

## Project overview

The 4 Avenue N.W. streetscaping project is part of the Kensington Area Improvements Phase 2 engagement initiative. Fourth Avenue between 9A and 10 Street NW serves as one of the main connections between Sunnyside Station and the Kensington commercial district. The goals for this corridors design were to:

- Create a more welcoming entrance to the Kensington commercial district for people arriving by LRT or from Sunnyside.
- Enhance the experience of pedestrians.
- Support the needs of local businesses

## Engagement overview

Due to Covid-19 restrictions, engagement was conducted entirely online with opportunity to provide input by visiting [engage.calgary.ca/kensingtonarea/4-avenue-nw-streetscaping](https://engage.calgary.ca/kensingtonarea/4-avenue-nw-streetscaping) or calling 311. Public feedback was accepted from August 31 until September 19, 2021.

## What we asked

Public feedback focused on citizens ranking their enthusiasm on a 5 point Likert scale for changes along the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor as well as the effectiveness of two proposed conditions: Option A and Option B. Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide qualitative feedback in response to the following questions:

- What is important to know about the current streetscape? Tell us why.
- What do you think about Option A? Tell us why.
- What do you think about Option B? Tell us why.

## What we heard

In general, stakeholders were enthusiastic about improvements to this corridor given its proximity to the LRT station, Kensington businesses and bike routes. The area near 10 Street and 4 Ave N.W. was identified as a northern community entry point and stakeholders communicated the potential for 4 Ave to be a neighbourhood gateway. Observations regarding the streetscape identified the following as critical issues for consideration:

- Active modes are not properly prioritized on this corridor;
- There is a lack of dedicated space for pedestrians and cyclists; and
- Traffic calming interventions would assist in mitigating cut through traffic and vehicle/cyclists conflicts.



## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

Both treatment options received favourable feedback with Option B ranking higher in its ability to meet the streetscape goals. In general, stakeholders felt the streetscape lacked a sense of place and that the proposed treatments would improve the public realm. Option B was noted to be a superior solution for separating modes of travel and prioritizing active modes though a few respondents questioned if it would consume too much street width.

Critical comments for both options frequently cited that the street functioned well already and there was no need for investment at this corridor. These comments were often correlated to opposition to the permanent installation of bike lanes.

For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.

For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

### Next steps

The public feedback received during this phase of engagement will be used in conjunction with technical analysis and cost considerations to select which projects will be carried forward for implementation. Phase 3 Engagement will include the presentation of refined design drawings of the projects that were selected through the Phase 2. The public can expect the Kensington Area Improvements Project Phase 3 to launch in the winter of 2022.

## Summary of Input

Citizens were shown current streetscape conditions and asked to rate their level of enthusiasm for corridor improvements on a five-point Likert scale. In total, 60 comments were submitted regarding what citizens felt project staff should know about this streetscape. Results of citizen feedback can be seen in the table below:

1 – Not at all: Leave the corridor as it is	2	3	4	5 – Very excited: Improvements are really needed at this location
11	0	0	23	49

Citizens were presented with a visual concept and description for 4th Avenue titled Proposed Condition A. They were then asked how well Option A met the goals described in the concept drawing.

1 – Does not meet goals at all	2	3	4	5 – Meets the above goals
11	13	7	26	28

Citizens were presented with a visual concept and description for 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue titled Proposed Condition B. They were then asked how well Option B met the goals described in the concept drawing.

1 – Does not meet goals at all	2	3	4	5 – Meets the above goals
9	8	1	21	52

Below is a summary table that outlines core participant concerns, issues, feedback, and observations about their experience on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW.

