

Meeting Notes

Project: Mississauga Road, Old Main Street, Bush Street, Winston Churchill Boulevard and Olde Base Line Road EA

Subject: **Community Working Group (CWG) Meeting #3**

Meeting Date & Time: Wednesday, October 16, 2013, 6:30 p.m.

Location: Belfountain Community Centre
17204 Main Street, Belfountain

Prepared by: Veronica Restrepo and Sue Cumming

Attendees: [REDACTED] – CWG Member
[REDACTED] – CWG member (represented by [REDACTED] at the beginning of the meeting)
[REDACTED] – CWG Member
[REDACTED] – CWG Member
[REDACTED] – CWG Member
Allan Thompson – Regional Councillor, Town of Caledon Ward 2
Doug Beffort – Area Councillor, Town of Caledon Ward 1
Lori-Ann Thomsen – Region of Peel (Observer)
Steve Ganesh – Region of Peel
Gino Dela Cruz – Region of Peel
Sue Cumming – Facilitator, Cumming and Company
Tyrone Gan – HDR, Consultants
Veronica Restrepo – HDR, Consultants

Regrets: [REDACTED] – CWG member
[REDACTED] – CWG Member
[REDACTED] – CWG Member
Richard Paterak – Regional Councillor, Town of Caledon Ward 1
Asha Saddi – Region of Peel

Distribution: All

	Item
1.0	Welcome, Introductions and Purpose of Meeting
1.1	<p>Sue Cumming introduced the project team from the Region of Peel and the Consultant, and explained the purpose of the meeting. Brief roundtable introductions were made by all CWG members and observers.</p> <p>It was noted that all CWG members received the draft presentation ahead of the meeting, and although there was a lot of background information in the slides, the focus of the meeting would be the recommended designs. The project team plans to present the road profile, cross-sections and plans for each of the roads. The goal of the meeting is to receive feedback on the recommended designs along with alternatives considered.</p> <p>This information will be reviewed with the public at the Public Information Centre (PIC) scheduled for November 20, 2013. Sue Cumming advised that the format of this meeting has been designed to allow maximum opportunity for residents and stakeholders to look at large plans and understand the recommended design for each area. It will be an Open House format allowing people to drop in anytime between 4:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m. to view the plans and discuss ideas and concerns with the project team. This is an excellent format for providing the level of detailed information that is being presented and ensuring that residents and stakeholders can have one on one review of the information. CWG members were encouraged to provide advice on any of the materials and large plans being reviewed today and other information that would be helpful to have available for the PIC.</p> <p>It was further noted that this would be the last CWG meeting for the study and the upcoming Public Information Centre (PIC) is the last scheduled.</p>
2.0	Truck Routes
2.1	<p>A continuing concern of CWG members is the implication of the Strategic Goods Movement Networks Study and use of area roads by trucks. Before presenting the recommended designs, truck routes were discussed. CWG members asked if the proposed design recommendations being presented today would bring the roads up to “truck route standards”. The project team clarified that the designs would bring the roads up to Regional standards and provide safe roads for all modes. It was reiterated that the Strategic Goods Movement Network Study proposed roads as potential future routes, and would require further investigation before any given road can be designated as a truck route and its truck restrictions are modified.</p>
3.0	Project Recap, Alternative Solutions, Evaluation Results and What is Being Recommended
3.1	<p>Key design principles to guide the design options were presented. The preferred designs aim to accommodate the existing mix of traffic while maintaining the rolling terrain, retaining the rural character of the area, and minimizing impact to adjacent properties and landscapes. The project team re-emphasized the importance of the</p>

