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Mr. R. P. Sparks,

Chairman, Gatineau Park Advisory Committee,

Victoria Building,

140 Wellington Street,

Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Sparks:

We are pleased to submit the “General Report of the Parkway Subcommittee for Gatineau Park, Part I.”

In considering the recommendations made in the report, cognizance should be given to the “Committee Procedure” which appears on Page 25, and which forms the basis on which the report was developed.

The next phase of the work of this Committee should consist of detailed studies, already instituted, of consecutive local portions of the Parkway so that definite routes can be established in an integrated manner with the numerous points of interest and utility which must be serviced.

It will require a considerable amount of time, effort, and further expenditure to make these detailed studies. This does not appear to be justified until the Subcommittee receives approval of the recommendations made in the report as submitted or is provided with alternative instructions covering those portions of its recommendations which are not approved.

Yours truly,

Howard D. Hyman

for the Parkway Subcommittee of Gatineau Park

**Preface**

**Locale**

Gatineau Park represents an area of some 70,000 acres of relatively unspoiled and representative Canadian terrain. Its contiguity to Ottawa makes the Park unique amongst the capitals of the world, in part because of its size but particularly because of its natural beauty and the wild life which inhabits it.

The importance of the Park to the Capital Plan can be judged by the following excerpt from a report by Mr. Jacques Gréber, Consultant, dated September 25th, 1952:

“The potentiality of this magnificent Forest Reserve at the gate of the National Capital, needs no justification for a long range programme of extensions and protection. Its natural structure, the infinite variety of its beauty and the attractive possibilities of such a Park, are far beyond the needs of an ordinary city park at the service of the population of neighbouring cities. It is really the essential feature of the whole plan of the National Capital of Canada.

Its development must be conceived for the manifold requirements of the requirements of the regional population itself and also for the fast growing number of visitors and tourists coming to the Capital from all parts of Canada, and the entire world. Not speaking of aesthetics at all, but from only the economic point of view, it represents an asset of unlimited value.”

**Park Development Policy**

The Gatineau Park Committee, and in turn the Federal District Commission, realize that the Park can only remain a priceless asset if its development is planned primarily to enhance its natural beauty.

Accordingly, as a matter of policy, it has been decided that its development shall be planned to that end. It is to remain as natural as possible and such man-made features as are necessary to allow full enjoyment of its wonders shall be designed in keeping with nature. As a general practice, stone shall be preferable to concrete, wood shall be preferable to steel and, where necessary, natural green and soft contrasting reds and browns shall be preferable to aluminum. Nature at its best is relatively silent and never unsightly. Development plans should include provision for retaining these virtues to the greatest extent possible.

Further, the entire conception shall present a balanced effort of harmonious unity with nature. Deviations from this conception will be allowable, to a limited extent, within such areas where the particular locale will permit of such deviation because of its particular nature.

The architectural treatment of park structures, accommodations and facilities, as also their sitings and landscape development, necessarily must be the subjects of meticulous care and foresight to ensure that they will be in complete harmony with their natural environments, Lodges and overnight cabins should be located preferably in secluded wooded areas having attractive outlooks over scenic areas, the appreciation of which can be enhanced through the judicious provision of balconies and terraces incorporated in the structures. Even in cases where such accommodations are located in other than heavily treed areas, the matters of seclusion and outlook are primary considerations.

The general impression should be that each individual structure is erected from materials originating on the site by craftsmen well skilled in the adaptation of methods native to the region and developed through conventional necessity to use the materials at hand.

The only exception to the above would be in the construction of service groups which should not be visible from the parkway. Here concrete block construction with sheet metal or transite roofs, strictly utilitarian in character, would predominate.

In order to allow full enjoyment of the Park, it will obviously be necessary to provide access by the installation of appropriate parkways.
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**General Report**

**Definition**

For purposes of Gatineau Park, a Parkway is a strip of land set aside for pleasure travel over which the abutting property holders have no privileges or rights of access.

**Object**

Gatineau Park is a unique and essential feature of the whole plan for the rational Capital of Canada. As such, its primary function is to preserve and present to visitors from other parts of Canada and foreign countries, scenery, recreational opportunities, and cultural subjects which are characteristic of the region and which will impart to them a sense of the beauty, wealth, and breadth of territory which our country possesses.

It is therefore the object of the Parkway to make these attractions accessible to the public in a convenient, pleasurable and safe manner.

