APPENDIX F
Comments and Responses
Comments indicated that four lanes for motorized traffic are not necessary on Longwood Road, and that there should only be two or three lanes for vehicles, in accordance with *Shifting Gears 2009*. The approved cycling map in *Shifting Gears 2009* proposed bike lanes on Longwood Road/Aberdeen Avenue between Main Street and Studholme Drive. In addition, there were two applicable cycling elements recommended in *Shifting Gears 2009* for implementation:

- **Element #158** was for a multi-use recreational trail on the south side of Aberdeen between Longwood and the TH&B rail bridge. At the bridge, cyclists would dismount to proceed under the bridge, although an option to provide a bike lane or sharrow under the bridge was to be explored. The estimated cost was $53,950. That element was to complement the existing bike lane on the north side of Aberdeen Avenue. Aberdeen Avenue was to continue to provide four lanes for vehicles.

- **Element #196** was for revisions to pavement markings on Longwood between Aberdeen and Main, for three lanes plus bike lanes on both sides within the existing curb lines. The estimated cost was $17,500. The note accompanying the element listing in the table in Chapter 5.1.1 was, “BL with road diet – see Report”. The “Report” referred to was the *West Hamilton Bicycle Network Review (2006)*, which was one of several complementary reports completed in 2006, including the *Kirkendall Neighbourhood – Traffic Management Plan – Project File Report (Sept 2006)*, and the *McMaster Innovation Park and West Hamilton Innovation District Coordination Study Traffic Impact Study (August 2006)*. The recommendations of the *West Hamilton Bicycle Network Review (2006)* were:
  - Longwood – Aberdeen to Hwy 403 bridge - interim three lanes plus bike lanes; ultimate four lanes plus bike lanes plus parking
  - Longwood - Hwy 403 bridge to Main - two lanes northbound and one lane southbound plus bike lanes

The three lane plus bike lane solution south of the Hwy 403 bridge was intended to apply to a short-term interim period, until such time as area development and traffic volumes on Longwood Road necessitated four lanes and reconstruction to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians, enhanced streetscaping, and urban design features. The three lane plus bike lane solution over the Hwy 403 bridge to Main Street was intended to be the ultimate solution only if a new ramp was added from Main street West at Columbia College on to Hwy 403 westbound toward Ancaster and Brantford; however, the City has since studied the ramp option, negotiated with MTO, and decided not to proceed with further studies or detailed design in the foreseeable future.

*Shifting Gears 2009* was approved by City Council in 2009, and subsequent modifications to the document were consistent with the 2009 Council-approved recommendations, so the recommendation for implementing element #196 for Longwood Road, i.e. “BL with road diet – see Report” remained, notwithstanding that it was intended as an interim solution. However, in 2010, during planning and implementation of the Frid Street Extension, the City determined that traffic volumes on Longwood Road had increased to the extent that the interim pavement marking plan for Longwood Road, i.e. three lanes plus bike lanes, could no longer be recommended.
The Longwood Road Class EA Study updated both traffic count information and development assumptions for the surrounding area. The traffic projections and micro-simulations prepared for the interim period (approximately 2016) and the ultimate period (approximately 2031) for the Longwood Road Class EA Study confirmed that four lanes were warranted on Longwood Road for those time periods.

A comment implied that as bike lanes are not recommended for Longwood Road, cyclists would not be provided with suitable cycling infrastructure.

The preferred concept for cycling infrastructure on Longwood Road and Aberdeen Avenue is designed to connect the existing bike lanes on Longwood Road north of Main Street to the cycle network connections on Studholme Drive. The preferred concept includes a number of complementary elements between Main Street and Studholme Drive:

- Separate crossrides for cyclists across the north and east legs of the intersection of Main Street and Longwood Road to access the cycle track (see description below). The cyclist crossrides would be in addition to traditional pedestrian crosswalks, and would allow cyclists to ride rather than walk when there is a green signal for the crosswalks/crossrides. The maximum delay for southbound cyclists in crossing the two crossrides would be the same as one signal cycle (90 to 100 seconds), the minimum delay would be zero, and the average delay would be half of a signal cycle (45 to 50 seconds). To illustrate, the maximum delay would occur when the cyclist reaches the cyclist crossride just as the signal turns green for southbound vehicles, requiring the cyclist to wait for the signal to turn red for vehicles and green for the first crossride, and then wait for the green signal at the second crossride. The minimum delay would occur when the cyclist reaches the cyclist crossride and has a green signal for the first crossride, and then an immediate green signal for the second crossride. Statistically, the average delay would be mid-way between the minimum and maximum delay.

- A 3.7m wide two-way cycle track on the east side of Longwood Road and north side of Aberdeen Avenue, separate from traffic and from pedestrian sidewalks. The cycle track would be accommodated on a proposed new 6m wide bridge over Hwy 403 for Active Transportation (AT), located northeast of the existing Longwood Road Bridge over Hwy 403. The only existing road crossings of the cycle track would be at the new Frid Street Extension and the driveway on the north side of the Atrium Building in the McMaster Innovation Park, but it is possible that another driveway access will be required across the cycle track in the longer term. The cycle track would mean that cyclists would not have to navigate the proposed roundabout at Aberdeen Avenue and Longwood Road.

- Improvements under the north abutment of the TH&B rail bridge, to accommodate both pedestrian and cyclist connections to the intersection at Studholme Drive.

- A separate crossride for cyclists across the west leg of the intersection of Aberdeen Avenue and Studholme Drive. The cyclist crossride would be instead of a traditional pedestrian crosswalk, and would allow cyclists to ride rather than walk when there is a green signal for the crossride. The cyclist crossride would provide the connections to the on-street cycle routes on Studholme Drive and to the proposed multi-use trail through Chedoke Golf Course to Glenside Avenue. Cyclists northbound on Studholme Drive would continue to use the existing bike box for left turns to access the cycle track, subject to the constraints under the north span of the TH&B rail bridge described above. The traffic signal at Aberdeen Avenue and Studholme Drive would be actuated by push-button or presence-detector, so delay to cyclists would be minimal, as is the case for northbound cyclists on Studholme Drive at Aberdeen Avenue now.

In summary, the preferred concept proposes robust and convenient cycling infrastructure between the existing/proposed cycle network elements at Main/Longwood and Aberdeen/Studholme.
Comment indicated that the proposed cycle track is not consistent with the cycling elements recommended in *Shifting Gears 2009*.

Chapter 4 of *Shifting Gears 2009* contains the following analysis:

“In addition to the four established elements described above (i.e. 1. Multi-use Recreational Trails (off-street, rural & urban), 2. Reserved Bike Lanes (on-street, urban), 3. Signed Bike Routes (on-street, urban), 4. Paved Shoulders (on-road, rural)), other facility designs that were considered are as follows:

**Bike Lanes Beside the Sidewalk (Behind the Curb)**

The City considers the design where a bike lane is positioned behind the curb (or beside the sidewalk) as the least preferred option. This design may cause conflicts at intersections and driveways due to poor visibility, is very difficult to manage at signalized or stop-controlled intersections and thus will be avoided unless conditions are ideal for its use (a situation with no intersecting roadways or driveways for an extended distance is preferred).”

Having regard to the above analysis contained in *Shifting Gears 2009*, the Longwood Road Class EA Study considered the relative merits of bike lanes vs. a cycle track, and concluded that a cycle track offered a superior net benefit within the study area, notwithstanding that it would not be “ideal”, i.e. no roads or driveways crossing the cycle track. Contributing factors include: avoiding having to negotiate or take a separate route around the proposed roundabout at Aberdeen Avenue and Longwood Road; utilizing space on a new AT bridge separate from the Longwood Road bridge over Hwy 403, rather than requiring the replacement of the existing Longwood Road bridge; and, the few intersecting roads/driveways (currently two, with potentially another in the longer term) over the 850m length of the proposed cycle track.

It was suggested that a roundabout would be worse than a conventional intersection, because of driver unfamiliarity with the concept, pedestrian and cyclist unfriendliness, and/or capacity to handle the traffic demands.

The intersection of Aberdeen Avenue and Longwood Road is within the controlled access highway designation of Hwy 403, and is subject to Ministry of Transportation (MTO) approvals for any changes in geometry and traffic control. In 2006 when the Kirkendall Neighbourhood studies were ongoing, the MTO did not support a roundabout. Today, the situation is reversed. After review of the traffic forecasts and micro-simulations, the MTO will only consider a roundabout at this location.

There are very good reasons why roundabouts have been gaining support in Ontario and elsewhere:

- Reduced delay and improved energy efficiency
- Reduced collision rates and severity of collisions
- Improved response to traffic demand
- No traffic signal capital and operating costs

There are some downsides to roundabouts, such as challenges for cyclists and pedestrians using them, but those effects can be mitigated, and in the case of Aberdeen/Longwood, almost eliminated through the concentration of cycling and pedestrian activity to the north and east of the roundabout, outside of the roundabout itself.

The micro-simulations prepared during the study indicate that the conventional and roundabout options perform in a similar fashion overall, but that the conventional intersection may be more susceptible to operational and safety issues with the weaving from Hwy 403 ramp, and to queuing back onto Hwy 403 in the peak hours.
Roundabouts are becoming more and more common in Hamilton. It is imperative that proper signing and pavement markings be implemented in the first instance, in addition to a targeted media campaign, but it is inevitable that roundabouts will become much more common in Hamilton because of the long term benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Intersection design in the Netherlands</th>
<th>A link to an on-line video was provided of cycle-friendly intersection design in the Netherlands, <a href="http://raisethehammer.org/blog/2425">http://raisethehammer.org/blog/2425</a>. The City's alternative transportation coordinator has been provided the link, and is also aware of numerous best practices worldwide. The proposed treatment of the Main/Longwood and Aberdeen/Studholme intersections incorporates similar elements to those described in the video, including separate marked crossings for cyclists, in addition to pedestrian crosswalks, but the suggestion to incorporate separate islands as described in the video can be considered at the detail design stage, so the Environmental Study Report will include the recommendation to consider such design elements to improve safety and operations for all users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The TH&amp;B rail bridge construction</td>
<td>The existing space under the rail bridge at Studholme is very limited, and the recommended alternative has regard to the need for a suitable connection between the cycle track and sidewalk on the north side of Aberdeen Avenue west of the bridge, and the intersection of Aberdeen/Studholme east of the bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Comments from HCA, Hydro One and City departments</td>
<td>Requirements for permits, sediment control, tree protection and replacement, and appropriate budgets for both capital and operating will be addressed in future phases, including the detail design phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>First Nations comments</td>
<td>The Curve Lake First Nation advised that should excavation unearth bones, remains or other such evidence of a native burial site or any Archaeological findings, it must be notified without delay, in accordance with the City’s obligations under the Cemeteries Act to notify the nearest First Nation Government or other community of Aboriginal people which is willing to act as a representative and whose members have a close cultural affinity to the interred person. The Alderville First Nation advice was similar. Notwithstanding that the entire area has been significantly disturbed in the past by industrial development and by road and highway construction, the Environmental Study Report will include recommendations to be carried forward to detail design and construction regarding the obligations and protocols should there be findings of heritage, cultural, and archaeological significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alternatives to a ramp at Columbia College</td>
<td>It was suggested that if Paradise Rd was made two way, and the King Street bridge was made two way, a traffic signal could be installed on the King Street bridge where the 403 ramps intersect it, allowing traffic to enter the 403 in either direction from the east and from the west, solving problems with access to homes and businesses on King between Dundurn and Paradise, and relieving pressure at Dundurn/King and Dundurn/Main. Extensive studies were undertaken as part of the investigations of Rapid Transit in Hamilton, including the options to convert Main and King to two-way traffic. The outcome of those studies was that Main and King should remain one-way. Such extensive system-wide investigations are not within the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Suggestion that planning for cars and trucks is paramount</td>
<td>While many of the issues are addressed in the response regarding four vs. fewer lanes on Longwood Road, there have been suggestions that the planning has favoured cars and trucks over pedestrians and cyclists. The existing Longwood Road is four traffic lanes within a 20m road allowance. Investigations by both City staff and consultants have determined that interim plans to reduce Longwood Road to three lanes are no longer viable for a number of very good reasons, as outlined in the previous response. The reality is that Longwood Road is an important arterial road with a direct connection to an interchange with Hwy 403. However, the recommended alternative proposes to maintain four lanes, plus turn lanes where appropriate, within an ultimate 36m road allowance, with most of the additional 16m of road allowance space being allocated to the pedestrian and cyclist domain. In other words, the proportion of road allowance dedicated to active transportation and streetscaping will increase from about 30 percent to more than 50 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern with the Longwood kink through Main</td>
<td>It was expressed that there is a sharp change in the alignment of Longwood Road northbound through Main Street that causes vehicles to deviate from the lane. The Environmental Study Report will recommend that the issue be addressed during detail design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Concern that the Study Area should extend to Aberdeen/Studholme</td>
<td>It was expressed that the Study Area should be extended to include Aberdeen/Studholme, and that the recommended alternative should recommend a suitable connection between the cycle track and sidewalk west of the TH&amp;B Rail Bridge and the intersection of Aberdeen/Studholme, through the area of the bridge. A holistic complete alternative linking the bike lanes and pedestrian domain on Longwood Road north of Main Street with the on-road shared lanes on Studholme Drive (that connect to the rail trail and to the future trail connection to Glenside Avenue) is desirable, and the Recommended Alternative has been modified to complete the necessary connection to Aberdeen/Studholme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Concern with use of bike boxes and unusual cyclist-related features, especially without adequate education and enforcement</td>
<td>Great care must be taken during detailed design to ensure that the intersection designs for Main/Longwood, Longwood/Frid, and Aberdeen/Studholme reflect best practice with respect to pedestrian, cyclist, and motorist interactions. This commitment is included in the Environmental Study Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Received

All comments received regarding the Public Notices and the Public Information Centre are organized as set out below.

