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THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF WHITBY

NOTICE OF STUDY COMMENCEMENT AND INVITATION FOR COMMENT

Transportation Master Plan

The Corporation of the Town of Whitby has retained Totten Sims Hubicki Associates to undertake a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) for the Town of Whitby. The intent of the Master Plan is to identify an integrated and diversified transportation framework, at a strategic level, that supports long term growth and provides for the efficient movement of people and goods to areas within and to/from the Town. The scope of the TMP will focus primarily on the review of arterial and major collector road systems within the Town's boundary, with the potential modifications to include: the addition of new roads, missing linkages, and road/rail/water grade separations and changes to road classifications to better reflect their role and function in the future network. Following the completion of the TMP, additional environmental assessment and design activities will be required to further define the operational and physical requirements of the proposed infrastructure.

This study is being carried out in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000) process for Master Plans as approved by the Ministry of the Environment.

Public consultation is vital to this study. Consultation will be held throughout the course of the study, and will include a Public Information Centre (PIC) in early 2007 to present the study issues and transportation alternatives being considered. Notices indicating the date and location for public meetings will be published in local Whitby newspapers. At this time in the study process, we would like to extend our invitation for public and stakeholder input on the TMP.

Upon completion of the study, a report documenting the findings will be prepared for public review and comment.

If you have questions or comments regarding the study, or wish to be added to the mailing list, please contact either of the following project team members:

Mr. Paul Bumstead, B.E.S.,
Project Manager
Totten Sims Hubicki Associates
300 Water Street
Whitby, Ontario L1N 9J2
Phone: (905) 668-9333
Fax: (905) 668-0221

Ms. Suzanne Beale, P.Eng., PTOE,
Manager of Engineering Services
Town of Whitby
575 Rossland Rd E,
Whitby, Ontario L1N 2M8
Phone: (905) 430-4307
Fax: (905) 686-7005

*Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.*
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF WHITBY
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
AND INVITATION FOR COMMENT

Transportation Master Plan

The Corporation of the Town of Whitby has retained Totten Sims Hubicki Associates to undertake a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) for the Town. The intent of the Master Plan is to identify an integrated Town wide transportation framework, at a strategic level, that supports long term growth and provides for the efficient movement of people and goods to areas within and to/from the Town. The scope of the TMP will focus primarily on the review of arterial and major collector road systems within the Town’s boundary, with the potential modifications to include: the addition of new roads; missing linkages; road/rail/water grade separations; and changes to road classifications to better reflect their role and function in the future network.

Public consultation is vital to this Study and two Public Information Centres (PICs) are being held to obtain comments from interested and affected individuals. The first PIC has been scheduled to present project information related to the existing and future transportation conditions, issues and preliminary alternatives; and to seek feedback from interested residents. The dates, times and locations of the first PIC are as follows:

**Whitby Open House**
- **Date:** Tuesday, October 30, 2007
- **Time:** Open House from 2 to 4 p.m. and 6 to 8 p.m., presentation at 6:30 p.m.
- **Location:** Council Chambers, Whitby Municipal Office, 575 Rossland Road East, Whitby

**Brooklin Open House**
- **Date:** Wednesday, November 7, 2007
- **Time:** Open House from 6 to 8 p.m., presentation at 6:30 p.m.
- **Location:** Brooklin Community Centre, 45 Cassels Road East, Brooklin

The public will have the opportunity to review display panels illustrating the study process, transportation issues, traffic and land use information, and potential alternatives; as well as, have the opportunity to discuss the material with Town of Whitby staff and their consultant. Comments received at this PIC will be considered in the assessment of alternatives and identification of recommended transportation strategies, which will be presented to the public at future information centres in 2008.

Upon completion of the Study, a report documenting the findings will be prepared for public review and comment.

If you have questions or comments regarding the Study, or wish to be added to the mailing list, please contact either of the following Project Team members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Paul Burnstead, B.E.S.</th>
<th>Ms. Suzanne Beale, P.Eng., PTOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>(Acting) Director of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totten Sims Hubicki Associates</td>
<td>Town of Whitby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Water Street</td>
<td>575 Rossland Road East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby, Ontario L1N 9J2</td>
<td>Whitby, Ontario L1N 2M8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (905) 668-9363</td>
<td>Phone: (905) 430-4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: (905) 668-0221</td>
<td>Fax: (905) 686-7005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.*
October 24th, 2006

Mr. Richard Saunders  
Director, Negotiations  
Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat  
720 Bay Street, 4th Floor  
Toronto, ON M5G 2K1

Attention: Mr. Richard Saunders  
Director, Negotiations

Subject: Town of Whitby  
Transportation Master Plan Study

On September 5, 2006, Town Council approved the recommendations of the Public Works Director to undertake the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan Study (Report #46-06). The purpose of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Study is to identify, at a strategic level, an integrated and diversified transportation framework to support long term growth, and which provides for the efficient movement of people and goods to areas within and to/from the Town. The scope of the TMP will be focused primarily on the arterial and major collector road system within the Town’s boundary, with consideration given to changes to road classifications as well as the addition of new roads, missing linkages, and road/rail/water grade separations. Following completion of the TMP, additional environmental assessment and design activities will be required to refine and further define the operational and physical specifics of the proposed infrastructure.

The Town proposes to complete this study in compliance with the Municipal Engineers Association “Municipal Class Environmental Assessment” (June 2000). As such, it will complete the requirements for Phase 1 (Problem or Opportunity) and Phase 2 (Alternative Solutions) of the Class EA including public consultation. Input and advice from local residents, the business community, regulatory agencies, etc. is essential for this project.

The primary Study Area is to encompass those areas bounded by the entire Town. Transportation network plans relative to the Town will be developed and considered within the context of the primary Study Area. A secondary Study Area, which considers travel demands and road network configurations beyond the Town’s borders, will also be considered.

We would appreciate it if you would please advise the Project Team how your agency would like to participate in the Study using the attached fax back sheet.

Please refer to the attached Notice of Study Commencement for additional details of the study.
If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the undersigned. Thank you for your assistance with this project and we look forward to working with you.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
Paul Bumstead, B.E.S.
Consultant Project Manager

Attachment

cc: S. Beale, Town of Whitby
FAX BACK FORM

To: PAUL BUMSTEAD, TSH ASSOCIATES

Fax: (905) 668-0221

RE: Town of Whitby
Transportation Master Plan Study

NAME: ____________________________________________

TITLE: ____________________________________________

MUNICIPALITY/AGENCY: ________________________________

ADDRESS: __________________________________________

POSTAL CODE: ________________________________________

PHONE: ____________________________________________

FAX: _______________________________________________

E-MAIL: ____________________________________________

Please indicate the appropriate response.

Yes No My group/agency would like to be kept informed. Please retain on the Town’s mailing list for this project.

Yes No Please take my group/agency off the Town’s mailing list.

Agency’s areas of interest or concern/preliminary comments:
Welcome to Public Information Centre (PIC) #1 for the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Study.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to introduce the Study and present the following:
- Study background, need, scope and objectives;
- Master Plan process and schedule;
- Study issues and constraints;
- Existing and future traffic conditions;
- Preliminary transportation needs;
- Potential alternatives and opportunities; and
- Next steps to be undertaken in completing this Study.

Your comments are important to us and will be considered in shaping the Study findings and recommendations.

Following your review of the information, please complete one of the comment forms provided.

Please sign in – Thank You

We welcome you to attend our presentation at 6:30 p.m., at which time we will be providing highlights on the key issues of the Study.
The primary Study Area encompasses those areas bounded by the Town of Whitby. Transportation network plans relative to the Town will be developed and considered within the context of the primary Study Area.

A secondary Study Area, which includes travel demands and characteristics beyond the Town’s borders will also be considered to ensure external transportation patterns are examined.
STUDY BACKGROUND / NEED

- *The Town of Whitby is growing:*
  - Since the mid 1980’s, the population has grown from approximately 45,000 to its current 115,000 residents.
  - The population in Whitby has the potential to increase to as much as 200,000 within the next 20 years.

- *Whitby’s Transportation Plans:*
  - The transportation network included in the Town’s Official Plan was last updated in 1995 and does not reflect the present road system nor identify the long term network needs for the community.

- *History of road improvements in the Town:*
  - Historically, expansion to Whitby’s transportation system has been limited to local and collector streets. While some Town arterials have been extended / widened, the majority of the expansion to the arterial system has been on Regional facilities.
  - Many transportation corridors in Whitby have been developed to provide auto and sidewalk access to adjacent residential land uses and not for other modal opportunities for moving persons, such as bicycle facilities and transitways.

