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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this study is to develop a concept plan for a continuous multi-use path traversing from Scenic Drive to Ridge Road to be known as the Mountain Brow Trail. This study provides a framework for the reconstruction and renovation of the existing trail segments, the extension of the trail into undeveloped areas, and possible integration with existing and proposed pedestrian and cycling infrastructure along the route. The recommended trail route was developed through a combination of field investigations, public and stakeholder consultations and research.

Over the course of the study, a route was developed and refined based on an iterative process consisting of field visits, public consultation, feasibility assessment and stakeholder input. Following the mandate, the majority of the route follows the Niagara Escarpment edge, except where challenging site conditions and spatial constraints limit implementation opportunities. The recommended route was also informed by the Recreational Trails Master Plan, the Cycling Master Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and the Mountain Brow Vista Study and Management Plan, to maximize connections and take advantage of existing and planned viewsheds.

Although the primary facility type along most of the proposed route is multi-use path or trail, other facility types were also identified to address site-specific challenges, roadway context and ensure connectivity. Overall, the route will consist of a combination of multi-use paths and trails; sidewalks and signed cycling routes along quiet streets; sidewalks and bicycle lanes along urban roads where necessary; and, paved shoulders in rural areas.

The recommended trail route has been divided into fifty-one (51) segments, based on existing conditions, roadway context (i.e. speed limit, volume, etc.), access to destinations and major intersection crossings. However, the 51 segments have been further grouped into twenty-six (26) project groups for implementation purposes. Each of the 26 project groupings has been assigned a project phase that clearly identifies the anticipated project timeline. The phasing provides for the construction of the length of the trail over a twenty-year period, prioritized based on potential trail impact, safety, feasibility and project costs, among other factors.

In addition to defining the route, this study identifies Mountain Brow Trail-specific branding and wayfinding elements to help create a cohesive trail identity, and identifies amenities to be considered along the length of the route. These elements will help to define the Mountain Brow Trail as a unique trail destination.

Once complete, the Mountain Brow Trail will be a continuous and connected multi-use route that will provide significant recreational opportunities for the city’s residents. The route connects multiple wards, provides access to many community destinations and facilities, and will provide a unique experience that showcases the role of the Niagara Escarpment in Hamilton’s geography.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Overview

The Mountain Brow Feasibility Study began in the fall of 2017 as a collaborative effort between the City of Hamilton and IBI Group to assess the feasibility of a continuous and integrated recreational trail along the upper edge of the escarpment from the west terminus at Iroquoia Heights Conservation Area in Ward 8, to the east terminus of Devil’s Punch bowl in Ward 9. The recommended trail route spans four wards and has the potential to be a city wide tourist destination, offering connections to natural vistas, recreational amenities and heritage destinations across the area that is locally known as the Mountain Brow.

In determining the recommended trail route, the study involved conducting a comprehensive review of the area context; existing site conditions; relevant documents, policies, legislation, master plans and studies; best practices in trail design; public safety; and a public engagement process.

This feasibility study is an extension of the City of Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan (RTMP) 2007 & 2016 update.
Vision Statement

The vision was developed through consultation with internal City of Hamilton staff and external stakeholders, including the communities along the Mountain Brow.

The existing section of the Mountain Brow Trail in Ward 6 from Oakcrest Drive to Mohawk Road East is an important community asset that provides a precedent example of the desired trail characteristics. The trail width, lighting, fencing and site furniture shall be applied to all sections of the recommended trail where feasible and appropriate.

The Mountain Brow Trail vision is as follows:

The Mountain Brow Trail will be developed as a recreational trail that follows the escarpment edge as closely as possible to take advantage of views and provide connectivity between wards. The trail shall include a mixture of facility types with a preference towards accessible off-road, multi-use trails that are wide enough for pedestrians and cyclists.
Mandate

The study mandate is to determine the feasibility of the trail from the west terminus at Iroquoia Heights Conservation Area in Ward 8, to the east terminus of Devil’s Punch Bowl in Ward 9.

A feasible trail route is to be illustrated at a conceptual level and project sections are to be identified for future capital budgets. The study aims to develop a design program including the development of a thematic vision for the trail, branding, identification of the trail facility types and accompanying facilities, the approximate location of the recommended trail location, along with high level costing.

Considerations of user safety, existing conditions, visibility, maintenance, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), and innovative low-impact development technology opportunities guided the route selection and are noted as considerations on individual project sheets for future work.

Trail sections and site improvements were analyzed for cost, safety, connectivity, anticipated usership, and projected neighbourhood growth patterns to identify phasing opportunities and rank trail sections by priority for future construction. Locations and implementation priorities for landscape improvements, equipment, site furniture and viewpoints along the escarpment are identified on individual project sheets for future consideration.
2.3 Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives for the trail were identified as a means of achieving the study mandate.

The goals and objectives are drawn directly from the Recreational Trails Master Plan (RTMP), which include:

**Goals:**
- Develop a trail facility that is a recreational tourist destination (RTMP Economic Benefits);
- Encourage physical connectivity between wards by increasing continuity along the Brow (RTMP Social Benefits);
- Enhance area stewardship; achieve greater awareness of the existing natural heritage features that are located along the escarpment (RTMP Environmental/Ecological Benefits);
- Preserve and enhance vistas (RTMP Environmental/Ecological Benefits)

**Objectives:**
- Provide an identifiable and attractive recreational route to experience the brow;
- Provide branding and wayfinding to enhance the user experience and to create a sense of identity;
- Develop responsible connections to the natural heritage features through thoughtful trail design;
- Provide strategic facilities for passive activities, e.g. lookout points, rest areas, etc.;
- Encourage trail connections to the City’s current and future recreational and active transportation network.

While the goals and objectives remained the same, the process refined these options further with a shift towards determining feasibility. This shift was achieved through field verification, public engagement, stakeholder feedback, safety considerations, data analysis and reassessing the subsequent opportunities and constraints.

It is these goals and objectives that directed the development of the recommended route for the Mountain Brow Trail.
This study employed a multi-step process to select the recommended Mountain Brow Trail route. This process is presented in Exhibit 2 and an overview of each step is provided in this chapter.
Conduct Field Surveys & Review Background Documentation

Early in the process (Summer/Fall 2017), multiple site visits were conducted by the team to assess existing conditions along the route and document the findings. The results of the field surveys are further discussed in Chapter 4.2 Summary of Findings.

The information gathered from the field surveys along with thorough review of relevant documents, including the Mountain Brow Vista Study and Management Plan (2018), Recreational Trail Master Plan, Cycling Master Plan, and Niagara Escarpment Mapping, among others, is the primary means of informing the preliminary route and developing a list of opportunities and constraints.

Identify Opportunities & Constraints

Through field analysis, consultation with stakeholders and public engagement, the team identified opportunities and constraints to inform the recommended Trail route. Existing conditions, forecasted capital projects, safety issues, infrastructure and stakeholder input are some of the opportunities and challenges identified. Further information on the opportunities and challenges are identified in Chapter 3.4 Opportunities and Constraints.

Prepare Preliminary Route Mapping

Based on preliminary analysis and background review, a preliminary recommended route was mapped and presented for comment at the first round of public consultations in November 2017. This mapping offered alternatives for the public to provide feedback on for further review and consideration by the team.