A) Agencies, Municipal Departments, and Special Interest Groups

B) The Public (names and contact information removed for protection of privacy)
   
   B.i) Scanned comment sheets left at the PIC or mailed in after the PIC
   
   B.ii) Excerpts from comment sheets emailed in after the PIC
   
   B.iii) Excerpts from emails sent in after the PIC
A) Agencies, Municipal Departments, and Special Interest Groups

-----Original Message-----
From: EnviroOnt [mailto:EnviroOnt@tc.gc.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2012 3:54 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: CLASS EA LONGWOOD ROAD, CITY OF HAMILTON NEATS 34460

Thank you for the information regarding the above referenced project. We have reviewed the information, and note the following:
Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the *Navigable Waters Protection Act* (NWPA), which prohibits the construction or placement of any “works” in navigable waters without first obtaining approval. If any of the related project undertakings cross or affect a potentially navigable waterway, the proponent should prepare and submit an application in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the attached Application Guide and Form. Any questions about the NWPA application process should be directed to the Navigable Waters Protection Program at (519) 383-1863 or NWPontario-PENontario@tc.gc.ca.

Please review the *Minor Works and Waters (Navigable Waters Protection Act) Order*, established to outline the specific standards and criteria under which Transport Canada considers a work as a minor and does not require an application under the NWPA. It is the responsibility of the applicant, prior to submitting an application to the Navigable Waters Protection Program for review, to assess whether their work meets the criteria, as described, and, therefore, falls within one of the excluded classes. An application will only be required if it is determined that the work cannot meet the criteria established for that particular “class” of excluded work.

Transport Canada is also responsible for inspecting and auditing federally regulated railway companies that are subject to the *Railway Safety Act*. Transport Canada also regulates some provincial shortlines from the Province of Ontario that are part of an Agreement between the Federal Government and the Province of Ontario. The *Railway Safety Act*, with related regulations and rules, provides the legislative and regulatory framework for safe railway operations in Canada. The rail safety program develops, implements and promotes safety policy, regulations, standards and research, and in the case of railway grade crossings, subsidizes safety improvements. A list of all the Rail Safety legislations (the Act, Regulations, Rules, Guidelines, Policies and Standards) that applies to the federally regulated railways, can be found here:


The Act also addresses the construction and alteration of railway works, the operation and maintenance of railway equipment and certain non-railway operations that may affect the safety of federally regulated railways. If a proposed railway work is of a prescribed kind, pursuant to the *Notice of Railway Works Regulations*, the proponent shall not undertake the work unless it has first given notice of the work in accordance with the regulation. More information related to railway works is available at the following internet sites:

- *Standards Respecting Pipeline Crossings Under Railways*:
- *Guideline on Requesting Approval to Undertake Certain Railway Works*:
  http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/railsafety/guideline-283.htm

General inquiries about the Rail Safety Program can be directed to RailSafety@tc.gc.ca or by calling 613-998-2985.

Thank you,
Lorissa,

Robert Edwards and Dean Carron of CareGo attended the Public Information Centre for the Longwood Road EA and have some concerns with the proposed roundabout. CareGo operates out of Canadian Pacific Railway’s Aberdeen Yard under their SteelCare, Transcare Logistics and Careport Warehousing divisions. Existing traffic volumes are close to 150 trucks leaving the facility daily.

The concept of the roundabout will give through traffic the right of way and merging traffic from the CPR Aberdeen Yard will have to yield entering into the roundabout. During peak morning hours, a steady stream of traffic is anticipated exiting off of Highway 403 and heading north on Longwood as well as those vehicles that will head back onto Highway 403 as a by-pass to the congestion on the highway. As previously noted by CPR, the by-pass traffic is already significant with the signalized intersection and a roundabout would make it even easier for drivers to opt for this route. The slower moving loaded trucks would find it difficult to enter the roundabout as it is unlikely that there would be a sufficient break in traffic allowing a truck to merge into traffic.

In speaking with Councillor McHattie and Ted Gill, the CareGo representatives were advised that the city would be willing to facilitate a meeting with CareGo and with CPR’s other operator, Polymer Distribution Inc., as well as the MTO to discuss the design in further detail. We would appreciate if such a meeting could be arranged, again to review the truck traffic leaving the CPR Aberdeen Yard as well to provide CareGo an opportunity to provide their comments as to the impact on their operations with the additional lands required to accommodate the roundabout.

---

Orest Rojik SR/WA | Right-of-Way Representative Ontario | 800-1290 Central Parkway West, Mississauga, ON L5C 4R3 | 905-803-3425
Canadian Pacific Driving the Digital Railway
Hello Lorissa,

I have reviewed the circulation and note that our only concern would relate to the regulated areas associated with Chedoke Creek in the areas of Aberdeen Ave and Longwood Rd S and Longwood Rd S and Highway 403. While work in these areas will require a permit from the Hamilton Conservation Authority, the actual need for a permit can be confirmed once the detailed drawings for the project are completed. We would also note the requirement for erosion and sediment control measures. Please keep us advised as this project progresses.

Thank you,

T. Scott Peck, B.A., DPA, MCIP, RPP
Manager, Watershed Planning Services
Hamilton Conservation Authority
838 Mineral Springs Road, Box 81067
Ancaster (Hamilton), Ontario L9G 4X1
Tel - 905-525-2181, Ext. 133
Fax - 905-648-4622
tspeck@conservationhamilton.ca
Website - www.conservationhamilton.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Mike McNamara (Forestry & Horticulture) - "Must provide plans as they develop to F&H for review. Must develop plans to ensure protection of trees and the installation of new trees. Must include operating costs in Construction Capital Budget submissions."

Thank you.

Lynda Mackay
Researcher/Copywriter
City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2996
Fax: 905-546-3972
Email: Lynda.Mackay@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Don Boswell [mailto:Don.Boswell@aadnc-aandc.gc.ca]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 11:30 AM
To: Skrypniak, Lorissa
Cc: Ralph Vachon
Subject: Notice of Study Commencement and PIC – Longwood Road, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, City of Hamilton

I am writing in response to your letter of February 27, 2012 inquiring about claims in the above noted area.
In determining your duty to consult, you may wish to contact the First Nations in the vicinity of your area of interest to advise them of your intentions. To do this you may:
1. find the Reserves in your area of interest by consulting a map of the region such as the Province of Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs online map at http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ai/scr/on/rp/mcarte/mcarte-eng.asp ; then

To determine the First Nations in your area of interest who have submitted claims please consult the Reporting Centre on Specific Claims at http://pse4-esd4.ainc-inac.gc.ca/SCBRI/Main/ReportingCentre/External/ExternalReporting.aspx?lang=eng.

It should be noted that the reports available on the INAC website are updated regularly and therefore, you may want to check this site often for updates. In accordance with legislative requirements, confidential information has not been disclosed.

Please rest assured that it is the policy of the Government of Canada as expressed in The Specific Claims Policy and Process Guide that:

"in any settlement of specific native claims the government will take third party interests into account. As a general rule, the government will not accept any settlement which will lead to third parties being dispossessed."

We can only speak directly to claims filed under the Specific Claims Policy in the Province of Ontario. We cannot make any comments regarding potential or future...
claims, or claims filed under other departmental policies. This includes claims under Canada’s Comprehensive Claims Policy or legal action by a First Nation against the Crown. You may wish to contact the Assessment and Historical Research Directorate at (819) 994-6453, the Consultation and Accommodation Unit at (613) 944-9313 and Litigation Management and Resolution Branch at (819) 934-2185 directly for more information.
You may also wish to visit http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ai/mr/is/acp/acp-eng.asp on the INAC website for information regarding the Federal Action Plan on Aboriginal Consultation and Accommodation.
To the best of our knowledge, the information we have provided you is current and up-to-date. However, this information may not be exhaustive with regard to your needs and you may wish to consider seeking information from other government and private sources (including Aboriginal groups). In addition, please note that Canada does not act as a representative for any Aboriginal group for the purpose of any claim or the purpose of consultation.
I hope this information will be of assistance to you. I trust that this satisfactorily addresses your concerns.
Sincerely,
Don Boswell
Senior Claims Analyst
Ontario Research Team
Specific Claims Branch

-----Original Message-----
From: Jenny.Mui@HydroOne.com [mailto:Jenny.Mui@HydroOne.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 9:22 AM
To: Skrypniak, Lorissa
Cc: w.d.kloostra@HydroOne.com; ierullo@HydroOne.com; l.hart@HydroOne.com
Subject: Longwood Road Municipal Class EA

Dear Ms. Skrypniak,
In our initial review, we have confirmed that Hydro One Transmission facilities are located within immediate vicinity of the proposed site in your study area. Please allow appropriate lead-time in your project schedule in the event that proposed development impacts Hydro One infrastructure which requires relocation or modifications, or needs an outage, that may not be readily available.
In planning, please note that developments should not reduce line clearances and limit access to our facilities at any time in the study area of your Proposal. Any construction activities must maintain the electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors as specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective line voltage.
The integrity of the structure foundations must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. There must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the structures.
Note that existing rights of ways may have provisions for future lines or already contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, water mains, parking, etc). Please take this into consideration in your planning. Once details are known and it is established that your development will affect Hydro One facilities including the rights of way, please submit plans that detail your development and the affected Hydro One facilities to:
Please note that the proponent will be responsible for costs associated with modification or relocation of Hydro One facilities, as well as any added costs that may be incurred due to increase efforts to maintain our facilities.

Regards,

**Lok Man (Jenny) Mui**
*Transmission Lines Sustainment, System Investment Asset Management, Hydro One Networks Inc.*
483 Bay Street, 15th floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2P5
Phone: 416-345-5338
Jenny.Mui@HydroOne.com
Lorissa:

We have completed our review of the Longwood Road Environmental Assessment (EA) Study, as it pertains to the intersection of Longwood Road and Aberdeen Avenue, and we have the following comments:

Please be advised that the Ministry’s acceptance of or agreement with the Longwood Road EA is by no means an endorsement of any current or forthcoming Traffic Impact Studies pertaining to the McMaster Innovation Park or West Hamilton Innovation District. It is noted that the EA and the two redevelopment projects are very closely intertwined.

However, in future, MTO will request separate Traffic Impact Studies for all upcoming phases of the development of the McMaster Innovation Park lands. Any further Highway 403 corridor improvements resulting from these future developments will be the responsibility of the developer.

McCormick Rankin Corporation’s Traffic Review Memorandum dated October 11, 2011, has clearly demonstrated that the ultimate roundabout configuration provides the optimal operational conditions for the eastbound Aberdeen Avenue approach, which is under the Ministry’s control. The Level of Service for this approach is improved substantially by implementing a roundabout at this location. The ultimate configuration roundabout alternative reduces delay and queue lengths on the eastbound approach, in addition to providing a “gateway” feature that will complement the former industrial land revitalization project.

Furthermore, the City of Hamilton will benefit from the implementation of the roundabout alternative, as it will act as a traffic calming feature that will help slow eastbound traffic down before vehicles reach the built-up areas along Aberdeen Avenue after exiting from Hwy 403. Roundabouts are better for the environment by helping reduce vehicle emissions through less idling. They are also much less costly to maintain and uses no energy to operate. They are also much safer for motorists as they operate at a slower speed with little risk of fatal accidents due to vehicles running red lights and right-angle collisions, which is characteristic of signalized intersections. The Ministry would strongly support the implementation of the ultimate roundabout alternative, subject to a review of the roundabout geometrics and layout during detailed design.

The traffic signal alternative is not preferable from the Ministry’s standpoint. The ultimate traffic signal alternative will invariably have complex signal phasing, due to the
multiple double-left and double-right turn lanes and fully-protected movements. The Ministry’s position is that the traffic signal alternative is extremely risky. The long cycle length and complex phasing will make it very difficult to maintain an acceptable level of service and queue lengths on the eastbound Aberdeen Avenue approach in the event that long-term traffic projections and trip generation rates are understated in the EA. A signalized intersection at this location places limitation on the extent of land developments. There is a possibility that the signalised intersection may require further intersection improvements in the future to accommodate the land developments in order to maintain an acceptable level of service at the off-ramp.

The Ministry conducted a sensitivity analysis that found that even a slight increase in traffic volumes at this intersection will have significant impacts on the eastbound Aberdeen Avenue approach, which in turn could affect the operation of the Hwy 403 off-ramps. In addition, the Ministry does not feel that the southbound dual right-turn lanes will work from a geometric standpoint, since there are only two receiving lanes on westbound Aberdeen Avenue.

Therefore, MTO would prefer to see the adoption of a roundabout alternative as it results in the best level of service for our off-ramps, even if it means exploring options of realigning some of the existing ramps.

Accordingly, the Ministry does not wish to see the signalized intersection alternative carried forward by the City of Hamilton.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Greg Roszler
Project Manager
Corridor Management Section
Ministry of Transportation
1201 Wilson Avenue
Downsview, Ontario
M3M 1J8
Phone: (416) 235-5124
Fax: (416) 235-4267
March 9, 2012

Ms. L. Skrypniak
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
400-77 James Street North
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. Skrypniak:

Re: Notice of Study Commencement and PIC
Longwood Road Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Thank you for your Notice received March 6, 2012 wherein you have advised that the City will be undertaking a MEA class EA process for a portion of Longwood Road. The study has its origins in the Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan which identified a certain set of improvements for this road including lane, sidewalk and bicycle lane additions. You have indicated that due to the nature of these improvements, the City will be following the requirements for Schedule C projects.

Schedule "C" projects require preparation of an Environmental Study Report (ESR) once the preferred design has been determined and design work has progressed to the point where the details of any environmental protection measures to be incorporated in the construction package have been finalized. A suggested outline for an ESR is presented in the MEA Class EA document. Once the ESR is finalized a Notice of Completion is issued, allowing the public at least a 30 calendar day period for documentation review and comment. You are also reminded that when concerns are raised during the public comment period, the concerned party should be consulted in an attempt to resolve the concerns. Discussions may result in the 30-day review period being exceeded. The concerned party must be advised that if discussions are unsuccessful at resolving the concerns, they can submit a Part II Order request if they have not already done so to the Minister within a further seven calendar days following the end of discussions. You may wish to make use of the Ministry’s “Using Mediation in Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Process” to assist in conflict resolution. This Code of Practice can be accessed at http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/ir/@ene/@resources/documents/resource/std01_79522.pdf

Please note that as part of the required stakeholder and agency consultation, proponents are advised to contact the following agencies to determine potentially affected Aboriginal communities in the project area. You are encouraged to visit the ministry’s website at http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/eaab/aboriginal-resources.php for the most up to date contact list in this regard. Once identified, you are advised to provide notification directly to the Aboriginal communities who may be affected by the project and provide them with an opportunity to participate in any planned public consultation sessions and comment on the project. You may wish to make use of the Ministry’s “Consultation in Ontario’s Environmental Process” to assist with public consultation efforts. This Code of Practice can be accessed at http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/ir/@ene/@resources/documents/resource/std01_79520.pdf
Should you have any questions regarding the Class EA process, please contact me at (905) 521-7864 or at Barbara.slattery@ontario.ca.

