North End Traffic Management Study

Community Advisory Meeting #1
Meeting Purpose

- Review of First PIC
- Results of Data Collection
- Future Traffic Projections
- Potential Options to Address Stated/Observed Issues
- Next Steps
• 53 people signed in
• Wide ranging interests, issues and opinions
• Lots of specific issues
• Some confusion/mis-information on future transportation plans
• Desire to protect positive attributes of neighbourhood
Key Issues and Frequently Asked Questions

• MacNab Street Bridge
  – Will it be two way?
  – Will it be pedestrian only?

• Mary Street Bridge vs. Ferguson Avenue Bridge
  – Why is a Ferguson Bridge needed and what will it look like?
  – What will the Mary Street Bridge look like?

• Pier 8 traffic and Special Event traffic on neighbourhood roads
  – What will the impacts be and how can they be mitigated?
Existing Volumes and Speeds

Legend

- 85th percentile speed
- Peak number of vehicles per hour
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Results of License Plate Survey
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Existing Travel Characteristics

AM Peak Period Auto
driver trips/capita = 0.26 trips/person

AM Peak Period Transit Mode Share
for trip origins = 15%

AM Peak Period Auto Mode Share = 79%
• Field investigation carried out at locations where reported collision rates higher than expected in City’s network screening report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Main Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Collisions (Jan 2000-Dec 2004)</th>
<th>Above Expected Collision Rate</th>
<th>City-wide Rank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Signal</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Signal</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Simcoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way stop</td>
<td>Macnab</td>
<td>Strachan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way stop</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Strachan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way stop</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Strachan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way stop</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ferrie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way stop</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-way stop</td>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rank is based on a total of 2080 intersections contained in the City’s database
Field Investigations – High Collision Locations

Southbound James Approaching Strachan
Looking North on James Street from Ferrie Street
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Field Investigations – John Street

- Concerns raised by residents include:
  - On-street pick-up and drop-off activities by parents; and
  - Students crossing at unsignalized and mid-block locations
Field Investigations - Other

Bay Street – Lack of bike facilities

Bay/Guise – Accessibility issues
Field Investigations - Other

Burlington Street at Wellington
- wide cross-section approaching NEN

Burlington Street at James
- Information overload
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## Potential Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Development</th>
<th>Typical Trip Rate</th>
<th>Estimated Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>% Inbound in PM Peak</th>
<th>PM Inbound Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pier 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-1000 medium density residential units</td>
<td>0.4 /unit</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,200 m² commercial</td>
<td>1.6 /100 m²</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 m² retail</td>
<td>2.2 /100 m²</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,800 m² institutional</td>
<td>2.0 /100 m²</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barton-Tiffany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 low density residential units</td>
<td>0.5 /unit</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790 medium density residential units</td>
<td>0.4 /unit</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 m² retail</td>
<td>2.2 /100 m²</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>784</td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferguson-Wellington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 low density residential units</td>
<td>0.5 /unit</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 medium density residential units</td>
<td>0.4 /unit</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.f retail</td>
<td>2.2 /100 m²</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Two-way peak hour trip rate. Institutional rates will vary depending on use.

Retail trip rates assume 20% pass-by
Implications of Future Trips

• Pier 8
  – Approximately 500 trips entering neighbourhood in PM peak hour
  – Similar to peak direction volumes on James (440) and Burlington (550)

• Next step is to look at where these trips will go
Initial Issues Raised by Residents

- Traffic infiltration
- Overall increase in traffic in neighbourhood
- Possible loss of on-street parking on local and mobility streets
- Extension of grid network into Waterfront (Pier 8)
- Traffic from special events
- Traffic safety and speeding
Broader Issues Raised

- Air quality and health Impacts
- Maintaining and improving child-friendly aspects of community
- Concern that north-end will become “core to shore” conduit
- Generating local interest and grass-roots changes
## Scoping of Potential Options/Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES/CONCERNS</th>
<th>POSSIBLE OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Closures or Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic infiltration</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall increase in traffic in neighbourhood</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible loss of on-street parking</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of grid network into Waterfront (Pier 8)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic from special events</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic safety and speeding</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality and health Impacts</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-friendly streets</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid “core to shore” conduit</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating local interest and grass-roots changes</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road Closures or Restrictions

- Turn restrictions
- Physical restrictions
  - Partial Closure
  - Full Closure
Road Closures/Restrictions - Examples

Partial Closure

Full Closure
Traffic Calming

- Horizontal Deflections
  - Curb extensions
  - Traffic circles
  - Chicane
- Vertical Deflections
  - Speed humps
  - Raised Cross-walks/Intersections
- Lane Reductions/Lane Narrowing
- Speed limit reductions
- One-way to two-way conversions
- Additional On-street parking
Traffic Calming - Examples

Curb Extension

Raised Intersection
Safety Improvements

- Traffic control changes
- Signage
- Pavement markings
- Delineated pedestrian areas
- Traffic calming
- Education programs (e.g. schools)
On-street parking

- Reallocation of vehicle lanes
- Change/Reduce parking restrictions
- Implement permit parking

Bay Street Before

Bay Street After

North End Traffic Management Study
Bike facilities

- On-street bike lanes
- Off-street bike paths
- Bike parking in key areas (parks, school)
- Community facilities
- End-use facilities (outside neighbourhood)
Travel Demand Management

- Increase use of transit by residents
  - Increased service levels
  - Neighbourhood transit pass
- Increase use of transit by others
  - Improved service to employment areas
  - Transit for special events
- Options to promote carpooling, ride sharing, etc
- Walk to school programs
Enforcement

• Increased police presence overall
• Increased enforcement of specific locations/issues (e.g. turn restrictions)
  – Effects tend to be short-lived
Community Initiatives

- Speed watch and similar programs
- Neighbourhood associations
- User groups (bikes, accessibility committee, transit users)
- Community meetings
- School-related programs
Policies and Guidelines

• Streetscaping Guidelines
• Urban Design Guidelines
• Traffic Impact Study Guidelines
• Various City-wide TMP policy papers

Key is to make these known and lobby for their enforcement
Next Steps

• Confirm study directions
• Refine future traffic projections
  – Look at where traffic will go
• Work with residents to define what their “ideal vision” is for specific streets
• Apply potential solutions to specific locations and evaluate impacts
• Neighbourhood walk-about
• Generate community interest/involvement