Seek Public Feedback

In November 2017, the project team conducted four (4) public information centres and created an online survey to engage the public and gain feedback. The goal of the sessions and survey was to collect information in order to
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further refine the route, identify potential opportunities and constraints, and gain a general understanding of how residents use the existing sections of trail and identify their priorities. Further information regarding public engagement is discussed in Chapter 5 - Public and Stakeholder Engagement and Appendix I - Blue Sky Ideas.

**Undertake Data Analysis & Route Revision**

Following the close of the on-line survey in January 2018, the project team began the task of analyzing the information gathered from public engagement and preparing a summary that was used to inform further refinement of the route. Alternatives were eliminated or validated, and a new revised recommended route was prepared to be presented to the public as an update. For further information regarding the data analysis and public engagement including the route alternatives, please refer to Chapter 5 - Public & Stakeholder Engagement.

**Provide Update to Public**

In March 2018, the project team presented the revised recommended route to the public in an open house setting. The route was identified as being “preferred” with minor exceptions. Further comments from the public were taken into consideration in the preparation of the final recommended route and noted on the individual project sheets, as applicable.

**Prepare Study Master Plan Document**

**Draft & Final Report and Presentation to Council**

Through a series of drafts, this study master plan document was prepared by the project team, vetted through municipal staff and presented to council for adoption in July 2018.

Using this sequential process, a preferred route for the recommended Mountain Brow Trail - both desired and feasible within the scope of this study - is generated and communicated in a manner that accounts for environmental and economic realities and community desires.
3.0 CONTEXT

3.1 Planning Context

In addition to the Recreational Trails Master Plan, the context for this report includes policy direction provided by a number of City of Hamilton planning documents. The Urban Hamilton Official Plan guides all development within the urban area of the City, supported by Secondary Plans and Policies, as well as area-specific design guidelines and a variety of other influences that extend beyond the limits of the City, such as the Niagara Escarpment Commission Plan.

The Mountain Brow Trail feasibility study is a complex undertaking that involves the interests of a wide variety of stakeholders, a range of infrastructure, and many important environmentally sensitive and culturally significant places. As a result, a review of the on-site and documented contextual conditions is critical in order to gain an accurate understanding of existing conditions and planned efforts.

The contextual review explored connections to existing recreational trails, the lower city centre and surrounding neighbourhoods; proximity to natural features, vistas, current and forecasted development, and open space along the Brow; the impact on/of existing property ownership and forecasted (future) infrastructure plans; as well as feedback through public engagement.

In addition to the planning context, as it relates to master plans, the Official Plan and policies, the review of current best practices in design and accessibility of trails in Ontario further define the parameters of the Mountain Brow Trail and help to identify the scope of the study.
3.1.1 Relevant Plans and Policy Framework

**Urban and Rural Hamilton Official Plans**

The Urban and Rural Hamilton Official plans are the primary sources of direction for all Urban and Rural land use designations in Hamilton, and “guide development by identifying where and under what circumstances specific types of land uses can be located” (City of Hamilton website). High level parent policies dictating elements such as the urban structure, road classifications, and natural heritage features are supported further by Secondary Plans and other more area-specific plans, guides, policies and by-laws.

With particular focus on open space land use designations, Section B of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan designates a large portion of the Mountain Brow Trail study within natural and general open space areas (Schedule B – Natural Heritage System). Objectives of these designations include ensuring that parks and open spaces are retained, linked wherever possible and enhanced to include provisions for accessibility. Likewise, the Rural Hamilton Official Plan Chapter B notes the use of lands designated as open space shall be utilized for both active and passive recreational uses, community or recreational facilities, and other open space uses.

**Natural Heritage & Open Space Systems**

Sections of the recommended Mountain Brow Trail route directly interact with the Niagara Escarpment and other areas holding natural heritage significance and therefore fall under Natural Heritage policy. Lands designated as Natural Open Space often have significant environmental features and are intended to be preserved in their natural state. Section B – Urban Hamilton Official Plan outlines that where appropriate, limited recreational activities or uses may be permitted, including trails, picnic areas, and forest and conservation management.

In addition to the parks hierarchy outlined in Policy B.3.5.3.4, there are two open space...
categories not considered 'parks' but are used for both active and passive recreational activities and contribute to the City’s open space system and are relevant to the Mountain Brow Trail. They include:

a) General Open Space (golf courses, urban farms, community gardens, pedestrian and bicycle trails, walkways, picnic areas, beaches, squares and core spaces); and,

(b) Natural Open Space (woodlots, slopes, creek/ravine corridors, the Niagara Escarpment, environmentally sensitive areas and areas of wildlife habitat).

Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and archaeological reviews may be required in areas under these designations and should be considered in the planning stages.

Other area specific policies – namely neighbourhood secondary plans - further these guides and provide policy on a case-by-case basis. Two such plans with direct relevance to the development of the Mountain Brow Trail include the Nash Neighbourhood and Chedmac Secondary Plans; these plans establish land use and development standards for their respective areas.

**Nash Neighbourhood Secondary Plan**

The lands covered by the Nash Neighbourhood Secondary Plan study area contain the former West Quarry Landfill site, the East Quarry Landfill site, small infrastructure and a number of natural and built heritage features including environmentally sensitive areas and the Niagara Escarpment. Certain areas within the Nash Neighbourhood area are already approved for development, including the Heritage Green Community Park and the lands at the north-east corner of Mud Street West and First Road West. Within the established Heritage Green Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, the Nash Neighbourhood area is designated as a Special Policy Area ‘B”, which will require a subsequent secondary plan prior to further development.

**Chedmac Secondary Plan**

The Chedmac Secondary Plan encompasses areas surrounding the Chedoke Hospital to the west, generally bound by Mohawk Road West to the south, Sanatorium Road to the east, San Pedro Drive to the North and
Magnolia Drive to the west (Ch. B – Hamilton Secondary Plans). The Secondary Plan provides goals and objectives of the area and outlines specific development guides for low and medium density residential use, parks and open space designations, of which there are three (3) - institutional development, utilities, and transportation designation.

Of particular note, the Secondary Plan highlights the opportunity for an open space linkage from the existing neighbourhood to the recreational facilities located within the Chedmac Planned Area.

3.1.2 Contextual Integration

Recreational Trails Master Plan (RTMP)

The City of Hamilton produced a comprehensive Master Plan in 2007 outlining a plan for a multi-use, recreational trail system throughout the city. The 2016 update was done to reflect on what had been installed, respond to the installations and revisit planned infrastructure projects and recommended new trail connections. Various trail corridors along the edge of the escarpment were identified in the update, laying the groundwork for the idea of a continuous trail connection across the brow - the Mountain Brow Trail.

The goals and objectives of this Feasibility Study speak to eight (8) of the ten (10) RTMP objectives:

- Guiding the development of a comprehensive multi-purpose trail system.
- Collaborative trail management and development standards that meet varying commuting needs and opportunities in a manner consistent with municipal land use, transportation, cultural heritage and sustainable development policies.
- Design methods intended to create trail gateways and scenic vistas to enhance a positive public image of the City of Hamilton and to improve the local user and tourist experience.
- Preservation and conservation of wooded areas and sensitive ecological habitat.
• Significant natural features such as the wetlands streams will be protected by new trail development.
• Consideration of applicable City of Hamilton policies, by-laws, documents, guidelines and recommendations.
• Trail facilities developed to serve expanding residential communities.
• Trail safety and security in the community associated with trails.