	design principles that have been developed with public input and that these contributed to the how the recommended designs were developed.
3.2	<p>Speed Reductions proposed throughout the study area. Speed reductions are proposed throughout the study area to address deficient stopping sight distance and driveway sightlines while minimizing changes to the existing vertical profiles. Proposed posted speeds are as follows (design speeds are 10km/h higher than posted speeds):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village: keep at 40km/h with 50km/h transition towards Bush Street and Old Main Street • Mississauga Road: keep at 60km/h between Caledon Mountain Drive and The Grange, and lower from 70km/h to 60km h from The Grange to Olde Base Line Road • Bush Street: lower from 80km/h to 70km/h between Winston Churchill Boulevard and just west of Shaws Creek • Winston Churchill Boulevard: keep at 60km/h between Bush Street and Sideroad 10; lower from 70km/h to 60km/h from Sideroad 10 to Olde Base Line Road (also consistent with 60km/h posted speed for Winston Churchill Boulevard south of Olde Base Line Road as per approved Environmental Study Report) • Olde Base Line Road: lower from 60km/h to 50km/h from Winston Churchill Boulevard to Mississauga Road <p>These speed reductions would improve safety for all road users, including motorists, cyclists and pedestrians, and are expected to reduce the number and severity of collisions involving wildlife. In general, CWG members are supportive of the proposed speed reductions. Several members commented that although the speed reduction is good, enforcement will continue to be an issue and wondered whether stop signs at intersections are being considered. The project team advised that the traffic volumes do not warrant stop signs. CWG members would like to see more enforcement on the roads.</p> <p>It was suggested that the public information materials should show the changes in travel times associated with the proposed reduction of speed limits for different segments of the study area.</p>
4.0	<p>Recommended Designs for each of the roads</p> <p>The project team presented the recommended designs for each of the roads and other alternatives that were considered. The group discussed potential modifications to the preferred options.</p>
4.1	Bush Street (Winston Churchill Boulevard to Shaws Creek)
4.1.1	<p><u>Profile</u></p> <p>In general, there are no profile changes proposed along this segment of the study area.</p>

	A CWG member asked what this meant with respect to resurfacing. The project team advised that full reconstruction is recommended.
4.1.2	<p><u>Cross-section</u></p> <p>Cross-section options for Bush Street west of Shaws Creek were presented. In general, the wider right-of-way (ROW) at this location allows for a rural option. The preferred option is the 11.4m platform rural option, with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m paved shoulders to accommodate active transportation and adequate ditches on both sides. The buffer between the travel lane and paved shoulder would be pavement line markings, and the shoulders would be signed as a cycling route through the use of signed posts (pavement would not be marked specifically for cyclists). Pavement markings would also be used at the edge of the shoulder. Various CWG opinions were shared about views on the effectiveness for cyclists of buffers vs. white strips. It was noted by some members that a buffer would be nice to have but not essential. A further question was noted about whether the road width could be reduced to 3.3 metres. The project team advised that the TAC standards are 3.5m. for a posted speed of 60k/hr.</p>
4.1.3	<p><u>Plan</u></p> <p>A plan showing the extent of the grading impacts corresponding to the recommended design was presented. In general, all impacts are within the existing ROW, and localized improvements will be considered at the locations where impacts extend beyond the existing ROW.</p>
4.2	Winston Churchill Boulevard (Bush Street to Olde Base Line Road)
4.2.1	<p><u>Profile</u></p> <p>The proposed profile for this segment includes subtle changes to the existing vertical profile in order to minimize impacts to the rolling terrain while maintaining a reasonable design speed. Proposed profile changes include raising the profile at The Grange. A CWG member asked if a retaining wall was considered with natural stone instead of a cut. The project team indicated that this will be considered and reemphasized the subtle change with a 60k/hr posted speed.</p>
4.2.2	<p><u>Cross-section</u></p> <p>Cross-section options for Winston Churchill Boulevard were presented. The preferred option is the 11.4m platform rural option, with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m paved shoulders, and adequate ditches on both sides. However, the existing ROW along Winston Churchill Boulevard is relatively narrow and a rural cross-section would result in significant impacts to adjacent properties and natural/culturally significant landscapes. Where the landscape is constrained (by features such as trees and fences, for example), an 11.4m platform, semi-rural cross-section (with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m mountable curbs and underground drainage infrastructure) would be preferred. Both options would accommodate active transportation.</p> <p>CWG members asked what percentage of the road would be rural and what</p>

