

From: Dino Capuani

Re: Planned Development for 12972, 12878, 12966, 12958 HIGHWAY 27 & 15 WELLINGTON STREET
TOWNSHIP OF KING (NOBLETON)

File No: Z-2022-07

Request to conduct a more comprehensive traffic study:

Traffic data does not contain provisions for the increase of vehicle traffic from maturing residents. Primarily in the 15 – 24 year age groups. Extrapolating data from the 2021 Census survey for the Township of King. There is approximately 878 people that fall within the 15 – 24 year age group. Assuming, 50% of this population will acquire their driver's license and obtain their own vehicles. This means that there will be an additional 439 vehicles on the roads within the next 1 to 5 years.

A recommendation to conduct a more comprehensive traffic study is warranted with the inclusion of above-mentioned data. Considering that the 2030 future total intersection capacity, Table 5-2: 2030 Future Total Intersection Capacity Analysis – Nextrans Transportation Impact Study, illustrates that seven roads way are at a LOS rating of E and F.

It would be prudent to understand how the additional traffic volume will impact these ratings. And impact the surrounding arterial residential roadways. As there will be a potential to use the residential roadways as alternative paths to avoid the increase in traffic. Therefore, a recommendation to conduct a more comprehensive traffic study is requested.

Question:

9.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

“The resulting net auto trip generation for the proposed development will yield 69 trips (21 in, 48 out) and 107 trips (61 in, 46 out) in the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.”

Question: How is it possible to have such limited in and out traffic when there is a proposed 169 units with 211 residential parking spaces allotted?

Argument: 1.25 parking spaces per residential unit is the basis for parking space determination. Considering there is no public transit available. It is reasonable to assume that analysis of traffic flow in and out of the proposed development should consider 211 vehicles. “61 in trips” at peak PM hours represents 29% of all the potential vehicles for the proposed development. Therefore, it is logical to suggest that traffic volume must be higher than projected.

Question:

What provision is Township of King considering in order to prevent left turn traffic into the proposed condo complex from Highway 27 northbound lane?

Letter from Ainley Group to Colin Parks, Township of King. “1. Introduction: a right-in / right-out / **left-in access may be considered at the site access on Highway 27** given the site access is located within the northbound left turn lane/taper area of the intersection of Highway 27 / King Road.”

Question:

What provision is the Township of King considering for accommodating the increase left turn vehicle traffic onto Ellis Ave from Highway 27?

Question:

What provision will the Township of King implement to mitigate the safety risks to pedestrian and cyclist traffic if this development is approved for construction?

Taking into consideration that Ellis Ave., Wellington St., Faris Ave., Kinsley St., Henry Gate do not have pedestrian sidewalks. Meaning roadways are shared by motor vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclist. Coupled with poor street illumination. There inherently becomes an increase of risk to safety to the pedestrian traffic with the increase of vehicle traffic to the residential roadways.

Question:

Was there any provision, to development plans, to expropriate land for future expansion of Highway 27?

* If not, what are the plans for ultimately requiring expanding Highway 27 and potentially King Road?

According to York Region's 10-Year Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program Map. There are no projects to enhance roads ways and transit within the Township of King.

Supporting information:

Planned and scheduled regional road and transit improvement projects can be found on the Region's 10-Year Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program Map. A copy of the map can be found on the Region's website via the link address below:

<https://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/roads/roadconstructionschedule/roadimprovementandconstructionprojects/>

No planned public transit plan for Township of King within the York Region 2051 plans.

Question: What is officially planned in the York Region 2051 road map for potential road improvement? Does it include widening the existing roadways?

2051 Road map indicates potential road improvements for Highway 27 to King Road and King Rd from Highway 27 to 400 highway.

Future long-term road and transit improvements can be obtained from Region's Transportation Master Plan. A copy of the documents can be downloaded by following the link below:

<http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/yorkregion/yr/plansreportsandstrategies/transportationmasterplan/transportationmasterplan>

Question: Regarding the statement below, does it not contradict the recommendation from Nextrans to convert the exclusive northbound right turn lane in to a northbound through right lane?

Email from James Szeto to John Nhan Subject RE: Terms of Reference - 12966 Highway 27, Nobleton, Township of King, York Region - Transportation Impact Study

“Any access onto a Regional Road, including affected intersections nearby, shall provide exclusive turn lanes, designed to Regional standards.”

Question: Regarding the statement below, does it not disallow the traffic in/out access on to Wellington St.?

Email from James Szeto to John Nhan Subject RE: Terms of Reference - 12966 Highway 27, Nobleton, Township of King, York Region - Transportation Impact Study

Based on the proposed site plan included with the ToR, the Region does not support a full-moves access onto Highway 27 due to potential counter left turns from the site access and Old King Road. **Note that the Region does not normally permit off-set accesses to adjacent existing streets.** Therefore, access onto Highway 27 shall be restricted to Right-In/Right-Out.

The recommendation to make the right turn lane on Highway 27 Straight through Ln., in my opinion, will have minimal effect on resolving the density issue. As it quickly turns into a merge lane. Which will ultimately slow down traffic.

Point of clarification:

The submitted proposal information from Nextrans to York Region does not align with the proposed plan submitted to the Township of King. Number of units and parking space do not correlate to the proposed plans.

Question: How does the discrepancy of 12 residential units and 15 parking spaces effect the traffic results?

Appendix B – Terms of Reference

Shahid Matloob, York Region Clement Sin, Township of King

Terms of Reference – Transportation Impact Study

Page 2 “... introduce one (1) six (6)-storey building consisting of **157 residential dwelling units** and 374.3m² (4,028.9ft²) of at-grade commercial retail space and one (1) building addition to the existing heritage building consisting of amenity space for the residential units within the building addition and 160.8m² (1,730.8ft²) of at-grade commercial retail space within the heritage building. A vehicular parking provision of **229 spaces** is proposed at-grade and within two levels of underground parking levels”

Point of clarification:

TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT & STUDY HORIZON YEAR

The study will focus on weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic operations. Synchro version 10 will be used to assess intersection operations during the peak hours. A five (5)-year horizon after the assumed full buildout year of 2024 will be assessed in this Transportation Impact Study for the year 2029.

Question: How does the discrepancy in the time period effect the traffic results?

Question: Have alternate sites been considered for these types of low-rise developments?

As a suggestion, Old King Road seems to provide a more desirable area for low-rise development.

- Traffic would be able to enter and exist the site with current road configuration with little impact to surrounding residential roadways.
- Building would not impact surrounding residential homes as it would be adjacent to the Community centre.
- Residents would have easier access to the Community centre and park lands.
- Building would be set back and provide less visually obstruction compared to the proposed site.