams...Healthy Communities!
P.O. Box 7099, 838 Mineral Springs Road, Ancaster, Ontario L9G 3L3 905-525-2181 or 905-648-4427
Office Fax 905-648-4622 • Shop Fax 905-525-2214 • E-mail: nature@conservationhamilton.ca • Website: www.conservationhamilton.ca
By Fax and Mail (905) 546-4435

September 27, 2007

Ms. Natasha D’Souza, Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 320
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. D’Souza,

Re: HCA Comments on Downtown Transportation Master Plan
5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

The Hamilton Conservation Authority is in receipt of your Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre for the 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for the Downtown Transportation Master Plan.

Given that the study area encompassing the Master Plan is located entirely within the limits of the downtown core and does not involve outlying rural areas and their associated natural heritage features, it is not anticipated that our office will have any concerns with the outcome of the review process. We do however, request that our office be included on future circulations regarding the 5 year review.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact Darren Kenny, Watershed Officer at ext. 131 or Nora Jamieson, Watershed Planner at ext 132.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Katherine J. Menyes
Director of Watershed Planning and Engineering
DK/
Ms D'Souza
Please see attached letter

Thank you
Darylann Perry
Engineering Services
September 20, 2007

Natasha D’Souza  
Project Manager, Environmental Planning  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 320  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Ms D’Souza;

Re: Downtown Transportation Master Plan – City of Hamilton  
Municipal Class EA - Notice of Study Commencement and PIC

Thank you for your notice of study commencement, dated September 17, 2007 informing us of the Class Environmental Assessment for the above noted project. This project does not affect any CN rail line or property. This project does not affect any CN rail line or property and request to be removed from the project mailing list.

Sincerely,  

Darylann Perry for  
John MacTaggart, P.Eng.  
Senior Engineering Services Officer
TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner

From: Almeida Bruna [almeidab@HHSC.CA]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2007 3:46 PM
To: bholling@ibigroup.com; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: Downtown Transportation 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

Importance: High

Please note on September 21, 2007 Hamilton Health Sciences received a letter which was addressed to Hamilton Health Sciences Corporation under the Name Marvin Ryder. We have made several attempts to change the contact information as Mr. Marvin Ryder is no longer the Board Chair. Please address all mail to:

Mr. Murray Glendining, Executive VP of Corporate Affairs,
Hamilton Health Sciences Corporation
1200 Main St. W Rm 2E35
L8S 4J9

This will ensure that all correspondence will be distributed to the appropriate individual(s) and that any action required can be done.

Please let me know if there is someone else I should be contacting in order to make this change.

Thank-you,

Bruna Aviles
CEO Administration Assistant
Hamilton Health Sciences
1200 Main St. W
Hamilton, Ont.
Telephone: 905 521 2100 ext. 75626
Fax: 905 521 5067
E-mail: almeidab@hhsc.ca

This information is directed in confidence solely to the person named above and may not otherwise be distributed, copied or disclosed. Therefore, this information should be considered strictly confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately via a return email for further direction. Thank you for your assistance.
September 20, 2007

Ms. Natasha D'Souza, MES
Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste 320
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. D'Souza:

RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan
    5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment
    Notice of Study Commencement

Thank you for the Notice of this Study Commencement dated September 17, 2007.

The proposed undertaking lies outside the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area and no direct
or indirect impacts are anticipated to the Plan Area.

On this basis, the Niagara Escarpment Commission has no comments, and requires no
further mailings on this undertaking.

Yours very truly,

Kathy Pounder, MA, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
have a couple of additional comments to make as brought up by our Bus Operations:

1) The two-way conversion of John Street has not worked out for us as it's increased our travel time by 4-6 minutes. I realize this is not in the scope of your review but I would like it noted.

2) If the efficiency of the left turn movement from John to King is significantly compromised, we may consider using York Blvd to each Hwy 403 instead.