	<p>percentage would be semi-rural with a mountable curb. The project team was still in the process of assessing the corridors and will present this level of detail at the upcoming PIC. It was suggested to show pictures of mountable curbs at the PIC for the public to visualize what the design will look like. Some CWG members are not in favour of mountable curbs and don't like the look of them. Most agree, however, that a semi-rural cross-section would be a good compromise between providing an adequate road design for all users and minimizing impacts.</p>
<p>4.2.3</p>	<p><u>Plan</u></p> <p>A plan showing the extent of the grading impacts corresponding to both cross-section options was presented. The project team will further evaluate both options and determine the location where each cross-section option is recommended, and the recommended design (likely a combination of rural and semi-rural) will be presented at the upcoming PIC. Localized improvements will also be considered where impacts extend beyond the existing ROW.</p>
<p>4.3 Mississauga Road (Olde Base Line Road to north of Caledon Mountain Drive)</p>	
<p>4.3.1</p>	<p><u>Profile</u></p> <p>The proposed profile for this segment includes subtle changes to the existing vertical profile in order to minimize impacts to the rolling terrain while maintaining a reasonable design speed. Proposed profile changes include raising /lowering driveways at some locations, but these changes are not drastic.</p>
<p>4.3.2</p>	<p><u>Cross-section</u></p> <p>Cross-section options for Mississauga Road were presented. The preferred option is the 11.4m platform rural option, with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m paved shoulders, and adequate ditches on both sides. However, the existing ROW along Mississauga Road is relatively narrow (around 20m, with a designated 30m ROW in the Official Plan), and a rural cross-section would result in significant impacts to adjacent properties and natural/culturally significant landscapes. Where the landscape is constrained (by features such as cemeteries, trees and fences, for example), an 11.4m platform semi-rural cross-section (with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m mountable curbs and underground drainage infrastructure) would be preferred, similar to Winston Churchill Boulevard. Both options would accommodate active transportation.</p> <p>It was noted that due to the narrower, constrained ROW, Mississauga Road is more likely to have longer segments of semi-rural cross-section (and shorter rural cross-section segments) compared to Winston Churchill Boulevard. More details will be presented at the upcoming PIC.</p> <p>Some CWG members suggested designing rural cross-sections with narrower lanes (to reduce footprint and avoid the need for a semi-rural option) and post at lower speeds than currently being proposed.</p>
<p>4.3.3</p>	<p><u>Plan</u></p> <p>A plan showing the extent of the grading impacts corresponding to both cross-section</p>

options was presented. The project team will further evaluate both options and determine the location where each cross-section option is recommended, and the recommended design (likely a combination of rural and semi-rural) will be presented at the upcoming PIC. Localized improvements will also be considered where impacts extend beyond the existing ROW. For example, at the pond north of The Grange, special design considerations will be taken into account and a semi-rural cross-section at this location could allow the mountable curb to drain water away from the pond, while a rural cross-section on the other side of the street would provide a ditch. Concerns were noted about how the design would be developed to take in to account for ponds and other features close to the road. The project team confirmed that this would be the approach taken and that options would be reviewed with property owners.

4.4. Olde Base Line Road (Winston Churchill Boulevard to Mississauga Road)

4.4.1 Profile

The proposed profile for this segment includes some significant changes to the existing vertical profile. The project team has tried to minimize elevation changes at all driveways, while also minimizing impacts to adjacent landscapes and providing a safe road for all users. The proposed profile, in combination with a reduction in the posted speed limit, attempts to balance all impacts and trade-offs.

It was suggested to produce cross-sections for locations of deep cuts/fills. It was noted that a lot of the cuts occur in bedrock areas. If fills are minimized and cuts are increased, it would create an interesting landscape to drive through.

It was noted that the rolling profile along Olde Base Line Road results in conflicts with cyclists as they slowly move up the hill, creating a greater speed differential with motorists and making it dangerous to share the lane. It is therefore important to provide a bike lane or shoulder. This is reflected in the cross-section options presented.