Thank you,

Barbara Slattery
EA/Planning Coordinator
April 12, 2012

Lorissa Skryniak
400-77 James Street North
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

Dear Lorissa Skryniak,

RE: Notice of Study Commencement and PIC - Longwood Road

We would like to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence, which we received on 3/5/2012 regarding the above noted project.

As you may be aware, the area in which your project is proposed is situated within the Traditional Territory of Curve Lake First Nation. Our First Nation's Territory is incorporated within the Williams Treaty Territory and is the subject of a claim under Canada's Specific Claims Policy. We strongly suggest that you provide Karry Sandy-Mackenzie, Williams Treaty First Nation Claims Coordinator, 8 Creswick Court, Barrie, ON L4M 2S7, with a copy of your proposal as your obligation to consult to also extend to the other First Nations of the Williams Treaty.

Although we have not conducted exhaustive research nor have we the resources to do so, Curve Lake First Nation Council is not currently aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to our Traditional, Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

Please note that we have particular concern for the remains of our ancestors. Should excavation unearth bones, remains or other such evidence of a native burial site or any Archaeological findings, we must be notified without delay. In the case of a burial site, Council reminds you of your obligations under the Cemeteries Act to notify the nearest First Nation Government or other community of Aboriginal people which is willing to act as a representative and whose members have a close cultural affinity to the interred person. As I am sure you are aware, the regulations further state that the representative is needed before the remains and associated artifacts can be removed. Should such a find occur, we request that you contact our First Nation immediately. Curve Lake First Nation also has available, trained Archaeological Liaisons who are able to actively participate in the archaeological assessment process as a member of a field crew, the cost of which will be borne by the proponent.

If any new, undisclosed or unforeseen issues should arise, that has potential for anticipated negative environmental impacts or anticipated impacts on our Treaty and Aboriginal rights we require that we be notified regarding these as well.

Thank you for recognizing the importance of consultation and respecting your duty to consult obligations as determined by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Should you have further questions or if you wish to hire a liaison for a project, please feel free to contact Melissa Dokis or Krista Coppaway at 705-657-8045x222 or dutytoconsult@curvelakefn.ca.

Yours sincerely,

Chief Keith Knott
Curve Lake First Nation
March 6th, 2012

Att: Lorissa Skrypniak MCIP, RPP

Re: Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre
Longwood Road
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Dear Lorissa,

Thank you for your consultation request to Alderville First Nation regarding the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for Longwood Road, which is being proposed within our Traditional and Treaty Territory. We appreciate the fact that the City of Hamilton, recognizes the importance of First Nations Consultation and that your office is conforming to the requirements within the Duty to Consult Process.

As per the Alderville First Nation Consultation Protocol, your proposed project is deemed a level 3, having minimal potential to impact our First Nations' rights, therefore, please keep Alderville apprised of any archaeological findings, burial sites or any environmental impacts, should any occur.

Although we may not always have representation at all stakeholders meetings, it is our wish to be kept apprised throughout all phases of this project. I can be contacted at the mailing address above or electronically via email, at the email address below.

In good faith and respect,

Dave Simpson
Lands and Resources
Communications Officer
Alderville First Nation
dsimpson@aldervillefirstnation.ca

Tele: (905) 352-2662
Fax: (905) 352-3242
Lorissa Skrypniak
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works – City of Hamilton
400-77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON, L8R 2K3

Re: Notice of Study Commencement and PIC – Longwood Road Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Skrypniak:

Thank you for informing the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) of your project. Please note that MAA treats all letters, emails, general notices, etc. about a project as a request for information about which Aboriginal communities may have rights or interests in the project area.

As a member of the government review team, the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) identifies First Nation and Métis communities who may have the following interests in the area of your project:

• reserves;
• land claims or claims in litigation against Ontario;
• existing or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights, such as harvesting rights; or
• an interest in your project’s potential environmental impacts.

MAA is not the approval or regulatory authority for your project, and receives very limited information about projects in the early stages of their development. In circumstances where a Crown-approved project may negatively impact a claimed Aboriginal or treaty right, the Crown may have a duty to consult the Aboriginal community advancing the claim. The Crown often delegates procedural aspects of its duty to consult to proponents. Please note that the information in this letter should not be relied on as advice about whether the Crown owes a duty to consult in respect of your project, or what consultation may be appropriate. Should you have any questions about your consultation obligations, please contact the appropriate ministry.

You should be aware that many First Nations either have or assert rights to hunt and fish in their traditional territories. For First Nations, these territories typically include lands and waters outside of their reserves.
The information upon which the above comments are based is subject to change. First Nation or Métis communities can make claims at any time, and other developments can occur that could result in additional communities being affected by or interested in your undertaking.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Wendy Cornet  
Manager, Consultation Unit  
Aboriginal Relations and Ministry Partnerships Division
July 20, 2010

Ms. Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager Transportation Planning
Strategic Planning & Rapid Transit Environment & Sustainable Infrastructure Division
Public Works
77 James Street North Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. Skrypniak:

RE: Longwood Road Class Environmental Assessment Study

This letter is provided to record some comments, concerns and questions in regards to the current Longwood Road Class Environmental Assessment Study. On behalf of McMaster Innovation Park (MIP), I want to express our appreciation to the City for the efforts to consult and inform us on the study investigations and status. However, I would like to note the following items for your consideration in this study:

1) McMaster Innovation Park is currently working in partnership with McMaster University in the planning of a new Primary Care Centre building on the north east quadrant of Longwood Road and Aberdeen Avenue. We were aware of the proposed intersection improvements identified in the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Study and the possible requirement for some additional road right of way. However, the proposal for a major roundabout at the Longwood and Aberdeen intersection as discussed at the stakeholder meeting of June 17, 2010 will have a significant impact on the building plans and we are opposed to the proposal for this reason. This building project is moving forward in the near future and we will need the City’s assistance in resolving this issue.

2) There was some discussion at the June 17, 2010 meeting of shifting the Longwood and Aberdeen roundabout southerly and westerly to reduce the impact on the property on the north side of Aberdeen Avenue. In this regard, we would urge you to investigate these options within your study and we will cooperate fully in providing our feedback to proposed new plans.

3) McMaster Innovation Park is investigating the possibility of renovating the existing building on the west side of Longwood Road and we anticipate that there will a significant capital cost saving for our future developments by doing this. However, we understand that the ultimate right of way identified for Longwood Road is a 36 metre wide right of way and this would likely encroach on the existing building footprint. We believe that the primary needs
including bike lanes for the Longwood Road corridor in this area can be accommodated in a reduced right of way width. We believe that a roadway plan can be designed to accommodate these primary needs while avoiding the requirement to remove the existing building. We would request that you include these investigations within your study and we will be available as required to respond to proposals that would enable the building to be maintained and renovated. We will forward a possible solution to this concern shortly.

4) In reviewing the Kirkendall Study, we note that the traffic forecasts used to assess future transportation needs are based on full build-out of the MIP lands as well as the West Hamilton Innovation District (WHID) lands and other vacant lands in the area. We have some concerns that this is a very long term scenario that may not occur for decades, if ever. The effect of basing the study on this aggressive forecast is that the extent of the new infrastructure that is required will be greatly overstated. We understand the need for long term planning but we would also suggest that your study give consideration to an appropriate staging of improvements that would accommodate an interim level of development that would reasonably be expected in perhaps 10 to 15 years.

5) The work to date indicates that some major roadway improvements may be recommended on Longwood Road and at the intersection of Longwood and Aberdeen. The Kirkendall Study provided some estimates of these improvement costs which indicate that a major capital investment will be required. We are not aware at this stage of how the City would fund these improvements. This is a matter of some concern to McMaster Innovation Park as we are currently the only active developer in this area. We would request that you advise us on the current City plan in regards to how the proposed improvements will be funded.

We look forward to your response on these items. If you have any questions or require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Yours truly,

Zach Douglas,
President & CEO
McMaster Innovation Park

Copy to: Mr. Tim McCabe, General Manager, Planning & Development Dept. Councillor Brian McHattie, Ward One Councillor
3 April 2012

To: Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager

Subject: Longwood Road Class EA

Transportation for Liveable Communities (TLC) is a citizen advocacy group established in 2000 to address sustainable transportation in Hamilton Ontario.

TLC is very concerned with the Longwood Road “Preferred Alternative” presented at the Public Information Centre Wednesday, March 21, 2012.

Beginning with the “Problem and Opportunity Statement” referencing the Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan’s statement that “Community concerns indicated a need for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access and improved safety along the existing corridor,” the trajectory seems clear enough.

Yet we are next informed that because the city will not pursue an onramp to Highway 403 westbound from Main at Columbia College, “the implication...is that four general purpose lanes will be required between Aberdeen Avenue and Main Street.”

So, it is clear that any changes that would address the prime problem and opportunity statement to “enhance pedestrian and bicycle access” begins with the core assumption that Longwood road will act as an extended on/off ramp to Highway 403 westbound (and eastbound), requiring 4 lanes for cars.

This is a surprising turn of events, especially considering the main objective began as an effort to make the street safer and friendlier for cyclists and pedestrians.

Cyclists are especially aggrieved after seeing the Shifting Gears Cycling Plan for this stretch of road crumble: project number 196 in that plan for Longwood has: “Bike Lane with Road Diet, Longwood, Main to Aberdeen.”

Continuous connection is an important consideration when building a comprehensive bike network. As it is, the preferred option of the city planners seems to suggest cyclists using the new southbound bike lane
between King and Main will have to dismount at Main, cross in a crosswalk to the east side of Longwood to continue through another crosswalk to the south side of Main where there will be a bike path on the east side of Longwood.

At the same time, cars will continue to have two lanes in each direction, ensuring the status quo of a hostile environment for cyclists and pedestrians. This is entirely unacceptable to TLC.

TLC instead strongly supports bicycle lanes on each side of Longwood, which would create a continuous connected cycling route from Aberdeen to King Street (and eventually all the way to Princess Point) – it is our position that the road diet planned in the Shifting Gears Cycling plan should be implemented to help calm traffic and create the space required for cycling lanes.

With three lanes of traffic, rather than four, the city could consider using the centre lane as a morning southbound, evening northbound lane (Jarvis Street in Toronto has used this method to adopt to demands of flow at peak times), which would maintain two-lanes when required, however TLC adamantly insists that the priority should return to improving pedestrian, cycling and transit opportunities.

A pedestrian sidewalk on the east side of Longwood will have to suffice until the City decides to improve the pedestrian crossing on the west side of Longwood at Main.

The “preferred option” of a bike path only on the east side of Longwood will, at Aberdeen, isolate cyclists on the north side of Aberdeen, which means another disconnected crossing to get to the bike path south of Aberdeen by the Chedoke golf course. Therefore, TLC supports the recommended roundabout at Longwood and Aberdeen, but with cyclists and pedestrians given proper consideration for safe access.

We hope you will take our concerns seriously, since we see the emphasis of the “preferred alternative” wrongly placed on maintaining automobile traffic flow at the expense of an integrated cycling and pedestrian environment.

Thanks for your consideration,

Randy Kay
Transportation for Liveable Communities – Hamilton

cc – Councilor McHattie
-----Original Message-----
From: Ryan McGreal, Raise the Hammer [mailto:editor@raisethehammer.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 8:37 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Cc: Skrypniak, Lorissa
Subject: Submission to Longwood Road Class EA

To: Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP
Re: Longwood Road Class EA

Dear Ms. Skrypniak,

It is deeply disappointing to see the City once again give top priority to automobile traffic flow-through in its road planning – and particularly on a street intended to host a dense, mixed-use innovation park designed specifically around walkability and accessibility.

The City's own Class EA page notes, "The design and function of [Longwood] road is integral to the implementation of [the West Hamilton Innovation District] Secondary Plan" - yet the preferred plan is antithetical to the goal of multi-modal access:

* No curbside parking on Longwood
* Four general-purpose vehicular traffic lanes plus turn lanes
* No continuous bike lanes

At some point, we are going to have to stop talking about "aggressively targeting transportation mode use and ... emphasizing that persons walk more" and actually put walkability into practice on our streets, even if that means compromising maximum automobile flow-through*.

If we can't design Longwood Road to be a "complete street", as this year's Transportation Summit extols, how can we expect to do it on any of the other Hamilton streets that overwhelmingly cater to the automobile and actively deter pedestrians and cyclists?

Why is automobile traffic inviolate, while pedestrian and cycling traffic is merely an added bonus if there's enough room left over after maximizing the number of automobile lanes?

This is not an engineering problem; after all, a road can be engineered for any combination of objectives and "traffic" means more than just automobiles. Rather, it is a problem of *priorities*.

Respectfully,
Ryan McGreal
B) The Public (names and contact information removed for protection of privacy)

B.i) Scanned comment sheets left at the PIC or mailed in after the PIC
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

A 2.6 - Roundabout with East-North Weighing

C 3 - Separate pedestrian/cyclist bridge

I can both a motorist and cyclist.
The roundabout makes complete sense for roundabouts.
Less stopping and starting.
Less blind intersections.
Less full my (too dead end)
Less noise for acceleration.
Less fear for breaking engines.
Better traffic flow.

I also reiterate the separate bike/pedestrian bridge. I am a firm what feels like riding across the Longwood bridge.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED.

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL EMAIL

Name:

Mailing/Email Address:

Telephone:

Property Location (if different from mailing address):
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

- The preferred alternative is the right choice, but the pedestrian crossing at rantoul will be unsafe and also inefficient. It would be wiser to keep pedestrians off of the south side of Aberdeen to restrict development there. The north side of Aberdeen ought to be developed first anyway, without lights stopping traffic, hitting the 403 will be annoying to fast and pedestrians will not be safe there.
- Having 2-way bicycle lanes on the east side of Aberdeen is excellent, having them separated from traffic by a curb may not be necessary, and I think that there should be a higher barrier to make cycling more appealing.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED.

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☒

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing/Email Address: [Redacted]
Telephone: [Redacted]
Property Location: (if different from mailing address): [Redacted]
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

Thank you for the thorough review of the options.

The traffic circle should work for cars + pedestrians.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT:  MAIL  EMAIL

Name:                           Mailing/Email Address:   
Telephone:                     
Property Location: (if different from mailing address):  
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

Regarding the "Preferred Alternative":

As a cyclist I am concerned that the northbound access across Main St. W. to the bike lane adjacent to Wattle Highschool is at the sharp an angle that is, it is very common for cars to bend and cut the path for cyclists through the intersection.

