

**From:** Herman Turkstra

**Sent:** May-12-17 1:27 PM

**To:** John, Edward

**Cc:** KevenSails Piper; Stephen Park; Bryan Ritskes; Dave Stephens; Mary Catharine Lawlor; Hank Nyhof; Peter Chernets; Murray, Chris; Farr, Jason; Thorne, Jason; Robichaud, Steve; Phillips, Chris; Rozema, Diedre

**Subject:** Pier 8 - Traffic Questions

Edward , at your invitation I can supply you with the following background information relating to the "first reading" concerns HWN has with your report to Council on Pier 8. While the 212 pages of your report need a lot more study, here is what we can report at this time.

First and foremost, I hope you understand that the HWN concerns are directed primarily to the issues of traffic and parking impacts on the adjacent residential neighbourhood. The North End neighbourhood associations have never been opposed to well designed and implemented intensification that does not harm the quality of live for the existing families. While we know that many people in the neighbourhood would prefer Pier 8 to become a park, as a former Mayor used to say, we understand "that ship has sailed."

We start with the fact that there are virtually no children living on Main Street between Dundurn and Kenilworth. There is a reason for that. We have learned that the nature of the traffic in front of a dwelling always impacts what happens inside the nearby dwellings. Parents do not choose to live where their children are at risk. It is this focus that separates HWN from the traffic and parking staff and consultants. They look at how traffic flows. We look at how traffic impacts lives.

Perhaps the best introduction to that topic is Donald Appleyard's work. A quick introduction can be found [here](#).

We have experience in what traffic does to your life. It ranges from the people who pull into my driveway for special events on the waterfront and get aggressive when I point out that it is private property to a father of three children on John Street having to deal with an overwhelming number of vehicles a few weeks ago for a harbour event that made John Street completely unsafe to a parent calling us to see what can be done with a flotilla of construction vehicles on a residential street adjacent to Pier 8 to a senior system feeling unsafe to cross at an intersection.

It is, with all due respect, relatively easy to take a piece of land like Pier 8 and subdivide it and build a zoning by-law and development controls. That, from our perspective, is standard greenfield stuff that your department does all the time. What is much more challenging when developing in an existing neighbourhood is to assess impacts.

The impacts are our concern.

This was the framework for our work on Setting Sail and the NETMP. The North End has been seen for decades by City Hall and much of the broader community as a corridor from the gore to the shore. We see it as a place where people live, and more importantly, a major civic asset. We believe that family neighbourhoods in the inner city are a serious positive for a city.

We start with asking the question, "How does the plan work for an 8 year old living next to the development".

We have found that answering that question deals with a whole range of impacts. Think about that 8 year old and you resolve most of the concerns of seniors and disabled and cyclists and pedestrians.

In that context there are four streets of serious and permanent concern: Ferguson, John, McNab and Bay. Mary Street has been largely protected by the closing of the Mary Street bridge, a development that has produced conspicuous beneficial changes in the character of that street. That is also true to a large extent for Hughson with the closure at Guise.

Ferguson, John, McNab and Bay remain at serious risk. The four existing bridges on these streets are clearly designed to funnel through traffic through the neighbourhood to the waterfront. We have more bridges per mile of CN rail than any southern Ontario community. They are a key to our perception of the threat.

So we will tend to look at your report and try and understand how your recommendations will impact an 8 year old on those four streets and what the parents of that child will think.

Doing that without the help of an independent third party planner advising the neighbourhood presents almost insurmountable challenges. This of course helps the developer.

We tie this in with the requirement of Setting Sail that the Pier 8 development must enhance the adjacent neighbourhood. We know of no demand in the adjacent neighbourhood for increased access to the waterfront. It works fine right now. We know of no demand in the adjacent neighbourhood for increased commercial except to replace the loss of the bank that recently closed. We know of no demand in the adjacent neighbourhood for significant changes in the current waterfront park system. All the features you have identified as enhancing our lives do not seem to be based on any "needs" analysis.

The "need" that has been consistently and constantly expressed by residents since we started work on Setting Sail in 2002 is the need to protect the residential streets from through traffic and from intrusive parking.