Many of the features of the recommended Mountain Brow Trail are mentioned as built and natural features in Wards 6, 7, 8 and 9 (See RTMP Table 2: Summary of Individual Ward Characteristics). These features include the Niagara Escarpment and Bruce Trail, the existing portion of the Mountain Brow Trail, Sam Lawrence Park, Mountain Brow Park, Juravinski General Hospital, St. Joseph’s Healthcare Campus, numerous waterfalls, Heritage Green Sports Park and Devil's Punch Bowl Conservation Area. The report also refers to recreational trail design opportunities that align or intersect with the Mountain Brow Trail at various locations. The opportunities identified are the connections along Mountain Brow Boulevard from Mohawk Road East to Limeridge Road, the connection from Mount Albion Pedestrian Bridge to Red Hill parking lot at Mud Street, and the connection from Mud Street West to Green Mountain Road through the Heritage Green Sports Park.

Within the 2007 initiatives to be completed, there is a proposed facility between Mud Street and Mountain Brow Boulevard (Initiative 6-2) and proposed multi-use trail initiatives known as the Heritage Green Link and First Road West Link (Initiatives 9-2 and 9-3). Neither of the 2007 initiatives were completed at the time of the 2016 update (See RTMP Table 3: Summary of 2007 Initiatives). Additional initiatives were proposed in the updated plan such as the Mountain Brow Boulevard Trail (Initiative 6-7), Heritage Green Sports Park Link, and Devil’s Punchbowl Link (Initiatives 9-5 and 9-6) (see RTMP Table 4: Summary of 2015 Trail Initiatives).

For the development of trails, the RTMP emphasizes the consideration of trail users and associated needs (pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users), and general trail design parameters which evaluate criteria related
to operating space, design speed, stopping distance, alignment and clear zone. The network design must include analysis of:

• Accessibility requirements, with attention paid to conforming to the requirements of the Accessibility for Ontarian with Disabilities Act (AODA).
• Personal security and using Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.
• Trail lighting and safety using cost-effective methods (e.g. solar lighting) and focusing on areas of high use ("commuter routes") and adjacent to stairs.
• Trail hierarchy and surfacing (see RTMP Table 7: Trail Hierarchy and Surfacing).
• Trail crossings, particularly at major or minor roads, active railways, bridges, underpasses and tunnels.
• Trail structures, such as gates and barriers, bollards, and switchbacks and stairs.
• Trail signage to provide simplified route identification and to improve wayfinding and trail stewardship.
• Trailheads at primary and secondary entrances, and trail amenities (rest areas and bicycle parking).
• Public art along trails at major destinations, as advocated by the Public Art Master Plan (2008).
• Trails in natural areas and environmental buffers that allow the public to experience nature, but must be balanced with the protection of the environment and sensitive ecological elements.
• Creating new trails in established neighbourhoods, which involve various levels of consultation with the public and stakeholders.
• Lease agreements and land acquisition, including easements.
• Insurance, risk liability and risk management, during construction and maintenance phases; and
• Public outreach and trail promotion through community based social marketing; trail maps, signs and brochures; partnerships with business, local developers and other agencies; and other education, outreach and stewardship activities.
The Mountain Brow Feasibility Study also follows the RTMP Implementation Plan, which involves developing a trail implementation strategy. This has been accomplished by establishing priorities for the route implementation, developing a system to establish those trail priorities, employing interdepartmental collaboration, and designing a comprehensive strategy. The strategy incorporates flexibility in the anticipation of modifications as the trail development evolves through design reviews, detailed design implementation, and monitoring and maintenance. The RTMP also identifies the need for outreach, promotion and potential funding sources; managing trails and maintenance expectations; and establishing a trail maintenance plan. This information is presented in Chapter 6.0 Implementation Strategy.

**Public Art Master Plan**

Section 2.12 of the RTMP highlights considerations for public art involvement with trails throughout the City, as directed by the City of Hamilton Public Art Master Plan (2016). As outlined by the Master Plan, public art is created by artists or in collaboration with artists through a public process and existing in publicly accessible Municipally owned property.

The Public Art Master Plan identifies fourteen (14) priority project sites, for which installation will take place from 2017-2023, and eighty-five (85) secondary sites, which will be considered if resources (staff and funding) become available. The selection is based on the plan’s associated evaluation matrix (scoring out of 100). Sam Lawrence Park is the only location along the Mountain Brow Trail identified as a priority project site. The secondary list includes, in order of priority, the Niagara Escarpment Stairs at Wentworth (Wentworth stairs), the Niagara Escarpment Stairs at Margate and Mountain Brow (Kenilworth stairs), Cliffview Park, Mud Street and Red Hill Valley Trail Entrance.

**Mountain Brow Vista Study & Management Plan**

The Mountain Brow Vista Study and Management Plan (Vista Study) report was created to identify existing and potential vistas along the Brow and to create a long-
The established vista locations were vetted by the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) as the lands along the Escarpment edge (within Wards 6, 7 & 8) remain under their jurisdiction. The Vista Study is closely tied to the objectives of the NEC, from which the Mountain Brow Trail will take measures to protect the Escarpment ecology and heritage while providing safe recreational opportunities along the escarpment.

In all, eighty-seven (87) vistas were identified as part of the study, of which:

- Forty-one (41) are existing views, and no actions are needed to maintain them now or in the future;
- Twenty-nine (29) are existing views, which will need remedial improvements and will require maintenance; and
- Seventeen (17) are new locations which may require moderate to intensive improvements to the ecology and site access.

The geographical scope of the Vista Study forms a large portion of the recommended route for the Mountain Brow Trail. The study extends from Scenic Park (Ward 8), at the west end, to Matt Broman Park (Ward 6), at the east end. The recommended Mountain Brow Trail continues south along Mountain Brow Boulevard into Ward 9. Recommendations from the Vista Study include monitoring the 41 existing views, upgrading and establishing the other forty-six (46) views, as necessary, and collocating amenities (e.g. benches and waste receptacles) with the established views.

The Vista study advocates setting the highest priority to locations of cultural heritage significance (such as Sam Lawrence Park, and Cliffview Park) and those that have had long standing access to vistas (Juravinski Hospital and Cancer Care Center, and Mountain Brow Reserve).

The recommendations of the Vista Study were taken into consideration in the development of the recommended route and location of amenities. Lookout locations have been identified as destinations within each project segment (Chapter 6.4 Project Sheets).
Cycling Master Plan (2009 & Planned 2018 Update)

The City’s Cycling Master Plan is intended to guide the development and operation of cycling infrastructure across the City of Hamilton for the next twenty years. It identifies cycling facilities of various types (shared routes, bike lanes, paved shoulders, cycle tracks and multi-use paths) and provides a prioritization for route implementation over time.

The Mountain Brow Trail is primarily intended to be a recreational facility. Nonetheless, integration with existing and recommended cycling facilities identified in the Cycling Master Plan is critical to provide a seamless user experience.