I believe that the northeast corner of the main-lane intersection needs to be modified to allocate the lane cutting to improve safety for cyclists.

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL ☑ EMAIL ☑

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing/Email Address: [Redacted]
Telephone: [Redacted]
Property Location: (if different from mailing address): [Redacted]
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

There is overwhelming evidence that the non-regulated road about is the safest & best alternative. Real experience rather than opinion should guide decisions. Political influence seems to get in the way of professional expertise & opinion. Most decisions should be based on evidence not popularity.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED.

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☐
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

I am very much in favour of your proposal for a roundabout. They are an efficient, safer alternative to traffic lights and the public will, in time, become accustomed to using this method. Roundabouts are abundant in the U.K. and certainly keep traffic moving.

YES to roundabout.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED.

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL EMAIL
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

Roundabout, Roundabout, Roundabout!

The best solution.

The only problem is teaching people how to drive on one.

The concerns from the rail transfer station and the transport trucks is warranted but lets find them a new home. There is no need for this kind of operation in the middle of an Inland Port.

Please check here if a response to your comments is not required. ☐

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

Preferred method of contact: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☒
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

I wholly support the Roundabout concept for the Aberdeen/Hamilton Main roadway problem and transfer of the railway yard and site to join the present Rail Yard/CNR yard at Aberdeen. Regardless of the cost of purchase of the railway yard the proceeds for that purchase properly provide suitable greenbelt space for both the City of Hamilton.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☐
A PROPOSAL

SUBJECT: Possible Re-location Site for the CPR Aberdeen Rail Yard by the City of Hamilton for expansion of the McMaster Innovation Park or Health Sciences Projects.

BACKGROUND: Purchased from the now-defunct TH&B railway, the Aberdeen yard has been operated by the CPR for at least the last ten years as a holding/make-up yard for trains traveling to and from Goderich, Niagara Falls, and Toronto. Their cargoes have consisted mainly of steel coils and mixed freight. Because of the increased shipment of steel coils from the Aberdeen yard a great opportunity for truck deliveries saw the development of a secondary industry take place with the creation of a loading/unloading facility on the railroad’s property. The interaction of truck and rail traffic has been a healthy boon for the city. Indeed, the easy access of the 403 Highway to the rail site was also instrumental in promoting this operation.

PROBLEMS: 1. The railroad bridge over Aberdeen Avenue funnels all traffic with no possible expansion options for relief.

2. The intersection of Aberdeen/Longwood currently must accept truck traffic along with increased car traffic to and from the McMaster complex. Inclusion of bicycle traffic will compound future congestion.

3. The soon-to-be-opened Frid Street extension at the Innovation Park site will require a stoplight intersection at what will probably be a 90 degree intersection. For trucks utilizing this intersection wide turns will be necessary. This will take place right before the Longwood Road bridge and the entrance to the parking facility for Innovation Park employees, already controlled by a pedestrian walk light. No doubt that walk light could then be eliminated and co-ordinated with the Frid/Longwood intersection light.

4. Aberdeen Avenue and Longwood Road are student walking and bicycle accesses to Westdale High School, Colombia College, and McMaster University.

5. Aberdeen Avenue and Longwood Road are local bus routes.

6. McMaster Innovation Park has now completed its opening phase. Its future will obviously include more facilities utilizing an increased work force who will naturally add to the traffic and housing problems of Hamilton’s West end.

All of the above serve to highlight the present and forthcoming magnification of problems generated by increased human and vehicle traffic on these arteries.
PROPOSAL: Suggest to CPR the possibility of moving its facility from its present location to join that of the CNR/RAIL LINK setup on Stuart Street. Since CPR already leases rail rights with CNR for its trains running to Toronto, talks should be simple to initiate. The resulting vacated acreage could be used jointly by the City of Hamilton and McMaster University.

ADVANTAGES to such a move would be manifold:
1. Train traffic would cease from the Aberdeen Yard along with considerable truck traffic. Also eliminated would be rail crossings at Gage, Cannon, Barton and Beach Road with deliveries made by RAIL LINK. (See #3)

2. CPR would be relieved of making up trains and would only have to deposit or pick up trains in the same fashion that CNR does presently.

3. CPR’s Kinnear Yard operation could be entrusted to RAIL LINK, used by GO Transit for layover trains, or abandoned.

4. The present rail route through the east end of the city through the tunnel and out to the High Level Bridge could be used exclusively by GO Transit. CPR could use it in emergency situations.

5. Rail maintenance costs would be substantially reduced for CPR as well as municipal taxes on the existing properties.

6. CPR would have direct access to the Goderich, Toronto, Niagara Falls routes. The Goderich route would require implementation of a cross-over from the CNR “Cowpath” trackage to the CPR route through Waterdown at the Hamilton Junction location east of the High Level Bridge.

7. The land along Stuart Street could easily house the present loading/unloading facilities for incoming and outgoing trucks. Stuart Street from lower Queen Street east to Bay would be cut off for city traffic allowing for a special “truck exclusive” route to be considered beside the rails. Indeed, an exit to the 403 highway to avoid their using city streets would also be worthy of discussion.

8. The Chatham Street Bridge would be redundant and could be removed thereby creating better accesses to the extended Frid Street and also to Dundurn Street. The east and west “Y” rails would be removed.

9. Hamilton would not lose two symbiotic industries with the relocation.
10. The soon-to-be-created Frid Street extension should consider revision of its Main Street access with the replacement of the present S-Curve arrangement with a proper right-turn. The resulting conflict with the 403 exit on to Main Street will be a problem to be addressed.

11. A connecting road could be constructed finishing all of the streets presently bounded by railroad property (ie Rousseau, Stanley (part), Herkimer, Charlton) thereby improving their accessibility and real estate values.

12. The Aberdeen Street Railway Bridge, like the Chatham Street Bridge, could be removed thereby allowing widening of Aberdeen Avenue. Indeed, an exit from Aberdeen could be considered in conjunction with #10 as another route to Main Street via the extended Frid Street. An exit at the 403 Highway end could also be considered.

13. Consideration could be made for the extension of Hunter Street as an elevated roadway from Queen Street reopening accesses for traffic at Ray, Pearl and Paulette Streets as well as linking with the roads proposed in #’s 11 and 12.

14. The reclaimed land from the departure of CPR’s Aberdeen and Kinnear operations would open vast vistas for the city planners, not the least of which would be greater traffic alleviation in the Aberdeen/Longwood area. Moreover, the relief of the western end of the Aberdeen rail yard over the 403 Highway would allow for the potential development of communication routes through West Hamilton to the main McMaster University campus that could range from simple bicycle/walk paths to a sophisticated mono-rail or University LRT system further alleviating normal city traffic. The possibilities therein are limitless.

15. The use of the acquired rail yard land by McMaster University and/or The City of Hamilton would see a future of growth through its very purpose. Indeed, if used by the Innovation Park, its concomitant needs (i.e. housing, hotels, restaurants, entertainment, transportation, et al) would be rendered by the city’s work force. In effect, the McMaster Innovation Park would eventually become a self-liquidating asset to the city.
CONCLUSION: By relocating the CPR’s Aberdeen rail yard and utilizing the yard for further expansion of the Innovation Park, the city, in company with McMaster University, would have the potential to move into a new era whereby Hamilton, now in the process of being deprived officially by US Steel and our Federal and Provincial Governments of its Steel Town heritage and image, could become Hamilton: A University City Where The Future IS Today.

Respectfully submitted by
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

I am a cyclist who commutes year-round from Beckley Avenue to Miskincrest University (where there is no continuous safe route to take). The new bridge over the 403 near Sandtown is a great improvement, but one still must interact with busy traffic along Aberdeen in order to make the commute.

The current preferred alternative represents another great leap forward in terms of safety, getting between east and west Hamilton. In particular, the plan for separated bike/ped cycle and vehicular traffic is wonderful. Pedestrians are seen as a key part to be constructed near the 403 for cyclists, is wonderful. Not only is it the safest, most pleasant alternative for those entering in active transportation, but the bridge would serve as an advertisement for health to all westbound 403 traffic. The advertisement would proclaim "Healthy Support Active Transport!"

Two suggestions: 1) The northeast corner of Main St./Sandtown is a bit steep for "2.5". Consider a more gradual "1.5". It would be nice enough to ride that curve a little, or to extend the painted lines into the intersection. 2) As a cyclist, I understand that there are plans to extend cycling infrastructure east of the train bridge at Sandtown. I agree this is a high priority in order to get less brave cyclists on the roads. Aberdeen is Scary! Build it before they will come.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL [ ] EMAIL [X]

Name:
Mailing Address:
Telephone:
Property Location: (if different from mailing address):
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

A2b - roundabout preferred
C3 - separate pedestrian/cyclist bridge

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

- My biggest concern is this area is a Roundabout (RA) where there are going to be lots of trucks. RA in Ancaster means about not driving beside a truck on the RA: I avoid driving beside a truck going on 403 under Hwy Main + Ring 0 as it follow risk.
- worst RA I've seen is in Kitchener at Union + Margaret. It's at a T-intersection (one lane RA)
- cars travelling to the right in Margaret monopolize the RA. And drivers are lined up on Union trying to get in. A lot of tailgates. Margaret St drivers are not hindered by others because few cars go leftbound or turn onto Union.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED. ☐

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanningk@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☐

Name:

Mailing/Email Address:

Telephone:

Property Location: (if different from mailing address):
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

I wasn't able to attend the public information session the other night but have reviewed the presentations.

My one concern is the crossings for pedestrians and bikes (even limited) on the West side of Longwood and the south side of Aberdeen close to the roundabout. I realize these are narrow and limited and that the majority of use is intended for the opposite side, however today, one of the more dangerous aspects for cyclists is when they are trying to turn left onto Aberdeen and cross in front of southwest (403) bound traffic. Why not restrict cyclists and pedestrians to the west side of Longwood at the crossing near the north portion of the Careport Centre and the south side of Aberdeen closer to the railway bridge. I think this would give more protection for pedestrians and cyclists from traffic going onto and coming from the 403.

A roundabout seems an odd choice however if the MTO believes it will work and not cause issues on the 403 then I'll bow to the experts.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED. ☑

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT:   MAIL ☐       EMAIL ☒
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight:

1. The presentation as per PIC boards falls short of a complete description of the project for the following reasons:
   a) The study area should have included the section of Aberdeen Ave from Hwy 403 to Studholme Road since your alternatives include this section;
   b) No traffic information is supplied, just a statement for the need for multiple turning lanes at the Longwood/Aberdeen intersection or a roundabout;
   c) No details are given about the alternatives that were screened out because right-of-way constraints or how these constraints could be mitigated;
   d) It is not clear why a new on-ramp to Hwy 403 (Brantford) off Main Street West is not pursued, particularly after having some evidence during the recent Hwy 403 bridge reconstruction that it is feasible – this ramp would significantly reduce east > south traffic at the Main St. West/Longwood Road intersection.

2. The preferred alternative provides good accommodation for pedestrians but not for cyclists for the following reasons:
   a) Longwood Road is a cycling route used by commuter cyclists (e.g. University staff and students) who need safe on-road facilities. The alternative does not include on-road bicycle lanes but instead a two-way multi-use path with its potential conflict points on the east side of Longwood Road and Aberdeen Avenue. Your exhibit shows a note at the east end of this path: “transition to limited space for pedestrians and cyclists under railway bridge”; how do eastbound cyclists safely ride from here?
   b) As to multi-use paths, studies show a much higher risk of being involved in a collision with a motor vehicle than riding on the roadway. Therefore these paths are not recommended by MTO and TAC except in special cases such as where uninterrupted and/or independent rights-of way are available. This project is not such special case;
   c) There are major safety concerns for cyclists coming from the southbound bike lane on Longwood Road north of Main Street and heading east then south through a very busy intersection to the multi-use path on the east side of Longwood Road south of Main Street. Introducing a “bicycle box” (the first in Hamilton) at this location may lead to confusion rather than serving this type of crossing movement;
   d) Some of the beautiful photos on the streetscape plan (taken elsewhere) are somewhat misleading since they would not apply to this project.

3. A roundabout seems to govern the selection of this preferred alternative. A signalized intersection is preferred for the following reasons:
   a) The roundabout has to be large to accommodate the heavy trucks and trailers going to/from the railway yard. A new signalized intersection would require less property and would be less expensive than a roundabout;
   b) While a properly designed single lane roundabout should not pose an obstacle for a confident cyclist, a signalized intersection with bike lanes would avoid having cyclists to mix with eastbound motor vehicles coming from the Hwy 403 off-ramp.

4. This project needs a peer review since it does not “enhance bicycle access” (Kirkendale Traffic Management Study problem statement). The Ultimate Road network Improvements on your Board # 7 (MRC Exhibit 17) should be the starting point of such assessment.
Please provide your comments on the information available for review tonight.

Thank you for providing the information session on the future of Longwood Road. I was happy to see that the city is taking the needs of not only vehicle traffic, but also cyclists and pedestrians. I have three main concerns with what I saw in the Preferred Alternative presented at the session. The first is that I am not convinced that roundabouts would adequately control the flow and speed of traffic, particularly the traffic that travels east along Aberdeen Ave toward Locke and Queen Streets. I would prefer whatever traffic management solution that would result in the speed of the traffic going down along Aberdeen. I walk along Aberdeen and often I am concerned that cars travelling to and from the 403 (or anywhere along Aberdeen) are moving too quickly. As a pedestrian, and a cyclist, I feel that when you walk along Aberdeen, you have very little room for error. You have to be unusually aware of the cars coming towards you and where you are walking along the sidewalk. Second, I don’t think any work done on Longwood can be done without looking at the Aberdeen/Studholme intersection. Especially for cyclists, the Aberdeen/Studhome intersection is too narrow and the elevations too odd to be left alone in the overall effort to update or improve the Longwood Road corridor. Finally, I do not like to the separated bike lane solution proposed by the consulting engineers. Since there are very few areas in the city where there are separated bike lanes, this one separated lane communicates to both cyclists and drivers that cycling (and to some extent, walking) is an activity that should, whenever possible, be taken off the road and located in a distinct parallel set of lanes. Unless there is a clear statement from the city that this is the direction it is going to go with cyclists in the future, I would prefer a solution that puts drivers and cyclists on the same roads with appropriate lane markings so that drivers and cyclists can be reminded that they share the roads – all the roads and not just some of them in some of the areas around the city. I like the idea of the separated cycling and pedestrian bridge over the 403, but I would like another built in the SB direction so that cyclists in particular could ride with the traffic for the full length of Longwood Road. I am aware that building bridges is probably the most expensive option under consideration. I hope I have been clear. I can try to explain my reactions to the city’s plan a different way if you are interested.

