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1.0 Introduction
1.0 Introduction

The Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies (PCS) were approved by City Council in 2015 and provide the long-term vision for providing accessible, convenient and safe walking and cycling infrastructure for people of all ages and abilities. The PCS also assist in the prioritization of active transportation infrastructure projects throughout the city. A key direction of the PCS is to develop local bike networks for each neighbourhood that connect to the existing network and to the Downtown.

The Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike project was identified as an important part of the network in the PCS and when completed will provide connections to the Omand’s Creek pathway, the protected bicycle lane on Assiniboine Avenue and Sherbrook Street, the bike lane on Maryland Street, and the planned neighbourhood greenway on Ruby Street. The study area runs east-west from Raglan Road through Wolseley Avenue/Westminster Avenue, Balmoral Street, and Granite Way to Osborne Street.

The top three priorities identified by stakeholders through Phase 1 of the project engagement (November 2018) included safety, bike network connections and cycling comfort. A public engagement report is available in documents tab of the project website. Phase 1 feedback guided the development of preliminary design options which were then shared during Phase 2 of the public engagement (spring 2019). Phase 2 public engagement strategies included an online survey and several in-person engagement events (a stakeholder workshop, a public workshop, three pop-up events, and a guided walk/bike tour). Design treatments were proposed to address issues identified in Phase 1 including short-cutting traffic, speeding, intersection and pedestrian safety, and parking for local businesses. Feedback documented in this report, along with technical analysis, was used to inform design options, that will again be shared for public comment in winter 2020.
2.0 Purpose of engagement
2.0 Purpose of engagement

The purpose of Phase 2 public engagement was to gather perspectives on preliminary design options and treatments. Key areas for feedback in this phase of engagement included:

- Overall design options for both east and west segments of the project
- Specific treatment options (e.g. vehicle access restrictions, one-way street conversions, speed humps, geometric improvements, curb extensions, raised intersections, crosswalk improvements [new painted crosswalks, crosswalk overhead flashers, raised crosswalk], parking adjustments, bicycle infrastructure [protected, raised, or painted bike lanes])
- Parking implications

Feedback on these options was collected during public engagement events and through the online survey. This report describes the public engagement process, communication materials, public engagement events and key perspectives on preliminary designs. How major feedback themes were considered by the project team is available on the project website. Phase 3 of public engagement will take place in Winter 2020 to solicit input on the recommended design.

See Figure 1 for the overall project and engagement timeline.

[Figure 1 - Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project Timeline]
3.0 Public engagement techniques
3.0 Public engagement techniques

Phase 2 of public engagement activities occurred between May 31, 2019 and June 23, 2019. Stakeholders were asked to provide their feedback at various events and online to help refine preliminary designs to improve travel choices, accessibility, and connectivity in the study area. Engagement events were scheduled at various times of the day to allow people with different schedules to participate; an online survey was available for those who were unable to attend events or wished to provide more input.

Accessibility for all stakeholders was an important factor when deciding event locations. Events were held in proximity to the proposed project route, allowing for improved stakeholder accessibility through various forms of transportation (walk, cycle, transit, and vehicle). Recommendations from the community influenced the location and timing of pop-up events to support improved stakeholder accessibility (e.g. during after school pick-up at Balmoral Hall School, coinciding with children’s athletic events at Mulvey School field [mini soccer] and at a local café during expected busier times of the day). Indoor events were held in a facility that allowed for accessibility for participants with mobility restrictions (elevator lift).

The City also conducted school travel planning and engagement (STPE) at three elementary schools in the study area: Mulvey School, Laura Secord School, and Wolseley School. The STPE process involved engaging via questionnaire with students, parents, staff, and the broader school community to identify safety issues and barriers to active school travel, and to propose solutions on how to address these concerns. Members of the school community, faculty, and student body painted a picture of issues faced by children and families walking and cycling to school.

STPE resource team members (staff from Manitoba Public Insurance, Winnipeg Police Service, City of Winnipeg Transportation Division, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, Winnipeg School Division, the principals at the three schools, as well as representatives on each school’s STPE working group were given the opportunity to provide input on the feedback and comments the project team received in Phase 1.

STPE resource team members (staff from Manitoba Public Insurance, Winnipeg Police Service, City of Winnipeg Transportation Division, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, Winnipeg School Division, the principals at the three schools, as well as representatives on each school’s STPE working group were given the opportunity to provide input on the feedback and comments the project team received in Phase 1.

Phase 2 engagement techniques for both the public and stakeholders are included in Table 1. See Appendix A for a stakeholder list, Appendix B for the workshop presentation, Appendix C Phase 2 online survey, Appendix D for the school travel plan and engagement reports, and Appendix E for the school travel plan and engagement questionnaire.
### Table 1 - Phase 2 engagement techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Engagement technique</th>
<th>Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 2018 – September 13, 2019</td>
<td>Project email address and stakeholder distribution list</td>
<td>357 stakeholders on email distribution list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8 – June 23, 2019</td>
<td>Stakeholder outreach discussions (phone &amp; in-person)</td>
<td>Discussions with 6 key stakeholder groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31 – June 23, 2019</td>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>Accessed by a total of 2,445 people and 883 visitors provided survey responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6 &amp; 20, 2019</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg public engagement newsletter</td>
<td>Over 5,000+ recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1st issue</td>
<td>Wolseley Leaf ad</td>
<td>Distributed to the entire project study area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Workshops

- **June 11, 2019**<br>Stakeholder, St. Margaret’s Anglican Church, 160 Ethelbert St.<br>6 attendees
- **June 11, 2019**<br>Public, St. Margaret’s Anglican Church, 160 Ethelbert St.<br>97 attendees

#### Pop-up events

- **June 12, 2019**<br>Tall Grass Prairie, 859 Westminster Ave.<br>45 interactions
- **June 12, 2019**<br>Balmoral Hall School, 630 Westminster Ave.<br>64 interactions
- **June 12, 2019**<br>Mulvey School Field, 750 Wolseley Ave.<br>71 interactions
- **June 13, 2019**<br>Guided Walk/Bike Tour, began at the corner of Raglan Road and Wolseley Avenue<br>13 attendees

#### School travel plan and engagement

- **February 26, 2019**<br>STPE Report created for each school; STPE Phase 2 Questionnaire<br>STPE resource team members (10 participants); STPE working groups (23 participants)
3.1 Stakeholder outreach discussions
Stakeholder outreach discussions were held with key stakeholders, schools, property management companies, and resident associations. Discussions were designed to elicit information on the priorities, interests, issues, and concerns of stakeholders in relation to preliminary design options within the study area. One-on-one discussions were conducted in-person or over the phone with the following stakeholders:

- Canada Life (Great West Life)
- Wolseley Residents Association
- Home Street Residents
- Houston Properties
- Onyx Properties
- Granite Curling Club

3.2 Workshops
Two workshops were held on June 11, 2019: one for the general public (97 participants) and another for key stakeholders (six participants). At the workshop, the team presented the preliminary designs, answered questions, and recorded in-person feedback. A presentation on overall design options and treatments kicked off both the general public and stakeholder workshops. As participant attendance was greater for the public workshop participants were split into smaller groups (approximately 20-25 people) to facilitate more detailed discussions. Each discussion group included a technical design expert and as well as a public engagement team member. Sign-in sheets were provided at the workshop entrance to determine the number of participants as well to record email addresses of anyone who would like to be added onto the project mailing list.
3.3 Pop-up events
Pop-up events were held on June 12, 2019 at several locations within the study area, including local high-traffic businesses and easily accessible locations. Pop-up events were designed to build awareness of the project and provide stakeholders the opportunity to view and ask technical questions about the preliminary designs, and provide feedback directly on large map prints of each project design option. Participants were provided a postcard that included an image of the study area, link to the project webpage, and online survey web address to allow for additional feedback. A total of 193 people participated in pop-up events.

3.4 Guided walk/bike tour
A guided walk/bike tour along the corridor route was used to provide residents an opportunity to provide real-time considerations and feedback on the overall design and treatment options. The goal of the tour was to understand different perspectives on design and ideas/concerns.

In addition to the pop-ups, a guided walk/bike tour through the study area was held on June 13, 2019. The tour began at the corner of Raglan Road and Wolseley Avenue. Participants were invited to ride or walk the proposed route with the design team, discuss design options, and provide feedback. A total of 13 people (11 biking and two walking) participated.
3.5 Online survey
An interactive online survey was available from May 31 to June 23, 2019 on the project webpage. The online survey was designed to determine level of support and gather feedback on preliminary design options. The survey asked participants to provide their overall level of support for different treatments and options and share details about likes and dislikes. Maps illustrated design options, and photos described potential treatments. The survey included questions about respondents’ demographics to help the project team understand where feedback was coming from, and who was underrepresented in the engagement process. In total, 883 surveys were completed.

3.6 School travel plan and engagement activities
Phase 2 consisted of gathering feedback from Phase 1 of the STPE process. Comments and conclusions were provided by 11 members of the STPE working groups and STPE resource team. This input helped the project team refine the proposed design for this corridor to improve the safety of students attending the three schools in the area.
4.0 Promotion
4.0 Promotion

Engagement opportunities were promoted using several methods, including:

- A notification promoting the online survey, workshop, and pop-up events was distributed via email to the stakeholder distribution list on May 31, 2019.
- Posters, which included pop-up event information, project website address, online survey link, and project email, were delivered to 12 businesses along the project corridor.
- Fifteen businesses along the project corridor received postcards for distribution to patrons.
- The City of Winnipeg issued public engagement newsletters June 6, 2019 prior to the public engagement events and on June 20, 2019 prior to the closure of the online survey.
- Public engagement newsletters promoting public engagement events, online survey link, and project email were distributed to 5,000+ email addresses on June 6 and June 20, 2019.
- Reminders about the online survey closure deadline were distributed to the stakeholder distribution list via email on June 19, 2019 and on June 21, 2019 with a notification that the survey closure had been extended until June 23, 2019.

- The City of Winnipeg’s Facebook and Twitter platforms included six posts each from May 31- June 20, 2019.
- There were 193 stakeholder interactions during the pop-up events.
- Twelve signs were updated throughout the study area. A sticker was added to the signs to indicate design options were now available, directing the reader to the project website to learn more.
- STPE opportunities were promoted using the following methods: Emails sent to the STPE Resource Team (10 participants) and STPE working group members (23 participants) on February 26, 2019 for feedback on STPE Report.

See Appendix F for Phase 2 the materials used to promote project engagement.
5.0 What we heard
5.0 What we heard

5.1 Online survey results
The following section summarizes the results of what we heard through the online survey. The survey received 883 responses between May 31, 2019 and June 23, 2019.

Survey respondent demographics
Survey responses were split almost equally between female (48 percent) and male (50 percent), with two percent attributed to other. The largest group of respondents (27 percent) included those between the ages of 35-44, closely followed by 25-34 year olds (20 percent), and 45-54 and 55-64 groupings (19 percent each). Respondents in the 75-84 age group only accounted for 2 percent of all respondents along with only 3 percent representing the 18-24 year old age group. Phase 2 respondent percentages are comparable to the results from Phase 1, with the greatest change noted in the decrease (7 percent) in respondents in the 25-34 age group. Overall response volumes from participants 18 to 44 years old remained the same or decreased (3-7 percent) between Phase 1 and 2. This contrasts with the increase (2-3 percent) in participation from respondents 45 to 84 years old.
Survey respondents self-identifying as residents in Phase 2 of the project (64 percent) showed an increase of 22 percent when compared to the Phase 1 online survey results (42 percent). In contrast, respondents’ who identified as having a connection to the corridor because they travel through the area decreased by 9 percent (11 percent). Of note, Phase 2 respondents included work/business as a connection to the corridor (12 percent) which was not indicated as a corridor connection in Phase 1. The majority of survey respondents were from the R3G (353) and R3C (158) postal codes. As the study area falls within these two postal codes, high survey response from these areas was expected.
5.1.1 Design options
The study area was divided into two segments’ based on treatment options being explored and typical land use. The west segment which extends from Raglan Road to Furby Street is comprised of predominantly single family homes, whereas the east segment, which extends from Furby Street to Osborne Street, is mostly multi-family homes.

5.1.1.1 West segment
Option 2 for protected bicycle lanes on Westminster Avenue and a neighborhood greenway on Wolseley Avenue garnered the highest support in the west segment (51 percent support) versus Option 1 (40 percent support). Protected bicycle lanes and dedicated bicycle infrastructure was viewed as the most favourable components of West Option 2.
WEST OPTION 1 - NEIGHBOURHOOD GREENWAYS ON WESTMINSTER AVENUE AND WOLSELEY AVENUE

What do you LIKE about west option 1?

- Reduced short-cutting traffic, volumes, traffic diversion: 108
- Speed humps: 83
- Traffic calming: 80
- Parking maintained: 80
- Improved pedestrian safety: 72
- Reduced traffic speeds: 69
- Improved cycling safety and environment: 60
- One-way traffic: 23
- Improved intersection geometry: 22
- Enhanced pedestrian realm: 19

The potential reduction in traffic volumes and short-cutting was viewed as the most favourable result of the West Option 1 (108). Other aspects of the West Option 1 design that were generally in favour included: speed humps (83), traffic calming (80), maintained parking (80), improved pedestrian safety (72), reduced traffic speeds (69), and improved cycling safety and environment (60).

What we heard from respondents...

“This is an amazing and bold option! Currently there is constant through traffic as an alternative to Portage along both Westminster and Wolseley. At rush hour I sometimes wait several minutes just to cross Wolseley Avenue.”

“I live in the area and have been concerned for some time about the amount of non local vehicle traffic in the area - this looks like a way of calming and perhaps discouraging unnecessary travel through this area and making it safer for walkers and cyclists.”

“I like the idea of having a neighbourhood greenway. I think it will be safer and more pleasant for us in the neighbourhood, especially the children.”
Disliked features of this design included transit rerouting on Home Street (92) and the lack of protected bicycle lanes and designated cycling infrastructure (91).

---

**What do you DISLIKE about west option 1?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit re-routing on Home Street</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of protected bicycle lanes and designated cycling infrastructure</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced and limited access</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed humps</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signals</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained parking</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic diversion to side streets</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (safety for cycling)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of comments

---

**What we heard from respondents...**

“I do not like the #10 bus re-routing. It’s important that it stays along Westminster for as much of that commercial stretch as possible, to better serve the neighbourhood.”

“I do not like the one way feature on Wolseley. This will disadvantage local residents who wish to access the Maryland bridge without getting stuck in long lines on Maryland, especially during rush hour traffic.”

“It doesn’t do enough to protect cyclists and pedestrians. With so much parking maintained, I still run the risk of getting doored on my bike.”
WEST OPTION 2 - PROTECTED BICYCLE LANES ON WESTMINSTER AVENUE, NEIGHBOURHOOD GREENWAY WOLSELEY AVENUE

What do you LIKE about west option 2?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected bicycle lanes and more dedicated bicycle infrastructure</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transit changes or rerouting</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed humps</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced short-cutting traffic, volumes, traffic diversions</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved cycling safety and environment</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parking and parking restrictions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced traffic speeds</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization and encouragement of active transportation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety and crossing improvements</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provision of protected bicycle lanes and dedicated bicycle infrastructure was viewed as the most favourable result of the West Option 2 (174). Other aspects of the West Option 2 design that were generally favoured included: no transit changes or rerouting (47), speed humps (39), reduced short-cutting traffic, traffic volumes and traffic diversions (36), traffic calming (29), and improved cycling safety and environment (28).

What we heard from respondents...

“Fully protected bike lanes minimize conflict between road user types and improve ease of movement for cyclists. Cyclists are able to travel at their own pace without having to skip to the front of the line of vehicles at intersections and without vehicles having to pass cyclists.”

“I really like the protected bicycle lanes - I cycle-commute in this neighbourhood and there is a lot of bike traffic on Westminster during the summer. Two years ago I was hit by a car on Westminster just west of the intersection with Maryland, and a dedicated bike lane (with physical barriers) would have prevented this accident.”

“The many speed humps along Wolseley will make the neighbourhood so much more walkable and bicycle friendly! Currently, the traffic along Wolseley is very high!”
Survey participants disliked the removal of parking (62), one-way streets (19), traffic diversion and access restrictions (14), speed humps (12), and protected bike lanes (10).

"I particularly dislike the loss of parking. I live on Walnut Street. There is already nowhere near enough parking when there is an event at Westminster Church and it is a busy venue for concerts, graduations, weddings and so much more."

"Wolseley does not need to be one way. It will cause all sorts of traffic backlog on the surrounding major streets."

"I think reduced parking on Westminster will hurt the businesses there and they are a critical component of our neighbourhood character."
5.1.1.2 East segment
Overall, East Option 1 gathered greater support (52 percent) compared to East Option 2 (34 percent) and East Option 3 (24 percent). The protected bicycle lanes in East Option 1 were viewed as the favored treatment option for bicycle infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST OPTION 1 - ONE WAY VEHICLE TRAFFIC, PROTECTED BICYCLE Lanes</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing/leave as is</td>
<td>Full support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST OPTION 2 - TWO-WAY VEHICLE TRAFFIC, RAISED AND PROTECTED BICYCLE PATH</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing/leave as is</td>
<td>Full support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST OPTION 3 - TWO-WAY VEHICLE TRAFFIC, AT-GRADE PAINTED BICYCLE Lanes</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing/leave as is</td>
<td>Full support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Option 1 garnered the highest support in the east segment. The provision of protected bicycle lanes was viewed as the most favourable (181). Other favourable aspects of East Option 1 included: improved cycling safety and environment (69), one-way traffic (44), and reduced short-cutting traffic (27).

