Appendix C.4
Community Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes
Purpose

The Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC) will be a task-oriented committee to provide input from residents, property owners, and other stakeholders into the ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review (TMP). This input will assist the Public Works staff in preparing recommendations for the approval of the Public Works Committee, and Council. CLC members will help identify issues, assist in the development and review of alternative solutions, and facilitate communication with local residents.

Mandate

The City believes that the advice of local residents, businesses and community leaders can lead to improved decisions and enhanced communications with the local community. The CLC will be one of the methods through which advice will be provided to City of Hamilton elected representatives, staff and consultants with regard to the ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review (TMP).

The mandate of the CLC is to:

- Assist in the identification of current and potential community issues related to transportation;
- To share information and knowledge of the study area;
- To comment on consultant and staff presentations and reports;
- Provide input on alternative solutions;
- To identify or comment on mitigating measures to be put in place to minimize impacts; and
- To attend public information centres and CLC meetings.

Membership

Members will be invited to represent local residents, other area stakeholders (e.g. neighbourhood groups, etc.), and citizens of the area at large. Members should be from a wide range of geographic locations to represent the overall study area.

Attendance and Alternate Members

It is assumed that members will make every effort to attend all meetings. Alternate members will be identified who may attend in place of members unable to attend
meetings. Alternates are encouraged to attend as many meetings as possible to help ensure continuity.

Observers

Observers are welcome to attend meetings of the ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review (TMP) CLC, including those who are not members or who do not represent any of the key stakeholder groups. These meetings are open to the general public.

Staff Resources

Staff of the Transportation Planning section of the Public Works Department will coordinate the study and provide primary staff support. Staff of various departments and agencies will be available to the CLC as resource people, as needed. These staff will include members of the study team who support the study. Resource staff will attend meetings of the CLC as needed to address issues. Staff will provide professional advice relating to the study.

Meeting Dates, Times and Locations

These meetings will be held during the evening on dates suitable for members. The proposed meeting time is 6:30 – 8:30 p.m. The proposed location for the meetings has yet to be determined however it is likely that all meetings will take place within or near the study area.

Staff will provide meeting materials to committee members, including an agenda and background materials, at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Quorum and Majority

A quorum will consist of 50% plus one member. In most cases, decisions of the committee will be made by consensus. In some instances where a vote is required, a majority will consist of 50% plus one member.

Advisory Role

The CLC will work together to ensure a full discussion which will value the different perspectives and will strive to achieve general consensus on project issues where feasible. While opinions and ideas may differ, the CLC will respectively work together and listen to all members' concerns and ideas. CLC members will have an equal opportunity to share and express ideas and opinions.

CLC members are encouraged to consult with neighbours and advise the committee as necessary.

ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review (TMP)
December 19, 2011

Dear Sir / Madam:

**Subject:** ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review – Citizens Liaison Committee – Invitation to Participate

The City of Hamilton is undertaking the development of a Transportation Master Plan Review (TMP) for the Regional Official Plan Amendment, ROPA 9 study area (see map). The study will consider modifications to the TMP due to changes in land use plans approved for the lands to the east of the Eramosa Karst.

As part of the public consultation component for this study, a Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC) is being established. The CLC will help identify issues and opportunities, and provide important input into the Transportation Master Plan. The CLC will consist of citizens and other stakeholder representatives.

We would like to invite you to become a member of the CLC to provide assistance with our study.

This commitment will involve approximately two to three meetings over the course of the project (January to September 2012) to be held on weekday evenings, from 6:30 – 8:30 pm. Meetings will be held in January and early in 2012. The exact meeting dates will be set based on the availability of members.

The initial CLC meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 19, 2012 at the Salvation Army Church, Rooms 2 & 3, 300 Winterberry Drive from 6:30 – 8:30 p.m. This meeting will provide an overview of the role and mandate of the CLC, a review of the study process and include an exercise to establish a vision while identifying strengths, constraints and opportunities for the plan area.

Please contact Mohan Philip at Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca or at 905-546-2424 ext. 3438 to confirm that you wish to be part of the CLC by January 13, 2012 or if you have any questions. Participation will involve some time commitment but we hope it will be a rewarding opportunity to take part in shaping a vision for your neighbourhood.

Once we receive all responses to this letter, we will make a final selection on membership on the CLC as it will depend on the degree of response we receive, as well as a wish to have a broadly based membership from the community.
If you are unable to participate, you will still have the opportunity to provide input into the Transportation Master Plan, including participation at the Public Information Centres. Notification for the Public Information Centres will be mailed separately.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

(for) Mohan Philip, Project Manager
Planning & Economic Development, City of Hamilton
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thanks for accepting our invite to be a member of the Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC) formed for the "ROPA9 TMP Review". The first meeting is scheduled for January 19, 6.30 pm at the Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Dr., Stoney Creek. Please find attached the Agenda, Background Information and CLC Role and Mandate.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Thank you,

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation/Transit
Strategic Planning & Rapid Transit
Environment & Sustainable Infrastructure Division
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
any attendees would be there representing the community. Although a few FOTEK people might be present, "FOTEK" has no issues what so ever on roads, other than we do not want a road through the EKCA Feeder lands. The recent zoning change protects the feeder lands from any development. Additionally, I agree with Sam. Closing Second would be a waste of money. To improve North-south, let's add a stop light Pritchard. The traffic can then instead of clogging up Upper Mount Albion, head West a bit and use Pritchard. I might or might not be at the meeting & as such have expressed my concerns here.

I'm not sure what the theme is that I would be taking to this meeting. Am I representing FOTEK? Am I going as a concerned individual who will be using these roads eventually and want the best solutions put forward? Will my views be against the people of the Second Rd. W. area who want it closed at Rymal or do some of them want it left open? If I lived there, I wouldn't want to have to back-track all over the side streets just to get to Rymal Rd.? It simply calls for a traffic light at this intersection. My personal opinion is to leave all arteries open, with the addition of traffic lights where required (no round-abouts ever). If you went in for a heart operation and they closed off 3 arteries to your heart, wouldn't it stress the flow so badly that you would end up with a heart attack? Blocking off Second Rd., Upper Mount Albion Rd., and Pritchard Rd. at Rymal Rd. are not good choices. I will attend the meeting but I need to know the goal here ahead of time.

P.S. - Mohan, I was instrumental in fast-tracking the traffic lights at Dakota & Rymal Rd. with the help of then-councillor Dave Mitchell and the traffic department at City Hall because there was soon to be a death at that corner if the red tape wasn't cleared immediately. I have also had talks with current councillor, Brenda Johnson and Melanie Jajko of the City Planning Department about the future of Rymal Rd.
Information Package for Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC)

January 19, 2012
Purpose of this Package

This information package has been prepared for members of the Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC). It includes the following material:

- Description of the project
- Description of the Class Environmental Assessment Process
- Tentative schedule for meetings

Please review this information package before the first meeting. Please contact Mohan Philip, City’s Project Manager, at (tel: 905-546-2424 ext 3438; e-mail: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca), if you have any comments, questions, or concerns before the first meeting.
Description of the Project

Background

The City of Hamilton has initiated a review of the previously completed Rymal Road Planning Area Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The Master Plan was completed in June 2006 in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment process.

The major projects/improvements recommended through the 2006 Rymal Road Planning Area TMP included:

- Widen Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to Regional Road 56. Widen Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to approximately 900 m to the south. The Phases 3 & 4 study process for this project was completed in 2007.
- Constructing a new road, Trinity Church Arterial Corridor (TCAC), with two lanes in each direction, from the intersection of Stone Church Road and the Red Hill Valley Parkway ramp towards the south, crossing Rymal Road East at midway between Pritchard and the existing Trinity Church Road, and connecting to the proposed Twenty Road realignment. The Phases 3 & 4 of the EA process was completed in 2008. Subject to opening of this new road, the Upper Mount Albion (UMA) road was recommended for closure at Rymal Road.
- Road widening and intersection improvements to Stone Church Road East/Paramount Dr. and Winterberry Dr. surrounding the Special Policy Area “C”. These improvements have been completed by developers prior to the development occurred in the Special Policy Area “C”.
- A new collector road Trinity Neighbourhood Collector Road (TNCR) connecting Gatestone Road at Second Road West to Highland Road was also identified as a required road link to provide capacity in the north-south direction, and partially to support the ROPA 9 developments. This new road alignment was proposed through the lands east of the Karst area which is owned by Infrastructure Ontario (IO), formerly Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC). However, the Phases 3 & 4 Municipal Class EA process for this project was suspended at the direction of the Council based on the concerns of potential adverse impact on the Karst.