CWG members asked if the Niagara Escarpment Commission had been consulted about cut and fill. The project team confirmed that the NEC was involved through the Technical Advisory Committee and their input is being sought.

A further question was noted as to how individual property owners would be able to provide input and whether the project team would be receptive to changes to accommodate fences and trees. It was noted that an exaggerated profile will be shown at the PIC on November 20 to illustrate what is proposed and to discuss fences and trees with property owners. The project team advised that meetings could also occur with property owners when the design is 60 to 90% complete to review the design, options to accommodate specific conditions and to discuss mitigation.

4.4.2 Cross-section

Cross-section options for Olde Base Line Road were presented. The preferred option is the 11.4m platform rural option, with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m paved shoulders, and adequate ditches on both sides. However, the existing ROW along Winston

	<p>Churchill Boulevard is relatively narrow, and a rural cross-section would result in significant impacts to adjacent properties and natural/culturally significant landscapes. Where the landscape is constrained (by features such as trees and fences, for example), an 11.4m platform semi-rural cross-section (with two 3.5m wide lanes, 1.7m mountable curbs and underground drainage infrastructure) would be preferred. Both options would accommodate active transportation.</p> <p>Similarly to Mississauga Road, it was noted that due to the narrower, constrained ROW, Olde Base Line Road is more likely to have longer segments of semi-rural cross-section (and shorter rural cross-section segments) compared to Winston Churchill Boulevard. More details will be presented at the upcoming PIC.</p>
<p>4.4.3</p>	<p><u>Plan</u></p> <p>A plan showing the extent of the grading impacts corresponding to both cross-section options was presented. The plan also illustrates subtle shifts to the road centreline to centre the road within the existing ROW. This would maximize utilization of the existing ROW and minimize impacts on either side of the road.</p> <p>The study team will further evaluate both cross-section options and determine the location where each cross-section option is recommended, and the recommended design (likely a combination of rural and semi-rural) will be presented at the upcoming PIC. Localized improvements will also be considered where impacts extend beyond the existing ROW.</p> <p>Questions about roundabouts were noted and why these are not being recommended. This discussion is referenced in section 5.0 of the CWG meeting notes.</p>
<p>4.5</p>	<p>Belfountain Village</p>
<p>4.5.1</p>	<p><u>Profile</u></p> <p>In general, there are no profile changes proposed along this segment.</p>
<p>4.5.2</p>	<p><u>Cross-section</u></p> <p>Due to the uniqueness of the village area, cross-section options for various locations along Bush Street and Mississauga Road/Old Main Street through the village were presented. In general, the existing ROW is narrow and constrained compared to the rest of the study area. All options presented include 3.3m wide travel lanes. The project team welcomed suggestions for modifications to the cross-sections that were presented, that would further accommodate all road users through this area. The project team will look at these options more closely and revise the designs through this area.</p> <p>Bush Street approx. 300 m east of Shaws Creek</p> <p>The available ROW at this location is approx. 12 m. Three options were presented: sidewalks on either side; shoulders on either side; or narrow buffer on one side and parking on the other side. A sidewalk with a rollover curb was suggested, but the project team pointed out safety concerns. It was questioned whether sidewalks/shoulders are required on both sides of the street. In order to better</p>

accommodate active transportation through the portion of the study area experiencing the highest volume of cyclists and pedestrians, it is recommended to have shoulders/sidewalks on both side of the street. The second option, with shoulders on either side, more closely matches existing conditions.

Bush Street approx. 200 m west of Mississauga Road /Old Main Street

The available ROW at this location is approx. 10.5 m. Two options were presented: sidewalk on one side and no Active Transportation (AT) facility on the other side; or narrower buffer/shoulder on both sides. The second option, with buffer/shoulders on either side, more closely matches existing conditions. It was pointed out that due to the school zone on the south side, it might make sense to have a full sidewalk on the south side of the street. CWG members asked whether input has been received from the community regarding their preference for sidewalks. Through consultation to date, there are mixed opinions. From a policy perspective, it makes sense to accommodate pedestrians through the village, where the highest pedestrian volumes occur. The project team noted that the sidewalk design, look, and material are open to suggestions.