**Parkway Design Policy**

The Parkway should be:

1. Routed and constructed with the object in view of serving: first, the visitors to the National Capital: second, the local populace.
2. Designed to discourage through traffic between points outside the Park.
3. Designed with balance. It is an axiom that the Parkway should take the public to the scenery in every reasonable instance. Unfortunately, it may not be possible to make available all of the major points of interest. From an inventory of the scenic, recreational and educational assets of the Park, as many locations should be made accessible as considered advisable, having regard to their value in relation to other similar sites and the various factors of design. A serious effort should be made to present a major attraction at reasonably close intervals. Where special points of interest are very difficult to reach by the main Parkway or where relative peace is desirable, spur roads or trails may be run in. Scenic values must be the dominating influence on Parkway location.
4. Completely sympathetic with the general Park development policy. With that in mind, the committee has studied the “Report on Master Plan for the development of Gatineau Park” dated May 1952 and subscribes in general to the notes on structures, materials, parking and other subjects.

**General Route**

It is recommended that the general route start at the Taché Boulevard on the western edge of Val Tétreau and proceed to a point near Pink Lake. Here it will divide, one arm passing near Old Chelsea and thence following Meach, Harrington and Phillips Lakes. The second arm from Pink Lake should pass near Kingsmere and gain the escarpment beyond King mountain. It will travel along the escarpment among the high mounds and gorges to the vicinity of Clear Lake and return between Clear and Taylor Lakes to the upper and of Lac Philippe where it will meet the first arm. An extension from this loop may eventually be projected to and probably around Lac Lapeche.

This general routing will accomplish several things.

1. It will establish early connection with present traffic arteries and will at once move into territory un-crowded by housing and uncluttered by access roads.
2. It will introduce to the public the beautiful lakes and rolling hills on one branch and the sweeping panoramas of the escarpment on the other.
3. The eventual extension of the Parkway to Lac Lapeche would cover a still different type of forested country.

**Loop Roads**

In order that visitors may travel part of the Parkway and return by another type of scenery without going over the whole route, and in order that circuit drives may be enjoyed before construction is complete, some loop or connecting roads are recommended. They will also assist in the rapid cross movement of firefighting equipment.

The present road between Kingsmere and Old Chelsea would be the first to join the two arms. A second cross road would be constructed from Dunlop’s by way of Camp Fortune to the escarpment.

A third one at McCloskey’s would be rather indirect but useful. A fourth one between Meach and Harrington Lakes may be possible and should be investigated. If these loop roads were established, the following return trips from Ottawa and Hull would be possible:

To: The Memorial;

Pink Lake;

Old Chelsea, returning via Kingsmere;

Dunlop’s to Fortune Loop, returning via Escarpment

Meach Lake Loop, returning via Escarpment

Harrington Lake Loop, returning via Escarpment

Taylor Lake Loop, returning via Escarpment

**Parkway Treatment**

It is considered that greatest enjoyment of the parkways with maximum safety can best be obtained by the use of dual roads each carrying one way traffic. Wide separation on different levels so that the roads are not visible from one another is desirable. Cross connections should be made at opportune intervals. This would allow many more return options than the major loop roads mentioned above.

The advantages of this type of Parkway are many.

The distraction of the driver by opposing traffic and the interruption of the views on the left hand side are eliminated. Head- light glare does not exist. Dust and fumes are cut in half. Slow moving drivers are more safely passed and lateral friction with oncoming cars is done away with. The whole atmosphere is more peaceful.

A greater variety of scenery is presented.

The narrowness of each half of a divided Parkway allows construction to proceed with much less destruction of the natural terrain than if a single wider road were built. However, it is considered advisable to build most of the Parkway as a two lane single road with two way traffic until one complete loop, embracing both the lake and escarpment country, has been completed. A possible exception to this could be the construction of a dual road from Taché Boulevard to Pink Lake or Dunlop’s. This could serve as a preview of future design for the general public.

While it will be some years before the traffic on Gatineau Parkway will justify the construction of dual one way roads, provision for their location should be made in the original design. The Subcommittee can only contemplate with grave concern the desecration of the natural beauty of the wilderness park which would be apparent if an undivided four lane highway were to be constructed through the Park.

