



REBUILDING DOWNTOWN INFRASTRUCTURE
Task Force Meeting #10 - AGENDA
2024-06-21

23145

Location

Menesetung Room
10:00 am

Invited Attendees

Trevor Bazinet	Janice Hallahan	Vicky Culbert - BIA Appointment
Randy Carroll	Sean Thomas	Colin Carmichael - Huron Chamber of Commerce Appointment
Allison Segeren	Andrea Fisher	Christopher Spaleta – Citizen Appointment
Dennis Elliott	Mark Zuzinjak	
Matt Pearson	Jennifer Hachler	
Dale Erb		

Brief Agenda Items

Lead

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Call to Order | Chair |
| 2. Approval of Agenda | Chair |

Moved by:
Seconded by:

That the Rebuilding Downtown Infrastructure Task Force hereby accepts the June 21, 2024 Agenda, as presented.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| 3. Adoption of Minutes | Chair |
|-------------------------------|--------------|

Moved by:
Seconded by:

That the Rebuilding Downtown Infrastructure Task Force hereby adopts the May 7, 2024, Meeting Notes, as printed.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 4. Council Direction | Chair |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

- May 21st Meeting: Council Motion = That Council authorize staff to work with BM Ross & Associates and GSP to advance to the preliminary design stage of the Downtown Revitalization design to be presented to the Downtown Revitalization Task Force for a

recommendation back to Council, in order to prepare the design, develop and engage in a communication plan, with a goal to tender the project later in 2024.

5. Public Update Notice

BMROSS

Refer to attached public update notice.

Item	Milestones	Approx Timing / Milestone Date	Comments
i.	Council Authorization to Proceed with Preliminary Design	May 21st	Council Motion: That Council authorize staff to work with BM Ross & Associates and GSP to advance to the preliminary design stage of the Downtown Revitalization design to be presented to the Downtown Revitalization Task Force for a recommendation back to Council, in order to prepare the design, develop and engage in a communication plan, with a goal to tender the project later in 2024.
ii.	Develop Preliminary Design Concept Update Concept and refine based on Alternatives 1 and 2	June 19th	Refined concept will consider the following: - planter locations relative to existing business type - intersection design and functionality - direction of parking - accessibility
iii.	Task Force Meeting to Present the Preliminary Design Concept Update	June 21st - 10:00am	Presentation to Task Force: Obtain Comments
iv.	Present Preliminary Design Concept Update	June 27th - 11:00pm	Meet with Staff and Stakeholders (Fire/EMS/Building/Operations/Etc. : Obtain Comments
		June 27th - 1:00pm	Meet with BIA and Review : Obtain Comments
		June 27th - 2:00 pm	Meet with HCAAC: Obtain Comments
		June 27th - 3:00 pm	Meet with Heritage: Obtain Comments
v.	Review and Summarize Comments Received. Prepare Report of Council.	June 28th	Prepare Council Report for submission on July 1st
vi.	Present to Council	July 8th	Presentation of Preliminary Design to Council.
vii.	Public Open House	July 11th	Public Open House - Held in Council Chambers
viii.	Advance to Final Design	Summer/Early Fall	BMROSS and GSP advance the various design elements.
ix.	Prepare Tender Documentation	Fall	Prepare project tendering documentation (specifications, drawings, details, etc.)
x.	Present Final Design	Fall	Details to be presented include: - design and tender drawings; - construction staging approach and phasing plan; - servicing elements; - surface material selection; - accessibility details; - street lighting; - etc.
xi.	Tender Project	November to December	Prepare project tendering documentation (specifications, drawings, details, etc.). Projected award date in late December or early January
xii.	Tentative Construction Schedule	January 2025	Present Construction Schedule

6. GSP Concept Update

GSP/BMROSS

- GSP to present (refer to attachment)
- Discussion

Motion for consideration:

Moved by:

Seconded by:

That the current preliminary design be received for information.

7. Information Received

All

- Don Scott – June 6, 2024

- Marilyn Elgie – June 7, 2024
- Barry Page – June 18, 2024
- Jim Rees – June 18,2024

8. Rear Alleys	Goderich Staff / BMROSS
9. Off-site Parking	Goderich Staff / BMROSS
10. Near Future Next Steps	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with Stakeholders and Committees – June 27th • Prepare Council Report for July 8th meeting 	
11. Other Business	All
12. Next Meeting	All
13. Press Reporters and Citizen Question and Answer Period	Chair
14. Adjourn	Chair

Moved by:
 Seconded by:

That the Rebuilding Downtown Infrastructure Task Force does now adjourn at ____.

PUBLIC UPDATE NOTICE
June 2024 Circulation

REBUILDING DOWNTOWN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT UPDATE

- The Town of Goderich, along with the Rebuilding Downtown Infrastructure Task Force, and the Design Team of BMROSS and GSP are advancing the Downtown Square project to the preliminary design stage.
- Over the next several weeks the Design Team will be working on refinements to the plan and meeting with various Stakeholders to obtain valuable comments.
- A Public Open House is planned for July 11th at the Town Hall: 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm. Details of the meeting will be advertised in advance.
- A project Timeline has been prepared which includes key milestones and the associated target dates.