Category	Response Summary
Prioritize active modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders reported a need to prioritize and improve active modes of transportation in the area, with a few suggesting that the area become pedestrian only.</li> <li>Current conditions were cited by some as being hostile toward cyclists.</li> </ul>
Not enough room for bikes/pedestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A group of participants commented on the current lack of dedicated space for bikes and pedestrians, with some commenting on the impact of 18 wheeled vehicles in the area and associated safety concerns for walkers and cyclists. Concerns were expressed regarding the impact of narrowing traffic lanes further.</li> </ul>

## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

Traffic calming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants in this category expressed a need for traffic calming interventions due to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue's frequent use as a cut through street for motorist accessing other parts of Sunnyside and Memorial Drive.</li> </ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents recognized the interplay between pedestrians/ bicycles and vehicles as a safety concern. In general, there was support for traffic calming measures that would create a greater sense of safety in the area.</li> </ul>
Esthetically unappealing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A batch of comments reference a lack of quality streetscaping and esthetic appeal along this corridor.</li> </ul>
Not supportive, already working well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A group of stakeholders felt there were other projects in the Kensington Area more worthy of investment.</li> <li>A few comments cited that the street was functionally fine in its current condition.</li> </ul>
Prioritize traffic throughput	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants indicated that no changes to the streetscape should interfere or inhibit vehicular traffic patterns and street access.</li> </ul>

### Option A – 4 Ave N.W. Streetscaping

Below is a summary table outlining core participant feedback and impressions when presented with Proposed Option A. In total, 53 comments were submitted regarding how citizens felt about the proposed streetscape changes on 4 Avenue N.W.

Category	Responses
Prioritize active modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was general support for active mode enhancement including protected bike lanes, sidewalk extensions and streetscape improvements.</li> <li>Bike turning into and out of 4 Avenue N.W was cited as an ongoing issue and one stakeholder hoped would be address with the change proposed in Option A.</li> </ul>
Traffic calming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants referenced mode conflicts along this corridor as well as a need to address traffic and noise. Option A plantings and trees were considered traffic calming solutions and were referenced favourably.</li> </ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian and cyclist safety were perceived to be an issue along this corridor with particular attention to no required stopping for vehicles at 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave and 9A Street. A few stakeholders asked if this would be address in Option A changes.</li> </ul>
Prioritize traffic throughput	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants indicated that no changes to the streetscape should interfere or inhibit vehicular traffic patterns and street access and cited that Option A would create negative impacts.</li> </ul>
Working fine already	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants in this category did not see the need for street changes at 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.</li> </ul>

Proximity to LRT station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LRT proximity and access were cited as a variable for creating a busy corridor with multiple modes of transportation utilizing the corridor daily. Stakeholders connected these elements are important for consideration in proposed streetscape changes.</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---

### Option B – 4 Ave N.W. Streetscaping

Below is a summary table outlining core participant feedback and impressions when presented with Proposed Option B. In total, 68 comments were submitted regarding how citizens felt about the proposed streetscape changes on 4 Avenue N.W.

Category	Response
Prioritize active modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Segregated and two-way bike lanes were supported in this category as this corridor was cited as an important connection point to other bike routes.</li> <li>The two-way bike lane was generally supported in response to the Option B proposal.</li> <li>Enhanced public realm and cycling infrastructure were connected to the beautification of the streetscape making it more user-friendly.</li> </ul>
Traffic calming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants indicated 4 Avenue N.W. as an important community entry point and one that should be accessible and safe to all modes of transport. Traffic calming was associated with potentially creating a more cyclist and pedestrian friendly corridor.</li> <li>A few comments mentioned the Safeway parking lot as creating conflict modes and questioned how Option B would address this ongoing issue.</li> </ul>
Importance of parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preservation of parking was cited as an important consideration for businesses on the southside of the street and criticism was expressed for the parking Option B would remove.</li> </ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders reported observations of mode conflict and separated bike infrastructure was perceived as a safety solution for cyclists crossing into and out of Sunnyside.</li> </ul>
Not supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A group of stakeholders felt other projects in the Kensington Area were more worthy of investment.</li> <li>A few comments cited that the street was functioning fine in its current state.</li> </ul>
Minimize bike lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants in this category felt that bike infrastructure should be allotted minimal space on the road and not compromise parking.</li> </ul>
Not enough room for bikes/pedestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders cited that the current streetscape did not adequately separate modes and therefore its current state lacks functionality for active users.</li> </ul>