In particular, the Cycling Master Plan identifies several routes that will “feed” into the Mountain Brow Trail route from the lower city, providing opportunities to expand the potential use of the trail and extend the benefits of the trail to a larger group of residents.

Some recommended key connections from the lower city into the Mountain Brow Trail include:

- **Claremont Access**
  A bi-directional multi-use facility is currently being studied along the Claremont Access, which will improve connectivity and safety between downtown Hamilton and the mountain, including the Mountain Brow Trail. This project has received provincial funding and is anticipated to be built in 2020.

- **Henderson Lift**
  A connection is recommended from Lower to Upper Sherman over the long-term horizon.

- **Greenhill Avenue Connection**
  A connection is recommended along an old service road, passing by Glover Falls, while maintaining the connection between Greenhill Avenue and First Road West.

Additionally, the Mountain Brow Trail will overlap and tie into existing and proposed corridors identified in the Cycling Master Plans, providing opportunities for partnerships in implementation.
3.2 Stakeholders and Partnerships

As articulated in the City of Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan, creating trail networks within established neighbourhoods can be a challenge for many reasons. Overcoming these challenges requires coordination at all levels, as well as extensive consultation with a range of parties – most notably the public.

The cooperation between levels of government, relevant authorities, organizations and land owners will help to address the challenges of determining a feasible route for the Mountain Brow Trail.

In addition to the residents of the communities along the Mountain Brow Trail, there are a number of key local stakeholders of particular note to trail development:

**Municipal Council**
As the City of Hamilton moves forward with the development of the Mountain Brow Trail corridor, Council will have an important role in supporting both the overall Feasibility Master Plan and individual projects.

**City of Hamilton Internal Departments**
Although the Mountain Brow Trail Feasibility Master Plan is primarily led by the Landscape Architectural Services (LAS) Section with support from Engineering Services, the delivery and implementation of the trail will require involvement by other sections (buy-ins, and in some cases approvals), as well as support from a number of other internal stakeholders at the City of Hamilton. Certain projects shall be implemented through road reconstruction projects and other active transportation initiatives - in these cases, the projects will be lead by other City sections with support from LAS.

In particular, the following departments, divisions and sections will be key partners:

1. Public Works
   - Environmental Services
   - Landscape Architectural Services
   - Forestry & Horticulture
   - Parks and Cemeteries
Landscape Architectural Services will lead the delivery and implementation of certain trail segments, and will support projects spearheaded by other City of Hamilton Sections.

The Forestry & Horticulture Section will be involved in the decision making for any tree planting or removal requirements.

The Parks and Cemeteries Section will have a role in the coordination and budget for on-going maintenance work and issues.

- Engineering Services
  - Asset Management
  - Construction

Certain segments of the trail overlap with planned capital road works led by Engineering Services, so the trail will need to be scoped and bundled with these planned improvements to ensure efficiency, limit impacts to residents during construction and to maintain consistency in the design elements.

2. Planning and Economic Development
   - Transportation Planning and Parking
     - Alternative Transportation

The Alternative Transportation Section will assist with the segments of the trail that overlap or tie into existing or planned cycling facilities (per the Cycling Master plan). In cases where the trail development may impact the supply of parking, the group will provide input related to parking needs.

- Growth Management
  - Infrastructure Planning

Where sections of the trail pass through developing and forecasted communities, the Growth Management division will help to ensure that trail portions are delivered as part of planned development. The priority for particular trail segments will be influenced by future growth initiatives.

- Planning and Chief Planner
  - Development Planning, Heritage & Design

Through the Development Planning,
Heritage & Design Section, input from Natural Heritage planners will be important for areas of the recommended trail that are adjacent to, or fall within, natural core areas and linkages. This section will also assist in determining Environmental Impact Study (EIS) requirements.

Additionally, the City’s Cultural Heritage planners will be engaged in dictating any requisite archaeological studies, particularly in areas adjacent to watercourses.

4. Corporate Services
   - City Solicitor
     - Legal

The Legal Section is responsible for property acquisition or potential agreements between the City of Hamilton and property owners to allow the trail to traverse across non-city owned land. They will be working in coordination with the Real Estate Section.

4. Economic Development
   - Real Estate

Real Estate is responsible for property acquisition or potential agreements between the City of Hamilton and property owners to allow the trail to traverse across non-city owned land. They will be working in coordination with the Legal Section.

5. Healthy and Safe Communities
   - Public Health Services, Health - Environments

Public Health can play a role as the trail develops in the promotion and awareness of the Mountain Brow Trail as a key community asset that supports healthier, active lifestyles.

Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC)

Where the trail development falls in close proximity to the Niagara Escarpment edge, individual projects may require a permit from the NEC.

There are different designations, including escarpment natural area, that will dictate the
types of facilities that can be implemented in the zone.

**Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA)**

Where the trail will pass through lands either under the authority of or owned by the HCA, the appropriate permit must be obtained. The HCA will have approval over the trail configuration in these situations and specific land agreements may be required.

**Various Trail Organizations**

There are several intersecting and nearby trails in the proximity of the Mountain Brow Trail that have active organizations. In particular, the Bruce Trail Conservancy and the Hamilton Burlington Trails Council should be actively included in the development of the Mountain Brow Trail, particularly in locations where the integration of Bruce side trails into the City’s multi-use trail network are being recommended.

**Environmental Clubs**

The Hamilton Naturalists’ Club is actively engaged and has provided suggestions for potential interpretative signage themes to animate the Mountain Brow Trail and to educate trail users about the natural local environment, as well as explore the environmental context in which the trail exists.

**Hillfield Strathallan College (HSC)**

HSC has expressed great interest in the trail development as it runs along the frontage of the institutional property. The potential exists to connect the Mountain Brow Trail into the HSC campus.

**Mohawk College**

As one of the City’s largest employers and home to over 30,000 students the College is located along the recommended trail and is a potential stakeholder in it’s development, particularly for segments of the trail along the frontage of the Fennell Campus.

**Hamilton Health Sciences & St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton**

The recommended route passes through the St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton’s West 5th Campus and across from the Juravinski...
Hospital and Cancer Centre. These health organizations have vetted the recommended route option but will need to be further consulted on the trail development.

**Infrastructure Ontario/Ministry of Infrastructure**

The Ministry of Infrastructure's involvement in the implementation of the trail will be inherent as the owner of the lands on which St. Joseph's Healthcare resides, and through which the recommended route is proposed. The recommended route has been reviewed by Infrastructure Ontario, who manages the parcel on behalf of the Ministry of Infrastructure, but further discussions and agreements will be required.

**Utilities**

At various locations along the recommended route, utilities conflict with the preferred layout of the trail. For future work, coordination will be required to create optimal conditions for both parties.

**SoBi Hamilton**

The non-profit Bike Share operator in Hamilton, SoBi, has expressed interest to expand its operations to support this project. Since the funding of such an expansion is a challenge, partnerships would be needed. In support of a potential future network expansion, suggested locations to be considered for future bike share stations have been identified on project sheets and is also discussed in Chapter 7.3 - Trail Amenities.

**Private Land Owners**

Existing residents and developments having direct interaction with the trail have been key influences on developing the recommended route outlined in this study and will remain as such throughout the trail design and implementation process.