Thanks,
Mike

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn lower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetscaping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Yours,
Mike

---

Michael Sone, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner

GO Transit
10 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563

1/26/2007
From: Brian Hollingworth [bholling@ibigroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 9:36 AM
To: Mike Sone
Cc: Stuart Anderson; Ken Armstrong; John Womersley; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: RE: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

Thanks Mike,

We have spoken to GO about the impacts of the conversion of James and John which took place in 2005 and will take these comments into account in evaluating future conversions.

Brian.

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Sone [mailto:Mike.Sone@gotransit.com]
Sent: October 23, 2007 10:13 AM
To: bholling@ibigroup.com
Cc: eplanning@hamilton.ca; John Womersley; Ken Armstrong
Subject: Comments Re: Downtown TMP 5 Year review

Hi Brian.

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn slower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetscaping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Cheers,
Mike

T. Michael Sone, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner

GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563

11/26/2007
Hi Brian.

In respect of the Downtown Hamilton TMP 5 year review, GO Transit does not have any major concerns at this time. We do want to point out however, that the conversion of 2-way conversion of King Street has some potential to impact our bus operations given the higher traffic flows it experiences.

Our GO Buses currently travel north from the GO Centre along John St and subsequently turn left (west) onto King St. As a one-way street, this move is efficient. We just want to make you aware of this current turning movement, keeping in mind that buses turn slower, require more space to clear the intersection, and can sometimes become constricted by cars stopped in the opposite (east) direction that may be too far out into the intersection. Although this situation would be no different than many other densely developed environments in which our GO Buses operate, it is good to note when considering the conversion.

We also ask that any proposed streetscaping consider potential blind spots that may compromise the safety of pedestrians and drivers.

Cheers,
Mike

T. Michael Sone, M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Transportation Planner

GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario CANADA
M5J 2W3
Tel: (416) 869-3600 x5402
Fax: (416) 869-1563

11/26/2007
Thank you for your letter regarding the above referenced environmental assessment.

> We have reviewed the information, and note the following:

> Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, which prohibits the construction or placement of any "works" in navigable waters without first obtaining approval. If any of the related project elements or activities related to this Master Planning process cross or affect a potentially navigable waterway, you are requested to prepare and submit an application in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the attached Application Guide. Any questions about the NWPA application process should be directed to Suzanne Shea, NWP Officer at (519) 383-1866.

> Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Railway Safety Act to ensure the safe operation of railways. The Act addresses the construction and alteration of railway works, the operation and maintenance of railway equipment and certain non-railway operations affecting railway safety. Pursuant to the Notice of Railway Works Regulations, the project proponent will be required to give notice of the proposed project to the following persons: the railway whose line is to be crossed, the municipality in which the crossing works are to be located and the authority having responsibility for the road in question. An approval may be required for certain railway works that depart from engineering standards set under the regulations or where an objection has been filed against the work. Any questions about the Railway Safety Act and the Notice of Railway Works Regulations should be directed to Luciano Martin, Manager of Engineering, at (416) 973-2326.

> You may also wish to review the Act and Regulations by accessing the following Internet sites:


> Please note that certain approvals under the Navigable Waters Protection Act or Railway Safety Act trigger the requirement for a federal environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. You may therefore wish to consider incorporating CEAA requirements into your Master Planning process.
October 24, 2007

Natasha D’Souza, MES
Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
320-77 James Street North
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. D’Souza:

RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class EA Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

Thank you for your letter of September 17, 2007 regarding the above project.

For all provincial and/or municipal undertakings, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada requests that the proponent of such projects make efforts directly from the initiation of a project to identify and notify all potentially interested First Nation communities. It is recommended that this identification and notification occur at the earliest planning stages of the undertaking and if requested by any First Nation(s), maintain communication with such communities. To assist with identifying First Nations and other Aboriginal groups within the vicinity of a specific proposed project, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada can provide the following information sources:

- The Chiefs of Ontario website (http://www.chiefs-of-ontario.org) provides a directory of contact information for all First Nations and Chiefs, as well as a map of the locations of all Ontario First Nations.

