

Port Credit Local Advisory Panel

Minutes of Fourth Meeting

Tuesday, November 17, 2009 @ 7.00 p.m.

Port Credit Library, Texaco Room

Attendees: Twelve (12) members of the Panel were present. Two (2) Policy Planning Staff attended in support of the Panel. There were four (4) guests.

Local Politicians: Councillor Carmen Corbasson; *Regrets:* MPP Charles Sousa

Community Groups: Chris Mackie, Brian Holtham, Leonard Walsh, Don McVie, Boran Hrelja, Deb Greenfield, Dorothy Tomiuk

Business: Marion Morewood, Robert Cutmore, Frank Giannone; Jonathan James

Policy Planning Staff: Susan Tanabe, Paul Stewart

Guest Staff: **Steve Barrett**, Manager, Transportation Asset Mgt, City of Mississauga
Anne Farrell, Planner, Community Services, City of Mississauga
Mel Kayama, Transportation Planning Analyst, City of Mississauga

Guest: **Stephen Keen**, Consultant, HDR|iTRANS Consulting

1. Overview and Introductions

Councillor Carmen Corbasson introduced the guests, and substitute panelists in attendance. Staff then indicated that the Panel would be presented with the preliminary results from the Lakeshore Corridor Study in progress. The Study encompasses Lakeshore Road from Port Credit to Lakeview District. It was noted that the Clarkson section of Lakeshore Road was already dealt with by the City's Transportation and Works Dept. as part of the Clarkson Village Study. Panelists were invited to ask questions during the presentation.

Staff provided further background by referring to the Directions Report for Lakeview and Port Credit, citing sections pertaining to need for a balance of transportation modes for pedestrians, cyclists, transit and motor vehicles on Lakeshore Road in order to maintain the mainstreet vibrancy and help to realize Port Credit's vision of "Evolving the Urban Village".

Note from Secretary & Staff: The Directions Report is located at the following link:
http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/lakeviewportcreditreview?paf_gear_id=9700018&itemId=104802865n

With reference to the presentation by Metrolinx of "The Big Move" at the previous month's Panel meeting (see PCLAP Minutes for October 20, 2009), staff affirmed that

Lakeshore Road east of Port Credit is a designated regional rapid transit route, along with the Highway 10 (Hurontario Street) and Dundas Street Corridors. It was noted that as of yet there are no funding commitments to implement rapid transit in any of these corridors.

Councillor Corbasson stated that in her opinion it was unlikely that there would be any higher-order transit on Lakeshore Road within the next 10 years.

2. Background; Terms of Reference for Lakeshore Road Transportation Review

The Panel was shown a table of the highest-ranked transit routes in the City by ridership. The highest was Highway 10, followed by Burnhamthorpe Road and several other routes, with Lakeshore Road last, in 15th place.

It was noted that there are presently other studies being conducted concerning this same issue of rapid transit routes, including the Hurontario Main Street Corridor Study and the Port Credit Mobility Hub Study, per presentations at the previous month's Panel meeting (*see* PCLAP Minutes for October 20, 2009). In addition, there is a Lakeshore Road Urban Design Review, as well as the Port Credit District Policies Review in progress.

Staff have been participating in the Transportation Review Study from different departments to ensure all perspectives are considered.

Consultant **Stephen Keen** then began his presentation by reviewing the Terms of Reference for the Lakeshore Corridor Study. The Goals are (1) to determine how to accommodate all modes of transportation along the Corridor, and (2) provide input and background for the preparation of the Official (Secondary) Plans i.e. District Policies for Port Credit and Lakeview.

The Objectives of the Corridor Study include development of a long-term transportation strategy for the Corridor and responding to stakeholder suggestions identified in the Directions Report.

The Scope of the work entails the review of a number of issues including: a traffic analysis, on-road cycling, right-of-way restrictions, safety, narrowing of lane widths, provision of a continuous centre left-turn lane (going east from Seneca Ave.), elimination of on-street parking and provision of pedestrian facilities. The Work Program includes data analysis, evaluation and concept design drawings.

To accomplish this, the Main Steps are:

1. Division of the Corridor into critical segments in order to identify the constraints and opportunities of each. This segmentation is based on measurements of the right-of-way, which in turn determine the range of options available. Especially critical are the segments with narrow right-of-ways. This is where the Study sits at this moment.