The report for the National Capital is quoted: “The development of Gatineau Park if it would involve the construction of wide parkways, large parking spaces, stately hotels and vast places of recreation for big crowds, would mean exactly the destruction of its scenery.”

There are some regional considerations which affect the roadway. The entrance from Taché Boulevard to Dunlop’s and Kingsmere is in lower country with more regular topography. It serves the ski areas and the more heavily used parts of the Park. It will be kept. open during the winter. The traffic will be heavier here than on any other section. The design standards of the Parkway in this Suburban Region should be above the average for the roads in the remainder of’ the Park.

The Parkway through the woodland and Lake Region would be more concerned with presenting the scenery and opening the recreational areas than adhering too closely to design standards. The section along the Escarpment would be almost wholly concerned with the scenic opportunities of the region.

 In construction, vegetative cover should be undisturbed to the greatest possible extent. Where it is disturbed, cover should be quickly re-established: road shoulders, ditches with easy grades, side slopes and meadows should be covered with turf. The remainder, outside the road surfaces, should be clothed with trees and shrubs native to the locality.

On steep slopes where the deposition of heavy rock fill may denude the hillside unduly, toe walls should be constructed. These would retain the rolling rock and flatten the final grade.

Variety should be sought. This will be provided in general by the different types of scenery which the park offers. It should be assisted by vista cutting. For wide panoramic views, a clear-cut opening should be made. For intermediate views, a thinning of trees and under brushing would allow a delightful filtered view. For points of interest within the woods, a light cutting may show a waterfall, a rock face, or some secondary feature.

The element of surprise can be introduced by running the Parkway for a distance through dense woods and suddenly presenting a long spectacular view, where forests are continuous over long stretches, monotony can be prevented by clearing irregular borders along the roadside and converting these openings to turf or low shrubbery.

Crossing from one side of a range of hills to another by means of a saddle or col allows the traveller to observe the difference between the lowlands on either side and increases interest by swinging the view from one side of the car to the other.

Moving the Parkway from low to high levels and back again allows a complete change of aspect.

The occasional use of tunnels, spirals, and through cuts should be encouraged rather than avoided. A few vertical rock walls on both sides are attractive. These features add greatly to the enjoyment and memories of the visitor.

Attempts should be made to disclose spectacular views directly in front of the motorist. These would be ideally presented while travelling on a down grade through a cut or woods. Points of human and historical interest should be created by the restoration and preservation of old villages, mills and similar projects. These and a handicraft centre should be served by the Parkway.

The Parkway will pass through some meadow lands. They are a valuable feature and serve as a foil for the other types of scenery. They will, however, rapidly become overgrown with the natural forest cover unless it is kept constantly in check. Continual mowing and removal of grass, weeds, and brush is too expensive. Rental for pasturage or cropping is advocated.

Most of the original coniferous stands have disappeared. Large plantations of mixed conifers with a scattering of hardwoods for colour effect, and one extensive planting of pure pine, should be made as early as possible along the route which the Parkway is to follow.

**Overlooks, Turnouts and Drinking Fountains**

Adequate places for rest and observation should be provided along the Parkway. In view of the shortness of this drive and the large number of people who will be using it, turnouts or overlooks should be frequently located. Spacing will depend upon views offered and traffic demand.

Considerable care should be taken with the selection of observation points in order that the finest vistas may be presented to the travellers. Curves, grades, and visibility should not carry as much weight in the location of an observation point as the scene itself.

A turnout is simply a widening of the road to provide parking at a strategic point. It makes for traffic hazard and should only be used where space is limited.

An Overlook is a parking area so situated that it commands a major view. The ideal one is separated from the main Parkway by a planting strip, with turf and native trees and is lower in level so that the passing motorist will not have his view obstructed. It is approached and left by roads which are in effect acceleration and deceleration lanes. A raised walk is provided for pedestrians between the car bumpers and the outside curb or retaining wall. Low stone walls are used at the outer edge only at the most dangerous points. Otherwise eight inch rough cut stone curbs are used. Shade trees are provided. The larger overlooks may serve as hubs for hiking trails and may have water, sanitary facilities, and picnic tables placed to one side. Unless the development is extensive enough to support at least a dozen tables, the picnic facilities are better left out.

In order to take advantage of viewpoints which may not be reached by motors, parking areas may be constructed just off the Parkway and trails led in to them.