The Eramosa Karst Natural Science ANSI area had been identified and had been deeded by the Province to the Hamilton Conservation Authority for the creation of the Eramosa Karst Conservation Area. The original neighbourhood plan was no longer valid as the karst area restricts the development of the collector road and the interior lands. The existing secondary plan had to be revised to reflect this large no-build open space area in the centre of the Trinity Neighbourhood. As such, the City initiated a secondary plan for the Trinity Neighbourhood and further designated the environmentally significant Eramosa Karst lands “Open Space”, restricting development and build-out of interior lands and limiting the viability of the proposed 2-lane Trinity Neighbourhood Collector Roadway.
Preserving the Eramosa Karst lands has been a key factor in this entire process which is why efforts have been made to maintain the Trinity East lands as Open Space. However, in doing so, this poses a major constraint and challenge in identifying solutions for the transportation issues in the Trinity Neighbourhood and adjacent areas.

**Study Purpose**

The purpose of this Transportation Master Plan Review will be to review the previous TMP findings and update the TMP with regards to the network revisions now that the new TNCR can no longer be constructed. The study will include the following tasks:

- Analyze existing conditions and identify deficiencies;
- Identify alternative solutions based on current conditions;
- Identify transportation alternatives that will satisfy short-term, medium-term and long-term traffic demands; and
- Present a recommended plan that is responsive to neighbourhood concerns while regarding the need to maintain the integrity of the road network.

**Study Area**
Description of the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Process

What is a Class Environmental Assessment?

A Class Environmental Assessment (EA) is a process that enables the planning and implementation of municipal infrastructure projects to be undertaken in accordance with an approved procedure designed to protect the environment. The current approved procedure is the (October 2000, as amended in 2007) Municipal Engineers Association Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.

Under the Class EA there are three project schedules, with each schedule having different requirements to fulfill the environmental planning process. This Master Plan is intended to fulfill:

- Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA requirements for any Schedule B projects that are identified through the course of this review; and
- Identify the need for future Schedule C projects (construction of new road facilities and major expansions to existing road facilities, greater than $2.7 million).

What phases are involved in a Transportation Master Plan?

1. Identify the problem or opportunity

   The proponent identifies the problem or opportunity that needs to be addressed through the EA.

   **Phase 1 is currently underway.**

2. Identify alternative solutions to the problem and select a preferred solution

   Alternative solutions are the various methods of addressing the problem or opportunity.

   This phase involves:
   - Identifying solutions that can address the problem statement
   - Preparing an inventory of the natural, social, and economic environments
   - Identifying the environmental impacts of each solution
   - Evaluating the alternatives and selecting a preferred planning solution
   - Consulting with public and review agencies

   **Phase 2 will be undertaken after the first Public Information Centre.**
## Preliminary CLC Meetings Schedule

Provided below is a preliminary schedule which identifies the points in the study where meetings will be held with the Citizens Liaison Committee, and the objectives of the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid January 2012</td>
<td>CLC Meeting #1 - Preparation for PIC #1</td>
<td>Initial CLC meeting. This meeting will be held prior to PIC #1 to discuss the draft material to be presented at the PCC. Material will be submitted to the CLC prior to the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1 2012</td>
<td>PIC #1</td>
<td>PIC #1 will present to the community the material discussed at CLC Meeting #1, as well as the preliminary problem statement, the preliminary planning alternatives and preliminary criteria which will be used to evaluate the planning alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>CLC Meeting #2 – Preparation for PIC #2 (Identification and Evaluation of Planning Alternatives)</td>
<td>This meeting will be held prior to PIC #2 to discuss the draft material to be presented at the PIC. This material will include for example, the problem statement, the inventory of the natural, social, and economic environments, criteria used to evaluate the planning alternatives, the evaluation of the planning alternatives, and the preliminary preferred planning alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>PIC #2</td>
<td>PIC #2 will present to the community the material discussed at CLC Meeting #2, with any changes as discussed at the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

Project: Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands)
Transportation Master Plan Review

Subject: Citizens Liaison Committee Meeting 1

Meeting Date: January 19, 2012 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm

Location: Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Drive, Rooms 2 and 3

Attendees:
Mohan Philip – City of Hamilton
Bart Brousseau – City of Hamilton
Members of the Citizens Liaison Committee
Stephen Keen – HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Role and Mandate of the Citizens Liaison Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Study Background / Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Study Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.0    | Discussion of Study Area  
  • Strengths,  
  • Constraints and  
  • Opportunities | Stephen |
| 6.0    | Vision for Study Area | All |
| 7.0    | Other Issues | All |
| 8.0    | Next Steps | Stephen |
Meeting Minutes

Project: ROPA9 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Review
Subject: Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting 1
Meeting Date: 6:30 p.m., Thursday, January 19, 2012
Location: Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Drive, Rooms 2 and 3
Prepared by: Nathalie Baudais – HDR
Attendees:
  David Trevisani – Resident
  Lee Austin – Resident
  Mike Borrelli – Resident
  Steve Spicer – Multi-Area
  Emily Edmunds – SmartCentres
  Anthony DeSantis Jr. – DeSantis Development
  Adi Irani – A.J Clarke.
  Robert Poppa – Resident
  Dave Cunningham – Resident
  Sam Marranca – Resident
  Tom Zietsma – Resident
  Margaret Reid – Resident
  Les Myers – Resident
  Brad Gautreau – Resident
  Paul Silvestri – Silvestri Investment
  Mohan Philip – City of Hamilton
  Alan Kirkpatrick – City of Hamilton
  Lorissa Skrypniak – City of Hamilton
  Bart Brosseau – City of Hamilton
  Stephen Keen – HDR
  Nathalie Baudais – HDR

Distribution:
Attendees
Luis Ponte – Resident
Brad Clark – City Councillor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Roundtable introductions were made.

2. **Role and Mandate of the Citizens Liaison Committee**

   2.1 M. Philip discussed the role and mandate of the CLC, as circulated prior to the meeting. The intent of the CLC is for the CLC members to bring forward transportation issues from the community.

3. **Study Background / Overview**

   3.1 M. Philip provided an overview of the 2006 ROPA9 Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The 2006 ROPA9 TMP recommended several transportation improvements, including:

   1. Rymal Road Widening to 4 lanes with centre left turn lane between Pritchard Road and Upper Centennial Parkway and Regional Road 56 Widening to 4 lanes from Rymal Road to 900m south. This project was approved.
   2. Trinity Church Arterial Corridor (TCAC) from Stone Church Road to Twenty Road and subsequent closure of Upper Mount Albion Road. This project was approved.
   3. Special Policy Area ‘C’ improvements to Stone Church Road and Winterberry Drive. This project was approved and has been built by the developers.
   4. Trinity Neighbourhood Collector Road (TNCR) from Gatestone Drive to Highland Road and subsequent closure of Second Road West. Since these lands have been designated as open space east of the Karst, development on these lands is not possible. This project is not feasible.

   3.2 There are resulting North/South capacity issues now that the TNCR cannot be built. The Upper Mount Albion road closure was subject to the opening of the TCAC, north of Rymal Road. The Second Road West closure was subject to the opening of the TNCR. Second Road West cannot be closed since the TNCR cannot be built.

   3.3 The ROPA9 TMP Review study will review the capacity and closure issues to provide solutions that consider and respond to neighbourhood concerns while supporting development of the area.

4. **Study Process**

   4.1 S. Keen discussed the Environmental Assessment process and explained that this study would complete Phase 1 (data gathering and identifying problems) and Phase 2 (Alternative Solutions) of the process.
| 4.2 | There is plenty of opportunity for public input during the TMP Review. Two Public Information Centres (PIC) and two CLC meetings are planned. |
| 4.3 | The first PIC (scheduled for February 1) is part of Phase 1 and the project team will host another PIC during Phase 2 after the alternative solutions have been assessed and evaluated. |
| 4.4 | The discussion held will provide some background to the team as they prepare the problem/opportunity statement. |

### Discussion of Study Area

| 5.1 | The CLC openly discussed transportation issues that concerned them and suggested solutions that the project team should consider during the study. The highlights of this discussion have been grouped according to area of concern are included below. |

### Implementation

| 6.1 | Several of the CLC members expressed concerns with the timing of the transportation recommendations. The 2006 recommendations have yet to be implemented. What has been the cause for the delay? Why weren’t the roads built before development proceeded? |
| 6.2 | The TCAC is currently in the detailed design phase. Issues regarding drainage and wildlife movement have come up during the detailed design phase. These issues are taking some time to resolve; it will likely be another 2 years before construction begins. The funding has been allocated for this project. *Additional details regarding the outstanding design issues for the TCAC to be provided to the CLC.* |
| 6.3 | The Rymal Road widening west of Fletcher is on the priority list for detailed design. The timing for the widening east of Fletcher is unknown. It is important that the TCAC extension connect to a widened Rymal Road. The City has yet to approve the funding for this work. Developers are paying for the design of the Rymal Road widening. |
| 6.4 | Development charges often pay for a portion of the roads, therefore, it is difficult for the City to allocate funding for the roads prior to the development. |

### Trinity Neighbourhood Collector Road
The TNCR was originally identified in the Stoney Creek Official Plan to provide a ring road through the Trinity Neighbourhood. The goal would be to find an alternative solution to provide North/South capacity between Upper Centennial Parkway and the TCAC. The modelling work is currently being updated to identify the amount of capacity required.

