

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments presented here include all feedback, suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and in-person through the engagement described in this report. All input has been reviewed and provided to Project Teams to be considered in decision making for the project.

Any personal identifying information has been removed from the verbatim comments presented here. Comments or portions of comments that contain profanity, or that are not in compliance with the [City's Respectful Workplace Policy](#) or [Online Tool Moderation Practice](#), have also been removed from participant submissions.

Wherever possible the remainder of the submissions remains. No other edits to the feedback have been made, and the verbatim comments are as received. As a result, some of the content in this verbatim record may still be considered offensive or distasteful to some readers.

Segment 1

For the proposed concept design above for Segment 1 (24 Street to 20A Street NW), please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support). Tell us why you gave your rating:

A 3 meter pathway along 14 ave nw is overkill, to put it mildly. The amount of foot traffic along 14th ave is minimal. If by making it multi use I assume you are including cyclists. Same comment. Overkill. This is not a high use cyclist street!!

I believe that your cross section dimensions are flipped. If the landscaping on the north side of 14th ave is to be maintained, the boulevard dimension should be 3.6 m (not 3.3 m) and the boulevard dimension on the south side of 14th ave should be 3.3 m (not 3.6 m). This would also maintain the current location of the south side sidewalk.

I do not understand the purpose of the 3m pathway on the North side of 14th Avenue. I have lived in this community for over 15 years and do not believe the existing pathway is overly crowded or in need of an expanded pathway. I walk or bike along 14th Avenue every day on my way to work. Will this require existing home owner property to be annexed to allow for a 3m pathway?

The multi use pathways should not have ramps on them for alley access. This is very hard to use for people walking, especially in the winter. Just have short abrupt ramps by the edge. It will force people to drive them at a slow pace and make is safer for everyone.

\$ it is fine as it is.

Although the concept makes sense, there is little point in putting in the effort west of 20a street until such time as there are definitive plans and timelines for the redevelopment of the Crowchild overpass. This overpass is a horrible design for wheeled users making 14th ave undesirable as a multi-use route. There cannot be

much in the way of bicycle or other wheeled users using this bridge. As a result, doing this project west of 20a street (the access to school and park to the south) is a premature waste of funding and resources.

Any traffic system improvement that removes car preference in this car centric hellscape is a win. Please do this more, 3/4 of this city is dangerous to anyone not using a car and you want people to raise their children here!?

From a traffic perspective, I still cannot see the need for a dedicated separated bike lane. I live on 14th avenue, and see very few wheelers use this path - instead people tend to cycle on 13th avenue, or south of the 16th avenue sound wall. I do however, support traffic calming on 14th avenue (including speed bumps) as what little traffic goes this way does go quickly on what should be a quiet residential road.

good curb bulbs, & grade-separated multi-use pathway on one side

I am a driver, but I often bike to get to NorthHill, the library, or Briar Hill. Anything that can be done to make biking and walking safer and more appealing is a win, in my book. So much of the city is completely centered around cars and I feel like people are increasingly flouting no turn rules and other traffic calming measures to cut through residential areas on their commute.

I do not believe that traffic would be badly impeded on this section of road with these changes.

I never visit this part of 24th. I can imagine though that, if I did live here, I'd find these solid and reasonable fixes for little concerns I'd have, especially fixing up the access to the overhead walkway.

I really like the addition of a dedicated multi use pathway, especially since this street connects the neighborhood to so many pedestrian overpasses. I also like prioritizing pedestrian safety, especially around the elementary school so that kids feel safe walking from a young age.

I ride my bike along this corridor most days. It would be great to see some of the improvements to the MUP to create more predictability by helping drivers to know where the bikes are and how to travel with them along the roadway. Ideally better connections will come with better crossings so that we can better share the space with cars, peds, and bikes.

I think this addresses the needs of all types of users - there is still ample parking (a quick scroll through google maps shows very few cars parked along 14th) & no lanes are being taken away from vehicles. Curb bump outs and traffic calming are great additions around schools - would love to see continuous sidewalks for the pathway, especially where it crosses other connections. It's a great way to further calm traffic where it interacts with those outside of cars (walking or wheeling).

I will always be supportive of improvements to cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, though parking could be removed to further separate cyclists from pedestrians.

In general, I do support the addition of multi use cross walk, curb bulbs and enhanced accessibility changes.

Looks good but in reality the parking on one side of street does not leave enough room for the two other lanes to actually pass each other, currently one has to pull into the oncoming lane if someone has parked on the road...people don't drive minis, they drive SUVs and trucks, let's be realistic please

Looks good! Would like to see east/west crosswalks align more with the pathway, it can be hard to tell which direction people are going when they have to turn at the corners.

My primary concern is that I have a driveway that accesses directly onto the North side of 14th street and wonder how the bike pathway will affect my property

Parking on the North seems to be more reasonable with more houses in the North face 14 Ave than houses on the south. Widen the sidewalks for walking and wheeling would increase the safety of community including drivers.

There is currently not enough room for two cars to safely pass when there is a vehicle parked on the side. One has to drive into oncoming traffic to get around a parked car. The road is literally not wide enough - we don't drive tiny vehicles, it's trucks and SUVs, let's be realistic please as it is already a problem. And with the higher density housing approval that always seem to not consider including garages, or sufficient garages for the high density housing sizes, it's only going to be more of a problem

This is a great design! It slows down moving vehicles going down 14th Ave. It seems like everyone speeds down this street, and it can be very loud and dangerous, especially when me and my siblings go to walk our dog. Also being able to take my bike down the street to North Hill Centre would feel much safer than mixing with cars. Lastly, I have to park my cars on the North side of the street because I have no parking space due to a fire hydrant, having a dedicated lane for parking would make me feel much safer that my cars won't get hit. Thank you!

What I have seen so far is that widened sidewalks and bike paths are not used much. 14th ave will be the same, I attribute this to being a winter country and having short summers. I think all that investment is in vain. However, such projects are suitable for the city center and river banks. I hope only our old roads and sidewalks will be renewed.

You are presenting a solution looking for a problem. Direct the money elsewhere.

You should have bulb outs for every intersection and raised crosswalks too. Why so few? This would be way safer for kids walking to school or to visit friends.

For the 20A Street N.W. - Option 1 and 2, please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support). Tell us why you gave your rating for each option:

Option 1 looks only one drive lane for each direction? No bike lanes are needed with this quiet traffic. Please do not waist Tax money!

Option 2 will never work. Do you know how congested on 19 Street during lash hours?!

For option 1, I think there should be curb bulbs on both side.

For option 2, I think it makes crossing and pedestrian visibility poorer

Regarding optionI reside on 20A St. south of 14 Ave. I have young children, 10 years old, who are at the age where are learning to cross the street safely on their own. I don't think a roundabout is a good idea as many drivers are confused about how to use one, let alone pedestrians. There are U-turning vehicles, but I don't really see it too often.

Regarding option 1, I don't feel the need for the bulb outs. That would reduce the ability for cars to make uturns. I don't make uturns, but it can be done safely. I've seen my share of uturning cars as a pedestrian.

I also bike, walk, take transit, and drive in that order.

This is not a busy road. I'm not sure doing anything except maybe a flashing walk signal is required. I hate roundabouts. Most drivers in North America cannot handle them. Not going to get any better no matter what you do. Go around about is totally unwarranted in this situation IMO.

My spouse and I utilize this street multiple times a day, driving, cycling to work and walking our dog twice daily. There is not enough reason to add bike lanes to segment 1. Not enough usage, just needs paving. Even widening the sidewalks seems like a waste of taxpayers money, not enough walking and wheeling to justify this. We live on a corner lot and spent lots of time outside to be speak on this. Just pave and redo sidewalks from 19th St to wall on Crowchild.

Option 2 can improve vehicle flow out of the strip mall along 19th street by providing an option for traffic to exit and not congest the 19th St intersection

Lions gate mall requires a right turn only sign. U turn or traffic circle on 20A Street will allow for safe commute. 14 Ave requires straight lane and a Left turn lane to access 19 Street N.W.

19 Street Can not be a traffic circle. Sea train scheduling. Traffic backs up to turn left on 16ave N.W. at 3pm each day past 14 Ave.

Option 1: Reducing the width of the street will obstruct traffic. The street is not that wide to require it.

Option 2. If the purpose of the traffic button is to allow for U-turns, why is it not located on the intersection with 20 st NW? It is not clear why the cars need to drive more to turn around. It is not explained, but the drawing suggests that the pedestrian crossing is as it is now.

Option #2 would hopefully slow down motorists, which would improve pedestrian safety, particularly families like mine with young children. Traffic speed is a very high concern for me as a Briar Hill neighbourhood resident.

I love the curb bulbs and the proposed raised cross walks and I think if there is some balance between that would be ideal. Maximize traffic calming and pedestrian safety is my preference.

waste of time and money nothing needs to be done on this stretch of 14th Ave NW, this is not a high traffic or speeding area, no pedestrian accidents have occurred in living memory - focus on areas that need it, this is not one

Anything that makes the pedestrian experience is the better option. People forget how slow you move as a pedestrian and propose all sorts of things like the godforsaken overpasses over 16th that add significant time to a commute so cars don't have to stop for pedestrians another 20 seconds. Also the signal is great. They should be in a lot of areas.

I oppose the traffic circle which will be confusing when drivers, bikers and pedestrians are all trying to use it. There should not be a legal u-turn in this area with so much pedestrian traffic including many children. Cars leaving the strip mall to head southbound should just the exit from the parking lot directly on to 19 Street. Cars heading north or east from that parking lot can go around the block to enter on to 16 Ave eastbound. Anyone else can go around a block. A crosswalk button would be nice, but only on one side of the road. Make it as simple as possible.

The legal u-turn idea is excellent. Signage must be installed at the strip mall on 19th street to exit by turning right (west) and utilizing the new intersection. Traffic has been encumbered long enough at the exit from the strip mall. Let's get this right the first time. Thank you!

Option 1 seems like the better option, as it prioritizes the safety of pedestrians over the convenience of cars. If you have to have a traffic button, then 20A St NW seems like a better place than the earlier proposal of 20 St NW. The way people drive in our neighbourhood, I think that the traffic button will make things easier for cars but more challenging for pedestrians.

No need for a pathway. Not enough traffic to worry about in this part of the city!

Not a big fan of curb bulbs, as I understand from more avid cyclists that they push cyclists into traffic. The idea of a button intersection may work, as it does allow the u-turn. But why a stop sign from the north - I don't like that at all, if it's a button it should be a standard button - Canadians have enough trouble with buttons as it is, without confusing them! (I'm quite comfortable with buttons, having lived in the UK).

