

Chapter 4. Transportation (written submissions received up to July 5, 2013)

PROPOSED POLICY CHANGE	SUBMISSION by	REF #	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	STAFF RESPONSE (Where no response is indicated, staff believe the proposed Regional Plan addresses this adequately or has previously been addressed.)	CDAC DIRECTION
4.1 Objectives	Rogers, N.		Table 4-1 lists Road Network Projects and identifies the status of each project as planned, programmed, or future potential. [...] I respectfully request that HRM expand the discussion in Chapter 4: Transportation in a meaningful manner so that all citizens can understand the rationale and importance behind each of the Road Network Projects.	Brief rationale will be added to the Plan. The connection between settlement patterns and network capacity requirements is more fully explained in the Road Network Functional Plan.	
	Spryfield Residents association		“Forecast the region’s need for mobility and provide service and infrastructure to meet this demand..... This opens the discussion of future needs for Arm bridge and impels municipality to plan to include a span across the NorthWest Arm in its long-range planning. Without such a span, significant development in Mainland South should be curtailed. Mainland South also needs active and transit connectors to other parts of the City. Again, plan to build trails near NorthWest Arm Drive along NSP right of way. Transit routes should connect Spryfield with Mainland North. Innovative forms of transportation should be explored to connect Mainland South to Peninsula South. Water taxies, cable cars, may address pedestrian crossings of Arm.		
4.2 Demand Management Strategies	Rogers, N.		In regards to RP+5 Chapter 4 on Transportation Section 4.2.5, why is the Bayers Road Widening Project still considered as “Planned”, without any substantial text detailing why it’s a necessary “planned” transportation option? There has been tons of information shared about the project and substantial public consultation as already occurred. Why is the Regional Plan void of this valuable information for context and work to date?		

	Creighton, M.		<p>4.2.2 Active Transport - Page 59 Policy T-4 (b) How will HRM require developers to build planned greenways?</p> <p>It is recommended that policy T-4 include more closely defined mechanisms whereby developers will be required to build planned greenways.</p>	The policy suggests the mechanisms that can be used.	
	Creighton, M.		<p>4.2.5 The Road Network Priorities Plan – Page 60 Table 4-1 Road Network Projects There is no mention of any of the recommendations contained in the Planning District 14/17 Transportation Study Report even as "Future Potential". Does this indicate that there are no plans to implement any of the recommendations in that report?</p> <p>It is recommended that recommendations contained in the Planning District 14/17 Transportation Study Report as they apply to road networks be included in Table 4-1.</p>	The Plan lists projects that create capacity within the regional network. It does not include intersection improvements or new connections from communities to the regional network. Those are done through community plans such as the one cited.	
	Turner, R.		<p>Dedicated bus lanes are essential to make transit on the peninsula reliable and worthwhile. My dream is to see Agricola reserved for buses and bikes. I think widening Bayers Road and building a third crossing are both wasteful and shortsighted ideas that try to fix the problem backwards. In my view, in order to decrease congestion from the outskirts we need to increase the number of people living in the core of the city (by making the core more attractive and affordable); concurrently, we need to get those people who live in the core of the city out of their cars.</p>		
	Caldwell, D.		<p>It seems unfair that as HRM continues to develop suburban areas, it is the urban areas that more and more take their traffic volumes. To do so, HRM continuously converts urban Local streets to Collector streets, as you are attempting to do here[Hawthorn Street]. I'm sure you would be concerned if they were doing this to your street.</p>		

