

What We Heard Report Car-Free & Shared Streets Engagement Sessions

Fall 2023

| **SHARE** YOUR VOICE
SHAPE OUR CITY

Edmonton

Acknowledgement

The City of Edmonton acknowledges the traditional land on which we reside, is in Treaty Six Territory. We would like to thank the diverse Indigenous Peoples whose ancestors' footsteps have marked this territory for centuries, such as nêhiyaw (Cree), Dené, Anishinaabe (Saulteaux), Nakota Isga (Nakota Sioux), and Niitsitapi (Blackfoot) peoples. We also acknowledge this as the Métis' homeland and the home of one of the largest communities of Inuit south of the 60th parallel. It is a welcoming place for all peoples who come from around the world to share Edmonton as a home. Together we call upon all of our collective, honoured traditions and spirits to work in building a great city for today and future generations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Project Overview	PG 4
2. What We Heard	PG 6
3. How We Listened	PG 8
4. What We Did	PG 10
5. Next Steps	PG 10
6. Appendices	PG 11
A. Who We Engaged	PG 11
B. Stakeholder Feedback - Phase I	PG 12
C. Stakeholder Feedback - Phase II	PG 20
D. What We Did Table	PG 22

“We are Excited about downtown vibrancy and want to be included as part of the decision making process”

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Council directed City Administration (the City) to engage with local stakeholders to develop an approach for temporarily closing or partially restricting vehicle traffic on some roads downtown and return with a report including a streamlined process for setting up temporary road closures. The purpose of allowing these closed (car-free) or partially restricted (shared) streets would be to help enable other uses for these spaces, such as festivals, markets, or active transportation (eg. cycling, walking).

This report is a summary of the feedback we received during two phases of engagement. This, along with information gathered during consultation with other internal City of Edmonton business areas was used to develop an approach regarding car-free and shared streets downtown.

The report back to Council will include an approach that incorporates findings such as what sort of characteristics of roadways should be considered when discussing car-free and shared streets and opportunities to address concerns with the current temporary road closure application process. It will also consider how specific downtown streets best align with the findings of this work and planning considerations for longer term changes to facilitate car-free and shared streets.

Establishing a car-free and shared streets approach will make it easier for businesses, festival and event organisers to navigate the application process and help ensure consistent decision making across applications. It also helps meet [The City Plan](#) goal of creating a vibrant, safe downtown by helping to generate more opportunities

for activated, people-centred spaces and comfortable and enjoyable options for walking and rolling.

While temporary car-free and shared streets in the downtown area have been the primary focus of our discussions, this work also provides an opportunity to consider how to approach the consideration of more permanent operational changes at select locations. Consideration will also be given to how the process may be applied to other areas of the city in the future.

DEFINITIONS

- **Car-Free and shared streets** support alternative public uses for roadway space by managing or restricting vehicle access. These operational changes are typically temporary to facilitate festivals, markets, or active transportation events. With additional review and administrative process, car-free and shared streets could be implemented permanently in appropriate locations. Car-Free and shared streets do not include roadway closures to support construction, staging, or re-allocating a portion of the roadway for specific infrastructure like bike lanes.
- **Car-Free Streets** involve the exclusion of vehicular traffic from roadway space to permit alternative non-vehicular uses. Users of car-free streets will not encounter operating motor vehicle traffic. Common examples of car-free streets include streets closed to vehicles for festivals and markets, such as the Fringe Festival.
- **Shared Streets** still permit vehicle traffic, however the roadway space is shared between vehicular and non-vehicular uses. Users of shared streets may encounter operating motor vehicle traffic, however interventions are often used to limit vehicle traffic to local traffic only, and ensure that vehicular speeds are slow enough to ensure safety and comfort for vulnerable users.
- **Permanent road closures** refer to the permanent closure of vehicle travel lanes. Though permanent closures are not the primary focus of this report, consideration will be given to potential opportunities for permanent modifications at select locations. Any future permanent road closure would require

direction by Council, public hearings and further administrative process.

2. WHAT WE HEARD

The stakeholder discussions held during phase I of engagement provided insights on what should be considered in the development of an approach regarding car-free and shared streets downtown. There were some recurring themes that emerged in discussions across stakeholders, which are summarised below. These themes were validated in phase II engagement and stayed consistent. More detailed feedback is included in Appendices A and B.