PLEASE CHECK HERE IF A RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED. ☐

Comments and information received will be considered in the analysis and will be kept on file for use during the study. Information is being gathered to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information, such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions, will be kept confidential. Only comments will become part of the public record files for this project.

Please drop these comments in the Comment Sheet box provided, or return them by April 5, 2012 to:

Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP RPP
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning
Public Works
77 James Street North ~ Suite 400
Hamilton, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 2732
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONTACT:  MAIL ☐  EMAIL ☐

Name:

Mailing/Email Address:

Property Location: (if different from mailing address):
B) The Public (names and contact information removed for protection of privacy)

B.ii) Excerpts from comment sheets emailed in after the PIC

(Excerpt of Comment Sheet received by email March 23, 2012)

I am disturbed that the focus of the study has been to ease and accelerate the movement of motor vehicles on Longwood. The original street sections shown as part of the Secondary Plan gave significant weight to creating a walkable, safe and pleasant street that could accommodate pedestrians, bikes and motor vehicles. At that time there was an acknowledgement that Longwood is an inhospitable, car first environment and that it would be changed to link the South West with Westdale.

As an adult who drives, walks and bikes regularly on Longwood, I don’t see any relation to the Secondary Plan goal by creating a suburban arterial road designed to accelerate vehicles on to the 403. There is no indication that the preferred option of a roundabout improves safety or function for cyclists or pedestrians. This model of interchange may work in the outer suburbs but there is no indication how I can get through, life intact, on a bike or on foot.

The assumption of the study is that motor vehicle traffic is the highest and best use of a street. Successful, livable cities use streets for multiple modes of movement and multiple purposes. The proposals presented will not improve the experience or safety of pedestrians or cyclists on this street. Without a returning to the vision of the Secondary Plan, we seem condemned to imposing suburban planning on some of the most walkable parts of Hamilton.

(Excerpt of Comment Sheet received by email March 23, 2012)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. I have two questions:

A) Assuming increased traffic with the expansion of McMaster Innovation Park; increasing trucking traffic off Highway 403; and greater density of pedestrian and cyclist traffic sharing the same road, how will the proposed round-about increase the safety of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians?

B) Can the City provide residents with data from existing round-abouts from Ancaster, Cambridge, Kitchener etc, indicating a reduction in traffic accidents, and/or an increase in pedestrian/cyclist safety?

(Excerpt of Comment Sheet received by email March 23, 2012)

I believe a roundabout at the Longwood Rd / Aberdeen Ave cross-section is a bad idea. The traffic around there is usually fast – due to exiting the highway,
preparing to enter the highway, and general speed due to not being a residential / pedestrian area. 
Also, people in Canada don’t know how to use roundabouts properly. 
I see many accidents happening at this very busy location if there was a roundabout there.

(Excerpt of Comment Sheet received by email March 27, 2012)

Thank you for providing the information session on the future of Longwood Road. I was happy to see that the city is taking the needs of not only vehicle traffic, but also cyclists and pedestrians. I have three main concerns with what I saw in the Preferred Alternative presented at the session. The first is that I am not convinced that roundabouts would adequately control the flow and speed of traffic, particularly the traffic that travels east along Aberdeen Ave toward Locke and Queen Streets. I would prefer whatever traffic management solution that would result in the speed of the traffic going down along Aberdeen. I walk along Aberdeen and often I am concerned that cars travelling to and from the 403 (or anywhere along Aberdeen) are moving too quickly. As a pedestrian, and a cyclist, I feel that when you walk along Aberdeen, you have very little room for error. You have to be unusually aware of the cars coming towards you and where you are walking along the sidewalk. Second, I don’t think any work done on Longwood can be done without looking at the Aberdeen/Studholme intersection. Especially for cyclists, the Aberdeen/Studhome intersection is too narrow and the elevations too odd to be left alone in the overall effort to update or improve the Longwood Road corridor. Finally, I do not like to the separated bike lane solution proposed by the consulting engineers. Since there are very few areas in the city where there are separated bike lanes, this one separated lane communicates to both cyclists and drivers that cycling (and to some extent, walking) is an activity that should, whenever possible, be taken off the road and located in a distinct parallel set of lanes. Unless there is a clear statement from the city that this is the direction it is going to go with cyclists in the future, I would prefer a solution that puts drivers and cyclists on the same roads with appropriate lane markings so that drivers and cyclists can be reminded that they share the roads – all the roads and not just some of them in some of the areas around the city. I like the idea of the separated cycling and pedestrian bridge over the 403, but I would like another built in the SB direction so that cyclists in particular could ride with the traffic for the full length of Longwood Road. I am aware that building bridges is probably the most expensive option under consideration. I hope I have been clear. I can try to explain my reactions to the city’s plan a different way if you are interested.
I wasn’t able to attend the public information session the other night but have reviewed the presentations. My one concern is the crossings for pedestrians and bikes (even limited) on the West side of Longwood and the south side of Aberdeen close to the roundabout. I realize these are narrow and limited and that the majority of use is intended for the opposite side, however today, one of the more dangerous aspects for cyclists is when they are trying to turn left onto Aberdeen and cross in front of southwest (403) bound traffic. Why not restrict cyclists and pedestrians to the west side of Longwood at the crossing near the north portion of the Careport Centre and the south side of Aberdeen closer to the railway bridge. I think this would give more protection for pedestrians and cyclists from traffic going onto and coming from the 403.

A roundabout seems an odd choice however if the MTO believes it will work and not cause issues on the 403 then I’ll bow to the experts.
B) The Public (names and contact information removed for protection of privacy)

B.iii) Excerpts from emails sent in after the PIC

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2012 10:15 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood Rd/Aberdeen roundabout

I just got the email with the information of the past Longwood Rd EA meeting. There is a proposal to put a roundabout in at Longwood and Aberdeen vs traditional traffic lights. I would like to say that I think that is a bad idea. This is a high traffic area with people just coming off the highway or just getting on. Most people don’t actually know how to use a roundabout properly, it is more popular in Europe. A could see there being a lot more accidents and angry motorists as not knowing how the right of way works would be an issue. I think traditional lights as currently exist with the advanced green is the best idea. Please do not change this. Your studies are not always correct, it was determined that it would provide safer operating conditions – I disagree, as most people aren’t sure how and when to enter and who has the right of way, I think it would be more confusion and instead of traffic flowing better, it would slow things up. Less maintenance, sure no lights, not a good excuse. I drive through that area frequently, and know it first hand. Again, this is too high of a traffic area to have a roundabout, traffic lights are still the best choice. Thank-you for your attention,

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 1:51 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood and Aberdeen

Lorissa,
I travel along Aberdeen to Longwood on a daily basis if not more so and I definitely travel that way to head to Brantford or to Toronto exits.
One of the biggest issues I have (and I would like to thank your group if you are responsible for placing stops lights before the bridge at Studholme) is the north exit along Aberdeen at Longwood. There needs to be a third lane, where possible, to allow for smoother traffic to egress along Longwood toward Main Street. I believe this can be accomplished if the City can cut into some land at that corner on the north/east side where it belongs to Innovation Park. My hope is that the plans do not include that they are going to build right to the side walk. I think that with a yield sign, it allows for better flow and you will not have people jumping the sidewalk trying to move around stopped traffic.
Hi Dale and Brian,

Thank you very much for the update, Dale. Unfortunately, I won't be able to attend. Some thoughts, which I am sure you have both considered, but for the sake of having an official record of one person's thoughts:

- Ensure wider than-usual sidewalks on the east side of Longwood. Lots of kids going to/from Westdale CI use that sidewalk, and when there's uncleared snow (or mud!) on the ground next to the sidewalk, people often need to walk on the street (especially if going against pedestrian traffic flow!)
- Allow for a sidewalk over the 403, on the west side (currently over the east only).
- A fully separated bike lane along Longwood is preferable to a painted line. If road work is to be done along Aberdeen, then a meaningful, separated bike lane could be considered as well.

Thanks!

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 12:46 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Cc: Bender, Daryl
Subject: Cycling facilities on Longwood Road

Dear all

I am happy to read about the positive changes Hamilton is making with regards to cycling facilities in the city. When I moved here eight years ago, I was rudely shocked that I could not safely travel around the city via bicycle as I had done in Victoria and Ottawa. I hope that will change eventually.

On that note, I am hopeful, but a little disappointed to learn about your preferred plan for Longwood road. There is no need to benchmark four lanes of traffic at this time, especially when the Urban Hamilton Official Plan states that priority should be given to *shared* use of the road network. I am concerned that this mandate will preclude any substantive changes to improve non-vehicular access along this corridor.

The Bayfront, and the Escarpment are rare expanses in our urban jam. Residents ought to be able to cycle from one to the other without
tangling in traffic. We will not develop a healthy, active community until it is safe and pleasant to make such trips. What's most frustrating is that we are tantalizingly close to this ideal now. There are bike lanes down (part of) Aberdeen to Longwood on one end, and down Longwood from Main to the Bayfront on the other. We just need to connect the two without interruption.

I hope you will reconsider the wording of the preferred alternative with this issue in mind. Thank you for your time.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Saturday, April 07, 2012 2:16 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Cc: Bender, Daryl
Subject: Re: Cycling facilities on Longwood Road

I should clarify my points. I'm not outright opposing the preferred option outlined in the PIC boards. In fact, I'm happy to see the plan include a bike lane and bridge constructed to carry cyclists across the 403. However I think it's premature to mandate that the street only has space for bike lanes on one side, and that four lanes are required for vehicle traffic. I am convinced that two or three lanes of traffic, combined with wide sidewalks, street parking, and bicycle lanes would best serve all users.

Keep up the good work.

----- Original Message ----- 
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 08:19 PM
To: Skrypniak, Lorissa
Cc: McHattie, Brian
Subject: Longwood

RE: Longwood Road Class EA

I am writing to let you know that I and many other residents of west Hamilton are extremely frustrated by the Longwood Road Class EA process, which yet again, seems to be hijacked by a consulting firm ignorant of the local community’s desires and city’s official traffic priorities. The thoughtful community consultation, Kirkendall Traffic
Management Plan, clearly identified “a need for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access and improved safety along the existing corridor.” Instead of addressing this explicit need, the outside firm running the class EA took as a starting point 4 automobile lanes on Longwood.

The current preferred plan does not properly address residents’ desire and need to walk and bike safely in their neighbourhood. The only way to address these is to have wide sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides of Longwood road from its northern point to its southern end. Automobiles can readily use the exits to 403 east and west available on the main automobile thoroughfare of Main St so the argument of a need to maintain a 4-lane car road at Longwood is weak.

In short, I and other local residents strongly oppose to the Longwood Road Class EA process, and will take any possible action to prevent the plan presented in the last PIC from implementation.

This has not been the vision presented in either Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan and a variety of presentations by the McMaster Innovation Park.

The City of Hamilton should do better in choosing what professionals are paid our taxes to plan our neighbourhoods!

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2012 9:55 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood Road Class EA Study: comment

Dear Lorissa,

I attended the public information centre on Wednesday (March 21), and have some comments. Let me first indicate the perspective from which I am making these comments. I live in Westdale (18 Cline Ave. S.) and get around by cycling, driving and walking, depending on where I am going and what the weather is.

I rarely cycle on the stretch of Longwood Road between Aberdeen and Main, because I consider it too dangerous. Cars go very fast on that stretch and there is no bike lane. So I am very pleased that the preferred alternative involves a separate bicycle and pedestrian path from Studholme Drive to Main Street, on the north side of Aberdeen and the east side of Longwood. That will make for a safe cycling route between Westdale and the southwest. I assume that there is experience of joint cycling-pedestrian paths that will enable this one to be designed for minimum conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. In Amsterdam, where I lived briefly, there are separate paths for bicycles and pedestrians, often separated by a painted line, and with the bicycle path clearly marked.
Brian McHattie mentioned to me that some cyclists are concerned about the need for cyclists northbound on Longwood Road from King to cross both Longwood Road and Main Street in order to get on the projected bike path on the eastern side of Longwood Road, south of Main. It occurs to me that a solution to this problem is to make the bike lane on the east side of Longwood Road, between King and Main, a two-way lane. That could just happen informally, as it does in the bike lane on the north side of Sterling, between Forsyth and North Oval. Or there could be some repainting of lines to accommodate it, or (even better) separation from car traffic with a curb. Anyway, I suggest exploring this idea, even though it is outside the study area.

As a driver, I share the experience of many people travelling west on Aberdeen and wanting to turn north onto Longwood Road of being delayed by cars waiting at the traffic light to proceed west onto Highway 403 eastbound. I therefore support the idea of a roundabout at that intersection. I am familiar with roundabouts from having driven occasionally in England, and I know how well they work to keep traffic moving and how safe they are. The roundabouts on Wilson Street in Ancaster are proof that they can work here in Canada, even though most drivers are unfamiliar with them.

I waited to send these comments, in case any alternative occurred to me other than the ones on display at the public information centre. None did.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 11:50 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Attn: Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP

To Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP

RE: Longwood Road Class EA

Ms Skrypniak,

I must admit that I have not been following the development of this project very closely. I had intended to go to the public meeting last week but due to a last minute schedule change, was unable to.

However, I saw the issue in the news today and decided to take a look at the work that has been done to date. I was thrilled! I saw presentation boards that had images of divided bike lanes, walkable streetscapes, wide sidewalks, benches for elderly people that need to take a break. I saw images of trees and of scaled roadways that promote slower traffic rather than faster.

Then I realized I was looking at Step 2, the previous public meeting's materials.

I opened Step 3. I was horrified.

Gone were the walkable streets. Gone were the scaled roadways. Gone were bike lanes. Gone were, seemingly, any consideration of anything other than cars and trucks.
I have 7 specific issues with the plans presented.

1. I see that a roundabout is proposed for the intersection of Aberdeen and Longwood. If the goal is to create a neighbourhood walkable street (which I believe was a stated goal and certainly should be given the type of development that MIP is) then a roundabout of the scale indicated will not accomplish that goal. How exactly does a pedestrian cross a roundabout?

