HDR
255 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 1X9
Tel: (416) 847-0005
Fax: (905) 882-1557
www.hdrinc.com
www.itransconsulting.com

File: 2.2
Project # 6776

Orientation Session Notes

Project: Class EA for Regional Road Corridors bound by Bush Street, Mississauga Road, Olde Base Line Road and Winston Churchill Boulevard

Subject: **Community Working Group Meeting #1 – Orientation Session**

Meeting Date & Time: Tuesday, October 23, 2012, 6:30 p.m.

Location: Belfountain Community Centre
17204 Main Street, Belfountain

Prepared by: Nathalie Baudais

Attendees:

Glenn McMichael – CWG member
David Jobe – CWG member
Bryan Bibby Smith – CWG member
Carolin Spanetta – CWG representative for Sergio Panetta
Steve Ganesh – Region of Peel
Hitesh Topiwala – Region of Peel
Asha Saddi – Region of Peel
Sue Cumming – Facilitator, Cumming and Company
Stephen Keen – HDR, Consultants
Nathalie Baudais – HDR, Consultants

Regrets:
Sergio Panetta – CWG member
Sarah Morgenstern – CWG member

Distribution: All Attendees

	Item
1.0	**Welcome, Introductions, Overview of Agenda**
1.1	Roundtable introductions were made. CWG members commented on why they wanted to be part of the CWG together with preliminary observations/comments about transportation and community issues.

2.0	**Opening Remarks**
2.1	Steve Ganesh introduced the project and explained that the Region of Peel was looking to work with the community to preserve and maintain the community character while providing a safe road network.
2.2	Steve Ganesh provided a brief overview of some of the Region of Peel initiatives including the Active Transportation Plan which encourages alternative modes of travel, such as walking and cycling, and, the Road Characterization Study, which considers the design elements within the road right of way that reflect the character of communities adjacent to the road.
2.3	Steve Ganesh thanked the members for contributing their time and thoughts throughout the process.
3.0	**Mandate, Roles, Responsibilities and Meeting Organization**
3.1	Sue Cumming reviewed the Terms of Reference with the CWG, confirming the non-voting stature of the committee and its important role in providing input and advice on study directions. She also provided the committee with Ground Rules for the facilitator's commitment to the CWG members: • Treats everyone equally • Helps everyone feel comfortable participating • Ensures that everyone's voice is heard • Sets a tone of respect for different viewpoints • Stays neutral • Keeps the discussion on topic, organized and focused • Provides guidance and support for the CWG She discussed expectations of the CWG members, seeking their commitment to the following: • Everyone is equal • All members need to feel comfortable to participate • We don't have to agree, but will respect each other's viewpoints • Bring your ideas to the meetings - not your agenda • If you don't understand, just ask what is meant • One speaker at a time, do not interrupt, be respectful of time • Ensure opinions outside of the CWG meetings represent personal viewpoints versus those of the Group Sue Cumming conveyed that significant agenda time at all meetings would be devoted to roundtable discussion. Presentations by the Project Team when warranted would be short, and, where feasible, information would be sent out in advance of meetings with the meeting agenda. An important role of the CWG was to liaise with members in the community. She

	advised that in doing so, should members communicate their opinions, they need to do so in a manner that is reflective of their own views and not speak on behalf of other CWG members.
3.2	All correspondence between CWG members and the Project Team should be forwarded to Asha Saddi and copied to all members. Meeting notes will be taken at each future meeting to record the ideas and key messages. These will be provided in draft for the CWG's confirmation with a request for any changes within two weeks of distribution after which time the notes would be posted on the Region of Peel web site.
3.3	If a CWG member was not able to attend, an alternate could attend on their behalf and the name of the individual should be provided in advance to Asha Saddi.
3.4	The timing for future CWG meetings was agreed to be appropriate with a 6:30 p.m. start. A light supper will continue to be provided at future meetings.
4.0	**Project Background**
4.1	Hitesh Topiwala and Stephen Keen reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the CWG.
4.2	An overview of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process and Schedule "C" projects was provided. It was explained that the creation of the Community Working Group and the scheduled Public Open House for October 30, 2012 were not mandated by the EA process. The Region of Peel had included these as an opportunity for community engagement in this project.
4.3	It was noted that no changes had been made to the drainage system since the 2009 study was initiated. It was explained that the Region of Peel could not proceed with any drainage recommendations until the EA study was completed and the necessary permit approvals were in place.
4.4	It was noted that the Rockfort Quarry application delayed the study expansion.
4.5	Winston Churchill Boulevard is part of the shared jurisdiction between Wellington County and Region of Peel. Wellington County is a participant through the Technical Advisory Committee.
5.0	**Group discussion on transportation issues, the needs and vision for the roads**
5.1	*Questions/comments about why the study is being undertaken (again)* **Why is the study being undertaken?** It was noted that the study had started twice before and the community will want to know why it was being started again. **What will the outcome be?** Discussion ensued on who makes decisions on the study,