The options are pretty similar for the way I use that intersection: mostly on my bike, mostly going E-W. I like the tighter radius on NW corner of Option 1, just a little extra feature to slow down vehicle traffic. I don't like the extra distance that bikes and peds have to go if they're following the pathway: it bumps north to the crossing and then back south. But I know that's a safer configuration so I support that. The button configuration isn't as good for cyclists using the roadway. I wonder if there's a way to add a bulb out slightly east of the east crosswalk? That way motorists won't try to cut around a cyclist going through there on the roadway. Maybe it's even possible to put in one of those temporary yellow bulb outs, just to try it out after construction of Option 2? Basically I like the bulbs outs! Shorter crossings, restricting car speed, etc.

Option 1 is safer for pedestrians, option two is interesting with the roundabout for u-turn capability, but I prefer curb bulbs more as both a driver and pedestrian.

They are both improvements over the existing. It's not clear if the "traffic button" is a traffic circle (google results just shot pedestrian crossing beg buttons). If so, then I support that plan more. If it's some kind of traffic signal then I support it less.

Option 2-think this would be a reasonable solution and placement @ 20A St is far enough from 19 St to avoid back ups and u-turn collisions
- improves and allows for legal u-turn

I think a traffic button is needed to manage traffic speeds and u-turns

Assuming all traffic exiting the mall parking lot have to turn right (west) to do a u-turn. Anticipate cars being lined up during peak times when trains, red light, and left hand turners at 19th street.

I like the bulbs, I just don't know why there is only one. The traffic circle seems excessive without really helping pedestrians all that much.

Traffic flow is not a major issue on this section of 14th Ave. pedestrian crossing is more important here.

While more expensive, as a person who bike commutes across the city fairly often I have found that traffic circles nicely slow down drivers in such a way that doesn't give preference, they seem to get used to watching out for each other and in so doing make it safer for both pedestrians and cyclists/scooter riders.

Option 2 is pointless. The only people that would be doing u-turns is from the strip mall and there are already two exists from this strip mall. In addition there is a access to 16th Ave without having to do a u-turn

Option 2 is the best for slowing down motor vehicle traffic, some cars will be going down this street at 70+ km/h. Enough is enough.

as a driver or pedestrian option 1 feels better and supposedly its less expensive

Option 2 is way better but it needs more bulb outs and not just one.
Option 1 traffic buttons has drivers navigating their vehicles fast towards the sidewalk

and just feels dangerous for people. Unless you're going to have raised crossing on all sides of the buttons to slow drivers down, the traffic buttons just feel unsafe.

Option 1 seems to be a resource effective solution that just need a little investment to enhance the current system that lead to the goals of improve safety for all (pedestrians, cyclists, drivers). Whereas option 2 increase the functionality that is just nice to have but not so much of necessity for safety; and would cost higher, which I would not support as much in this economic downturn we are experiencing.

Stop signs will ensure vehicles come to a complete stop - this is important for children and pedestrians who use this route as a school crossing. Roundabouts do not stop vehicular traffic - only slow. Roundabouts also create safety issues for cars - aswhilst they are going around the circle, pedestrians can enter the crossing area behind them and may not be seen.

A circle/roundabout would be better situation closer to the strip mall which has dreadful and dangerous access.

For Option 1, I don't understand the need for a curb bulb as it disrupts traffic flow for sure as the road is not wide enough for two cars to pass safely. I walk and cross 14th avenue a lot and do not understand any need for a curb bulb

For option 2, I guess the traffic circle is ok, better than option 1 I assume you are to leave the left turning lane from 14th avenue onto 19th street when heading east on 14th avenue to go north on 19th street - that is a necessity.

Option 1 impedes traffic too much, while option 2 would allow for better vehicle flow.

People are generally unfamiliar with how roundabouts (i.e. the button) work and they create confusion.

A traffic button is preferable. That allows anyone at the strip mall along 19th to turn west and then circle around, in case the line at the light is too long.

Traffic circles are safer. Where is there consideration of cyclists?

Option 2 allows pedestrians to cross safely in all directions, which is ideal. There are only two marked crosswalks in Option 1, which makes crossing difficult as drivers do not always acknowledge pedestrians in unmarked crosswalks. The roundabout will help with traffic flow.

I strongly recommend including raised sidewalks in both Options. They support traffic calming and are a physical reminder to drivers that they are in an area where there are people walking too.

\$

I really appreciate both. They each do good things for road safety.
Having a U-turn lane would probably be smart?
Though, that comes at the cost of making the intersection wider and crossings less visible, so it might not be a perfect solution.

Guess my logic would be to save a little here by going for option one and put the big money into the roundabout fix for the 19th Ave NW intersection.
don't like traffic buttons - can squeeze out bikes
Traffic circles are great IMO. Would love to see some thought go into how the MUP will cross these intersections. Do they jog right, cross, jog left or is there a way to make it a continuous pathway and further calm traffic at the same time.
Option 2 is worse for pathway users
Not a fan of these micro traffic circles based on the ones on 13th Ave east of SALT due to the raised concrete rings around the actual island.
option one makes for narrower roadway which can make for dangerous driving. We see this on 24 Ave where cars trying to turn left are waiting for traffic or peds/bikes, and other drivers try to go around not realizing there are peds/bikes. the narrow roadway makes it harder to see. Option two keeps the line of sight more clear and more natural for all users.
Either is pretty okay.
Wish both N-S crosswalks were bumped out as well as the north E-W crossing. Every crossing should be painted.

Segment 2

For the proposed concept design above for Segment 2 (20 Street N.W. to North Hill Centre Pedestrian overpass), please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support). Tell us why you gave your rating:
- a separate bike lane is needed here either through the park or through what is currently the parking lot
I do not see evidence of an OVERpass as mentioned. Pedestrian traffic from LRT to North Hill Mall is treacherous with people crossing over 14th often inattentive.
I fully support wider multi-use pathways and less road traffic lanes.
I support the overall direction of providing a multi-use path. My butts are as follows:
There should be more permeability between the LRT station and the north-south sidewalk that leads to the Safeway and MAX Orange station. Making it harder to "jaywalk" instead of making it safer and easier to cross the road is a misstep and fails to prioritize people walking and using transit NEXT to an LRT station.
waste of time and money - only the sidewalks need to be fixed for wheelchairs
We live in briar hill and see so many near misses of ppl getting hit here
Wider sidewalks are much better especially if they are multi-use, i.e. bikes take part of the path.

You need to make one of the two east bound lanes a transit only lane.
14 Ave N.W. Requires a straight east bound lane to 14 Street. Bus station would be helpful to move farther east . 14 Ave requires Left turning lane. 19 Street bump out at 14 Ave N.W. is helpful for traffic reduction. Vehicles like to use right turn lane on 19 street to go straight.
A multi use path along the north side would be great. I would only like to see a better bike connection at Lions Park as many cyclists use 17A street from West Hillhurst and connection to the MUP would be important - otherwise cyclists will continue to ride on the south side and cross at the lights (not always correctly) or ride up 19 Street which can be dangerous for everyone. SO improved connection to the MUP would be a suggestion.
Again, I I drive this route daily sometimes more often, my needs are to access with the left hand turn Safeway at the north hill shopping centre. Currently there is no problem. I also need to do a left hand turn onto 19th Street northbound and this works fine. Traffic signals are quite reasonable I find in all instances currently. Ingress and egress from the strip mall along 19th Street can be a little problematic but I don't see any room for mitigation without negative impacts on more important items.
Again, not busy enough to need a bunch of changes. Might make sense if the North Hill Mall space gets some added residential apartments built on it (ie more SAIT residences).
Again, the bike lane duplicates the bike path in Lions Park, and the community would have liked to see more activity in Lions Park and improvements to that pathway, rather than making a new one... but I do see there is more direct connection to the Library and stores with this path. I like that it is on the north side, where it is less 'in the way', though I am concerned that turning vehicles will struggle to see the bikes. I do like that there are good through lanes for vehicles, and there are good left turn lanes (including the extended left turn lane coming out of Briar Hill). This plan respects the need to use cars, as well, which is appreciated.
bike lane needed
CONNECT THE NEW PATHWAY TO THE PATHWAY ON 16 AV NW - WHY ARE WE BUIDLING MISSING LINKS INTO OUR NETWORK ??!!!
Consider moving Louise Riley driveway to west side to remove the two driveways that are side-by-side.
Doesn't feel like there is enough change to make a difference.
Easy driving access to the mall and library.
Exploring LRT fence barriers is excellent. Need something to stop the j-walking.
Fine with 1 vehicle lane going west and 2 going east.
Given the road is parallel to 16th Ave, it should be narrowed to single lane in each direction to move demand back onto the 16th Ave through road.

Going further down, Option 2 is much better concept for this area.
I can't complain about improvements to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure - It's just a question of how much more can be done?
I love the cross section of the proposed street.
I support widening the sidewalk and narrowing and calming the road. There's so much foot traffic that vehicle traffic is worth slowing down for safety's sake.
I think it will improve safety to get rid of the island on the NE corner of the intersection. It is currently difficult when walking westward at this intersection to monitor traffic coming behind you to ensure you can cross.
I think that putting the pathway on the north side ignores the fact that most foot traffic in this area is either travelling to or from the Irt station. Maintaining parking on the north side of the road should also be a lower priority
I would give it 5 stars if it got rid of everything but bikes, walkers and transit users, but that is too much for Calgary. There is literally nothing along this stretch that a vehicle couldn't access by going on 16th and going through the parking lot. My kids and I bike to the library from the SAIT direction and the crazy unsafe turns that people are constantly making across the path of bikers and pedestrians is very frustrating and sometimes scary. If the city wants people to choose transit and other modes of transportation, we need to keep working to make them a safe and attractive option.
Improvement over existing
is there a bike lane here - if not it should be considered - many people ride to sait
It would still be a pretty lousy place to walk or bike. Safety measures are appreciated, but it's still very car-centric. There needs to be clear connections to pathways, so people aren't just spit out into traffic.
It's too timid. The pedestrians cross everywhere. Stop pretending they don't. The existing east crosswalk should e from the existing location through to the pathway coming out of the mall. Another crosswalk should be added to the east side of the west driveway coming from Safeway as well. This is a transit hub. Anyone who decides to drive through it should understand that and live with it.
It's mediocre. The wheeling lane should be better connected to Lions Park station to facilitate multi-modal transportation. For the potential barrier at the train station to prevent "jaywalking" (ew), I promise to climb over, under, or through it to cross the street wherever I please. A better option may be to create a calmed section of the street with pavers of some sort to encourage slow speeds by motorists and better integrate the station into the urban fabric.
Looks great except the risk is bus would slow down a lot of traffic on the single line going west. Would love to learn more on the bus stop set up that could mitigate the concern.