- *Whitby’s need for a Transportation Master Plan (TMP):*
  - It is important to update and refine the Town’s transportation network plans to enable Whitby to function in the long term in a safe and prosperous manner.
  - The completion of a TMP will result in a transportation action plan that guides the Town in its infrastructure building for the long term.
STUDY SCOPE

• The scope of the TMP Study will be focused primarily on the arterial and major collector road system within the Town’s boundary, with modifications comprising changes to road classifications, as well as the addition of new roads, missing linkages, and road / rail / water grade separations.

• The intent of the Master Plan is to identify at a strategic level, an integrated and diversified transportation framework to support long term growth and which provides for the efficient movement of people and goods to areas within and to / from the Town.

• Following completion of the TMP, additional environmental assessment and design activities will be required to refine and further define the operational and physical specifics of the proposed infrastructure.

• The plan for the recommended infrastructure provided in the TMP is that implementation would occur in stages as conditions warrant.
Town of Whitby
Transportation Master Plan

THE MASTER PLAN PROCESS / PROJECT SCHEDULE

Completed Tasks
July 2007

We are here
October/November 2007

Next Steps
Spring 2008

Additional Steps
(Beyond This Study)

TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN REPORT
Prepare and File TMP, Notice of Completion, 30 Day Review Period

FUTURE EA REQUIREMENTS
Detailed Design and Construction

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Display Findings of Alternatives Assessment and Corridor Review

CORRIDOR REVIEW
Identify and Evaluate Feasible Future Transportation Corridors

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT
Evaluate Alternative Solutions

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1
Display of Need and Justification Findings, and Identification of Alternative Solutions

STRATEGIC NETWORK ASSESSMENT
Data Collection and Analysis, Identify and Describe Problems and Opportunities, Study Notice of Commencement
Peak Period
The time periods during the day with the greatest travel volumes, generally the two- or three-hour periods during a weekday.

Peak Hour
The consecutive sixty minutes within a 24-hour period with the highest traffic volume. Peak values are often expressed as a percentage of daily traffic volume.

Volume/Capacity Ratio
A measure of capacity sufficiency, that is, whether or not a link can provide sufficient capacity for the movement of vehicles.

Level of Service
A quantitative measure of the service provided by available transportation infrastructure.

Screenlines
Screenlines are imaginary lines drawn across major transportation facilities in a corridor. Screenlines are used to analyze travel demand and system performance at strategic locations around the Town of Whitby.

Traffic Flow Arrows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/C</th>
<th>Volume/Capacity Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.70</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70 - 0.90</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required Action:
- V/C < 0.70: Consider minor physical and/or operational improvements to roadway intersections.
- V/C = 0.70 - 0.90: Implement minor physical and/or operational improvements as warranted. Begin planning for road improvements and/or new facilities.
- V/C > 0.90: Implement improvements and/or new facilities.

Screenline Key Map
EXISTING (EB) CONDITIONS FROM VICTORIA ST. TO MYRTLE RD.

EXISTING (NB) CONDITIONS FROM LAKE RIDGE RD. TO GARRARD RD.
FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

• An analysis of travel demand and system performance at strategic locations was completed for the years 2006, 2021 and 2031.

• The analysis was completed using the Region of Durham’s 2003 Development Charge (DC) Demand Forecasting Model.

• The Demand Forecasting Model includes special considerations such as the Taunton Road commercial corridor, the West Whitby Planning Area, and the growth forecasts of the Places to Grow Act.

• The analysis considered Ministry of Transportation and Region of Durham network improvements including Highways 401, 407 and 7; Taunton Road, Victoria Street and Brock Street; and Thickson Road, Lake Ridge Road and Adelaide Avenue.
NEED AND JUSTIFICATION

• Population and employment in Whitby will continue to grow resulting in increased travel demands throughout the community.
• North-south and east-west roadways through Whitby are reaching and / or exceeding capacity today.
• Even with significant improvements, critical screenlines are approaching capacity in the long term.
• Future congestion will result in social and economic impacts, such as traffic infiltration and delays to the movement of goods and services.
• Failure to address the projected congestion and delays within the Town will make it more difficult to provide a safe and acceptable level of transportation, emergency and maintenance service to existing / future developments.

Therefore, the need is justified to:
• Further investigate and detail the operating conditions and problems within the Town by zone and area;
• Identify and assess alternative solutions; and
• Develop and protect a transportation system to enable long term mobility, access and safety.
A reasonable range of alternative solutions has been developed to address the problems and opportunities identified through the strategic review of long-term transportation network needs for Whitby.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANNING ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do Nothing (Base for Comparison)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves no major changes to the road, transit or active transportation networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement Transportation System Management (TSM) Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves such things as localized intersection improvements, access control along major corridors (i.e., improved signal coordination, turn restrictions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Improvements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves promoting programs to encourage walking, cycling, ride-sharing, telecommuting, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Transit Services (Interregional, Regional, Intermunicipal, GO and Rail Transit)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves increases in existing bus services, expansion of bus routes to new areas, increased GO Transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expansion of existing transportation corridors and development of new transportation corridors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves selected road widening where justified based on demand, construction of new arterial or collector roads to serve new development, and construction of missing road links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage Community Growth Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves encouraging developers to promote sustainable transportation when envisioning site layouts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS

Following this PIC, the Project Team will:

• Respond to comments received;

• Evaluate and Assess Transportation System Planning Alternatives
  • Identify range of alternative solutions
  • Apply assessment criteria to “long list” of route alternatives
  • Identify short list of route alternatives

• Identify and evaluate feasible Future Transportation Corridors.
  • Review horizontal and vertical alignment of potential corridors
  • Identify impacts to social and environmental features
  • Identify costs associated with alternatives
  • Identify preferred alternatives

• Prepare for PIC #2 in spring 2008 to present:
  • Corridor Review
  • Alternative Assessment findings.
Session Details
Public Information Centre (PIC) #1 consisted of three sessions as follows:

Whitby Open House
Date: Tuesday October 30, 2007
Time: Open House from 2 - 4 pm and 6 - 8 pm, presentations at 2:30pm and 6:30 pm
Location: Council Chambers, Whitby Municipal Office, 575 Rossland Road East, Whitby, L1N 2M8

Brooklin Open House
Date: Wednesday November 7, 2007
Time: Open House from 6 to 8 pm, presentation at 6:30 pm
Location: Brooklin Community Centre, 45 Cassels Road East, Brooklin, L1M 1A4

Notification
A notice advertising the Public Information Centre was published in the Metroland and Whitby This Week newspapers on October 24 and October 28, 2007. The notice was also posted on the Town of Whitby website at www.town.whitby.on.ca and is included as Appendix A of this summary.

Project Team Attendance
Representatives from the Consultant and Town of Whitby staff were on hand to present information and respond to questions and concerns.

The following members of the Project Team were in attendance:

Town of Whitby: Suzanne Beale, P.Eng, Project Manager
                Sarah Raetsen, Project Coordinator
                Michael Prevedel, Traffic Technician

Consultant: Paul Bumstead, Project Manager
            Debbie Clayton, Facilitator/EA Consultation Lead
            Mary Grozdanovski, Registration

Public Attendance
Upon arrival, stakeholders were asked to sign in to record their attendance and to add to the project mailing list. The PIC’s were attended as follows:

Whitby Open House – Forty-six (46) people signed in.
Brooklin Open House – Five (5) people signed in
Information Presented
The following information panels were presented for public review and comment:

- Study Area
- Study Background/Need
- Study Scope
- The Master Plan Process / Schedule
- Screenline Information
- Existing Conditions Screenline Analysis
- Environmental Issues Mapping
- Social Environment Issues
- Future Considerations
- 2021 Conditions Screenline Analysis
- 2031 Conditions Screenline Analysis
- Potential Alternatives and Opportunities
- Next Steps

Summary of Comments
Participants were encouraged to ask questions and make use of the comment sheets provided. The following outlines the summary of comments and responses during the Question and Answer period following the presentation as well as details the comment sheets received.

Q: How were the sub areas defined?
A: They were based on strategic analysis but may be open to change.

Q: Why do sub-areas 1 and 2 encompass Highway 401? It seems that the Highway 401 would be a natural dividing line for sub-areas.
A: Access to/from and crossing Highway 401 are significant issues that will be assessed as part of the TMP. We have therefore created the sub-areas to incorporate the issues surrounding Highway 401 with the communities/areas directly impacted.