What we heard from respondents...

“Love the protected bike lanes. They reduce conflict between road user types and allow easier movement for cyclists.”

“Great for cycling and walking. In the morning the area is congested from Furby to Young Street. Impossible to cycle at times and I will walk my bike on the sidewalk to get around traffic when heading into the down town.”

“Making Balmoral a one-way will reduce intersection conflicts and improve safety overall.”
The one-way traffic conversions were noted as a reason respondents both liked (44) and disliked (61) the design. Additionally, removal or lack of parking (26), re-routing transit (22), and insufficient measures for traffic calming (18) were noted as design details that were disliked.
**EAST OPTION 2 - TWO-WAY VEHICLE TRAFFIC, RAISED AND PROTECTED BICYCLE PATH**

What do you LIKE about east option 2?

- Protected bicycle lanes and designated infrastructure: 89
- Grade-separated bicycle lanes: 53
- Lack of one-ways: 49
- Minimal impact on traffic and access: 20
- Improvement cycling environment and safety: 19
- Maintains parking: 6
- Pedestrian safety and crossing improvements: 6
- No changes to transit: 6
- Reduced short-cutting traffic, volumes, traffic diversions: 3
- One-way: 7

East Option 2 feedback noted support for protected bicycle lanes and designated infrastructure (89), grade-separated bicycle lanes (53), retaining two-way traffic (49), minimal impact on traffic and access (20), and an improvement to the cycling environment and safety (19).

What we heard from respondents...

“I really like the grading option because it’s more sustainable than paint and cars are more likely to avoid the bike lane then.”

“Raised bike lanes are good, because painted bike lanes disappear each year (especially winter).”
Survey participants disliked the grade-separated bike lane (90), narrow bike lanes (68), cost (41), and lack of safety and comfort for cyclists (24).

What we heard from respondents...
“Cyclist grade changes pose a hazard to cyclist safety, especially in winter.”

“Not being able to pass will cause a lot of frustration/conflict for long distance commuters vs casual cyclists and children. Faster cyclists may choose to instead cycle on narrow roads. It could also cause difficulties for bike trailers.”
East Option 3 feedback noted support for the lack of one-way streets (90), the lower cost (68), dedicated bicycle infrastructure (41), and lack of protected bicycle lanes (24).

What we heard from respondents...

“Preserves two-way traffic on important route between Wolseley and downtown.”

“I like this idea as the low cost allows us to implement a safer cycling environment as soon as possible.”

“The two-way cycle track provides a very good level of protection and comfort for people on bikes.”
Disliked features of this design included the lack of protected bicycle lanes (131), lack of safety and comfort for cyclists (35), narrow bike lanes (30), and removal or lack of parking (24).

“Without a physical separation between vehicles and cyclists there is no real safety in having the bike lanes.”

“Narrow bike lanes in this area where there is reduced visibility due to twists and turns – not as safe.”
5.1.2 Design treatments
In Phase 1 we heard that short-cutting traffic, speeding, intersection and pedestrian safety, and parking for local business needs were concerns within the study. Participants were presented with proposed treatments designed to specifically address these issues, and were asked to provide feedback on each.

**Issue 1 - Short cutting traffic**
*Vehicle access restrictions*
Vehicle access restrictions are physical barriers that limit motor vehicle traffic from cutting through certain areas. Access restrictions were tested in four areas, and received a mix of high (30-37%) and low (31-38%) support.

Respondents liked that they limited traffic volumes and short-cutting on otherwise quiet streets (99), potential for improved cycling and pedestrian safety (42), and reduced speed (25) but disliked reduced access (48) and the potential for increased traffic on other routes and side streets (42), and also thought the restrictions were unnecessary (38).

*One-way street conversions*
While 26-30 percent of survey respondents liked the idea of using one-way street conversions to reduce short-cutting traffic (63) and improve cycling safety and environment (40), many disliked the concepts of rerouting traffic to the other side of the street (67), and restricting access (57).
### ISSUE 1 - SHORT CUTTING TRAFFIC

#### Vehicle restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th>High Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue &amp; Arlington Street</td>
<td>38% 6% 11% 8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubrey Street &amp; Palmerston Avenue</td>
<td>33% 10% 16% 11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue &amp; Sherburn Road</td>
<td>32% 9% 16% 11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue &amp; Raglan Road</td>
<td>31% 8% 16% 10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General LIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited volume of traffic and short-cutting on quiet streets</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety for cyclists and pedestrians</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced speed of motor vehicles</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential neighbourhoods</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of active transportation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved stop sign compliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved cyclist and pedestrian experience</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quieter streets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced vehicle volumes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General DISLIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced access</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic on other routes and side streets</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecesssary</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic volumes and congestion</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact to businesses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-routing transit route</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced safety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased issues for larger vehicles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of comments: Number of respondents
### ISSUE 1 - SHORT CUTTING TRAFFIC

#### One-way street conversions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Conversion</th>
<th>Low support</th>
<th>High support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young/Balmoral Street eastbound/northbound only from Langside Street to Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>48% 6% 12% 8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite way westbound only from Osborne Street to Balmoral Street</td>
<td>48% 6% 9% 7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Avenue westbound only from Arlington Street to Home Street</td>
<td>39% 7% 17% 9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue westbound only from Walnut Street to Maryland Street</td>
<td>47% 7% 12% 7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General LIKES

- Reduced short-cutting traffic: 63 comments
- Improved cycling safety and environment: 40 comments
- Wider protected bicycle lanes: 13 comments
- Improved safety for residents: 13 comments
- Improve traffic flow: 9 comments
- Traffic calming: 8 comments
- No inconvenience: 6 comments
- Reduced vehicle speeds: 5 comments
- Improved safety for motor vehicles: 5 comments
- Prioritization of active transportation: 4 comments

#### General DISLIKES

- Rerouted traffic to other routes and side streets: 67 comments
- Restricted access: 57 comments
- Increased congestion: 34 comments
- Unsafe: 32 comments
- Difficult for drivers to navigate: 27 comments
- Not an issue: 19 comments
- Cost: 9 comments
- Re-routed transit: 9 comments
- Negative impact on businesses: 6 comments
- Inconvenient for emergency access: 5 comments
**Issue 2 - Speeding**

Speeding was another identified issue. Speed humps were proposed to ensure vehicles travel at speeds deemed safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

*Speed humps*

Speed humps rely on vertical deflection to slow motor vehicle traffic. Study participants indicated strong support (45 percent) for this deterrent; however, others saw them as unnecessary and uncomfortable for cyclists.

The online survey included a question regarding speed humps on Wolseley Avenue, north of Westminster Avenue and east of Arlington Street; the question was posed and described inaccurately and therefore corresponding results have been removed from analysis.
**ISSUE 2 - SPEEDING**

**Speed humps**
Wolseley Avenue from Raglan Street to Maryland Street, along Westminster Avenue from Aubrey Street to Maryland Street

### General LIKES
- Reduced speeds of motor vehicles: 128
- Improved safety: 30
- Reduced short-cutting traffic: 21
- Improved safety for cyclists and pedestrians: 16
- Traffic calming: 10
- Residential area: 8
- No changes or blocked access: 7
- More effective than stop signs: 7
- Cost: 6
- Improved cycling experience: 4

### General DISLIKES
- Unnecessary: 61
- Uncomfortable for cyclists: 23
- Ineffective: 23
- Winter maintenance issues: 13
- Cost: 11
- Hazardous: 11
- Increased congestion and traffic issues: 8
- Obstacle for emergency access: 5
- Noise for residents: 5
- Re-routing of traffic: 5

Number of comments

Percentage of respondents

Low support<br>23% <br>7% <br>14% <br>10% <br>45% <br>High support
**Issue 3 - Intersection safety and pedestrian safety**

Safety concerns were identified at several intersections. Pedestrian safety was an issue identified by respondents, particularly around major intersections. Design treatments were developed to improve intersection geometry (modified curb enhancements) and pedestrian safety.

**Geometric improvements**

Geometric improvements were proposed to improve sightlines through modified curb locations at key intersections; participants indicated 47-51 percent support for this treatment. The majority of participants (91) liked that the improvements increased safety but some felt they were unnecessary (39) and costly (14).

**Curb extensions**

Curb extensions, which narrow roadways, slow motor vehicle traffic, and reduce crossing distance for pedestrians, were proposed for five locations within the study area. Participants indicated between 38-40 percent support for this design treatment. Survey respondents liked improved pedestrian and cyclist safety (55), improved general safety (31), and reduced vehicle speeds (26) but some questioned whether extensions would be unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists, were unnecessary, or would result in traffic congestion.

**Raised intersections**

Raised intersections elevate an intersection’s road surface to sidewalk level to slow vehicles and provide greater crossing comfort for pedestrians. Three raised intersections were proposed for the study area, all of which received general support (48-50 percent). Survey participants liked how the raised intersections would reduce vehicle speeds (36), increase pedestrian safety and environment (35), and increase general safety (27). Some respondents felt this design treatment was unnecessary (33), costly (26), and ineffective (15).

**Crosswalk improvements**

Proposed crosswalk improvements included adding new painted crosswalks, improving existing crosswalks with overhead flashers, or raising crosswalks to require vehicles to slow down when passing. Survey respondents supported crosswalk improvements at all four proposed locations (52-55%) and liked the associated improvement in pedestrian safety and environment (48), improved general safety (37), and reduced vehicle speeds (19). Those who disliked the treatment said it was unnecessary (28) and noted a dislike of the overhead flashers (16).
## ISSUE 3 - INTERSECTION SAFETY AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

### Geometric improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th>Medium Support</th>
<th>High Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balmoral Street and Granite Way</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Canora Street</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Ethelbert Street</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Camden Place</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Clifton Street</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General LIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKES</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased pedestrian and cycling safety</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved visibility and sightlines</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved general safety</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer for children around schools</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced motor vehicle speeds</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased motor vehicle safety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No inconvenience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced volume of traffic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved motor vehicle experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General DISLIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISLIKES</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottleneck for traffic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing for drivers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact for businesses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic on other routes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-routed transit access</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of comments
ISSUE 3 - INTERSECTION SAFETY AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Curb extensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Low support</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>High support</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balmoral Street and Granite Way</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Canora Street</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Ethelbert Street</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Camden Place</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Clifton Street</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General LIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved pedestrian and cyclists safety</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved general safety</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced vehicle speeds</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced crossing distance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved visibility and sightlines</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved environment for pedestrian and cyclists</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No inconvenience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced vehicle volume and short-cutting traffic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower vehicles turning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General DISLIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing for drivers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow maintenance issues</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe for drivers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging for buses and large vehicles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic on other routes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of respondents
ISSUE 3 - INTERSECTION SAFETY AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Raised intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Low support</th>
<th>High support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Ruby Street</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Ruby Street</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Raglan Street</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of respondents

General LIKES

- Reduced vehicle speeds: 36 comments
- Increased pedestrian safety and environment: 35 comments
- Increased general safety: 27 comments
- Increased visibility: 12 comments
- Makes drivers more aware: 10 comments
- More accessibility: 10 comments
- Traffic calming: 8 comments
- Limited or no convenience for drivers: 6 comments
- Reduced volume and short-cutting: 5 comments
- Improved stop sign compliance: 5 comments

General DISLIKES

- Unnecessary: 33 comments
- Cost: 26 comments
- Ineffective: 15 comments
- Damage from snow clearing equipment: 5 comments
- Maintenance requirements: 4 comments
- Not enough to improve pedestrian safety: 5 comments
- Interference with cyclists: 2 comments
- Increased traffic on other routes: 2 comments
- Too gradual of a slope: 2 comments
- Reduced speeds of vehicles: 1 comment

Number of comments
ISSUE 3 - INTERSECTION SAFETY AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

**Crosswalk improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Low support</th>
<th>High support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Street midblock</td>
<td>15% 6% 14% 12%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Walnut Street</td>
<td>13% 5% 14% 12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Avenue and Lenore Street</td>
<td>14% 5% 14% 13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Lenore Street</td>
<td>14% 5% 15% 12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General LIKES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved pedestrian safety and environment</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved general safety</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced vehicle speeds</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased visibility</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents vehicles from running stop signs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced jay walking</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing lights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accessibility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced volume of vehicles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General DISLIKES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead flashers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively impacts travel by motor vehicle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic on other routes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough to improve safety</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk noise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-routed transit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issue 4 - Parking**

*Parking –West Segment*

West Segment Option 2 proposed protected bicycle lanes along Westminster Avenue. Different parking changes and features were recommended in different options to accommodate bike lane infrastructure. (Parking changes were indicated in West Option B: shared use lane, parking maintained Aubrey Street.) Time-limited residential street parking for non-residents was included in some options to mitigate parking impacts and increase availability of visitor parking.

Survey participants indicated greater support of parking adjustments with West Option A: Protected Bike Lane, Parking Removed (29%) when compared to West Option B: Shared Use Lane, Parking Maintained Aubrey Street to Arlington Street (14%). Further to this, residential side street parking solicited a limited level of support (25%).

In West Option A, respondents liked the protected bicycle lane (36), parking on side streets during business hours (24), and the improved cycling safety and environment (27).

Respondents disliked the potential impact on businesses and churches (119), the lack of parking in the area for residents and visitors (90), and congestion (20).

West Option B gathered support for maintaining parking in some areas (42), minimized impact on businesses (25), and improved pedestrian and cycling safety (8) while respondents generally disliked the shared-use lane (32), the potential impact on businesses and churches (26), removal of parking (25), and lack of protected bike lanes (22).

Respondents liked that residential side street parking would likely result in no impact/positive impact for businesses (18), and also liked the concept of introducing time-limited parking for non-residents (17) and adding parking permits for residents (12). Dislikes included lack of parking (44), lack of parking for residents and visitors (26), and its impact on businesses (29).
West Option A: Protected bike lane, parking removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General LIKES</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected bicycle lane</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on side streets during business hours</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved cyclist safety and environment</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less car-dependent neighbourhood</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved general safety</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits parking of vehicles on public roads</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to businesses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety for pedestrians</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better flow of traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety for motor vehicles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General DISLIKES</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on businesses and churches</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking in the area for residents and visitors</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces accessibility for mobility needs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced traffic flow</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced access</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased speeds of vehicles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West Option B: Shared use lane, parking maintained Aubrey Street to Arlington Street

General LIKES
- Parking maintained in some areas: 42
- No impact to businesses: 25
- Improved pedestrian and cycling safety: 8
- Some parking removed: 5
- Protected bicycle lane from Arlington to Furby: 5
- Unprotected bicycle lane: 4
- Reduced impacts to residents: 3
- No impact to transit route: 1
- Maintained vehicle access: 1
- Prioritization of active transportation: 1

Number of comments

General DISLIKES
- Shared use lane: 32
- Impact on businesses and churches: 26
- Removed parking: 25
- Lack of protected bicycle lane: 22
- Inconsistent with switch on Arlington: 14
- Uncomfortable for cyclists: 11
- Lack of parking: 11
- Ineffective: 10
- Lack of safety for cyclists: 9
- Unnecessary: 9

Number of comments

Percentage of respondents:
- Low support: 41%
- High support: 14%
- Moderate support: 18%
- Neutral: 15%
- Opposed: 13%
ISSUE 4 - PARKING

Residential side street parking

Percentage of respondents

Low support 38% 8% 17% 13% 25%  High support

General LIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact/positive impact for businesses</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-limited parking for non-residents</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking permits for residents</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected bicycle lanes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking maintained in commercial area</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset parking issues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced impact to residents and visitors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking removed on main streets</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of active transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and environment for cycling</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General DISLIKES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking for residents and visitors</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on businesses</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-limited parking</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to enforce</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to navigate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking – East Segment

East segment options proposed raised and protected bicycle lanes. Depending on the location, some parking changes were also proposed to accommodate the bicycle lane infrastructure.

For East Option A: One-way vehicle traffic, preserves parking, one-way vehicle traffic and protected bicycle lanes are proposed. This option retains eight existing parking spaces on Balmoral Street and shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way. Twenty-four percent of survey participants indicated support for this parking adjustment design. Survey respondents liked the maintained parking (41), protected bicycle lane (31), and improved cyclist safety and environment (17) but disliked the one-way conversion (37), maintained parking (28), and reduced access (23).