Most importantly, please improve the safety of the train with everyone having to enter the train platform via a fare gate. This would mean that only those people who are using the train would be using the platform. Secondly, please beautify the greenspace/park with colorful shrubs and trees. Thirdly, please connect the pathway to existing bike/running paths, between 24st-10st.

Not a lot needed here. Does not address Ped crossing by library which needs work because ped light is in the middle of a muddy pool when it is wet and the crosswalk has a massive puddle or ice rink covering the north end of it in wet weather.

Not enough walking traffic to justify an unsightly structure.

Overall good intentions and I understand the right of way is constrained. However, I have a few issues. I don't think jay walking should be restricted. If anything, I would love to see us embrace the high number of conflict points. I feel safest in this section, because people are vigilant due to the large confusion of things happening. Whether I'm on my bike or car or transit/foot, I think (feel) this is one of the safest sections in the study area. Narrowing lanes will help I suppose. But I wonder what it would look like to make the entire section from the track crossing to the eastern ped crossing a raised section? Make it a different colour, make it a 20km/h zone, give peds and bikes right of way and drivers lowest priority. Basically a ped plaza where buses and drivers are allowed. I am also unsure about the multiuse pathway. Do we need to keep left turn lanes? Or would we be able to 1) work with the mall owner to have a bus loop, 2) allocate the EB right lane to trees and a separated bike path. As a person who goes along there by bike most often, I would probably continue to use the street if there weren't any good or easy connections to 19 St NB/SB or 14 Ave EB. Which, to be fair, there aren't currently any good connections at the 19 St intersection, as I usually come SB on 19th to EB on 14 Ave. Unless we go with the traffic circle option for 19th, it's probably going to still be easiest for me to take the street, but unlikely that I'll choose the pathway south of Lion's park unless I'm going south before 14 St.

Please make sure to construct the north side pathway with bollards or at very least a hard/square/tall curb. This will prevent drivers from using the 4m pathway as a parking or driving lane. Especially important in winter when it's easier to mount the curb and to not notice that the 4m wide space is for peds and bikes not cars. The nearby pathway on Banff Trail by the hotels is a disaster with vehicles parked in it constantly because the curb is such a gentle slope and there's no signage or bollards to clarify to drivers that this is not their space.

Riding with children on sidewalk en route between SAIT and Louise Riley regularly, the narrow pathway has led to several close calls of my daughter falling off the narrow curb into the traffic lane.

strong support for improved cycle connectivity E-W along 14th Avenue. Could be better improved by better connectivity to the south side of 14th Avenue and Lion's Park.

Suggest Lions Strip Mall that vehicles can only enter and exit from 19th street (slightly north of 14 Ave. And ONLY enter from the current 14th Ave access point. Exiting

from the 14 Ave portion of the parking lot is treacherous, often cars move into the opposite lane. All traffic should not come further west into the 20th intersection - as it is also a well used pedestrian crossing. Basically keep flow out of the strip mall on 19th Street.

The curb line on the south side of 14 AV NW (adjacent the LRT station) should bump out to reduce the crossing distance and allow for an additional crossing to the Safeway sidewalk. Unclear why there needs to be two eastbound lanes here past the turn into the Safeway.

The multi use pathway should NOT have ramps built in them for cars, makes it challenging to walk on especially in winter.

These options and design are great! As a University student it's nice to be able to save money on gas and insurance and have the option to bike to the university and to North Hill Mall without feeling like my life is in danger by getting hit by a car

-this is a busy portion of the avenue and current design is likely to lead with lots of conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians, especially around the main bus stop

This is the area that has the most safety concerns. In my short time in the neighbourhood, I've had cars almost hit me several times crossing 19 St NW coming from the Safeway, and crossing from the LRT by the library. The most common issue is southbound drivers not slowing down or stopping when they are turning right onto 14 Av NW. The proposals for crossing from the LRT station are inadequate to address the issues with cars turning out of the Safeway or reducing jaywalking by putting crosswalks where people actually want to go.

This section must have low speed with so many people walking. It should be 30 km/h, anything more is a failure to people's safety.

This will be a huge improvement! On the northside where there will be a multi-use pathway, please make sure the crossings at the railway tracks are big enough to get through if you have a larger bike or mobility device, or a stroller. The current ones are tight to get through unless you're a pedestrian.

those of us on bicycles/scooters use the Lions Park pathways instead

vague and poorly motivated but seems like good ideas

Very busy area, overpass would make much better

Why is the city considering wasting money on an overpass instead of addressing the actual issue of safety which are the drug users who make the area dangerous? It's the drug users that is the problem and making the area unsafe with their antics!

Will be nice to have some more space in front of Louise Riley to appreciate the lovely area directly in front of it, which would benefit from benches to admire the green space. Could something be done to access the library parking lot from elsewhere other than directly next to it when attempting to enter from north hill mall?

For the proposed concept design above for Segment 2 (19 Street N.W.), Options 1, 2 and 3, please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support). Tell us why you gave your rating for each option:

\$

1 - slip lanes are dangerous, and I don't think they belong in any intersection with a multi use pathway or cycle track.

2 - Good! Concerned about integration with potential further 19th st improvements, but assuming it accommodates those, I'd be pleased with this

3 - I do like roundabouts but making walking and wheeling users coming from NB 19th st cross 6 segments to go EB is a bit on the punishing and dangerous side

19st is a complex intersection. LRT schedule. Rush hour on 19 Street about 3pm and backs up on either side of 16 Ave past 14 Ave. I think it will be helpful to relocate bus lane further east on 14 St. Either of the 1st 2 options are workable. The 3rd most expensive option would not work. pedestrians would never get across 19 street. 14 Ave n.w. would never be let in to traffic circle.

A roundabout will not work at this intersection during rush hour. High volume n/s traffic would make it difficult for vehicles exiting off of 4th Avenue. Plus the high volume lrt crossings at that time would back up into the roundabout. Lots of kids cross in the west side of that intersection when heading north to branton school. How would their safety be accommodated in option 3? Having children stand in the middle is less than ideal.

A slip lane is a regressive proposal that is NOT ALIGNED from your own guiding documents. This is contradictory to Calgary's Complete Streets and Vision Zero design principles. Option 1's slip lane would cater to driver speed and convenience at the expense of pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Agree with slowing down drivers turning right onto 19th.
Traffic circle will cause more confusion which will not make it safer for pedestrians.
Light is safer for that high volume.

Allows more efficient movement of bikes and cars.

Am I missing a key element here? Apologies if I'm mistaken. How can there not be a provision for protected bidirectional E W bicycle / micromobility movements between 20 St. NW and SAIT's W entrance? Off or on street - either acceptable. Perhaps through the length of Lions Park if space permits? Project planners must be aware of 14 Avenue's significance as a major 'top of escarpment' corridor for bicycle / micromobility users - Silver Springs - Varsity - Foothills Medical Centre Mayland Heights. The regional E W significance of the 14 Ave. NW bridge crossing 14 St. NW was mentioned but not the rest of 14 Ave. NW. Thanki you for asking!

As a pedestrian and driver, I prefer the enlarged island and the curb bulbs of option 1. There doesn't seem to be any great advantage to option 2. Option 3 I dislike as a pedestrian because of the further distance to travel to cross, as well as a driver

because of the unpredictability of user knowledgeability of roundabout function particularly in high-traffic areas.

At peak traffic this intersection has a lot of north and southbound vehicles. A traffic circle would be very difficult to navigate by east and westbound traffic or pedestrians.

doesn't the city have better things to do with its money? Extending the left turn lane onto 19th St makes sense. Cub bulbs are a total nuisance.

No roundabouts! They are a total annoyance. This is a small intersection and not a problem for cars or pedestrians.

What is the point of this? To prepare for a huge amount of new housing along 14th Avenue? Why fix something that isn't broken when there is so much that is?

Don't feel this area needs a lot of improvement, but would like traffic light to cycle more quickly to reduce pedestrian wait times.

Eliminating signals is my preferred solution due to the continuous flow of traffic.

for option three, cars will enter the roundabout without having an exit (due to traffic at 16 Ave or a train - this will greatly impact the flow of traffic on 19 Street. Would option two gives best connectivity for walking and cycling, while keeping the impact on drivers lower than the other options.

I am sorry to say that option 3 will definitely not work. I have spent enough time at that intersection during rush hour to know that traffic is backed up along 19th street waiting for left turn onto 16th avenue westbound. I envision traffic blocking the traffic circle during rush hour to head north on 19th street. It would be a nightmare. And a circle leading into a C-Train crossing, yikes! I didn't care for option 1 as I dislike curb bulbs and see little value to this concept. Option 2 covers it all. Please remember that this ties into the west of the strip mall and that the drivers exiting the strip mall must be enforced to turn right onto 14th avenue and use the new circle at 20A Street to do a legal u-turn to queue eastbound traffic. It is dangerous as it stands now with drivers trying to exit the strip and head directly east on 14th avenue. Thank you.

I do not think a traffic circle will improve anything for walking , driving or biking. I use the intersection for all three. It is not a good corner for a traffic circle especially during the rush hour. It would especially be a bad idea for drivers making left turns. Horrible idea.

i don't think round about fit in well with a wheeling or biking

I leave for work at various times during the day depending on my shift. the intersection has never been too busy for me to justify changing the configuration. occasionally having to wait to turn left on to 19th St Nw, but this is after school traffic etc. I would not feel that this justifies major changes to the current set up

I like minimising the fear factor for pedestrians with option 1.

My only fear in option 3 is we're doing this to a relatively high volume intersection (compared to many other roundabouts I've experienced). In my experience most

drivers don't even know how to signal properly in roundabouts, much less to behave. Presumably the signage would aid in this. Fingers crossed.