Q: What are the plans for Garden Street? Currently, drivers don’t realize it is a dead end, so I would like to know if you are planning to extend it.
A: Within the Town’s Official Plan there is a future extension of Garden Street northerly. It is also within the 10 year Capital Plan.

Q: What are the plans for Garrard North of Taunton Road?
A: Garrard Road is classified as an arterial with protection for an ultimate four basic lanes. Widening beyond two lanes will be dictated by area development and other road network improvements, including implementation of Highway 407. Widening beyond two lanes is not identified within the 10 year planning horizon.

Q: Why isn’t Port Whitby (south of Victoria Street) included in the TMP?
A: The graphic is incorrect and the slide will be revised to show that areas 1 and 2 end at the lake.
Q: Port Whitby residents met with Town staff in 2004 and it was noted that this study would address truck traffic and larger Port Whitby traffic concerns.
A: The specific issue of truck traffic in Port Whitby is not an element of the TMP. This Plan will provide broader strategic direction than solutions for Port Whitby itself.

C: In 2004 the residents were lead to believe that something was being done.
A: The Town has gathered significant truck data and speed data for Port Whitby and have a good understanding of the port area and it is an issue that is under discussion.

Truck restriction signage has been installed on local roads and Town staff continues to review the truck volumes. Enforcement of a truck restriction is difficult.

C: The roads in Port Whitby are severely degraded, what plans are underway to rectify the situation?
A: There are design plans in the works for Watson Street and Charles Street. Some examples: resurfacing of Front Street, looking at sidewalks and bicycle lanes. The Region also has plans for a sanitary trunk sewer. Port Whitby in not being ignored, and that the Town is aware of the trucking issues in Port Whitby.

C: An improvement that should be considered is an extension of Burns Street to Thickson Road.
A: Burns Street extension is included in the Town’s Capital budget and the need for the protection and planning of the corridor is being assessed as part of the TMP.

Q: Can residents of Port Whitby have a separate public meeting to discuss our issues?
A: Absolutely. All residents who attended the PIC and signed in will get invited to a separate public meeting specific to Port Whitby issues.

Q: How do we provide comments on the sewer projects?
A: There is a separate consultation process and the Town will host a public meeting in April or early May for all capital projects which consider storm sewers. Issues/questions regarding sanitary sewers should be forwarded to the Region of Durham.

Q: Is there a waterfront plan, and can we sit down and look at Port Whitby as a community with the Town?
A: On November 28th there will be a meeting to review the Town of Whitby Official Plan. The comments from this evening will be passed along to the appropriate staff.

Q: Plans and designs are already complete by the time a budget is announced. Correct? Why are residents not consulted and asked for input before a plan is in place?
A: The Town proceeds from a needs perspective that is based on development patterns and capacity needs. The process that is followed is that staff develops a plan and then takes that plan to council and residents for comment.

Q: Why was Sobey’s allowed to be built there, and what is the process to stop the trucks from turning onto any streets?
A: The Sobey’s would have gone through a planning process which would have considered trucking movements. The Town will review opportunities to replace truck prohibitions on local streets. Although it is recognized that enforcement is difficult.

Q: Congestion within the GO Transit hub, is that part of this TMP study?
A: No, that specific issue is not part of the TMP. However, the Town has asked that the province consider an additional GO Station at Lake Ridge Road as the logistics for widening Henry Street to accommodate the traffic are very difficult. As well, the Region has been requested to investigate improvements.

The Region has installed traffic signals at the Go Station access and Henry Street, as well as optimized signal timings between the new signal and the Watson Street/Victoria Street traffic signal.

Q: With massive development and now large condominiums going up, how can that be undertaken with roads in such poor condition?
A: Part of the exercise that the development must do is a traffic study to determine traffic impacts and what improvements are required.

Q: Are we waiting to expand these roads after the development occurs?
A: The population, employment forecasts are at a Regional level, a municipal level and a traffic zone level. For new developments, roads are typically built in concert to accommodate the traffic. Widenings and other improvements attempt to occur in advance but can occur after as additional approvals from the Ministry of the Environment are required to support such changes. These typically require definitive proof that such a need exists.

The intent of this plan is to clearly identify new road needs, so that when development occurs it is understood where the roads are going.

Q: In Brampton most roads are four lanes even if there is nothing there, why aren’t we doing that here? Why are we not building roads before the development occurs?
A: In order to build roads in advance of development, the municipality typically fronts all of the costs with no guarantee that the road will be used. From an Environmental Assessment perspective, it is very difficult to get any type of approval in that situation because you cannot prove the “need” as is a necessary part of the EA process. By timing roads and development, the costs are shared and we can establish a need to build the roadway.

Q: Why are roads built only to have to widen them a few years later? Why are roads not built to accommodate the traffic?
A: It is industry practice that as a minimum a road is built to the traffic capacity requirements for ten years from the building time. Therefore, if forecasts identify a four lane road is required within 10 years, typically four lanes are built now rather than two now and two later.
Q: Is the TMP a five-year plan, or will it be updated every five years?
A: It is proposed to be reviewed and updated every five years.

Q: Where will my comments go?
A: Comment sheets are placed in the EA documentation, which puts them on the public record. Your comments, questions and issues that you write on the comment sheets are included directly in the EA documentation report. Your name and address are removed to protect your privacy given that your comment will be available for public viewing.

C: With the increasing taxes in Toronto, more people are moving to the “905”. Five years is too long to wait for an update on this TMP. We understand that the TMP is a “broader” plan, but when will action take place on the ground?
A: One of the key aspects of this project is to protect the property required to implement the various projects that are recommended in the TMP. Implementation of the various recommendations will occur over the now to longer term planning horizon. Many of the more significant infrastructure changes will be built as development occurs and the traffic volumes dictate.
Although the meeting wasn't what we thought it was going to be, it turned out well, and was informative for other issues too! As a member of the Port Whitby residents group, I had a question regarding speed and noise! Who is it, and how is it that it gets determined what is too loud or too fast for a city road (more specifically, Victoria and Brock St's respectively)? Also, it seems that with the trucks having a negative impact on our community roads in our neighbourhood, that the obvious choice (the only other choice) is for the trucks to use South Blair, to cross the tracks! On the other hand, I personally have had to take South Blair a lot recently, because of the water main renewal on Dufferin, and found two reasons (obvious ones) as to why the trucks avoid South Blair. 1st. the trucks hate the 5 tracks and how the bumps scatter their trailer full of goods all over the place (no doubt, very frustrating). 2nd. I personally had to wait for 40 minutes, as 2 very long freight trains passed by at the same time. Now, for a just in time trucking company, both of these issues need to be addressed, which brings me back to train whistles (which Tony Prevedel knows me for) all of these problems could be addressed with an overpass so see if that fits into your plan.

Thank you for participating in today's event. Please deposit your comments in the box provided. Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Town of Whitby, and to meet the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). If you are unable to respond at this time, please submit your comments by November 20, 2007 to:

Mr. Paul Busstead, Totten Sims Hubicki Associates
300 Water Street, WHITBY ON L1N 9J2
Phone: 905-668-9363
Email: pbusstead@tsh.ca
I am interested in your subarea study as Montgomery Av in Brooklin needs to be looked at strategically.

The Town has closed off way south so there is now increased volume of speeds on Montgomery Av.

There are approximately 500 residents in this little block with 2 cars each 77 yet nothing is being done by the Town.

Thank you for participating in today's event. Please deposit your comments in the box provided. Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Town of Whitby, and to meet the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). If you are unable to respond at this time, please submit your comments by November 28, 2007 to:

Mr. Paul Bumstead, Totten Sims Hubicki Associates
300 Water Street, WHITBY ON L1N 9J2
Phone: 905-668-9363
Email: pbumstead@tsh.ca
As a home owner in Queen's Commons, The Meadows, my family and neighbours have been highly impacted by the technically preferred route of the 407-401 link, and designation for West Whitby and now by the future of Bon Accord Ave. My street is near Bon Accord and I was only to extend west to Concession St (as on Whitby OP). I strongly oppose any future plans to extend Bon Accord further west to Hallett's/Hull's as that would bring a lot of east-west traffic through a residential area. The traffic would bring noise, air quality and safety issues to my community.

It is a fact that the east-west flow of traffic would have to be eased by connecting Bonaccord and Manning which is unfair to people living there as well as experience and safety.

I suggest improving east-west flow by widening Rossland, Taunton, Dundas, 401 and the 407 extension. Do not extend Bonaccord further west or widened it as that will have further negative impact to my neighborhood.

Thank you for speaking with me.