An overview of key project stakeholders overlaid onto the project route is shown in Exhibit 3.

Note that many stakeholders will have more high-level and generalized input and are therefore not shown specifically on the map.
Exhibit 3 - Map showing project stakeholders

- Private Homeowner
- Hamilton Conservation Authority
- Hamilton Health Sciences
- Hillfield Strathallan College
- Infrastructure Ontario
- Mohawk College
- Hamilton Burlington Trails Council
- Private Developer
- Bruce Trail Conservancy
- St. Joseph’s Healthcare
- Niagara Escarpment Commission Boundary
- Recommended Mountain Brow Trail
- Rail Line
- Park
- Ward Boundary
According to the Ontario Trails Strategy (2005), an increasing number of communities are recognizing that developing quality places is an important factor in where people choose to live, work, and invest. Trails are an ideal opportunity to create such places, as they contribute directly toward healthy lifestyles, social communities, environmental stewardship and economic prosperity.

By promoting active living and alternative modes of transportation, trails attract a range of recreational tourists including cyclists, runners, dog walkers, environmental tourists (bird-watchers, nature-viewers) and other active-minded users; revitalizing businesses, creating jobs, and increasing public revenue.
The strategy also suggests that the development of trails has a positive effect on property values. Living near trails offers pleasing views, quiet streets, convenient recreational opportunities, and often is synonymous with enhanced environmental quality.

Trails help connect people of all ages to the places they live, work and play, and provide an ideal setting for walking, bicycling and other modes of physical activity (P. Troped, 2011). Investments in recreational and active transportation opportunities provide people with affordable transportation options that increase their access to employment, education, recreation, and consumer opportunities for vulnerable populations including seniors, children, Canadians with lower incomes and people with disabilities. (Bergeron & Cragg, 2009)

By developing the Mountain Brow Trail, the community is investing in a healthy lifestyle that is attractive, economically stable, and environmentally conscious. The trail facility will enhance the user’s quality of life and value of space, while the ecological, mental health, recreational and physical health benefits can have positive effects on the local and extended community.
3.4 Opportunities & Constraints

Through the process of identifying potential trail connections, reviewing the feasibility of trail segments, and meeting with the public and stakeholders, various project opportunities and constraints were identified for the Mountain Brow Trail.

Examples of Opportunities
a) Naturally occurring views & vistas
b) Wide existing road widths with low speeds
c) Wide boulevards
d) Existing parks
e) Existing parking lots
f) Natural destination features such as waterfalls
g) Existing trails
h) Current or future roadworks and active transportation projects that provide opportunity to include trail in right of way design or provide opportunity for connections

Examples of Constraints
a) Difficult road crossings such as the Kenilworth Traffic Circle, Scenic Drive & Garth Street and Centennial Parkway
b) Protection of natural heritage features and existing street trees
c) Safety concerns near escarpment edge
d) Spatial constraints due to existing natural features, built features and existing infrastructure
e) Additional permitting required on regulated land
f) Private ownership of desirable Brow lands
g) Commercial areas where trail implementation may require removal of on-street parking
h) Configuration of some residential areas inhibit implementation of a multi-use trail. Alternate facility types recommended in these areas
i) Rural road cross-section inhibits implementation of a multi-use trail. Alternate facility types recommended in these areas
j) Steep grades limit universal accessibility in some areas

The escarpment is a naturally occurring feature that people are instinctively
attracted to, which creates the potential for the Mountain Brow Trail to be a destination, similar in profile to the Waterfront Trail. Some constraints may be overcome through design solutions, while others have ecological or structural limitations that require deviation from the Escarpment edge. Together, the opportunities and constraints inform the recommended route put forward in this document.
4.0 EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

In addition to new trail links to be developed as part of the Mountain Brow Trail, there are a number of existing trail pieces that will form a portion of the route. Much of the emphasis of this project is the inventory and documentation of existing assets, both as a way to emphasize the current assets of the corridor, and also to identify areas for upgrade in the formation of the Mountain Brow Trail. This section documents the process used to review existing trail assets, and provides a summary of key findings.
Existing infrastructure was assessed through a series of site visits to inform the local community context, natural environment and conditions of existing assets. Assessments were generally geared toward determining whether or not a trail facility would be feasible at particular locations along the study route. The investigation was to identify steep slopes, erosion issues, alternate route opportunities, informally established paths, spatial constraints, segments that would require upgrades, segments in which the existing infrastructure will be maintained, proposed facilities based on existing constraints, and existing adjacent features (vistas, bridges, waterfalls, parks, and parking lots and lay-bys). Photographs were taken for documentation and future review.

- **August 15th 2017**
  A review of the route was conducted to examine high-use areas and/or areas that may pose future design and construction issues, as well as to review opportunities and constraints in detail. The review began at the existing trail at Sanatorium Road & Scenic Drive, followed by locations at the Ministry of Infrastructure owned land (St. Joseph’s Hospital), Southam Park, Mountain Park Avenue, Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail under the Red Hill Valley Parkway to Albion Road, Heritage Green Sports Park area and the Devil’s Punch Bowl area.

- **September 12th 2017**
  The Centennial Parkway area was examined to explore east-to-west trail connection opportunities given the constraint of the speed of travel and slope of Centennial Parkway. Starting at the Battlefield Park car park and walking south towards the escarpment on the east side of Centennial Parkway, areas north and south of the rail corridor were explored, including existing sections of the Bruce Trail.

Following this, the study route was explored from the Ministry of Infrastructure owned land (St. Joseph’s Hospital) east along the Claremont Access towards Southam Park, and from Southam Park entering the Bruce Trail adjacent to the Claremont Access towards the Jolley Cut.
The review began at the Devil’s Punch Bowl car park, exploring the Bruce Trail area north of the viewing area heading west towards Centennial Parkway looking for desirable recreational opportunities. The next segment of study began at the north end of First Road West to explore the Bruce Trail and escarpment terrain that is identified in the Secondary Plan as trail connection. Moving farther west, the team visited Upper King’s Forest Park on the west side of Albion Falls to review vistas and feasibility of trail routes through this area.

The team continued west towards the west terminus at Scenic Drive, with periodic stops to explore the existing conditions, to observe changes in pavement (width and surface treatment), and to observe traffic movements, particularly at Inverness Avenue and Upper James Street.

**November 17th 2017**
West 5th Street to Concession Street - via the Claremont Access Spur, Claremont Access, Arkledun Ave and Jolley Cut - was presented as an opportunity to connect the trail to the lower city. Concerns were raised about cyclists being able to use the Jolley Cut Pedestrian portion where stairs and a path connect Concession Street and Arkledun Avenue. The site review confirmed an existing bike trough - a channel alongside a stairway to facilitate walking a bicycle up or down the stairway. This area serves as a potential linkage to Downtown Hamilton and the lower city; however, it is not included in the recommended route.
4.2 Summary of Findings

- The trail presents an opportunity to implement, or at least support, measures recommended by other Hamilton plans such as the Recreational Master Plan, Public Art Master Plan, Cycling Master Plan and the Mountain Brow Vista Study and Management Plan, each of which has identified locations for trail establishment and improvement, public art installations and vista establishment and maintenance. Further review and future report updates will be required for the integration of the trail route with the features of the plans mentioned.