	MacEachern, L.		I would like to offer my opinion regarding Bayers Road widening. I am fully in support of Bayers Road widening AND I am in support of active transportation infrastructure AND of better use of mass transit in this city. No one can question the growth of this city, particularly in the west end, from Fairview to Bedford and beyond. Bayers Road is the single most frustrating bottleneck and the only one that can be easily addressed. The volume of traffic has increased substantially and will increase, whether by car, bike or bus. I am not looking for a highway through the city. Simply a workable solution that provides sufficient lanes and space for cars, active transportation and mass transit. And until the transit system and culture shifts sufficiently in this city, cars will be, by far, the primary mode of travel using that artery. So, I ask you to not fight widening AND to fight for active transportation and transit. That street is the primary entrance to the peninsula and I envision a solution that is workable for all. Even better if it was a grand avenue with trees. As it relates to the transportation plan, I do no support another harbour crossing. I think the work done in widening, adding a bike lane and the transit strategy has worked well.		
	Connor, P.		Transit- Suggest showing transit hubs on the Urban service Boundary plan.	This will be evaluated in the Transit Priorities Plan.	
4.2.5 Road Network Priorities Plan Table 4-1	Mensink, N		I would oppose another harbour crossing that would encourage single occupant vehicles further. Perhaps through public transit (bus, train, ferry) would be more sustainable for everyone	The Plan states the third harbour bridge is beyond the 20 year horizon remaining for the regional plan.	
	Millward, H.		I am pleased to see that a 3rd Harbour Crossing is listed as having “future potential”. The Cross-Harbour Traffic Needs Assessment (Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission, 2008) strongly urged such a crossing, preferably with construction to start well prior to 2030. To quote from that study: “A new harbour crossing is not only inevitable, but desirable.[and] additional harbour capacity could be required as early as 2016 to accommodate planned growth as outlined in the HRM Regional Plan” (p.58). Clearly, based on this detailed expert study, it would be prudent and preferable to move the 3rd crossing into the “planned” category.	The 2008 study considered minimal mode switch. Demand will be monitored to confirm requirement.	
	Fillmore, P.		road capacity for bringing cars onto the peninsula should NOT be increased. Instead put parking lots around the periphery with rapid transit to get people from them to the core. This would also encourage car-pooling. Restrict certain lanes to rapid transit and cars with two (three) or more people. And let's get moving on bicycle infrastructure --the greenway in the south end has been stalled at both ends for several years!	This will be evaluated in the Transit Priorities Plan.	

	Spryfield Residents Association		(Pg.62) T-13 We recommend the establishment of a Transportation Reserve Zone for a future North West Arm Bridge for reasons mentioned already. This should be included in Map 7. If it is appropriate to include a 3rd harbour crossing to service anticipated development, then it is equally appropriate to include a North West Arm crossing to service the development that is occurring in Mainland South which has few access points.		
4.3 Street Design	Creighton, M.		<p>Page 62 Policy T-15 Does this mean that a traffic impact study will be required? Can this policy include any development that may impact on traffic patterns?</p> <p>It is recommended that Policy T-15 be amended to include the requirement for a traffic impact study on any development that may impact on traffic patterns.</p>	HRM Traffic Services have guidelines for when traffic impact statements are required.	

<p>Map 8 Road Classification Hierarchy</p>	<p>Caldwell, D.</p>		<p>I and many of my neighbours are concerned to find out that the new proposed Regional Plan designates Hawthorne Street as a Collector Street. We note that this is a change from the 2006 plan. I strongly object to this new designation and request that it is removed from the plan. As a community we have been trying to implement traffic calming measures for some time and I feel that this new designation will severely restrict any change that may be considered. Also, recently, Trucks have also been using our street as a cut through and the Collector designation changes truck use from 'large vehicles restricted' to 'some truck limitations'. This is clearly not acceptable on a street with many young children, an elementary school and several group homes. Additionally, over the years street widening has resulted in many homes being directly on the sidewalks, the children play close to the street creating an additional safety concern, exacerbated if the street is deemed Collector.</p>	<p>Map 8 shows street classifications consistent throughout the region and reflective of current practice. The classification is based on observation of how the street is connected into, and functions within, the regional transportation network. Hawthorne Street is the only street in the area to directly connect an arterial roadway (Prince Albert Road) to two other collector roadways (Portland, major collector and Crichton, minor collector) and therefore functions as collector street. Street classifications are used to set priorities for operations such as maintenance and snow clearing as well as setting priorities for street rehabilitation projects.</p>	
--	---------------------	--	--	--	--