Bush Street approx. 60 m west of Mississauga Road /Old Main Street

The available ROW at this location is approx. 9.0 m. Two options were presented: narrow buffer on one side and no AT facility on the other side; or narrower buffer/shoulder on both sides. The second option, with buffer/shoulders on either side, more closely matches existing conditions.

Mississauga Road /Old Main Street approx. 85 m south of Bush Street

The available ROW at this location is approx. 13.3 m. Only one option was presented: 2.25 m paved shoulder on either side. This shoulder would provide space for active transportation, and might accommodate parking. CWG members suggested modifying this design to provide adequate parking on one side, and a sidewalk or multi-use trail on the other. Having parking at this location is important, but so is having safe, separate space to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists through this segment of the village. Sidewalks in this area are noted to be very important. Multi-use pathways are also considered to be very attractive for all users and for connections to the village.

Mississauga Road /Old Main Street approx. 275 m south of Bush Street (east of the community centre)

The available ROW at this location is approx. 8.0 m. Only one option was presented: narrow paved shoulder on either side. In order to accommodate an adequate sidewalk, widening to the south (but still within the existing ROW) would be required. It was suggested to bury hydro lines along this segment to maximize the available space available, or move the hydro poles onto people's lawns through the pinch point area. It was also suggested to hang the sidewalk as a cantilever over the existing retaining wall, but this creates a safety issue as pedestrians would be on the inner curve and sightlines are not adequate. It was further suggested to connect the sidewalk on either side of the pinch point with a trail behind the existing buildings; this might be a

challenge because of the marsh area at that location, but could be further investigated. It was noted that there is a tree buffer between the road and hydro corridor north of Caledon Mountain Drive. CWG members recommended that these options be considered and noted the importance of sidewalks and multi-use trails along the road in this location. Conflicts with cyclists were also highlighted as needed more review in the development of designs.

5.0 Roundabouts

Although roundabouts are no longer being considered for the study area, roundabout concepts for Mississauga Road /Olde Base Line Road, Winston Churchill Boulevard/Olde Base Line Road, and Winston Churchill Boulevard /Bush Street were discussed.

CWG members asked why roundabouts are no longer being proposed, as they would slow down motorists and have the potential to reduce the number of collisions. The project team recognizes the safety benefits of roundabouts, but there are significant impacts associated with them. In addition to their large footprint and impact to adjacent properties/landscapes, they would require profile adjustments beyond those currently being proposed by the team. Roundabouts would also result in a safety concern for cyclists, as it is difficult to accommodate them through a roundabout in rural settings. An off-street cycle path was suggested, but cyclists in this area tend to stay on or closer to the street. CWG members suggested consulting with local cyclist groups and the project team noted that there has been consultation with several groups in the area.

There are other safety mitigation measures that can be implemented in the study area, such as reducing speed limits, and removing/relocating obstacles like overgrown vegetation and guiderail at some locations.

CWG members noted that roundabouts might encourage traffic to divert. This study is not looking to divert traffic or change traffic patterns in the area. Policies to encourage roundabouts as a means of creating a network of roundabouts throughout the Region of Peel are also not a guiding principle for this study.

For the Mississauga Road /Olde Base Line Road intersection, it was suggested to have the posted speed transition from 60 to 70km/h south of Olde Base Line Road, rather than at the intersection. It was also suggested to consider 4-way stops at this intersection, as this would force motorists to stop. It was pointed out that some motorists already stop at this intersection due to misinterpretation of the yellow beacon.