### Alternative Solutions for Consideration

#### 8.1
Temporary traffic signals be considered at the Pritchard Road and Rymal Road intersection. This would likely alleviate much of the traffic currently using Upper Mount Albion Road (which is signalized at Rymal Road).

#### 8.2
If North/South capacity is an issue, Pritchard Road could be widened to 4 lanes as an alternate collector road. Don’t support spending money for temporary works.

#### 8.3
Alternative solutions to be considered will include the closure of Second Road West without providing an alternate north/south link. Another alternative would be to close Second Road West while providing another north/south collector.

#### 8.4
Extend Gatestone Drive south to Rymal Road (between Second Road West and Whitedeer Road). This alternative could pose difficulties since it would have significant impacts to a woodlot (north of Rymal Road).

#### 8.5
Resident L. Austin previously provided some alternative solutions to Councillor Brad Clark 3 years ago. L. Austin to forward his alternative solutions to the project team for consideration.

#### 8.6
Would the widening of Upper Centennial Parkway or the TCAC to 6 lanes provide the additional North/South capacity required?

### Upper Mount Albion

#### 9.1
Upper Mount Albion Road closure has been on the City plans since the Stoney Creek Official Plan in 1989 prior to amalgamation. Residents are concerned at the length of time that it’s taking to get the TCAC constructed.

#### 9.2
Safety of Upper Mount Albion Road is a concern. Due to the vertical geometry of the road (rolling), narrow shoulders, visibility issues, residents don’t feel safe walking on the road.

### Second Road West
### 10.1 Second Road West residents expressed concerns with the 85% target for implementation of traffic calming measures. Any area residents who don’t live on Second Road West won’t vote for the closure. What type of support, if any, would residents of Second Road West have to get their road closed?

### 10.2 Traffic volumes are a concern to Second Road West residents. City has undertaken recent counts along Second Road West and will present those volumes at the first PIC.

### 10.3 Aggressive driving and speeding is a concern.

### 10.4 Second Road West closure has been on the City plans since the Stoney Creek Official Plan in 1989 prior to amalgamation. Second Road West representative supports the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road.

#### 11.0 Rymal Road

### 11.1 Safety of Rymal Road is a significant concern to some members of the CLC.

### 11.2 Would traffic signals be provided at Second Road West and Rymal Road? TMPs are a higher level assessment and don’t typically assess traffic signals since they are an operational issue. However, the traffic signals at Rymal Road and Second Road West were recommended as part of the widening (Phase 3 and 4 Environmental Study Report approved in 2007).

### 11.3 Rymal Road widening is integral to this area and its problems. The CLC wants the City to be proactive rather than reactive.

#### 12.0 Other Issues/Concerns

### 12.1 Members of the CLC expressed concerns with the rapid development in the study area and the resulting changes to the study’s traffic projections. As such, they worry that the alternative solutions are dated and won’t be valid when the plans are to be implemented. S. Keen clarified that the transportation modelling undertaken for the study includes planned and approved subdivisions and the projections will be forecasting up to 2031.

### 12.3 It was suggested that a sign-up sheet for speakers and an allocated allotment of time for each speaker would help ensure that the meeting is run as efficiently as possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Members of the CLC would appreciate having their Councillors in attendance at future CLC meetings. The Councillor was invited for this meeting but was unable to attend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Members of the CLC appreciate the chance to provide input into the study but have invested a lot of time on these issues so encourage the City to proceed as quickly as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Pritchard Road closure was on the 2006 TMP study plans as well; however, this closure will also be revisited during the ROPA9 TMP Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>CLC members would like to see the Trinity West Secondary Plan. <em>City to present to members of the CLC at the next meeting.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Several members of the CLC posed the following questions. Where have all the development charges gone? Why hasn’t the City approved funding for the design and construction of Rymal Road widening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Sewers in construction along Rymal Road are being put in because they are needed now to allow for limited development in the area to proceed. It could not be coordinated with the widening of Rymal Road since the design for the road construction hasn’t been completed. Underground work is often completed first to allow for settlement prior to proceeding with road works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for attending the first CLC meeting. Your suggestions and comments will help us in developing alternative solutions. Please find attached the PIC notice.

Thanks you,

Mohan Philip
Project Manager
Dear Mr. Philips,

On Thursday, January 10th, 2012 we had our first meeting regarding the Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Transportation Master Plan Review. I left that meeting feeling very disappointed, frustrated and skeptical about many things including the individuals invited to represent our immediate surrounding areas. As a resident of Second Road West and the co-chair of S.O.S. (Safety On Second), we shared our own concerns but also those that benefit others in our community.

For example, we stated over and over that the Upper Mount Albion residents need to have their issues addressed before any others, including our own. We base our support on merit, so we will continue to support the Upper Mount Albion crew because it is the right thing to do.

Many people that were speaking against S.O.S. were not arguing with facts, rationale or reason. In my opinion, their lack of knowledge was counter-productive as a committee, a community and as stakeholders. It is very difficult to assign any credibility to this committee when some are so far removed from the facts. We heard statements like (please refer to minutes for exact wording):

a."I don't care that you were promised closure from your builder and the city of Hamilton"

S.O.S. rationale based on facts: We must keep deep-pocketed builders accountable for selling a dream. Also, the City of Hamilton needs to stop hiding behind the word “Process”. S.O.S. has been through several rounds of process and we have deteriorated as a residential road because of it. The commercial and residential growth
keeps outgrowing our remedies, plans and solutions. We have gone through Ann Bain, Phil Bruckler and Brad Clark (currently on his second term). They all outlined the “Process”, we have engaged in it, and we are worse off 11 years later.

b) "If your road is too narrow to handle more than 700 cars per day, then why do you park your cars on the road?"

_S.O.S. rationale based on facts:_ Second Road West is a residential street; it is 28 feet wide. Parking is allowed on a residential street. Second Road West homes are set back a very shallow distance. The west side of Second Road West has the boulevard; therefore, the driveways allow for one car parking. This means that, most of us, at some point, will need to use our road as a parking option. Most families today own at least two cars. Where would this gentleman like me to tell my friends and family to park? Where do I park my third vehicle? Since when has it been against the law to park our cars on a road that has no parking restrictions other than the general city wide overnight parking guidelines? Also, let’s say that we do implement a onesided parking restriction to please this person, who probably is one of our 4000 rushed motorist per day (why else would he want no parking on Second Road West?) Our road essentially becomes a 16-foot road. Unsafe? A road like Highbury is approximately 60 feet wide, they have double-sided boulevards and both sides have 2 car deep driveways. Gatestone? Again, a 35-foot collector road with deep set back homes and sidewalks on both sides. Those roads are made to see thousands of cars per day. If you purchased a home on those roads, hopefully you understood that you bought more volume, but less property tax. (The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation at 1-800-296-6722).

c) "I use Second Road West up to 3 times a week and it's a ghost town.

_S.O.S. rationale based on facts:_ According to Mr. Chris VanBerkal, we see 1,895 cars per day SOUTHBOUND ONLY. This was taken almost 8 months ago on the summer holidays and partially on a long weekend where most people were either away at the cottage or in their backyard having a BBQ. It also did not include the North bound traffic that comes from Rymal. It is a safe assumption that the traffic numbers would be higher than 1,895 coming from Rymal given the nature of that road. The traffic count today, during the low point of family vacations, could be close to, or over 4000 cars per day south bound and north bound together. Ghost Town? Not on this Second Road West! What happens when the 10,000 cars from Upper Mount Albion no longer have that access? Will Second Road West get all 10,000? Probably not, but if we get even 50% we will be up to their numbers in no time. I believe it will more like 80%. Yes, I could be off a touch, but my statements are based on carefully studied facts. We are missing that component on our present committee, as even the chair was unaware that Second Road West is not a collector road but instead a residential road.

d) “S.O.S. was in favour of and fought for Karst conservation and so that means Second Road West remains open. It’s their own fault. S.O.S. should move on!