	Orr, B.		<p>I am concerned to find out that the new proposed Regional Plan designates Hawthorne Street as a Collector Street. I live close-by, on Thompson St., and I have a number of friends with young children on Hawthorne St. This is obviously a residential street, and shouldn't be allowed to become a "cut-through". I strongly object to this new designation and request that it is removed from the plan. As a community we have been trying to implement traffic calming measures for some time and I feel that this new designation will severely restrict any change that may be considered. Recently Trucks have also been using our street as a cut through and the Collector designation changes truck use from 'large vehicles restricted' to 'some truck limitations'. This is clearly not acceptable on a street with many young children, an elementary school and several group homes.</p>	<p>Application of the Neighbourhood Short-cutting policy also relies on classification to determine where traffic is collected from a neighbourhood and where accessibility for emergency response vehicles is needed.</p> <p>That policy allows for the consideration of physical traffic calming measures on local and some minor collector roads based on specific traffic volume thresholds, whether alternate area roads can provide the same service function, transit and emergency response requirements. All of these factors are considered when assessing a particular street for physical traffic calming measures, regardless of the classification.</p> <p>Whether Hawthorne Street is designated as a collector street or a local street in Map 8, it is designated as an emergency response route and so physical traffic calming measures <u>would not be considered</u>.</p> <p>Regulation of truck traffic is done through the Truck Route Bylaw. Hawthorne Street is not a truck route and that can be <u>changed only with an</u></p>	
6	Draft July 9, 2013			<p>amendment to the Bylaw which includes a public process.</p>	

	Browne, H.		<p>I and many of my neighbours are concerned to find out that the new proposed Regional Plan designates Hawthorne Street as a Collector Street. We note that this is a change from the 2006 plan. I strongly object to this new designation and request that it is removed from the plan. As a community we have been trying to implement traffic calming measures for some time and I feel that this new designation will severely restrict any changes that may be considered. Recently Trucks have also been using our street as a cut through and the Collector designation changes truck use from 'large vehicles restricted' to 'some truck limitations'. This is clearly not acceptable on a street with many young children, an elementary school and several group homes. Thank you in advance for your support on this matter. I would appreciate any updates that you may have through the regional plan consultation process.</p>		
	Armstrong, R.		<p>I am writing to express my concern of the change in designation of Hawthorne Street to a collector street. I do not live on the street but I do live in the neighbourhood and I see no reason to change its designation. There alternate routes namely Pleasant and Portland Streets that one can use as collectors. Further, there would be significant safety concerns with increased traffic and speed of traffic on Hawthorne. The street passes by Hawthorne School and park with many children nearby. The location of the school, which is close to street provides little buffer between the street and the front of the building--this is a very busy spot during the school drop off and pick up times. We who live the downtown neighborhoods of Old Dartmouth--value our communities as a wonderful place to live and raise our families--Hawthorne Street is a very important part of this community and it is much more than a collector route. Again I strongly urge that it remain a street for local use and support traffic calming measures be take to futher slow traffic along the street.</p>		
	Mussett, L.		<p>It has been brought to my attention that a new designation for Hawthorne Street is in the works. I must strongly oppose the designation change from "local" to "collector". This is a street full of young children (with more on the way!), an elementary school, families, dogs, cats and walkers going to and fro from the beautiful lakes, trails and parks in this neighborhood. Indeed, this is what attracts people to our area. I have been a resident on this street for 25 years and we constantly battle the issue of high speed traffic in order to protect our residents. Please do not, I repeat, DO NOT make this designation change for Hawthorne Street. There is already a serious issue of traffic running red lights at the corner of Hawthorne and Prince Albert. This is a heavily used intersection by both pedestrians of all ages as well as cars. It is a dangerous as is. We do not need to make it worse.</p>		