Top Themes

- Access Accommodation and Communication
- Aesthetics and Amenities
- Civic Events - One stop shop
- Collaborative Process
- Site Specific Engagement
- Costs
- Location Examples and Activation

a) ACCESS ACCOMODATION AND COMMUNICATION

We heard that it is important to consider vehicle access to businesses and parkades for both patron and business needs, such as deliveries, repairs, food delivery services and accessible drop-off zones. The City needs to consider the impacts that nearby construction closures may have on vehicle movement in the area, in particular, recognizing that some visitors are already uncomfortable getting into and around downtown, and road closures make it more challenging. Some stakeholders also indicated that if the City closes roads, it is important to keep sidewalks and bike lanes open. There were also a number of suggestions on how to help downtown visitors navigate their way around closures, find parking, and the importance of notifying people of road closures.

b) AESTHETICS AND AMENITIES

Stakeholders shared that both the aesthetics of the space, and the infrastructure/amenities provided is very important for successful street closures and festivals. We heard a wide-range of suggestions from more attractive event road closure signage for recurring events to ensuring new construction projects consider how festivals and events will access utilities.

c) CIVIC EVENTS

The existing one-stop shop approach provided by Civic Events staff for event help and permits received a lot of positive feedback; however many stakeholders felt that Civic Events may not have the resources/support to manage increasing volume and types of events (eg. festivals & culture vs. sports vs. business and conferences).

d) COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

There is a desire for a collaborative process between applicants and the City that focuses on identifying challenges and finding solutions. Some groups feel that there is a disconnect between internal City departments and that there is not always a problem-solving approach, even though the City claims to support festivals and events. Some stakeholders do not feel the City is supportive of road closures, and this may be a deterrent for both local and international organizers that are considering holding events.

e) SITE SPECIFIC ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholders shared that it is very important for the City to do site specific engagement before pursuing any longer term closures or operational changes. There are businesses and residents that will be impacted by changes and it would be best to have those discussions more focused on those local issues and impacts.

f) COSTS

Stakeholders indicated that the costs associated with temporary road closures are a barrier to many organisations. The quoted costs seemed inconsistent and it was not always clear to groups how the costs were calculated. In some cases, groups felt that the quotes were not received early enough for them to make important event decisions. Some stakeholders felt that the current process favours certain types or sizes of event and do not

consider the additional security and logistics costs of evening and winter events.

g) LOCATION EXAMPLES & ACTIVATION

We asked stakeholders what factors need to be considered when making decisions around fully or partially closing streets to vehicle traffic to enable other uses and enhance vibrancy. Feedback emphasised the importance of ensuring these spaces are activated through intentional programming and/or are aligned with existing street-fronting businesses. We also heard recurring suggestions or examples for the following locations:

- Rice Howard Way: Existing businesses can help activate space and ensure that Rice Howard Way works for occasional closures and as a shared street.
- 99 Street (Shoctor Alley - 103a Ave) is not a major thoroughfare, and could be closed north of 102 Avenue, however as it is already used for festivals, it does not provide any additional space for growth. South of 102 Avenue was identified as an important space to retain access to for deliveries, bus field-trip drop-offs, DATs drop-offs and parkade access.
- 100 Street (102 Ave to 103A Ave) is a natural expansion location for festivals in Churchill Square, however, festival organisers have safety concerns when the street is partially closed, placing festival infrastructure and programming close to vehicle traffic.
- 104 Street is walkable, has businesses, patios, trees and already feels like a shared street. The lack of curbs, parking entrances/loading docks makes it a good street and it has a history of successful closures and programming.
- 102 Avenue had some hope that it might provide a connection, but people didn't feel comfortable due to no businesses and no activity.
- 104 Avenue is a substantial barrier to pedestrians between downtown and events/institutions north of 104 Ave, making it difficult to integrate events on both sides of the avenue without closures but City support for closures of 104 Avenue is limited at this time.
- 108 Street provides a good connection between institutions and the future Warehouse Park, has interesting design and has a history of hosting some events.