_S.O.S. rationale based on facts:_ The name of our organization is called S.O.S. (Safety on Second) not “Friends
of the Karsts”. We had only one resident that was unofficially in favour of no development across from their home. That person admitted that it was because they wanted the lot in front of them to remain unoccupied (can’t blame them). They were not against the road that would run behind Richdale. The rest of us remained neutral on conservation, but strong on the collector road running as planned. Why? Look at the Red Hill Expressway; we were able to accommodate green space and volume. We felt the same was possible with the Karst area. It was our position, and that of several experts, that a road could have been built through there without disturbing the Karst, which are beautiful but far from the eighth wonder of the world. I can say this because I have been in them. I have also been in the ones in the South of Sicily where a large boat toured through this phenomena. Ours are worth conserving, but a road is more than feasible. Besides, the Karsts have been here for a while now. Aren’t our homes built on them? How many did we damage and collapse with the very homes that we live in? Have you ever tried to drive on Highbury Street by St. Mark Catholic Elementary School? I guess we should keep some things a secret? Where were the friends of the Karsts then? It is my opinion, based on reliable sources; that there were people on that committee that were there to literally conserve their own backyard. Apparently, some Richdale residents got away with not paying a premium to their builder for backyard green space if the Karst remained untouched.

It is necessary at this time to educate these so-called stakeholders on the realities of Second Road West. I would strongly suggest that only people who are prepared and well versed be included on this committee, otherwise their opinions are harmful to the well being of our community and to this process. To do this properly, the correct and most updated information is needed and the appropriate people, departments and organizations need to provide us with it. I apologize, but I do not have the appropriate ability and disposable time to explore these numbers. As taxpayers, I believe we pay specific departments to collect, process and present these facts and figures when the time is needed. That time has come, but we don’t have these numbers. What we do have is some unfounded and blanket statements and opinions from local residents. Comments not only inaccurate, but out of order in the committee setting. It is clear that some chosen stakeholders are lacking on the pressing issues and facts of Second Road West. So the question has to be asked, “Who is responsible for informing them?” I believe we have to answer that question immediately and certainly before the next meeting can be held.

Some Facts regarding the past 11 years:

1. A 28 foot residential road with shallow set backs should be seeing 500-800 cars per day. Second Road West is surely over 4000 and growing.

2. The taxpayers of Second Road West have invested countless hours to help the process move along. All we get is new process and more process.

3. We have endured profanity, threats, vandalism, slander and punitive action from rebelling local residents. Our children have been subjected to much of this. Reports to the Hamilton Police Department, the Aggressive driver hotline, 911 dispatch and the City of Hamilton staff and all of its politicians are on record.
There have been countless accidents of which the city has no records. I called 911 for serious accidents 3 times last year alone. For whatever reason, the records of the countless accidents are nowhere to be found. With the auto insurance discouraging claims, many don't process the collisions. Also, the Police stated that they often arrive at the scenes of accidents on Second Road West and encourage private settlements. We are often victims of hit and runs, mischief and much more. Some of this has been documented through the city, the politicians, the police, or all of the above. Many residents are afraid to report issues, as they are afraid of being targeted. I can't blame them!

**What do the residents of Second Road West have to look forward to?**

1. Bishop Ryan Catholic Secondary School: The Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School Board recently had to file for additional funds to avoid having dozens of portables in their first years of opening. It is projected to see over 2000 students and over 200 staff members within the first 2 years of opening. With Upper Mount Albion closing, it is safe to assume that increased volume, school buses, teenagers with loud exhaust and more speeders and aggressive drivers will further punish Second Road West.

2. Continued commercial development: I believe that Brad Clark put a motion forward to halt all commercial development until the process can catch up. I am still very unclear as to what the details were on that motion. Great idea, but will it materialize?

3. Residential development as close as on Second Road West North of Highland: A survey just opened up this past year. There is also an explosion of development in Binbrook. They are not even close to being done there. We will surely see them through Second Road West.

**In summary, what are the problems:**

1. Past volume
2. Present Volume
3. Future Volume
4. Speeding
5. Stop Signs being ignored.
7. Accountability: Where are the true numbers of Second Road West in terms of volume(North & South), accidents etc.? One gentlemen asked where the forwarded funds from Smart Centre, Multi-Area development etc. have gone. The response was “It kind of gets spread like peanut butter”. Unbelievable, but that is the answer that was given. I don’t believe that this kind accountability would be accepted in my line of work, or anyone else’s for that matter.
8. Aggressive Drivers: The Hamilton Police Department has all of the data to support this.
9. Lack of knowledge: Many people are not aware of the reality on Second Road West. They don’t see it, live it or pay for it.
10. Delays: It has been in the plans since July 25th 1980.
The Solution:

1. Close Second Road West as per plan.
2. Inform all stakeholders properly.
3. Drive a plan that includes Second Road West closing. It has to move "On Block" as part of an incorporated solution, or it will never close and this problem will continue to grow. (ITRANS was capable of creating a plan that considered this problem)

Local surrounding residents are bitter towards S.O.S. because they:

a. Received letters from the Aggressive driver hotline.

b. Have been pulled over by Hamilton Police and sometimes ticketed.

c. Have had to slow down for legally parked cars.

d. Would not have a convenient and speeding method to go shopping.

e. Feel hostility towards our effort even though we are trying to be pro-active.

For these reasons, many will not help us, if nothing else, they will work against us. I have always felt that we should not have to ask others if we can close a road that has been in the plans for decades, but rather they should have to ask us to NOT close our road.

Respectfully,
April 23, 2012

Dear CLC member,

Subject: ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review – Invitation for the Citizens Liaison Committee Meeting # 2

The City of Hamilton is undertaking a review of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) completed in 2006 for the Regional Official Plan Amendment, ROPA 9 study area and adjacent areas. The study will consider modifications to the TMP due to changes in land use plans approved, especially for the lands to the east of the Eramosa Karst.

As part of the public consultation component for this study, a Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC) has been established and the first meeting was held on January 19, 2012. Following this, the first Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on February 1, 2012. The input received from the CLC and PIC has been reviewed and the potential solutions have been identified for the transportation systems in the study area.

Through this letter, we invite you to the second CLC meeting, details below, to discuss the potential solutions and to seek further input into the study.

Date: Tuesday, May 8, 2012 - 6.30 to 8.30 pm  
Location: Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Drive, Stoney Creek

Following CLC meeting #2, a public information centre (PIC#2) will be held. The exact date for PIC#2 will be set based on input received and the outcome of this CLC meeting.

Please acknowledge receipt of this invitation letter and confirm your attendance by April 30, 2012. We believe it will be a rewarding opportunity to take part in shaping a vision for your neighbourhood.

If you are unable to participate, you will still have the opportunity to provide input into the study by participation at the next PIC. Notification for the PIC will be mailed separately.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at mohan.philip@hamilton.ca or at 905-546-2424 ext. 3438.
Sincerely,

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning
Strategic Planning & Rapid Transit
ESI Division, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
Chow, Tavia

From: Philip, Mohan [Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 10:40 AM
To: Keen, Stephen; Baudais, Nathalie
Subject: FW: Invitation for the ROPA9 TMP Review CLC meeting #2
Attachments: 20120423135218.pdf

For your information and for file.

From: Philip, Mohan
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 2:14 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Kirkpatrick, Alan; Skrypniak, Lorissa; Clark, Brad
Subject: Invitation for the ROPA9 TMP Review CLC meeting #2

Dear CLC Members,

Please find attached the invitation for the next CLC meeting scheduled for May 8, 2012. Kindly acknowledge receipt of this and confirm your participation by April 30, 2012.

Thank you

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation/Transit
Strategic Planning & Rapid Transit
ESI Division, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
Chow, Tavia

From: Philip, Mohan [Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2012 9:55 AM
To: Keen, Stephen; Baudais, Nathalie
Subject: FW: Upper Mt. Albion Road

FYI

---

From: Clark, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 03:09 PM
To: 'Subject: Re: Upper Mt. Albion Road

The delay was to permit briefing of politicians. Further, I requested a joint meeting of all departments with the HCA to discuss their concern around an eco-corridor.

