

## Community Workshop 1 - July 17, 2010

### 1. Issues – A Community Perspective

What are the key factors / contextual issues that the Project Team should be aware of when generating and evaluating alternatives? *(In alphabetical order)*

- 8 lanes of connectivity through corridor
- Air quality
- Broad corridor planning
- Buffering of vegetation
- Carpooling lots
- Consider tolling/congestion pricing
- Costs for each alternative
- Cultural heritage effects on the bridge and community
- Cycling connectivity in the broader context; tying in with transit nodes
- Define and design to capacity; distinguish between local and through needs
- Do nothing options should be explored more
- Don't consider HOV lanes
- East-west connectivity
- Environmental impact on river valley
- Goods movement; percentage of capacity on bridge that is goods flowing through
- Increasing GO parking
- Lakeshore impacts and other corridors and neighbourhoods
- Long-term plan for expropriation; comprehensive plan for expropriation and encroachment
- Noise
- Potential restrictions on truck traffic in local community
- Pedestrian crossings
- Realignment of the road; making use of the hydro corridor
- Relaxing standards for lane widths, shoulders, geometry, etc.
- Respect Mississauga Road as a heritage road
- Which alternative will minimize expropriation/property impacts?

## 2(a). Mainline / Bridge Alternatives – North Twinning

### Alternative #1 North Twinning

#### Positives

(What do you like about this alternative — what are its strengths, advantages...what’s good about it...what makes a lot of sense or resonates most strongly, etc.?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Enhanced interchange on the west side of Mississauga Rd
- Less cultural impact (aesthetics)
- Less disruption to traffic
- Less impact on marshlands to the south
- Less impact on residents
- Opportunity to straighten the curve
- Utilizes the hydro corridor

#### Enhancements

(How can the ‘positives’ be made even better — how can the alternative be improved, refined and made stronger?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Design alternative to minimize impacts at corner of Keddleston and Knareswood *(common to all options)*
- Improve landscaping/public access on south side
- North service road connection
- Realign and adjust curve
- Relaxed design standard around Atoka Drive
- Sound barriers of the highest quality – also consider ‘full cover’ *(common to all options)*
- Pedestrian and cycling access *(common to all options)*
- Provide cycling below the bridge deck *(common to all options)*

#### Objections

(What do you dislike about the alternative — what are the weaknesses/disadvantages, things that work less well, things that don’t make sense to you or that are potentially problematic, etc.?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Broadens the scar on the landscape (larger footprint) *(common to all options)*
- Encourages auto/goods movement *(common to all options)*
- Impact on hydrology of the river
- Property impacts (to the north)
- Property values and broader community impacts *(common to all options)*
- Structure is larger *(common to all options)*
- With tunneling (i.e. covering the bridge or noise walls), would lose the view (aesthetics) *(common to all options)*

#### Remedies

(How can your concerns or objections be addressed — how can perceived weaknesses/disadvantages or flaws be mitigated, reduced or eliminated?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Augment community infrastructure (roads, transit, etc.) *(common to all options)*
- Double decking the bridge *(common to all options)*

- Enhancing design and construction quality standards (lighting, design of barriers, etc.); reflective of community (*common to all options*)
- Maximize transportation choices/options (*common to all options*)
- Minimize construction effects on community; consider compensation fund for community (*common to all options*)
- Put it in a tunnel (with a green roof) ) (*common to all options*)
- Relax MTO standards (*common to all options*)
- Rehab the bridge, but don't expand the number of lanes (*common to all options*)
- Sound barriers of the highest quality; with windows to maintain views (*common to all options*)
- Tolling to the west; use money for construction (*common to all options*)

**What Else?**

(What, if any, other comments, suggestions, ideas, feedback would you like to share?) (*In alphabetical order*)

- No tolls

## 2(b). Mainline / Bridge Alternatives - Widening

### Alternative #2 Widening

#### Positives

(What do you like about this alternative — what are its strengths, advantages...what's good about it...what makes a lot of sense or resonates most strongly, etc.?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Enhances the interchange on the west side of Mississauga Rd
- Least cultural heritage impact
- Less structural impact on bridge
- Shares property impacts

#### Enhancements

(How can the 'positives' be made even better — how can the alternative be improved, refined and made stronger?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Accommodate a longer ramp without affecting the interchange
- Cover the bridge (tunnel)
- Provide cycling below the bridge deck *(common to all options)*
- Design alternative to minimize impacts at corner of Keddleston and Knareswood *(common to all options)*
- Flexibility with Right of Way and setback standards
- Non-symmetrical widening
- Sound barriers of the highest quality – also consider 'full cover' *(common to all options)*
- Pedestrian and cycling access *(common to all options)*
- Widen the bridge and use an alternate strategy for the roads