I like option 1, as flow is maintained similar to the current situation. The change of the angle of the yield lane (right turn island) is a feature. Note that as a pedestrian, I wouldn't see this as a longer cross (just like now) - rather I cross the yield lane separately from the main road, so it functions as two shorter crossings. The improved angle will help with crossing the yield lane, whilst maintaining the flow and convenience of not having to wait for a green to make that right turn (something Renaissance residents do lots). Option 2 just slows down that right turn for no gain - I don't see it as an improvement for a pedestrian crossing (which I often am). Option 3 has MANY issues, and just would not work. - During rush hour the main flow will not have enough gaps to allow the other directions in, which will create bad delays for the other directions (ask anyone who's lived with traffic circles in Europe how this can be an issue - the rush hour traffic on 19th Street is often 'bumper to bumper'); - Queuing for the LRT gates will likely back up into the traffic circle, causing it to seize up (this is a key concern); - Traffic control needs pre-emption to sync with the LRT gates, which a circle will not allow; - Large vehicles (buses, fire trucks) will use the intersection a lot and have trouble with space; - Pedestrian movement across the intersection on the east side will be stopped, likely causing J-walking and unsafe conditions (as a pedestrian, I would resent the loss of the cross on the east side of 19th (I cross there often), and I'd be tempted to J-walk, and I suspect I'm not the only one); - There are lots of cyclists in the area, and the circle would be harder and less safe for them (particularly those trying to cross on their new pathway). Note that these points come from a city criteria for traffic circles, and this location FAILS the criteria on several points. (For some of the same reasons - functionality when one direction dominates - I would not be a fan of a traffic circle at 19th Street and 12th Ave NW either.)

I like some of the ideas around option 3, but I'm concerned that those walking and wheeling across here and going to have a hard time with vehicles not yielding unless there is something other than a crosswalk signaling them that they're mixing with people walking/wheeling (like implementing continuous sidewalks). Option 3 is a great option if we're looking to the future. Option 2 is a good option that eliminates many issues. Option 1 is ignoring a lot of safety issues for anyone outside of a car.

I really like option two because it improves pedestrian safety, but being able to remove the lights and improve traffic flow is a very elegant solution. The only worry would be traffic backing up through the traffic circle during rush hour.

I ride my bike along this intersection, and would like to try out the proposed Option 3 BUT with a caveat / request of creating an opening to get into Lion's park as the cycle path / walking / shared path for pedestrians is located there. It would be funny for a cyclist to go on the road or have to ride on the sidewalk because there is no entry point to get to Lion's Park to use the mixed use pathway. The traffic circle may seem good as it might reduce congestion as the lights are quite funny during off-peak times. I worry about Option 2 as it seems like there might be some road rage / congestion without the right turn lane. For Option 1 and 2, can there be a wider pedestrian entryway / cycle entryway to get into Lion's park as currently, when coming from 16th

Ave, it feels really tight or the entrance to Lion's park requires you to go straight into oncoming traffic instead of it coming from the crossing.

I want the roundabout so I don't have to stop when going down 19 St.

In the long run, I think option 3 would function better and be less annoying for pedestrians, bikers, vehicle drivers and just plain be better looking. I like looking at the public wealth of public infrastructure being attractive. Next favourite is #2. I don't mind annoying drivers a little though in favour of a safer and bit more pedestrian-friendly outcome. This is a pretty densely populated part of the city and one where I think making it more walkable and bikeable will be taken up in the form of more residents walking and biking and using transit. I acknowledge that option 1 would be less wonky. In the long run, I think Option 3 would function better and be less frustrating for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers—not to mention it would simply look better. I really value when public infrastructure feels like a form of public wealth, especially when it's designed to be attractive.

My next preference would be Option 2. I don't mind inconveniencing drivers a bit if it means a safer, more pedestrian-friendly outcome. This is a fairly dense part of the city, and I believe that if we make it more walkable and bikeable, people will actually take it up—walking, biking, and using transit more often.

I do acknowledge that Option 1 might feel less “wonky” from a design or traffic flow standpoint, but overall, I think the long-term benefits of the other options are more compelling.

Making people walking and wheeling cross a slip lane (in Option 1) is bad - pedestrians should be the priority at this intersection, not drivers.

Removal of east crosswalk in Option 3 is bad as if you are walking south down the east side of 19 ST NW and want to catch a eastbound (Somerset) train, you have to cross the LRT tracks twice. This means you could get stuck waiting at the gate arms TWICE and potentially miss your train.

Modifying the intersection to just remove a traffic island is money that motorists will lambast the city for waste for. A traffic circle would be amazing for everyone.

No round a bout. Not safe and difficult to drive.

NO SLIP LANE PLEASE! THIS IS OUTSIDE A TRANSIT STATION!

no traffic circles. Too hard on bikes and pedestrians

Option 1 - Creates one more crossing for pedestrians

Option 2 - Simple clear crosswalks. again the parking lot entrance to the strip mall on 14th is unsafe - allow for entry on 14th and exit on 19th. the 14th Ave access for cars is too close to 19th St to allow for cars to exit safely.

Option 3 - more dangerous for cars and pedestrians alike.

Option 1 - While it's an improvement over the previous design, this still looks like it would be scary to cross as a pedestrian. The slip lane is what does it for me, as well as the number of lanes. I don't think 14 Ave needs all that many lanes.

Option 2 - Removing the slip lane makes this intersection feel so so much safer. If option 3 is too expensive, this is the best alternative.

Option 3 - The roundabout is really nice. The constant flow makes up for the reduction of lanes, and the whole thing becomes safer! Actually, if this one gets built, maybe the roundabout from the previous section won't be necessary? Regardless, I like this, and my only criticism is the lack of crossing on the east side of the roundabout.

Option 1 allows for the best flow of traffic through the intersection, although it appears the right turn onto 14th from 19th going north will be restricted for the right turn. Option 2 would be a mess in the morning and evening rush hours. It removes the right turn lane off 14th Ave westbound and eliminates a lane of traffic on 14th Ave eastbound

Option 3 would be worse than either options 1 or 2. A circle works in light traffic, but the northbound traffic on 19th st will jam up the circle as the traffic will be backed up from 16 Ave and cars on 14th Ave will have difficulty entering the circle creating big backlogs during rush hours. Lights are essential at this intersection.

Option 1 and 2 are relatively low cost and accomplish the goals. Option 3 is far more expensive, disruptive, higher footprint and is a make work project in comparison. Option 3 also fails on the westbound 14th due to a lack of "storage" between the circle and the tracks. during busy times, even with a circle this will back up into the crossing. Option 3 also excludes a pedestrian crossing on the east side of the intersection. I regularly see pedestrians crossing on the east side. Removing the crossing is a hinderance to pedestrian usage.

Option 1 is horrible for people walking because of the slip lane.

Option 2 is best, but need to find a way to shorten the crossing distance for people walking

Option 3 is interesting, but I see this traffic circle being problematic so close to the train crossing. It will congest all directions of travel quickly. There is no need to have two lanes entering the traffic circle from the south heading north on 19 St. It just makes it more difficult for people walking.

Option 1 is the most practical. Option 3 is garbage and infeasible, a traffic circle or roundabout is not something drivers can navigate in this area and will result in more casualties and accidents.

Option 1 Should have curb bulbs removed.

Option 2 Would not work during rush hour traffic. It would be a log jam of cars everywhere

Option 3 Interesting. However this is a small diameter traffic circle which usually don't work

Option 1: DO NOT REDUCE THE WIDTH OF 19 ST. or 14 AVE. The Intersection is very busy, especially in the peak hours: morning, lunchtime and afternoon. Keep the 2 lines so residents of Briar Hill can use one to turn west, and the Southbound traffic can continue, and the buses and other Eastbound traffic can use the other line.

Option 1: Extending the left turn lane on to northbound 19th street will improve access to vehicles turning left. I am in favour in keeping the right turn island on to northbound 19th street. I am in favour relocating the bus stop on 14th Avenue and consolidating with the larger bus stop across from North Hill Mall.

Option 2: Don't like removing the right turn island onto northbound 19th street. It think this will create traffic backup on 14th Ave for vehicles turning right.

Option 3: I think a traffic circle will improve traffic flow overall, but concerned about cost.

Option 1: This is the best option. Good for drivers and pedestrians considering the current constraints on signal timing.

Option 2: I don't fancy the idea of removing the pedestrian island. Without dedicated access to a right turn, the traffic can be backed up a lot WB on 14th. Especially when 2 trains are crossing with a longer gap in between. I see this as a driver.

As a pedestrian, I prefer the island so I can choose which way I want to cross easily. I cross often on foot and have never had a issue with a pedestrian - vehicle conflict.

Option 3: Many drivers in Calgary do not know how to drive safely in roundabouts. Pedestrians do not know how to cross in a roundabout.

There are a lot of junior high school students that go to North Hill mall for lunch and cross at that intersection. I'm sure most would have not crossed a roundabout before. As in this particular section of the city, there are no high traffic roundabouts with pedestrian crossings.

There is a roundabout on Bow Valley Trail in Canmore that has high vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic. It does not work well at all. I have been almost hit while crossing it.

Option 1:

This area should prioritize pedestrian movement and safety due to it's proximity to a transit hub, condo complex, park, and library. A design that prioritizes vehicle speed and flow is not appropriate

Option 2:

Removal of the slip lane is a great idea to improve pedestrian safety, as well as reduced lanes on the south side

Option 3:

I think this is the best of the presented options. I would like to see the pedestrian

crossings set further back from the intersection to reduce the number of things drivers and pedestrians have to be aware of when crossing the street

Option 2 is best, but with the addition of an all directions stop with no right turn, allowing pedestrians to cross diagonally. There should be lighted signs for no right turn on red when the diagonal crossing is allowed.

Option 3 would be a disaster for pedestrians, of which there are many at this intersection throughout the day. And 19th street backs up for the long light at 16th. This area will be so congested at times, it will make it impossible for pedestrians. This is clearly a car-focused solution, when what is needed in this area is something safer for pedestrians.

Option 3 creates a VERY confusing intersection. There are already so many different types of intersections in Calgary, and drivers become confused when they encounter so many different setups. I feel that cyclists in particular would be vulnerable in this intersection, if drivers become confused and make last-minute corrections.

Option 3 does not take into account any of the realities of the area traffic flow via transit (train especially), walking, and vehicle. Option two makes accessing the neighbourhood west of 19th street much more difficult during times of heavy congestion, as they can be blocked by a single right-turning vehicle having trouble getting onto 19th street northbound.

Option 3 is fantastic! It will improve traffic flow and support pedestrian safety. Option 2 is also a great improvement. I appreciate removal of the turn island, which is a very small turn island and uncomfortable to be on as a pedestrian. The addition of raised sidewalks would further support pedestrian safety and traffic calming, which not interfering with traffic flow.

Option 3 is inappropriate and will never work. There will be lack of flow from east to west on 14th street during high volume traffic times. One lane in and out of the traffic circle is not practical at all. Please eliminate this option.