3. HOW WE LISTENED

Engagement was divided into two phases. Phase I input was received to [ADVISE](#) City Administration and consisted of 13 facilitated stakeholder discussions. These were held in April and May of 2023, and included a total of 36 participants representing approximately 20 organisations with various interests in downtown. They were approximately 1 hour each, including a brief presentation on the project background and definitions followed by discussion.

Phase II of engagement took place in September 2023 and was an opportunity to validate findings from phase I and share how they are being incorporated into the report.

PHASE I ENGAGEMENT

In phase I the open-ended discussions were framed around the following questions:

- *What has been your experience with road closures for festivals, events, etc?*
- *What is working well regarding the current roadway-event closure process? What is not working?*
- *What factors do you feel need to be considered when making decisions around closing streets to vehicle traffic to enable other uses and enhance vibrancy?*
- *Any additional thoughts, concerns, or recommendations that should be considered in discussions regarding car-free and shared streets downtown?*

Feedback was used to help understand what factors make a road an appropriate temporary car-free (closed) or shared (partially closed) street location to allow other uses (eg. festivals, markets, etc) .

PHASE II ENGAGEMENT

The information gathered from phase I engagement was used, along with technical and policy considerations, and discussions with internal City stakeholders to identify opportunities and considerations for a temporary car-free and shared streets approach. These findings and

opportunities were summarized and shared with the same stakeholders from phase 1 discussions.

Stakeholders were given the option of attending an in person feedback session and/or filling in an online feedback form. Feedback was collected on the following:

- Section 1 - Comments on a draft list of different types of car-free and shared streets.
- Section 2 - Comments about a draft list of opportunities for City road closure process support identified through conversations with downtown stakeholders. This included obtaining feedback on which, if any, opportunities should be a higher priority.
- Section 3 - Comments about the considerations for select Downtown corridors that may present opportunities and/or challenges for the implementation of a successful car-free or shared street.



4. WHAT WE DID

Phase I of engagement helped to identify the general approach and opportunities to improve processes and planning support for car-free and shared streets downtown. The ideas being considered for the report were shared with stakeholders during Phase II of engagement in August 2023. The feedback in phase II was consistent with what was heard in phase I and validated the general approach. See Appendix D for detailed table.

5. NEXT STEPS

The report that summarises the approach will be presented to the Urban Planning committee in the fourth quarter of 2023. Stakeholders and members of the public will have the opportunity to register to speak to members of Council on the content of the report at that committee meeting.

APPENDIX A

Who We Engaged (phase I and II)

Through a series of discussions with a range of downtown stakeholders in [phase I](#), administration identified opportunities for the City to improve the support of car-free and shared streets downtown. For phase II engagement, these opportunities were shared through e-mail and stakeholders were given the opportunity to attend an in-person meeting at the Edmonton Tower on September 7th and/or share their feedback through an online form that was sent via email. Representatives from the following sectors were contacted and invited to participate:

- Arts & Entertainment: Citadel Theatre, Winspear Centre, Art Gallery of Alberta, Royal Alberta Museum, Edmonton Arts Council
- Business & Tourism: Explore Edmonton, BOMA, Downtown Business Association, Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, NAIOP
- Events, Festivals and Markets: Do North Events, Taste of Edmonton, The Works, Street Performers Festival
- Educational Institutions: MacEwan University, University of Alberta, Norquest
- General: Downtown Edmonton Community League, Urban Development Institute, Paths for People, Oilers Entertainment Group
- Nearby Business Improvement Associations (BIA's): Chinatown BIA, 124 Street BIA, North Edge BIA, Old Strathcona BIA
- Public facilities: Edmonton Public Library - Stanley Milner Branch
- Service Agencies: Boyle Street Community Services

APPENDIX B

Stakeholder Feedback - Phase I

The feedback can be grouped into four overarching categories:

- a) the temporary road closure process,
- b) longer term strategic considerations,
- c) comments on specific locations and
- d) other general comments regarding safety and security downtown.