General	Miller, K.		I would suggest that HRM establish requirements for electric transport infrastructure as part of the official plan. Fully electric cars already ply the streets of Halifax, and they are a reasonably common sight in other Canadian cities like Toronto. As fuel costs increase, climate change worsens, technology improves, and renewable sources for electricity become more widespread, there will be more and more electric cars on our roads. It is virtually inevitable.	This is a consideration in the upcoming revision to the Community Energy Plan.	
	Larry, T.		There have been decades of academic study and hand wringing about how to revitalize lovely old Halifax. Sadly the heritage core of the city is dying-the veritable heart of the city has been atrophying from congestive heart failure certainly for the last 40 years. There comes a time when some transformative act sets in motion a process which leads to incremental change. My belief is that the restriction or closing of Barrington Street is just such an act. Once this is done many issues also will be addressed as more of the downtown core calls for ‘pedestrianization.’ Truck access to the port through the southend rail cut needs to be addressed-despite the powerful uproar that the ‘well connected’ will raise-That rail line has supported filthy diesel emissions for decades and there has been no problem accommodating the most discriminating and valuable real estate in Eastern Canada. The resolution of the ‘interchange from hell’ is also part of the problems seeking solution. I suggest it will proceed well if the preservation of the ‘heritage core’ of the city is converted to a pedestrian space. This is the heart of the issue. If there is no pulse, no desire at the heart-there is no organizing principle. Everything is ad hoc and the result is a predictable mess. My suggestion is that council should pass a motion that ‘Barrington street will have vehicular traffic terminated or greatly diminished within 12 months.’ Then get it done.	Barrington Street is a key transit corridor and relocating buses to another downtown street is undesirable for many reasons. Limiting the street to just buses and pedestrians has been actively consider and evaluated in concert with downtown businesses. The concern of businesses about a reduction in access to their property is an important consideration and the key reason for implementation not occurring. The use of the rail cut for trucks was studied extensively. While impact on adjacent areas is a concern, the key reason for not proceeding is that the cost to construct is ten times the value of any transport benefit that would be gained.	

	P. Cooley	<p>Almost all that I have heard and read from citizens and experts after countless meetings, engagement processes, research projects, reports, paper submissions, ideas, data, surveys, experts, and passionate dialogue from citizens from all aspects is to ask the staff and Council to create a city that reduces the dependency on single occupancy owned vehicles. However, the transportation section insists on continuing on the same path it has over the last 20 (maybe more) years and that is to build and plan the HRM for the car owner and suburb developers. The section keeps everything separate, confusing and contradictory. It has no vision and it lacks any real evaluation of progress. This approach of staff, that is to ignore the endless effort on behalf of it tireless citizens, is not only outdated and archaic, it is costly and arrogant. It seems to me it comes down to two arguments that I would like to ask the people who have written the transportation section. {...}. Either way, it denies all of us who have been diligently following this process with good faith that we will be listened to. [...] I still uphold the "HRM on the Move" document first submitted in November of 2012.</p>	<p>The Plan strives to direct more mobility demand to modes other than vehicle.</p>	
	Heritage Gas	<p>Heritage gas is very interested in working with HRM and third party equipment providers to realize this opportunity [to reduce operational costs, contract costs, and improve air quality with the conversion of fleets and procurement of new vehicles to utilize natural gas for vehicles].</p>	<p>Exploration of such opportunities is underway.</p>	
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS FROM JUNE 13 FALL RIVER OPENHOUSE</p>				
Public Transit		<p>Agree but...express drops & pickups on Hwy#2; create bus stops in the area of Tim's/Sobeys so that people are not left to walk from the 118 Perrin Drive & ride area. Will it take a robbery or an attack on a person to change this policy?</p>		
		<p>I am concerned that we may lose the 320 bus; perhaps it should be promoted more in this area; more incentive/ability to use it Suggest incorporating a 320 bus stop at Sobey's in Fall River; it's easier to see it/notice and may entice more people to use it Inbound Windmill Rd – 7-9am reversing lane Akerley to new lights/intersection/new development/cars/trucks move over leaving inside lane right turn only and bus lane – NO LEFT TURNS</p>		
Regional Road Works		<p>New lights/intersection to McDonalds build right turn lane only & sidewalk to Wright Ave</p>		