### 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.

#### What is important to know about the current streetscape? Tell us why.

- i On the overall map of the Kensington area improvements, the section of 4th Ave NW east of the C-Train tracks is coloured brown, for traffic calming enhancements, but there is no explanation what is proposed. Please clarify this.
- This is a confusing spot when coming from 6th Ave.
- Mostly approve of the addition of bike lane. I think even added paint on the road for a designated lane would do the trick.
- This is a busy section of the the area, often with drivers shortcutting through.
- Needs more greening and improvements for walkability to provide a synergy with the proximity to Riley park.
- High traffic Area and is one of 2 ways out of Sunnyside as well as truck traffic for Safeway. Keeping it simple and efficient here
- this currently works
- Generally run down
- The sidewalks are very narrow for being a walking neighborhood.
- This area is just a little tricky because it is not with the streetlights, so my concern here is usually for the bikes and pedestrians trying to cross.
- Feels neglected and quiet. Connection to 5 Ave via bike isn't great...
- not safe for kids or bikers



## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

- Vehicle traffic has no place whatsoever in pedestrian districts. We should do more than simply reduce vehicle access to Kensington Rd. and 10 Ave: we should make this a pedestrian-only neighbourhood.
- This and 2ave are the two west gateways to Sunnyside. Traffic is exceptionally heavy as it is a short cut from Memorial Drive to 10 st northbound. The proximity of the intersection of 9a st to the Lrt crossing is bad. Heavy traffic down the back lane also
- This is an important cycling connector and is currently very dangerous.
- Lots of pedestrian and vehicle traffic on this road.
- Cycling through this intersection from Hillhurst always keep me on edge. Having an extension of the bike lane would be great.
- One of main vehicle access ways into and out of Sunnyside, both of your plans reduce vehicle lane width, which is already pretty tight. One tiny block with bike lanes makes no sense.
- not safe, too much traffic/noise
- Allows parking on both sides of street as this is residential area.
- This is a dangerous stretch with cars turning illegally left onto 4 AV NW from 10 ST NW. There are a lot of bikes and pedestrians. I don think widening sidewalks is a great idea. Bike lanes need a commitment from the city for shovelling.
- This is kind of at the end of the 10 St area; not sure how important it is vs. 3rd Ave. Only one business on the street (I think); the others have 10 St sides.
- right now it almost just seems like a walking street and not very pedestrian friendly.
- Not too much...busy area
- Shabby little street, not much can be done on south side because of apt. parking lot and safeway loading area. Any improvement would be welcome
- It's functional enough, but not great. In particular I want to see protected cycling/scooting/etc lanes.
- Sidewalks are too small
- It's a closed off space that doesn't have a lot of appeal
- It's an area with a lot of loitering and not very inviting.
- more trees please
- No issues with this block
- Access in and out of this bit of road is very challenging. The turns are confusing, and the transition from shared bike/car to bike lane is not intuitive.
- The only thing wrong with this area is the garbage smell from the Safeway dumpsters and that it looks run down because of the poorly maintained parking lots.
- This street is not very bike-friendly, and does not have enough nature.
- I'm not terribly concerned about this road, but it is pretty drab.
- The current design isn't very welcoming.
- Road is too wide. Having space to activate would be awesome - the amount of young people who use the green space to meet and hang out is great. We should support that.
- There is no reason for changing the streetscape here at this point. It will not accomplish anything.



## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

- There's a couple of real "ugly" spots in this area.
- It is very meh.
- It's a tiny half block! My route on my bike to Safeway. Not a priority except for George at Geo's haircuts. He would like to get the [removed] out of his face.
- Wide road
- It doesn't feel very welcoming and feels a wee bit unsafe. As a pedestrian, I feel like I am always jaywalking and running across the street because the sidewalks are narrow.
- Never seen this as an issue
- Too much space is given to vehicles given the proximity to Sunnyside Station and the very high volumes of people walking and cycling. The sidewalks are tiny and the streetscape is not visually appealing.
- Not good for cars or people to share at the moment
- This area is ugly, the crossing at 4th by the c-train is awkward.
- I would spend any effort on 4 Ave NW. I'd work on 3 Ave NW instead.
- currently riding through this area feels hazardous and cars are aggressive with bikes
- I'm not that enthusiastic about this project - it is a stretch to say that this is an entrance to the BRZ. There is a liquor store and the ass end of Safeway. Improvements are needed for cyclists to get to 9a from 10th.
- It is a key link
- This is one of only a few exits out of Sunnyside. As residents we are extremely limited to ways to get in and out of our neighbourhood. This was very apparent during the 2013 Flood. More study should be completed on main corridors.
- This is where the bike lane should be incorporated not 3rd that is mostly transit pedestrian s
- Southbound traffic on 10 St often take a shortcut into Sunnyside - east onto 5 Ave, south down the laneway, east onto 4 Ave - causing excessive laneway traffic. There is an opportunity to solve this problem by installing traffic control devices on 4 Ave.
- This would be a nice improvement to the area, but I would argue that 4 Ave is much less trafficked by transit users than the south end of the station at 3 Ave - the latter would be my priority
- The north-south crosswalk is at a strange angle that leads to me and I think many other, taking a more natural but not painted crossing towards the commercial building entrance to the West.
- It is not working well for pedestrians and inexperienced cyclists. Cars cut corners and have priority even though there is a high foot and non-motorized traffic.
- Dangerous for bikes and pedestrians, the intersection at 9a needs a 3 way stop.
- The street is a major bike connection and a major walking route to the LRT. It's also a common cut through route. It has terrible public realm quality.
- While not a high traffic area for riding on the street, improvements to this small corridor will help strengthen the link from the 9A bike lanes to the 5th avenue ones.

**What do you think about Option A option? Tell us why.**



## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

- This is ok but would require crossing the street right at 10th ave where a lot of traffic turns in and out.
- Like added bike lane but I think that is all that is required (skip the sidewalk changes) with maybe some additional planting in the current planting area.
- I like the protected bike lanes, and that they are extensions of the sidewalk area. This creates a large area for multiple modes.
- Improvements along this theme would be welcomed. This area is the entry point from the north to the community and needs to be welcoming and provide a welcoming feel through green plaza and friendly pedestrian activity.
- Not enough room as there are semi trucks backing in to safeway and this creates a major hazardous situation for safeway and already block residents for sometime so
- restrictive and does bike traffic warrant it
- I think this would be the easiest change to allow bikes to turn.
- Doesn't resolve conflict of connection to 5 St for eastbound cyclists.
- Vehicle traffic has no place whatsoever in pedestrian districts. We should do more than simply reduce vehicle access to Kensington Rd. and 10 Ave: we should make this a pedestrian-only neighbourhood.
- It is good in that there is no need for on-street parking here but splitting the bike lanes makes 9a st junction more complicated. The space for trees on both sides is good. Going down to two traffic lanes is good.
- Separated mode use
- I believe a combined bike lane here would be a better option due to the existing bike infrastructure on 10th st.
- Please review 2nd ave NW and 9a St NW. Very dangerous for cyclists at this intersection as no stop for 2nd ave vehicles
- needs parking as a residential area
- Does the larger vehicle on diagram indicate the use of this street as a bus lane - if so not supportive. traffic and noise reduction strategies are required
- Busy cycling area already; better to not have bikes have to cross road to get to 10 St. and 5 Ave intersection
- I think the bike lanes in this design make most sense.
- Looks feasible
- This is the preferred bike lane design. Good idea to narrow car lanes. Please ensure furnishing zone is not completely cluttered with signs, poles, boxes etc. Need space for stepping off sidewalk (2m social distancing) and snow storage
- I love everything about this except the lack of parking. See below!
- I like more space for peds and bikes but dislike separated two way bike lanes
- I like all the ideas except less width for vehicles - tons of people U-turn here and it would be less safe.



## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

- Many people need to turn left from lane onto street. This would make this even more difficult in my opinion
- I like how this transitions to more pedestrian and bike space.
- It's not a busy street so bike lanes are not necessary and the sidewalks are plenty wide.
- This option adds bicycle lanes to both sides of the street (which is a safer option for cyclists and pedestrians), and adds greenery.
- I definitely support narrowing of the road-way, but I wonder if complete removal of parking here would be detrimental to the south-side businesses.
- I prefer this design for the location as I do not believe street parking is required for this particular corridor.
- Better, but ignores the existing green space on Safeway's land in the south. Bike Lane inclusion nice but making it much easier and safer to go from 10th St S to 4th Ave is required.
- Road too narrow, especially in winter.
- There is no reason for changing the streetscape here at this point. It will not accomplish anything.
- Narrower vehicle lanes increase congestion and the risk of hitting pedestrians or cyclists.
- like the bike lanes on either side
- Great!
- I like the raised bicycle-lanes!
- Seems fine. I like that biking and walking are well separated.
- I don't get it. I find these diagrams difficult to figure out. Screened-back photos of the existing area with changes drawn on top might work better..
- Good idea with separated bike lanes, but vehicle roadway is too narrow
- Do not think the volume of people require bigger sidewalk
- Like more space given to pedestrians, the cycle track and the reduced vehicle lanes.
- Separated bike lanes are best
- More opportunities to make the streets welcoming and safe for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Don't bother with 4 Ave, do 3 Ave instead.
- need barriers between bikes and cars as cars can often be threatening even when a bike lane is present
- I like the cycling design but this shouldn't be a priority. This is a relatively safe zone for cyclists. Why would we spend money to make separated track for one block before they risk their lives on the non-separated 10th street?
- Not bad
- The traffic shortcut problem through the laneway is caused by the no-left-turn at the intersection of 4 Ave and 10 St, and the installation of the C-Train line in 1986. The City should have had a solution to this problem at that time.
- I would be interested to know how this would tie into gates for pedestrian crossing across the tracks.
- This split bike path I think would not integrate as well with the other cycling infrastructure in the area. Also, the south lane is not as convenient to access the commercial to the north

- It could work but only if cycle tracks have different colour than the road.
- Pretty good, the bike lanes need to be protected better to stop cars from parking in them
- Great. Accommodates all modes and is more attractive.
- Raised protected bike lanes on both sides is the win here.

### What do you think about Option B? Tell us why.

- This one would be easier to navigate on bike coming from the lights on 10St. Wouldn't need to cross traffic near 10th street.
- Like added bike lane but I think that is all that is required (skip the sidewalk changes) with maybe some additional planting in the current planting area.
- I like the protected bike lane, but I prefer lanes on both sides of the road.
- This is preferable with the green bike lanes going north up the hill this should be a entry point to the community for bike traffic. the separate bike lake is essential. by double wide bike here (4ave) 3ave can be developed as an open plaza
- More trees and less cars please
- I think that one bike lane not 2 is a good option as long as it doesn't go past train tracks as parking is a nightmare for residents on this street. As well as Safeway has semi trucks and is already hell for the drivers because of the tight street.
- do we really need this what is the traffic count
- I really like the segregated bike lanes, that is important to me as I bike to work near this area but take a different route as I do not find it very bike friendly.
- Meets the intent of the neighborhood
- Retain some parking and get all cyclists closer to 5St connection. Also get more cyclist eyes on the street north of 4 Ave... higher crime area.
- Bike lanes on either side of the roadway (in Option A) are safer for all
- plan for bikes and socializing, not cars
- Vehicle traffic has no place whatsoever in pedestrian districts. We should do more than simply reduce vehicle access to Kensington Rd. and 10 Ave: we should make this a pedestrian-only neighbourhood.
- Probably the best solution but there should not be on-street parking.
- This is the preferred arrangement to transition to the shared space in front of the liquor store Near the lights.
- Also, allowing left hand turns from southbound 10th st would really help the residents of Sunnyside get home. Currently there is lots of vehicle traffic that uses the alley behind the liquor store.
- 2-way bike lane on one side is safer. The flexible space for different users and more green space and seating would make this a much more inviting space.
- allows residential parking for owners and will reduce vehicular traffic and noise



