Please sign in.

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

We also invite you to fill out a comment sheet so that we can ensure that your ideas are recorded.
Purpose of Public Information Centre

- The purpose of this Public Information Centre is to:
  - Describe the Problems and Opportunities to be addressed;
  - Review Existing Conditions;
  - Describe Alternative Solutions;
  - Present the Evaluation of Solutions and the Technically Preferred Alternative; and
  - Receive feedback on the Alternative Solutions.

Your comments are essential to adequately identify problems and develop feasible and effective solutions.

Important: No decisions have been made at this time. We need your input before deciding on the direction for the North End Neighbourhood.
Study Background and Objectives

- This study was initiated to develop a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan for the North End Neighbourhood
- The study is to be carried out according to the guidelines set out for Class Environmental Assessments (EA). The EA process ensures that a reasonable range of alternatives are considered and that the public has sufficient input into the decision process.

Vision as Articulated by the Community Advisory Group:

To create a child and family-friendly community in Downtown Hamilton.
- Build on unique attributes of North End Neighbourhood
- Foster live-work opportunities
- Create pedestrian-friendly streets
- Increase walking, cycling and transit use
- Integrate Pier 8 into community through active transportation links and economic/cultural links
- Promote waterfront events while managing traffic and parking
Following the first PIC, a Community Advisory Group (CAG) was established. The purpose of the CAG is to act as a sounding board for the study team. To date, the CAG has met three times.
Summary of First Public Information Centre

Overview

- Over 60 people in attendance
- 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

Frequently Asked Questions:

- What will happen to MacNab Street when bridge is completed?
  - MacNab Street will initially remain one-way and be open to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. This study will determine whether MacNab Street should be two-way.

- Why is a Ferguson Bridge needed and what will it look like?
  - Ferguson Avenue is being planned as a key route for pedestrians and bicycles from the Mountain to the Waterfront, and the proposed Ferguson Avenue Bridge will enable that connection to be made. The concept design of the bridge includes one traffic lane in each direction, plus bicycle lanes and sidewalks.

- What will the Mary Street Bridge look like?
  - The Mary Street Bridge will be a pedestrian bridge.

- What is planned for Pier 8 and what traffic impacts will there be on the neighbourhood?
  - Pier 8 is planned to have 750-1000 medium density residential units plus approximately 17,500 m2 of commercial, retail and institutional development. This will result in approximately 500 new trips entering neighbourhood in PM peak hour.
Existing Conditions
Travel Characteristics

Where people from the North End are going to in the morning

Key Facts

- Most trips made by North-end residents are destined to the Downtown Area (29%) and Downtown East (12%)
- About 15% of these trips are made by transit and 79% by car. The remainder are by walking or cycling.
- There are opportunities to increase walking and cycling trips.

Data collected and presented at PIC #1 confirms that speed is an issue on some streets but volumes are within expected ranges.

Legend

- 85th percentile speed*
- Peak number of vehicles per hour

* The 85th percentile speed separates the fastest 15% of traffic from the slowest 85%. Typically 85% percentile speeds greater than the speed limit indicate a problem.
**Existing Conditions**

**Socio-Economic and Cultural**

---

**Key Facts**

- In 2001, there were 5,700 residents living in the North End Study Area.
- On average, North End residents are younger than Hamiltonian’s as a whole.
- Average family income in the North End is $48,000/yr compared to $66,000 for the whole City.

---

**Population by age group 2001**

---

**Major Public Events Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada Day Fireworks</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardigras</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racalmultese</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Days</td>
<td>Pier 8</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragon Boat Races</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Cruise</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s DREAMS</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Daughter Walk</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runner’s Den</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries for Kids</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Pride</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Walk for ALS</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids Walk for Life</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Fundraiser Ride</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources July</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row for Heart</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina’s Walk for Smiles</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges P. Vanier High School</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heel ’n’ Wheel Thon</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crohn’s and Colotis Foundation</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle &amp; Southern Highlanders of Canada</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiggle Waggle Walkathon</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Federation of Commercial Workers Picnic</td>
<td>Pier 4 Park</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkathon (Walk the World)</td>
<td>Bayfront Park</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study provides an opportunity to improve existing environmental conditions by:

- Reducing emissions from automobiles by reducing traffic, promoting alternative modes of transportation and reducing speeds
- Reducing noise from traffic
- Increasing the amount of public space available for planting
Transportation Context

Road Network

Transit Network

Cycling Network
Summary of Problems

- Other Issues and Concerns
  - Wellington and Victoria should be promoted as major routes
  - Air quality and noise from traffic
  - Special event traffic and parking
  - Safety
Potential Solutions

- This study is being conducted as a Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment (EA). Under this process, it is necessary to identify a reasonable range of alternative solutions to the problem, including a “Do Nothing” option.