Option 3 won't work (IMO) due to the LRT train crossing. This shuts the road down at this point which will back up the road and thus the entire traffic circle in all directions. Would be an excellent option, and my choice, if the LRT train didn't cross the road.

I like the separation of the right hand turning lane from 14th onto 19th, but agree a bigger island for pedestrians is needed.

Removing the transit stop will also help.

Option one does not adequately address volume/congestion issues in this interchange - made more complicated by the LRT crossing interrupting traffic flow esp. during the commute.

Option 2 would have congestion issues westbound due to the loss of a turn lane westbound and the LRT

Option 3 is preferred - for vehicle, cycle and pedestrian flow. Will have to address

potential for traffic stacking onto eastbound 14th Avenue at the LRT crossing - will this back up into the traffic circle?

Option three is horrible, does not take into account at busy times There's huge backups from 16th Ave that often go right through the intersection, this would clog up a roundabout. There must be traffic lights at that intersection! Option two would disrupt my nearly daily travels because it would impede direct access across 19th Ave NW. During rush hour this would be miserable. In option one The curb extension on the SE corner negatively impacts right hand turns from 19th St NW and again in rush hour situations this may be important

Options 1 and 2 are both good in my opinion. Option 3 is not a good option because roundabouts are not well understood. Further the movement from west to east would be negatively impacted during rush hour in the afternoon as the south to north movement of vehicles would clog up the roundabout. Also pedestrians would be negatively impacted without lights to halt traffic. I currently walk from 21A Street to the mall a number of days a week and the number of vehicles that run the intersection when their light is mostly red is troubling. One need to wait at least 5 to 10 seconds before proceeding.

Options 1 and 2 do little to address the issues with this intersection, and are just 'window dressings' on bad urban design.

Pedestrian crossings spanning 5 lanes of traffic have no place in any acceptable solution that prioritizes the individuals and families that live in their community.

Option 3 at least prioritizes pedestrian safety and community. This could also be achieved by reducing traffic to single lanes in options 1 and 2.

The elimination of a marked crossing on option 3 is naive and will not stop pedestrians crossing - it will just make it more dangerous.

PLEASE DO NOT PUT A ROUNDABOUT THERE. That would be a complete nightmare.
I completely disagree with any kind of pathway on 14th Ave. See above - IT IS NOT NEEDED AND WILL NOT BE WORTH THE EXPENSE for the handful of people that will want to bike on it

I vote for no change. Leave our neighbourhood alone. Spend may tax dollars on something useful.

roundabouts work well for me as a cyclist.

I think it could reduce be problematic during rush hours when the lrt gates are down. Otherwise better for non-busy times.

Slip lane is too dangerous and is unnecessary in option 1.

Round-about is confusing and overly complicated for this intersection in option 3,

particularly with the bizarre train crossing when existing a round-about.

Keep it predictable and simple like 95% of interesections, don't reinvent things - option 2 is preferred.

Slip lane should be a non-starter, especially when the same intersection without it is presented as an option. I wouldn't mind either option 2 or 3, however the extra right turn lane added to Option 3 is wildly unnecessary given the fact that it's a roundabout.

Slip lanes hate humans, this roundabout is bad for pedestrians (we're gonna cross on the East spoke regardless of paint or not...), and option 2 is actually quite nice, simple, and reasonable.

That traffic circle configuration is way too confusing, especially considering it is so close to the Trans Canada Hi-Way and many businesses and services that bring people to the community infrequently. The traffic mostly backs up here because of a backlog of vehicles turning left from Northbound 19th street onto Westbound 16 Ave. If that turn signal time could be lengthened it would help a lot. As a resident who frequently heads straight through on 14 Ave westbound, I prefer to maintain a separate right turn lane to keep the traffic moving.

The round about seams awkward with the Ctrain

The roundabout design is not an ideal design for this area. Due to high levels of pedestrian traffic coming from Lions Park, especially during rush hour, you can expect cars to be backed up, possibly to trans Canada. Furthermore, the fact that there is a train track right beside the roundabout will lead to a total freeze in vehicle traffic within the roundabout when a train is passing by. A signalled intersection for this area is ideal.

The roundabout eliminating the traffic signal issues from the LRT would be a huge advantage, as well as eliminating pedestrians having to wait for the traffic signal to cross. It would be worth the additional funding

the roundabout seems nice but as soon as a train is crossing you'll end up with a traffic jam

There still doesn't seem to be any consideration given to cyclists who may be trying to access the transit centre, library, or shopping centre. The designs are better for pedestrians overall, and the traffic calming measures are appreciated. Moving the bus stop makes sense too.

think that option 1 maintaining the right turn island westbound 14 Ave to northbound 19 St allows for better traffic flow for vehicles trying to cross over 19 St to inside left turn lane to westbound 16 Ave
Option 3- Traffic circle- this does not look like it benefits anybody ie uncontrolled ped crossings makes this a scary endeavour for peds especially during high vehicle traffic times; lights at 16 Ave will interfere greatly with traffic flow of northbound 19 St during high volume times; ditto for westbound traffic flow

This first option seems to want dead cyclists. The second one is pretty good. Not sure how a traffic circle works with the transit lights. Seems like it will clog up but not sure. I don't live the cycling crossing though.
Too many nearby stops (16th ave lights, train crossing) and yielding to pedestrians would reduce/hinder the flow through the traffic circle, especially during rush hours.
Traffic circle make sense but during rush house, I would foresee ppl travelling north bound turning westbound on 16 would easily clog it giving traffic circle turns northbound into single lane. If 16th and 19th turn traffic circle then yes. All for traffic circle as long as blocks use it.
Traffic circles are confusing and unnecessary, please dont add these in at a perfectly functioning traffic light. Maintaining a dedicated right turning lane onto 19 st works perfectly fine, no need to make it harder to do a sharp right turn. Leave as is. My vote is strongly for leaving things as they are - option 1.
Traffic circles are not appropriate for intersections such as this, where most of the traffic is going in one direction. A traffic circle here will make things much less safe for pedestrians. I don't know if I can tell which of options 1 or 2 are better, but from your description, it seems like option 2 might be safer for pedestrians? Whatever you do, you need to improve the drainage in this area. In the winter, it's an icy or slushy mess at the curbs, making it extremely unsafe for pedestrians.
waste of time and money - only the sidewalks need to be fixed for wheelchairs there is no need to change anything on the intersection
Westbound traffic (especially transit) will back up too much with only one lane into the 19th street intersection. Option 1 allows separate lanes for traffic going straight or making either turn.
Why are you thinking of spending all this money on changes when the City is broke?
With another light on 16 ave, I think the roundabout and slower the traffic and provide safety to pedestrians when crossing with potential placemaking. Only that the cost would be higher than the other options.

For the proposed concept design above for Segment 2 (Lions Park Station Area) Options 1 and 2, please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support). Tell us why you gave your rating for each option:

Doesn't seem like there is value added for option 2. Ppl will jay walk regardless given there are barely any traffic there.

Both options need more convenient crossings for pedestrians. Otherwise jaywalking will not disappear. The one close to the library can be moved close to the bus bay, besides the mall road (bus bay). The other one also can be moved close to the bus bay.

Option 1:

Traffic flow should not be given priority in such a high ped area

Option 2:

I like the single lanes of traffic around the station, and the expansion of the station. It would be good to see the station area expended more on the west side too. Also, I think the west crosswalk could be better positioned by moving it to the east side of the parking lot entrance. This would reduce conflicts with eastbound vehicles turning left into the parking lot.

There's definitely enough space for improvements in option 2.

These options are a little bit confusing. Option two seems unrealistic because I don't think it would stop jaywalking because these people are very determined and will overcome most barriers. My needs are a left hand turn into the Safeway area of North Hill which needs to be maintained but there should be remain a through Lane on the right hand side for through traffic. In reality the only way to stop jaywalking is with a complete barrier of some ilk within the station.

I prefer option 1. Option 2 thinks it would prevent J walking, but it won't for those that use this section daily and already do this.

better pedestrian connectivity/safety with option 2. Reduction to single eastbound lane can help address speeding issues

This is the 3rd time this section of LRT has been changed. Pedestrian's always want to jwalk I don't know how you can stop that. Is it worth the money. Unless you put in overpass was created at plat form which would not be cost effective.

The barrier on option 2 might prevent some from crossing but no guarantee. An upgraded bus waiting area on 14 ave n.w. I would want to see what this will look like to support.

An elevated median and curb bulb will just slow traffic down. There is already congestion in this section so we need more flow of vehicles. Who owns the short-term parking space for Safeway? Could that be used for a new bus station? Or what does it mean : "to improve passenger waiting area with commercial development?

THERE IS ALREADY A PEDESTRIAN AND BIKING PATHWAY ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE LRT. WHY DO YOU NEED TO CREATE A NEW ONE ON THE NORTH SIDE? The existing one, South of 14 Ave. and the LRT nice because it goes through the green area and allows access to the playground and SAIT. Keeping the pathway on the South is a better option for hot days because of the cooling effect of the trees. Also, by being in the South / green area, pedestrian and bikers are away from the emissions from vehicles. That is better for health reasons.

THE ELEVATED MEDIAN AND REDUCING THE STREET TO ONE LANE WILL WORSEN TRAFFIC PROBLEMS. TO REDUCE JAYWALKING, JUST REPLACE THE CHAIN WITH A FENCE ALONG THE LRT STATION to divide the curb from the street.

Limiting driving lanes is a great idea, but something I love about this space is the high number of potential conflicts forces everyone to slow down and keep their wits about them. Limiting ped jay-walking would make this less safe because drivers would be going faster unless there were other engineered designs that forces them to slow down like speed bumps and other traffic calming measures. Would love to see this turn into a ped/bike/transit zone, with no cars for that reason. Multiuse pathway is okay, though less ideal than having separate lanes for all speeds. The conflict zone at the bus stop will be difficult to manage, with bi-directional ped/bike traffic in addition to loading/unloading of buses. I may end up staying on the street for this section if I were on my bicycle. Another good reason to add traffic calming to ensure drivers are going slowly. Overall, this area is a massive *destination* for people, and I think the final design should consider that fact as higher precedence over the use of 14 Ave as a *throughput road*. Moving people safely (all modes) needs to be higher priority than moving cars East-West. I love this area for all its destinations and would love to see it have more benches and green space in the medium term.

Option 2 seems to enhance safety for pedestrians.