	the role of senior Regional staff and Council, and, the impact of the community is voice in influencing outcomes.
5.2	*Important to convey to the community - what the study is not about:* ▪ Not about the widening of roads ▪ Not about improvements that do not respect the natural and rural character of the area and the roads ▪ Not about safety improvements at any cost
5.3	*Overriding theme of balance and respect for rural and village character* ▪ Opposed to having an urbanized treatment of roads in the Study Area. ▪ Want to see a "made in the community" solution respecting the rural character of the area and the roads. ▪ Do not want to see Mississauga Road and Winston Churchill urbanized. Do not want to see the roads become a "King Street".
5.4	*Must have focus on improvements for pedestrian and cycling that enhance the community character* ▪ It was noted that 100% of school children (180) are bussed to the Belfountain School. This is determined by the District School Board's policy respecting road classification. A Grade 4 class had written to the Mayor requesting bike lanes and sidewalks be built around the school and in the community. The Mayor had attended the school to talk with the school children. ▪ Would like to see safe pedestrian and cycling corridors to/from the school. Would like to improve safety for school children walking along Old Base Line Road to the Conservation Area for field trips where there was no wide shoulder or sidewalks. ▪ A question was raised about whether there was room on the shoulders for cycling infrastructure, given the soft shoulders, narrow space and steep grades. A reference was also made about concerns of driving in to a pond on an owner's property. ▪ In some areas it may be practical to separate cars from people while in other areas the topography would preclude this and other improvements need to be explored. Rumble strips along the shoulder could be considered. ▪ It was acknowledged that safety considerations were a challenge given the existing grades. The issue of guard rails was discussed. ▪ Unsafe cycling practices were occurring on Old Base Line Road with cyclists travelling in the center of the road. ▪ Vehicle sight lines were an issue with cycling safety. CWG members were not supportive of flattening out the road. They felt focus should be on cycling behaviour. ▪ Members supported a sidewalk or pathway being built through the Village from Caledon Mountain Drive to Bush Street and to Belfountain School. It was noted that presently there was no safe way to walk to the Village.

5.5	*Not supportive of road improvements that would result in an increase in truck traffic* ▪ The Community was concerned about the potential for growth in truck traffic. Constraints on existing roads do not allow truck traffic. The CWG felt that road improvements should not accommodate truck traffic.
5.6	*Need to balance improvements so that traffic is not shifted from one road to another* ▪ It was acknowledged that there was more traffic. There were more people travelling to the stores in the Belfountain Village and Erin which brought in more commuter traffic. ▪ People will travel the path of least resistance. Members did not want to see one route improved over another in order to redirect traffic. Achieving a balance was important to the community members. ▪ Speeding was an issue along Winston Churchill despite the sight lines. The road improvements along Winston Churchill have resulted in more racing and speeding in the area. Noise is also an issue for those whose homes are closer to the road. There are marsh and pond areas near the edge of the road along Winston Churchill. ▪ The community members would like to see traffic volume and speed addressed, especially commuter traffic going south along Winston Churchill in the morning. ▪ It is important to working group members not to redirect the problem from one route to another. There was a lot of traffic moving through Belfountain Village. New planters and gardens were put in to help reduce cut through traffic. ▪ Community members underscored the importance of an overall solution that did not impact the Village, Winston Churchill or other roads in area. ▪ Volume was also a factor to be considered. There was a need to determine how to manage volume from motorcyclists, tourists and commuters in a way that maintained the character of the roads and the area.
5.7	*Ideas about community character* ▪ There was a strong environmental and natural character in the area which was why many chose to live in the area. All agreed that this was extremely important and that the outcomes of this study could not be safety at any cost. Improvements need to respect the environment. ▪ People in the community were very passionate about the natural and rural character of the area and supported preserving / enhancing the area. This would be a strong factor in assessing the benefits of any safety improvements that came forward in this Study. ▪ Not looking for a lot of change. Many in the community do not support the building of sidewalks and curbs along the roads. There is an interest in traffic calming / slowing people down. Roads as they are with some potholes are quite acceptable. Community members were not looking for a perfect road. They did not want to see a highway type of road condition in the area. People like Mississauga Road as it is.
5.8	*Other information communicated to the Project Team* ▪ Members have previously requested collision data and there is not much data

	available. ▪ It was noted that a proposal for 72 lots off Woodland Court, from Mississauga Road to Bush Street, was being considered again with a potential application for the preparation of a draft plan. The community members wanted to ensure the study team was aware of the pending application. It was noted that this application had been debated for at least 30 years. The Project Consultant advised that a development in this area would not justify road widening. ▪ Water issues in Belfountain. ▪ Winter ponding was not being experienced on the roadways.
5.9	*Suggestions for outreach* ▪ The community members were supportive of expanding outreach through networks. Notices could be forwarded to CWG members who would distribute them through the Belfountain Village Association, Schools and other networks. ▪ The community members confirmed that notices posted in the community hall, coffee shop and community space would be effective. Some community members felt that only a few residents may see an advertisement in the newspapers and supported a mail out (Canada Post mail drop) along the streets in the Study Area, including River Road and Caledon Mountain Drive.
6.0	**October 30 Open House Outreach**
6.1	*Input for Open House* ▪ A start time of 6:30 p.m. was felt to be early. A presentation start time after 7:00 p.m. was good and would provide residents with an informal opportunity to learn about the study and discuss what was important to them. ▪ Draft Workbook was good for use at the Open House. ▪ It was felt that a representative from the Credit Valley Conservation Authority should also be present at the Open House to answer any appropriate questions. ▪ The community members wanted to see key messages communicated: o The study was not about widening roads. o It was important to learn about the community character to ensure the right balance is achieved between making the road improvements and enhancing the community character. o Focus on engagement with community through CWG, Open House and other means.
7.0	**Next Steps**
7.1	Open House – October 30, 2012 Technical Studies Community Working Group Meeting – Winter 2013 Public Information Centre – Winter 2013
8.0	**Closing Remarks**

8.1	Steve Ganesh reiterated that the Region of Peel would like to actively engage the community and if the CWG members knew of other organizations (e.g. ski clubs, school students, etc.) that would appreciate additional outreach, to please advise the study team.