East Option B: two-way vehicle traffic and raised and protected bicycle lanes were proposed. In this option, parking would be removed along Young Street and Balmoral Street and shifted to the north side of Granite Way. Survey participants indicated 22 percent support for this design treatment. Parking removal (40), preserving two-way traffic (21) and adding a protected bicycle lane (17) were the top ranked. In contrast, removing parking (82), no protected bicycle lanes (23), and one-way conversions (22) were the most disliked design elements.
East Option A: One-way vehicle traffic, preserves parking

### General LIKES

- Maintained parking: 41
- Protected bicycle lane: 31
- Improves cyclist safety and environment: 17
- Reduced cut-through and volume of traffic: 9
- Improved safety in conflict areas: 7
- One-way: 5
- Easier to navigate: 4
- Prioritization of active transportation: 4
- Parking on side streets: 4
- Bi-directional flow for cyclists: 2

### General DISLIKES

- One-way: 37
- Parking maintained: 28
- Reduced access: 23
- Parking removed: 22
- Congestion: 17
- Reduced safety for cyclists: 9
- Re-routed transit: 9
- Difficult to navigate: 7
- Cost: 6
- Unnecessary: 6

Percentage of respondents:

- Low support: 48%
- High support: 24%

Number of comments:

- Number of comments (General LIKES): 31179754
- Number of comments (General DISLIKES): 221799766
East Option B: Two-way vehicle traffic, removes parking

**General LIKES**
- Parking removed: 40
- Two-way traffic preserved: 21
- Protected Bicycle Lane: 17
- Minimal impact on parking: 13
- Improved general safety: 12
- Improves cyclist safety: 11
- Maintained traffic flows: 8
- Improved visibility and sight-lines: 7
- Access maintained: 4
- Easy to navigate: 3

**General DISLIKES**
- Parking removed: 82
- No protected bike lanes: 23
- One-way: 22
- Raised, narrow bike lanes: 13
- Cost: 9
- Unnecessary: 9
- Impacts to businesses: 7
- Reduced safety for cyclists: 7
- Reduced access: 6
- Congestion: 6

Number of comments

Percentage of respondents

Low support 40% 10% 16% 12% 22%  High support
5.2 Stakeholder outreach discussions, workshop, pop-up and STPE events feedback

Engagement feedback included perspectives related to safety, bike network connectivity, cycling comfort, accessibility, design details, engagement, parking and loading, pedestrian comfort, safe travel to school, and vehicular traffic flow. Input collected through the dedicated project email, stakeholder outreach, workshop, and pop-up event discussions are summarized and presented in this section.

West Option 1
People were generally in favour of traffic calming within Wolseley. The conversion of Home Street to a bus route was the main concern, with a petition on this conversion signed by several Wolseley residents.

West Option 2
Feedback on the protected bike lane treatment was positive and negative. Cyclists liked the increased safety that a physical barrier would provide especially for children biking. The businesses in the area indicated the associated removal of parking along Westminster Avenue would be extremely detrimental to their businesses and were strongly opposed to parking adjustments required by the protected bike lane design. It was also noted that the Westminster Church, Misericordia Hospital and other large businesses in the area heavily rely on street parking and would be negatively impacted by any parking loss.

East Option 1
When presented with the option of a one-way traffic couplet, residents voiced concern about accessibility. Residents were particularly concerned about the impact one-way traffic would have on access to homes, school drop-off at Balmoral Hall, and traffic flow for delivery trucks and emergency vehicles, as well as how removing parking would take away from what is already a limited supply of on-street spaces. An increase in safety and reduction in cross-cutting traffic was mentioned as a beneficial result of this design.

East Option 2
Participants questioned whether the lesser width of the proposed raised bicycle lane would make it difficult for cars to pass cyclists. It was also noted that the ability to be able to cycle side-by-side is important, which may not be possible with a smaller width bicycle lane. Concerns were voiced regarding the City’s ability to effectively maintain these bicycle paths as they were perceived as being quite narrow.

East Option 3
East Option 3 received the least amount of support from cyclists. Without a physical barrier, cyclists commented that safety and cycling comfort would not be improved when sharing the road with vehicles. Infrastructure design shows that the painted bike lane may not have the same impact on vehicle speed reduction that a physical barrier would provide by narrowing the roads.

See Appendix G for Stakeholder outreach discussions, workshop, and pop-up event feedback.
Responses were received from a total of 11 members of the STPE resource team and STPE working groups, and the feedback received is provided below:

1. Wolseley School working group comments:

“The report did a good job of capturing our concerns. I would like to see the PAC work on sidewalk games to encourage walking to school, and the creation of a bike train program to encourage cycling to school. I really appreciate that you asked the students to participate and enjoy learning their perspectives.”

“I’d like to revisit the concerns around vehicle volume in school zones and better safety. I would also like to revisit the safety concerns of the parents who live North of Portage Ave. and have children who go to school in Wolseley. Those of us who have children who would like to walk or bike to school, but feel there is a very real safety concern with Portage Ave. I feel like the most important issues have been identified in this report. Safety and bike network connections, along with pedestrian comfort are my top priorities. I know that the ability to cross Portage Ave. is not going to be specifically addressed in this report but I feel like it should be. There is a large population of the parents of Wolseley School that have children that need to traverse Portage Ave. in order to get to and from school. That population is only going to increase in the coming years.”

“If we stick to the scope of the project then I feel that we have covered everything well- eventually I would like the city or school division to revisit how students safely cross Portage Avenue. I feel that all of our concerns were addressed well. I appreciate the engagement of the students- seeing the streets from their perspective was very helpful. I would like to continue to push the city and the province to expand this to include routes to Polo Park/St James and to tie in to the Assiniboine Park trail system....it would be beneficial if all of the bike routes were connected- to allow for safe cycling throughout the city.”

“I thought the report was very thorough and also very reflective of my concerns. My biggest concern being safe crossing for children north of Portage. I don’t think I have anything else to add at this time. Thanks so much for your efforts.”

“North of Portage corridor / access to Wolseley for commuters and students is an issue for me. I’d also like to revisit the Wolseley bike lane concepts, and what is really necessary, and to make sure it is a cost effective, reasonable addition to our neighbourhood, that doesn’t affect our neighbours with parking etc. I would also like to see support from the City / School divisions to help with Adult Crossing Guards for Portage Ave. But would love to hear long term/year-round ideas moved forward.”
2. Laura Secord School working group comments:

“Perhaps the notion of a reduced speed limit along the length of Wolseley Avenue?”

“I’m not sure where this fits, but strategies for change and implementation (beyond changes to the built environment and “enforcement”) would be useful. This has come up in subsequent discussions at parent council meetings. One item that came up was the idea of facilitating student walkabouts to attempt to change parent behavior through educating the kids.”

“One thing that’s come up since this process started is the 30km signage and it’s distance from the school on Wolseley Avenue – I believe that the parent council is going to be advocating for a larger area to be covered under the 30kmph signage.”

“I’m always happy to lend my support on making streets safer for our community where I can!”

3. Mulvey School working group comments:

“I’m wondering if all of the safety concerns/suggestions that were brought up at the Mulvey meeting will still be considered in the plan? In particular, there were suggestions regarding the intersections at Westminster/Maryland and Wolseley/Maryland including a curb bump-out (not sure if I have the right term), and a turning light (Wolseley onto Maryland) to help improve safety during/after school rush hour. There were two occasions that a parent/guardian was hit at these intersections by turning vehicles last year, so anything that improves safety for pedestrians would be greatly appreciated.”
4. School travel planning and engagement (STPE) resource team comments:

“Based on our existing knowledge of the community, we feel that the reports have captured the main issues.”

“Children travel to and from school as one of their major destinations, but not the only destination. Is there a way to capture travel to additional locations that children may frequent (ie. before and after school care; recreation centre; nearby businesses, etc.)?”

“We were before and after school care providers in the area consulted? They may offer additional insights”

“The reports were very well written and captured the main points from the sessions we attended.”

“The three travel planning and engagement reports provide a lot of great data! I really appreciate the amount of feedback you were able to get from the students themselves and am thrilled to see that the work done here will inform he design concepts for the Wolseley to Downtown project!”

“Educational components for parents and students would be helpful. Maybe not so much the case for these three schools, but often I notice that it is parents who are creating unsafe situations for students during pick up and drop off. Development of pick up and drop off protocols that are regularly circulated to students and parents.”

“Really enjoyed being a part of the working group and appreciated the diverse input from a variety of representatives.”

“We were students surveyed on mode choice? If so, it would be interesting to include the results at the start of the report (e.g., 60 percent walk to school, 20 percent are driven, 20 percent bike)”

“In future STPs, it would be good to ask working groups what are some things they like about their commute to and from school. Identifying issues is critical and this process did a great job of doing that. It would also be nice to identify positives and things that are already in place and working well. For example, highlighting the patrol program and Laura Secord School would be great to include in the report as something that is working well. Knowing what works well at some schools could help us solve issues at other schools.”
6.0 Next steps
6.0 Next steps

Stakeholder feedback provided valuable insight into how the project team had to balance many needs and viewpoints when developing a recommended design.

Phase 3 of public engagement is planned to begin in early 2020 and will focus on sharing the final design recommendation and highlighting how public feedback influenced the design process. Phase 3 engagement will include opportunities for residents to provide feedback through an open house, online survey and stakeholder meetings.

The STPE facilitator will meet with the Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) of each of the three study schools, share the results of each school’s family and classroom surveys, and present the recommended design for review.

Before proceeding to final design, students in the older grades (4, 5 and 6) will be given the opportunity to review the recommended design and solutions to make sure we accurately heard their needs and wants.

The engagement program is expected to conclude in February 2020, at which point the project team will use feedback from all phases of engagement to confirm and finalize the recommended design. Once the design is finalized, it will be posted on the project website and presented to Council for budget consideration prior to construction.
Appendices
Appendix A: stakeholder list

• Bike Winnipeg
• Manitoba Cycling Association
• The WRENCH
• Green Action Centre
• Winnipeg Trails Association
• Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management – University of Manitoba
• City of Winnipeg Access Advisory Committee
• Government of Manitoba - Indigenous and Municipal Relations
• Injury Prevention/Recreational Trails Healthy Living and Healthy Populations Branch, Manitoba Health, Seniors and Active Living
• Wolseley Residents Association
• Misericordia Health Centre
• West Broadway BiZ
• Laura Secord School
• Mulvey School
• Wolseley School
• Thom Bargen Coffee
• Verde Juice Bar
• Tall Grass Prairie
• Food Fare
• R.A. Steen Community Centre
• Balmoral Hall School
• Broadway Neighbourhood Centre
• West Broadway Community Organization
• Cornish Library
• Canada Life (Great-West Life)
• Korners Stop Grocery Store
• Westgate Mennonite Collegiate
• City Councillor– Cindy Gilroy, Daniel McIntyre Ward
• City Councillor– Sherri Rollins, Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward
• McClure United Church
• Korean Full Gospel
• Saint Margaret’s Anglican Church
• Westminster United Church
• Saint Peter’s Lutheran Church
• St. Demetrios Romanian Orthodox Church
• United Church Halfway House
• Transportation Options for Seniors - TONS
• Wolseley Family Place
• Flaming Cheetahs
• Wolseley Wheels - A Kids of Mud Cycling Club
• Young Food Mart
• Helen Grocery
• Chestnut Grocery
• Best Way Foods
• The Shoe Doctor
• Tall Grass Prairie
• Granite Curling Club
• Barchet’s Grocery
• The Nook
• Organic Planet Worker Co-op
• Urban Massage Therapy
• Yoga North
• Spence Neighbourhood Association
• Balmoral-Spence Residents Association
• Tamarack Recovery Centre
• Houston Properties
• Onyx Properties
• Individuals who requested project notifications
Appendix B: workshop presentation
AGENDA

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Study Background
3. What We’ve Heard
4. Design and Treatments Overview
5. Part 1 Discussion: Design Options
6. Part 2 Discussion: Treatments
7. Closing and Next Steps

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. STUDY BACKGROUND

- In 2015, Winnipeg City Council approved the Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies (PCS), which provides a vision and roadmap for the future of walking and cycling in Winnipeg.

- This connection was identified as an important part of the network and will provide connections to the Omard’s Creek pathway, the protected bike lane on Assiniboine Avenue and Sherbrook Street, the bike lanes on Maryland Street, and the planned neighbourhood greenway on Ruby and Banning Streets.
STUDY PURPOSE

- To improve east-west connections between the Omand's Park pathway and the downtown core.
- To identify options to improve travel choices, accessibility, and connectivity.
- To determine what concerns and issues exist with the existing facilities and determine the best design options, including alignment options and facility selection.
- To develop a preferred design based on public input and technical analysis.
3. WHAT WE’VE HEARD
PHASE 1 ENGAGEMENT

- Pop-Up Events
  - November 23 to 25, 2018
  - Thorn Bergen Coffee
  - Verde Juice Bar
  - Foodare
  - R.A. Steen Community Centre
  - Over 600 interactions

- On-Line Survey
  - November 9 to December 8, 2018
  - 845 completed responses

- School Travel Planning Engagement
  - PAC meetings
  - On-line survey
  - Hands up surveys
  - Student engagement workshops
  - Community and school trip maps
  - Walkabouts
  - Visioning workshops

PHASE 1 ENGAGEMENT

- What are the key design priorities for this project for community members?

- What are the current uses and features of the study area? (e.g., loading zones, school zones, major crossings, garbage collection, etc.).

- What are the top transportation issues within the study area? (e.g., safety, short-cutting traffic, high traffic volumes, high traffic speeds, etc.).

- What would future usage be if cycling improvements were made along these corridors?
4. DESIGN OPTIONS

DESIGN OPTIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project

DESIGN OPTIONS FOR ALL AGES AND ABILITIES

Busy streets
- Protected bicycle lanes

Quiet streets
- Neighbourhood greenways

Off-street
- Bike paths

Low volumes
(1,500 or less)

Low speeds
(30 km/h)
**DESIGN FEATURES – SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**

- **Crosswalk Improvements**
  - Include adding new painted crosswalks, improving existing crosswalks with treatments such as median barriers or a raised crosswalk that requires motor vehicle traffic to slow down when crossing.
  - Locations considered:
    - Wolseley Avenue & Cannon Street
    - Wolseley Avenue & Lansdowne Street
    - Wolseley Avenue & Wilmot Street
    - Clifton Street

- **Roadway Improvements**
  - Modify the road geometry by redesigning the curb locations of intersections to improve sightlines for all road users.
  - Locations considered: Wolseley Ave & Clifton St, Wolseley Ave & Cameron Pl, Wolseley Ave & Ethelbert St, Wolseley Ave & Canon St, Baldwin St & Granite Way

**DESIGN FEATURES – REDUCING SPEEDS**

- **Curb Extensions**
  - Lower the roadway at intersections to slow down motor vehicle traffic and reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians. Curb extensions are a consistent and practical geometric improvement.
  - Locations considered: Wolseley Ave & Clifton St, Wolseley Ave & Cameron Pl, Wolseley Ave & Ethelbert St, Wolseley Ave & Canon St, Baldwin St & Granite Way

- **Raised Intersections**
  - Raised the road surface to sidewalk level at the intersection to slow down motor vehicle traffic and provide more comfortable crossing for pedestrians.
  - Locations considered: Wolseley Avenue & Regent Street
  - Wolseley Avenue & Ruby Street
  - Wolseley Avenue & Ruby Street

- **Speed Bumps**
  - Common traffic calming devices that rely on vertical obstruction to slow motor vehicle traffic.
  - Locations considered: Wolseley Ave from Regent St to Maryland St, along Wolseley Ave from Academy to Mary, and north of Wolseley west of Arlington
**DESIGN FEATURES – REDUCING VOLUMES**

One-way street connections:涉及修改交通运营，
along specified roadways to only allow traffic to travel in one direction，
one-way connections being determined range in length from one block to several depending on the location.

Locations considered: windshield Ave from Walnut St to Maryland，Preston Ave from Arlington St to Henry St，Citrus Ave from Philadelphia to Balsam，Young/Baltimore from Langdale St to Broadway

Vehicle access restrictions:限制进入机动车均
from making certain movements at intersections with physical barriers to prevent cut-through traffic from accessing their destination.

Locations considered: windshield Ave & Magnolia Pl，Windham Ave & Sheffield Rd，Ashby St & Palmetto Ave，Westminster Ave & Arlington St

**OPTION 1 - WEST**

Neighbourhood Greenway

Legend:
- Parking Mismatched
- Slow Intersection
- One-way treatment
- Pedestrian Intersection
- Neighborhood greenway
- Traffic calming for shared
- Safety access and sidewalk

![Diagram of Option 1 - West Neighbourhood Greenway](Image)
**OPTION 1 - EAST**

**One-Way Vehicle Traffic with Protected Bike Lanes**
- 2.0m protected bicycle lanes
- Change to one-way vehicle traffic operation eastbound on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, northbound on Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and northbound on Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way
- Change Langside Street to one-way southbound vehicle traffic operation from Broadway to Westminster
- Change Granite Way to one-way westbound vehicle traffic from Osborne Street to Balmoral Street
- Maintain on-street parking on Granite Way to the north side of the street

**OPTION 2 - EAST**

**Two-Way Vehicle Traffic with Raised Bike Lanes (Young & Balmoral), One-Way Vehicle Traffic with Protected Bike Lanes (Granite Way)**
- Maintains two-way traffic operations on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way
- Change Granite Way to one-way westbound for vehicle traffic as described in Option 1
- Remove 8 parking spaces on Balmoral Street between Young Street and Granite Way to accommodate raised bicycle lanes
- Shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way
- Narrow bicycle lanes
**OPTION 3 - EAST**

**Two-Way Vehicle Traffic with Painted Bike Lanes (Young & Balmoral), One-Way vehicle Traffic with Protected Bike Lanes (Granite Way)**

- Maintains two-way traffic operations on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way.
- Change Granite Way to one-way westbound for vehicle traffic as described in Option 1
- Remove 6 parking spaces on Balmoral Street between Young Street and Granite Way to accommodate raised bicycle lanes
- Shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way
- Narrow bicycle lanes with no physical protection

**6. NEXT STEPS**
Appendix C: Phase 2 online survey

Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project

Help shape the Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project!

The Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project is looking at options to improve travel choices, accessibility and connectivity from Wolseley to Downtown. The project focuses on improving conditions for people of all ages and abilities walking and cycling throughout the neighbourhood. Design options considered include neighbourhood greenway treatments that create low-speed and volume streets; comfortable for all users and protected bicycle lanes that provide a physical separation between people cycling and driving.