- The Mountain Brow Trail aspires to incorporate branded trail features and amenities (trailheads, fence, benches, lighting, pavement markings), as well as establish and maintain the identity of the trail apart from other trails within the Hamilton trail network. Some portions require simple upgrades to paving, fencing and/or lighting, typically in areas where there is sufficient open space; while others within the road right-of-way (ROW) require more in-depth analysis of the interactions between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic.

- The recommended trail overlaps with a number of other existing trails such as the Bruce Trail, Escarpment Rail Trail and the Red Hill Valley Trail. While a separate facility with deliberate intersections was preferred, existing conditions would not allow the implementation of the trail within the constraints of typical trail infrastructure. Therefore, the recommended route takes advantage of existing infrastructure that enhances the experience for users who already use these trails, allows safe passage for its users, consolidates maintenance efforts and reduces overall construction costs. This integration will need to be considered in the Design Considerations and Branding initiative (Chapter 7.0) in coordination with the branding of the other trails.

- Existing conditions in some areas present challenges for safe access (e.g. steep slopes falling from the edge, eroding escarpment edge,
traffic patterns). Ecologically sensitive areas will not allow for an accessible, safe multi-use trail without endangering the local environment, and the cost of infrastructure to implement the trail at the Brow fall beyond the typical budgets allotted to trail development. The trail will need to deviate from the Escarpment edge for portions of the trail.

- Multiple facility types will need to be established to maintain a continuous trail along the full length of the corridor. This is necessary in locations that present challenges due to spatial constraints, neighbourhood context and natural heritage features where a full multi-use facility would not be an appropriate application. These facility types were chosen based on road right-of-way width, road characterization, roadway speed limit and existing infrastructure, and are presented in Chapter 6.2 Facility Types. The specific facility designation is shown in detail in Chapter 6.4 Project Sheets.

- The implementation of the Mountain Brow Trail will require coordination with stakeholders whose properties or interests lie within the sphere of influence of the recommended route (i.e. the route traverses the property, the property is adjacent to the route, the entity would like to participate in trail design and/or implementation). Such entities include Hillfield Strathallan College, Mohawk College, Hamilton Health Services and St. Joseph’s Healthcare, SoBi Hamilton, Hamilton-Burlington Trails Council, Hamilton Naturalists’ Club and private Land Owners (See also Chapter 3.2 Stakeholder and Partnerships).
Stakeholder and Partnerships).

- In select locations, direct routes would require large up front investments, permitting requirements, coordination and ongoing maintenance investments. With reasonable alternative routes available, these large investments currently do not present benefits to justify the cost of the establishment of the Mountain Brow Trail. However, these projects are not without merit and may be explored should a future cost-benefit analysis prompt further investigation into the implementation of these direct routes.

Such projects are discussed as blue sky ideas (Appendix I) for future consideration should the implementation become feasible.
4.0 EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Mountain Brow Trail at Mountain Brow Boulevard
5.0 PUBLIC & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Public & stakeholder engagement was an important element in the development of the Mountain Brow Trail Feasibility Master Plan. With the trail viewed as an opportunity to connect communities and wards across the Mountain, input from residents, council, city staff, other relevant agencies and interested parties about the development of the trail is critical to project success. This section summarizes engagement activities completed as part of the Master Plan process.
## 5.1 Overview of Public & Stakeholder Engagement Process

### Public Information Centre #1

Two rounds of Public Information Centre (PIC) sessions were held in conjunction with the development of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>Ward 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 13, 2017</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 15, 2017</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 21, 2017</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 22, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm-8:30pm</td>
<td>6:00pm-8:30pm</td>
<td>7:00pm-9:00pm</td>
<td>6:00pm to 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House with a presentation from 7:00pm-7:30pm</td>
<td>Open House with a presentation from 7:00pm-7:30pm</td>
<td>Open House with a presentation from 7:30pm-8:00pm</td>
<td>Open House with a presentation from 7:00pm-7:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Library Meeting Room, 467 Upper Ottawa St.</td>
<td>Sherwood Library Meeting Room, 467 Upper Ottawa St.</td>
<td>Chedoke Multi-Use Bocce Club, 91 Chedmac Dr,</td>
<td>Winterberry Heights Church, 300 Winterberry Dr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton L8T3T3</td>
<td>Hamilton L8T3T3</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON L9C 7R5</td>
<td>Stoney Creek, ON L8J 3Y1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four PIC sessions were held in round 1; one for each ward that the trail is recommended to traverse. The dates and times for the PICs were scheduled as summarized in Exhibit 7.
In round 1, the PICs were advertised 1-2 weeks prior to the date of the PIC through the City of Hamilton’s website, the City of Hamilton’s Twitter Feed and through the local paper – Hamilton Mountain News (Wards, 6, 7 & 8) and Stoney Creek News (Ward 9). The City of Hamilton’s Manager of Landscape Architectural Services also did an interview with Cable 14 News on November 30, 2017, providing a summation of the sessions and informing the public that a future session was pending. Residents of properties directly abutting the recommended trail alignment received mailed notices about the PIC. The advertisement and the notice sent to participants is included in Appendix A.

For all of the sessions, City of Hamilton and IBI Group staff (hosts) were on hand to review information and discuss the project with individuals on a one-on-one basis or in small groups (2-3) of participants. This took place as participants entered, in an effort to promote engagement as quickly as possible and one-on-one interactions that could support discussion of individual concerns. Once a quorum of participants were in attendance, the group was assembled for the scheduled presentation, which outlined the objectives of the sessions, the recommended trail route, identified areas of interest (opportunities and constraints), and informed participants about the steps that will follow. For Ward 7 the presentation was withheld - the small number of participants made it more suitable for one-on-one discussions with facilitators for the length of the session.
In addition to the formal presentation, participants were guided to one of four stations (any order) to participate in:

1. **Dotmocracy** – a facilitation method that allows participants to respond to questions using sticky ‘dots’ to vote. In a dot matrix questionnaire (Appendix B), consisting of 10 questions, users were asked to place one or more sticky dots in response to individual questions as instructed. This allowed users to show how they currently use the existing trail, how they expect to use the completed trail and improvements they would like to see implemented as part of the completed Mountain Brow Trail. The hosts often walked through the process with participants to clarify or explain any issues that were unclear, or to foster additional feedback not necessarily requested by the questionnaire.

2. **Investment Jar** – Two (2) mason jars were placed where users were asked to make a choice between potential investment strategies for the completion of the trail using poker chips dropped in the strategy of choice. Users were asked to indicate their preference for either:
   i. a fully connected trail route experience, with amenities instituted later on; or
   ii. sections of trail installed with full amenities, leaving connections to be made later.

3. **Roll Out Plan** – the extent of the Mountain Brow Trail was printed out on two (2) large sheets and laid out on a table, where users were asked to identify – using dots - where they lived, where they usually access the trail, where they park and where they would like additional parking, based on a preset colour system. They were also asked to mark the route they take to their preferred access point(s) using markers.