Mr. Paul Bumstead, Totten Sims Hubicki Associates
300 Water Street, WHITBY ON L1N 9J2
Phone: 905-668-9363
Email: pbumstead@tsh.ca
January 8/08

Whitby Transportation Master Plan
C/O Mr. Paul Bunstead B.E.S.
Project Manager
Tohben Sims Robiski Associates
300 Water Street
Whitby, Ont.

This letter is regarding the extending of Bonacord Ave to Lake Ridge Rd. The idea of creating more traffic on Cochrane St. is very alarming. It’s bad enough that all the new housing north of Rossland Rd. has increased traffic by at least ten times on what is now called the Cochrane Expressway. It takes us longer to get out of our driveway than it does to go to the store and back.

I’m sure that the widening of Taunton Rd. and if you were to widen Rossland Rd. all the way to Lake Ridge, that would handle traffic from north Whitby. Dundas & Victoria would service south Whitby.

We hope that you will reconsider extending Bonacord Ave for the sake of our sanity and the safety of our children.

Thank you very much

Concerned Residents
of Cochrane Street.

P.S. A radar trap on the north or south side of railway bridge of Cochrane St. would be a gold mine!!!
August 8, 2007

Ms. Suzanne Beale  
Acting Director of Public Works  
Public Works Department  
Town of Whitby Municipal Building  
575 Rossland Rd. East  
L1N 2M8

Dear Ms. Beale:

Thank-you for taking the time to discuss over the telephone my concerns about the future of Bonacord Ave. I would like to summarize these concerns in writing. I know I speak on behalf of the other residents on Lennon Crt.

As you know, Lennon Crt. is situated on the western edge of Queen’s Commons/The Meadows and, as such, is highly affected by the Technically Recommended West Whitby 401-407 Link location. This unforeseen and upsetting decision occurred after we bought our houses and started raising our families. Now we will have to live with the impact of a major highway 600 meters away.

Now that the Technically Preferred Route has been announced, there is great interest on deciding the Land/Road Use of West Whitby with many parties anxious that it proceed quickly. I am under the understanding that Dillon Consultants will be called in again to provide the urban planning study, much like what was unveiled at the Public Open House on October 30, 2006. In all 6 options presented at that time, Bonacord Ave. was extended out to Lakeridge.

The major concern that I discussed with you is this future use of Bonacord Ave. My neighbours and I strongly oppose the street being extended westwards, especially all the way to Lakeridge Rd. Lakeridge Rd. is now going to become a 401 exchange as well as a future GO station. This would mean an enormous amount of traffic and noise down Bonacord as it would become a major east-west corridor with the possibility of being widened to 4 lanes. Again, more negative unforeseen and unexpected events that were not evident when we bought our homes.

Just as there was concern about the Link cutting off West Whitby Lands from the rest of Whitby, in a similar manner, our Court would be cut off from our housing development of The Meadows with whom we identify. It would become a dangerous situation as children and residents alike try to cross the busy street the access the closest
neighbourhood park, public school, school bus stops and friends. And, I fear it would not be feasible to put a stop sign or traffic lights so close to the bridge that would have to be constructed over the ravine.

I want to be in contact with you to express my concerns before the independent consultants do their jobs, decide the Land/Road use, and conduct Public Information Centres (PICs). Unfortunately, I have been through that process with TSH/MTO, following the format and was very involved in voicing my own and my communities concerns. But, after all that… there it is… the Link… 600 meters away.

I am asking you to consider our situation and understand how upsetting another potential road expansion could be. Lennon Court and surrounding streets have to live with the negative impact of the Link, and this now could be compounded by the Bonacord issue. Having yet another traffic, noise, air quality and safety issue with which to deal, is frustrating and detrimental to the neighbourhood in general.

I look forward to hearing from you in the future as you mentioned. Please keep me and my neighbours informed.

Yours Sincerely,

cc. Her Worship Pat Perkins
    Roger Anderson, Regional Chair of Durham
    Elizabeth Roy, Councillor, Ward 2 West
    Bob Short, Whitby Planning Dept.
Transportation Master Plan
o/a Susan Beale
Acting Director of Public Works
Town of Whitby

Port Whitby Traffic:

1. South Blair.
An underpass is required at the railway or Watson Street needs to be extended to Hopkins St.
Where there is already an overpass and access to and from the 401.
Close South Blair from Victoria to Watson Street.
No bridge required.
Open Water St. to Hopkins Street even though some people may object.
Control the speed on Watson Street East.
We have had a 40 M.P.H. limit on Watson St. East.
There are a few motorcycles that use this street and many cars that use Watson Street as a speedway.
It could get worse once the motorcycle shop and store open on Victoria Street.
TRUCK TRAFFIC:

Brock Street South:
No Trucks South of Victoria Street
For Now Use South Blair
Widen Watson Street East to Hopkins Street
To Create Development Areas
Close Brock Street at Front Street

Remove Bridge, Open the Waterway,
Dredge and Clean up Waterway to as far as Watson Street.

Change Zoning on East Bank to High Density,
Open Harbour Street to Water Street.
Finish Winsor Bay Park from Brock to Watson.
Open Bond Street to Front Street
Open Front Street to Dufferin Street.
Dozens upon dozens of trucks pass through Watson Street both in an easterly direction from Brock St. and in a westerly direction from the industrial area in spite of signs posted in three locations on Watson Street prohibiting trucks from using Watson Street between Brock St. and Dufferin St. I have never witnessed any enforcement of this sign. Truck drivers violate this law with impunity. Watson Rd. is extremely narrow and in desperate need of repair. There is also a very high volume of trucks of all sizes up and down Brock St. from Victoria St. to the industrial area day & night. Brock St. is a single lane road accommodating a very high truck usage combined with regular overnight and daytime parking between Watson St. and Front St. Particularly on the west side of Brock St. I have observed many trucks crossing the centre line into the opposite lane doesn't seem right to me.

Burns St. connect to Thckson
Sent: Saturday, August 12, 2006 8:39 PM
To: Internet, Planning
Subject: Manning Extension through Palmerston park?

To a Member of the Planning Department:

Hello,

I have recently heard "through the grape vine" that an extension of Manning Road, west of Brock Street, (currently called Starr Avenue) is being planned for some time in the near future. Apparently, the extension of Manning will run through Palmerston Park somehow.

I am extremely curious about this rumour as our home on Rosewood Court backs onto Palmerston Park and my children use the paved path through the park to get to and from Palmerston Avenue Public School.

I was alarmed to hear this rumour of a road being built through the park as this would drastically decrease the value of our home property and would completely change the nature of our neighbourhood.

Please let me know if there is any truth to this rumour.

Thank you kindly,
Hi Paul,

Could you please add the following name to the mailing list for the TMP:

I spoke with today with regard to his concerns about a Bonacord-Manning extension. He does not see the need for an extension and does not want to see it be built. I informed him about the process we are undertaking now - a TMP to review all of the road networks in Whitby, and from that we will review whether new linkages are required. I mentioned that we would be having a Public Open House hopefully in May or June and he could further express his concerns there. He was interested in making a presentation, but I said that he may have to wait until the end of the TMP study, if and when it is presented to council. He also asked about a noise assessment, whether they would be compensated due to the decrease in their property value and what the by-law was with regard to the proximity of a road to their property.

He mentioned that he is concerned, because now that the word is out there that there may be a new road in their backyard that they may have greater difficulty in selling their house and/or will get less value for it.

He also mentioned that when they first purchased their house they did so because of the area. At the time they did not know that a road linkage was being planned for.

If you have any questions about this, please give me a call.

Thanks,
Sarah
Paul Bumstead  
Consultant Project Manager  
Totten Sims Hubicki Associates  
300 Water Street  
WHITBY ON L1N 9J2  

Dear Mr. Bumstead:

Re: Town of Whitby Ontario, Transportation Master Plan Study (Report #46-06), Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.

This letter is in response to your request for information of October 24, 2006 addressed to Maryanne Pearce. You inquired as to whether there were any First Nation land claims in the above noted area.

We have conducted a search of our records and determined that no specific claims have been submitted in the area of interest. Although no specific claims hinder the proposed construction identified in your letter have been filed to date, we cannot make any representations regarding potential or future claims.

The Crawford and Gunshot Treaty are in close proximity to the project. You may wish to contact the Mississauga Tribal Claims Council (ASSCTN) directly to advise them of your intentions. They can be reached at PO Box 1299, Blind River, ON, P0R 1B0 (705) 356-1621.

Please rest assured that it is the policy of the Government of Canada as expressed in Outstanding Business: A Native Claims Policy that “In any settlement of specific native claims the government will take third party interests into account. As a general rule, the government will not accept any settlement which will lead to third parties being dispossessed”.