This is the second survey conducted as part of this project and is intended to get your input on design options and treatments being considered. We want to learn about what is important to you as we move forward with design options for the project.

This survey will take approximately 15 minutes of your time. The survey will be collecting feedback until June 21, 2010.
The Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike study area has been divided into two areas based on the different treatment options being explored and the typical land use. The West Segment, which extends from Raglan Road to Furby Street, is comprised of predominantly single family homes, whereas the East Segment, which extends from Furby Street to Osborne Street, is mostly multi-family homes.

The following survey presents the proposed designs through two levels of questioning:

- In part one we are looking for feedback on the overall designs for both the East and West Segments.
- In part two we are looking for feedback on specific treatment options that are being considered as components of the proposed designs.

The feedback you provide will be used to select and modify designs for both the East and West Segments.

**Design Options**

In Phase 1 we heard that Safety, Bike Network Connectivity, and Cycling Comfort were the top three priorities for project design. Keeping these priorities in mind, two options have been developed for both the west and the east segments of the study area. We want to know what you think about each option.

**West Option 1 – Neighbourhood greenways on Westminster Ave. and Wolseley Ave.**

Key Features:

- Neighbourhood greenway provides traffic-calmed streets, safe and comfortable for cycling and walking
- Geometric and crossing improvements to improve pedestrian safety
- Speed humps to slow down motor vehicle traffic
- Traffic diversions to eliminate short cutting traffic
- Strategic one-way traffic modification at Preston Avenue between Home Street and Arlington Street, and Wolseley Avenue between Maryland Street and Walnut Street.
### Aspects of Design:
- Enhanced pedestrian environment
- Opportunity for landscaping improvements
- Significantly reduced traffic volumes and speeds creates an enhanced cycling environment
- Parking maintained throughout
- Limits access/egress for residents
- #10 transit route shift from Elman Street to Home Street required between Westminster Avenue and Wolseley Avenue
- May not improve cyclist comfort and safety at Westminster Avenue and Marylaud Street

What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following pages.

- Do Nothing / Leave As Is
- Full Support

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

### West Option 2 - Protected bicycle lanes on Westminster Ave., neighbourhood greenway Wolseley Ave.

**Key Features:**
- Maintains neighbourhood greenway along Wolseley Avenue as shown in option 1
- Protected uni-directional bicycle lanes on Westminster Avenue from Sherbrook Street to Aubrey Street
- Geometric and crossing improvements to improve pedestrian safety
- Speed humps to slow down motor vehicle traffic along Wolseley Avenue and Clifton Street
- Traffic diversion on Wolseley Avenue to eliminate short cutting traffic

### Aspects of Design:
- Fully protected cycling infrastructure on Westminster Avenue
- Limits traffic diversion required
- Narrowing of travel lanes will slow traffic
- Transit route modification not required
- Requires all parking to be removed on Westminster Avenue from Sherbrook Street to Aubrey Street
- Requires traffic calming on Wolseley Avenue to connect to Reglan Road to the west
What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following page.

- Do Nothing / Leave As Is
- Full Support

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

One-way and two-way vehicle traffic design options respond to public feedback which prioritized pedestrian, cycling, and vehicle safety, specifically along Balmoral Street between Lansdowne Street and Granite Way.

**East Option 1 – One-way vehicle traffic, protected bicycle lanes**

If viewing on a PC zoom into the map by pressing [Ctrl] and [+].
Aspects of Design:
- Enhanced pedestrian environment
- Opportunity for landscaping improvements
- Significantly reduced traffic volumes and speeds creates an enhanced cycling environment
- Parking maintained throughout
- Limits access/egress for residents
- #10 transit route shift from Everson Street to Home Street required between Westminster Avenue and Wolseley Avenue
- May not improve cyclist comfort and safety at Westminster Avenue and Maryland Street

West Option 2 - Protected bicycle lanes on Westminster Ave., neighbourhood greenway Wolseley Ave.

Key Features:
- Maintains neighbourhood greenway along Wolseley Avenue as shown in option 1
- Protected uni-directional bicycle lanes on Westminster Avenue from Sherbrook Street to Aubrey Street
- Geometric and crossing improvements to improve pedestrian safety
- Speed humps to slow down motor vehicle traffic along Wolseley Avenue and Clifton Street
- Traffic diversion on Wolseley Avenue to eliminate short cutting traffic

Aspects of Design:
- Fully protected cycling infrastructure on Westminster Avenue
- Limits traffic diversion required
- Narrowing of travel lanes will slow traffic
- Transit route modification not required
- Requires all parking to be removed on Westminster Avenue from Sherbrook Street to Aubrey Street
- Requires traffic calming on Wolseley Avenue to connect to Reglan Road to the west

What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following page.
Do Nothing / Leave As Is  Full Support

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

If viewing on a PC zoom into the map by pressing [Ctrl] and [+].
What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following page.

Do Nothing / Leave As Is  
Full Support

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

East Option 1 – One-way vehicle traffic, protected bicycle lanes

One-way and two-way vehicle traffic design options respond to public feedback which prioritized pedestrian, cycling, and vehicle safety, specifically along Balmoral Street between Lansdowne Street and Granite Way.

If viewing on a PC zoom into the map by pressing [Ctrl] and [+].
Key Features:
- 2.0m protected bicycle lanes allow people cycling to pass comfortably
- Change to one-way vehicle traffic operation eastbound on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, northbound on Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and northbound on Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way
- Change Langside Street to one-way southbound vehicle traffic operation from Broadway to Westminster
- Change Granite Way to one-way westbound vehicle traffic from Osborne Street to Balmoral Street to accommodate bi-directional protected bicycle lanes on the south side of the street and on-street parking
- Move on-street parking on Granite Way to the north side of the street
- Protected bicycle lanes for reduced conflict between vehicles and bikes

Aspects of Design:
- Bicycle infrastructure meets minimum design criteria for width
- Reduced roadway volumes
- One-way operation is safer because it has fewer conflict points at intersections
- Opportunity to retain eight existing parking spaces on Balmoral Street and shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way
- Protected bicycle lanes provide physical separation minimizing conflicts between bikes and motor vehicles
- One-way vehicle travel (vehicle speeds could increase)
- Limits access/egress for residents and businesses
- #10 transit route modified to travel northbound on Balmoral Street and southbound on Langside Street

What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following page.

Do Nothing / Leave As Is ☐ Full Support ☑

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

If viewing on a PC zoom into the map by pressing [Ctrl] and [+].
Aspects of Design:
- Grade separated cycling infrastructure to provide vertical separation for reduced conflict between vehicles and bikes.
- Grade separated cycling infrastructure has a high cost and potential impacts on drainage and may have significant implementation challenges.
- Grade separated cycling infrastructure with narrow width is not wide enough for cyclists passing and may present safety issues with the addition of vertical separation. This design may not be comfortable for all cyclists.
- Maintains two-way vehicle operation.
- Constrained street width requires narrow raised bicycle lanes and narrow vehicle travel lanes.
- Limited boulevard space to widen, further investigation required to determine tree root impact with widening.
- No parking or loading maintained on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way.
- Raised bicycle lanes need to transition to street level at intersections and driveways increasing the chance of conflicts.
- Cyclists have many grade changes at driveways and intersection approaches along Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way.

What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following page.

Do Nothing / Leave As Is  

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

Key Features:
- Maintains two-way traffic operations on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way.
- Change Granite Way to one-way westbound for vehicle traffic as described in option 1.
- Remove 6 parking spaces on Balmoral Street between Young Street and Granite Way to accommodate painted bicycle lanes.
- Shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way.
- Narrow bicycle lanes with no physical protection.
Aspects of Design:
- Constrained street width restricts ability to achieve desirable widths, resulting in narrow bicycle lanes and narrow vehicle travel lanes.
- Established trees in the boulevard limit the ability to add pavement width, further investigation required to determine tree root impact with widening.
- Painted cycling infrastructure does not provide physical separation between vehicles and bikers.
- Painted bicycle lanes can be installed quickly and at significantly lower cost with fewer implementation challenges than raised bicycle lanes (Option 2).
- Painted bicycle lanes are not considered comfortable for people of all ages and abilities.
- Maintained two-way vehicle operation.
- No parking or loading maintained on Westminster Avenue east of Langside Street, Young Street from Westminster Avenue to Balmoral Street, and Balmoral Street from Young Street to Granite Way.

What is your overall level of support for this option? Definitions and specific questions about individual treatments are presented on the following page.

Do Nothing / Leave As Is  
Full Support

What do you like about this option?

What do you dislike about this option?

Design Treatments

In Phase 1 we heard that short-cutting traffic, speeding, intersection and pedestrian safety, and parking for local business needs were concerns within the study area. To address these issues, design treatments have been proposed at locations throughout the entire study area. We want to know what you think about each treatment.

Issue 1: Short-cutting traffic

We heard that high traffic volumes and short-cutting traffic are a concern throughout the study area, particularly during peak periods. A number of treatments are proposed to reduce short-cutting traffic in different options.

Vehicle access restrictions involve limiting motor vehicle traffic from making certain movements at intersections with physical barriers to prevent cut-through traffic from accessing their destination.

Locations considered: Wolseley Ave & Reglan Rd, Wolseley Ave & Sherburn Rd, Auburn Dr & Palmerston Ave, Westminster Ave & Arlington St.

Please rate treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.

Wolseley Avenue & Reglan Road
Wolseley Avenue & Sherburn Road
Aubrey Street & Palmerston Avenue
Westminster Avenue & Arlington Street

Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected these ratings.
**Issue 2: Speeding**

To ensure vehicles driving through the study area are traveling at safe speeds for pedestrians and cyclists, speed humps are proposed to discourage fast travel speeds, including:

**Speed humps** are common traffic calming devices that rely on vertical deflection to slow motor vehicle traffic.

Locations considered: Wolseley Ave from Raglan St to Maryland St, along Westminster Ave from Aubrey to Maryland, and north of Westminster east of Arlington.

Please rate each treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.

Wolseley Avenue, north of Westminster Avenue east of Arlington Street

Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected these ratings.
Issue 3: Intersections and Pedestrian Safety

A number of intersections were identified as having safety concerns. Pedestrian safety is an issue, particularly around schools and at major intersections. Design treatments were developed to improve intersection geometry and pedestrian safety.

Geometric improvements modify the road geometry by redesigning the curb locations at intersections to improve sightlines for all road users.

Locations considered: Wolseley Ave & Clifton St, Wolseley Ave & Camden Pl, Westminster Ave & Ethelbert St, Westminster Ave & Gannot St, Balmoral St & Granite Way

Please rate each treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.

Wolseley Avenue & Clifton Street
Wolseley Avenue & Camden Place
Westminster Avenue & Ethelbert Street
Westminster Avenue & Canora Street
Balmoral Street & Granite Way

Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected these ratings.
**Raised Intersections** elevated the road surface to sidewalk level at the intersection to slow down motor vehicle traffic and provide more comfortable crossings for pedestrians.

**Locations Considered:**
- Wolesley Avenue & Raglan Street
- Westminster Avenue & Ruby Street
- Wolesley Avenue & Ruby Street

---

**Crosswalk Improvements** can include adding new painted crosswalks, improving existing crosswalks with treatments such as overhead flashers, or a raised crosswalk that requires motor vehicle traffic to slow down when passing.

**Locations Considered:**
- Wolesley Avenue & Lenore Street
- Westminster Avenue & Lenore Street
- Westminster Avenue & Walnut Street
- Clifton Street midblock

---

**Please rate each treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.**

- Wolesley Avenue & Raglan Street
- Westminster Avenue & Ruby Street
- Wolesley Avenue & Ruby Street

**Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected these ratings.**

---

**Please rate each treatment considered with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.**

- Wolesley Avenue & Lenore Street
- Westminster Avenue & Lenore Street
- Westminster Avenue & Walnut Street
- Clifton Street midblock

**Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected these ratings.**
Issue 4: West - Parking

West Segment Option 2 proposes protected bicycle lanes along Westminster Avenue. This design feature requires parking adjustments to accommodate the bicycle lane infrastructure. Depending on the location and option, some parking changes are proposed, including:

A. Westminster Avenue (Aubrey Street to Furby Street): To accommodate a protected bike lane, parking would be removed on both sides of the street.

B. Westminster Avenue

- (Aubrey Street to Arlington Street): Shared use lanes that accommodate on-street parking in a low-speed environment
- (Auburn Street to Furby Street): To accommodate a protected bike lane, parking would be removed on both sides of the street.

Please rate each treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.

Option A

Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected this rating.

Option B: Shared use lane, parking maintained Aubrey Street to Arlington Street

If viewing on a PC zoom into the map by pressing [Ctrl] and [+].

Please rate each treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.

Option B
Please rate each treatment with 1 (low support) to 5 (high support) stars.

Option B

Please provide a comment to help us understand why you selected this rating.

Residential Side Street Parking: to minimize any parking changes, options could be considered to allow time-limited parking on side streets (residents exempt) to increase the availability of parking for visitors.

If viewing on a PC zoom into the map by pressing [Ctrl] and [+].
Issue 4: East - Parking

East Segment Options propose new dedicated bicycle paths. These design features require parking adjustments to accommodate the bicycle lane infrastructure. Depending on location and option, some parking changes are proposed, including:

A. East Segment 1 - One-way Vehicle Traffic, Protected Bicycle Lanes, Parking Maintained: Opportunity to retain existing parking spaces on Balmoral Street and shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way.

B. East Segment 2 and 3 - Two-way Vehicle Traffic, Raised and Protected Bicycle Lanes, Parking Removed: Removes parking on Balmoral Street and shifts parking to the north side of Granite Way.

Option A: One-Way preserves parking

Option B: Two-way removes parking
Thank you for your input so far! Do you have any additional comments or thoughts you would like to add?

Tell Us About You!

Please answer a few questions to help us better understand who we're hearing from...

What is your age?
- 17 years or younger
- 18-24 years old
- 25-34 years old
- 35-44 years old
- 45-54 years old
- 55-64 years old
- 65-74 years old
- 75+ years old
- 85 years or older

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Other

What is your postal code? (leave 3 digits)

What is your main mode of transportation?
- Car
- Walk
- Bike
- Public Transit

What is your main connection to this area?
- Resident
- Work/business
- Student
- Travel through the area
- Volunteering

Did you participate in the first phase of public engagement for this project?
- Yes
- No

How did you hear about this Project?
- City of Winnipeg website
- Email invitation
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Public Engagement News
- Other

Stay Involved

Please visit the project website for more information about the study, arts to join in other public engagement events. Thank you for your participation!
## Appendix D: School travel plan and engagement reports

### Malvey School School Travel Planning and Engagement Report February 2019

#### Executive Summary

Particularly problematic areas in the Eastern section of Westminster Avenue for students walking to and from school, the school community strongly requesting pedestrian safety improvements in this area. Vehicle volumes on Wolseley and Westminster Avenue perceived to be very high, making for difficult crossings for students due to volume of right turning vehicles. Pedestrian crossing at Wolseley and Maryland has a high volume of vehicles, as well as small sidewalks and wide crossing distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue(s)</th>
<th>Potential Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland and Wolseley</td>
<td>Vehicles parked close to intersections on east side of street, resulting in cars turning from 2nd lane, not seeing pedestrians</td>
<td>Ensure no parking setback is appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back lanes between Maryland and Sherbrook on Westminster</td>
<td>Blind spot</td>
<td>Install convex mirrors at corners to allow for visibility of vehicles and pedestrians, install signs warning of pedestrians crossing at blind corners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland and Wolseley</td>
<td>Cars turning west onto Wolseley off of Maryland Avenue at speed while pedestrians are present</td>
<td>Change angle of turn to slow vehicles, install curb bump out to shorten crossing distance, increase enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland and Wolseley</td>
<td>Cars turning south on Maryland off of Wolseley Avenue (East and West) at speed for students to only cross on north side of Wolseley</td>
<td>Limit right turns off of Wolseley from 7 am to 5 pm every weekday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue between Maryland Street and Walnut Street (school zone)</td>
<td>Parents shopping students off into traffic while double parked on Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>Create a student drop-off zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue between Maryland Street and Walnut Street (school zone)</td>
<td>Vehicles speeding through school zone</td>
<td>Improved signage, speed bumps, bump outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on West side of Maryland between Westminster Avenue and Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>Cracked and broken sidewalk used by walking school bus twice daily, as well as 40 students walking to and from daycare 4 times a day at Westminster Church</td>
<td>Repair and maintain sidewalk in this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Malvey School Walkabout Summary**

**Time:** November 21st, 2018, 8:30 am

**Attendance:** 15 including students, parents, Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer, School Principal and Teachers

**Photo:** Students, Parents, and Staff of Malvey School on the STPI walkabout - November 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Recommended Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk south of the school on Woodrow Place</td>
<td>Sidewalk in very poor condition, cracked and broken concrete in bike lane in poor condition, cracked and broken, frequent potholes, standing water, resulting in students not riding to school</td>
<td>Repair and maintain sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Street Bike Lane</td>
<td>Concrete in painted bike lane in poor condition, cracked and broken, frequent potholes, standing water, resulting in students not riding to school</td>
<td>Repair and maintain bike lane pavement, install physical barrier, change slope to improve drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Maryland St and Wolfeley Ave</td>
<td>Narrow sidewalk on South West corner with steep slope, crowded at dismissal times, very close promonts to heavy traffic lanes</td>
<td>Install curb bump out to allow for wider sidewalk, change angle of curb-cut to shallower angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland St and Sherbrook Ave</td>
<td>No bus shelter for students bussing to and from school</td>
<td>Install bus shelters or transit amenities at these locations near the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Forbes St and Wolfeley Ave</td>
<td>Vehicles not stopping at three way stop intersection</td>
<td>Install painted line markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk at Walnut Street and Wolfeley Ave</td>
<td>Crosswalk location too far away for students to use regularly</td>
<td>Move crosswalk closer to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Maryland St and Wolfeley Ave</td>
<td>Crossing too wide on Wolfeley to allow for safe crossing of small children</td>
<td>Install curb bumps out to shorten crossing distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfeley and Westminster Avenues</td>
<td>Volume of vehicles too high, making unsafe crossing for students crossing east west on Maryland St and Sherbrook St as vehicles turn while pedestrians present due to traffic back-up frustrations</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of vehicles using these streets at arrival and dismissal time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Wolfeley Avenue and Maryland Street</td>
<td>No tactile paving or any curb cuts at this intersection, making it difficult for visually impaired students to navigate</td>
<td>Install tactile paving on these sidewalks at intersection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Recommended Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrook Street and Wolfeley Avenue</td>
<td>Cyclists in bike lane not yielding to pedestrians, running red light</td>
<td>Install &quot;yield to pedestrian&quot; signage in bike lane, increase enforcement of running red light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forby St and Westminster Ave</td>
<td>No pedestrian crossing, steep grade at curb cuts, intersection used by walking school bus with 20 students at the school twice a day, Two students have been hit by vehicles while crossing here in the last 5 years</td>
<td>Install 4 way stop or raised crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langside Street and Westminster Ave</td>
<td>Dangerous pedestrian crossing, 6 students have been hit by vehicles while crossing here, including one who suffered serious brain damage</td>
<td>Install raised crosswalk or improved signage, expand school zone in front of Balmoral Hall school to slow vehicles approaching crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Street and Woodrow Place</td>
<td>School bus has difficulty turning West onto Woodrow Place</td>
<td>Move parking to the West from intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Street</td>
<td>Vehicles encroaching/driving in bike lane</td>
<td>Install physical/separated barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West corner of Wolfeley Avenue and Maryland Street</td>
<td>Vehicles parked too close to crosswalk, limiting visibility</td>
<td>Install bump out that extends into existing no parking zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mulvey School Visualizing Workshop Action Plan

Time: 5:30 p.m. November 26th, 2013

Attendance: 12, including parents, Mulvey school administration, Winnipeg School Division staff, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, Healthy Built Environment specialists.