2. Address the segments with wider right-of-ways for evaluation and development of a plan and drawings.

In order to match the Metrolinx transit plan, the Lakeshore Corridor Study is broadly divided into two portions: East of Highway 10 (where rapid transit has been identified) and West of Highway 10. In addition the Study also recognizes that the Corridor is located within both the 'Lakeview' and 'Port Credit' planning districts.

3. Review Existing Conditions

Going further into the data analysis, Stephen Keen reviewed existing conditions on the Corridor, beginning with trip origins. Of drivers, 77% of those crossing Mississauga Road going East originate from within Mississauga. For these commuters, there is no choice – it is either Lakeshore Road or the Q.E.W., neither of which are particularly good options during rush hour. A further 19% of the drivers come from Oakville, and the rest are from Halton Region.

In terms of trip destinations, 50% are heading somewhere else in Mississauga, 23% are heading to Etobicoke and 12% are driving to downtown Toronto, with the remainder going elsewhere in the Greater Toronto Area. The City's modeling projects little growth in traffic along Lakeshore Road over the next 20 years. There will be a small peak in the morning rush hour due to job growth in SW Mississauga. Otherwise, any growth will come from localized development. The 50% figure for destinations within Mississauga will increase, and travel to Etobicoke and Toronto will go down slightly.

The concept of average annual daily traffic counts was then presented over the last 10 years. Volumes have held steady, going from approximately 30,000 in 1999 to 32,000 in 2009. This is pretty much the same story everywhere along the Port Credit portion of the Corridor, with little growth projected over the next 20 years, and the road already saturated.

A panelist asked at what percent capacity Lakeshore Road is operating in rush hour?

Staff replied that it operates at 100% during key times. West of the Credit River it is bad. East of Highway 10 it gets better. The bridge over the Credit River is a bottleneck, especially since the GO Station and Highway 10 are significant driving destinations for the morning traffic. In the afternoon it is the reverse, though not as concentrated as in the morning. There are no alternatives south of the QEW, and the QEW can cause problems for Lakeshore Road when highway traffic backs up and the overflow comes down to the Lakeshore.

The consultant continued by reviewing the locations of highest collision rates, which are at the Highway 10, Stavebank Road and Mississauga Road intersections. He stated that it is hard to cross the Credit River in other spots and there is local resistance to adding additional motor vehicle crossings through neighbourhoods (e.g. Mineola), so the existing intersections are high-volume and prone to accidents.

A panelist pointed out that drivers will seek alternatives when the commuting time becomes too long. Active transportation needs to be supported. Staff indicated that realignment of the Lakeshore–Stavebank Intersection would help reduce the collision rate at this intersection.

The consultant then reviewed the right-of-way constraints and the options possible to balance use of the road. Shawmarr to Broadview is 39M, Broadview to Highway 10 is 26.2M (for 2 km), and Highway 10 to Seneca is 26.8M (for 2 km). While there is potential to make improvements in the multi-modal use of the Corridor, one has to look at the constraints and plan for the most restricted sections and then expand out to the other sections. The constricted conditions in Port Credit will dictate the options.

Staff stated that it is also the length of the section that is important to consider: 2-3 km is a long section to try and implement creative solutions (e.g. it would be difficult to run a streetcar on a single track through this area without causing backups elsewhere on the route as streetcars wait to take turns going through the area).

In the analysis, the division of Lakeshore Road east and west of Highway 10 shows an LRT could run to the east of Highway 10, since west of Highway 10 is most constrained. The LRT needs a width of 7.2M within the road allowance. As well, Metrolinx documents indicate that the LRT would stop at Hurontario and connect to the Port Credit Go Station.

The consultant indicated that in the ideal scenario, the right-of-way would be 41M, with 2 traffic lanes each way, plus 2 bike lanes (either side), 2 LRT lanes and parking on both sides. This is not possible west of Highway 10, given the narrow road allowance.

4. Transportation options / Cross Section Analysis

East of Highway 10 to Seneca, there are 4 possible scenarios and sub-options: status quo, buses in mixed traffic, dedicated LRT and operational variances (e.g. LRT in mixed traffic). In these scenarios, it is possible to look at bike lanes.

The consultant then presented an Evaluation Matrix with codes for all the sub-options. After this analysis, only the physically feasible options remained. Some permutations include:

- One traffic lane (each direction) only: separate LRT and bike lanes will fit, but there is no room for parking spaces
- LRT with mixed traffic (i.e. LRT and traffic share a lane) is another option that allows bike lanes, but there is no room for parking spaces
- Buses in mixed traffic, with a wide curb lane to accommodate bicycles, with bay parking for vehicles

It was also noted that pedestrians can suffer if the sidewalk is too narrow.