4. **Alternate Routes** – Route options were presented across seven (7) boards - a context plan, the recommended route (including alternate routes) broken down into five (5) sections, and a comments board. Users were asked to indicate the preference for the recommended alignment or the alternate route in the locations indicated. Comments, suggestions and concerns were
written onto sticky notes and left on the comments board (Appendix B).

Users were also encouraged to use sticky notes to leave additional comments on the roll-out plan.

Attendees were requested to sign in, and though not mandatory, a total of 39 residents were recorded as having attended across the four (4) PICs, with PICs in Ward 6 and 8 being the most well-attended (20 and 14 persons respectively).

For users who were not able to attend any of the consultation events, an online survey (Appendix C), was made available to allow participation from as many residents as possible. Similar to the PICs, the online survey was advertised through the City of Hamilton’s website, Twitter Feed and advertised in local papers. From this process, ninety-two (92) respondents completed the full, or a portion of the Mountain Brow Trail Survey. Some residents also directly emailed responses to the City Project Manager. Results are a composite of the three methods of resident feedback.
5.2 Summary of Public Input

Demographics

Respondents represented a wide cross-section of Hamilton Wards having vested interests in the development of the new trail (Exhibit 9). There was a fairly even spread across age groups, with the exception of those under 15 years old as shown in Exhibit 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Online Survey</th>
<th>PIC Meetings</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 9 - Distribution of respondents

Exhibit 10 - Demographics of respondents
**Trail Use and Access**

Most respondents expect to use the trail daily (25%) or a few times per month (52%), with the top three activities being walking/hiking (28%), bicycling (20%) and nature viewing/sightseeing (15%) (refer to Exhibit 11). The majority of respondents use sections of existing trail along the Brow for fitness/exercise (32%), enjoyment of nature (28%) and for access to special destinations: historic sites, waterfalls, parks, etc. (20%) (Refer to Exhibit 12). Throughout the year, the majority of respondents use the trails in the evenings (39%) on weekdays and in the mornings (34%) or afternoons (31%) on weekends.

The majority of the respondents arrive at the existing trails through walking/running (45%), driving (27%) or biking/rollerblading/skateboarding (18%), spend 30 minutes to 2 hours (62% 30 minutes – 1 hour; 32% 1-2 hours) and travel 1-10 kilometers (67% 1-5 kilometers; 24% 6-10 kilometers).

Overall, respondents were comfortable using the different types of facilities that are recommended along the Mountain Brow Trail, as shown in Exhibit 13.

**Trail Improvements**

Respondents generally prioritized installing a fully connected trail within a shorter timeframe, with amenities added over time (66%), over installing segments of trail installed within a shorter timeframe, with full amenities installed first, connecting those segments over a longer period of time (34%) (Exhibit 14).

Respondents were asked to indicate their top three (3) wish list improvements for the Mountain Brow Trail (refer to Exhibit 15). The top three responses were scenic views/lookout points (13%), year-round maintenance (12%) and lighting (10%). Other amenities mentioned, but not listed, included free 2-3 hour parking, washrooms, and pedestrian bridges at key locations, such as Kenilworth Access, Upper Centennial Parkway and the Jolley Cut.

**Exhibit 11 - Respondents’ top three (3) trail activities**

- Walk/Hike (28%)
- Bicycle (20%)
- Nature Viewing/Sightseeing (15%)
- Run/Jog (9%)
- Pet Walking (8%)
- Photography (5%)
- Rollerblade/Skate (1%)
- Other/Skipped (13%)

**Exhibit 12 - Respondent feedback on trail use**

- **Fitness/Exercise** (43% Most Often; 19% Sometimes)
- **Enjoyment of nature** (39% Most Often; 16% Sometimes)
- **Special Destinations** (9% Most Often; 32% Sometimes; 6% Never)
- **Commute to Work/School** (5% Most Often; 15% Sometimes; 43% Never)
- **Shopping/Errands** (1% Most Often; 17% Sometimes; 9% Never)
- **Other** (3% Most Often; 1% Sometimes; 13% Never)
Exhibit 13 - Respondents feedback on level of comfort using various facility types for the Mountain Brow Trail

- Multi-Use Path: 41%
- Paved Shoulder: 35%
- Street Bicycle Lane & Sidewalk: 16%
- Sidewalk & Signed Cycling Route: 8%

Exhibit 14 - Respondents' investment preference

A fully connected trail installed within a shorter timeframe with amenities (i.e. drinking fountain, benches, look out points) added over a longer period of time.

- Year-Round Maintenance (12%)
- Scenic Views/ Lookout Points (13%)
- Trees (for shade) (8%)
- Trees: (8%)
- Distances Markers (4%)
- Parking (3%)
- Interpretive/ Educational Panels (3%)
- Benches (4%)
- Lighting (10%)
- Trash Receptacles (7%)
- Exercise Stations (5%)
- Water Fountains (7%)
- Wayfinding Signage (5%)
- Bike Racks/ SoBi Stations (5%)
- Other (3%)
- Parking (3%)
- Paved Trails (7%)
- Wider Trails (3%)

Exhibit 15 - Respondent “Wish List” of trail improvements

Segments of the trail installed with full amenities (i.e. drinking fountain, benches, look out points) over a shorter time frame, full connectivity of the trail over a longer period of time.
Online respondents were also asked to identify the Ward that should be prioritized for development first or to select a continuous/connected trail that spans all the wards. 62% were in favour of a continuous/connected trail, 18% prioritized the segment in Ward 8, 10% prioritized the segment in Wards 6 & 7, and 2% prioritized the segment in Ward 9.

Exhibits 16-20 show respondents’ choices for the recommended route or alternate routes in five (5) locations. Respondents were in favour of the recommended route in two (2) locations – Sanatorium Road (57%) (Exhibit 16), and Mountain Brow Boulevard (75%) (Exhibit 18). Respondents preferred the alternate route of Scenic Drive/Fennell Avenue (76%) to Denlow Avenue/Garth Street (24%) (Exhibit 17). There was no clear preference for either First Road East/Dofasco Trail (50%) versus Upper Centennial Parkway/Ridge Road (50%) (Exhibit 19), or Claremont Drive/Inverness Avenue (47%) versus Claremont Access/Jolley Cut (44%) (Exhibit 20).

Exhibit 16 - Feedback on alternate routes - Sanatorium Road vs Scenic Drive

Exhibit 17 - Feedback on alternate routes - Denlow Avenue-Garth Street vs Scenic Drive-Fennell Avenue

Exhibit 18 - Feedback on alternate routes - Mountain Brow Boulevard vs Upper Ottawa Street-Edgewood Avenue-Oakcrest Drive

Exhibit 19 - Feedback on alternate routes - First Road East-Dofasco Trail vs Upper Centennial Parkway-Ridge Road

Exhibit 20 - Feedback on alternate routes - Claremont Access-Southam Park-Inverness Avenue vs Claremont Access-Jolley Cut vs Brantdale Ave-Skyland Drive
General Input

Outside of the formal survey, City of Hamilton & IBI Group staff at the PIC #1 noted specific input from residents.

General feedback received included:

• Support for a trail that emphasizes the Brow’s natural beauty and unique views. This was accompanied by a desire to emphasize trail alternatives that stayed as close to the Brow as possible.