Brad

Brad Clark
Councillor Ward 9
Heritage Stoney Creek
905 546-2703
Web Blog: www.councillorbradclark.blogspot.com

This message sent by a hand-held BlackBerry. The information transmitted above is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 03:02 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Upper Mt. Albion Road

Mr. Mohan, I was wondering if you have any idea as to when the next meeting replacing the cancelled one earlier this month for the "Transportation Master Plan Review" is going to be held? I am also asking if the cancellation has anything to do with the large area of land currently being prepared for construction south/east of Fletchers Road & Rymal Road. There are already three large homes under construction on Fletchers just south of Rymal. There is also a large developers sign when you come to the intersection of the up bound Red Hill feeder lane and Stone Church Road. Why is this construction going to start when the "Transportation Master Plan Review" as far as I know has not been completed. This raises questions about the credibility of the whole review. As you know, Upper Mount Albion Road has been inundated with far too much traffic since the opening of the Red Hill Expressway and these new homes will just add that much more traffic. This is completely unacceptable to the residents of Upper Mount Albion Road. Leave our road alone, please do not attempt to upgrade it in anyway to carry more traffic, if any upgrades are done it will only delay the building of the Trinity Road Extension. We fought to get it closed, it was passed by Council but has now been delayed until 2014.2015. If all this construction is going to be started shortly, I would suggest whoever is responsible for the extension move up the date or have the
developers put on hold. We were invited to sit in at meetings to see how progress was being made with the review but we increasingly feel that the city and developers are going to do what they want with no regards to our concerns. Please get them moving on the Trinity Church Road Extension. It is needed NOW.

Yours truly

[Redacted]
Good morning, In a follow up to your story about the young man involved in the hit and run of last Friday on Upper Mount Albion Road. It might interest you to know that as a resident of Upper Mount Albion Road, we the residents petitioned the city to close Upper Mount Albion based on a decision to close it by the former city of Stoney Creek. I was a spokesperson who made an oral presentation to the Planning & Economic Development Committee back in the fall of 2004 giving reasons why we felt the road should be closed. Aside from the Red Hill Expressway, the other reasons dealt with were the "Ropa 9" project which in 2004 claimed there would be an addition of some 3500 housing units, the widening of Rymal Road and the building of the Trinity Church Road extension which would connect at the T intersection of Stone Church road and the exit/feeder lanes for the Red Hill and proceed due south to the intersection of Trinity Church Road and Rymal Road. To make a long story short, Council passed the closing of our road and a date given was 2013 at which time the Trinity Church Road Extension was supposed to be completed and our road to be closed. It has since been put back to 2014/2015. Our road as stated in your article is absolutely terrible for traffic and at rush hour is backed up some distance, speeding, safety factors, garbage thrown from vehicles and a previous serious accident involving a resident a couple of years ago dictate the need to have this road closed a.s.a.p. People now back into their driveways as trying to back out is too dangerous. We have followed up over the years trying to see when the T.C. Extension is going to start to no avail. Now construction is going into high gear along Rymal with a huge tract of land being made ready for construction to begin on more homes. Two other residents and myself have gotten on a committee to attend meetings for the "Traffic Master Plan Review" in regards to roads that will be affected with all this construction. In a letter to the head planner at City Hall I have questioned the credibility of the "Traffic Master Plan Review" as nothing is being done in regards to our road and the Trinity Extension does not have shovels in the ground and construction is going into high gear. I have yet to receive a reply. We have waited long enough. Is it going to take a fatality to get some action. We want no improving of our road, we want it closed.

Regards
September 11, 2012

Dear CLC member,

Subject: ROPA 9 Transportation Master Plan Review – Invitation for the Citizens Liaison Committee Meeting #2

The City of Hamilton is undertaking a review of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) completed in 2006 for the Regional Official Plan Amendment, ROPA 9 study area and adjacent areas. The study will consider modifications to the TMP due to changes in land use plans approved, especially for the lands to the east of the Eramosa Karst.

As part of the public consultation component for this study, a Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC) has been established and the first meeting was held on January 19, 2012. Following this, the first Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on February 1, 2012. The input received from the CLC and PIC has been reviewed and the potential solutions have been identified for the transportation systems in the study area.

Through this letter, we invite you to the second CLC meeting, details below, to discuss the potential solutions and to seek further input into the study.

Date: Thursday, September 27, 2012 - 6.30 to 8.30 pm
Location: Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Drive, Stoney Creek

Following CLC meeting #2, a public information centre (PIC#2) will be held. The exact date for PIC#2 will be set based on input received and the outcome of this CLC meeting.

Please acknowledge receipt of this invitation letter and confirm your attendance by September 18, 2012. We believe it will be a rewarding opportunity to take part in shaping a vision for your neighbourhood.

If you are unable to participate, you will still have the opportunity to provide input into the study by participation at the next PIC. Notification for the PIC will be mailed separately.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at mohan.philip@hamilton.ca or at 905-546-2424 ext. 3438.
Sincerely,

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning
Strategic Planning & Rapid Transit
ESI Division, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
For record

---

From: Philip, Mohan
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2012 4:55 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Rescheduled CLC meeting #2 for the ROPA9 TMP Review

Dear CLC members,

Please find attached the invitation for the next CLC meeting scheduled for September 27, 6.30-8.30pm at the Salvation Army Church in Stoney Creek. Confirmation of your attendance by September 18th would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

_Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng._
Project Manager, Transportation/Transit
Strategic Planning, ESI Division
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
Dear CLC Members,

Please find attached the Agenda for the September 27th CLC meeting.

Thanks

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning Services
Strategic Planning, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
Hi,

Please find attached the agenda for the September 27th CLC meeting.

Thank You
Mohan Philip
## Agenda

### Project:
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands)
Transportation Master Plan Review

### Subject:
**Citizens Liaison Committee Meeting 2**

### Meeting Date:
Thursday, September 27, 2012 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm

### Location:
Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Drive

### Attendees:
- Members of the Citizens Liaison Committee
- Mohan Philip – City of Hamilton Project Manager
- City of Hamilton Project Team
- Nathalie Baudais – HDR
- Avril Fisken – AECOM- Facilitator / Meeting Chair
- Dave Kielstra – AECOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Transportation Master Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Alternative Solutions for Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West; including review of existing conditions and previous recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Evaluation of Alternatives &amp; Preliminary Recommendations: Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Question and Answer Period – Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Highland Road – Alternative Solutions and Preliminary Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Question and Answer Period – Highland Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Question and Answer Period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For your consideration

Thanks, Mohan. I noticed there is nothing on the agenda regarding the still undeveloped Red Hill extension from the top of the Red Hill Expressway to Twenty Road. This lack of a viable roadway is what is causing the heavy traffic flows on Upper Mount Albion. It should have been built ages ago and it hasn’t even been started yet. The developer (Losani) is already going ahead with his construction along the west side of Upper Mount Albion and south of Highland Rd. There needs to be an update to the attendees at the meeting tomorrow!

Dear CLC Members,

Please find attached the Agenda for the September 27th CLC meeting.

Thanks

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning Services
Strategic Planning, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
Good Morning to All,

Please find attached the minutes of the Citizen Liaison Committee meeting held on September 27, 2012 and the PIC#2 notice for the ROPA9 TMP Review project.

Thanks

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning Services
Strategic Planning, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
Minutes of Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** September 27, 2012  
**Start Time:** 6:30pm  
**Project Number:** 60266159

**Project Name:** Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9) TMP Review  
**Location:** Salvation Army Church, 300 Winterberry Drive, Stoney Creek  
**Regarding:** Citizen Liaison Committee Meeting No. 2

**Attendees**

- **Residents:** Lee Austin, Mike Borrelli, Dave Cunningham, Brad Gautreau, Luis Ponte, Margaret Reid, Paolo Testaguzza, Sam Marranca, David Trevesani  
- **City Staff:** Brad Clark, Councillor, Daryl Bender, Alissa Mahood, Guy Paparella, Mohan Philip (Project Manager), Lorissa Skrypniak, Shveta Shukla, Bart Brosseau  
- **HDR Staff:** Nathalie Baudais  
- **AECOM Staff:** Avril Fisken (Facilitator), David Kielstra  
- **Developers:** Anthony DeSandis Jr, Emily Edmunds, Adi Irani, Ana Malino

**Distribution**  
Attendees; file

**Minutes Prepared By:** David Kielstra, AECOM

**PLEASE NOTE:** If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.0 **Group Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review**

- Avril Fisken (Meeting Facilitator) opened the meeting shortly after 6:30pm by:
  o Welcoming CLC members to the meeting  
  o Leading the roundtable introductions where individual members of the CLC and the project team introduced themselves.  
  o Reviewing the meeting’s agenda

2.0 **Transportation Master Plan Update**

- Mohan Philip (Project Manager) described the need to review the Transportation Master Plan because a karst was identified in the area, the lands were since designated Open Space and the previously recommended Neighbourhood Collector Road was no longer feasible.
Trinity Church Arterial Corridor Update

- Discussions are ongoing between the City of Hamilton, developers and the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) regarding storm water retention and eco-passage.
- The HCA will have to justify the requirement for an eco-passage through biological surveys. The eco-passage would also accommodate a multi-use path for a trail connection.
- The height of any required eco-passage is under consideration since designs will need to compensate for area low-points.
- The detailed design phase is expected to begin early next year, with a final design targeted by the end of 2013.
  - Construction of road infrastructure will likely follow at the end of 2013 or in 2014.