Within each of these categories we grouped the feedback into themes, as summarised below.

a. Temporary Closure Process

ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS

- Consider other network closures, including construction and ensure reasonable access to and from downtown in general as well as to specific areas of downtown.
- Maintaining parkade access is important
- Maintaining service vehicle access is important (deliveries, repairs, food delivery services, DATS. etc) and any impacts should be communicated to these services
- Would like a guarantee that certain roads will not be closed so that people know some roads that will always be available
- Concern that downtown will be left with slow moving roadways and no higher speed roads for access
- Individual organisations and business may have unique access concerns to consider (eg. daycare, security access)
- If the City closes roads, it is important to keep sidewalks and bike lanes open
- Organisations have busy times where impacts are more pronounced, with the impact varying depending on the timing
- Important that any road disruptions be communicated to downtown visitors in advance
- Some visitors are already uncomfortable getting into and around downtown already and road closures make it more challenging
- Would be great if there was a map that would highlight public parking areas and on-street parking

AESTHETICS & AMENITIES

- Important to have places that are attractive and interesting where people want to spend time
- Temporary road closure signage and barricades are not attractive and could be improved, or provide more flexibility to organisers to try something different
- Signage, colour, lighting, planters and streetscaping are important to make spaces vibrant and friendly
- Temporary barricades, bollards, and tarping look okay at first but quickly begin to become unsightly

- City services to event areas should be coordinated to avoid issues like waste receptacles often overflowing
- Fences, utilities, waste and grease bins can be unsightly for festival neighbours
- Areas we want to showcase to the public are often difficult to close eg. downtown & Whyte Ave
- Maybe there's a way to work more closely with BIA's to help showcase Edmonton by offering incentives to help them add vibrancy to their areas
- Temporary closures are best where there are active edges where people want to be
- Kiosks and food trucks help to activate and support the streets
- Important to have connection between inside and outside space (eg support for patios)
- Some events/festivals are limited by space available, allowing additional closures would help keep festivals and growth sustainable
- Some events and festivals can be crowded/cramped and extending the closure space will make events more inviting
- More public amenities, such as washrooms and power outlets, are needed downtown to support both events and general population downtown
- Communal resources would be very helpful for events. This includes fire pits, heat lamps, tables, and secure storage spaces for propane tanks for winter events and patios
- Explore opportunities for partnerships between the City and arts organisations for beautification projects

CIVIC EVENTS

- The existing one-stop shop for City event help/permits is good, a common point of contact and a positive experience
- Concern that City's civic events area may not have the resources/support to manage increasing volume and types of events (eg. festivals & culture vs. sports vs. business and conferences)
- Communication is key to letting people know about road closures and Civic Events has been really good about letting people know
- The Civic Events checklist is very helpful for guiding event planning
- Notification for closures is always provided which is very helpful
- Event organising companies know how to navigate the process, but may not be clear/accessible to others

COMMUNICATION

- Overall, when there are closures for other events, it seems like it has been well done
- If there are going to be temporary closures it needs to be really well communicated and advertised to help people to get downtown
- Social media is a communication opportunity
- Clear communication needed on how to access parking and how to get there
- Signs on the closure area warning of upcoming closures in days leading up to the event so that people can modify their routes
- When there is a full road closure, it is important to have more notice
- Perhaps the application process should require that the proponent of both public and private events need to contact all of the building owners as a courtesy understandable that unexpected/emergency closures cannot be shared ahead of time (eg. digging a hole in the road)
- Notifications for road closures are sometimes forwarded to group via other people,

but some may not be getting the notifications (eg. owners vs. property managers vs. residents)

COSTS

- Costs seem inconsistent, and it is often not clear how the costs are calculated
- Costs for closures are often high, and difficult for community groups or non-profits to manage
- Some costs are understandable, not necessarily expecting closures to be free
- There is a desire for evening events, but the night time economy comes with additional costs which are often much higher and may need special consideration
- Sometimes the quoted cost seems to be set high to deter the applicant from proceeding
- Cost estimates are not always received ahead of the event, and if they are the actual costs charges are often different, which makes it very difficult for planning and budgeting
- Even if costs come in lower than expected, organisers still need to plan for the initial quote which is challenging
- With the high costs of transit and police especially, it feels like events are getting costed out of feasibility
- Cost information sometimes comes late and is needed earlier in order for the group to make the event work
- Explanation of costs has improved, but would like more detail
- It seems like the current process favours certain types or sizes of events over others, as some events have discounts/certain costs covered by the City while others don't
- Would be good if the City covered some of the costs for events that were in line with the broader goals of the City
- City invoices take a really long time to get to the groups