We do not see that your recommendations do anything to enhance that protection. In fact there is a suggestion in your recommendation of a traffic signal at Ferguson. That plus the lack of your report identifying the parts of the NETMP not yet completed that raises very strong concerns that your recommendations will detract from the existing living standards of the adjacent neighbourhood.

You asked me to provide you with the details of our concerns regarding implementation of the NETMP. You can find the [the approved NETMP physical changes here.](#)

We believe it was important to recall that it was on the basis of council approval of this plan that the neighbourhood association withdrew its appeal of Setting Sail. Setting Sail had originally been appealed primarily on traffic and parking issues. The NETMP was a settlement of that dispute, approved by Council, and as stated in Setting Sail must be implemented before any development on Pier 8. There is no confusion as to the terms of the NETMP. It was approved by the OMB.

Here is what is incomplete today:

1. The roundabout at James and Strachan was agreed to with the City and IBI as a key component of the NETMP. It was to signal to drivers that they were entering a different traffic culture, one that respected pedestrians, cyclists, disabled persons, in other words drive respecting a full mixture of street uses.
2. The road narrowing at John and Guise has disappeared from sight. This was the City's proposal to overcome at the OMB the residents objections to John Street being carried on to Pier 8. To enforce the concept that dock service road should be a primary access route to the Piers, John Street should have been closed at Guise. The City refused this request. That meant that John between Guise and Burlington is particularly vulnerable. If the John Street bridge is re-built, the street will clearly become a main access route to the waterfront. John Street, as you know, has two schools, a rec centre, a health centre and a playground for children. Through traffic should not be anywhere near it.
3. The roadway structures that have radically changed traffic on Bay between Burlington and Strachan are temporary and given that the NETMP was implemented by a Master Plan, could disappear as soon as the 5 year pilot program is over. Their permanence should be assured.

4. The construction of an intersection improvement at Guise and Bay has been ignored. It is one of the most dangerous intersections in Hamilton because of its angles and proximity to the Guise Street hill.
5. The Ferguson Avenue road closure has not been built. We recognize that some residents of Ferguson Avenue responded negatively to this because it could impede their drive home from work. However, there has been no public process to examine changing that from a partial closure to a traffic signal as recommended in your report.
6. The same considerations apply to the other partial road closures which have been altered or eliminated without a public process.
7. A number of crossing enhancements have not been completed.

This should all be put in the context that, as Brenda Khes testified under oath on behalf of the City at the NETMP OMB hearing, our traffic work was based on an understanding that there would be 750 residential units on Pier 8.

It should also be put in the context that our understanding of Setting Sail is that the size and character of the commercial and retail would be, as Setting Sail clearly states, primarily to satisfy local needs. That was relatively easy to understand. It meant a place to buy boating supplies, probably a convenience store for the new residents, perhaps a doctor (although the available space in the Port Authority building would seem to be able to accommodate that) and similar retail commercial that would serve the neighbourhood north of the CN.

How your proposed zoning compares to the local commercial in By-Law 05-200 is something we have not tried to work through because of lack of time. But 13000 square meters of commercial retail would seem to be the equivalent of Locke Street between Herkmer and Bold. That is not local.

The reason for these concerns is that the permitted areas for commercial and retail will have a direct impact on the North End streets. The space recommended in your report combined with the space in Piers 6 and 7 seems to equate to what was previously called a district shopping centre. Placing such a facility at the end of a series of streets that dead-end at the water would likely produce a significant traffic impact if it were successful. Customer arriving in vehicles for that commercial/retail have no choice but to drive through the North End neighbourhood. The residential streets need protection from that traffic.

I hope you will understand that because of the City's consistent refusal to provide the neighbourhood with an independent planning resource, our analysis may not touch on all the potential negative impacts from your report on Pier 8.

In the simplest terms, our concern is that you have not recommended strong provisions that would insulate the existing residential streets from becoming increasingly corridors to the waterfront.

That would not be a problem if the City clearly stated that having families with children attracted to live in an inner city neighbourhood was no longer feasible.

But that is not what the Council has said. We had hoped we would see in your report how the planning for Pier 8 implements the city mission to be the best place to raise a child. We have difficulty finding the 8 year old in the report.

I hope this is helpful.

Herman.

Herman Turkstra  
Harbour West Neighbours Inc.  
Supporting Hamilton's Child and Family Friendly North End Neighbourhood