Aside from the drinking fountains provided at points of concentration, (picnic areas, etc.) fountains may be located at points along the Parkway where natural springs provide gravity flow. These fountains encourage e the motorist to get out of his car, relax for a short time, and enjoy small waterfalls and streams which would have otherwise been missed. A widening of the gravel road shoulder is sufficient stopping place.

 In all cases, parkway signs indicate the rest point well in advance. At the rest point markers give any historical facts and indicate centres of interest. The elevation of the Overlook and the valley are shown.

**Markers**

Markers are used at overlooks and historic spots. In a description, not exceeding a hundred and fifty words, they tell the story of the surroundings. Where rules are necessary, prohibitive wording is to be avoided. An appeal to the reader’s better nature is more effective.

**Picnic Areas**

Picnic spots should be well distributed along the Parkway. They should be set off from the road by access roads. The parking area should be near the entrance to the picnic area. Neither area should be visible from the highway.

 Small groups of tables should not be allowed by the Parkway nor strung out along trails. The area of muss and heavy use should be concentrated. Picnic areas should not be near camp grounds.

**Camping Areas**

Provision should be made at widely separated intervals for travelers with tents or trailers to camp, using their own equipment.

The general treatment should be similar to that given picnic areas except that one way roads laid out in circuits allow motor vehicles in. Each trailer has its own resting place.

 The first of these areas should be not closer than Pink Lake. This would give a striking location close to both the Capital and the hills. In this location local campers would not be permitted. Length of stay would be limited. Camp grounds and trailer parks may be in the same general area but should be separated.

**Concessions**

The park area will be planned to provide recreational and other facilities and must provide the amenities and services required by those who visit it. Such amenities and services and the structures made necessary by them must be conveniently located to serve their purpose but should not be so conspicuous from the parkway as to interfere unduly with the overall natural beauty of the surroundings.

 This policy eliminates distraction of the traveller from the scenery and provides peace and quiet for those using chalets, restaurants, picnic areas, or camping sites.

The location and nature of the above units is considered to rest with the Gatineau Park Advisory Committee. It is recommended that the Commission undertake the construction of all concession buildings and that these be leased to private operators. Qualifications and character should have a large influence on the selection of concessionaires.

Full information concerning policy regarding concessions, as followed by the National Parks Service of the United States and the National Parks Branch of Canada, is on file and more detail can be obtained when required.

Light refreshment stands particularly, should not be erected directly on the Parkway. The confusion arising from stopping and starting traffic and the litter caused from paper, bottles and other debris both at the site and along the road should be prevented. Such stands should be located to serve primarily those points where large numbers of people are on foot rather than the through motorist.

 In view of the relatively short mileage of the Parkway, it is recommended that construction of any gas stations be deferred until the need is demonstrated. Due notice of their absence would be given at Parkway entrances. Park patrols would have access to small supplies for emergencies.

**Bridges and Culverts**

Every effort should be made to make features of the bridges and larger culverts which are visible from the Parkway. The grace of arch spans is preferable to beam or truss construction. The softening of concrete surfaces by stone facing is recommended.

Where the substructure is not seen by the travelling public, it may remain as unadorned steel or concrete with only the balustrade in stone, or well designed open steelwork, allowing clear vision.

On occasion, timber crib abutments and timber beams should be employed. Such examples would demonstrate the methods that served our pioneering forefathers so well. If a typical timber dam and sluiceway could be located nearby, it would add to the picture.

It is recommended that one authentic covered wooden bridge be constructed.

**Spillways**

In most instances it will be possible to allow the water from culverts and catch basins to flow over the land without protection beyond sodding or placement of boulders. Where erosion is apt to take place, the use of timber, or concrete spillways faced with stone when visible, is suggested.

**Parkway Design Standards**

The overall design of the Parkway will be controlled by the following:

1. Necessity of providing access to a large number of scenic areas and features.

1. Safety. The standards adopted should conform to those generally accepted for parkway construction under similar conditions of environment and patrol. Extensive use of certain areas in the winter must be given due consideration.
2. Speed limits. It is recommended that a maximum speed of 40 miles per hour be set and that, where this is not a safe speed, a system of speed zones clearly marked by signs be established. The allowable speed would govern the design standard in the zone. The maximum design speeds are indicated in Table A. These should not be confused with allowable speed. Maximum design speed refers to the speed for which a parkway is designed. For added security and pleasure this may be above the allowable maximum travelling speed.
3. Cost. (a) Original construction; (b) Maintenance.