- Natural Resources Canada produced provincial maps, showing all First Nation reserve lands, are available for purchase at: http://cccm.nrcan.gc.ca/english/canada_lands_index_e.asp

- Natural Resources Canada’s online Historical Indian Treaties map, showing historical First Nation treaties across Canada, is available at: http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/site/english/maps/historical/indiantreaties/historicaltreaties
September 20, 2007

Natasha D’Souza  
Project Manager, Environmental Planning  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 320  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Ms D’Souza;

Re: Downtown Transportation Master Plan – City of Hamilton  
Municipal Class EA - Notice of Study Commencement and PIC

Thank you for your notice of study commencement, dated September 17, 2007 informing us of the Class Environmental Assessment for the above noted project. This project does not affect any CN rail line or property. This project does not affect any CN rail line or property and request to be removed from the project mailing list.

Sincerely,

Darylann Perry for  
John MacTaggart, P.Eng.  
Senior Engineering Services Officer
## Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Hamilton Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>October 12, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI EA No.</td>
<td>10049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Natasha D'Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:eplanning@hamilton.ca">eplanning@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. No.</td>
<td>(905) 546-2424 ext. 5101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>New Transportation Routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our initial review, we have confirmed as listed below that there may be potential impacts on Hydro One Transmission Facilities within the area of the study:

- Hydro One Elgin TS located near the intersection of Elgin and Wilson streets as well as the 115kV transmission line corridor running along sections of Head, Napier, Cannon, Mary, Wilson and Hess Streets may be affected by proposed changes in the EA to the transportation system in Downtown Hamilton.

Please allow appropriate lead time in your project schedule for in-depth assessment and evaluation in the event that consideration is given for relocation, modifications and/or outages for our facilities, which may not be feasible and/or readily available.

Potential impacts on any Hydro One Distribution facilities are usually of a lesser degree and these will be managed through our field offices which are listed on the attachment for your convenience.

In planning, please note that the development should not be directly located within the Hydro One transmission lines rights of way, encroach transmission structures, reduce line clearances and limit our access to the facilities at any one time. All construction activities must maintain the required electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective voltage rating. The integrity of the structure foundations for lines must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. There must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the line supporting structures.

Note that existing rights-of-way may have provisions for future lines or already contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, water mains, parking, etc). Please take this into consideration in your planning.

Once details are known and it is established that the development will affect Hydro One Transmission Line facilities and the associated rights of way, please submit detailed plans that are going to impact affected Hydro One facilities to:

Bob Evans, Hydro One Real Estate Management  
185 Clegg Road, Markham L6G 1B7  
Phone: (905) 946-6250  
Fax: (905) 946-6287  
Email: bob.evans@HydroOne.com

Please note that the proponent will be responsible for costs associated with potential modifications to, or relocations of Hydro One facilities as well as any added costs that may be incurred due to increased efforts as a result for maintenance of Hydro One facilities.

Please be advised that this is only a preliminary assessment based on current information. Upon receipt of more detailed plans Hydro One Networks Inc. will provide additional comments.

If you have any further questions or concerns regarding specific clearances or Hydro One right of way situations, please feel free to contact me.

Charles Esental, P.Eng.  
Sustainment Manager  
Lines Information Systems & Programs  
Hydro One Networks, Inc.  
483 Bay St. Toronto M5G 2P5  
Phone: (416) 345-5931  
charles.esental@HydroOne.com
October 16, 2007

Ms. Natasha D’Souza
Project Manager, Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste 320
HAMILTON, ON L8R 2K3

RE: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

Dear Ms. D’Souza,

I am responding to your notification sent to the Comprehensive Claims Branch, by mail, on September 17, 2007.

We can confirm that there are no comprehensive claims in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. We cannot make any comments regarding potential or future claims, or claims filed under other departmental policies. This includes claims under Canada’s Specific Claims Policy or legal action by the First Nation against the Crown. For more information, I suggest you contact the Director General of Specific Claims Branch at (819) 994-2323 and the Director General of Litigation Management and Resolution Branch at (819) 997-3582.