In summary, the consultant presented the draft Interim Option which is considered doable at this stage of the Study. It was stressed that this is only a “Preliminary Draft Finding”. The Interim Option includes: mixed traffic, a wide curb lane that is more bike-friendly, sufficient sidewalk for pedestrians, streetscaping the same as now, parking the same as now (2.7M wide) and the 4M curb lane to be marked with “sharrows” to indicate “Share the Road”.

The consultant stated that in some cases, narrowing the road down to one lane each way would result in a reduction of traffic, but that is not expected in this case as there are no alternative routes to Lakeshore Road in order to get across the River. The Study will not consider this option. The consultant cited the traffic congestion in Clarkson, which was not reduced when the lanes went from 4 to 2 during the extensive infrastructure work over the past year.

Jane Street north of Bloor Street in Toronto is similar to Lakeshore Road in Port Credit, and the solution is mixed traffic, according to the consultant.

East of Highway 10, in the long-term, possible options include dedicated LRT lanes (with one lane for vehicular traffic in either direction, plus bike lanes, larger sidewalk, but no street parking) and LRT in mixed traffic (which would have two lanes for vehicular traffic in either direction, plus bike lanes, larger sidewalks, but no parking).

West of Highway 10, the options are status quo, mixed traffic or dedicated BRT (bus lanes), with various sub-options. It would be feasible to have no dedicated bus lanes, but rather buses in mixed traffic with bike lanes (but no parking) – this is a long-term view that would require a parking solution for Port Credit.

The Real Option in the short-term is similar to what is proposed East of Highway 10: parking, 2 lanes of traffic each way, sidewalks and shared bike (curb) lanes.

It was stressed by the consultant that the only way to rebalance Lakeshore Road is to provide a wide enough curb lane for cyclists, keep the parking and wide sidewalks and 2 lanes of traffic each way. Rapid transit is years away and in the longer term there will need to be a parking solution. In the intermediate term, rapid buses in mixed traffic will work.

5. Additional Panel Comments / Summary / Next Steps

A panelist asked if the LRT line could not fit along the CNR dedicated right-of-way instead of being positioned on Lakeshore Road?

Staff replied that there is likely not enough room and getting the railway companies to cooperate would be a significant challenge. Electrification of the CNR line will have to happen first.

The panelist rejoined that would be an opportune time to parallel the two transportation lines (train and LRT), and that the walk down to Lakeshore from the LRT would not be onerous.

Councillor Corbasson indicated that she thought the railway right-of-way allowed room for a total of 6 lines. Further to this, Staff indicated that the City had never looked at higher-order transit in the CNR right-of-way.

A panelist asked if we needed another bridge at the Queensway, or the North or South Service roads, or on Queen Street? Another panelist added that we need a pedestrian/cycling bridge just south of the CNR line to take the pressure off Lakeshore Road and allow for more aggressive solutions to balance use of the road.

Staff indicated that Queensway and Mineola Roads have both been identified as possible traffic routes, but they will need funding to be built and further study is required.

The consultant added that the existing traffic bridge across the Credit River is not wide enough to make the wider curb lane solution (for cyclists) possible there – the bridge would need to be widened for pedestrians to continue crossing on both sides.

A panelist said that a Queen Street bridge connection shouldn't be a political problem (as with the neighbourhoods north) and would tie in well with the Port Credit Mobility Hub concept. Staff indicated this would be a logical place to put a pedestrian/cycling bridge.

A panelist offered that the Waterfront Trail is a good alternative to Lakeshore Road. Another panelist stated that there is a difference between recreational and commuter cycling, and that cyclists needed the efficiency of traveling along the direct Lakeshore Road route. Cyclists are doing this now, and create unpredictability for motorists. It only takes one cyclist presently to slow down traffic. Due to the lack of bike lanes, there is always ambiguity as to where the cyclists can ride.

A panelist proposed an HOV (High Occupancy Vehicle) lane for buses, taxis and cars with 2 or more people. The policies implemented should cause a migration to transit and give Mississauga Transit an edge. Mississauga Transit needs to increase ridership, and increase reliability of service in bottleneck traffic – our whole future is based on more people using transit.

Councillor Corbasson pointed out that there is no enforcement of HOV lanes on Dundas Street.