#### Objections

(What do you dislike about the alternative — what are the weaknesses/disadvantages, things that work less well, things that don't make sense to you or that are potentially problematic, etc.?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Broadens the scar on the landscape (larger footprint) *(common to all options)*
- Encourages auto/goods movement *(common to all options)*
- Lose natural areas on north and south
- More disruption to traffic flow during construction
- Property value and broader community impacts *(common to all options)*
- Sharing of the impacts to the north and south
- Structure is larger *(common to all options)*
- With tunneling (i.e. covering the bridge or noise walls), would lose the view (aesthetics) *(common to all options)*

#### Remedies

(How can your concerns or objections be addressed — how can perceived weaknesses/disadvantages or flaws be mitigated, reduced or eliminated?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Augment community infrastructure (roads, transit, etc.) *(common to all options)*
- Double decking the bridge *(common to all options)*
- Enhancing design and construction quality standards (lighting, design of barriers, etc.); reflective of

community (*common to all options*)

- Maximize transportation choices/options (*common to all options*)
- Minimize construction effects on community; consider compensation fund for community (*common to all options*)
- Preserve the heritage look and feel of the bridge, only if it makes sense
- Put it in a tunnel (with a green roof) ) (*common to all options*)
- Relax MTO standards (*common to all options*)
- Rehab the bridge but don't expand the number of lanes (*common to all options*)
- Sound barriers of the highest quality; with windows to maintain views (*common to all options*)
- Tolling to the west; use money for construction (*common to all options*)

### **What Else?**

(What, if any, other comments, suggestions, ideas, feedback would you like to share?) (*In alphabetical order*)

- Consider costs and pricing

## 2(c). Mainline / Bridge Alternatives – South Twinning

### Alternative #3 South Twinning

#### Positives

(What do you like about this alternative — what are its strengths, advantages...what's good about it...what makes a lot of sense or resonates most strongly, etc.?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Enhanced interchange on the west side of Mississauga Rd
- Engineering advantages (more perpendicular span)
- Displaces people who are living near a highway (creates a buffer that should have been there)
- Less effect on the river

#### Enhancements

(How can the 'positives' be made even better — how can the alternative be improved, refined and made stronger?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Design alternative to minimize impacts at corner of Keddleston and Knareswood *(common to all options)*
- Sound barriers of the highest quality – also consider 'full cover' *(common to all options)*
- Pedestrian and cycling access *(common to all options)*
- Provide cycling below the bridge deck *(common to all options)*

#### Objections

(What do you dislike about the alternative — what are the weaknesses/disadvantages, things that work less well, things that don't make sense to you or that are potentially problematic, etc.?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Aesthetic effects
- Broadens the scar on the landscape (larger footprint) *(common to all options)*
- Consumes and sterilizes more land
- Disruption and less flexibility for interchange design
- Encourages auto/goods movement *(common to all options)*
- Greater disruption to use of river
- Heritage impacts to the community
- Higher community effects
- Impacts to wetlands south of the existing bridge
- Property impacts indirect and direct (to the south)
- Property value and broader community impacts *(common to all options)*
- Structure is larger *(common to all options)*
- With tunneling (i.e. covering the bridge or noise walls), would lose the view (aesthetics) *(common to all options)*

#### Remedies

(How can your concerns or objections be addressed — how can perceived weaknesses/disadvantages or flaws be mitigated, reduced or eliminated?) *(In alphabetical order)*

- Augment community infrastructure (roads, transit, etc.) *(common to all options)*
- Consider changing alignment to the west, push it north
- Double decking the bridge *(common to all options)*

- Enhancing design and construction quality standards (lighting, design of barriers, etc.); reflective of community (*common to all options*)
- Maximize transportation choices/options (*common to all options*)
- Minimize construction effects on community; consider compensation fund for community (*common to all options*)
- Put it in a tunnel (with a green roof) ) (*common to all options*)
- Relax MTO standards (*common to all options*)
- Rehab the bridge, but don't expand the number of lanes (*common to all options*)
- Sound barriers of the highest quality; with windows to maintain views (*common to all options*)
- Tolling to the west; use money for construction (*common to all options*)

**What Else?**

(What, if any, other comments, suggestions, ideas, feedback would you like to share?) (*In alphabetical order*)

- Enhances the curve

### **3. Interchange Alternatives**

**Interchange Alternatives.** *(Comments shown in alphabetical order)*

#### **ALTERNATIVE 1 (Partial Parclo)**

**Advantages:**

- *(None mentioned)*

**Disadvantages:**

- Knareswood property impacts *(common to all options)*
- Turnaround not sympathetic to the community and environment
- Very busy during rush hour
- West of Mississauga Rd traffic flow not preferred

#### **ALTERNATIVE 2 (Roundabout)**

**Advantages:**

- *(None mentioned)*

**Disadvantages:**

- Roundabout design
- Knareswood property impacts *(common to all options)*

#### **ALTERNATIVE 3 (Operation Improvements)**

**Advantages:**

- *(None mentioned)*

**Disadvantages:**

- Knareswood property impacts *(common to all options)*