Goals: Agreed with the goals as stated.
1. Improved Children’s Health and Well-being
2. Input into the design process for their community
3. Environmental Benefits
4. Increased Safety
5. Reduced Transportation Costs
6. Community Cohesion and Connectivity
7. Development of life-long healthy habits

Barrier:
- Volume of vehicles on Wolseley Avenue perceived as a barrier for children walking to school.
- Can rolling through steps signs frequent issue for children and parents walking to school.

Comments:
- Vehicle volumes, especially those on Wolseley Avenue turning right onto Maryland Street were perceived as being too high, causing issues for children coming to school from the East.
- Only 10% of the students at the school lived to the West of the school premises in the Wolseley neighborhood.
- Angry and impatient drivers were observed by many parents, especially those coming onto Maryland southbound. They observed that these drivers often entered the crosswalk while pedestrians were still present, leading to frequent “near misses” with parents and students.
- Participants suggested the installation of a turning light on Westminster Avenue to ensure pedestrian safety. All nursery and kindergarten children cross this intersection 4 times per school days, and have had some near misses at this intersection in particular.
- Cut through traffic to the East of Sherbrook viewed as problematic, especially for cars heading north on Sherbrook turning right onto Wolseley Avenue, and then turning north onto Fulby Street.
- Langside Street also viewed as a frequent "cut through" route. Residents on this street recently circulated a petition to reduce the speed limit on this street.
- Establishment of a formal "drop-off and pick-up" zone was suggested.
- Participants suggested installation of raised crosswalks on Westminster Avenue and Wolseley Avenue to help ensure student safety, and slow traffic at these intersections.
- Participants were "strongly in favor" of improvements to the crosswalk at Langside and Westminster, including consideration of a raised crosswalk and improved signage. Consideration of right lines should also be included. A student who attended Mulvey School was hit and seriously injured at this crosswalk several years ago.
- Participants also requested consideration of the installation of a pedestrian crossing at Fulby and Westminster, as this is a crossing for one of the Walking School Buses, and a student was hit and injured at this intersection several years ago.
- The size of the school zone was viewed as being too small by the workshop attendees, and they requested that the maximum setback be installed.
- The crosswalk to the west of the school on Wolseley Avenue was considered problematic due to the geometry of this crossing, and did not serve the needs of the students at Mulvey School due to it being 100 meters from the entrance to the school.
- Parents left cars were parked too close to the crosswalk at Wolseley and Wolseley, obscuring sightlines for drivers and pedestrians.
Proposed Action Plan Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve lighting on bike cage</td>
<td>Mulvey School Administration/Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installations of line markings at stop signs to encourage vehicles to come to a complete stop at the sign itself, and discourage “roll through” stops.</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase enforcement of parking violations around the school</td>
<td>Winnipeg police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a formal “drop-off and pick-up” zone near the school</td>
<td>Mulvey School Administration/City of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider installation of raised crosswalks at Westminster and Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider installation of raised crosswalk at Furry and Westminster streets, as this is a crossing for one of the walking school busses.</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of the reduced-speed school zone</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase U-Locks for student use</td>
<td>Mulvey School PAV/T Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo: Mulvey students providing feedback on observed issues around the school.

Student Feedback
Mulvey School – November 21st, 2018
Room 18 (24 students):

- Students in this class identified large volumes of vehicles on Sherbrook Street at Wolseley Avenue as being problematic, and a barrier to walking or biking to school.
- Students in this class identified the intersection of Wolseley Avenue and Maryland Street as being difficult to cross on foot, with small sidewalks and many vehicles turning off of Maryland Street onto Wolseley Avenue westbound, often while students were present in the crosswalk.
- Students in this class also identified the large volume of vehicles turning southbound off of Wolseley Avenue (both East and Westbound) onto Maryland southbound (often while they crossed and were present in the intersection) as a major safety concern.
- Students in this class identified the area immediately in front of the school on Wolseley Avenue between Maryland Street and Walnut Street as having many vehicles as arrival and dismissal times, with many cars double parking to drop off students.
Students in this class identified the intersection of Maryland and Westminster as being an area of concern, with high vehicle volumes and difficulty crossing on foot as a result, especially when trying to cross Maryland Street and dealing with cars turning off of Westminster Avenue.

Students in this class identified the challenges in navigating the back lane off of Woodrow Place due to the tight confines and rumbled pavement, as several students in this class took the bus to school.

Room 20 (24 students)
- Students in this class identified Sherbrook Street and Wolseley Avenue as being a busy and problematic intersection, with high vehicle volumes and turning vehicles posing a challenge when walking or biking to school.
- Students in this class identified Maryland Street and Wolseley Avenue as being a hazardous intersection, with high numbers of vehicles and difficulty crossing on foot due to the large number of turning vehicles.
- Students in this class identified the sidewalk on the north side of Wolseley Avenue between Walnut Street and Chestnut Street as being in poor shape, and difficult to navigate on foot.
- Students in this class expressed their desire for bike lanes to be installed on Furry Street between Westminster Avenue and Wolseley Avenue, as many of them live in the West Broadway community, and would like to be able to bike to school along this street.

Room 17 (27 students)
- Students in this class identified the crosswalk at Langside Street and Westminster Avenue as being particularly hazardous for them, with poor sightlines, and vehicles accelerating off of the corner at Young Street and Westminster Avenue.
- Many students in this class live north of Broadway Avenue, and expressed challenges in safely crossing this street due to lack of crosswalks.
- Students in this class expressed a strong preference to see a bike lane installed on Furry Street, as this would connect directly to Wolseley Avenue, and allow them to ride their bikes to Mulvey School.
- Students in this class also expressed a desire for a safer crossing at the intersection of Wolseley Avenue and Furry Street, as their experience has been that there is a large number of vehicles on this street cutting through off of Sherbrook Street, and crossing here can be risky due to the volume of vehicles.
- The sidewalk on the East side of Furry Street South of Wolseley Avenue was identified as being in poor condition, with cracked and broken pavement. Many students live in the apartments and Manitoba Housing buildings on this street.
- Many of these students accessed the Cornish Library, and requested a safer crossing for pedestrians to access the library, particularly from the West Broadway neighborhood.
- This class also identified their desire for separated bike lanes on the Maryland bridge, as many of them cross this bridge to visit friends on the other side, as well as attend River Heights Junior High and Kelvin High School when they graduate from Mulvey School. Students also identified the need for separated bike lanes on the Sherbrook Bridge to connect to the parking protected bike lanes on Sherbrook street.

Next Steps
Input from the school walkabout, visioning workshops, student feedback workshops, and discussions with school staff will be used alongside technical information and broader public engagement findings to inform the development of proposed design concepts for the Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project. For more information and updates on this process, please register for email updates on this page: https://www.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/pedestrianscycling/walkbikerides/projects/wolseleytodowntown.html

Phase 2 of the Wolseley to Downtown public engagement program is expected to begin in the spring of 2019. This phase will provide members of the public and other area stakeholders the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the preliminary design options and alternatives that will be presented at this time.

To learn more about this project and other City of Winnipeg Walk Bike projects, please visit https://www.winnipeg.ca/walkbiketknightsproject
Laura Secord School Walkabout Summary

Time: December 4th, 2018, 8:30 am - 10 am

Attendance: 20 members of the school community, including parents, Laura Secord school administration and teaching staff, city transportation staff, Laura Secord students, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority's Healthy Built Environment specialists, Road Safety staff from Manitoba Public Insurance, Transportation staff from the Winnipeg School Division, Building staff from the Winnipeg School Division.

Executive Summary: Vehicle volumes, parking and stopping in unsafe or prohibited areas, pedestrian safety and comfort, driver compliance rates at stops signs, handicapped loading areas, and maintenance of walking and cycling facilities are the main issues of concern for this school, largely focused on the area in front of the school on Wolseley Avenue. The walkabout group noted many near misses and dangerous driving behavior, and the high volume of students walking to school that had frequent risky interactions with the high volume of vehicles in the zone surrounding the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue(s)</th>
<th>Potential Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side of Wolseley Avenue between Lenore and Ruby Streets</td>
<td>Cars parking is “no stopping” zone in front of the school, encroaching into marked crosswalk</td>
<td>Install curb bump-outs at Lenore crosswalk and extend edge of “no stopping” zone to the West, shortening crossing distance for students and narrowing the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of Wolseley Avenue between Lenore and Ruby Streets</td>
<td>Cars sitting idling in “no stopping zone” for as long as 22 minutes</td>
<td>Install “no idling” signs around the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Street, Lenore Street, and Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>Students being dropped off while stopped at stop signs on Ruby, Lenore, and Wolseley Avenues</td>
<td>Install curb bump-outs on Lenore and Ruby streets to shorten crossing distance and dissuade student drop off while in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue and Lenore Street</td>
<td>Vehicles rolling through cross walk at Lenore while students and parents present</td>
<td>Raised crosswalk on Wolseley Avenue at Lenore Street to slow traffic and increase visibility of crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenore Street and Westminster Avenue</td>
<td>Students crossing at Lenore St and Wolseley Avenue also crossed Lenore at Westminster Ave where there is no pedestrian crosswalk or traffic signs</td>
<td>Install pedestrian crossing at Lenore and Westminster to line up with the crosswalk to the south at Lenore and Wolseley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of Ruby Street, South of Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>Garbage pick up area on Ruby street used a student drop off zone</td>
<td>Install barrier to dissuade parents from using garbage lane as a student drop off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of Wolseley Avenue between Ruby and Lenore Streets</td>
<td>Students being dropped off directly in front of the school on south side of Wolseley Avenue in handicapped drop off zone</td>
<td>Increased enforcement of parking restrictions in front of the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ecole Laura Second School STPC Report February 2019

| Ruby Street South of Wolseley Avenue | School Bus drop-off on Ruby Street - cars attempting to turn down Ruby should be back up onto Wolseley Avenue by the intersection as a result. Install bump-out on Ruby Street at South West corner of Ruby and Westminster. Consider installing no right turns from 7:30 am to 9:30 am off of Wolseley onto Ruby Street south. |
| Alleyway between Lenore Street and Evanston Street on Northside of Wolseley Avenue | Student drop-off at alley between Lenore and Evanston, dropped off and then reversed into traffic. Increased enforcement of dangerous driving behavior. |
| Lenore Street south of Wolseley Avenue | Parents using Lenore as a student drop-off zone. Install "no drop off" signs on Lenore south of Wolseley Avenue |
| Southside of Wolseley Avenue between Ruby Street and Lenore Street | Handicapped drop-off vehicle parked in front of school for 23 minutes. Communicate with support staff the need to drop off efficiently in front of school in handicapped zone. |
| Wolseley Avenue between Ruby Street and Lenore | U-turns in middle of school zone. Driver education, enforcement of dangerous driving behavior such as runs in a school zone. |
| Ruby Street, Wolseley Avenue, Westminster Avenue, and Lenore Street, high traffic walking routes for students | Cars cutting through stop signs at Ruby, Wolseley, Westminster, and Lenore streets. Raised crossings at Wolseley, Ruby, and Lenore Streets. Stop line markings on North/South streets. |
| Wolseley Avenue | Volume of vehicles too high (patrol captain feedback) making it tough for pedestrians to safely cross students. Neighbourhood traffic calming to reduce volume of vehicles passing by school. Close road is front of school during morning and afternoon rush hours. |
| Wolseley Avenue, particularly on north side of street | Cars stopping in sidewalk crossing zones, forcing pedestrians to detour. Zebra markings on North side of Wolseley Avenue at Ruby and Lenore streets. |
| Wolseley Avenue | Sidewalks in poor condition. Repair sidewalks near school. |

| East and West Side of School | Bike racks not compatible for proper locking of bikes. Install bike racks that allow for locking of both front and rear tires. |
| Southside Wolseley Avenue between Ruby Street and Lenore Street | Student drop-off is no parking/no stopping zone in front of school. Consider designating RA Street as a student drop-off zone. |
| Southside Wolseley Avenue between Ruby Street and Lenore Street | Handicapped student drop-off is currently located on south side of Wolseley Avenue, directly in front of the school, resulting in students being unloaded into traffic, and cars having to maneuver around parked handicapped van. Consider designating area on Lenore Street as a handicapped drop-off zone. |
| Ruby Street South of Wolseley Avenue | Tail swing of buses turning northbound off of Ruby onto Wolseley Avenue eastbound have struck parked car near crosswalk on Ruby and Wolseley intersection. Consider no parking setback for cars parked on Ruby Street south of Wolseley Avenue to allow for bus tailswing. |
| Wolseley and Westminster Avenues | Snow clearing not curbing curbs, resulting in narrow cross sections, difficult for cyclists and cars to share. Improve snow clearing on these streets to accommodate both cyclists and drivers. |
| Wolseley Avenue | Snow clearing occurring when cars are present, resulting in partially cleared roads. Clear roads at night when snow route parking ban in place. |
Laura Second School Visioning Workshop Action Plan

Time: November 29th, 2018 6 pm

Attendance: 17 members of the school community, including parents, school staff, city transportation staff, students, child care providers.

STPE Goals:
1. Improved Children’s Health and Well-being
2. Input into the design process for their community
3. Environmental Benefits
4. Increased safety
5. Reduced Transportation Costs
6. Community Cohesion and Connectivity
7. Development of life-long healthy habits

Goals as listed were agreed upon, but group wanted to add Children’s Independence as another key goal of the STPE process

Barrier:
- Time a constraint for busy parents, faster and easier to drive and dropoff kids at school
- Perception of risk remains, both for abductions as well as getting hit by vehicles on busy streets
- Bike theft is a real concern for many, especially since there have been bikes stolen using power grinders at this school
- CFS intervention and investigation of school aged children walking to school alone or with others is a concern for this group due to the recent CFS investigation of children walking to the store alone in Wolsey.
- Winter season seen as a barrier, especially as sidewalk maintenance is a timely manner is perceived as lacking
- Peak traffic in the mornings and afternoons is pronounced, and results in an often chaotic situation in front of the school due to high vehicle volumes, and cars double parking/dropping off children while in traffic
- Visibility of children walking, especially in winter due to high snowbanks on sides of road was also cited as a barrier
- Conditions of roads viewed as a barrier, as cyclists encounter frequent pot holes, and have to quickly adjust course when biking on community roads
- Standing water on Wolsey Avenue near Mulkey School cited a problem for cyclists
- Graduates of Laura Second who attend River Heights school find Maryland bridge difficult to cross on bike

Comments:
- U-turns on side streets at drop off time was noted as a problem
- Double parking was noted on all three streets around the school
- Parking right up to the corner of intersections was listed as a problem
- Handicapped drop-off zone was considered hazardous by many, zone is right in front of the school on the south side of Wolsey Avenue, blocking westbound traffic, often for long periods of 5-20 minutes as these students are unloaded, sometimes into the traffic side (due to two students being transported in one vehicle). Proposed solution was to install a handicapped drop-off on Lenore Street.
- Cars proceeded down at a time through the stop signs at Ruby intersection
- Crossing at Lenore and Westminster noted as hazardous due to no crosswalk or traffic control device
- 4-way stop at Camera and Westminster noted as having very low compliance rate for vehicles
- Providing crossing at Walnut and Westminster suggested, as it connects to crosswalk at Walnut and Wolsey Avenue to the south
- Blind corners noted a frequent and problematic for pedestrians walking on Wolsey avenue, particularly where apartment buildings are located at back lanes.
- The sidewalk on Ruby street south of Laura Second School was noted as being in poor condition
- Speeding cars, particularly on Wolsey and Westminster avenues was noted
The school zone was noted as being too small: starts 12 meters from the edge of the school property on East Side, 20 meters from edge of school property on the West side. Current regulations allow the school zone to be expanded up to 150 meters from the edge of the school property.