It is apparent that no one set of standards can be laid down for the roads in the Park, because of the various requirements of traffic, terrain and seasonal use. It is proposed that four classes of roadway be considered, the design standards for which are listed in Table A. SEE MAP.

Class I - Main Parkway from Aylmer Road to Dunlop’s.

Class II - All other sections of the main Parkway.

Class III - Spur and side access roads (e.g. Dunlop Road).

Class IV - Local roads including fire protection trails.

**Engineering Standards**

Grades - See Table A.

Curvature – All curves should be built with spiral transitions and super-elevation designed according to standards which are generally recognized.

Curve Compensation – No compensation is recommended on curves of more than 500’ radius (11-1/2°).On curves sharper than 500’ radius where grade is over 5%, reduce the allowable gradient by 0.5% for each 50’ radius less than 500’.

Side Slopes on Fills – Up to 6’ height – slopes 4 to 1. Over 6’ height – slopes 2 to 1.

Back Slopes – In earth, at least 3 to 1. In part earth and part rock, at least 1 to 1. In rock, as required for sight-distance.

Centre line Marking – Single, white, reflectorized, solid and broken.

**Consistency of Standards**

If a sudden lowering in standard takes place by the introduction of an unusually sharp curve or steep hill, ample advance warning should be given. Consistency is important.

**Table A**

**Design Standards – Roads**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  **Class I** |  **Class II** |  **Class III** |  **Class IV** |
| Maximum Design Speed (For Special Speed Limits see page 12) |  50 |  40 |  35 |  20 |
| Maximum Desirable Grade |  6% |  6% |  6% | As dictated by terrain |
| Occasional Isolated Grade Maximum |  7% |  10o |  20o |  “ |
| Maximum Desirable Curve |  6o |  20o |  30o |  “ |
| Occasional Isolated Curve Maximum |  9o |  20o**\*** | 30o**\*** |  “ |
| Super-elevation |  Maximum for all curves .10’ per foot |
| Surface Width |  24’ | 22’ | 20’ |  12’ |
|  Up to 3’ width on curves  |
| Shoulder Width |  Up to 10’ |  Up to 5’ |  Up to 5’ |  3’ |
| Horizontal and Vertical Sight Distance  | As recommended in “A Policy on Sight Distance for Highways” – American Association of State Highway Officials. Due to terrain this must be liberally interpreted.  |
| Vertical Clearance  | 14’ over pavement. 12-1/2’ over shoulder for all classes. Standard pavement widths should be maintained.  |
| Lateral Clearance  | At least 6’ from right edge of pavements of through traffic lanes to the face of walls, abutments or piers: left edge clearance to a centre pie r or abutment shall not be less than 4-1/2’ for Classes I, II, and III |
| Roadway Width over Bridges and Culverts (Classes I and II only) | For s pans of 20’ or less, including Culverts to carry full width of pavement plus shoulders. For spans of over 20’ to carry full width of pavement plus a minimum of 4’ on each side  |

**\*** Subject to feasibility when final location determined.

In addition to the standards set forth in Table A, the following requirements are proposed:

**Road Surface**

Stage construction is advocated. The first stage would provide a driving surface of stabilized crushed gravel treated with either calcium chloride or liquid bituminous priming material. The second stage would have black top pavement with medium non skid texture.

Due to the high cost of maintaining gravel surfaces, as well as to the dust nuisance, it is desirable that almost all roads used by the public within the Park will ultimately be given some type of all-weather surfacing,

**Guide Rails**

The provision of guide rails must definitely be limited to the more precarious locations. A policy of providing adequate consolidated shoulders for outer edges and lookouts has been found to meet the average situation, and has not increased the incidence of accidents. On the contrary, it would appear that such design leads to improved driving practices.

With the availability of natural stone within Gatineau Park, its use in the construction of guide rails and retaining walls is strongly warranted from the standpoint of maintenance and its affinity to the physical elements of the Park. Where long stretches are necessary, substantial wooden rails bolted to semi-concealed concrete posts are effective, durable, and pleasing in appearance.

Stained timber posts with reflecting squares and a single light steel cable are also useful.

**Signs**

While inspecting the Shenandoah and Blue Ridge Parkways, it was observed that the motorist was largely put on his own good judgment with the minimum of signs and rails to guide him. The result was a remarkably low accident rate.