LOGISTICS

- There seems to be a different process for recurring closures and one-time closures
- Extending an event approved for Saturdays to a Sunday involves an entirely different application process and different costs
- People power needed to close the street is a barrier ie. volunteers needed to stand at every alley/access way
- Identify what the desired streets are (eg. 'easier' to shut) downtown by providing a list with standardised, predictable costs and requirements.
- Larger events may have unique needs that are not fully considered in the process
- Partial closures are a lot easier to organise than full closures because of the requirements for emergency access, which limits the ability of all businesses along a corridor to participate
- Smaller scale/recurring events seem to work well

PARKING

- Parking rate increase may deter people from visiting downtown
- Free parking is really important for visitor access to certain events and institutions downtown.
- Full road closures can decrease parkade revenues

CULTURE & PROCESS

- Would like negotiation and solution based problem solving - what is the road to yes and is there organisational support to find solutions?
- Perception that Edmonton does not support road closures, which is a deterrent for international/travelling events that can go elsewhere with more support.
- City needs to hear on the ground experience and be a part of the solution
- Missing opportunities for coordinating events eg. if there is a large event at Rogers Place, it seems other closures are not permitted
- The desire is to make downtown more vibrant, so it is important to allow other events on the same night
- Festivals want to grow, and City says it wants to support, but requests to close streets are turned down and/or the cost estimates are so high that its not affordable
- Disconnect between internal departments, often doesn't seem like everybody is on board
- It feels like it used to be more of a partnership, but it has changed (over the last 7 years) and there is no longer joint problem-solving in advance
- Lots of enthusiasm when bidding on large travelling events, but gets more difficult at the execution stage and previous commitments for closures may not be honoured by the City
- Would like use of roadways for event to be higher up the list of priorities
- The City is inconsistent when communicating the reason why a road closure request was or was not approved

b. Strategic Direction

GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES

- Longer term/permanent changes likely warrant more focused discussion and further engagement
- Important to consider reasons why the community looks for (requests) a specific location, alternative locations may not have the same utility or significance
- When the focus is too much on programming and events, it obscures the discussion of the longer term closure, active transportation, safety and community
- Difficult for effective development planning without vision/plans for closures
- Short term and long term closures are different and cannot always use short term closures to justify longer term closures
- Broader strategic work is required that doesn't focus on temporary closure process
- Need to think about where spaces should be pedestrianised in the future as part of a connected network
- Consider street fronting retail and existing activity as built-in activation
- Move towards shared streets or allowing jaywalking could be a step in the right direction in some locations
- Many streets downtown are wide and there may be opportunities to close lanes

COLLABORATION

- General interest in future opportunities to host programming in closed spaces in collaboration with other groups
- Want to be part of the community and involved

- Excited about downtown vibrancy and want to be included as part of the decision making process
- A lot of traffic downtown is because of events at Rogers, but we also have a vested interest in other events

INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN

- Considerations for future road rebuilds that might have festivals on them: drainage and electrical access (ie. for vendors)
- Existing power supply and lighting need to be upgraded and incorporated into the street design so generators don't need to be used for cooking and more lighting options can be accommodated.

CONSISTENCY & TRUST

- Unclear who has the final say at the City to close down a street
- 99 Street closure has been consistent, and one lane closed on 100 Street for some events at Churchill ; consistency / predictability is good
- Very different experiences (inconsistent); Patio permitting (generally good) versus others not as good
- Felt like the decision regarding 102 avenue was already made and stakeholder engagement didn't really impact the discussion
- Investors are taking risks and going based off current plans, sudden changes without enough engagement creates uncertainty

c. Specific Locations

When asked what factors need to be consider when making decisions around closing or partially closing streets to vehicle traffic to enable other uses and enhance vibrancy, stakeholders also shared specific thoughts about what works or doesn't work at the following locations:

RICE HOWARD WAY

- 100A Ave works okay for occasional closures
- Existing businesses can help activate space and ensure that Rice Howard Way works

99 STREET

- Closure of 99 Street does have impacts on loading and delivery access in the area
- Bus parking is required for field trips to arts district facilities
- Works okay for summer but may not be good permanent closure location
- Not a major thoroughfare anyways, longer term closure may be feasible
- Street is pleasant for alternative uses - bright, lots of sunshine, open to the sky, access to arts facilities and City Hall
- Closures of 99 Street, including construction work, has significant impacts, particularly south of 102 ave due to delivery, loading, parkade access and accessible parking
- 99 Street is already used for festivals, does not provide space for growth - just accommodating existing programming