I cycle along this area and would love to have a cycle path / mixed use path along here or a safer entryway to Lion's Park multi-use pathway as when I come from SAIT, it's very hard to enter to Lion's Park to access the multi-use pathway. If there was a way to have the cycle path/multi-use path to be on the left side of the street away from the Lion's Park LRT station for the direction heading to the Library, then the turn-off consideration to get to 16th Ave, that would be great! As a cyclist, I worry a bit about Option 2 as I feel some cars might be aggressive behind me... Would be great if for Option 1 or 2, the extended pedestrian pathway could include cyclists / active transport wheelers as well.

waste of time and money - only the sidewalks need to be fixed for wheelchairs they are too bumpy with cracks the holes

Same as my general comments. Make the crosswalks bigger and add one to the west of the westbound transit stops. They'll j walk unless it's physically impossible. And why is that a problem. It's not a thoroughfare...it's a transit hub

Option 2 looks like it will control the chaos in this area better.

I vote for no change.
Please don't waste any more money on this.

Sadly you will never prevent people from jaywalking. It's just what people do. I like option 2 as an attempt is made to prevent this. How high is a raised median, and can it be esthetically pleasing with plants/trees in it?? The two existing crosswalks are sufficient and well placed. I would like to see the entrance to Safeway from 14th avenue (beside the library) be totally closed and drivers forced to use the entrance at the mall. Traffic can then travel adjacent to 14th avenue inside the parking area and make their way to the north side of the building. Two lanes of traffic entering/exiting so close together does not work (i.e. library access and current Safeway access). For that matter, drivers can head north on 19th street and east on 16th avenue to access

Safeway. Far safer and well laid out. It's just a matter of adjusting to the change. You could go even one step further: close both existing entrances off 14th to library and Safeway and make a decent intersection at the mall entrance. Moves traffic away from the C-Train crossing and consolidates access to the mall. Something to think about....

Thank you.

More work is needed to provide a more coherent option that increases pedestrian safety. I'm not sure an island or the curb bulb is going to help the issue of jaywalking or the fact that people drive too fast in this area and often almost hit people in the crosswalk. Neither option addresses the flow of traffic turning right out of the Safeway or Library directly into the crosswalk. Perhaps thinking about having a third crosswalk option, as the jaywalkers are primarily trying to go to the mall, and making them go across near the library, where they have to dodge cars turning out of Safeway, makes no sense. I hope you'll step back and think again about this area. Drainage is also a huge concern here, as a huge slush lake forms at the curb by the crosswalk.

The raised median island in option 2 will only provide a "safe haven" for jay-walkers.

Don't like reducing the east bound vehicle traffic in option 2 going down to 1 lane. Will only congest traffic from those waiting to turn left.

Like option 1 better. Like the larger sidewalks and larger transit waiting spaces. I'm fine with still having the 2 pedestrian crossings. Would prefer only 1 in the middle but that won't work with the large bus stop on the N side of the road.

Have a bike path in the widened sidewalk.

I like the wider pathways, I like the left turns being maintained. I slightly prefer the version where there is a definite through lane and definite left turn lanes, as this will lead to less weaving of traffic around those waiting to turn left. I like that the through lane in effect makes a bus bay on the south side too. And I like the shorter cross walk where the through lane swings left - that's a very busy cross walk, so it will help with pedestrians being safer and clearing the road faster, allowing the traffic to proceed.

Option 2 median seems like it would deter pedestrian traffic, but as a pedestrian I feel it would only engender frustration and encourage riskier jaywalking behaviour. I like the bus bays and hope they will not disappear - parking on the south side of the mall could be reduced since it is not as convenient as it seems. Finally, there seems like there should be room for a centre-of-the road crosswalk, which would provide higher visibility for drivers and avoid the double-jeopardy crosswalk areas where pedestrians and drivers have to contend not only with street traffic, but traffic turning into/out of the mall exits/entrances.

Option 1 isn't much of a change

Option 2- does this maintain multiple left turn access to NorthHill centre??

This is a very busy area that deserves more investment in infrastructure to improve safety for pedestrians and reduce dangerous driving
Things are fine the way they are. The islands seem to narrow the lanes, causing confusion and more traffic congestion along this often busy strip of road. These seem like unnecessary changes.
Clipped from Option 1: "Bus bay to be reconstructed to allow for wider pathway." This widened pathway needs to extend further east beyond the bus parking bay to N Hill Mall's SW entrance. The current well-trodden soil substantiates this imperative.
Jaywalking is a car centric mentality that detracts from good street design. Find out why people are jaywalking and design the street so they can do the same thing but safely.
Slowing people down at this area would be good, While it isn't legal many people cross where ever due to mobility issues, I watched an old man do this yesterday, making this dangerous excursion safer but also slowing down flow would make both this and regular use of the crosswalks feel safer to everyone.
Option 1 with 2 lanes
Crosswalk by library needs better signaling. Improving waiting area at bus stop should include a better sidewalk from stop across driveway to library. This is especially difficult in winter when snow piles up and no one seems responsible for clearing it. #2 is excessively elaborate and expensive. Even with a walker, I have never had trouble crossing from entry to mall to LRT/bus stop
It is best to have a design that prioritizes pedestrians in this area, especially due to the high level of pedestrians going to and from the train station, mall, and library. Thus, option 2 is the best design for this scenario.
reduce weaving good. curb bulbs very good. just put the [removed] crosswalk where people want to cross, if everyone's jaywalking then it's obviously too far from the bus stop
Option 2 is great with the reduction of a driving lane and the introduction of even more sidewalk space! If you are going to move the Louise Riley cross walk towards the east, why not move the Louise Riley Library's driveway to the west side of the library building and move the crosswalk even further east. Making the crosswalk even closer will deter even more people from crossing elsewhere.
A raised median island doesn't seem to discourage jaywalking instead having a platform to be safe while jaywalking would encourage more jaywalkers.
This would help prevent jaywalking
Option 1 maintains traffic flow in an area that already is congested due to left turns and crossings. Option 2 would make a mess of the traffic flow through the area. Likely the traffic would back up on eastbound 14 th Ave.

Option 1 doesn't look any different to me that what is already there. Option 3 won't stop jaywalking. People will just walk half way across and wait on the island, perhaps forcing traffic to stop when they otherwise wouldn't have to.
It is my understanding higher "fencing" will be installed to stop train users from jaywalking between the two current crosswalks. Unless the fencing is at least 5 feet high, there will be those that jump it. Not sure what the best solution to this would be but people will always find the shortest distance between 2 points.
This option is simplest and makes logical sense. I don't like reducing the east bound thru lane to one lane.
Two through lanes are a waste here. I strongly prefer the dedicated turn lanes, wider pathway and improved safety for pedestrians for Option 2.
Option 2 seems to make the area safer for pedestrians.
I don't think the median will deter jaywalking. Consider increasing the side of the crosswalks. This is a heavily used pedestrian area and those two crosswalks are tiny for the volume they see.
Firstly, "explore opportunities" in a design proposal is the planning equivalent of "thoughts and prayers" - you've committed to doing nothing, without the decency to admit to your own failure. "Jaywalking" is blaming the pedestrian for having the audacity to walk in a walkable community. If you've achieved the gold standard of creating a highly walkable community, build on it, make the space prioritized for pedestrians. Is a pedestrianized street "Jaywalking"? Or is it the responsibility of a driver to yield in such a space? Raised or Cobbled street surface goes a long way to changing space priority.
\$
Option 1 - If I didn't know that the sidewalk was extended a little, I wouldn't have noticed a change. Option 2 - The added islands and bump-outs are nice, not only to control traffic, but also to calm it and provide refuges for pedestrians crossing. That includes the middle island there, as I can imagine pedestrians will inevitably cross illegally - so providing a block of concrete for them to wait at makes the whole thing a lot safer.
don't like the use of medians. People will jaywalk anyways. I like the location of the current pedestrian crossing by the library
Anything that reduces weaving where people are crossing is a good idea. Could the crosswalk by the library also be raised. Lit crosswalks are good, but the addition of a physical reminder that this is shared space is safer. I cross at a lit crosswalk multiple times a day that at least 1-2 cars fail to stop for after the light has been activated.

Could we also make all beg buttons easily accessible? Often, you have to go out of your way to push it or they are inaccessible to wheelchair users or those on larger bikes.

Big supporter of shorter crosswalks here! Better design to curb driver aggression.

Get rid of the extra eastbound lane and make it easier to cross 19 ST NW. Add a crossing if possible (or make the west crossing a wider scramble crossing) to improve the desire path to the sidewalk to Safeway and the MAX Orange BRT.

Option two gives more thought to the pedestrian but a raised median is the wrong thing to do. People will jay walk keep the road slim add a chicane reduce the speed limit so no one gets hit.

I would support reducing EB to 1 lane east of the Safeway left turn providing a wider walkway however, unless there is a wall or fence put up, the people that I've observed jaywalking are going to jaywalk regardless of whatever soft measures the city installs. The actual best option for stopping jaywalking is to make the WB LRT platform accessible from only the ends forcing users to use the crosswalks

North side of Library ped crossing is awful to use in wet or winter weather.

I like the median for jaywalking because that is a big issue in the area. I don't think there are enough improvements on option one to reduce the car/train/ped/ bike confusion or negative interactions. The predictability of users in this area is the challenge. Maybe having a timed crossing rather than a RFID might help the flow but could increase jaywalking .

Either would be fine really as long as at least 1 lane of uninterrupted traffic can be maintained in each direction

Honestly, this would be a great place to create a great HUMAN urban space. There's a train, a library, a mall, housing (hopefully more in the near enough future). Why not think ahead to the future. Make this space for humans. Throw down some pavers, make it beautiful and worthwhile.

Option 1 is essentially unchanged from existing conditions, with some threads to maybe make improvements in the future, very non-committal, and very disappointing for a mobility improvement proposal that deserves so much better.

Option 2 is passable, but also very disappointing. It's sad we're using language like "deter jaywalking" about a street literally directly between a train station and a mall, library, and bus pull-out. Not only that, but one of the rare C-Train stations that opens up directly onto the street! What the heck!

This is a transit and pedestrian street. We need to quit acting like it's 1929, and show the most frequent users of this space some respect. Why not "deter jaydriving" with a woonerf raised crosswalk design?

Option 1 having two through lanes is not necessary. Pedestrians crossing from Lions Park should be prioritized which Option 2 does a much better job at.

Segment 3

For the proposed concept design above for Segment 3 (North Hill Centre Pedestrian overpass to 14 Street N.W.), please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support)

I like the wider sidewalks and beautification with trees. Would be much improved over the vast concrete/asphalt expanse.