We can only speak directly to claims filed under the Specific Claims Policy for the Province of Ontario. We cannot make any comments regarding potential or future claims, or claims filed under other departmental policies. This includes claims under Canada’s Comprehensive Claims Policy or legal action by First Nations against the Crown. You will have to contact the Comprehensive Claims Branch at (819) 994-7521 or the Litigation Management and Resolution Branch at (819) 934-2185 directly for more information.
Specific Claims has developed a Public Information Status Report on all claims which have been submitted to date. This information is available to the public on the Indian and Northern Affairs Canada website and can be found at http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ps/clm/pis_e.html

I hope this information will assist you in any further queries. As there are no claims in the affected area, it is not necessary to keep this office informed of the project’s progress. I trust that this satisfactorily addresses your concerns. If you wish to discuss this matter further please contact me at (819) 956-2258.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Boswell
Claims Analyst
Ontario Research Team
Specific Claims Branch
December 18, 2006

Town of Whitby
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, Ontario
L1N 2M8

Attention: Mr. A. Prevedel, P.Eng.
Director of Public Works

Dear Sir:

Re: Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan and the Background Planning Studies for West Whitby (Dillon)

I would like to thank you and Suzanne Beale for the November 10th, 2006 meeting with Bryce Jordan (Sernas) and myself in our capacity as representatives of the West Whitby Landowners Group (WWLG).

The meeting was prompted by concerns expressed by the WWLG regarding the relationship between the two above noted studies and the Highway 407 East Extension EA. In particular, your report 46-06 (September 5, 2006) indicates (on Page 4): "While the Transportation Master Plan will be assessing long term mobility needs for the entire Town, infrastructure specifics currently being addressed as part of other major study initiatives will not be specifically dealt with, namely the West Whitby Study Area and Highway 407 East Extension." The WWLG was concerned that there might be a "disconnect" between these studies as they are each being managed by different Town Departments or MTO.

The WWLG wishes to ensure that the West Whitby Area is included in the Town’s Master Transportation Plan Review to avoid any potential conflicts in the final recommendations of any of these studies.

We were re-assured at our meeting that this would not be the case based upon your explanation of the interrelationship between the two Town studies and particularly the scope of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). For the record, we took this explanation to mean that:

- The TMP will be a "high level" plan examining arterial and major collector roads and will not be to the level of detail of the West Whitby Study.
- The TMP will not be assuming any land use changes or urban expansions.
- The TMP will assume a traffic capacity for a potential 407/401 link but will not identify or be dependant on an alignment for the link.
- Those portions of the West Whitby Study conclusions dealing with arterial and major collector roads will be reviewed by and commented on by Public Works and subsequently incorporated into the TMP as appropriate.
Furthermore, we were pleased to hear that your department will be actively participating in the West Whitby Study to assist in bringing it to a timely conclusion. In particular, we understand that your staff will be reviewing the traffic component of the West Whitby Study to ensure that you are satisfied with the veracity of its conclusions. It is vitally important to the WWLG, and indeed the Town of Whitby, to have a preferred land use framework for West Whitby as we move forward together to address the Region of Durham’s conformity exercise with “Places to Grow” and with the Highway 407 East Extension EA.

Once again, thank you for meeting with us. If there are any inaccuracies or omissions in our understanding as indicated above, please advise the undersigned immediately.

Yours truly,

Delta Urban Inc.
On behalf of the WWLG

Myron P. Pestafuky P. Eng.
President

CC/ WWLG
CC/ Bryce Jordan, Sernas Associates
CC/ Mayor Pat Perkins
November 14, 2006

Totten Sims Hubicki Associates
300 Water Street
Whitby ON L1N 9J2

Attention: Mr. Paul Bumstead, B.E.S., Project Manager

Dear Mr. Bumstead:

Re: Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan Study

This is further to your letter of October 24th, 2006, where you include a Notice of Study Commencement and Invitation for Comment regarding the Transportation Master Plan Study that will be undertaken by the Town of Whitby.

Please note that there are provisions under the Cemeteries Act (Revised) (the “Act”) and its Regulations pertaining to the discovery of burial sites containing human remains. Should human remains be discovered during any excavation or ground-disturbing activities, all work must cease immediately. In addition, should human remains be found, the owner of the property is required to notify the police and/or coroner and must take whatever steps are necessary to preserve the site, the human remains and any artifacts until a disposition may be determined under the Act.

The Town of Whitby may wish to consider undertaking an archaeological investigation of the site prior to any excavation or ground-disturbing activities to determine the possibility of encountering a burial site, if they have not already considered this.

Please refer to the enclosed information package outlining the provisions under the Act that relate to burial sites. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me directly at 416-326-8404, or toll-free in Ontario at 1-800-889-9768.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Michael D'Mello
Registrar, Cemeteries Act (Revised)

Encl.

c: Suzanne Beale, P.Eng., PTOE, Manager of Engineering Services, Town of Whitby
Cemeteries Act (Revised)
Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990 Chapter C.4

Provisions related to Burial sites

A burial site is defined as "land containing human remains that has not been approved or consented to as a cemetery in accordance" with legislation.

It is a serious offence to disturb or order the disturbance of a burial site or artifacts except on instruction of the coroner or, pursuant to a site disposition agreement.

Any person discovering or having knowledge of a burial site must immediately notify the police or coroner. The police/coroners will investigate to determine if foul play is suspected. Once the coroner has declared that foul play is not suspected, the landowner must take whatever steps are necessary to preserve the site, the human remains and any artifacts until a final disposition is made in accordance with the Act or Regulations.

The Registrar will normally order the landowner on which the burial site is discovered to cause an investigation to be made to determine the origin of the site. The investigation must be carried out by a qualified person and is usually conducted by a licensed archaeologist (contact the Cemeteries Regulation Unit for listing of licensed archaeologists.) The investigator chosen by the landowner may wish to contact the Registrar to clarify the requirements of the investigation.

Any person investigating a burial site must do so with the minimum disturbance to the site as is reasonable in the circumstances.

Within five days after beginning an investigation the person conducting the investigation must advise the Registrar of the possible cultural origins of the human remains.

After completing the investigation the investigator must provide the Registrar with a report which contains the following information: the probable cultural origin or religious affiliation of the persons whose remains are interred and the basis upon which it is made; a description of the boundaries of the burial site, including the legal description of the property; the details of the style and manner in which the human remains are interred; a description of any artifacts that, in the opinion of the investigator, form part of the burial site; an opinion as to whether the burial site was set aside with the apparent intention of interring human remains in accordance with cultural affinities, and the basis upon which the opinion is made; and any information relevant to the preparation of a site disposition agreement.
The Register will make a declaration as to the nature of the site. The declaration will be either: an unapproved aboriginal peoples’ cemetery, an unapproved cemetery or an irregular burial site. (Refer to the copy of the Cemeteries Act (Revised) for a detailed description of each declaration.)

If the burial site is declared to be an unapproved cemetery, one month before making a declaration, the Registrar must publish notice in the local newspaper once a week for two consecutive weeks. This notice invites representatives of the persons interred to contact the Registrar within two weeks after the second notice. The registrar then notifies the representative of the persons interred who, together with the landowner, enter into negotiations with a view to entering into a site disposition agreement. The agreement will result in either the site being established as a cemetery or the remains/artifacts being reinterred in a cemetery. If no agreement is entered into between the landowner and the representatives; provision is made for binding arbitration.

In the case of an unapproved cemetery, if no representatives contact the Registrar, the landowner must either establish the site as a cemetery or ensure the remains are interred in a cemetery in the same or adjacent municipality in which the burial site is located.

If the site is declared an irregular burial site the landowner must either establish the site as a cemetery or ensure the remains are interred in a cemetery in the same or adjacent municipality in which the burial site is located.

If the site is declared an unapproved aboriginal peoples’ cemetery the Registrar will notify representatives of the persons interred, who together with the landowner, enter into negotiations with a view to entering into a site disposition agreement. The agreement will result in either the site being established as a cemetery or the remains being reinterred in a cemetery. If no agreement is entered into between the landowner and the representatives provision is made for binding arbitration.

Consent is required of the representatives to remove remains or artifacts, or to conduct scientific analysis of the remains or artifacts in an unapproved cemetery or unapproved aboriginal peoples cemetery.