100 STREET

- Having vehicles running right next to the festival is scary, closing only a portion of the street for festivals is not ideal (ie. on 100 Street, directly adjacent to the closed 2 ½ lanes)
- 100 Street (102 Ave to 103A Ave) is the natural expansion location for festivals in Churchill Square - nowhere else to go that is contiguous

104 STREET

- Already feels like a shared street because of the trees, businesses, no curbs
- City should exempt it from the jaywalking bylaw
- Is good for temporary full closures, but only when it is programmed as closing it and having it un-programmed causes frustration to people (business owners, patrons)
- The tree in the boulevard on 104 Street (at 102 Avenue) looks good but is a barrier that prevents certain activities
- Emergency access requirements prevent full programming of the space and participation of business on both sides of the street
- 104 Street seems to be a good street that could work well to close; vibrant and probably doesn't cause too much traffic disruption, deliveries could still get through
- 104 Street is walkable, there are so many restaurants but Jasper to 102 Ave currently has more potential than sections to the north
- 104 Street closures on Saturdays help increase pedestrian traffic & vibrancy
- Businesses, patios, programming, lack of parking entrances and loading docks make 104 Street a good street for programming

102 AVENUE

- 102 Avenue had some hope that it might provide a connection, but people didn't feel safe/comfortable due to no businesses and no activity.
- Location is important for events, for example 102 Avenue has no storefronts, and is not desirable place to spend time

104 AVENUE

- The partial closures on 104 Ave are already occurring as part of events but is not being supported now
- 104 Avenue is a substantial barrier between downtown and events/institutions north of 104 Ave, making it too difficult to support large number of pedestrian crossings without closures

108 Street

- Seems to be a good location that could support a shared street, some history of events hosted here
- Provides a good connection to Norquest & future Warehouse Park and interesting design

OTHER LOCATIONS

- 102A Ave East of Churchill Square is logistical challenge to close due to Law Courts and AGA

- 103 Street has potential (restaurants, etc) and works well for Pride events
- 103 Ave / Oilers Way has potential to connect Churchill and Ice District
- There is an opportunity to connect Churchill Square to the Downtown Farmers Market via 102A, 97 St, 103 Ave
- Consider impact of closures that are accessory to events eg. closure of bus turnaround on 103A Ave for fireworks
- 105 Avenue might have some opportunity to do a shared street, opportunity to integrate the North Edge better with MacEwan and Downtown
- MacDonald Drive has potential due to views and limited traffic
- It seems to work well when streets are closed around Churchill Square for festivals

d. Safety and Security

- Feeling safe is very important to tenants, clients and staff
- Employees regularly seeing concerning behaviour
- People are scared to visit - institutions are communicating with potential visitors about places to avoid
- Closed spaces need to be monitored outside of active times (eg. overnight).
- Would like to see some kind of housing to help mitigate the homeless encampment situation on downtown streets
- Dark sheltered areas such as 97 street rail bridge feels unsafe, dirty, unsanitary

APPENDIX C

Stakeholder Feedback - Phase II

Phase II Objectives

The purpose of phase II engagement was to share materials and gather feedback on general direction for the report and some of the potential opportunities for City support and improvements to the process for setting up temporary road closures to accommodate pedestrian and active modes. The feedback was used to help refine the approach regarding closed, car-free and shared streets in downtown to enhance vibrancy, active modes, safety and business activity. The feedback was also used to identify any additional considerations for the report being prepared for the Urban Planning Committee

Phase II - What Did We Ask

Participants were invited to share their feedback on the Car Free and Shared Streets in Downtown Draft Approach document. The following feedback was solicited:

- Section 1 - Comments about the types of car-free and shared streets described in the [Draft Approach document \(pp 1-3\)](#)
- Section 2 - Comments about the seven opportunities for City road closure process support identified through conversations with downtown stakeholders in phase 1 engagement and documented in the [Draft Approach Document \(p4\)](#). This included obtaining feedback on which, if any, opportunities should be a higher priority.
- Section 3 - Comments about the considerations for select Downtown corridors in the [Draft Approach Document \(p4-5\)](#) that may present opportunities and/or challenges for the implementation of a successful car-free or shared street.