Questions?

Contact Sean Thomas, Town of Goderich
sthomas@goderich.ca
519-524-8344 ext. 228




Project Timeline




June 13, 2024
v. 6

**DIG OUR DOWNTOWN ::
IT'S HIP TO BE SQUARE**

PRELIMINARY DESIGN UPDATE
June 20, 2024



- LEGEND**
- EXISTING BUSINESS - RESTAURANT
 - PROPOSED MEDIUM STATURE TREE
 - MOVEABLE PLANTERS
 - DECORATIVE PAVING
 - PERENNIAL PLANTING
 - HIGHLIGHTED CROSSWALKS



PROPOSED TYPICAL ROAD CROSS SECTION

GODERICH SQUARE RECONSTRUCTION LANDSCAPE CONCEPTUAL PLAN





**GODERICH SQUARE RECONSTRUCTION
LANDSCAPE CONCEPTUAL SKETCHES**

INFORMATION RECEIVED
Don Scott – June 6th, 2024

On Thu, Jun 6, 2024, 7:03 a.m. <dcscott@cabletv.on.ca> wrote:

Hey Trevor,

I still continue to find that most people that I get to talk to do not fully recognize the changes being proposed in the 'enhancement' of the Square, and when they understand the loss of a driving lane they do not agree with the idea. I cannot imagine where the Committee member gets the idea that 'everyone wants this change'. The other recurring theme in discussions seems to be that the lanes should be marked. People do seem to understand and agree with the actual infrastructure update. This project is a major step for the Town. If Council, and the Committee, were to think of leaning towards the vocal minority, who had the time to attend the days of meetings with the outside landscaping company, instead of the majority of the residents who want to be able to visit the Square, take care of their business and move along, and have a fiscally responsible Town Council, then the enhancement portion of the project should be up to the whole Town, not just a few council members. A survey or other means of getting more feedback should be considered.

Also **with such an important decision**, if council were to consider spending an extra \$2,000,000 - \$3,000,000 on the Square 'enhancements' instead of on actual needed infrastructure improvements like our streets, **I believe it worthy of planning an actual trial run** for people to experience the change before a '50 year mistake' is made.

I would also suggest the Town Reserves should be for necessary or emergency requirements, not beautification projects aimed at tourists. The same applies to tax increases.

I am certain that Council or Town employees, or BM Ross could **come up with a plan for the Square by blocking off current parking area and going to 2 lanes to test the theory and allow residents and visitors to actually assess the issues for a period of time**. This should not be a difficult or costly task and the benefits would certainly be worthwhile.

Also, the proposal for the infrastructure enhancements suggests moving to a 2 lanes situation will slow traffic. The proposal actually increases the width of the traffic lanes from 3 lanes at 12.5 ft to 2 lanes at 13.1 ft per lane. According to a John Hopkins study, theoretically this would not have an affect on slowing traffic since the lane width actually increases.

The study shows that it is the width of lanes not the number of lanes that could possibly make a difference in slowing traffic.

John Hopkins study link...

<https://link.edgepilot.com/s/f6a81b47/Sk8nvNulEEqE3Maa1NHLKg?u=https://publichealth.jhu.edu/2023/narrower-lanes-safer-streets>

excerpt from John Hopkins / Bloomberg study...

How Narrower Traffic Lanes Could Help Reduce Crashes

What did your research find?

We did a national study of more than 1,100 streets from seven cities in the U.S., covering more than 20 street design factors, plus lane weights, and tested the relationship between them and safety indicators like the number of crashes. This is the first national study on lane widths and safety.

What we found was that when you compare 9-, 10-, and 11-foot lanes, there is no difference in the number of crashes. But when you compare 12-foot lanes with 9- and 10-foot lanes, you see that the wider lanes are actually more dangerous. The number of crashes on a street with 12-foot lanes is significantly higher than on streets with narrower lanes. **That is the opposite of the general belief and what has been the foundation for street design and lane-width guidelines.**

We also looked at differences by speed and found that **at lower speeds, 20 to 25 mph, making the lanes wider makes no difference to safety**. When you move to 35 mph, wider lanes become significantly more dangerous, with a higher number of crashes. The reason is that wider lanes don't give drivers more room for mistakes, they just make drivers drive faster.

.....
Note:

-Existing driving lane width- 12.5 ft / lane (*11.5 m = 37.7 ft for driving , 3 lanes = 12.5 ft / lane*)

-Proposed driving lane width- 13.1 ft/lane (*8 m = 26.2 ft or 2 lanes at 13.1 ft/lane*)

.....
Thank you for your consideration, please let me know your thoughts, and perhaps you could pass this trial idea on to the Committee and Council.