 If signs were erected on a Parkway through irregular terrain according to Highway Standards, the number required would be so great that their frequency would render them ineffective. The landscape would be cluttered. It is therefore recommended that the only signs placed on the Parkway be:

1. Those denoting speed zones giving the maximum rate for safe driving.
2. Those giving direction at intersections.
3. Those giving advance notice of overlooks, recreation, and historic points.

The general type of sign proposed is that now in use on the Driveways and in Gatineau Park. Signs should be clear, concise and blend well into the locality. Most should be reflectorized for night driving. A symbol for identification of the Parkway may be worked into the design.

**Access and intersections**

The lower entrance to the Parkway from Taché Boulevard should have wide lawns on either side of the roadway flanked by tall trees. Not more than a mile above the Mountain Road an attractive Gate House should be erected between the traffic lanes. Uniformed rangers or police officers would be on duty here to distribute literature, check on traffic volume, answer questions, keep in touch with various parts of the Park and fulfill numerous other duties. To avoid congestion two or three traffic lanes would be built on the north bound or “in” side of the Parkway.

This, together with well designed entrance signs and a high standard of maintenance, would impress the visitor that he is in a rural park and no urban influences should be allowed to mar his enjoyment. His deportment and tidiness throughout his stay will be influenced by this impression.

The entrance sign would inform the motorist concerning speed zones, gas stations and other points. A one-line appeal would request his cooperation. A cross over loop would be constructed just beyond this sign to allow a return.

 There should be no grade intersections between Taché Boulevard and the Mountain Road. At the Mountain Road crossing a grade separation with partial access should be constructed. In general, it is recommended that all intersections with Class I and Class II roads be grade separations and that local connections at such points (partial or informal clover leafs) should be designed to prevent left turns onto the Parkway. All Class I and II and some of Class III roads should have only limited access. All intersections with Class I and Class II roads should be equipped with acceleration and deceleration lanes. (See Parkway Design Standards re: road classifications).

 It would be well to arrange the entry to the Parkway from the upper or Phillips Lake end in such a way that traffic from the Gatineau Highway and other roads would not be encouraged to use the Parkway as a through artery.

The general policy should be that the Parkway is not regarded as providing additional transportation facilities for local people. Objectionable use of the Parkway can be avoided by the use of collection or service roads which pick up the local traffic. It is then taken under the Parkway to previously existing roads by grade separation.

Grade separations are much preferred for all major intersections. Straight “T” or cross intersections with a widened centre strip should be used at picnic area and minor access points. Traffic circles are advisable only where a multiple number of roads must be sorted out. Traffic lights are foreign to Parkways.

The Parkway motorist should feel that once on the Parkway he is free of the annoyance of side entrances. Intersections should be allowed only after every other alternative has been explored. The elimination of private ownership within the general park boundaries would greatly lessen this problem.

The Parkway should always be considered the dominating road.

**Order of Construction**

Gatineau Park is close to the city. It has much to offer to the many visitors to the nation’s Capital. Yet its beauty and opportunities for recreation are still relatively inaccessible to the outsider. It is recommended that the construction of the Parkway be undertaken with the utmost vigour at the earliest possible time and that the whole project, at least to Parts I, II, III and IV listed be Low, be pressed to an early completion.

Should it be necessary to construct the Parkway over a period of years, the following order is suggested :

1. Taché Boulevard to the vicinity Dunlop’s Road.
2. (a) From Dunlop’s, west through the hills to the first area of the escarpment having a quarter of a mile of unobstructed view.

(b) From Dunlop’s along the valley of the lakes to the head of Phillips Lake.

Stages 2(a) and 2(b) are considered of equal importance.

1. From the head of Phillips Lake along the escarpment to the overlook in 2(a).
2. From the overlook above via Kingsmere to Pink Lake.
3. From the head of Phillips Lake to Lac Lapeche area.

**Headquarters Buildings and Service Yards**

The accessibility of the two arms of the Parkway to the Old Chelsea area indicates this to be the logical location for the Headquarters Building. Farther north this accessibility is not obtainable until the far end of Phillips Lake is reached. The proposed location is near Ottawa; it is in the middle of the most heavily used section of the Park and it is within twenty miles of the farthest boundaries.