The chair of the Wolseley Residents Association was present, and indicated that the WRA has previously requested that the speed limit along the entire length of Wolseley Avenue be reduced to 30 km/hr. Discussion of impact of traffic flow on Westminster and residential streets ensued—should these also be 30 km/hr as well as a result?

Participants felt that time restrictions on school zones were inconsistent with times that children use playgrounds and access the schoolyard.

City of Winnipeg staff noted that installation of traffic calming measures would be problematic if speed limits were maintained at 50 km/hr. Suggested that the design team may want to consider the installation of speed tables. These are currently being piloted on collector roads in the City of Winnipeg.

Curbs extensions and raised crosswalks requested at crossings in front of school.

Outdoor school group that plays in the neighborhood only crosses streets at stops signs due to vehicle speed and volume.

Parents at workshop expressed a desire for protected bike lanes so that children in community could safely ride to and from school.

Discussion centered around creating a culture of walking and cycling at the school. Participants expressed a strong desire for a community that residents could safely walk and cycle in.

A desire to cultivate connections among the three schools in the area was expressed, perhaps community wide walking and cycling events in fall/winter/spring?

Bike lanes desired by participants on the East-West corridors.

Participants asked the design team to “think big” and design a corridor that prioritizes student safety and health at these schools.

Some parents and students lived across Maryland and Sherbrooke streets, and asked for consideration to be given to improving these crossings at Westminster and Wolseley Avenues.

Workshop participants also asked that the design team improve accessibility for seniors in the community.

Participants wanted more multi-modal transportation options to be considered—maybe secure bike parking at bus stops in neighborhood for commuters from other areas.

One participant expressed concerns about the “sign farm” along Wolseley and Westminster Avenues. A protected bike lane similar to the McDermut/Bannatyne bike lanes was designed. Might be an unpleasant visual experience along a tree lined residential street.
Phase 2 Public Engagement Report

Laura Secord School: Student Workshop Feedback - November 27th, 2018

Room 116 (26 students)

- Heavy vehicle volumes were noted on Wobsey Avenue immediately in front of the school, especially from 8:45 am - 9 am, as well as 1:30 pm - 3:45 pm.
- Private vehicle drop-off locations were noted on Lenore Street near the intersection with Wobsey Avenue, Ruby Street near the intersection with Wobsey Avenue, as well as Wobsey Avenue in front of the school.
- This class preferred to see bike facilities located on Wobsey Avenue from Omand’s Park to Furry Street.
- This class likes trees on their trip to and from school, the many bus stops, as well as when there are few vehicles in the community.

Room 106 (16 students)

- This class wanted improved transit, with more regular buses, as several of them take transit to school.
- "more buses, more bikes, more walkers, less cars"
- They are hoping that the City of Winnipeg purchases more electric buses to help improve air quality
- Protected bike lanes for students on their way to and from school, with the preferred route being on Wobsey Avenue.
- "less cars on Wobsey Avenue"
- More road closures like on Sundays, except more often
- This class would prefer to see less cars in the community overall
- Permit drop off locations were noted in front of the school on Wobsey Avenue, as well as on Ruby Street near the intersection with Wobsey Avenue
- Discussed areas to walk or cycle were noted along the length of Westminster Avenue, as well as on Wobsey Avenue near Mulvey School.
- Heavy traffic volumes were noted immediately in front of the school on Wobsey Avenue, as well as near Mulvey School. They were noted on Westminster Avenue from Carona St to Maryland Street, as well as on Arlington Street south of Portage Avenue.
- This class also wanted to see intersections that forced cars to come to a complete stop, while cyclists were allowed to yield (Idaho stop)
- This class proposed a 5-block limit for car travel on Wobsey Avenue, in an effort to limit the amount of cut through traffic.
- Lastly, this class wanted to see the installation of crosswalks at all three schools along the corridor.

Room 110 (26 students)

- "less dog poop, less cars, more buses"
- More transit to travel from home to downtown
- Install a crosswalk and reduce the number of cars at the intersection of Greenwood Place and Wobsey Avenue
- More buses, less cars (raise the price of private vehicles)
- Electric buses
- Skywalk to school
- Cheaper electric vehicles, higher prices for gas cars
- Protected bike lanes on Wobsey Avenue
- More road closures in winter months, similar to the Sunday road closures from May long Thanksgiving. This would allow for street hockey games, tobogganing, and winter cycling.
- Specific lights for cyclists that allow them to proceed before vehicles.
- Less trash in the community
- Raised bike lanes on Wobsey Avenue
- More cars away from Wobsey Avenue where three schools are located
- Stops for cars, allow cyclists to proceed without stopping
Grade 1 French Immersion (24 students)
- Lack of respect for pedestrians in people in vehicles was noted by the pupils in this class.
- Short journey to school was noted by those walking.
- They like seeing bikes, don't like seeing cars.
- They don't like seeing people on their phones while they are driving vehicles.
- Kids running across the road, and the perceived lack of supervision was a noted concern.
- Lots of car pollution when crossing Portage Avenue.
- Lots of potholes on community roads were noted.
- Difficulty noted walking on Westminster Avenue from Dominion Street to Aubrey Street.
- High vehicle volumes noted on both Westminster and Wolseley Avenues.
- Bike lanes on both Wolseley and Westminster Avenues.

Room 105 (16 students)
- Class noted the “sidewalk ends” sign at Aubrey Street and Westminster Avenue, confirmed by it as sidewalk continues on south side of Westminster Avenue.
- Lots of cars noted along length of Wolseley Avenue. Ruby Street beside the school, Cameron Street between Wolseley and Westminster Avenue, and Arlington Street south of Portage Avenue.
- Class wanted to see bike lanes along the length of Wolseley Avenue.
- Class felt that the downtown bike lanes were “scary” where they were only painted.

Room 204 afternoon (16 students)
- Nursery/Kindergarten class. 10 walked to school, while 6 were driven.
- These young students (ages 4-5) noted nature, trees, grass, snow, birds, leaves, squirrels, clouds, buildings, apartments, hospitals, houses, and the 7-11 on their journey to school.
- These students would like to see more parks in the community, more playgrounds, more libraries, and more lending libraries.

Room 101 grade 2 (17 students)
- Want bike lanes on Portage Avenue.
- Want bike lanes along the length of Wolseley Avenue.
- High vehicle volumes noted on the streets around the school, including on Lenore Street (north and south of Wolseley Avenue), Ruby Street (north and south of Wolseley Avenue), Wolseley Avenue between blogging Street and Frances Street.
- Missing sidewalk on south and north side of Palmerston Avenue noted.
- Walking challenging at the intersection of Lenore Street and Westminster Avenue, Arlington Street and Preston Avenue.
- Biking challenging on Wolseley and Westminster Avenue at their intersections with Maryland Avenue.

Next Steps
Input from the school walkabout, visioning workshop, student feedback workshops, and discussions with school staff will be used alongside technical information and broader public engagement findings to inform the development of proposed design concepts for the Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project. For more information and updates on this process, please visit for email updates on this page:
https://www.winnipeg.ca/parks/publicworks/pedestrians/cycling/walkbikeprojects/wolseleytodowntown.htm

Phase 2 of the Wolseley to Downtown public engagement program is expected to begin in the spring of 2019. This phase will provide members of the public and other area stakeholders the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the preliminary design options and alternatives that will be presented at this time.

To learn more about this project and other City of Winnipeg Walk Bike projects, please visit
https://www.winnipeg.ca/walkbikeprojects
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Urban Systems

Wolseley School Walkabout Summary

Time: November 22nd 2018, 3:30 pm

Attendance: 15 people, including Winnipeg Regional Health Authority Healthy Built Environment staff, Wolseley School Administration, Wolseley School parents, City of Winnipeg Transportation staff, Winnipeg School Division Transportation Manager, Winnipeg School Division Buildings Manager, Urban Systems STP team members.

Executive Summary: School has a smaller catchment and only 290 students at present, but is growing (up from 120-140 range a few years ago), and is seeing more students living north of Portage Avenue attend the school. Major issues include vehicle volumes on Wolseley Avenue being viewed as too high for a school located in a residential area, driver behavior is listed as a concern due to non-compliance or "roll through" attitudes around school, parents view Portage Avenue as a major barrier and will not let students cross it solo due to perception of risk. While intersections around the school also pose challenges for families, as do the perceived lack of safe cycling routes for families at this school. Other issues include school buses striking vehicles, vehicles parked in no stopping zones, and winter maintenance of sidewalks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue(S)</th>
<th>Potential Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>Vehicle Volumes perceived be too high for a residential area</td>
<td>Reduce volume of non-resident traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue at Camden Place</td>
<td>Aggressive drivers encroaching on patrons at crosswalks</td>
<td>Raise crosswalk to encourage giving right-of-way to pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue at Erin Street</td>
<td>Timing of pedestrian crossings at these two locations considered too short by walkabout participants. Increasing numbers of students at this school live north of Portage Avenue.</td>
<td>Assessment of timing of pedestrian crossing, and adjusting as required to accommodate children’s walking speed. Identify crossing as a “hazard crossing” and hire an adult crossing guard for these locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue at Valour Road</td>
<td>School buses (52-58 feet long) turning east into back lane behind the school/have struck cars parked on Clifton due to large tailswing (11.5 ft tail swing)</td>
<td>Expansion of no stopping zone at crosswalk further north to ensure no further vehicle damage occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Street at school back line</td>
<td>School buses (52-58 feet long) turning east into back lane behind the school/have struck cars parked on Clifton due to large tailswing (11.5 ft tail swing)</td>
<td>Expansion of no stopping zone at crosswalk further north to ensure no further vehicle damage occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Place and Wolseley Avenue (Northeast corner)</td>
<td>Sightline looking east are blocked by parked vehicles, forcing southbound vehicles to move forward into pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>Install no parking signs on North side of Wolseley Avenue near intersection with Camden Place that move parked vehicles back two car lengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseley Avenue at Camden Place</td>
<td>Crosswalk across Wolseley Avenue places students in a private driveway</td>
<td>Move Crosswalk further to the West, install sidewalk across boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Place at Wolseley Avenue</td>
<td>Vehicles encroaching on patrons and students crossing Camden Place</td>
<td>Install 3 way stop or raised crosswalk to discourage encroachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Street</td>
<td>Parents conducting student pickup double parking</td>
<td>Increased enforcement by WPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Street</td>
<td>Cars parking in no stopping zone, encroaching onto crosswalk, blocking sightlines</td>
<td>Install curb bump outs to prohibit parking in the existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Recommended Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Parking Lot</td>
<td>Parents parking in staff parking lot to conduct student drop-off</td>
<td>Install no-parking signage, have School Resource Officer enforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks surrounding school</td>
<td>Winter maintenance lacking sidewalks often icy and snow covered for days after a snowfall</td>
<td>Timely cleaning of snow on sidewalks around school following a snowfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks on school property</td>
<td>Steep grade of sidewalk to the south of the school</td>
<td>Reduce grade, improve sanding and clearing in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Avenue and Erin Street</td>
<td>Middle lane of traffic can turn left or right, making it difficult to ascertain when safe to cross. Middle and right lanes can turn right on red.</td>
<td>Install no right turn on red signage, make the middle lane left turn only, make the right turn lane right turn only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Street and Wolseley Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>Very wide intersection design results in very large crossing distance for students (19 metres or 63 feet to cross Clifton at Wolseley)</td>
<td>Narrow crossing section of Clifton, install curb extension, change angle of turns to reduce vehicle speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Place</td>
<td>Can turn onto Camden Place from both eastbound Portage Avenue as well as southbound Erin Street, to cut through community and access Maryland Street Southbound</td>
<td>Limit vehicle access onto Camden Place by installing no right turn sign, curb bump-out at Portage entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back lane of Camden Place bordering school property</td>
<td>Corner of back lane on south side of lane near staff parking lot has tight turning radius, blind corner.</td>
<td>Consider easement for property owner to allow for wider turning angle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Barriers:
- Crossing at Portage and Erin/Wall Streets major barrier, as it has two turning lanes that can turn right on red. Middle lane can also turn right or left, resulting in difficulty in anticipating vehicle movement.
- Frequency of crossings on Portage cited as barrier. Only crossings at present near the school are at Valour Road (cited as having pedestrian light timing that is challenging for smaller children or parents pushing strollers), and Erin St (see above two-lanes of cars turning onto Portage Avenue as pedestrians crossing, including a middle lane that can turn right or left), a distance of 200 meters between the crossings.
- Several mothers who live north of Portage indicated that the perceived lack of “safe” crossings, as well as perceived short timing of pedestrian signals results in them not allowing their children to walk to school.

Comments:
- Need better support of winter cycling in community. Suggested supports included clearing of lanes from curb to curb to allow for winter cycling, faster clearance of snow on sidewalks would help encourage walking to school in winter season. Clearing snow on Wolseley Avenue at night when snow route parking ban is in place suggested.
- Blind corners at back alley to streets intersections noted as problematic. Installation of parabolic mirrors suggested.
- Need for before and after school child care noted as barrier—often parents do not have the time to walk children to school due to need to be at work at school arrival or dismissal. Before and after school child care would help address this issue.
- Volume of “cut through” traffic, particularly along Wolseley Avenue, was perceived to be too high for children and parents walking or cycling to school.
- Participants suggested right turns be allowed from Westminster and Wolseley Avenues onto Maryland during peak travel times, as they felt this would greatly reduce the volume of “cut through” traffic in the community.
- Vehicle speeds along Wolseley Avenue perceived as being too high between the three school zones.
- Parents indicated that they would not cycle with their children through the east side of the corridor past Sherbrooke street, as it was felt that vehicle volumes were too high, and the roads too narrow to allow for the safe passage of families on bicycles.
- The preferred cycling facility for this group was the installation of fully protected bike lanes with a physical barrier. Participants felt that this would allow for them to safely ride to school in the area with their children, or children to cycle to school alone or with friends. There was some concern expressed around sight lines for pedestrians past parked vehicles if parking protected bike lanes were installed.
- Snow clearing through Omands park was viewed as inadequate. This is a common route for students in the area who attend northerly heights junior high to the south.

---

Proposed Action Plan Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced traffic speeds for students biking to school, especially in winter</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Train Program at School</td>
<td>Wolseley School PAC/School Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore feasibility of fundraising for a kids' library at the school</td>
<td>Wolseley School PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely removal of snow on sidewalks around school</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine pedestrian safety of students using intersection at Erin Street to cross Portage Avenue</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the installation of parabolic mirrors at blind corners of back alleys onto streets</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the creation of before and after school child care at Wolseley School</td>
<td>Wolseley School PAC, Wolseley School Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket vehicles rolling through stops signs</td>
<td>Winnipeg Police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce amount of “cut through” traffic</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address dangerous driver behavior around the school by having one-on-one conversations with drivers. Double parking, U turns in school zone cited as concerns.</td>
<td>Winnipeg Police Service/School Administration to Flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install 4T signage eg. “you’re a 5 minute walk from Wolseley School”</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg/Design Team/PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of “sidewalk games” to play on the way to and from school to provide interest and motivation on school journey</td>
<td>Winnipeg PAC/City of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring segment in Wolseley Leaf about cycling and walking to school in the neighbourhood</td>
<td>Wolseley PAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photo: Wolseley students and parents crossing Clifton Street after student feedback sessions

Wolseley School Student Feedback November 22nd, 2018

Room 10 (27 students)
- Students in this class wanted their parents workplaces to be closer to their homes, so they didn't have to be driven to school when their parents went to work.
- This class preferred routes for a bike lane to be placed along the length of Wolseley Avenue.
- They felt that the intersection of Canora Street and Westminster Avenue was "too busy", with many drivers not stopping.

Room 2 (21 students)
- This was a grade 1 & 2 split classroom, and they had some fun observations.
- Students in this class expressed a desire to see crosswalks at Chestnut and Westminster Avenue, as some of them lived near there and wanted to be able to walk to the store.
- Students in this class expressed the desire to see a crosswalk at the intersection of Greenwood Place and Wolseley Avenue.
- These students wanted the installation of bike lanes on Wolseley Avenue, so that they would be able to ride their bikes to school with their families.

Room 17 (21 students)
- This class wanted a bike lane to be placed along the length of Wolseley Avenue.
- Students in this class had family in Charleswood, and wanted more bike lanes so that they would be able to ride their bikes to visit them.
- These students noted a high volume of vehicles on Wolseley Avenue.