- Possible solutions identified include:
  - Do Nothing
  - Signage, Education, and Enforcement
  - Traffic Management/Diversion
  - Traffic Calming
  - Pedestrian-oriented Streets

- These alternative solutions are introduced on the next boards.
Alternative 1- Signage, Education, Enforcement

- Involves actions undertaken by community to reduce speeds:
  - Speed limit reduction
  - Community specific signage
  - School programs
  - Increased police enforcement
  - Organized walkabouts

- Benefits:
  - Sign installation is relatively economical compared to physical improvements
  - Potential for minor speed reduction

- Disadvantages:
  - Requires frequent and aggressive enforcement efforts or it will have little effect, police have indicated resources are limited
  - Highway Traffic Act amendment would be required for reductions below 40 km/h on an area wide basis
  - Implementation time frame could be greater than 2-3 years
  - Pilot project study required for HTA change – potential for negative outcome
Alternative 2 - Traffic Management/Diversion

- This alternative would rely on regulatory signage and physical diversions to direct traffic away from residential streets and towards primary mobility streets.

- Benefits:
  - Address through existing and future traffic issues
  - Improves non-vehicle travel on restricted roadways

- Disadvantages:
  - Does not address speeding
  - Penalizes local traffic
  - Potential to divert traffic to parallel routes
  - Enforcement would be limited, reducing effectiveness
Alternative 3 – Traffic Calming

- Involves a combination of physical devices and on-street parking to address speed and safety concerns

- **Benefits**
  - Physical measures have direct impact on speed reduction
  - Physical measures allow for speed reduction to 30 km/h

- **Disadvantages**
  - Costs can be significant ($3,000 per speed hump)
  - Potential to divert traffic to parallel routes
  - May reduce emergency response times

These are examples of potential traffic calming options to be detailed following the selection of the preferred alternative. These may be applied in combination or individually.
Alternative 4 – Pedestrian Streets

- Uses trees, planters, roundabouts, parking areas and other obstacles to slow traffic
- Streets become extension of public space
- Could be implemented in Phased approach,

- Benefits
  - Can be implemented in phased approach
  - Potential to distinguish North End Neighbourhood

- Disadvantages
  - Full implementation would be costly
  - Potential liability concerns if non-standard approaches are used
  - Obstructions may create barriers for cyclists, emergency vehicles
## Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>SIGNAGE, EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT/DIVERSION</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CALMING</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN STREETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROTECT AND ENHANCE ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>- Maintains existing traffic patterns and behavior, and associated impacts</td>
<td>- May reduce air and noise impacts if implemented in combination with other measures</td>
<td>- Reduces traffic volumes and associated impacts on selected streets, overall reductions may not be significant</td>
<td>- Reduces traffic speeds</td>
<td>- Potential to increase street trees and plantings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Factors</td>
<td>- Maintains existing traffic patterns and behavior, and associated impacts</td>
<td>- May not have significant effect on cut-through traffic, effects may be short-lived - Higher potential for residents to get traffic tickets</td>
<td>- Significant potential to reduce traffic on selected streets - May increase traffic on some streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Factors</td>
<td>- Does not increase on-street parking or improve image - Access for Waterfront activities will not be affected</td>
<td>- May improve neighbourhood image; however excessive signage can have a negative impact</td>
<td>- No impacts on on-street parking - May restrict access to waterfront</td>
<td>- On-street parking opportunities increased - Neighbourhood image could be improved significantly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Factors</td>
<td>- Minimal cost impacts, but no benefits - Consistent with City policies</td>
<td>- Reducing speed limit to below 30 km/hr is not currently permitted by Highway Traffic Act and is not consistent with City policy - Requires continued police enforcement, which is costly</td>
<td>- Signage is low cost - Requires continued police enforcement, which is costly</td>
<td>- Speed humps, curb extension, etc are expensive to construct</td>
<td>- Full implementation involving pavers, lane narrowings, etc would be expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least Responsive ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Most Responsive ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒
The preliminary preferred alternative solution would involve:

- Passive traffic calming (increased on-street parking, one-way street conversions, curb-extensions with street planters and lane narrowing by painting)
- Speed limit reductions, in association with traffic calming

Collectively, these improvements would be implemented in combination with initiatives to “brand” the North End Community as a child and pedestrian friendly neighbourhood. This includes:

- Specific signage (e.g. embossed planters, gateway features, distinctive street signs)
- Education programs (e.g. in-school programs, newsletters, brochures, booths at public events, walkabouts)
Supporting Measures

- **Options to Address Special Event Traffic**
  - Increase number of events where special event parking is in effect
  - Consider new municipal parking lot near Liuna Station
  - Provide parking shuttle from York Parkade for major events (or increase frequency of Gore to Shore Shuttle)
  - Promote selected streets as pedestrian streets during events (e.g. MacNab Street, Bay Street north of Strachan)

- **Options to Address Pier 8 Traffic**
  - Make Hughson, John and Catharine priorities for pedestrianization treatments, lane narrowings, and curb extensions with planters
  - Enforce urban design standards
  - Improve transit service levels
Next Steps

- Refine Preliminary Preferred Solution
- Develop detailed plans (drawings) for specific measures
- Hold Final PIC (February 2007) to present proposed plan (s) to public
- Prepare implementation schedule, cost estimates, final report
- Take recommended plan to Council for endorsement
- Implement preferred plan
We Want to Hear From You!

These panels outline possible directions for the North End neighbourhood. 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/north-end-traffic

📞 Arrange a meeting with our staff

**Thank you for contributing to the North End Neighbourhood's future**