A screened service yard and buildings with a separate truck entrance would be located within a convenient distance. Planting would screen this area.

 Additional garage and storage space will be necessary in the north western part of the Park to reduce the travelling time to and from jobs.

**Communications and Electric Power**

For the convenience of the public and the efficient administration of the Parkway, electric power and telephone services should be available at all major points. For patrol purposes intermediate telephone stations should be established.

Where service lines are close to the Parkway, they should be screened or placed underground. In building groups, services should be underground, where high powered transmission lines cross the Parkway, long spans between towers should be insisted upon and the towers should be carefully located to ensure the least possible distraction from the scenery. In no case should wooden poles be permitted.

As the Parkway develops, all major points and officials’ cars should be connected by radio. In addition to everyday usefulness, this would provide insurance against line trouble at critical times.

**Patrols**

Patrolling of the Parkway should be by the RCMP and must be adequate. Park regulations and traffic laws should be as few as possible. Traffic laws should be strictly enforced.

**First Aid Stations**

The St. John Ambulance Association should be asked to provide the technical personnel. A suitable grant from the Commission might be made to cover expenses. A station in the vicinity of Old Chelsea should be the first consideration, as this would take care of hiking and skiing casualties, as well as those occurring on either loop of the Parkway. The hospitals in Hull will serve that section of the Parkway close to town and the Memorial Hospital in Wakefield will be available in the northeast. Later it may prove necessary to have a first aid station at the point where the Parkway from Lac Lapeche joins the Parkway over the Eardley escarpment. This will, probably be in the vicinity of Taylor Lake, and will serve near-drowning cases both at Phillips Lake and Lac Lapeche, as well as road accidents.

**Regulations**

It is recommended that a set of traffic regulations be prepared to cover the operation of the Parkway.

A copy of the “National Parks Act and Regulations Relating to National Parks” has been placed in the Commission’s library for reference on this and other points. It is felt that two items of policy should be touched upon.

**Motor Vehicles**

It is recommended that vehicles whose primary purpose is to provide recreation for passengers be permitted to use the Parkway. Whatever may be the objections to buses and trucks, and they are many, it is felt that, within reason, no one should be denied the enjoyment of the Park because he has not the means to own a private passenger vehicle. However, in the interests of safety, any person entering the Park by vehicle should be seated on a seat which is firmly attached to the vehicle and acceptable to the Park authorities. Notwithstanding, no vehicle or practice shall be permitted inconsistent with the provincial laws, where they apply.

Trucks bearing dead loads and buses should be rigidly excluded from running through the Park between two outside points.

**Tolls**

It is a generally accepted practice that, beyond those services supplied by municipal Parks, the citizens who make personal use of parks and parkways should make a direct contribution to their upkeep. Payment fosters greater appreciation of services and respect for property. It would, therefore, be in order to make a moderate toll charge, after at least twenty-five miles of parkway are in service and adequate check points have been established.

**Land Ownership**

While the exact route of the Parkway has not yet been established, its general direction has now been pretty well determined and it is evident that it will cross considerable land now privately owned.

In recommending the route of the Parkway the committee should be governed only by such scenic, engineering, and other considerations as will result in the best possible route without regard to privately owned land and building.

When the committee recently visited the United States to study park and parkway development, they discussed the question of privately owned land and buildings in National Parks, not only with officials from the Washington office of the National Parks Service, but also with engineers, landscape architects and park superintendents working in the field.

Opinion was emphatic and unanimous that it had proved to be impossible to properly develop a project of this character unless all privately owned land and buildings within the boundaries of the park, interior or exterior, were acquired.

Some of the reasons follow:

Private ownership will involve: complicated boundaries, making the game warden’s job difficult; increased expenditure for grade separations and access roads; construction of unsightly parallel service roads, unreasonable fencing costs; elimination of some of the finest sites from public use.

Private ownership will bring uncontrolled subdivision of land, with the probability of jerry-built houses, neon signs, plastic palaces, amusement parks, stock car speedways, questionable “Tourist Accommodations.” Subdivision means greatly increased population which leads to organization of pressure groups to request increased services, scheduled bus lines, additional winter ploughing, and many special privileges. Pressure groups inevitably create difficult situations between park authorities and the administrations of the municipalities and the province. Private ownership will be accompanied by disregard for park laws, and vandalism. Weekend visitors will be frustrated when coming across private holdings. Owners will resent infiltration and will resist the construction of Park developments near their boundaries. Fire hazards and fire protection costs will be greater. Dogs cannot be controlled. Conservation of wild life will be hampered.