For more information contact the: Ministry of Government Services Cemeteries Regulation Unit 5775 Yonge Street, Suite 1500 Toronto, ON M7A 2E5 Tel: (416) 326 - 8393, Fax: (416) 326 - 8406

A copy of the burial site provisions of the Cemeteries Act (Revised) and Ontario Regulation 133/92 is attached. See website: http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/DLBlaws/Statutes/English/90c04_e.htm
Cemeteries Act (revised)
Revised Status of Ontario, 1990, Chapter C.4

1. In this Act,

"burial site" means land containing human remains that has not been approved or consented to as a cemetery in accordance with this Act or a predecessor of this Act; ("lieu de sépulture")

"human remains" means a dead human body and includes a cremated human body; ("restes humains")

68. No person shall disturb or order the disturbance of a burial site or artifacts associated with the human remains except,

(a) on instruction by the coroner; or
(b) pursuant to a site disposition agreement.

69. Any person discovering or having knowledge of a burial site shall immediately notify the police or coroner.

70. (1) The Registrar may order the owner of land on which a burial site is discovered to cause an investigation to be made to determine the origin of the site.

(2) Section 68 does not apply to a person investigating the nature or origin of the site who is disturbing the site in the course of the investigation.

(3) A person conducting an investigation shall do so with the minimum disturbance to the site that is reasonable in the circumstances.

(4) If the Registrar is of the opinion that an investigation under subsection (1) would impose an undue financial burden on the land owner, the Registrar shall undertake the investigation.

71. (1) As soon as the origin of a burial site is determined, the Registrar shall declare the site to be,

(a) an unapproved aboriginal peoples cemetery;
(b) an unapproved cemetery; or
(c) an irregular burial site.

(2) An irregular burial site is a burial site that was not set aside with the apparent intention of interring therein human remains.

(3) An unapproved cemetery is land set aside with the apparent intention of interring therein, in accordance with cultural affinities, human remains and containing remains identified as those of persons who were not one of the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

(4) An unapproved aboriginal peoples cemetery is land set aside with the apparent intention of interring therein, in accordance with cultural affinities, human remains and containing remains identified as those of persons who were one of the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

(5) For the purposes of this section and section 72,

"unapproved" means not approved in accordance with this Act or a predecessor of this Act.

72. (1) The Registrar, on declaring a burial site to be an unapproved aboriginal peoples cemetery or an unapproved cemetery, shall serve notice of the declaration on such persons or class of persons as are prescribed.

(2) All persons served with notice under subsection (1) shall enter into negotiations with a view of entering into a site disposition agreement.

(3) If a site disposition agreement is not made within the prescribed time, the Registrar shall refer the matter to arbitration.

(4) Despite subsection (3), the Registrar, if of the opinion that an agreement may be reached, may defer referring the matter to arbitration so long as there appears to be a reasonable prospect of an agreement being reached.

73. The persons named in an arbitrated settlement who have been given the opportunity to fully participate in the arbitration process are bound by the settlement whether they chose to participate or not.

74. (1) An owner of land that contains an irregular burial site shall ensure that the remains found in the site are interred in a cemetery.

(2) No owner of a cemetery interring human remains for an owner of land to whom this section applies may charge more than the prescribed amount for the interment.
Cemeteries Act (Revised)
ONTARIO REGULATION 133/92

1. In this Regulation,

"aboriginal peoples" includes the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of Canada;

"First Nations Government" means the government of a "band" as defined in the Indian Act (Canada);

"representative", when used in connection with a person whose remains are interred, means,

(a) in the case of an unapproved cemetery,

(i) a descendant of the interred person, or

(ii) if there is no known surviving descendant, a representative of the religious denomination with which the interred person was affiliated as evidenced by the place of interim, or

(b) in the case of an unapproved aboriginal peoples' cemetery, the nearest First Nations Government or other community of aboriginal people which is willing to act as a representative and whose members have a close cultural affinity to the interred person.

2. (1) If an investigation of a burial site is ordered under section 70 of the Act, the person conducting the investigation shall, within five days after beginning the investigation, advise the Registrar of the possible cultural origins of the human remains.

(2) Upon completing the investigation, the investigator shall provide the Registrar with a final, written report containing the following information:

1. A determination of the probable cultural origin or religious affiliation of the persons whose remains are interred and the basis upon which it is made.

2. A description of the boundaries of the burial site.

3. Details of the style and manner in which the human remains are interred.

4. A description of any artifacts that, in the opinion of the investigator, form part of the burial site.

5. An opinion as to whether the burial site was set aside with the apparent intention of interring human remains in accordance with cultural affinities and the basis upon which the opinion is made.

6. Information relevant to the preparation of a site disposition agreement.

3. The owner of land on which a burial site is discovered shall, if a coroner declares that foul play is not suspected in relation to the discovered remains, take whatever steps are necessary to preserve the site, the human remains and any artifacts until a final disposition is made in accordance with the Act and regulations.

4. The owner of land that contains an irregular burial site shall,

(a) ensure that the remains are interred in a cemetery located in the same municipality as the land in which they were discovered or in an adjacent municipality; or

(b) establish the land as a cemetery.

5. For the purposes of subsection 74 (2) of the Act, the prescribed maximum amount that an owner of a cemetery may charge is $500 or the lowest price filed for the purchase of interment rights and of opening and closing services, whichever is less.

6. (1) One month before declaring a burial site to be an unapproved cemetery, the Registrar shall publish notice of the declaration in a newspaper with general circulation in the municipality in which the cemetery is located.

(2) The notice shall be published once a week for two consecutive weeks.

(3) The published notice shall invite any representative of the persons whose remains are interred in the cemetery to contact the Registrar within two weeks after the date of the second published notice.

7. (1) For the purposes of subsection 72 (1) of the Act, the following persons are to be notified of a declaration that a burial site is an unapproved aboriginal peoples' cemetery or an unapproved cemetery:

1. The owner of the land on which the cemetery is located.

2. The representative of each person whose remains are interred in the cemetery.

(2) If no representatives contact the Registrar within two weeks of the notice under subsection (1), the owner of the land on which an unapproved cemetery is located shall,

(a) ensure that the remains found in the cemetery are reinterred in a cemetery located in the same municipality as the land in which they were discovered or in an adjacent municipality; or
(b) establish the land as a cemetery.

8. Unless consent is given by a representative of a person whose remains are interred in an unapproved cemetery or an unapproved aboriginal people's cemetery, no person shall,

(a) remove the remains or associated artifacts from the cemetery; or

(b) conduct scientific analysis of the remains or associated artifacts.

9. (1) If the owner of land on which a burial site is discovered establishes the site as a cemetery, the owner shall ensure that no interment rights for the cemetery are sold.

(2) If the owner of land on which a burial site is discovered establishes the site as a cemetery, the owner is exempt from clause 3 (1) (a) of the Act and from subsections 3 (2) and (3) of the Act.

10. The prescribed time for the purpose of subsection 72 (3) of the Act is one month after the negotiations begin.

11. (1) The parties to the arbitration are,

(a) the owner of the land on which the burial site is located; and

(b) the representatives of the persons whose remains are discovered on the burial site.

(2) A matter referred to arbitration by the Registrar under subsection 72 (3) of the Act shall be referred to an arbitration board or, upon the request of the parties, to a single arbitrator appointed by the Director and selected from the list of arbitrators chosen by the parties.

(3) The arbitration board shall be composed of the following members:

1. A member appointed by the owner of the land.

2. A member appointed by the representatives.

3. A member appointed under subsection (5).

(4) The names of the members described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of subsection (3) shall be provided to the Registrar within five days after the expiry of the time for making the site disposition agreement.

(5) The members described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of subsection (3) shall within five days after their own appointment appoint another member who shall be the chair of the arbitration board.

6. If a member is not appointed within the prescribed time, the Director shall make the appointment from a list of arbitrators chosen by the parties.

7. A party to the arbitration is not entitled to challenge the member chosen by another party to be appointed to the board.

8. Any period of time mentioned in this section may be extended by written agreement of the parties.

12. The hearing in the arbitration shall begin within two weeks after the day the chair of the arbitration board or the arbitrator is appointed.

13. (1) The arbitrator or arbitration board may.

(a) inspect the burial site;

(b) appoint an expert to inspect the remains and any artifacts found on the site and to report to the arbitrator or arbitration board; and

(c) award costs of the arbitration as between the parties.

(2) The arbitrator or arbitration board shall not order the removal of human remains and associated artifacts from the burial site for scientific study.

(3) The arbitration award may include anything listed in section 14 to the extent it is not included in the site disposition agreement.

14. A site disposition agreement respecting an unapproved aboriginal people's cemetery or an unapproved cemetery shall contain the following:

1. A legal description of the location of the cemetery in which the human remains are interred and, if appropriate, a statement that the remains will be left where they are interred.