• Desire for the trail to be respectful of the community context, particularly from a privacy and access perspective; on the other hand, many residents expressed the desire for a continuous multi-use trail (rather than varying facility types) in order to maintain a consistent, high quality ‘trail’ experience’ along the full corridor.

• Residents expressed desires for the trail route to include high level transformational changes such as grand pedestrian bridges where key vista locations coincide with difficult road crossings; road repurposing to provide Hamilton’s version of the High Line (Manhattan, New York); and, proposing trail routes that remain close to the Brow despite the current state of ownership and/or those within sensitive natural areas.

While these ideas have merit from a long term visioning perspective for Hamilton Mountain Brow as a destination, these ideas are not immediately feasible based on the prioritization criteria used in the study and have not been included in the recommended route.

• Desire to use the trail project to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists, for example where sidewalks are currently missing.

• Desire for trail etiquette education to address safety concerns about multiple users on a single path.

Public Information Centre #2

Findings from PIC#1 were presented in a subsequent meeting (PIC #2, Exhibit 21), where twenty-four (24) residents were in attendance. Councillors and residents from Wards 6,7 and 8 were represented.
Like PIC #1, participants were engaged one-on-one or in small groups with facilitators to have updates explained and to provide feedback.

A formal presentation was made once a quorum was in attendance. The recommended route was presented and any additional feedback was noted for inclusion in the study. Issues on maintenance, particularly snow removal, were discussed at length. These issues raised by residents are noted on the appropriate Project Sheets (see Chapter 6.4 - Project Sheets).

**PIC #2 Schedule**

Tuesday, March 27, 2018

6:00pm-8:30pm

Open House with a presentation from

7:00pm-7:30pm

Westmount Recreation Centre, Room ‘D’,

35 Lynbrook Dr,

Hamilton, ON L9C 2K6

Exhibit 21 - PIC#2 Schedule

**Stakeholder Feedback**

Throughout the development of the feasibility study, various stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on the recommended route, alternate routes, existing site conditions and how the route may interact with their interests. Exhibit 22 shows an excerpt of the feedback received throughout the process. This information has been instrumental in the selection of the recommended trail and the Implementation Strategy (see Chapter 6.0).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC)</td>
<td>Green infrastructure is desirable, e.g. porous pavements, use recycled aggregate, erosion control/ prevention, solar lighting. Minimize impact of urban growth on Escarpment Environment (pg.35 Niagara Escarpment Plan-NEP). Permitted uses are NOT approved uses and must meet ALL development criteria listed in NEP (pg.50), if we are encroaching on Escarpment Lands. Development application will need to occur in future if we will be impacting Bruce Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)</td>
<td>Provided documentation to determine if site has archaeological potential, marine archaeological potential, or potential for built heritage and cultural heritage landscape. This can be flagged at preliminary planning stages if there appears to be great potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA)</td>
<td>HCA regulated properties adjacent to proposed route: Paramount Heights area, Felker’s Falls, Mount Albion area and Karst (not adjacent to lands but do connect into the East Mountain Trail Loop), portions of the East Mountain Trail Loop, Iroquois Heights Conservation Area (at west terminus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) (cont’d)</td>
<td>Idea to set up counters in key areas. Would like to see vistas enhanced (‘City of Vistas’), but also ensure safety close to edge of escarpment to prevent user/nature conflict. HCA manages the Dofasco 2000 trail and has an agreement with Dofasco that would need to be considered if linking to this trail. The property owned by HCA at the corner of First Road East and Green Mountain Road is under review. It is one of many sites being considered for a water retention area and is undergoing an Environmental Review. HCA should be contacted when trail is being considered near this land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Trail Conservancy/ Iroquoia Bruce Trail Club</td>
<td>Cyclist speed is an issue and may be handled by using side by side gates. Also noted that having points of interest along the trail would be beneficial. Show other trails on the map and their connections (e.g. Bruce Trail) Concerns regarding speeding cyclists on the Jolley Cut and Red Hill Valley, suggest installing dodgeways every 300 feet to slow down cyclists coming down hills. Consider opportunity to have bridges over Red Hill Valley Parkway and over Upper Centennial Parkway from Victory Ridge subdivision to a connection on Ridge Road Planning to blaze a trail along Ridge Road from the Devil’s Punch Bowl parking lot and heading west to a side access on the north side of Ridge Road that connects to the main trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillfield Strathallan College (HSC)</td>
<td>Of paramount concern is the impact on mountain commuter traffic routes and crossings. Of more direct concern for HSC is Garth-Fennell/Beckett Drive and/or Garth/Denlow intersections. Any institution of a specific pedestrian or ‘preferred signal’ mechanism at these respective intersections, particularly at peak traffic times, will further exacerbate the current traffic situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAKEHOLDER</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Naturalist Club (HNC)</td>
<td>Recommends installing interpretive signs in key areas, particularly about bird migration along the escarpment, Hamilton area wildlife and the Carolinian Region in general. Place signage at lower levels for youth. Include interpretive signage with a couple of themes (escarpment geology and ecology; ribbon of green; head of lake; bird migration; encouraging stewardship; mental/ physical/ spiritual benefits).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Ontario (IO)</td>
<td>The right-of-way that is within the hospital lands is owned by Ministry of Infrastructure (MOI) and managed by IO. IO has authority to grant an easement on the land but will require permission from St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton who leases the land. IO and St. Joseph’s are open to discuss the potential of a proposed route and potential agreements/ easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architectural Services (LAS)</td>
<td>Confirm if visual impact assessment will be required from NEC for locations that are to have lights. Include and tie into vista’s (where applicable) indicated on ‘Mountain Brow Vista Study and Management Plan’ dated September 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Economic Development</td>
<td>Explore connection trail to the Elfrida Growth Area and include Growth Area on Map. Chedoke Radial Trail to Fennell Avenue West: Natural Heritage Planning staff is concerned with the portion of the route that has been proposed adjacent to Scenic Drive and Sanatorium Road. This trail would involve the crossing of the watercourse and would be located within Core Areas (Significant Woodland and Hamilton Escarpment Environmentally Significant Area). A connection has been proposed from Glover Mountain Road to Greenhill Avenue. The trail would be within Core Areas (Significant Woodland and Felker’s Falls Escarpment Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would need to be completed if a new trail is proposed within this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and Horticulture</td>
<td>Include and tie into vistas indicated on Mountain Brow Vista Study and Management Plan (September 2016). Ensure ‘Public tree Bylaw’, 15-125 and the Tree Protection and Sustainability Policy is adhered to and the recommendations are in keeping with the overall mandate of the bylaw and policy to preserve and increase overall tree canopy. Any resulting development/ construction that may impact a public tree are to be provided to Forestry and Horticulture for comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Operations</td>
<td>There have been requests to add lighting to Mountain Brow Park. Future lighting will need to be explored. The fencing has been partially replaced from Mountain Brow West Park to Mountain Brow Drive park. Due to slope failure etc, the fence will need to be installed further from the Brow and will impact the placement of a future trail. Coordination will need to occur and options will need to be identified for pinch points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation</td>
<td>Difficult crossings/ grade highlighted on Bikeways Map: Scenic Drive at Garth Street; Mountain Brow Boulevard at Oakcrest Drive; steep section at Albion Falls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View of the lower city from the Jolley Cut.