CLC member comment: A resident noted that he has seen a less wildlife in recent years near the karst area.

The following describes questions and topics of the discussion that arose during this portion of the meeting:

- **Q:** In your recommendations have you accounted for traffic concerns due to the existing Janet Lee school and the planned catholic high school?
  
  **A:** Traffic counts were conducted at appropriate times to understand existing traffic volumes; some were taken during the school season. The results were considered in the preliminary recommendations. Projected volumes related to new developments, and road closures were also considered.

- **Q:** Are the Highland Road upgrades designed to encourage more people to use it?
  
  **A:** The upgrades to Highland Road are needed to increase capacity and safety. Improvements to Upper Mount Albion Road are also required because it has sub-standard conditions, high volumes, poor paving and a lack of sidewalks. The City cannot implement all construction projects at once; therefore, works are pursued sequentially.

### 3.0 Alternative Solutions for Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West

- Alternative solutions were discussed related to Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West. The Project Manager identified that suggestions from the previous CLC were considered.

- **Q:** Why is option 3 of the presented Alternative Solutions being considered, despite being unacceptable (i.e., “Keep UMAR open and any one of the following...”)?
A: As part of the environmental assessment process, a full range of options were considered. Each of the presented alternatives was evaluated, using the defined evaluation criteria, to assess their merits and downfalls. The alternatives considered are not decisions (i.e., the Preliminary Recommendation).

- **Q: Why are road widths now being described as Right of Way?**
  A: A *Right Of Way* is the city’s property including sidewalks and boulevards. It is not the same as pavement width (curb to curb). It is standard practice to consider Right of Ways when conducting transportation planning. Both the Right of Way and the road widths can be provided for comparison with previous meetings.

- **Q: The sub-division drawing shown (on slide 16) is from 1996. A 1989 drawing said that Second Road West would be closed. Have you considered the 1989 plan?**
  A: Second Road West was never proposed to be closed as a cul-de-sac, according to records on file with the city.

### 4.0 Evaluation of Alternatives & Preliminary Recommendations: Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West

- The evaluation criteria used to assess the Alternative Solutions and to determine the Preliminary Recommendation was explained by the Project Manager.
- Slides 19 to 26 were also explained; these depicted current and projected traffic volumes for the proposed Alternative Solutions.
- Preliminary Recommendations were presented and include the following:
  - An acceleration of TCAC design and construction (between Stone Church Road and Rymal Road).
  - Acceleration of Rymal Road design and construction (between TCAC and Upper Centennial).
  - Road closure on Upper Mount Albion Road, between Highland and Rymal (location as shown in the secondary plan).
  - Implementation of temporary traffic signals at Pritchard Road/Rymal Road until TCAC is open.
  - Continuity of sidewalks along Second Road West, where appropriate.
  - Second Road West remains open with traffic calming at select locations to ensure that closure of UMAR does not divert traffic to Second Road West.

- Calming measures were proposed to reduce speed and safety on Second Road West. Potential locations for these calming measures were suggested by CLC members, including:

### 3.1 For future Open Houses or CLC meetings, express figures in terms of Right of Way road allowances (incl. Sidewalks and boulevards) and pavement width (curb to curb).

### 4.1 Use consistent traffic forecast volumes (i.e., hourly/daily) for future meetings. Offer both peak hour and daily volumes for comparison.

### 4.2 Suggested calming measure locations will
- Near Highland Road
- South of Fairhaven Drive
- Near Gatestone Drive; and
- Between Rymal Road and Gatestone Drive.

**Q: Can you clarify the difference between capacity and volume on roadways?**
A: Capacity is determined by the intersections in an urban environment. Freeflow traffic on a street could handle 1800 vehicles going north and 1800 going south. Road capacity is the maximum potential capacity of a given roadway. It can be expressed in terms of vehicles per hour or per day. The factors which determine the actual capacity of a road are the physical characteristics of the road, characteristics of the traffic using the road and traffic controls used on the road.

The following describes questions and topics of the discussion that arose during this portion of the agenda:

- **Q: What portion of Second Road West was considered for the traffic study, since it has different classification?**
  A: The road has the same capacity regardless of its classification. The capacity of the road is acceptable along its entire length.

- **Q: Why are you now using peak hours to describe the roads?**
  A: Planning for signals, lanes and other uses relies on measurements for peak capacity. This is determined by determining the “peak hours” of use.

- **Q: How are the traffic flows identified on slide 19 to 26 impacting other streets in the area?**
  A: The impact to all area roads was considered when assessing changes in traffic flow (e.g., closure of Second Road West.) A larger map will be available at the open house to show the wider impact of the proposed changes.

- **Q: Will Gatestone Drive be included when monitoring the impact of the Second Road West calming measures?**
  A: The impact of the possible diversion of traffic from Second Road West onto Gatestone Drive was considered. Future monitoring of Gatestone Drive will be suggested.

- **Q: Will on-street parking along Second Road West be impacted by the planned changes?**
  A: On-street parking will experience localized restrictions in the vicinity of the speed cushions; however the calming measures will take up minimal room on the street.

<p>| 4.3 Study and monitor the impact of calming measures on Gatestone Drive traffic. |
| 4.4 Better explain the difference between road volume and capacity at future events. |
| 4.5 Future meetings should have larger regional maps to show the wider impact of changes. |
| 4.6 Consider ongoing monitoring of Gatestone Drive after changes to Second Road West are complete. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q: Is it possible to put a temporary traffic signal at Rymal Road and Prichard Road prior to the completion of the study? Is it also feasible due to the proximity of the temporary signals at Fletcher Road and Glover Road?</td>
<td>A: Signals decisions that are beyond the scope of the study are outside the jurisdiction of the project team. The requests will be passed on to the appropriate city staff members for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: What are the timelines for the proposed changes?</td>
<td>A: The Transportation Master Plan is subject to a review by council, and could be approved as early as the 1st quarter of 2013; this timeframe could be delayed if appeals are made to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment during the public comment period as these could lead to a review of the Environmental Assessment process by the Ministry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 The request for temporary traffic lights will be passed on to the appropriate City staff member for consideration as a proposed additional calming measure.

5.0 Highland Road – Alternative Solutions and Preliminary Recommendations

- The Alternative Solutions and Preliminary Recommendation for Highland Road were presented by the Project Manager

- **Preliminary Recommendation:** City of Hamilton recommends on-road bicycle lanes on Highland Road with the removal of parking on the North side.

The following describes questions and topics of the discussion that arose during this portion of the agenda:

- Q: What is the reason for the changes to the Highland Road configuration?  
  A: The City believes that the solution will help address safety concerns when individuals try to turn left into homes.

- Q: Would the provision of bicycle lanes prevent left-turn lanes from being provided at intersections along Highland Road?  
  A: Left turn lanes could be provided by the removal of parking on both sides of Highland Road in the vicinity of intersections.

5.1 Individuals supported the proposed bike lane configuration.

6.0 Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps

- Project Manager Mohan Philip reminded participants that a Public Information Centre meeting will be held in early November.
- The Transportation Master Plan will be subject to review by city staff, before being presented to council.
- The current schedule is to present the report to council in the first quarter of 2013.

Any additional comments or suggestions can be directed to the Mohan Philip at Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca or 905 546 2424 ext 3438.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Open House:</th>
<th>November 7th; 6:00pm to 8:00 pm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Hi Mohan,

Thanks for arranging this so quickly. Can you believe that now the post office has advised the residents on UMA that it is no longer safe to deliver the mail to our homes and would like to set up a centralized mailbox system. The questions that will come up is how are we as residents of the road supposed to get to the mailboxes, when we can't even walk on our road.

I have sent out the notice of the meeting to the other residents on the road.

Have a great day.
Hope you have received yesterday’s message sent as an update for the CLC members. With respect to the below message we would like to explain as follows.

Highland Road was included in the review of the Transportation Master Plan. We monitored the operating speed on Highland Road east of Winterberry Drive and identified a speeding issue there. As part of the solutions, on-road cycling lanes are recommended between Winterberry Drive and Upper Centennial Parkway with the removal of parking on one side.