- allows residential parking for owners and will reduce vehicular traffic and noise
- I think you need to be more clear you are removing all parking. But I am in support.
- Busy cycling area already; better to not have bikes have to cross road to get to 10 St. and 5 Ave intersection
- having the bike lane on one side makes a bit harder for cross over, i think
- Might be higher maintenance
- preference for 2 way bike lanes
- Two-way protected bike lanes are terrible design, no one knows how to use them and cars don't know where to look when turning, creates way more hazards for cyclists. Why is a tree growing out of a car in this diagram? Drawing is incomprehensible
- Love it. Perfect. Please do it :)
- Not sure about two-way bike lane
- I like having the bike lanes together
- I don't see how a place can be flexible to include both trees and parking. Be more clear or we'll have confusion.
- Negotiate with Safeway to activate the deadspace at the corner of 9A and 4th. This is a high traffic area.
- I really like this, though honestly I don't know if that much dedicated bike space is required.
- It's not a busy street so bike lanes are not necessary and the sidewalks are plenty wide.
- This option adds greenery and a bicycle lane. However, it is safer for cyclists to have separate bicycle lanes at each side of the road, as it follows the flow of traffic.
- The flexed parking space might be helpful for south-side businesses; a more fully protected bike lane, on the side of the street makes sense, as this would actually align/connect with the bike infrastructure at the 5th Ave & 10th St intersection.
- For this corridor, I prefer option A.
- Also better than the existing and makes it MUCH more clear for 10th St cycle traffic to move to 9A. Option A is better.
- Road too narrow, especially in winter.
- There is no reason for changing the streetscape here at this point. It will not accomplish anything.
- Narrower vehicle lanes increase congestion and the risk of hitting pedestrians or cyclists.
- The separated bicycle path looks more appealing, and would feel safer.
- not bad. Sure as hell is better than current condition
- Great!
- Integrated parking seems fine.
- I guess the parking makes sense if surface parking is to disappear in other places. Not bad, but the city doesn't do a good job maintaining segregated bike lanes. They just collect garbage.
- I don't get it. I find these diagrams difficult to figure out. Screened-back photos of the existing area with changes drawn on top might work better..
- Good idea with separated bike lanes, but vehicle roadway is too narrow

## 4 Avenue N.W. Streetscaping

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

December 2021

- Do not see the need
- Like more space given to pedestrians, the bi-directional cycle track and the reduced vehicle lanes.
- Prefer bike lanes in one side and f the street
- Ideal
- The cities needs more dedicated bike lanes.
- I like this better with the two-way bike lane.
- Don't bother with 4 Ave, do 3 Ave instead.
- pretty good! barrier and two way is great!
- This option looks good with the integrated two way bike lane
- Hard to say without knowing how both pedestrians and cyclists "flow" in this scenario. Right now people walk all over the road because it is very confusing.
- Keeping the bikes as separate from motor traffic as possible feels like the safest way forward
- Two way bike lane makes sense given existing lanes on 10th Street and 4th Ave
- I am not a huge fan of 2 way bike lanes on one side of the street. Am otherwise indifferent on option A vs B
- Please contact me at [removed] to discuss my traffic control ideas for 4 Ave to solve this traffic shortcut problem.
- The combined bike lane allows for better connection with the existing 10 St bike lanes (which only continue north of 5 Ave) - this may dissuade bikes from riding dangerously along 10 St
- This one is my favourite as I like the wider double direction bike lane - easier to use when biking with my kids to Riley Park. Will be important how this is tied into 10th around the corner and dumps into Riley Park.
- In general, I prefer two-way cycle paths. This also keeps the cyclist closer to a likely destination of the commerical area and will lead more naturally into the exisiting large intersection at 5 ave and 10th.
- Cycle tracks need to be installed on both sides of the road for easier navigation, so I wouldn't prefer this option.
- This is also good but a 3 way stop will be needed at the 9a intersection to avoid conflicts
- Street parking remains important for the foreseeable future.
- Don't like a two way bike facility because there's no connection at 10 St NW. would be an awkward transition.
- Flex space for parking not needed on the south side. The two way bike lane is ok but will create issues when an eastbound rider then has to transition to the south side of 4th past the LRT tracks.