

**Omand Park Bridge
Active Transportation Infrastructure Stimulus Project
Community Meeting, March 18, 2010
Comment Boards Results**

Note: Five (5) bridge or park improvement options were presented at the meeting. Display boards illustrating the five options were available for viewing in the lobby of the Portage Avenue Church where the Community Meeting occurred. Flip charts were located beside each of the Options for people to provide comments, as transcribed below. To reiterate, the Options are:

Option A: At-grade bridge south of the park.

Option B: At-grade bridge angled from street to river

Option C: At-grade bridge central to the park

Option D: Park Upgrades

Option E: Upgrades to the existing bridge

Option “A” Comments:

- Option A seems like an ideal solution compared to any of the others (see drawing)
- How will the vertical grade alterations affect the hill, in this option? I don't see it on the artist's rendering.
- People fish there.
- Better than other options. Put bridge at Aubrey for access to centre of River Heights and Schools.
- Why do we even need another bridge? It only floods for 3 weeks of the year?
- Good. It has all the main sledding hills.
- OH horrible, horrible, horrible... it will never go through (but thank you for a chance to speak)
- The best choice, but it needs some lighting for safe access at night
- Not too bad. Add lighting on top and beneath and let's also consider other safety measures to deter partying/undesirable and unsafe behaviours that would endanger women and children especially.
- People need houses, not bridges!
- We don't even really need another bridge
- This is the option I like the best – make sure it has good lighting
- This bridge will destroy the sledding hill, the only one for miles. What will happen to the small one? It will become obsolete. It will crumble after years of neglect.
- Its too big, it will block out so much space/plant growth, and what about the sledding? There's no place to sled...
- Good idea
- Horrible

Option “B” Comments:

- An eyesore

**Omand Park Bridge
Active Transportation Infrastructure Stimulus Project
Community Meeting, March 18, 2010
Comment Boards Results**

- Very concerned about changed appearance and ambience of the park and its nature and character
- Same for options A and B too. All these bridges are too big.
- A waster of taxpayer's money
- No extra bridge is necessary! We already have one! People with wheelchairs can use Portage to access the park!
- You can't think of anything cooler like a free pie stand or a homeless shelter with pop tarts!
- If you actually NEED to upgrade, please upgrade the existing bridge.
- This makes no sense!
- No!
- It may look cool but I still hate it. Spend it on free bagels at Tim Horton's.
- I like more room for sledding.
- I do not want the bridge
- This is too high up.
- The proposed expansion of the Omand's Creek bridge is clearly not shovel ready. It is an outrageous misappropriation of public funds designated for a hastily prepared and ill-conceived plan. Save the money, do the work – including public consultations – and spend out money appropriately.
- This is the least offensive of them all – but it still needs work – does it have to be so huge?
- Protect the trees and toboggan runs!
- Consider lowering the bridge. The street level design is not appropriate.
- Worse than C it is way too big just leave the park alone or clean it up for the people.
- The design is way too big, it's inappropriate!

Option “C” Comments:

- Ban the bridge!
- Worst option
- Oh the humanity!
- As a female cyclist I would never use any of these options at night or in the early am. Better access elsewhere would be safer
- Ruins sledding for children
- Think of the children!
- The park would not benefit in the least, and I think the low bridge is harder, and therefore, more fun, so this option is null and void!
- We were just asking that the park be lit and maintained cleared of snow etc. this is not what is required
- Bottom of the list
- Would destroy tobogganing tradition going back generations! I agree!
- How does it even fit?
- What if I fall off? (exactly)
- This is too high
- Its right where we like to go sledding! I say no!
- Completely and negatively changes the feel of the park
- As a cyclist, I do not feel this is necessary (I agree)

Omand Park Bridge
Active Transportation Infrastructure Stimulus Project
Community Meeting, March 18, 2010
Comment Boards Results

- Our family has no problem cycling as is and feel option C takes away from existing positive uses
- Hideous option
- Ugly
- No, no, no! We don't need another bridge
- Things are fine how they are! Really! I agree
- What's unique about the park is that it's a glen. There's plenty of flat land elsewhere.
- What would happen to the forest? I play there all the time
- Consider all the wildlife that would be destroyed in the process of building this bridge. Like all the bird and squirrels and plants. Can't we build the bridge somewhere else?
- This is not a Wolseley option
- I don't support interfering with sledding on the hill. This is one of the primary uses of the park.
- Don't do it

Option "D" Comments:

- This seems like the best option. Improved lighting in the park will increase safety without compromising all the varied uses of the park. Raising the bridge creates a potential hazard as people can lurk and hide there.
- By improving the bike path through the bowl, up to Portage Ave, you are connecting to the newly marked diamond/bike lanes. You don't need a new bridge.
- Keep this one – retain the present character of Omand Creek as it is
- This is the best option: Portage Ave Bridge exists already-grade the slope to everyone's access. Any street level bridges will ruin the beauty, ecosystem and public pleasure of the park – for 4 weeks out of the year – new bridge is overkill!!!
- If bike across an issue, cut poles out of middle of current bridge
- Improve N.W. corner access when regarding so the corner is not so slow on bike
- Add easy transition eastbound to Portage Ave bike lane
- Yes! For sure the best! No extra money wasted, and animal/plant life maintained! Good!
- What a great idea – access to park for all – saves all aspects of park and the activities of people. Love it!
- Good option
- Perhaps the government should consider that they cannot afford to maintain the infrastructure that already exists
- Sure! This isn't negative!
- Yes, yes, yes!
- This one is the most affordable and logical we shouldn't rush to do 'something' if its not well considered/conceived
- Nah! No! No hope! Not a good idea at all
- People need houses no dumb 'ol bridges keep the bridge, so what if it floods, it is just water and for a short amount of time! The old bridge is perfectly fine, flooding is just water, it goes away...

**Omand Park Bridge
Active Transportation Infrastructure Stimulus Project
Community Meeting, March 18, 2010
Comment Boards Results**

Option “E” Comments:

- Why do this change at all?
- Existing bridge should have been built higher in the first place so that flood waters did not close bridge
- Can we not upgrade the existing bridge so that it does provide flood protection? (raised)
- Why does option E – which seems “smallest” – require DFO approval but other bigger options do not? Does the same hold for environmental approvals?
- Option F
 - Agree!
 - Why do all the proposed options for building a new bridge have to involve a long, high at grade bridge??? Why not grade/build up some of the lower ground and ~1/2 way up?
 - Do we need a bridge 1:100 year flooding (every 100 years we can walk a block to Portage for 2 weeks).
 - These are loaded options – nice picture of big bridges but failure to explore the ‘middle option’ of a modest bridge as described above
- Option E Upgrade – I prefer – raise bridge 5 feet (or so) – a bit wider would be nice – this provides less negative visual impact
- I like this idea because it does not get rid of any tobogganing hill area! It just makes the bridge better!
- Don’t do anything! (but this is the best option, after option “D”)
- If you wait to do anything do this. If you want to use the money on something like pies.
- Will it kill you to walk another block?
- E is better – live with it!
- I like E because that bridge brings back old memories!! E is the best because it raises it
- I don’t like option D or E!! If you’re going to do these – then don’t do anything
- People are getting really lazy if they can’t wake up 15 minutes (earlier) to walk an extra block!
- Options D and E don’t seem to solve some important issues: accessibility and flooding
- D is my favourite