2. I see in the ultimate build-out of the roundabout, a bypass lane is proposed for people making a right hand turn from Longwood onto Aberdeen. What purpose does this serve? The whole purpose of a roundabout is to eliminate the need to stop. So why do cars/trucks need 2 ways to turn right? I can’t see that lane becoming anything other than a great place to get in an accident. It will create 2 different merge points within likely less than 100ft! Absurd!

3. Why is a roundabout being proposed for this location? I live in the area and am rarely stopped at that light due to congestion. Even in peak traffic times, its been my experience that one can make it through the light in one cycle.

4. Why put a roundabout here when a light was just installed at the road by the rail tracks? It seems completely counterintuitive.

5. A roundabout and the proposed roadway will not create the type of environment that will encourage people to walk from MIP to the neighbouring residential zones. When MIP was proposed it was understood that it should be a connection between two parts of a the city. This road and roundabout will ensure that they are divided.

6. I noticed that in Step 2, all the images and pictures were from street level. In Step 3, all the images were in plan view. There were a few sections on one board, but predominately, all the drawings were in plan. I believe that this is a subconscious conceit to the real force in the recent work on this project - the car is paramount, the experience of the street secondary. I would have expected to see a great deal more work done on the section of the roadway and how different modes of transportation could be accommodated instead of just how can cars and trucks get through here.

7. Step 2 talked about roads designed for 8 and 80 year olds. What happened to that idea?

To conclude, the design of a road, as you surely know, will affect the behaviour of the cars on it. Its more comfortable to drive on the highway (or in Ancaster subdivisions) because the roads are wide, the bends have a long radius and any visual distractions (people, mailboxes, light standards, trees) are kept well back from the road. A roundabout and wide road without careful consideration of the sidewalks, bike lanes, street trees will not create a street that meets any of the stated goals or achieves any of the images displayed in Step 2.

I urge you to reconsider this work and spend more time devising a design that considers how this road will support the stated objectives of the study, MIP and the City in terms of creating a walkable, safe community.
-----Original Message-----
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 1:13 PM
To: TOE, Temp Admin Ass't
Subject: Opinion for Aberdeen Roundabout

I understand the idea of roundabouts having travelled extensively in Europe. However, roundabouts are mostly used in lower traffic areas.

My personal opinion is that a roundabout at Aberdeen/Longwood is not the best idea. Points to ponder:

- Having moved into MIP 3 years ago, I have noticed the increased traffic flow.
- The ongoing expansion in the area with future buildings yet to be confirmed (addition of hotel/conference space).
- The Careport facility that has been increasing the number of events.
- The stoplight on Longwood (in front of MIP) that motorists ignore.
  - This coincides with the Careport facilities increasing number of events.
  - Dangerous for pedestrian crossing.
  - Suggest increased police presence or red light camera study.
- One of the most baffling points is why the 403 cut off from Main Street West (at Stirling) does not have an Ancaster/Brantford bound ramp. With the work recently done on upgrading the overpass, why wouldn’t the ramp “split” and afford motorists the choice of direction? This would greatly lessen the number of vehicles using Longwood Road to access the westbound 403.

Thank you,

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 8:13 AM
To: McHattie, Brian
Subject: TheSpec - Roundabout at Longwood and Aberdeen: What do you...

Hey Brian,

I won't be able to attend the public meeting for this, but my experience with roundabouts is they are great for cars. And that's it.

Note the locations of all other new roundabouts in Hamilton - in suburbs where nobody walks or cycles.

I really don't like this idea for an urban research park meant to have a balanced transportation network. It's just not suitable for an environment where we hope to see many more cyclists and pedestrians as the area develops more.

Cheers!
-----Original Message-----

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2012 8:27 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: longwood PIC

Hi - it was so nice out this week, we were at the park and forgot about the meeting!
i am interested in the PIC boards - i noticed that 'Need and Justification' board 7/28 is very blurry, even
when i zoom in extensively....could you please email me a copy i can read
re. slide 10/28 - something seems off re. the location of the double left...i don't think you can have a wb to
nb left turn movement....perhaps you mean double left for the eb to nb movement?? perhaps i am mixed
up, please advise....i imagine there is a traffic study that assessed all the am and pm peak hour volumes
and resulting needs for lane requirements for the 2016 and 2031 horizon years....is it possible to email me
a copy of that? or please advise if traffic peak hour data is to be redone since the idea of constructing
roundabouts is now being further investigated
- i think this could be a great locale for a roundabout
i will look at the slides in more detail when i have more time....as far as options C1-C3, i think we must
have option C3 - i cringe watching the students walk or riding to school, especially when i see a cyclist
battling for space over the bridge on the road. i do not let my son ride to school (Dalewood) along
Longwood and he can't ride on the sidewalk because there are too many pedestrians on the sidewalk.
Lots of peds is great but not enough space to share existing sidewalk with bikes which i know is one
reason you want feedback. We must find a way to separate active transportation over the bridge to
provide a vital link over the 403 to/from Kirkendall to Westdale.
thanks for any help with the above

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 8:55 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Cc: Ferguson, Lloyd
Subject: longwood road roundabout

The intersection of Longwood Rd and Aberdeen Ave is far too busy for a roundabout. There are several
route options at this corner. All traffic is travelling on a major roadway, no secondary or "less used" road
is involved. Cars waiting to turn right onto Longwood wait no longer than cars waiting to turn left onto
Longwood. Due to the right turn lane onto Longwood from Aberdeen, those cars have an advantage,
except for rush hour. Presently 2 lanes can turn from Longwood onto Aberdeen to go east which is also
an advantage.
It is my experience in Ancaster, that cars on the main straight road feel they have the right of way in a
roundabout and proceed to hurry through even though the car on the "secondary" road may have the
right of way. Most drivers do not know how to use/signal in the roundabout. The 2 lane roundabout at
Shaver Rd/Wilson St is the worst.( I don't use Jerseyville).Each time, i say a little prayer and give thanks
when i make it. These roundabouts do not have the traffic patterns of Longwood/Aberdeen.
Countries in Europe have lights at many city roundabouts due to volume of traffic. Singapore is replacing
roundabouts with traffic light due to volume of traffic causing congestion.
Roundabouts may be useful in residential subdivisions, or T intersections like Omni and Stonechurch, but
not for MAJOR INTERSECTIONS. I use Lonwood/Aberdeen intersection to enter/leave Westdale or West
Hamilton at least 2x a week .Periodically I use this intersection to go to the Queen St Hill, as many others
do to go to Mohawk etc. I will not continue to go to the businesses in these areas if a roundabout is used.

-----Original Message-----
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 21, 2012 2:37 PM  
**To:** McHattie, Brian  
**Subject:** Longwood Road between Main and Aberdeen.

Dear Mr. McHattie,

How are you? I am well. I teach at Columbia International College. I walk to school every day, rain or shine. I would like to attend the meeting tonight; however, I am unable to do so. I do want to express to you my concerns about Longwood Road between Main and Aberdeen. First of all, the sidewalk is in need of repair, if not replacement. It is badly cracked and uneven in many places. Second, the construction project going on at the corner needs to have erosion control, the sidewalk and parts of the road are covered in mud and debris after heavy rainfall. Third, bicycle lanes are desperately needed along Longwood, as it is a corridor for bicycle commuters. I have seen cyclists harassed and nearly hit by cars. One woman fell off her bike and would have been run over had a car been right behind her. Fortunately, I was able to assist her off the road. Finally, speeding needs to be more heavily policed on Longwood. Many children walk to school along this road. Nevertheless, cars often travel in excess of 70 kilometers per hour, posing a danger to other drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Thank you for considering my suggestions, as well as for your time.

-----Original Message-----
**Sent:** Thursday, March 15, 2012 1:18 AM  
**To:** McHattie, Brian  
**Subject:** Longwood_Aberdeen_Traffic_Circle

Dear Brian,

I noted in the newspaper the recent proposal of the Aberdeen and Longwood traffic circle with some concern and your reluctance with joy. Perhaps I can provide some support to your position.

I lived in Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates for 2 years. In that time, I learned to deal with the traffic circles at almost all of their road intersections; a legacy of former British rule. I look back with fondness on the traffic circles as they were a tremendous sport. Getting to and fro from the University was always exciting yielding at least a few bursts of adrenalin; really the original extreme sport.
The reason for the stress was the large amount of traffic which moved rapidly. The traffic circles were similar to ours, the rule to yield to traffic in the circle was the same but the view of other traffic was not obstructed. This meant that when approaching one, a driver could judge when a space would be available. For example, traffic entering the circle from the opposite direction would prevent traffic from the left entering allowing one a space to get into but one had to move quickly to be in before the car coming from the other direction arrived. The other difference was that the drivers knew how to signal intentions in the traffic circle, left signal indicates intention to continue in the circle, right signal intention to exit at the next exit. This approach is universal in the parts of the world I have visited including Europe, England and the Caribbean, but not taught in Canada. In fact the most recent Ontario driver’s handbook only suggests using the right signal to indicate intention to exit but very few seem to have picked this up. For example, neither the driving instructor who trained my daughter last Fall nor bus drivers appear to ever have heard of the expectation. This should mean if a car is not signalling it is remaining in the circle but since most don't signal at all, it means one must stop until one sees the actions.

From the environmental report that was prepared and available at the Library, for the Omni circle with which I am most familiar as I must navigate it to reach the Meadowlands, Ancaster or Hwy 403, there were a number of pros defined for traffic circles vs cons for traffic lights or 4-way stops:

1. traffic circles are better for pedestrians
2. traffic lights have expensive bulbs and consume a lot of power
3. traffic circles have a lesser likelihood of life-threatening accidents, especially t-bone accidents
4. traffic circles are more fuel efficient since cars don't have to actually stop
5. traffic circles facilitate traffic flow when traffic become heavy.

The only disadvantage identified was the greater cost of installation since the large circle must be created and paved.

My responses to the claims.

1. This claim was not made with any backup in the Omni document! Apparently inherent in this claim was the sense that drivers would be courteous and allow pedestrians to cross. In my experience, nothing is further from the truth as in the absence of conflicting vehicular traffic cars go through and a pedestrian better not get in the way. At Omni I have seen elderly pedestrians trapped by the traffic circle. In one case, as I was going to the Meadowlands for a quick pickup at the Shoppers, I had seen a middle-aged woman escorting an older woman with a walker walking west-bound, east of the Omni traffic circle. On return, I saw they were caught on the north-east corner of the circle unable to cross. I was so annoyed. I went around the block to return to the intersection, went around until I blocked the traffic so they could get through! Perhaps if there were signs requiring cars to 'Yield to Pedestrians" the situation could be improved but the only time a pedestrian is safe is when the car has been required to stop.

2. This claim ignored the advent of the LED traffic lights, the operating costs of which I understand are much less such that I doubt it matches the cost of creation of the traffic circle.
3. This claim is clearly has a face validity although I think it is overplayed. Interestingly at the
time that Omni was being planned, Waterloo region was well ahead on installation of traffic
circles, one of which I used several times a week travelling to and fro from Conestoga College
and at which I saw a t-bone accident. A driver had apparently decided rather than going 270
degrees around the circle to make functionally a left turn, she would take the “shortcut” to the
left. Unfortunately she could not see a truck coming from the other direction due to the high
centre and was hit on the passenger side and her car was driven right off the road. The absence of
ambulances suggested there were happily no serious injuries but the potential was there and I
have seen other drivers do similar moves locally, either out of confusion or rejection of
discipline. The issue is how many t-bones are likely with a traffic light compared to the traffic
circle and how dangerous are they. I know one person who was t-boned at a 4-way stop; messed
up the car but no serious injuries.

Does this justify the cost and inconvenience of traffic circles? Much of the cited evidence in
favour comes from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. This is a non-profit organisation
funded by the insurance industry. When the Omni circle was defended based on their research I
looked at their website and found the research data to be appallingly bad. Largely the data were
anecdotal not part of any substantive study which would involve control and test data. For
example, they stated that an intersection they had studied in New Jersey had less accidents after
conversion to a traffic circle without telling what intersection - in a city, in the country, the type
of traffic – heavy, light, rush hour, night-time, what periods were compared - ten years of
previous accidents vs a year since the modification, etc, etc. Furthermore, the numbers were so
small any diligent researcher would reject them on that basis alone. I then looked at their stated
objectives and found a comment to the effect that in the past they had had as their focus
preventing accidents and injury but had modified that to focus on minimising injury - thus the
focus on impact resistance of cars and things like traffic circles. Collisions are apparently ok as
long as people are not hurt! Of course my cynical and I think justified reaction was what was
unsaid was the insurance industry likes accidents, that is their stock and trade, but personal injury
is expensive. Although the specific issues are different, I think the criticisms documented in the
Wikipedia article on the IIHS are relevant: well down the page at this URL:


The URL of the IIHS is http://www.iihs.org/about.html, and although the text is less frank than
when I first saw it, the gist of my comments about their objectives remains, albeit dressed very
nicely as altruistic.

Counter to this are the problems of traffic in traffic circles, this being largely based on the one at
Omni but also in the Meadowlands and on Wilson in Ancaster.

a) Confused drivers who stop with no other traffic requiring panic braking by following drivers
who did not expect a stop since there was no need. I find it difficult to believe there have not
been a number of rear-end collisions of this sort but even if not the induction of anger evidenced
by honking horns is not good! Years after the introduction of traffic circles in Hamilton there are
clearly many people who are still unclear how to behave in them.

b) Problems with buses. I was third in line behind a bus travelling west-bound that stopped in the
middle of the Omni traffic circle to drop off a passenger on the north-west corner. Again there
was no reason to expect the stop and as is too often the case the driver did not indicate the stop with a right turn signal likely because he/she was frustrated by a late request to stop. Subsequent problems arose as the cars attempted to pass the bus in the limited space of the traffic circle and when the bus restarted without signalling. Anger abounded which was rather confirmed but honking back and forth between the bus and cars.

c) Both buses and worse large trucks use their size to bully their way through the traffic circles. I have seen a number of cases where a bus or truck should have stopped but continued while an apparently timid (or maybe wise) driver stopped although in the circle. Any situation creating opportunities for this sort of behaviour are bad, and unlike traffic lights where red-light cameras can be used to discourage the bad behaviour, there is no automatic system to deal with this sort of behaviour. I have seen similar behaviour in the more residential Stonehenge Dr - Cloverleaf Dr traffic circle with the intimidator being a large SUV.