INAC- Comprehensive Claims Branch does not have any specific interest in the project and would request to be taken out of the mailing list.

Yours truly,

Kevin Clement, Acting Director
for
Lynn Bernard, Director General
Comprehensive Claims Branch

Cc: Brian Hollingworth, IBI Group
NATASHA D'SOUZA  
PROJECT MANAGER  
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
320-77 JAMES STREET NORTH  
HAMILTON ON L8R 2K3

Dear Mrs. D'Souza:

Re: Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 Year Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Notice of Study of Commencement and Public Information Center

I am writing in response to your letter of September 17, 2007 inquiring about any claims that may affect the subject property. I regret that we were unable to respond earlier.

We can advise that our inventory does not include active litigation in the vicinity of this property. Please note that we are unable to make any representations regarding potential or future claims.

We cannot make any comments regarding claims filed under other departmental policies. For information on any claims you should also contact Lyle Henderson of the Specific Claims Branch at (819) 953-3192 to inquire about any Specific Claims, and Guy Morin of the Comprehensive Claims Branch at (819) 956-0325 to inquire about any current Comprehensive Claims.
If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me at (819)956-3181.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Allen
A/Litigation Team Leader
Litigation Portfolio Operations East
Litigation Management and Resolution Branch

DISCLAIMER: In this Disclaimer, "Canada" means Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and their servants and agents. Canada does not warrant or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any data or information disclosed with this correspondence or for any actions in reliance upon such data or information or on any statement contained in this correspondence. Data and information is based on information in departmental records and is disclosed for convenience of reference only. Canada does not act as a representative for any Aboriginal group for the purpose of any claim. Information from other government sources and private sources (including Aboriginal groups) should be sought, to ensure that the information you have is accurate and complete.
Thanx!

Nancy Clark, Administrative Assistant to Scott Stewart
General Manager, Public Works Department
320-77 James Street North  Hamilton ON L8R 2K3
905.546.3641 (Telephone) ~ 905.546.4481 (Facsimile)
c Clark@hamilton.ca

Hamilton Public Works ~ Providing services that bring our City to life!
November 15, 2007

Mayor Fred Eisenberger and Members of City Council
City of Hamilton
77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario

Dear Mayor Eisenberger and Members of Council:

The Downtown Hamilton BIA would like to thank the Mayor and members of council for their continued support for Downtown revitalization. The Board of Management of the BIA has discussed at great length the Mayor's proposal to create a pedestrian mall on both sides of Gore Park, detouring all but bus traffic off King Street East between Catharine and James Streets. The Mayor asked for public debate about the initiative and also extend the concept to other downtown cores in the city such as Dundas and Stoney Creek.

The Public Works Committee have now added the proposal to its 5 year review of the Downtown Transportation Master Plan and have directed staff to report back on cost and implementation. The Mayor's goal however is to have something happen within a year.

The Downtown Hamilton BIA board has agreed to support the Mayor's push for the removal of buses from the Gore Park area on the south leg of King Street to a MacNab Street location. Once that has been accomplished the BIA would like to see a pilot project to close the south leg from June 1 to Labour Day with some special event programming in that location to attract the public back to the space.

However most BIA members are opposed to a permanent closure of the street especially the north leg of King Street East for the following reasons:

1. In the 1970s many downtowns closed major streets and converted them to pedestrian malls as a way to attract customers. The success of such conversions has been minimal and thirty years later most have been converted back into traffic streets. Of the 200 or so pedestrian malls built during the past 40 years, only 30 remain today.
7. The City of Hamilton must undertake a completely new plan for Gore Park which could include the south leg of King Street East and the possibility of re-opening or creating new public washrooms in the park or somewhere else in Downtown.

The Downtown Hamilton BIA encourages the City to do further investigations of other communities' experiences and complete a full environmental and traffic assessment of the effects of a complete closure of King Street East on the surrounding business and residential communities.

Sincerely

Tim Bullock, Chairman