These are only a few of the reasons for the elimination of private ownership

Newton B. Drury, when director of the National Park Service of the USA wrote:

Though these inholdings represent only two and three quarter percent of the gross area of the system, the handicap they impose is out of all proportion to their extent, and the problem they create is one of the most serious facing the National Park Service.

Probably the greatest hazards are those which we cannot now foresee. It is axiomatic that a small incongruity can deface a lot of beauty. A classic example is the plate glass auto showroom complete with fluorescent painted paper streamers. This advertising, by its presence adjacent to the Pretoria Bridge, represents a blotch on the entire Ottawa Driveway System which does not go unnoticed or unmentioned by a large percentage of our visitors. Lack of foresight in acquiring or controlling that property should serve as a continuing example of what could happen to a disastrous extent if all land within the boundaries of the Park is not acquired and controlled.

Every mile of the Parkway which is built increases the value of the private lands towards which it reaches. Delay can provide no gain.

The Committee strongly recommends that all lands within the general boundaries of Gatineau Park be acquired for public ownership. Properties required for specific, major projects, should be obtained by clear purchase. It is obvious that steps should be taken immediately to prevent further settlement or building development before outright purchase can be made.

**Land Leases**

All properties within the general boundaries of the Park, not required for specific, major projects, should be acquired by purchase with consideration being given to the present legitimate owners even to the extent of lifetime occupancy as a tenant of facilities in their existing condition. The tenant would necessarily maintain and operate the property under such safeguards as the Commission might require.

In the projects visited in the United States a considerable amount of farm land had been purchased by the government and incorporated in the projects visited in interior valleys. The policy is to lease this back to private owners with preference to the original settlers or their descendents.

Very strict control is exercised. Attached to each lease is a carefully worked-out schedule indicating what crops may be grown, the type of stock to be raised, crop rotation, etc., all of which is worked out under advice from the Department of Agriculture. Consideration might be given to similar leasing methods when the question of farm land treatment is dealt with.

**Committee Procedure**

The Parkway Subcommittee held its first meeting on November 27, 1952. Since that time it has met frequently, for extended periods and with excellent attendance, A number of visits were also made to many parts of Gatineau Park so that the Committee was able to become familiar with the varied geographical features of the Park and its environs and to study, firsthand, many of the practical problems that will be encountered in developing an exemplary Parkway system.

The Committee first prepared a draft report covering their preliminary ideas on the development of the Parkway based on their general experience and observations, including that of the present Federal District Commission Parkways and many of the National Parks of Canada. During this period Mr. Jacques Gréber met with the Subcommittee.

The Committee then proceeded to the USA and spent eight days studying National Parks and Parkways extending from Washington, DC, through Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee, to Knoxville; and including the Recreation Areas of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

 The trip was made under the auspices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, USA, whose large staff gave unstintingly of their time and advice on Park matters throughout the visit.

During this inspection trip, the Committee was divided into study groups of two men, with each group being made responsible, in particular, for two or more different phases of the investigation and upon which each group subsequently made reports. The group reports were then reviewed in detail and approved by the entire Committee.

These group reports which we consider important in relation to this work were assembled and forwarded to you on December 1, 1953, additional copies being available. A classified album of appropriate photographs taken during the inspection trip has been placed in the Commission’s Library and is also available for study.

The Committee then reviewed and rewrote the draft report using as a checking medium the factual data on construction and operation gathered in the USA, the subsequent visits to various parts of the Park, aerial photographs which had become available, preliminary engineering studies made by the staff of the Federal District Commission, and other reference material.

The result, to an extent, of this effort is the “General Report of the Parkway Subcommittee for Gatineau Park, Part I.”

The Subcommittee is made up almost entirely of professional men, each of whom contributed substantially to the preparation of the report. Reconciliation of the various viewpoints on the many subjects covered was not simple. The report, therefore, can be considered as a factual recommendation, by a disinterested group, with a conception of National character in mind, as outlined in its Preface.

The Committee would be pleased to make any amplification necessary for the consideration of this report.

**Recommendation**

In the interest of attaining the greatest potential development of Gatineau Park, the Committee urges that the foregoing recommendations be adopted.
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