So while I think it is intuitively obvious that the most dangerous sort of accident (t-bone) is less likely there is a real possibility of others largely due to bad or confused behaviour. I would note that those who suffer whiplash and other back pain from rear-end collisions might take exception to dismissing that sort of accident as a minor problem. I think too that the slowing of traffic could make accidents likely to be less severe but again not everyone slows. All-in-all I have not seen any solid evidence of significant impact on accidents and have personally seen a lot of potential accident situations and situation which could generate reactions which could adversely affect the behaviour of drivers beyond the traffic circle. A major question is whether or not severe t-bone accidents are sufficiently frequent to justify traffic circles.

4. Greater fuel efficiency is to me unlikely. Unlike the previous though traffic on Stone Church road, with the traffic circle everyone must slow to some extent and with the poor handling of the traffic circle by many, one often must stop sometimes with hard braking. Thus fuel consumption would be increased. The original case for Omni was to allow those on Omni to get out more easily. I still frequently see two or three cars on Omni waiting to get out due to the relatively continuous flow of traffic along Stone Church, so they have not really benefitted. Furthermore, a traffic light system as is installed at Stonehenge and Stone Church and many other sites around the city which detects waiting traffic and interrupts the light cycle to let them out but maximises the time through traffic does not have to stop seems much more efficient. I would note at rush hour there are frequently 10 cars backed up east bound at Omni due to the traffic circle (I have counted from the rear of the line), which was never the case before. So greater fuel efficiency or movement of traffic is not the result of the traffic circle.

A problem not considered: I might also note as a resident in an area just east of the Omni traffic circle there is another problem. When we try to exit from Juliebeth Dr onto Stonechurch, we are frequently confronted by a continuous stream of traffic, spread out by the traffic circle and without breaks. The traffic coming westbound is broken up by the traffic lights at Upper Paradise which helps, but the Omni Circle has created a major problem for us which is getting worse as the subdivision behind us grows and more traffic is trying to exit from Juliebeth Dr.

5. I have seen no study data with respect to the ability of traffic circles to handle heavy traffic flows. Intuitively at a heavy traffic period there will be problems as traffic coming from all directions will compete for entry.
My perspective on this is based on my 2 years in Sharjah. While traffic was light, and with circles with open view and people signalling intentions, traffic movement was brisk. When traffic became heavier there was gridlock. In Sharjah, when I was there, they were already adding traffic lights to control entry to traffic circles to permit movement when traffic became heavy (like the famous/infamous Etoile Charles Degaule traffic circle in Paris). I just took a look on Google maps satellite view and many of the worse traffic circles I used to encounter have been completely replaced by intersections presumably with traffic lights.

A story to answer the response "How bad could it be". To get to the University I had to drive about 13 kms. Leaving at 6:50 am, the trip took about 20 minutes. Leaving at 7:05 am, the trip took 45 min. Exactly the same route, the traffic had simply passed the critical point and the traffic circles clogged and there was gridlock. I am not an early riser by nature; I did not tolerate meetings before 9:30 when I was a professor at Mac. I was up at 6 am every workday in Sharjah in order to beat the gridlock which I hated more than getting up early.

I apologise for the length of this note but the traffic circle issue has become very muddied. I no longer need to deal with the Omni circle and possible Longwood/Aberdeen circle at peak times. I am firmly convinced however, based on my Sharjah experience, and the experience with the traffic circles already installed in Hamilton, that one at Longwood and Aberdeen would be a terrible mistake. The problem with that exit from Hwy 403 is not the intersection but that the amount of traffic, headed for the area below the mountain and perhaps the north edge of the mountain via Aberdeen, and to Westdale and McMaster via Longwood exceeds the capacity of the roads involved at peak times. I must say that my experiences recently when driving our daughter to school have been not bad. As long as Longwood is flowing even if the traffic at the light backs up to the split in the ramp from 403, we are through the light in 2 rounds, and that is only the worst case situation. Usually the backup is within the turn lane and the delay is only one cycle of the lights. As earlier communications we had indicated obstruction of flow on Longwood (by construction at MIP in the past, and as more cars turn into the MIP sites especially on the west side now and in the future) can be disastrous and will remain an issue whether or not there is a traffic circle.

To me the only real solution for the long term is to find a way to divert some of the traffic heading for McMaster and Westdale, possibly adding a ramp to the exit to Main St W by Beverly Hills Apts to take traffic from north-bound Hwy 403. I am firmly convinced that a traffic circle will only make matters worse.

Hope this will be useful for you. I am at your disposal if I can be of help.

Sent: Friday, August 03, 2012 4:10 PM
To: Skrypniak, Lorissa; McHattie, Brian; Whitehead, Terry
Subject: Re: Longwood_Aberdeen_Traffic_Circle

Hello All,

A quick follow-up of the exchanges in March. I currently have a colleague and her father visiting from the Netherlands and have been proudly showing them the sights of our region and of course the Niagara Peninsula. They were aghast at the behaviour of Canadian drivers in the traffic circles! “How can your have proper flow of traffic through the circle if no one signals intentions? Are Canadians not taught to drive properly?” This of course mirrors my comments
below but I wanted to pass it on as the opinion of people who drive with traffic circles and know how.
My colleague is of course and educator and we had a good laugh when she suggested that more education needs to be done, after which she stopped and realised the almost futility of such an exercise. This of course is reflected in the failure of the distribution of pamphlets explaining how to drive in traffic circles done in Waterloo which apparently had no impact at all! Better to do without traffic circles! Stick with lights that are no less efficient, slowing down for the circle wastes as much as stop and start, and the LED traffic lights do not use significant power which was an argument against the old lights and with modern control systems the light can respond actively to varying traffic loads.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 11:43 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood Road

To Whom It May Concern,

As a citizen of Hamilton that regularly makes use of Longwood road as a cyclist, pedestrian and car driver, I wish to express my dismay at the current plan for Longwood Road.

A clear need has been expressed for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, yet this plan still maintains 4 lanes for cars!

Longwood requires cycling lanes on both sides of the street. Many students, including university and high school students, use Longwood in order to travel to and from school/University. This plan places the needs of car drivers ahead of pedestrians and cyclists.

I thought the main objective here was to actually make this road friendlier for pedestrians and cyclists.

I hope you will consider actually making improvements to this street that will include bike lanes in both directions and sidewalks.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 11:30 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood Road Class EA
Dear Lorissa Skrypniak,

This e-mail is in regards to the Longwood Road “Preferred Alternative”, which has recently been brought to my attention by the McMaster University Outdoors Club and Transportation for Liveable Communities (TLC; http://tlchamilton.blogspot.ca/2012/04/longwood-letter.html).

I am a new resident in Hamilton but also a regular cyclist and I use Longwood daily. I often cycle on King and Main as well. The TLC blog indicates that "...the preferred option of the city planners seems to suggest cyclists using the new southbound bike lane between King and Main will have to dismount at Main, cross in a crosswalk to the east side of Longwood to continue through another crosswalk to the south side of Main where there will be a bike path on the east side of Longwood". I would like to firmly inform yourself and city planners that as a cyclist, my bike is my primary mode of transportation. I treat it as I would a motorized vehicle, and I would never dismount my bike in order to make a crossing to another bike path as this would, for me, pose a great inconvenience, costing me unnecessary time and annoyance. I would instead continue to cycle on the street with regular vehicular traffic, therefore, as a cyclist, this compromise would not at all serve my needs and would not reduce my presence alongside regular vehicular traffic.

I strongly believe that disconnected crossings for bike lanes are ineffective for cyclists and do not improve the safety or friendliness of cities towards cyclists. Therefore, this alternative would be a waste of time and money. It is crucial, in my opinion, that bike lanes be continuous and provide simple and straightforward access to neighbourhoods, businesses and city services if they are to provide effective, safe and useful transportation routes to cyclists.

I thank you for taking the time to consider my opinion in this matter.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 6:57 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood Road Class EA

To: Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager
I work on Longwood road. One of the exciting things about working there was the stages of development for McMaster Innovation Park. The inclusion of a bike lane and the walkability of the area once all the buildings are in place. May of the people I work with park across the street from our building and use the light to cross the street. When using that light we always wait to ensure that cars actually stop, often they do not. When ever there is an event at the Care Port Centre, we see accidents and a lot a near misses. Several hundred high school children use that road to walk to and from school everyday. I see them pass by my windows at work.

I personally ride my bike to work. I use the bike lane on Aberdeen, and ride on side roads as much as I can. The construction and the speed of the on ramps onto the 403 from King and Main make it impossible for me to ride my bike on those routes. I know the construction there will end at some point, however the average car speeds across those bridges at 80 KM an hour.

I am not sure how a bicycle is to navigate the proposed traffic circle. It is illegal for an adult to ride on the sidewalk, and even if I did so it puts the children who walk to school on Longwood at risk.

Also having a bike lane on only the east side of Longwood, does nothing to recognize the fact that bicycles are vehicles. The safest way for them to travel is with the follow of traffic not against it.

A traffic circle, were vehicles only have to slow down and don’t have to stop will increase the speed in which they travel on Longwood. Again putting anyone who uses this road at risk. With the closing of Highschools in the Hamilton area there will be more and more students attending Westdale Highschool. With the price of Gas increasing at an alarming rate, more people are turning to bicycles as there main mode of transportation.

I am afraid that it will take a death or several before the city sees the problems with changing the plans for a walkable, bikable city.

-----Original Message-----
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 04, 2012 10:44 AM  
**To:** Transportation Planning  
**Subject:** Longwood Road Class Environmental Assessment

To Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager

I write because I am deeply concerned about the current preferred plan presented for Longwood Road. As a cyclist who commutes to McMaster everyday from the Locke St. area, I am worried that the current alternative will make an already bad and dangerous commute worse. The preferred alternative presented at the March 21, 2012 Public Information Centre is the source of this worry as it takes 4 lanes of traffic as its core assumption. During peak hours (unfortunately, the hours when I commute), navigating traffic on Longwood and Aberdeen is a high-intensity process as cars may be parked in the right lane on Aberdeen, the existing bike lane only goes from Studholme to Longwood before
disappearing, and traffic on Longwood is often moving very quickly in an attempt to get onto the 403 as fast as possible. I have not had an accident in the year that I have been travelling this route but close calls are not infrequent.

It is suprising that in the process of the EA, the community made it clear that pedestrian and cyclist safety needed to be enhanced yet this is not reflected in the current proposal. While I do support the implementation of a roundabout, I worry that without proper bike lanes this will become a dangerous spot in my commute as I will be forced to contend with all of the traffic heading south on Longwood rather than only those vehicles turning left onto Aberdeen at the lights. When I first found out about the Shifting Gears plan and saw the kind of sweeping changes it would bring to Hamilton's streets, I was quite excited at the possibilities. Unfortunately, in the three years I have lived in Hamilton, I have not seen much progress on the city's end, instead being forced to navigate non-continuous bike lanes, two multi-lane highways running through the heart of the city, and poorly signed and poorly designed bike routes.

It is disappointing that these two streets are being turned into an extended on/off ramp for the 403 when there are exits nearby at Main Street. I do use these ramps when I travel southern Ontario, but I would have no problem taking an extra minute to go to Main Street if it meant that my daily commute was made much more safe. I would prefer to see continuous bike lanes on both sides of Aberdeen and Longwood as this would ensure cyclist safety while also allowing for more pedestrian safety via the slowing down of vehicle traffic.

I appreciate the hard work of the planning committee in putting together these proposals and I know that we all want Hamilton to flourish as a city. However, proposals like this will not help our city become a great place to live as they simply maintain the status quo of an automobile-centric city that is hostile to cyclist and pedestrian traffic. If we want to make McMaster Innovation Park into something more than a throughway for vehicles, then we need to think seriously about how the streets themselves will either enable or prevent this area from becoming an accessible and inviting space.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 5:47 AM
To: McHattie, Brian
Cc: Transportation Planning; Farr, Jason
Subject: Longwood Road Traffic Plan Unacceptable

Dear Brian,
I am surprised and shocked to learn that once again the interests of cyclists and pedestrians are left out when the City starts making actual changes to road design. Now it is happening to Longwood adjacent to the MIP, which was supposed to adopt a new balanced approach to street design.

Every recent planning document, from the Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan to the site plan for the MIP, emphasized that enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access and improved safety were to be top priorities.

Despite all the public consultation on these plans, and on the cycling master plan, the interests of motorists are apparently trumping those of all other road users. In particular, the cycling master plan has been systematically gutted in the short time since it has been adopted by Council!

Why does the City bother with these plans if we know they will be ignored when the actual decisions are made, particularly if motorists are inconvenienced?

The City has adopted the pedestrian charter and has approved a hierarchy that is supposed to put the needs of pedestrians and cyclists well above those of motorists. When are these policies actually going to start influencing decisions?

It is just not acceptable any more to use "traffic flow" as an excuse to ignore the interests of cyclists and pedestrians, especially in what is intended to be a cycling and pedestrian centred campus.

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2012 1:35 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Attn: Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager

Dear Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager,

I am writing concerning the Longwood Road Class EA. I travel along Longwood every weekday as part of my commute, sometimes by bicycle, sometimes by foot.

I frankly cried when I saw your “Preferred Alternative”, as presented at the March 21, 2012 Public Information Centre. I have been following this file since the Shifting Gears report recommended a road diet and bike lanes, and figured that the city would eventually come to implement that plan, which strikes me as consistent with the vehicle volumes I encounter on my commute.

The preferred option strikes me as inconsistent with promoting the desired modal splits identified by the GRIDS process, as well as the attempts of McMaster to ensure that its innovation park promote active forms of transportation and limits the impact of private automobile movements on the area. Frankly, it strikes me as lazy planning
from a planning department eager to accommodate cars, rather than step up to the higher goals set in the GRIDS planning process.

What’s most egregious is that one can start with a “Problem and Opportunity Statement” which referred to the Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan’s problem statement that “Community concerns indicated a need for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access and improved safety along the existing corridor” and then quickly move to make keeping four lanes the driving force of all the planning, even if the result is to create a southbound bike lane that serious cyclists would refuse to use due to the ridiculous hassle of having to dismount and cross two sides of a busy intersection to access (and presumably have to navigate some difficult issues at the roundabout at the other end, not being in the natural lane position).