2. The style and manner in which the human remains are to be disinterred and reinterred, if applicable.

3. The time within which the disinterment and reinterment are to take place, if applicable.

4. The provisions being made for future maintenance of the cemetery in which the human remains are to be located.

5. The allocation of the costs for carrying out the agreement.

6. Such other matters as the parties to the agreement agree upon.
July 15, 1998

The attached document is a "best practices" guideline describing the procedures for the treatment of human skeletal remains discovered outside a licensed cemetery. It reflects an agreement among members of the various ministries and agencies involved in the resolution of such burials (i.e., First Nations Burial Committee of Toronto; Toronto Police Service; Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation; Cemeteries Regulation Section of Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations; Ministry of Transportation; and The Office of the Chief Coroner) and reflects what is seen as the best practice.

The document is intended to serve as a guide to approval authorities as a discovery goes through the many different steps involved in a reburial to ensure that human remains are treated with respect and dignity and processed in a timely and efficient manner.

It is intended that this guide be reviewed periodically to reflect experiences with the topic. The signatories to this guideline have agreed to ensure that staff within their jurisdictions have access to this guideline.

Should clarification be required, please refer to the Cemeteries Act (Revised) R.S.O. 1990 or contact one of the signatories.

Signatories:

First Nations Burial Committee of Toronto - A. Rodney Babinwash, Chair

Toronto Police Service - A.J. (Tony) Warr, Inspector

Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation - Michael Johnson, Manager

Cemeteries Regulation Section of Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations - Gary DeMets, Registrar

Ministry of Transportation - Gary Warrick, Regional Archaeologist

Office of the Chief Coroner - Dr. B. Porter, Deputy Chief Coroner for Inquests
The Discovery of Human Remains - Best Practices

Introduction

The following is designed to assist all those involved in responding to and addressing discoveries of human skeletal remains outside of a licensed cemetery. The advice is presented as a series of best practices among the many overlapping interests and jurisdictions of several ministries, agencies, police services and other government bodies that are triggered when human skeletal remains are uncovered. This approach has been developed with the support and approval of the First Nations Burial Committee of Toronto. The practices outlined here are equally applicable to discoveries of human remains across Ontario.

These best practices support the existing regulatory and statutory mechanisms in Ontario. Responsibility for a burial passes through a number of jurisdictions (i.e., Police, Coroner, Cemeteries Regulation Section) and the intent of this document is to ensure this flow is effective and seamless. This information should be read along with the attached flow chart outlining the mandatory process to be followed under existing statutes. Although the flow chart describes the process as being linear, in many instances events can and do happen simultaneously.

A Note on Public Notification:

Getting through the entire discovery and disposition process when human remains are found will see the authority of the issue shift among several agencies. As such, until all investigations have been carried out and the disposition resolved, formal press releases or contacting the media should only occur if all affected authorities have concurred (i.e. police, coroner and Cemeteries Registrar). In addition, after all investigations have been completed, the concerns of the landowner and group acting as representative for the deceased (e.g. First Nation), should be considered before media contact. Premature media notification, particularly prior to having accurate identification of the deceased, will lead to mis-information, misplaced concerns being raised, and potentially a hardening of attitudes. This can make a final disposition agreement more difficult to reach.

Any media interest should be directed to the agency that has authority over the burial site at the time of the media contact (i.e. police, Coroner's Office or Cemeteries Registrar). Media photography of the remains should be avoided: a publicly displayed photograph of skeletal remains is both disrespectful to the deceased and offensive to representatives for the deceased.

A Note on Archaeology:

It is important to note that the discovery of human remains will occur in two basic contexts: either through accidental discovery by an individual in unexpected circumstances, or through discovery as part of an archaeological examination/excavation of a locale by a trained archaeologist, licensed by the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture & Recreation (MC&CR) under the
Ontario Heritage Act. In the latter case, the archaeologist will possess the skills, knowledge and expertise to assist both the police and coroner in determining the age of the interment, as well as to assist the landowner in generating the information the Cemeteries Registrar will require to determine the nature, extent and cultural affiliation of the persons buried. His or her presence at the front end of the discovery process will greatly aid all authorities in making quick and accurate determinations, and as such should be relied on as much as possible in such circumstances.

Under the Coroner’s Act

1. A person finding skeletal material may first contact staff in an agency other than the police or coroner (e.g. MCzCR or Ministry of Consumer & Commercial Relations [MCCR] staff). When that occurs, the person is to be immediately instructed to report the find to the local police or coroner. An appropriate contact list (e.g. Regional Coroner’s offices) should be maintained by all agencies that may be first contacted about such a discovery.

2. When the police are first contacted they will attend the scene, protect the site and contact the local coroner. The coroner, or the police on behalf of the coroner, will conduct an investigation to determine if: a) the skeletal material is human and b) if the site represents a crime scene. The investigators will need to obtain all the information required to make a determination. However, efforts should be made at this stage to minimise site disturbance. All bone and associated grave goods still embedded in the ground should not be disturbed unless removal is essential for the coroner to make a determination. Poking, pulling, and digging up the bone in an uncontrolled manner can quickly destroy critical data essential to making accurate identifications.

3. Whenever possible, the police and coroner should seek the assistance of an archaeologist in conducting the investigation. This is especially critical since burials are archaeological deposits in their own right, and are often found as part of more extensive archaeological deposits. As such, confirming an association of the burial with a surrounding archaeological site will help determine whether or not the remains are part of a crime scene. Also, the archaeologist can help ensure that the larger heritage resource is not destroyed or damaged during investigation of the skeletal material. MCCR staff can sometimes be called on to visit the scene with the police.

4. Archaeologists will consider issues such as the condition and discoloration of the bone, presence of artifacts around the discovery site, and knowledge of known archaeological sites in the area to determine chronological (and cultural) associations. If intact deposits are examined, features such as the presence/absence of a coffin, depth of remains, position of body, presence of grave goods, etc., will also assist the determination.

5. When skeletal material is found and it is not readily obvious that this material is either a burial or crime scene, coroners will often employ the services of a physical anthropologist or osteologist to examine the bone in detail. While the coroner requires only a basic determination of age (i.e. recent vs. historic/ancient) and nature of the interment, the physical
anthropologist's study can also determine cultural affiliation (based on the presence/absence of specific skeletal traits), age of the individual at death, sex, and even funerary practices. This information will be essential for both the Cemeteries Registrar's investigation, as well as for the deceased's representative in determining the appropriate reinterment requirements. As such, latitude in allowing the physical anthropologist to complete a full, basic descriptive analysis of the skeletal material as a part of the coroner's investigation will greatly aid in addressing remaining issues associated with this process.

6. When the Coroner is satisfied the discovery site is not a crime scene, it is essential that he/she notifies the Registrar of Cemeteries of the discovery, and passes along any relevant information (e.g. contexts, results of any analyses, etc.). It is also essential that the landowner understand that he/she will need to preserve and protect the site from the point when the police are no longer involved, and until a disposition is made under the Cemeteries Act.

Under the Cemeteries Act

1. Under the Cemeteries Act the Registrar will be required to determine and formally declare what the locale is: either an irregular burial site (unintentional interment), or an unapproved cemetery or unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemetery. When the information is not already in hand (i.e. based on archaeological findings or the results of the coroner's investigation) the landowner normally will be required to undertake an investigation. Such an investigation will generate the information necessary for the Registrar to make an accurate declaration.

2. In most cases, such investigations will be undertaken by a licensed and qualified archaeologist hired by the landowner. MCzCR ensures that the Cemeteries Registrar has a current list of such licensees which can be made available to the landowner.

3. The intent of the investigation is to provide the Cemeteries Registrar with the data necessary to make a declaration. As such, burial investigations will minimise normal archaeological fieldwork and reporting requirements. It will be determined following the Registrar's declaration and disposition agreement reached between landowner and deceased's representative whether disinterment is necessary.

4. The investigation for the Registrar must determine whether or not the interment(s) were intentional, and the basis on which this is made, the cultural affiliation of the deceased, and the defined limits of the area containing burials, the style and manner in which the remains are interred, and a description of the artifacts determined to form part of the burial site. It may also be necessary to determine the exact number of discrete burials present in the area. Excavation methods should maximise recovery of this data, while minimising disturbances to the remains. Recording should also be limited to that required by the Registrar (e.g. emphasis on mapping location of burials in relation to property lines, existing structures, or other reference points). MCzCR will advise licensed archaeologists of the appropriate archaeological methods.
5. During the investigation, the remains must be treated with respect and care. All artifacts found in the burial area are to be considered grave goods, and should be treated as part of the burial, and kept with the skeletal remains. Burials must not be unnecessarily exposed to the elements or to casual viewing, and must be covered over as soon as possible following identification. The landowner continues to be responsible for preserving and protecting the site during this investigation, and until a disposition is made under the Cemeteries Act.