I think this new design will be an improvement. The current layout was shaped during a time when North Hill was trying to discourage people from using its parking lot as free parking for SAIT, the Jubilee, and AU Arts. Now that they charge for parking on the east side of the mall—at a rate slightly lower than SAIT's lots—that concern is less relevant.

no disagreements with what's proposed.

Not sure why two eastbound driving lanes are required. Seems your maintaining an overbuilt road. I could see maybe keeping two eastbound driving lanes if you were going to make one lane a dedicated bus lane.

Segment 3 changes are reasonable. The over pass on 14 Ave gets the job done. If you are walking or wheeling. Interchanges could be made clearer with this proposed designs.

With the plans to increase density in the mall area, having a median and one lane for vehicles going west, will increase traffic problems. There is already congestion because of the mall and the library. Put two lanes on both directions, between 19 ST. and the 14 Ave. Bridge, one for vehicles going to the mall or entering 14th street and one for vehicles passing by. There is already congestion

Cannot fully envision improvements, but would be keen to see some green space on the north of 14 Ave. as it is rather depressing and concrete as it is now.

Cross-section D-D: For pedestrian's safety, keep bikes on the existing biking path on the south side of the LRT instead of creating the multi-use path on the north side. Upgrade this path to increase its use. If there is more use of public transport and more people using the services at North Hill Mall, I do not see keeping bikes and pedestrians together as a good idea. With more people using the buses and more bikes, some of them electric (usually faster), there is a potential for accidents.

Disappointed that some of the budget isn't addressing the pedestrian overpass' bad state of maintenance, and its issues with the pathway in Lions Park. Again, more activity in Lions Park would been good, and isn't promoted here. If more boulevard is being added on the north side of 14th Ave, be sure to include trees, as currently this is a boring unshaded walk. For the sidewalk coming out of Lions Park just south of

the tracks, make sure that the pedestrian route is direct to the tracks crossing, rather than angling away from the crossing (so we pedestrians end up cutting a corner where the path should be).
Explain how future development of the Sears site will be considered. It should front onto 14th and have public roads through. If the alignment doesn't consider this, it's not doing enough.
Focus more on drivers being cautious in the area. The way the rain station is positioned it is a pain in the behind to get to the crosswalks when it takes half the time to jaywalk
For cross-section E-E, improve the existing pathways on the green area South of the LRT, instead putting a path alongside 14 Ave. It will be healthier and nicer for pedestrians and bikes.
Given I rarely drive past the mall east, I have little feedback on the proposed concept.
Hopefully will improve the dangerous crossing of LRT track for pedestrians at 14 and 14 intersection. Also needs traffic signal improvement to reduce wait times for pedestrians (the wait is very long to accommodate only the occasional vehicle traveling E/W). Does not address the danger of construction vehicles using the North Hill lot as impromptu gravel yard.
I am fine with 1 road for vehicles going west and 2 going east.
I like everything else in this section, but I would suggest a raised crossing for multi-use pathway at entrance to North Hill mall. I'd also recommend a red-light signalized crossing for people walking to the south side bus stop.
I like that bikes would be on the expanded sidewalks rather than on the road.
I like the improvements around the east intersection. I would like to see more landscaping improvements on the west pathway too. No one likes walking next to a road and parking lot without any trees for shade in the summer.
I see bus stops on this segment. Consider using the short-term parking lot by Safeway, or other space in the area, as a new bus station. That will free space to have two lanes in both directions and allow for a better flow of vehicles.
I would rather have lower taxes.
I'm not quite sure what's different between existing conditions and this design, but from a glance, it appears there are many situations where wheelers / pedestrians must cross the street twice instead of taking a more direct route towards a destination.
Include the information on rehabilitation of the bridge.
It makes sense that the redesign will focus more on accommodating the heavy foot traffic at the 14th Street corner, rather than discouraging it with features like steep

slopes and river rock edging. Addressing both the aesthetics and functionality of that space feels like a step in the right direction.
Much better. I like the multi use pathway and improved pedestrian crossings
Multiuse pathways may be safer for cyclists, but they aren't safer for pedestrians.
MUP in this location would be excellent. When passing through or going to the mall, it's quite hostile on a bike. One concern with this design is for EB medium speed users (bikes, scooters) on the pathway, I could see conflict with EB road users turning into the old Sears parking lot with pathway users approaching out of driver's blind spot while they're focused on approaching traffic.
my biggest concern is where do cyclists go after they cross the bridge? The City should give priority to developing longer bike paths that are designed for everyday commuters so they can navigate the city in a safe manner and without having to deal with bike lanes that suddenly stop and dump the cyclist into the traffic flow
Narrower driving lanes is good. Other traffic calming measures would be great, like speed bumps or at least raised crossings. Also having the pathway continue across driveways would be great. That way there's a visual reminder to drivers that they're entering ped/bike space. Compare Bowness separate bike lane (asphalt bike lane continues through driveways and there's a bit of a bump to the road) vs the separated bike lane on 24 Ave NW (driveways are concrete, interrupt the pathway continuity, and drop right to the road surface). More trees and benches please! Pathway crossing of LRT needs to be improved as mentioned... The solution should allow cargo bikes and bikes with trailers to cross... Please no maze gates.
Parking entrance to Indigo lot should have bump outs to reduce the crossing distance.
Reduce to one lane each way. Or put in curb to improve ease of crossing road.
Same time do a better job with the manhole on 14th. They do damage to small cars due to the width between the tires the hit every one to avoid them you risk oncoming traffic.
Seems mostly fine. Some better connections would be nice. Mid block crossings and such.
Still not clear how this improves accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians to SAIT and the shopping centre.
The elimination of lanes on 14th Ave at the 14th St area will impede traffic flow through to the other side of 14th Ave especially when left turns onto 14th St are needed.
These improvements look good. Especially appreciate the removal of channelized right turn islands (slip lanes) given how unsafe they are for everyone, including drivers.
This design is great, especially the part where you simplify the intersection at 14th Ave and 14th Street. Its a little bit confusing as it is now

This is an arterial Road , it works quite well today. I see no great necessity to make any improvements. Really in an era of watching the budget which should be happening, this must be a very low priority item. Additionally, Concord developments has been planning a huge condo/housing development on the site of the old Sears building and someday this will happen, at that time you will be forced to do some work on 14th Ave., maybe this all can wait till then?

well thought out & all-encompassing

What is the speed limit. Looks like it could be 50km/hr which kills 55% of those hit. Less lanes of traffic and slow the cars please.

would prefer to see improved connectivity for cycle/pedestrians on the south side (Lion's Park) - this is still a much more pleasant way to travel along 14th avenue. Connectivity for cyclists crossing over 14th avenue towards SALT is a concern to me - will there be a continued pathway on the north side of 14th avenue east of this segment? or will cyclists have to cross to the south and join eastbound vehicle traffic into SALT?

For the proposed concept design above for Segment 3 (North Hill Centre pedestrian overpass area), Option 1 and 2, please indicate your level of support (1= No Support, 5 = High Support). Tell us why you gave your rating for each option:

Avoid raised median islands. Instead, explore options to have two lanes going West, one for vehicles passing by and another for access to the mall, library, residential towers, Safeway, etc. Instead of widening paths on the North side, move bikes to the existing bike path on the South side of the LRT. Improve it.

I don't like the raised bit in the middle of the road. Fine with everything else.

I like the island, this area sucks to cycle in and traffic weaving is a plague, is it even illegal? It happens often enough that I assume its encouraged. Long run ups to the pedestrian overpass and minimum crossing over of any pedestrian only vs shared use interactions would be ideal. An example of horrid design in that regard is the university side bike ramps at the U of C train station. So many points of conflict, worst design award recipient...

Option 1 - does not meaningfully address pedestrian safety/speeding issues. Option 2 - provides some mitigation for these concerns

Option 1 - I'd say that this is very similar to the previous design, but the widened sidewalk does go a long way. Might need things like trees to provide shade and street wall on the north side. Option 2 - Breaking up traffic is good, but can this go further? Are all of these driveways necessary? Again, what about shade?

Option 1 is simple and gets the job done. Option 2 seems over kill for this intersection. Raised median Island. What happens with snow removal. Common sense and

Patience is required with pedestrians, wheeled traffic and vehicle traffic and City transit. Unfortunately that is lacking in Calgary.
Option 1 will allow the flow of traffic to move freely through the entire area. Option 2 will impede traffic flow through the area.
waste of time and money - only the sidewalks need to be fixed for wheelchairs. those of us on bicycles/scooters use the Lions Park pathways instead STOP WASTING OUR TAXPAYERS MONEY!
\$
Both designs have their pros and cons, but option 2 is best suited for motor vehicle traffic. There are not too many pedestrians in this part of 14th Ave, so a traffic calming design is not necessarily needed.
Both options look good. Would love to see if there is a good way to remove some of the driveways into the mall parking lot.
Can you provide more information on "improve pathway and overpass connection"? What changes are related to these? I cycle on this street coming from SAIT and heading towards 16th Ave and in a way, am grateful for the wide road so cars can just go around me; however, it would be great if the pedestrian is widened and turns to a multi-use pathway as maybe that might be safer / would eliminate potential conflict with cars. I do not see the difference / understand any of the changes of either of the options.
Cannot fully envision problems or improvements in this area, sorry.
Creating some raised crossings / continuous sidewalks midblock would be nice. The ped bridge is horrible for accessibility and I'm gonna cross wherever I want, anyways.
Don't see how option 2 is an improvement over option 1 beyond spending more money. Either option could see closure of the entrance to the mall as long as the other entrance to the east of Kal Tire is maintained.
I like that both options consolidate turn opportunities... currently there are many places where vehicles may turn, which makes it tough for cyclists who have to keep stopping to allow them to turn. I prefer option 1 because raised median islands always seem like an unnecessary obstruction to me, because a vehicle that is slightly off-course in the lane can collide with the island. This is especially true in winter, when it's difficult to effectively remove snow around the island, so that the island is sometimes hard to see and drivers might not know it's there.
I like the dedicated turn lane. Is there room for an EB Cycle track with either of these configurations?
I like the idea of consolidating entrance points for North Hill Mall, but you don't need two eastbound driving lanes. Make one of them a dedicated bus lane.
I see lots of unhoused people using drugs on overpass going over 14th Ave