Phase II - What We Heard

1. Themes / ideas that were reinforced by participants in phase II
 - a. Winter - Ensure that car-free and shared streets take all-season design into consideration, specifically maintenance and snow clearing needs in the winter
 - b. Vehicle movement - Always have at least one east-west corridor open for vehicle movement through and across downtown
 - c. Costs - Event/street closure permit holders want a clear articulation of why a cost is being charged by the City
 - d. Accessibility - Access for patrons/visitors with limited mobility is vital (eg. 99 St in front of Winspear)
2. Additional considerations shared by participants
 - a. Back alleys - It is important to consider back alleys in the overall context , for example as links between shared or car-free streets, and as access for deliveries and parking to allow adjacent street(s) to become shared or car-free.
 - b. Dedicated Transit and Active Transportation Lanes - Some combination of closing streets to private automobile traffic, opening up to pedestrians/cyclists/scooters/other active mobility AS WELL AS leaving dedicated transit lanes open (something for Jasper Avenue or 104 Avenue).

- c. Database - It is Important that the City does beta-testing with end-users before rolling out a new database
- d. Jay-walking bylaw removal- some downtown streets are ready for this
- e. Connectivity - Consider how to connect different shared/car-free locations; people will want to actively move between those locations
- f. Potential shared and car-free locations - The City should identify potential locations that can be up for discussion in the short, medium and long term.
Additional locations that could be considered for shared or car-free streets:
 - i. MacDonald Drive as a shared or seasonal shared street has been suggested by a number of stakeholders
 - ii. Columbia Ave / 105 Ave, north of MacEwan University

APPENDIX D

What We Did Table

This table summarises the top themes of the feedback in previous conversations, and how that feedback has influenced the draft approach. Additional information on the top themes, and other feedback received is summarized in the Summer 2023 What We Heard report.

Top Theme	What We Heard	What We Did
Access Accomodation and Communication	It's important to consider vehicular access for businesses and residents and ensure effective communication and notification.	Access accommodation and notification is already one of the key factors considered with respect to the current temporary road closure process. The City is investigating opportunities to improve detours and wayfinding, particularly for people using active transportation.
Aesthetics and Amenities	The aesthetics of the space, and access to amenities are important for facilitating successful streets closure and festivals.	There is also an opportunity for the City to review traffic control materials and identify opportunities for more aesthetically pleasing materials. Ongoing work and plans endeavour to create more attractive and pedestrian friendly spaces and developments through projects downtown.
Civic Events - One stop shop	A one-stop shop for events helps make the process smoother for external stakeholders, there is an opportunity to build on this approach.	Exploration of a database/program to help manage festival and event applications and permitting processes. This system could help streamline document submission, tracking, communications and coordination with the various city services and applicants and may provide an opportunity to provide one intake point for all types of road closure/event applications.
Collaborative Process	It is important for the City to actively engage with stakeholders to find solutions to the challenges around road closures.	There are ongoing conversations about opportunities to improve collaboration between the City and applicants with respect to temporary road closures. A database/program to manage the permit process may enable more direct communication and collaboration between various city business areas and applicants.
Site Specific Engagement	Site specific stakeholder engagement is needed before implementing any permanent operational change within the downtown mobility network.	Instead of recommending any immediate closures of downtown streets, the approach identifies considerations for downtown streets with respect to operational changes. These considerations can support more focused conversations regarding potential changes on specific streets.

<p>Costs</p>	<p>The costs associated with road closures for events can be a barrier and there is a desire for additional communication/transparency regarding these costs.</p>	<p>Internal discussions have identified that there is opportunity to share some additional breakdown of costs estimates for future events. A potential database/program to help manage festival and event applications could also help streamline the sharing of documents and communication between city business areas and community stakeholders.</p>
<p>Location Examples and Activation</p>	<p>There are some areas downtown with characteristics that better support car-free and shared streets. These characteristics can be used as a starting point to enable future conversations.</p>	<p>Additional work was completed to identify and summarise the characteristics of specific downtown corridors to both understand reasons for success/challenges and provide a basis for future location-specific conversations regarding car-free and shared streets downtown.</p>