Longwood road is not an extended on-ramp for the 403. It is a vital connection between Westdale and the Southwest. I would recommend that the planners for this project return to the Shifting Gears vision of a road diet and bike lanes on both sides of Longwood, and instead explore more innovative options such as a reversible middle-lane (to accommodate rush hours). Alternatively, if a roundabout more successfully deals with volume, then perhaps two lanes are no longer required southbound. However, I am not a planner, so I leave that to you. However, even not being a planner, I can see how your solution fails to measure up to the problem statement.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 12:54 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Roundabout feedback

Dear Lorissa,
I was very happy to see that feedback is being sought regarding this subject. I’m in favour of roundabouts, in fact I believe there is a strong case to be made in more areas of the city. I lived in the UK for many years, with roundabouts everywhere and they proved to be extremely effective. As you are well aware, we have quite a few examples of successful new roundabouts in the city. Traffic lights have their place, but I believe traffic circles should be the rule rather than the exception. In these days of ever increasing traffic it’s the only way to maintain traffic flow and cut down on emissions.
I have listed a few reasons why I think traffic circles are superior. You probably know this already but I thought I would put it in anyway.

- Traffic calming
- Less risk of rear-end collisions
- T-Bone collisions eliminated
- Ever tried to “run” a traffic circle
- Less Pollution
- Less Confusion
- Efficient traffic flow - all day long
- Elimination of the frustrating process of being stopped for no reason (no traffic coming the other way)
Thanks for the opportunity.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 11:50 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: roundabout longwood and aberdeen

its as stupid as making a bike lane on dundurn n.......
Did anyone ever sit down and "model" that scenario? - it would be interesting to see the results. Crossing King street almost daily in morning and afternoon by bicycle, I have yet to see traffic slow down, never mind come to anything resembling a traffic jam; my anecdotal experience thus leads me to suspect that the need for four lanes on Longwood for cars is overblown.

I certainly hope this process can be improved (indeed, the only hand-out at the PIC had the wrong URL for the project page, and the "Alternatives & Preferred Alternative" page was confusing and difficult to decipher), and that there are better plans coming after comments are received.

Thanks for your time.

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 8:14 AM
To: Transportation Planning; McHattie, Brian
Subject: Longwood Road class EA comments

To : ms. Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager, Transportation Planning
CC: Councillor Brian McHattie

I am writing to let you know that I and many other residents of west Hamilton are extremely frustrated by the Longwood Road Class EA process, which yet again, seems to be hijacked by a consulting firm ignorant of the local community’s desires and city’s official traffic priorities. The thoughtful community consultation, Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan, clearly identified “a need for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access and improved safety along the existing corridor.” Instead of addressing this explicit need, the outside firm running the class EA took as a stating point 4 automobile lanes on Longwood.

The current preferred plan does not properly address residents’ desire and need to walk and bike safely in their neighbourhood. The only way to address these is to have wide sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides of Longwood road from its northern point to its southern end. Automobiles can readily use the exits to 403 east and west available on the main automobile thoroughfare of Main St so the argument of a need to maintain a 4-lane car road at Longwood is weak.

In short, I and other local residents strongly oppose to the Longwood Road Class EA process, and will take any possible action to prevent the plan presented in the last PIC from implementation.

This has not been the vision presented in either Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan and a variety of presentations by the McMaster Innovation Park.

The City of Hamilton should do better in choosing what professionals are paid our taxes to plan our
neighbourhoods!

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 06:29 PM
To: Skrypniak, Lorissa
Subject: commuting & bicycle unfriendly...

hello Lorissa, I,m speaking on behalf of the gltc(gtcl?) group & also part of this group. I'm an avid cyclist and understand U will recieve some letters from them regarding the not so bike friendly action on Aberdeen/longwood but i have much more to say to any decicisons that contradict promoting cycling than automobile.

seems some1 has front row center to making these decisions that driving is like the mail truck " the mail must go on"...it's sad and ironic that this city is designed for lower speed extension highways and even many of the arteries welcome cars conflicting with pedestrians and cyclists. I wonder if some1 thinks or believes drivers spend more money is not necessarily true. I know people with fixed incomes can't afford my lifestyle as well as many fellow cyclists owning homes, business and work.

and the whole thing of this is stating a fact/reminder...driving is NOT a right while cycling is healthy more ways than one...driving costs more including road damages and the environment. Driving is a huge stress machine.. many drivers also smoke with one hand on the wheel, left hand outside is second hand smoke...some still use cell phones while driving...

every year more and more cars on the roads and this and other cities cater to the infrastructure ending in failure results...

I have no clue what is going on with the bike lanes on Longwood nor the intersection idea on Aberdeen but i also noticed a change on the King St overpass though I cycle the center lane as to stay and continue on left to Westdale ...

I want to see a change on Dundurn/King intersection so pedestrians can cross normally. It is very low minded to post a sign stating "pedestrians must cross the east side intersection" ....so saying this that drivers have right of way(???)..and i want a bike lane on dundurn street or share symbols at least as we get fed up using adjacent roads while sidewalk is safer/quicker so as not to be stuck behind tail pipe exhaust...

I have much and many more to add at a later time...Please help us make this city more bike friendly and many of us live here is our right over drivers passing through or even living here or working...Many to most could use GO or public transit and even carry a bike..
-----Original Message-----

Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 6:58 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Cc: McHattie, Brian
Subject: Attn: Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager

Dear Lorissa Skrypniak, MCIP, RPP, Senior Project Manager:

I am writing concerning the Longwood Road Class EA. I travel along Longwood almost every day at all different parts of the day. Sometimes by bicycle, sometimes by foot but mostly by car. I’ve seen the bicycle and foot traffic steadily increase over the last 10 to 15 years.

There is now a steady stream of cyclist on Longwood Road at all times of the day which really surprised me originally. I use to commute to work by bicycle every day and rarely saw another cyclist on the road but that was over 15 years ago. I currently work out of my home and have eliminated my commute but have always been keenly interested in cycling patterns and volumes in the city. Cycling is steadily increasing in popularity and will continue to do so. Especially given the current gas prices and the future expected gas prices.

Cyclist have just as much right to be on the road as cars and it would be nice if they were to be taken even a bit seriously. Ideally on Longwood one would put cycling lanes on both sides of the road.

I admit Longwood is busy for about 45 minutes in the morning but after that one (1) lane each way would be fine for the rest of the day.

The City should be encouraging other modes of transportation and not constantly giving the car priority.

I would be more than happy to meet to discuss this further or talk at a meeting. (I’m an avid cyclist and cycle around 10,000 km a year on the city streets and have cycled in most Cities in Ontario and Quebec and the Netherlands with my family.)

Thank you for considering my request.

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2012 12:02 AM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: comments for Longwood redesign

Hi,

I wasn't able to go to the PIC for the Longwood redesign due to childcare commitments, but I am very interested in this project. I used to either cycle or ride the bus along longwood everyday for a few years so I know the street well, and can't wait for it to be improved!
While I no longer use it daily, in less than ten years my sons will be using it daily to go to high school and I want them to be able to feel safe walking or cycling along there. I know there's been some controversy within the cycling community about the redesign. I would have preferred that the original options had considered three lanes for cars instead of four.

But given the options that I read in the PIC documents on the website, I see some great things about the preferred option. But as usual the devil will be in the details, and in this case the devil will be the longwood and main intersection and then the CN bridge transition and studholme intersection.

With regards to the Longwood/Main intersection, I am mainly writing today to make sure you saw this video:
http://raisethehammer.org/blog/2425

You being transportation professionals are no doubt much more up-to-date on these intersection styles, but I wanted to point it out in particular the idea of curb extension to protect cyclists in the intersection. I see in the PIC panel Bridge alternative P3 there are some of the features of this type of intersection, but the key will be to have true curb extensions as in the video to protect cyclists who are waiting to go on to longwood south (while at the north east corner) from cars turning right to longwood north from Main. I also hope the next phase includes specific details like painted cycling lanes in the intersection like in the video. These details will be key to making cyclists feel confident in this tricky transition area for cyclists.

With regards to the under the bridge transition near Studholme, I hope an option is presented that would consider only allowing one lane of eastbound traffic under the bridge, as the volume is quite limited in my experience.

I look forward to the next phase of the public consultation, please add my contact info to your mailing list.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2012 2:20 PM
To: McHattie, Brian
Subject: no roundabout on Longwood

Hello Brian,
I am saying a very strong ‘no’ to a roundabout on Longwood Rd. I saw the article the other day in the Spec. There are too many dangers to them: I did some research on them when I attended the Ancaster town meetings on these subjects: roundabouts are not good for areas where there are a lot of pedestrians and that area is heavily populated and; now with the new Careport centre possibly doing more event business, you will have speedier drivers coming off the highway who do not know where they are going to get to the Careport Centre and not be familiar with the area, so will make poor driving choices and not be paying attention to pedestrians.
I hate roundabouts since no one here knows how to use them and no amount of education helps. And, since the roundabouts the City has designed so far have great big trees or something in the centre, you cannot easily see what other vehicles are coming at you, or pedestrians in the other crosswalks which become hidden.

For this reason, since I am concerned about pedestrian safety, I always stop at any roundabout [especially if I'm turning right and need to check for pedestrians] and have almost have accidents since the driver behind invariably wants to go too quickly. Roundabouts are bad for people in wheelchairs, walkers, strollers because drivers do not want to slow down at all or give way. The roundabouts in the new Ancaster Meadowlands are notorious for bad drivers blazing through and that is a residential area where it is supposed to be 40km on some streets. A roundabout on Longwood road or any other major road in our City is a bad idea.

-----Original Message------
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:51 PM
To: Transportation Planning
Subject: Longwood Road Municipal Class EA - comments

I am completely unsatisfied with the designs presented at the Longwood Road EA PIC. Many other comments submitted articulate the detailed failings of the design very well, so I will not repeat them here. I will only state that the most fundamental failing of the proposed alternative is the complete failure to address the problem stated in the Kirkendall Traffic Management Plan which preceded this EA, namely "Community concerns indicated a need for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access and improved safety along the existing corridor." It is completely evident that this was not a priority. Automobile traffic concerns have disproportionately, I would suggest almost completely, driven the proposed design. In particular, on the poster describing the evaluation of alternatives as more or less desirable, "transportation" lumps together all forms of traffic, including pedestrian, cycling and automobile, and by doing so removing the transparency around the relative impacts/benefits to each mode.)

I am greatly disappointed in the proposed designs, particularly given the opportunity presented by the MIP development for the City to create a truly pedestrian-friendly environment in what should be a vibrant and people-friendly place. I dread that we will ruin this once in a lifetime opportunity. With this proposed design I truly believe that pedestrian use and cycling use will be minimized by the unfriendly environment constructed, and condemn the corridor to forever be the forbidding and car-dominated place it has been in decades past, completely missing the opportunity to turn it into the place envisioned in the previous meetings.
-----Original Message-----

Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:36 AM  
To: McHattie, Brian  
Subject: longwood road plan

Mr. McHattie,

I live on Spruceside Avenue and I work at McMaster University. I use Longwood Road every day, mostly in my car. I was really looking forward to the Longwood reconstruction as an opportunity to shift over to more bicycle riding, less driving. I am really very disappointed in the City's decision to eliminate the recommended bicycle lane from the Longwood reconstruction, basically telling all of us who would like to live in a pedestrian- and cycling-friendly city that our needs are not nearly as important as the drivers.

The ironic part, of course, is that in doing so, the city is creating more drivers. I want to bike, and I want to ride with my family to Cootes Paradise, to the Westdale theatre, or to the comic book shops on King. But there is no way that I would allow my 8-year-old to bike on Longwood Road--it's basically a highway! Drivers feel entitled to their lane and cut way too close to bicycles. A bike lane would make room for everybody and open up new possibilities for families on both sides of the 403 divide.

I know there is a lot of traffic on Longwood. I am one of them! But I also know full well that the Southbound side will flow just fine with one lane of traffic, especially if the roundabout moves traffic onto the highway and through that left turn onto Aberdeen more efficiently. We have a chance here to really make a better, more livable city, and I am so upset that we are going to let it pass by.

I hope there is something you can do to change this decision.

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 2:12 PM  
To: Transportation Planning  
Subject: Longwood Road Class Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Skrypniak,

I don't often voice my opinion on matters like this but I felt very inclined to after hearing about the potential loss of bikes lanes on Longwood Rd. I live downtown, and even though I own a car I try to cycle as much as I can around the city. For the most part, cycling in Hamilton is okay, the city is making progress but there is definite room for improvement.

One of the biggest problems for cyclists navigating the city is how to safely and conveniently get across the 403. All of the main roads that cross the 403 are heavily traveled by cars and not very safe for cyclists. I will at all costs try to avoid riding down King or Main St because it's like cycling on a highway and it's very dangerous trying to navigate past the on/off
ramps. Going down and around Princess Point is an option, but it's not overly convenient. Same with taking the new trail out by Chedoke that spits you out McMaster. Again it's useful, but not always convenient depending on where you are trying to go.

Having a bike route from Aberdeen, down along Longwood and out into Westdale would be terrific. It will also be a key piece in linking up some of the disjointed bike routes that we have in the city. It would help promote more traffic calming in the area and make things safer for everyone. It will also be great for all the Mac students who east of the 403 and who will have a safer route to get to school.

Cycling is becoming more and more popular for people as a way to get around the city. We need to recognize this and think ahead to the future that our car use will likely decline. Cyclists in this city need a safe and convenient way to cross the 403 without having to take detours or deal with the 403 on/off ramps. I very much hope that the redevelopment plan will keep the bike lanes there for us.

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 9:08 AM
To: McHattie, Brian
Subject: Roundabouts and Intersections and Air

Dear Brian
The proposed roundabout for Longwood and Aberdeen does not seem like the best solution. Roundabouts work best in residential areas where traffic is moving slower and would be ideal for all new development.

I have concerns about the safety especially people coming off the highway who are not expecting it and have no experience using a roundabout. Idling behaviour needs to be regulated actively by the city. I observed a driver idling for at least 10 minutes in front of Zarky's while he used his phone and laptop. Could the city invest in a sign like Tim Horton's to educate Hamiltonians on different issues affecting health (Asthma, Second Hand Smoke, Car Emissions, etc) that are air quality issues. Isn't it time that unnecessary car idling should be considered an offence. Parking infractions should no longer be the city's priority, but rather concentrate on behaviours that affect health as idling does. Why not redirect comissionnaires to give out warning tickets for a year and then start fines. Signage on buildings would also help!

Thank you!