Don Scott

INFORMATION RECEIVED

Marilyn Elgie – June 7th

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **mpelgie30** <mpelgie30@hurontel.on.ca>

Date: Fri, Jun 7, 2024, 4:32 p.m.

Subject: Downtown core plans

To: <trevorbazinetgoderich@gmail.com>

Cc: <mpelgie30@hurontel.on.ca>

Good afternoon Mayor Bazinet,

I have been mulling over the newspaper information in the Goderich Sun, dated May 16th. The article is titled, "Council suggests changes to proposed plan for downtown core".

For approximately 20 years or so I have been a volunteer gardener for the town and an active, member of Communitues in Bloom during the years we were involved in the program. We accomplished a great deal through that program achieving the very first, Canadian 5 Blooms Gold Award ever presented. We achieved marks of over 90 percent. (as I am now a senior I look after, with some help for heavy digging, the hosta garden at the Beach, but have given up planting and caring for an annual town garden).

I look forward to seeing the next phase of our lovely downtown once the infrastructure is completed, and am aware of the need for careful financial planning. I do agree that money should be wisely spent enhancing the downtown core, however at the expense of, and I quote, "council may consider reducing the town's gardens and flower beds in.other locations..."

There are possibilities of keeping the gardens but using perennial plantings rather than as many annuals. Carefully planned, these gardens can beautify our town with less maintenance once they are established.

Once the beauty of green spaces, trees, gardens, are replaced by cement, or grass the landscape becomes stark, and less interesting. That decision cannot easily be undone.

My hope is that Council will think carefully before replacing gardens with cement or grass.

Thank you for the opportunity of voicing my opinion.

Best regards,
Marilyn Elgie,
519-440-0019,
37 Fairhaven Lane, N7A0A5

mpelgie30@hurontel.on.ca

INFORMATION RECEIVED
Barry Page – June 18th, 2024

Rebuilding Downtown Infrastructure Project Update – a Review

Following are my observations and opinions concerning the preliminary design for the Rebuilding Downtown Infrastructure Project Update.

BLOCK CONCEPT

I have reviewed and compared the two Alternatives to the Block Concept as proposed by BM Ross and GSP.



Making a direct comparison using the concept artwork, I would consider that Alternative 1 has advantages over Alternative 2.

Some of the advantages are:

1. The extra, or third, tree makes for better streetscape balance.
2. For the same reason this extends to the planters themselves – three small versus one long.
3. The extra tree means extra shading.

4. The gaps between the planters still allow for store owner seating (if required).
5. The permanent benches at the corners is a good idea.
6. The clean lines of the street furniture will allow for efficient snow clearing.

If there are any disadvantages, they may be as follows:

1. Extra planter maintenance, but not too onerous.
2. Three trees versus two trees may obscure some storefront signage.
3. Additional cost for the extra tree on each block.

INTERSECTIONS

The final design should incorporate traffic calming methods to ensure the Stop Sign is obeyed. A centre island will help with pedestrian crossing ability – especially for handicapped/aging persons. With the right type of paving, snow removal shouldn't be a problem. To help with the 'walkability' aspect of pedestrians moving from one part of Courthouse Square to another, crosswalks between the inner and outer perimeters should be well marked out at all corners.

GENERAL

I think it's well known that backing into the parking slots on the outer perimeter is not popular, and that the current method of driving directly into the slots is preferred. Reversing vehicles of all types is problematic at any time. Many vehicle owners are seniors, and forcing them to back up – possibly between two cars – is unsafe. Visitors will not be able to cope with this strange method. People are just not used to such a maneuver – even parallel parking can be a huge challenge. I strongly suggest that the concept is abandoned in favour of the current, safe and accepted parking procedure.

One solution to the overall parking situation is to improve the existing satellite parking lots. Some visitors may not be able to access them because of the inadequate current signage. I suggest that more obvious signs – preferably labeled "FREE PARKING" – are installed at strategic places. Currently they can be found near or at the Livery Theatre, Post Office, Service Ontario and Library. It may be advantageous to install electric car charging points at all the satellite lots.

I suggest for safety and observance of the 30 km/h speed limit on Courthouse Square, that the road is marked out in two lanes dependant on the regulated width of each carriageway. Also with safety in mind, more obvious and permanent signs to deter skateboarders, etc., should be installed on each block.

Report prepared by: Barry Page

INFORMATION RECEIVED

Jim Rees – June 18th, 2024

Hey Trevor! Hope all is well. A couple questions that I have regarding the Downtown Infrastructure project

1. The \$7-\$10 million estimates. Do both versions have a contingency for budget overruns?
2. Since we are excavating 120 year old infrastructure. There is the possibility that artifacts with historical significance are exhumed. This typically results in a halt in construction, ultimately causing delays. Has this been factored into the timeline?

Cheers,

Jim