6.0 Other Design Details

6.1 Lane Widths

CWG members asked why the lanes outside the village are 3.5m wide instead of 3.2-3.3m, as narrower lanes would reduce impacts to adjacent properties at constrained locations, in addition to encourage lower speeds. The project team referred to Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) standards, which stipulate a minimum

	lane width for a specific posted speed and range of traffic volumes.
6.2	<p><u>Paved Shoulder Design</u></p> <p>It was asked if there was any evidence of the effectiveness of a wider buffer compared to pavement line markings. The Consultant explained that a buffer is nice to have, but it would not be required due to the proposed speed reductions.</p>
6.3	<p><u>Pavement Design</u></p> <p>CWG members asked if the proposed designs would require full depth reconstruction, or resurfacing only. The design recommends a combination of the two, based on the geotechnical assessment recommendations, proposed profile changes, and type of cross-section.</p>
6.4	<p><u>Drainage</u></p> <p>It was questioned whether a mountable curb or full ditch are really required. The team explained these are required to provide adequate drainage. Existing conditions do not allow to adequately drain the road. Although the drainage details are still being looked at, there is no proposed storm water management pond.</p>
6.5	<p><u>Cut and Fill</u></p> <p>CWG members asked if natural stone retaining walls were considered instead of cuts. The Consultant explained that where significant grading impacts exist as a result of the proposed cross-section and profile adjustments, retaining walls will be considered as an alternative.</p>
6.6	<p><u>Design Level of Detail</u></p> <p>CWG members asked what level of detail would be provided in the designs though the EA. The project project team explained that the EA would complete the design to 30%. Then, during the detailed design phase, a consultant would be retained to complete a peer review of the preliminary resign, including the geotechnical recommendations, and determine if additional boreholes and other studies are required to move forward with the detailed design.</p>
6.7	<p><u>Localized Improvements</u></p> <p>The proposed design will identify areas where localized improvements would be required to minimize/mitigate impacts. Designs would be developed through consultation with individual property owners. All property owners are therefore encouraged to attend the upcoming PIC for these discussions to start taking place.</p>
6.8	<p><u>Land Acquisition</u></p> <p>CWG members asked if the decision between rural and semi-rural cross-section where there is a constrained ROW would depend on how willing land owners are to negotiate property acquisition. The project team explained the decision would be based on a variety of constraints, including but not limited to, encroachment on private property. Lori-Ann Thomsen from the Region of Peel explained the property acquisition process and noted that there would be no negotiations at this stage.</p>

	<p>Consultation with land owners (such as at the upcoming PIC) would encourage the discussions to start taking place, but land owners would be contacted individually at a later stage once more of the design details are confirmed. Negotiations for land acquisition do not typically take place until the detail design stage (60-90% design). At that stage, there would be meetings with the individual land owners to discuss the impacts and options, and there are opportunities for design modifications and mitigation strategies before the design is finalized.</p>
6.7	<p><u>Cost</u></p> <p>CWG members asked about the construction cost for the project. Since some design elements need to be confirmed and finalized, costs cannot be reasonably estimated at this stage. More details will be available at the upcoming PIC.</p>
6.8	<p><u>Recent Construction in Close Proximity to the Study Area</u></p> <p>The group asked about the cross-section for the newly constructed portion of Mississauga Road between King Street and Olde Base Line Road. The project team agreed to have details of that design (cross-section elements, dimensions) at the PIC as the team did not have this information at hand.</p>
7.0	<p>Public Information Centre #2 – November 20, 2013</p> <p>PIC #2 is scheduled for Wednesday, November 20 at the Caledon Country Club.</p> <p>As noted, the format will be different from the May 9 PIC, with no formal presentation. There will be an Open House from 4:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. The public will be able to arrive anytime between those hours and talk to the different project team members about the specific concerns or interest. The material will be displayed by “themes”, and the recommended designs (cross-section, plan, and profile) will be organized by corridor. CWG members agreed that this was a good format for holding the meeting.</p> <p>Feedback forms will be provided for people to provide their comments.</p>
8.0	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>Public Information Centre #2 – November 20, 2013</p> <p>Confirmation of Preferred Designs – Winter 2013/2014</p> <p>Environmental Study Report – Spring 2014</p> <p>Study Completion and Filing with MOE – Spring/Summer 2014</p>
9.0	<p>Closing Remarks</p> <p>Gino reiterated that the Region of Peel would like to actively engage the community and once again thanked the CWG members for their participation and encouraged them to attend the upcoming PIC.</p>