We understand that there is a lack of north-south connectivity in the study area. To improve north-south connectivity in the area, the 2006 Transportation Master Plan recommended a new four lane arterial corridor road (Trinity Church Arterial Corridor Road) between Upper Mount Albion Road and Pritchard Road. The construction of the Trinity Church Arterial Corridor between Stone Church Road and Rymal Road is a high priority for the City. The construction is planned for 2014.

To clarify, Second Road West is not the only north-south link between Rymal and Highland. There is also Upper Centennial Parkway, Whitedeer-Highbury Dr., and Pritchard Road. Second Road West north of Gatestone is intended to provide a north-south road connection for local traffic.

As part of the recommendations, speed cushion is recommended for the Second Road West. This would discourage cut through traffic and help to ensure compliance with the posted speed limit. The speed cushions have been used successfully in other municipalities. It would not be an experiment. The recommended solution also includes completion of the sidewalk network which will better accommodate the pedestrians using the corridor. In addition to this, monitoring of traffic volume on Second Road West after closure is recommended.

Regarding the Rymal Road-UMA Road intersection, there wouldn’t be any direct access to UMA Road once it is closed north of Rymal Road. However, in future there will be an access to the Trinity West lands from Rymal Road (north leg of the intersection) when developments occurs in the Trinity West Secondary Plan areas. We don’t anticipate this new access road to happen prior to the Trinity Church Arterial Road construction.

Thank you,
Mohan Philip
Subject: RE: Support
Importance: High

Brad/ Mohan, have summed up our thoughts on the ongoing situation and more so the recent decisions made however, I do have some questions that I feel need to be answered.

Why has Highland become such a priority all of a sudden and why has there been such quick action? First off, the road is in excess of 60', residents should have been fully aware that it was a busy street 15 years ago and is a busy street now. Our issues have dated back to 1989 and certainly over the last 10 years and to date we have stop signs and stopping bars both because the residents requests and not planning or any other department in the City.

Secondly, on the North West corner of Rymal Road and Second Road West there is a sign that was just recently put up. The sign is for a new home developer and the strategic location of this sign sums up what our fears have been and what the current use of our street is really intended for. There is an arrow at the bottom of the sign pointing west stating that the new home offices are now open. Basically it wants to capture all the commuters that are travelling west on Rymal and turning north onto Second Road West for their convenience and because it is the only north/ south link. To make matters worse, once Upper Mount Albion is closed, Second Road West will be the only street with South/ north and vice versa access linking Rymal to Highland. Amazingly with all the dollars spent on planning by the City, this very issue when tabled was not acknowledged much less have a solution.

On the matter regarding the feelings of the Gatestone residents; although I understand what their perceived issues may be and to be quite frank, I don't care. The Road is acting exactly as it was intended to be, an artery to handle large volumes. It is an HSR route, width is in excess of 50', has boulevards and sidewalks on both sides and the homes are all set back a minimum of 35' from the sidewalks.

I can only speak for my family and will share my opinion on the recent suggestion by the Planning Department regarding speed cushions. Thanks but no thanks! Our road is not an experimental study on what might work or what may not. The demographic on the street is 90% young families with young children and experiments are not welcome. We need to protect our families and our investments.

Brad, we need your help on this matter, please let me know how we can get together and resolve these issues.

Mohan, throughout this so called process, you have very clearly maintained that nothing can be done until the Trinity corridor has been completed however, what it the City's plan for commuters travelling from the Rymal/ Hwy 20 corners and travelling West? Trinity? A stretch of 3-5 kms at the very least! I realize that there will be an entrance off Rymal and Upper Mount Albion however; isn't this really what the current situation is? My point again, Second Road is the only Street that will provide North/ South access and make no mistake; it will be what is used.

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 8:49 PM
To: 
Cc: Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca
Subject: Re: Support

I agree. I am not sure how this recommendation to keep it open could be followed by the city. It was the City of Stoney Creek that determined that Second Road West would be closed. That is why they was designed and built as a residential street. It is not possible to now re-design and re-build it as a collector road and maintain an acceptable level of safety for anyone.

To clarify, I know that the recommendation is not to make it a collector road, however, the reasons that are use to support keeping it open are because of some of the functions of a collector road that Second Road West provides would
be lost (ie. delivery of emergency services, a link between Rymal and Highland for North-South traffic, to divert traffic from other streets, etc.)

-----Original Message-----
From: <brad.clark@hamilton.ca>
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2012 23:49:31
To: <brad.clark@hamilton.ca>
Cc: <Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Support

Brad, leaving Second Road West open to absorb all the volume is going to be a real problem. What are you doing to help us?
As requested through your comment sheet following the PIC#2 held on November 7, 2012 we would like to advise you that the report to the Public Works Committee for this project will be discussed at the PW Committee meeting Scheduled for April 22, 2013.

Thanks

Mohan Philip,  M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning Services
Transportation Division, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
Hello Mohan - Please remove my name from the committee, as I do not agree with some of the recommendations and I don't want to be a part of what is going to transpire. Please read carefully what I am stating below.

1) I realize there is a heavy traffic situation on Upper Mount Albion Road, but what is needed is for the road to be widened, resurfaced and sidewalks installed. The traffic will lessen when the Trinity Church extension is completed. Closing any existing road in this area will be crippling to the flow of traffic that exists now and in the future.

2) I'm not in favor of a speed cushion on Second Rd. W, as it is not warranted. What is needed, is a set of traffic lights at Second Rd. W and Rymal Rd. because currently, when you turn east onto Rymal Rd. from Second Rd. W, you are taking your life in your hands. If you install a speed cushion, you are appeasing a very small group of people, not the majority and it will not discourage traffic, it will enrage and penalize the local homeowners who use this road in their daily travels.

I agree with the rest of the recommendations stated.

P.S. - The speed limit on Rymal Rd. is too high for the amount of traffic and the current and future traffic lights that are required, as this is not a highway any more - it is basically a city street. I live in this area and I drive these roads on a regular basis. I joined this group to give some "common sense" ideas on how to alleviate current and future traffic congestion in the area. When the rest of the citizens see what is going to transpire, there will be problems.

Thank you.
CLC members,

Further to the CLC#2 and PIC#2 held on September 27, and November 7, 2012 respectively, we would like to advise that the ROPA9 Transportation Master Plan Review study has been completed. The final recommendation will be forwarded to the City’s Public Works Committee for approval, scheduled for April 22, 2013. The recommendations are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Study Recommendations</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close Upper Mount Albion Road, Nor th of Rymal Road East</td>
<td>) Install temporary traffic signals at Pritchard Road / Rymal Road until they open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>) Asphalt overlay work on Pritchard Road, between Bigwin Rd. and Highland Road,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between Highland and Rymal Road, intersection of Pritchard and Rymal Road,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct paved shoulder along west side of Pritchard Road, between Highland and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated storm drainage works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>) Close Upper Mount Albion Road, north of Rymal with a cul-de-sac (West Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming on Second Road West</td>
<td>Construct speed cushion as a traffic calming measure, and to discourage closure of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Mount Albion Road in order to address residents’ concerns and traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide sidewalk on Second Road West</td>
<td>Construct sidewalk on both sides along Second Road west, where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Highland Road</td>
<td>Reconfigure lane markings on Highland Road to provide on-road bike lanes along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winterberry Dr. to First Rd. West and on the north side from Highland Road,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between First Rd. W and Highbury Drive, bike lanes would replace wide travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lanes and the existing centre turn lane would remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide sidewalk on Highland Rd. south side</td>
<td>Construct sidewalks along the south side of Highland Road, where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public and stakeholders have the option to make a submission to the PW Committee if they still have concerns with the recommendations. Subject to approval from PW Committee and Council the study report will be filed for public review for a minimum of 30 days. Please note that during the public review period there wouldn’t be an option to appeal the recommendations as the identified projects are either Schedule A or A+ under the Municipal Class EA document. The notice for public review will be posted in the newspapers and project website www.hamilton.ca/ropa9-TMP-review.