It ain't broke don't fix it.
It doesn't seem like you have given much thought to this very unattractive area.
Like segment 2, I like the version that has distinct left turn lanes, and cuts down on weaving of traffic (but the current version is OK also, important thing is to keep the left turn lanes, as you have). I do like the consolidation of entrances - that should help with walking along that stretch. I do hope you can improve the pedestrian overpass!
Lots of good ideas here. Option 2 reducing weaving is better for everyone, drivers included. It's safer for those walking and wheeling if driveway access into north hill is consolidated. If that can't be done - can continuous sidewalks be implemented as a physical reminder that vehicles are entering a space where people are walking and wheeling?
Maybe you should finish exploring opportunities and then get back to us, eh? Take a position. Make the Concorde site bend to what the city needs and make a street scape that creates a good urban environment here.
Much better to crossing single lane each way.
My only question: How is the City considering future development plans of North Hill mall into this revised scheme?
Neither option seems to significantly improve the pedestrian experience. There should be more crossing opportunities on this street and better tree coverage
No raised medians please squeeze the road instead. add a chicane. A boulevard separating pedestrians from traffic would be nice. Also trees here would help slow traffic.
Not a big change really, having better crosswalk over 14 ave between the train and the mall further down would be nice but isnt there already an overpass here? Not sure if a traffic island is really necessary, these can make things more difficult by making roads narrower.
Only major difference is the median, but it's a big one. In providing protection and clarity for those turning into North Hill, it not only makes the area safer, but reinforces the idea of the street as a means to arrive at a destination, rather than somewhere to move through.
Option 2 seems to be safer for pedestrians and drivers turning left into mall.
OPTION 2 TAKE AWAY LANES THIS ROAD IS TOO WIDE
Pedestrian changes definitely needed in this area. Medians in road would just be a waste of money
reduce weaving. 1 travelling lane + 1 turning lane is necessary & sufficient for this area
See comments above. I rarely need to come this far east.

the disconnected left turn lanes will create confusion in option 2
The second makes things safer.
the sidewalks and curbs in this area are terrible - need to accommodate wheelers and bikes with kid carriers
There are lots of safety concerns with the area around the overpass on the Lion's park side. I'm indifferent to the road improvements as I mostly bicycle that stretch.
There are many pedestrians who jaywalk or cross at the crosswalk without pushing the button to activate the flashing light and it is difficult as a driver to ensure pedestrian safety. There is too much going on - flashing lights for the C-train, 2 crosswalks with flashing lights, buses pulling out in front of you. I think that improving pedestrian behaviour would mitigate any need to change the roadway.
this is a busy area that deserves more investment to improve safety. It is only going to get busier!

Pop up #1: Hounsfield Heights – Briar Hill CA – Outdoor tent (31 participants)

General:
Pretty much would leave it as it is. Not heavily used enough. Overkill.
Taking away parking would be awful.
You can plan all of this but you can force people onto bicycles.
The road doesn't even go anywhere.
Bikes on 12 th Ave, not 14 th .
Make sure the left hand turn stays.
Don't want wider sidewalks, there are some things much more important than things like this.
Maintain what exists instead. We can't afford this.
You're absolutely mad with the MU pathway. There are minimal bikes. I live right on this street. It is madness to waste money on this when it is not needed.
I care about how this will impact my property if a MU pathway is built.
I don't like biking on 14 th Ave – not enough space with all the buses and I don't want to be in their way. I would use it more for biking if a MU pathway was there and I could use transit too.

Segment 1:

Parking concerns with removing south side.

Emergency vehicle impact with the removal of lane.

Worried about parking loss at 22A St / 14 Ave NW.

Would like to see improvements to stairs to overpass – steep and hard to get bikes up.

Home owner – can remove parking on north side between 23-24 street so not to impact walk (retaining wall).

Not going to do much – traffic at strip mall is low for SBL out of driveway – not worth it.

Segment 2:

I don't support pathway or any changes.

Circle is high cost and high risk. Not good for pedestrians in this area. Lot of seniors and children here.

Circles are not good for turning trailers.

Just one sidewalk at the LRT – not two.

Put up a high fence at the LRT station instead of more crosswalks. Too much starting and stopping for cars and too many distractions. It is hard to be a good driver in these conditions.

Segment 2: Keep the left turn – most cars are using that.

Segment 2: Would rather not see a traffic circle in this area because traffic is too heavy for it. It would get dominated. Won't work here.

Segment 2: Like it but don't think it will work for amount of traffic going northbound – back up from 16th Ave x 2.

Pop up # 2: Louise Riley Library (45 participants)**General comments:**

No concerns with parking removal on 14 Ave. Don't go north on 24th through the intersection.

Traffic circle could cause issues at 16 Ave.

14 street SB to 14 street WB – loss of slip lane disrupts bus traffic.

Historically bike path as recreation, not commuter. Make sure it is commuter friendly and connected. No surprises!
Lions Park path and the park need to be upgraded more than this is needed. Want to activate the park to combat social disorder. Am nervous that this will take from that.
Don't agree with the removal of on-street parking especially with the future growth going to happen in the area.
Rowhouses in that area are likely in the future – where are they going to park?
Much prefer these features being presented than in the previous engagement (2021).
A roundabout in this area is not a good idea because one direction of it would be completely dominated with rush hour traffic.
The LRT gates are overdone. This needs to be studied. They are down for too long. It is too much.
Some of the features being presented will cause more jaywalking.
The City does not approach things logically. This community would prefer to see the money getting spent on better uses.
Murals in underpasses are a distraction.
Sidewalks – only fix the areas that need repair. Don't widen them.
Find areas that need more work than this.
At the bottom of 19 th Street there should be a button for crossing.
How is the city being environmental friendly by printing all this material.
Leave things as they are so that cars can park somewhere.
Public safety to be addressed please. More CCTV in this area for businesses and staff.
School kids from St Andrews walk over to Briar Hill Elementary.
Consider bike path up 18 th Street can come over onto 14 th Ave.
Should have lights at 7 Ave – blind spot downhill.
Prioritize spending better than this.
Memorial onto 19 th is concerning.
Side walk on 14 street on westside needs to be more pedestrian friendly.
Integrate this side of the LRT with the other side.
Consider bio connectivity.

Bethanny home nearby – senior pressure to ensure east/ west becomes more user friendly.

For pathways post 20 km/hr for speed limit for all segments.

Segment 1:

Pedestrian concern with sharing bike lanes.

Dislike curb bulb outs – they push cyclists out to travel lanes.

East bound traffic lane at 19th street backed up – agree with doing something.

Concerns about traffic button for pedestrians and cyclists.

Pathway on northside is on Sunnyside – good for maintenance.

Segment 2:

Opportunity to improve trees along 14 Ave – is there something we could do to improve longevity and visual appeal.

Option 3: Don't like losing a lane both ways on 19th street.

Concerned about pedestrian safety at roundabout.

Option 1 & 2: Like extended left turn.

This area is wasted space now – would be good to do something.

Good with a multi use pathway – narrow section going westbound is challenging.

Currently low traffic not an issue.

Like option 2: Drivers follow one lane and still have left turn.

Agree with a 40 km/hr zone.

Encourage pedestrians and cyclists in Lions Park.

High conflict area at bus stops with bikes.

Should separate bikes and pedestrians in busy areas.

Option 3 east leg crossing is needed going from south of 14 Ave to Home Depot.

Option 2 is better than option 1 for pedestrian safety.

Coordinate 16 Ave and 14 Ave at 19th street signals.

Segment 3:
Gateway – more trees and landscaping. Sends the message to slow down visually.
The pedestrian bridge needs maintenance.
Currently most pedestrians are on pathway and also safety concerns.
Add greenery.
Round the EB to NB corner of pathway better.
Biking through park – has too many blind corners and needles especially by the overpass.
Concerns with vegetation.
Bike through SAIT to get to McHugh Bluff.

Pop up # 3: North Hill Centre (85 Participants)

General:
Use zebra crossings for wavy lines for crosswalks in general. More noticeable for drivers and safer for pedestrians.
Road is too narrow. I use 19 th street instead.
I think 40 km/hour is better for here.
If bike lanes, no parking on 14 th (not enough room for a car on each side of a lane).

Segment 1:
Option 2: Roundabouts in major areas are not good. They are effective elsewhere but not here and especially not at rush hour.
Not in favour of removing parking for future growth.
Not enough room to pass safely.
Live at SE corner of 14 Ave / 24 street.

Segment 2:
19 th street intersection: Driver frustration at LRT crossing. Signal timing is a concern.
19 street intersection: Most dangerous intersection as a pedestrian.
Pedestrian safety is key.

Option 2 is the best for safety.
Pedestrian safety on south side crossing 19 th needs to be better. Drivers don't see.
SW corner is hedge to sidewalk – drivers eastbound cannot see the corner.
Are there more accidents that occur at roundabouts than at controlled lights? That is what I would like to know before anything happens.
Curb bulb outs / traffic calming makes it difficult for cyclists they have to squeeze between vehicles due to narrow roads.
E-bikes make it dangerous for people walking if the pathway is shared.
Make cyclists and pedestrians separate – give bikes a lane on the road.
Much better to spend money on just pavement – no need for extra.
Don't put bikes and pedestrians on the same pathway.
Put the cyclists in the park.
Bigger waiting areas for the buses for people with walkers.
Bigger bus bays – lots of buses go through.
A lot of seniors live in the towers you are proposing a roundabout near – not in favour.
No option 3: No roundabout.
Option 1: Don't like curb bulb outs.
Not enough lighting at night. Especially behind the LRT. It doesn't feel safe.
No traffic circle – too many pedestrians, transit and vehicle interaction.
19 Street Option 2: Lots of trains coming through and people turning right cause congestion for the westbound through / right shared lane.
Do not put pedestrians and bicyclists in the same areas (pathway on the north side) especially at the LRT area.
Bicyclists do not stop and are dangerous for people.

Segment 3:

No left turn from Strip Mall onto 14 th Ave – it is too dangerous.
14 street bridge – drivers don't slow down for cyclists or pedestrians on right hand turn.
Like traffic calming and narrowing of 14 street.
Like bike connection across Crowchild Trail to Foothills Hospital and prefer crossing at 14 Ave.

Other: Difficulty timing at 19 street when there is a bus and train. Safer crosswalks.
Option 2 for 19 street best for safety.
Anything to improve pedestrian safety is good.
Concerns with bike commuters on shared path behind.
Like the realigned crosswalk west of station.
Likes the expanded left turn for EB to NB 19 street.
Hard to safely turn SB at 14 street.
Should be no parking on 14 street.
Would prefer a separate bike lane, better for snowplows.