Room 6 (27 students)
- This class wanted more paths in Wolseley overall, as they loved riding their bikes on them.
- They also wanted to see gas stations moved away from schools, as they were perceived as being "noisy and smelly".
- They wanted less cars near the school.
- They suggested an underpass for pedestrians to cross Portage Avenue to the West End, from a location near the school.
- This class wanted to see detours provided for people walking and cycling when there is construction blocking sidewalks and bike lanes.
- This class wanted more stop signs, and less traffic near their school.
- Their preferred route was to see a bike lane placed on Wolseley Avenue.
- They wanted more crossings for students walking to school, especially on Portage Avenue, with longer crossing times.
- A good bike route from D'orion's part to St. James was a desire of this class so that they could ride to Assiniboine Park.
Room 6 (26 students)
- Students felt that the drivers of vehicles in this area were “always in a rush”, and did not notice the children walking and biking to school.
- Students in this class requested that parking on Wolsley at Camden be pushed back to allow for better visibility at the crosswalk at this intersection.
- This class observed a large volume of vehicles on Wolsley Avenue, as well as double parking of vehicles dropping off students on Wolsley Avenue between Camden Place and Clifton Street.
- This class noted the large number of vehicles in front of Laura Secord school on their way to school.
- This class felt that the crossing time for pedestrians at the intersection of Erin and Portage Avenue was too short. They would love to see a crosswalk at the intersection of Clifton Street and Portage Avenue.
- This class preferred a bike lane running the length of Wolsley Avenue.

Room 7 (20 students)
- This class had a few comments on walking and biking to school. They found it fun, they get fresh air, they like the view and flowers on their walk, the archway of trees in Wolsley, and found biking to school to be fun and exciting.
- This class wanted to see the community have “car-free” days, where cars were left at home, and everyone walked or drove to school.
- This class wanted bicycle lanes everywhere when asked, as they wanted to ride their bikes more, but were limited by the lack of safe cycling routes near their homes.
- High number of vehicles were noted on Wolsley Avenue near the school.
- This class was excited to see the Ruby greenway become a reality, and asked when it was going to happen.
- The pedestrian crossing at the corner of Raglan Road and Wolsley Avenue was flagged as risky by this classroom.
- This was a young class who indicated that they would like to see more interaction on the way to school (i.e., sidewalks, safe cycling routes, and play structures along the way).
- Lastly, this class wanted more direct sidewalks to school with more crosswalks for them to walk with their families.

Room 8 (17 students)
- Students in this class noted high volumes of vehicles on Westminster Avenue.
- This class flagged the entrance from Omand’s Creek path to Wolsley Avenue as being problematic for them.
- This class requested the installation of a crosswalk at the intersection of Portage Avenue and Clifton Street, as many of them lived north of Portage Avenue, and felt that the crossing at Erin

Street was dangerous for children due to vehicles being allowed to turn in either direction from the middle lane, and that the right two lanes were permitted to turn right on red.
- This class enjoyed walking to school as a way to enjoy nature.

Room 9 (25 students)
- This class asked for longer crossing times when crossing Portage Avenue at foot.
- Many students in this class were parents, and stated that they observed many distracted drivers while on patrol and walking to and from school. They requested increased enforcement for distracted driving. They also felt that there were too many vehicles passing by the school on Wolsley Avenue every day, with many turning at the stop sign or crosswalk.
- Some of these students lived on the West end, and noted that they did not feel safe riding in the bike lane on St. Matthew’s street.
- As many other students and parents at this school expressed, this class expressed frustration at trying to cross Portage Avenue at Erin Street. They relayed that they had many near misses at this intersection due to right turning cars from the center lane. The students in this class expressed a desire for a longer crossing time at this intersection.
- This class had older students who were looking ahead to attending River Heights School next year, and wanted a better route to bike to this school via Omand’s Creek, most notably a wider path on the pedestrian/cycling bridge, and a crosswalk on Wellington Road so that they could cross this street safely.
- They also expressed a strong preference to see a walking/cycling bridge at the end of Arlington Street that would connect Wolsley to River Heights, and Kelvin High School when they eventually went there.
- This class felt that the bike lane on the Maryland Bridge was too narrow, and was a barrier for them riding to River Heights and Kelvin School.
- The lack of a sidewalk on the south side of Palmerston Avenue near the R.A. Stern Community Centre was also flagged as being a barrier for those kids when they wanted to the community centre.
- Arlington Street was seen as a barrier for these students, with some indicating that their parents forbade them from crossing this street due to the heavy traffic volumes. As a result, these students expressed a desire for a bike lane on Arlington Street, and less traffic entering Wolsley as a whole.
- The pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Ruby Street and Portage Avenue was identified as needing improvement, with longer timing and cyclist signals near the roadway.
- Aggressive drivers were a concern for these students, with many of them relaying stories of being honked at by aggressive drivers.
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Next Steps

Input from the school walkabout, visioning workshop, student feedback workshops, and discussions with school staff will be used alongside technical information and broader public engagement findings to inform the development of proposed design concepts for the Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project. For more information and updates on this project, please register for email updates on this page:
https://www.winnipeg.ca/public-works/pedestrian-cycling/walk-bike-projects/wolseleytodowntown.htm

Phase 2 of the Wolseley to Downtown public engagement program is expected to begin in the spring of 2019. This phase will provide members of the public and other area stakeholders the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the preliminary design options and alternatives that will be presented at this time.

To learn more about this project and other City of Winnipeg Walk Bike projects, please visit:
https://www.winnipeg.ca/walk-bike
Appendix E: School travel plan and engagement questionnaire

School Travel Planning & Engagement Working Groups & STPE Resource Team Input

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the School Travel Planning and Engagement (STPE) process and providing valuable feedback on the STPE Report. The attached STPE report summarizes the results from the three STPE activities that occurred at each of the schools in the fall and winter of 2018: student workshops, school community visioning workshops, and school walkabouts. The questions below are meant to provide an opportunity for feedback on the results from the fall School Travel Planning and Engagement activities and the STPE report, but please feel free to add additional comments beyond those listed below.

1) Are there any items arising from this report that you’d like to revisit in future meetings of the STPE School Working Groups? If yes, what items would you like to revisit and why?

2) Are there any major issues related to active school travel at these schools that are missing or not sufficiently captured in this report?

3) Do you feel that your questions, concerns, and prior feedback have been adequately addressed and included in the school travel planning and engagement process so far? If not, what areas would you like to see expanded upon?

4) Are there any other comments or input that you’d like to provide on the results of the school walkabout, visioning workshop, or student feedback? Please elaborate as much as possible.

5) Are there any Action Plan items arising from the Visioning workshop that you are interested in supporting moving forward?

6) Are there any additional comments or questions beyond those listed above that you would like to share?
Appendix F: Phase 2 Promotion Material

Poster used to promote Phase 2

Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project
Improving East-West Connections between Raglan Road to Osborne Street

View the proposed designs. Continue the conversation.
The City of Winnipeg is looking for ways to improve travel choices, accessibility, and connectivity from Wolseley to Downtown. The proposed corridor would provide improved connections to theornado’s Creek pathway, Assiniboine Avenue, Sherbrook Street, and the planned neighborhood greenway on Ruby Street. We started engagement on this project in late fall 2018 and are now looking for feedback on proposed design options, developed based on input gathered from members of the public.

- Participate Online
  Fill out a survey and learn more online at winnipeg.ca/walkbikeprojects

- Join an In-Person Event
  Workshop | Tuesday June 11, 2019
  St. Margaret’s Anglican Church (in the basement hall)
  955 St. Thomas St.
  6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

  View design options, speak with members of the project team, and provide feedback.

  RSVP by June 7, 2019 by email at wolseleytodowntown@intergroup.ca or by phone at (204) 945-0054.

  Pop-up - Drop-in format (come and go) | Wednesday June 12, 2019
  Tall Grass Theatre, 859 Westminster Ave., 10 a.m. - 3 p.m.
  Balmoral Hall School (outside gates at the corner of Westminster Ave. and Young St.), 620 Westminster Ave.
  3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.
  Mulvey School Field, 750 Wolseley Ave., 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

  View the design options, speak with members of the project team, and provide feedback.

  Guided Walk/Bike Tour | Thursday June 13, 2019
  Tour begins at the corner of Raglan Road and Wolseley Ave. at 6 p.m. and goes until 8 p.m.

  RSVP by June 7, 2019 by email at wolseleytodowntown@intergroup.ca or by phone at (204) 945-0054. In case of poor weather, the RSVP list will be updated with an alternative date.

For inquiries or for those who require alternate formats or interpretation in order to participate, please contact wolseleytodowntown@intergroup.ca or 204-945-0054.

Postcard used for Phase 2

WOLSELEY TO DOWNTOWN WALK BIKE
The City of Winnipeg is looking for ways to improve travel choices, accessibility, and connectivity from Wolseley to Downtown. The proposed corridor would provide improved connections to theornado’s Creek pathway, Assiniboine Avenue, Sherbrook Street, and the planned neighborhood greenway on Ruby Street. We started engagement on this project in late fall 2018 and are now presenting design options based on what we heard from stakeholders.

The City is committed to keeping area residents, landowners, and businesses fully informed at each stage of this important project. For more information, to view design options, provide feedback through an online survey, and to join our email list please visit:

winnipeg.ca/walkbikeprojects
Signs throughout the project study area

June 1, 2019 – The Wolseley Leaf newspaper
New Opportunities for Engagement
Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project

Phase 2 has begun. We are looking for your perspectives on preliminary design options and treatments. Preliminary design options have taken Phase 1 stakeholder priorities into consideration including safety, bike network connections, and cycling comfort.

Share your input on design options and alternatives through an online survey (available until June 21) or in-person at a pop-up, guided walk/bike tour or workshop event.

More information available at winnipeg.ca/woltekproject.

Ongoing Opportunities for Engagement
Building Public Engagement

Why do we engage? How do we engage? The draft Engage Winnipeg Policy is an early step in answering those questions as a result of your candid feedback provided over the past several years.

Thank you to those who attended the workshop on May 30. If you were unable to attend, provide your input online through a survey or discussion board to continue to build a strong foundation for engagement and build engagement for all Winnipeggers. The survey will be open until June 9.

What’s next?

After we gather your feedback, we will recommend a policy for Council approval and develop a plan for an engagement framework.

More information available at winnipeg.ca/publicengagement.

Revue des services en français (English to follow)

Contributez à façonner l’avenir des services en français à Winnipeg.

Merci à toutes les personnes qui ont participé à l’atelier du 29 mai. Si vous n’avez pas pu participer, veuillez nous faire part de vos expériences sur l’utilisation des services municipaux en français et faites-nous savoir comment nous pouvons améliorer ces services en répondant à un sondage en ligne, ou procurez-vous une carte pause-café et discutez des services en français avec votre famille et des amis. Répondez au sondage au plus tard le 13 juin.

Pour en savoir davantage, veuillez consulter le site Web winnipeg.ca/revuesfr.

French Language Services Review

Help shape the future of French language services in Winnipeg.

Thank you to those who attended the workshop on May 29. If you were unable to attend, please participate online through a survey or pick up or
print a coffee chat card and discuss French language services with your family and friends. Submit feedback until June 12.

For more information, please visit winnipeg.ca/fsreview.

**Engagement Updates**

**A Better Bridge for Arlington recommended design**

The public engagement report and summary for A Better Bridge for Arlington project are now available under the documents tab. Feedback gathered through the public engagement process was considered within the project design. The results were considered and an administrative report with recommendations were submitted for review at a meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works (SPC-IRPW) on May 28, 2019. An executive summary of the project report, design drawings, and report on property requirements are now available.

Visit winnipeg.ca/betterarlington for more information.

**Chief Peguis Trail Extension West recommended design**

An administrative report outlining recommendations for the Chief Peguis Trail Extension West has been developed. The report was presented at a meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works (SPC-IRPW) on May 28, 2019. An executive summary of the project report, updated design drawings, and report on property requirements are now available.

Visit winnipeg.ca/chiefpeguistrail for more information.

This newsletter is sent out every other Thursday.
We strive to promote events at least two weeks ahead through other means such as newspaper ads, social media, and direct mail.

**Connect with us**

Follow us on Facebook: facebook.com/CityofWinnipeg
Follow us on Twitter: twitter.com/CityofWinnipeg
Stadium Station decorative panels - Southwest Transitway

Winnipeg Transit plans to install six large panels with graphics to decorate Stadium Station, located beside Investors Group Field at the University of Manitoba, as part of the Southwest Transitway project.

We want you to vote for your favorite theme. The decorative panels will be designed based on the winning theme. The winning theme will be announced this summer, and the decorative panels are anticipated to be installed in the fall. Voting closes July 19, 2019.

More information at winnipeg.ca/stadiumstation.

Ongoing Opportunities for Engagement

Wolseley to Downtown Walk Bike Project

We are looking for your perspectives on preliminary design options and treatments. Preliminary design options have taken Phase 1 stakeholder priorities into consideration including safety, bike network connections, and cycling comfort. View the design options and provide feedback online until June 21.

More information available at winnipeg.ca/walkbikeprojects.

Revue des services en français (English to follow)

Contribuez à façonner l’avenir des services en français à Winnipeg.

La date limite pour répondre au sondage en ligne a été repoussée au 24 juin 2019. Pour en savoir davantage,
Appendix G: Stakeholder outreach discussion, workshop and pop-up event feedback

Stakeholder outreach discussion and pop-up event feedback

The following comments were recorded by the project team during stakeholder discussions, the public workshop, and pop-up events during Phase 2 Public Engagement. Information has been organized into general project related themes. Comments are not verbatim but appear in the way they were recorded by different members of the project team. The comments, in addition to those received online, were used by the project team during the design process to reflect the concerns and perspectives of Winnipeggers.

Safety:
• The East Option 2 design creates unsafe situations
• Suggestion for a protected intersection entering Sherbook
• Traffic rules need to be enforced by police
• All the streets are safe during the day but unsafe morning and evening
• The protected barrier on Sherbook at Westminster is too far from the intersection
• Interested in reducing speed throughout the West neighbourhood and calming measures through design (not necessarily diversions)
• There is a need for a safe bike crossing from Balmoral to Young north (currently not actually permitted to go straight)
• Unless you have a protected bike lane, it won’t have speeds conducive for children. Kids cycle at less than 20km/hr, there is no vehicle speed that works to share the roads with small children. The physical barrier of the West Option 2 is preferred.
• Wolseley doesn’t need any calming, already a safe street
• In favour of speed reduction
• Feels that walking and cycling conditions are already safe
• Would like to see vehicle speeds reduced in the neighborhood
• Focus should be on slowing traffic, adding more crossings, and a reduction in crossing distances rather than diversions
• Noted that several stakeholder perspectives changed when
• Informed of the safety benefits for all road users that protected infrastructure offered - 44% reduction in deaths and a 50% reduction in deaths for all road users

Bike Network Connectivity:
• A reduction in cross-cutting requires better bike access. If you walk/bus up Raglan Road you cannot cross Portage Avenue easily.
• Consider a bicycle pathway on the Assiniboine side of the curling club, noted that slope sensors have not shown any instability in the slope
• Connections to and from bike infrastructure on Maryland and Sherbrook need to be well thought out

Cycling Comfort:
• Bike Winnipeg wanted to confirm that proposed bike infrastructure was wide enough to allow for passing
• Physical protective cycling infrastructure is more comfortable for cyclist when compared to painted lanes
• The East Option 2 design creates a system of being difficult to pass people
• Social aspect of biking is important, including the ability to bike beside another cyclist (side-by-side)
• Painted bike lanes are less comfortable. Street will feel wider so people may drive faster. Any sort of physical separation is better.
• Is it as wide as Assiniboine two-way raised bike path (which is not very wide, but can still pass)?
• Needs to be a safe way for cyclists to continue north on Young (at Balmoral intersection). Currently there is “do not enter” signage.
• Many attempts have been made to request a cross-walk at this location. A stop sign may be needed at this location.
• Painted bike lanes are less safe. Raised bike lanes are a deterrent to drivers if they hit it, whereas it’s not a big deal driving over paint.
• Bike infrastructure need to include protected through the middle segment of the study area
• Concerns were raised about the ability to seasonally maintain the bike lanes (snow and leaf removal)
• Safety concern regarding vehicle passenger doors opening into bike lane. Normally when the passenger opens the door, they are right at the curb. With a bike lane this isn’t the case, the door opens into the bike lane and can hit cyclists.
• Protected bike lane on Wolseley would determine right-of-way
• On Wolseley near Chestnut and Walnut, there is a little hill. Anyone using a hand cycle finds this hill extremely tough.
• If there was a protected bike lane, more children would be biking
• People should be allowed to ride their bike on sidewalks
• Speed bumps are not great for cyclists unless they can go around them
• Many comments on how the narrow, raised bike lanes in East Option 2 will be hard to maintain and winter snow clearing and fall leaf clearing is already a challenge
• Many people wanted the most protected and comfortable cycling infrastructure
• A father noted that he sees many small children biking with their parents and that separated bike infrastructure would allow more people to feel comfortable
• Love the idea of bike paths

• An 8-year-old biking to soccer said, “the road is really busy”
• Supportive of improved cycling infrastructure

Accessibility:
• Concerns regarding accessibility to the Granite Curling Club if Granite Way is converted to a one-way
• Closure at Arlington and Westminster would impact a heavily used bus route
• Diverters would not affect local businesses, if someone is coming to Wolseley for a specific business, they will come regardless
• East one-way conversion: Access to the daycare parking lot on the corner of Balmoral and Granite Way would be challenging for people that live in the neighborhood and would require a reroute up to Broadway
• The Granite Curling Club would be okay with Granite Way being one-way if there was access off Osborne Street
• Many questions were asked about the type of access restrictions that would be designed for each location
• Concerns regarding emergency vehicle response times considering vehicle access restrictions
• Several residents that live on Langside, south of Westminster, were concerned with East Option 1 that changes many of the streets to one-way. They noted that it is already challenging to access their homes.
• Thinks there should be no right hand turn off Westminster and Wolseley at peak hours
• Some pointed questions about the vehicle access restrictions and their impact on local egress, however general support for the greenway and protected bike lanes were high