Thank you

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning Services
Transportation Division, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
CLC members,

Further to the CLC#2 and PIC#2 held on September 27, and November 7, 2012 respectively, we would like to advise that the ROPA9 Transportation Master Plan Review study has been completed. The final recommendation will be forwarded to the City’s Public Works Committee for approval, scheduled for April 22, 2013. The recommendations are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Study Recommendations</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Close Upper Mount Albion Road, North of Rymal Road East   | a) Install temporary traffic signals at Pritchard Road / Rymal Road unless the road is open.  
   |                                             | b) Asphalt overlay work on Pritchard Road, between Bigwin Rd. and Highland and Rymal Road, intersection of Pritchard Road.  
   |                                             | c) Construct paved shoulder along west side of Pritchard Road, between Highland and Rymal Road.  
   |                                             | d) Close Upper Mount Albion Road, north of Rymal with a cul-de-sac (Trinity West Secondary Plan) |
| 2   | Implement traffic calming on Second Road West            | Construct speed cushion as a traffic calming measure, and to discourage closure of Upper Mount Albion Road in order to address residents’ concerns.  
   |                                             | Monitoring                                                                 |
| 3   | Provide sidewalk on Second Road West                     | Construct sidewalk on both sides along Second Road west, where residents request it. |
| 4   | Provide bike lanes on Highland Rd.                       | Reconfigure lane markings on Highland Road to provide on-road bike lanes along Winterberry Dr. to First Rd. West and on the north side from Highbury Drive. Between First Rd. W and Highbury Drive, bike lanes would share wide travel lanes and the existing centre turn lane would remain. |
| 5   | Provide sidewalk on Highland Rd. south side              | Construct sidewalks along the south side of Highland Road, where residents request an urbanized section of the corridor (Winterberry Drive to Upper Centennial Parkway). |

The public and stakeholders have the option to make a submission to the PW Committee if they still have concerns with the recommendations. Subject to approval from PW Committee and Council the study report will be filed for public review for a minimum of 30 days. Please note that during the public review period there wouldn’t be an option to appeal the recommendations as the identified projects are either Schedule A or A+ under the Municipal Class EA document. The notice for public review will be posted in the newspapers and project website www.hamilton.ca/ropa9-TMP-review.
Thank you

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning Services
Transportation Division, Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400 - 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3

Phone: 905 546 2424 x 3438
Fax: 905 546 4435
Email: mohan.philip@hamilton.ca
As I mentioned during the last meeting when the proposals were being discussed, I am not in support of another calming measure to divert traffic. They have not worked until now and there is really no reason to believe they will this time. I am not of the opinion that this will help the North/South corridor on Second Rd. Also based on the last meeting the method in which data was collected was not consistent with previous data collection, we pointed this out and were dismissed with creative responses. So really, what do you expect me to honestly say?

Being involved in this situation for the while, what ever happened to Itrans and their participation in finding solutions?

And yes again, I will reiterate that I purchased my home based on a solid documented plan that the City had which indicated closure of Second Road West, not to mention the fact that when I the perspective owner was doing my due diligence was shown this plan by the City. This changed and quite honestly, nobody really seems to care. There were alleged issues that arose that forced the change in plan, I preface alleged because it was common knowledge to everyone that the Karst’s existed there.

If you would like me to respond with support for the plan, close Second Road and force traffic to Gatestone. The width of the road and the homes’ setback clearly was setup to handle the volume unlike the same characteristics on Second.

It really perplexes me when comments such as there are other north south corridors for people to use are said. Those corridors exist today and are not being used, Second remains the short cut. I've mentioned numerous times that until the short cut is removed, the other corridors will not be used.

So in short, I do not support the measure brought forward and it is incredibly disappointing to me as a voting citizen and taxpayer.

-----Original Message-----
From: Philip, Mohan [mailto:Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 11:45 AM
To: [blacked out]
Cc: Clark, Brad; Skrypniak, Lorissa; Elizabeth.Szymanski@hdrinc.com; Richards, Peter
Subject: FW: ROPA email requiring response
Importance: High

Hope you have received yesterday's message sent as an update for the CLC members. With respect to the below message we would like to explain as follows.

Highland Road was included in the review of the Transportation Master Plan. We monitored the operating speed on Highland Road east of Winterberry Drive and identified a speeding issue there. As part of the solutions, on-road cycling lanes are recommended between Winterberry Drive and Upper Centennial Parkway with the removal of parking on one side.
We understand that there is a lack of north-south connectivity in the study area. To improve north-south connectivity in the area, the 2006 Transportation Master Plan recommended a new four lane arterial corridor road (Trinity Church Arterial Corridor Road) between Upper Mount Albion Road and Pritchard Road. The construction of the Trinity Church Arterial Corridor between Stone Church Road and Rymal Road is a high priority for the City. The construction is planned for 2014.

To clarify, Second Road West is not the only north-south link between Rymal and Highland. There is also Upper Centennial Parkway, Whitedeer-Highbury Dr., and Pritchard Road. Second Road West north of Gatestone is intended to provide a north-south road connection for local traffic.

As part of the recommendations, speed cushion is recommended for the Second Road West. This would discourage cut through traffic and help to ensure compliance with the posted speed limit. The speed cushions have been used successfully in other municipalities. It would not be an experiment. The recommended solution also includes completion of the sidewalk network which will better accommodate the pedestrians using the corridor. In addition to this, monitoring of traffic volume on Second Road West after closure is recommended.

Regarding the Rymal Road-UMA Road intersection, there wouldn't be any direct access to UMA Road once it is closed north of Rymal Road. However, in future there will be an access to the Trinity West lands from Rymal Road (north leg of the intersection) when developments occurs in the Trinity West Secondary Plan areas. We don't anticipate this new access road to happen prior to the Trinity Church Arterial Road construction.

Thank you,
Mohan Philip

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2012 11:13 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Philip, Mohan
Subject: RE: Support
Importance: High

Brad/ Mohan, [redacted] have summed up our thoughts on the ongoing situation and more so the recent decisions made however, I do have some questions that I feel need to be answered.

Why has Highland become such a priority all of a sudden and why has there been such quick action? First off, the road is in excess of 60', residents should have been fully aware that it was a busy street 15 years ago and is a busy street now. Our issues have dated back to 1989 and certainly over the last 10 years and to date we have stop signs and stopping bars both because the residents requests and not planning or any other department in the City.

Secondly, on the North West corner of Rymal Road and Second Road West there is a sign that was just recently put up. The sign is for a new home developer and the strategic location of this sign sums up what our fears have been and what the current use of our street is really intended for. There is an arrow at the bottom of the sign pointing west stating that the new home offices are now open. Basically it wants to capture all the commuters that are travelling west on Rymal and turning north onto Second Road West for their convenience and because it is the only north/ south link. To make matters worse, once Upper Mount Albion is closed, Second Road West will be the only street with South/ north and vice versa access linking Rymal to Highland. Amazingly with all the dollars spent on planning by the City, this very issue when tabled was not acknowledged much less have a solution.

2
On the matter regarding the feelings of the Gatestone residents; although I understand what their perceived issues may be and to be quite frank, I don't care. The Road is acting exactly as it was intended to be, an artery to handle large volumes. It is an HSR route, width is in excess of 50', has boulevards and sidewalks on both sides and the homes are all set back a minimum of 35' from the sidewalks.

I can only speak for my family and will share my opinion on the recent suggestion by the Planning Department regarding speed cushions. Thanks but no thanks! Our road is not an experimental study on what might work or what may not. The demographic on the street is 90% young families with young children and experiments are not welcome. We need to protect our families and our investments.

Brad, we need your help on this matter, please let me know how we can get together and resolve these issues.

Mohan, throughout this so called process, you have very clearly maintained that nothing can be done until the Trinity corridor has been completed however, what it the City's plan for commuters travelling from the Rymal/Hwy 20 corners and travelling West? Trinity? A stretch of 3-5 kms at the very least! I realize that there will be an entrance off Rymal and Upper Mount Albion however; isn't this really what the current situation is? My point again, Second Road is the only Street that will provide North/South access and make no mistake; it will be what is used.

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]  
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 8:49 PM  
To: [redacted] <Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca>  
Cc: [redacted]  
Subject: Re: Support

I agree. I am not sure how this recommendation to keep it open could be followed by the city. It was the City of Stoney Creek that determined that Second Road West would be closed. That is why they was designed and built as a residential street. It is not possible to now re-design and re-build it as a collector road and maintain an acceptable level of safety for anyone.  

To clarify, I know that the recommendation is not to make it a collector road, however, the reasons that are use to support keeping it open are because of some of the functions of a collector road that Second Road West provides would be lost (i.e. delivery of emergency services, a link between Rymal and Highland for North-South traffic, to divert traffic from other streets, etc.) Lee Sent wirelessly from my BlackBerry device on the Bell network.  

Envoyé sans fil par mon terminal mobile BlackBerry sur le réseau de Bell.

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]  
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2012 23:49:31  
To: brad.clark@hamilton.ca  
Cc: [redacted] <Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca><Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca>  
Subject: Support

Brad, leaving Second Road West open to absorb all the volume is going to be a real problem. What are you doing to help us?