Staff noted that parking is being increased at the GO Stations. The consultant added that most people driving to the Port Credit GO Station are from Port Credit.

A panelist commented that more parking = more cars = traffic worsens. GO's policy is to double ridership – are they all to drive to the Station?

Staff commented that most employment is up by the airport, and Lakeshore Road transit won't help them get there.

A panelist commented that stop lights along Lakeshore Road will slow down any "rapid" transit.

A panelist asked if the consultant had considered tidal traffic lanes?

The consultant replied they had not, as they are not desirable from the point of view of traffic operations. The panelist rejoined that this option should be included in the universe of options being studied.

Another panelist noted that they would love to see three (3) lanes total on Lakeshore Road, and an additional bridge.

Staff indicated it might require DC (Development Charge) funding for a bridge. Given the mobility hub at Port Credit, there might be an option for a bridge. The consensus of the Panel might spur the construction of a bridge over the Credit River, however funding for construction as well as an Environmental Assessment is required.

A panelist remarked that citizens want something done *now*, and that some "real" options that could relieve the traffic situation should be looked at; citizens in this area would be willing to support them, given how much local discussion there has been about the problem.

Councillor Corbasson asked Staff how this discussion and proposed solutions will fold into the creation of the Port Credit District Policies? Clearly a proposed transportation solution will affect land use policies along the Corridor.

Staff replied that the goals and objectives for such a solution will be in the Policies, but not the details, e.g. the cross-sectional analysis.

Councillor Corbasson then asked "What do we do with this information, e.g. the need for another bridge? What is the process to take this forward?"

Staff replied that Transportation and Works will have to carry this concept forward for more detailed analysis.

The Councillor asked Staff what should happen next? Staff replied that while the information would feed into the District Policies, it was possible to have a separate feasibility study should the Transportation Study recommend examining another bridge for cycling and pedestrians.

There was additional discussion of parking issues, with one panelist remarking that parking is a problem for the businesses in Port Credit, but not for the residents.

Staff stated that parking is a huge issue – however, it may be an issue of convenient access to parking as opposed to the actual number of parking spaces available.

The Councillor revisited the process required for the decision about another bridge. Could it be decided at Council in conjunction with the approval of the District Policies? Would the feasibility study proposed to be conducted by the Transportation Dept. go to the broader public?

Staff replied that a Corporate Report related to the District Policy Review will go to Council, to elicit and support Council discussion about crossings of the Credit River. This staff report could include recommendations for further study (as part of the overall background report that will accompany the Draft District Policies).

A panelist asked if local traffic problems could be alleviated by changes elsewhere?

Staff indicated that roads need to service the whole City and no component of the City can be isolated. Trucks still need to come in to service the businesses, for example. Staff added that the MTO needs to rehabilitate the QEW bridge over the Credit River and in the longer term there is a need to replace the bridge, which may then enable connection of the services roads. Currently the QEW is being widened west of Mississauga.

Staff note: Consideration needs to be given as to any impacts associated with increased traffic on service roads on the adjacent homes and surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

A panelist stated that he was not in favour of building bridges through neighbourhoods. Traffic bridges at Queen Street or Mineola will fill up immediately. We need to make Lakeshore Road operationally more efficient, e.g. synchronize the lights for the prevailing speed limit, with Mississauga Road as base for such synchronization east and west.

Staff indicated there are different signal timing plans for different times of day in place already, and that it is more complex than setting one intersection as the reference point.

The consultant indicated that he was not dealing with bridges within the terms of his transportation study of the Lakeshore Road Corridor.

Staff leading the current Cycling Master Plan Review said their team was looking for input from the Lakeshore Road Study to inform the Cycling Master Plan.

The consultant reiterated that the wide curb lane solution is the preliminary finding.

A panelist reiterated that all possible options need to be included in the consultant's analysis in order to find the right solution for Port Credit. We need to take some

pressure off Lakeshore Road, and a cycling/pedestrian bridge is an effective approach that is lower in cost and doesn't have environmental consequences for neighbourhoods.

Many people in neighbourhoods north of Lakeshore Road on the west side of the Credit River would then have the option of walking or cycling directly to the GO Station, rather than driving down to Lakeshore Road and across the traffic bridge in order to essentially park their vehicle for the day.

6. Next Meeting

It was decided to forego the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 15, 2009.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 19th in the Port Credit Library.

The Panel will next receive a presentation on the Waterfront Parks Strategy.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Submitted by: Dorothy Tomiuk, Secretary