Design:
• Member of the Wolseley Residents Association was very supportive of traffic calming, expressing great thanks for the improvements this may offer the community
• Did not support East Option 3 as they felt it did not improve the comfort and safety of residents
• Suggestion to promote Young Street for cycling
• Traffic diverters would be greatly beneficial
• Suggestion to turn Preston to a one-way street
• What about advisory bike lanes on Westminster? Would this keep parking on one side?
• Suggestion to convert Westminster into a one-way and Wolseley into a one-way in the opposite direction to create a couplet system like East Option 1
• General appreciation for speed bumps. Speed bumps are effective and will make cross-cutting less likely. Include more speed bumps on Raglan to Sprague etc. for cross-cutting traffic.
• Why is there no traffic signal Raglan Rd and Portage Ave? Currently unable to turn left.
• Suggestion for no right turns off Wolseley and Westminster onto Maryland during busy times. How would a driver get to the South end of the City though?
• Implementing traffic tables like the ones found on Waterfront Drive would bring consistency to the city regarding road design
• Very supportive of the traffic calming on Wolseley Ave
• Suggestion to put up a sign for no access to Maryland Bridge
• East Option 1 couplet is not an option
• Supportive of two-way raised and painted bike lanes
• Not opposed to two-way treatment on Young and Balmoral but should maintain through Granite Way. Doesn’t think Granite Way is currently a problem. Would rather see parking removed on Balmoral for safety of cyclists.
• What will be done at the intersection at Granite Way and Balmoral?
• Preference for Granite Way to be one-way eastbound
• Consider adding a north bound left turn from Osborne to Granite Way
• Consider making a part of Granite Way two-way
• East Option 1 would improve the safety at Westminster and Young Street, an intersection that was identified by many as being dangerous for all modes of transportation
• East Option 3 painted bike lanes might lead to faster travel speeds due to no physical road narrowing
• Arlington would be preferred for both northbound and southbound transit
• West Option 1 should consider making Preston a one-way westbound from Arlington to Walnut
• Concerns were raised with the speed bumps shown in the design options for Wolseley. Are they needed? It is already hard to drive quickly.
• Overall most were okay with the access restrictions proposed
• Many people were interested in Wolseley having a 30km/hr speed limit
• Most people were supportive of a one-way conversion of Granite Way. Questions about preference for west-bound one-way. Unsure of one-way traffic implications through West Broadway. Asked about residents on Langside and if they have been consulted on potential for a bus rerouting?
• Treatments should be consistent with rest of city, sited Waterfront Drive as an example
• Suggestion to put speed humps on Telfer
• Major concern with the rerouting of a bus on Home Street
• Support for maintaining existing bus route
• Concern about property value and a threat of legal action if bus route moves to Home Street
• Suggestion to switch bus route from Westminster to Wolseley at Maryland?
• Suggestion for North/South bus route on Arlington
• Suggestion that Arlington could be the bus route street and move it off Evanson
• Does not mind buses on Balmoral
• Very concerned about East one-way option, especially from Langside to Broadway. Parking is a big issue and local residents use street parking dispersed throughout neighbourhood.
• Most of the residents in attendance were supportive of the greenway concept
• Many wondered why Wolseley Avenue was not being considered for protected infrastructure instead, as it has the three schools along its length and only one business
• Some felt a better option was to build the protected bike lanes along Wolseley Avenue, and connect to Furby and then Westminster. This option would make use of the increased street width of Furby and would also lower vehicle volumes.
• Both options in the West segment sound good
• Suggestion to make Arlington a one-way northbound (between Westminster and Wolseley), and Evanson one-way southbound (between Westminster and Wolseley)
• Likes West Option 1 traffic calming
• Likes crosswalk improvement on Walnut and Westminster
• Suggestion to add more garbage bins in the area
• Convert a sidewalk on one side of the street for cyclists
• Does not like the physical vehicle diversions impacting accessibility for residents
• There is a paved path behind Granite Way already, why not use this?
• Suggestion for Granite Way: add speed bumps and switch to eastbound so Osborne St can be accessed
• One-ways couplet in East Option 1 would be beneficial to address short cutting traffic
• West Option 1 is better than West Option 2
• Not in favour of one-way conversions on any of the eastern portion
• Very opposed to one-way on Westminster/Young/Balmoral

• Does not like the one-way on Langside
• Does not like the traffic diversions but likes the idea of implementing speed humps
• These design options are attempting to cure a problem that doesn’t exist. All options propose a lot of changes that are not necessary.
• Supportive of dramatic changes
• Does not like one-ways and parking removal
• Receptive to Wolseley being made one-way
• Suggestion to consider carpool lanes
• Resident likes to run on roads on winter mornings when it’s dark and is not in favour of speed humps
• Suggestion to consider one-ways on side streets
• Request for stop by stop transit boarding/unboarding information for the #10 bus route between Osborne and Aubrey. Information would be helpful and relevant in the discussion around potential rerouting of the #10.
• Bike Winnipeg shared a recommendation document regarding the Preliminary Designs for the Wolseley to Downtown Walk/Bike Study. Document recommends a modified version of East Segment Option 1 and West Option 2, adjusting the rerouting of the #10 bus from Langside to Furby, ideas to provide protected bike lanes between Maryland and Langside, and suggestions for significant improvement to Young Street that would provide improved access to the Broadway Neighbourhood Centre and Park and the University of Winnipeg.
• Would like the Cornish Path along the Assiniboine between Cornish and Granite Way to be considered. Upgrading this path making it usable for cyclists would not require any change to street parking in West Broadway, or any reroute of traffic onto new one-way conduits, and it would upgrade a bike route that many of cyclists already use despite its unmaintained condition. Its design could easily follow the upper part of the Cornish Path.
nearest the chain link fencing (which rarely, if ever floods at that height), continue past Spence, and seamlessly meet at the greenspace near to where Granite Way meets Balmoral. It would also solve the current ‘stranded at the corner’ traffic wanting to turn left at Balmoral once cyclists arrive at the end of Granite Way. No need to reroute the #10 Bus and it would keep cyclists and motorized traffic apart and safe.

- Not supportive of turning Langside into a one-way street and reroute the #10 bus down its two blocks. The street is narrow, residential, and populated by many children and families. Suggestion is to redirect the #10 to Maryland and then south on Maryland to Westminster. Balmoral, Sherbrook, and Maryland are presently used by numerous motorized vehicles, including buses, as they are the only streets in West Broadway that can reasonably accommodate a bus route.
- This project needs to be better planned with acknowledgement of both the width of the streets and the fragile residential nature of Spence, Langside and Furby Streets. Neighbourhood has struggled for decades to create and maintain a safe, welcoming, residential neighbourhood and sending a bus down two blocks of Langside after all their efforts would be viewed as disrespectful, intrusive, lazy urban planning, and done with no insight or understanding of the neighbourhood. Request to abandon this design component.
- East Option 2, considering the narrow street width, would be challenging for passing. How would maintenance work? However narrow lanes would help decrease travel speed.

Engagement:

- It was not obvious that this survey was different than the first survey in the fall
- Subject line on email was not strong enough, use “Bike Path, Traffic Calming etc.”
- Was not consulted, ever, regarding this project
- It was noted that the West Broadway community was underrepresented
- Several participants thanked the project team for the work required to facilitate the in-person sessions
- For streets affected in designs, would like project communication to be sent out via mail (hard copy)
- Several attendees had received project information flyers that were independently distributed throughout the East segment neighbourhood. Many people noted that the information on the flyer was incorrect and they wanted clarification of what was proposed.
- Residents thanked the project team and the City for doing a great job at describing the thought behind the design
- Resident showed up due to misinformation (flyers and sign) distributed throughout the East segment neighbourhood and wanted to find out what was going on so that they can distribute accurate information
- Make sure to consult with daycare (Granite Way and Balmoral St) and Granite Curling Club, they have parking and loading demands
- Everyone who lives or works on a street that would be affected by change should be considered a “stakeholder”, talked with neighbours and many didn’t know about this engagement
- Attended pop-up as was told that parking was going to be removed from Langside if converted to one-way—doesn’t want the parking to be removed
- Very appreciative of the different ways that we are reaching out to the community and that we accommodated children on the walk/bike tour
- Thanked the whole project team and the City for their hard work on the project so far. Mentioned that they could see a lot of thought had gone into what was being presented.
- Concern expressed regarding the engagement process, as they felt that senior citizens were not properly notified of the potential
changes
• Noted that casual conversation with pedestrians in the study area are feeling very aware of the project, and very happy with the process to date feeling extremely engaged with and heard
• Many have commented that there is no way you could have missed being aware of this project due to all the signage and social media coverage
• The Public Engagement team was thanked for facilitating the project workshop. Home Street community was surprised and concerned when they learned a week prior that one of the design options called for moving a bus route to their block. This was new information to them despite many of them being engaged with the project from the start.
• Noted that social agencies in West Broadway often fail to communicate with the folks who actually live in the area. Would like to see a commitment to inform the directly impacted residents who live along Balmoral, Spence, and Langside, as they have concerns about the considered designs. Would prefer door-to-door notice for the specific residents whose streets will now likely become one-way corridors and a new transit route.

Parking and loading:
• Concern regarding loading bay access for Canada Life and parking lot access for Granite Curling Club
• Parking along Westminster is important/ Strongly opposed to parking removal on Westminster
• Strong opposition from some local businesses along Westminster to any loss of parking along Westminster Avenue
• Businesses along Westminster wondered if accessible parking for clients would be considered in design options
• Suggestion for time restricted parking around businesses
• Removing parking between Westminster Church and the Wolseley Westminster businesses is not a good idea
• Suggests angled parking around businesses on Westminster
• Concern regarding lack of parking along Sherbrook and Westminster/Maryland (at any time)
• Current lack of parking around East segment residential buildings is a significant issue
• Parking is on a first come, first serve basis
• Parking with time restrictions could be an option to replace the parking lost with protected bike lanes
• Would residents always have the ability to park on time restricted streets?
• Additional accessible parking is desired in the commercial area of Westminster
• Many perspectives shared that the church and businesses in the commercial area would not be in support of parking removal
• Parking should not be allowed on Westminster between Maryland and Sherbrook
• Parking is an issue, many people park on the street (Home St)
• Street parking is not necessary on Young/Balmoral
• Concerns about protected infrastructure along Westminster as would like to ensure local businesses still had parking available in close proximity to their location
• Does not like East Option 1 as parking is currently difficult to find and challenging for visitors
• If additional parking is removed in the East segment, finding parking would be impossible
• Perception that East Option 1 would be difficult for residential tenants to find parking
• Resident works night shifts and finds parking already difficult as they cannot get parking permits on Langside
• Removing parking in the East would make it much more difficult to find spots. Losing any parking is unacceptable.
• Suggestion to remove parking on Broadway to give four lanes to speed up traffic and reduce cut through
• Noted that the limited amount of on-street parking in the neighborhood makes all parking spots very valuable
• Concerns regarding Balmoral Hall School dismissal vehicle traffic (vehicles waiting/parked on Westminster near Balmoral Hall). Will the design accommodate for these parked vehicles?
• Neighbourhood on-street restricted parking creates a challenge for people that live on Balmoral and do not have on-street parking
• Not supportive of parking removal on Westminster, noted change in usage in recent years (yoga studio and knitting class) taking up many parking spots for longer periods of time
• Parking is an issue on Canora due to many parking spots being taken by employees working in offices on Portage Avenue. Removing parking from Westminster would make it worse.
• Parking is required along Westminster as this is a destination that people come to from River Heights
• Noted how heavily parking is used in the area, especially by the church
• Residents noted that it is already hard for guests to find parking (West segment)

Pedestrian Comfort:
• Improve intersections at Maryland and Sherbrook
• Stakeholder rides their bike all the time and finds it much more dangerous as a pedestrian in the area than as a cyclist
• Perception that cyclists do not obey rules of the road
• If a crosswalk is added at Walnut and Westminster it should be a flashing crosswalk, as other crosswalks in the neighbourhood are begin ignored
• Liked the improvements for accessibility at raised intersections and raised crossings (no curb lips for wheelchairs/walkers/etc. to get stuck)
• Liked several of the geometry improvements at intersections (especially Westminster at Canora) as they noted that there are currently issues at this location
• Would like to see improvements for crossing Westminster as they noted traffic volumes can be high and you can wait a long time to cross at uncontrolled spots
• Liked the proposed crossing improvements on Westminster at Walnut and Chestnut in particular

Safe travel to school:
• Agreed that designs promote safety around schools
• School in support of improving alternative modes of transportation
• Likes West Option 1 as traffic is heavy when kids are going to school
• Concern regarding the safety of school kids crossing the road in front of Balmoral Hall School (witnessed near misses in the past). A crosswalk with lights as well as traffic calming treatments are needed. Many school kids cross at this point on Westminster to access the Helen Grocery – unsafe section of road.
• Suggestion to make the speed limit 30km/hr all through the Wolseley neighbourhood as there are kids everywhere, not just in school zones

Vehicular traffic flow:
• Daycare at corner of Balmoral and Granite Way creates an issue for parents dropping off their kids. If segment was converted to a one-way, they would be required to circle in and out of the area.
• One-way may not have huge impact on parents dropping off kids at Balmoral Hall School
• When parents pull off to the side buses must pass – creates challenge for narrow street
• If drivers come down Canora to attempt to short cut traffic, speed bumps are not enough
• Suggestion to make left turn onto Maryland from Westminster or Wolseley
• People coming up Academy cannot turn onto Wellington, so they come up Sherbrook, turn left, and go to Maryland to be able to turn right on Wellington
• Walnut to Furby is currently a large issue for traffic. Parking should be removed throughout this segment. Including all 4 points, Sherbrook, Maryand, Wolseley and Westminster.
• On Westminster heading East people bunch up into a single lane. Signage needed to let drivers know it is two lanes.
• Has the project studied the number of vehicles at each street turning onto Wolseley/Westminster for cross-cutting?
• One-way on Granite would create issues as the majority of school children are driven to school along Furby or Langside
• Concern regarding access for Granite Curling Club members living South of the Assiniboine River. People driving north on Osborne would need to do a loop into the West Broadway community to return southbound on Osborne to access Granite Way.
• Support for Wolseley changed to one-way from Maryland to Walnut
• No right turn on red restrictions were suggested for Westminster and Maryland
• Locals only right turns during peak hours off Portage Avenue was brought forward as a less expensive and easier solution to short-cutting traffic. Enforcement of this type of signage was noted as being virtually impossible. Potential to be a cheap interim solution.
• Concerns about traffic rerouting to Dundurn due to egress from Wolseley being restricted. Currently many people are already cutting down Dundurn to get to the Maryland. Can Dundurn be changed to a one-way westbound (from Maryland) to prevent short-cutting traffic? Most residents access via Maryland or an alley. Residents on Dundurn do not want the redirected traffic off of Wolseley Avenue to turn down their street to access Maryland, consider turning restrictions, or a one-way option.
• What traffic calming treatments can be proposed to maintain the bus routes on the same streets as now but reduce cut through traffic?
• Prefers two-way on Granite Way so residents can leave without having to go to Broadway. Lots of traffic due to Balmoral Hall and Westgate Schools. One-way would compound issue.
• Cyclist would like to see reduced vehicle volumes
• Concern that the one-way on Granite Way would create congestion on Broadway and then result in more traffic on Wolseley
• One-way on Granite Way is problematic for drop-off and pickup of children at the daycare
• No right turns off Wolseley onto Maryland, this really backs up traffic. Why not make this possible?
• One-ways in East Option 1 would make dropping off and picking up students at Balmoral Hall School difficult.
• Important to remember there are many people that are older who would like to drive on more scenic routes that main streets (example of Wellington, that you are unable to drive on Sundays)
• Questions were asked about an off-street option along Granite Way to maintain two-way travel
• Noted Balmoral Hall School turn off is a big back up
• Concerned about Broadway vehicle back up if Granite Way is one-way
• The four-way stop sign means a lot of people cut down Canora
• One-way on Wolseley will impact residents, it’s a small street with lots of kids
• Maryland and Sherbrook need to be redesigned as they are a bottleneck
• Any amount of traffic reduction and encouragement to increase cycling is excellent
• Conversations with neighbours and parents of children at Laura Secord School voice broad support for traffic calming
• Acceptance that it will slightly inconvenience locals due to indirect routes
• Concern regarding traffic flow considering moving/delivery trucks or emergency vehicles on Balmoral. Worried that alternate routes, including the back lane will now become congested and traffic will increase near the skate park.
• Dominion Street residents are concerned with both speed and volume of traffic on their street, particularly the block from Westminster to Portage. The proposed design options do not have speed humps continued onto Dominion Street, north of Westminster. The residents of this block have already agreed that they would like the humps. Even if traffic flow is significantly diverted from the neighbourhood (which is a GREAT plan, thanks!), it won't stop people from speeding to make the green light at the end of Dominion Street as they turn from Westminster. Lower traffic flow will give those speeders even more incentive to speed, as there will be less oncoming traffic to dodge. Speed humps would help dramatically.
• Requesting the design option limit the use of Dominion Street lights as a thoroughfare for commuter traffic, through restricting turning left to head west
• In favour of West Option 1: Could we add the extra 3 speed humps on Wolseley which are shown on West Option 2 (between Lenore & Evanson, Evanson & Home, Ethelbert & Canora)? On these last few streets before Palmerston ends there is a lot of speeding. Resolving this concern helps with active transportation at the same time as this is where children often begin to learn and practice on bikes etc. This will also assist them in strengthening habits for long term active transport with a lot less danger and possibility of major accidents to loss of life.