6. At the conclusion of the investigation a report must be submitted to the Registrar. This report will need to include the information required in Point 4. For sites that date to the last 200 years, historical research (e.g., land title searches, newspapers, local informant interviews, etc.) may be required to answer some of the information points outlined in Point 4. This report will also serve to address the archaeologist’s reporting requirements for the license issued by MCzCR under the Ontario Heritage Act.

7. Once the Registrar can make a declaration, and the locale is determined to be an unapproved cemetery, he/she will locate a representative for the deceased. If the locale is an unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemetery, the Registrar will contact the nearest First Nation Government. Another community of Aboriginal People whose members have a close cultural affinity to the interred person may also act as representative. As well, if agreed-to and established before-hand, a designated “Burials Committee” can serve as the first point of Aboriginal contact for the Registrar. If the burial is non-aboriginal, the Registrar will attempt to find a representative through media notification. Where no descendant is found, a representative of the same religious denomination as the person buried can act for the deceased.

8. The representative and landowner will agree to a disposition agreement outlining what is to be done with the burials. Where there is no agreement, binding arbitration is provided under the Cemeteries Act. Typically there are three options: 1) leave the remains intact and establish the site as a cemetery; 2) establish a cemetery nearby, remove the remains and reinter them there; 3) remove the remains and reinter them in an existing cemetery. The option selected with respect to an unapproved cemetery or unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemetery will be negotiated between the landowner and representative for the deceased.

9. If the discovery is declared to be an irregular burial site, there are three options: 1) leave the remains intact and establish the site as a cemetery; 2) establish a cemetery nearby, remove the remains and reinter them there; 3) remove the remains and reinter them in an existing cemetery. The landowner will decide which option and is responsible for all costs.

10. In respect to an unapproved cemetery or unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemetery, if a disinterment/reburial option is selected, the burials will need to be fully uncovered, removed and reinterred with a minimum of damage and time. Costs associated with a disposition agreement will be negotiated by the landowner and representative. While the time it takes to complete this work will be subject to the wishes of the landowner and representative, factors such as the number and nature of interments, level of observations required by the representative for reinterment purposes, etc., will affect the length of time needed to complete the removal and reinterment. Consequently, in order to minimize time while maximizing care
and documentation, this work is best done by a licensed archaeologist under the direction of
the disposition agreement.

11. During removal, detailed observations will need to be made of the archaeological context of
the burial to ensure that all associated remains and grave goods are fully recovered. Age at
deat and sex of the individual should also be noted. This information will assist in
determining the appropriate methods of reinterment, as well as to assist in determining what
specific ceremonies need to accompany the reburial. Basic mapping can be used to aid in
making these observations. No scientific analysis of the skeletal remains or grave goods can
occur during this process without the consent of the representative of the deceased.

12. Should the disposition agreement impact on adjacent archaeological remains, or should
concerns be raised for these deposits during negotiations, MCzCR will advise and work
closely with the Cemeteries Registrar and other concerned to determine what is the most
appropriate course of action. MCzCR will also assist in mediating any issues that might arise
between the licensed archaeologist and other parties.
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ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTING COMPANIES IN ONTARIO

The following is a list of the corporate offices for companies that have employed archaeological consultants who are or have been recently licensed under the Ontario Heritage Act to conduct archaeological fieldwork in some or all of the Province of Ontario. Most companies will work over the full extent of the province permitted in the licenses their staff hold. This list is provided as a courtesy to development proponents, approval authorities, and others who may wish to contact archaeological consultant companies or retain their services to investigate properties in order to address archaeological conservation requirements tied to particular development projects.

IMPORTANT – PLEASE NOTE:
As only a list provided to aid those trying to contact consultant companies, this should not be assumed to reflect pre-approved or certified companies. This Ministry is not responsible for ensuring the current capabilities of the companies listed, or that work conducted will satisfy legislative requirements. Prospective clients should confirm that the archaeologist about to undertake any fieldwork on their behalf is currently licensed. As well, some archaeologists hold licenses with specific conditions. Clients should ensure that the archaeologist holds a license to undertake the specific type of work to be completed. Seeking multiple bids, checking references, and being generally familiar with the requirements consultant archaeologists are expected to meet will help ensure you make an informed decision.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Typically, archaeological consultants can undertake one or more of the four following tasks on behalf of a client, as well as provide reporting of that work and general expertise and knowledge of archaeological issues (For further information please refer to the Ministry’s Comprehensive Guideline on Archaeological Conservation in Ontario):

**Background Study:**
The consultant evaluates archaeological sensitivities for a particular property or properties to determine if the potential for finding sites exists or not, as well as appropriate assessment methodologies for the property. The archaeologist can review available archaeological and historical data for the area, interview local archaeologists, develop predictive mapping for the property, or even conduct an initial reconnaissance to map past disturbances and other features of interest. These kinds of studies are often referred to as a “Stage 1.”

**Property Assessment:**
Referred to as a “Stage 2,” the consultant surveys a property to identify all sites present. The survey will include all lands that are part of the development proposal, with the exception of areas disturbed by previous, fully destructive activities or lands which are permanently wet (e.g. swamps, marshes, etc.), exposed bedrock, or are steeply sloped (greater than 20°). Survey consists either of walking a ploughed field, looking for artifacts lying on the surface of the ground, or shovel-test pitting unploughable areas (woodlots, old pasture, etc.), and screening fill to identify artifacts. Where possible and practical, all lands that can be ploughed needs to be ploughed and weathered, allowing the consultant to follow the more effective, and less costly, method of survey by walking ploughed fields.

**Site-Specific Assessment:**
Referred to as a “Stage 3,” the consultant collects specific information about the age, size, artifact frequency, and presence of sub-surface cultural features for a particular site in order to evaluate its heritage value. This normally includes mapping the surface extent of the site and excavating a limited number of test units (1 metre in size).

**Site Removal:**
Referred to as a “Stage 4,” this work is done when a site of heritage value has been found and cannot be protected from development impacts. In these cases, the consultant will remove the site through the controlled excavation and recovery of artifacts and context through hand excavations, occasionally aided through the use of heavy machinery. Once this work is completed, the site, in effect, has been removed and converted into collections, maps and a report, and the locale can then be developed without fear of destroying an important heritage resource.

Archaeological Consultant Companies

A

A.F.B.Y. Archaeological and Heritage Consultants
65 Cedar Pointe Dr., Suite 311, Barrie, Ontario L4N 9R3 Tel. (705) 326-9389; Fax (705) 326-9731
E-Mail: mail@afby.net; Web Page: www.afby.net

A. M. Archaeological Associates
88 Marchmount Road, Toronto, Ontario M6G 2B1 Tel. (416) 652-2141; Cell (416) 737-3870; Toll-Free 1-877-632-0182; Fax (416) 652-9263
E-Mail: andrew.murray@utoronto.ca

Adams Heritage
3783 Maple Crest Court, RR#1 Inventory, Ontario KOH 1X0 Tel. (613) 272-3676; Toll-Free 1-888-248-8865; Fax (613) 352-1463
E-Mail: info@adamsheritage.com; Web Page: www.adamsheritage.com

Advance Archaeology
P. O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z4 Tel. (905) 342-3250; Fax (905) 342-3250 (call first)
E-Mail: advance_arch@yahoo.com

Alder Heritage Assessments
485 Sandbanks Crescent, Waterloo, Ontario N2V 2J3 Tel. (519) 746-7090; Fax (519) 746-0196
E-Mail: ahb.lw@sympatico.ca

Amick Consultants
760 Walker Street, London, Ontario NSZ 1J4 Tel. (519) 432-4435; Fax (519) 432-6697

Archaeological Assessments Ltd.
1292 Roundwood Crescent, Oakville, Ontario L6M 4A2 Tel. (905) 469-8690; Fax (905) 469-8702
E-Mail: rjgutov@allstream.net

Archaeological Assessments Ltd.
135 Daphne Crescent, Barrie, Ontario L4M 2Y7 Tel. (705) 728-3600; Fax (705) 728-0900
E-Mail: kearsleyg@simcoe.net

Archaeological Research Associates
1160 Islington Ave, Toronto, Ontario M8Z 4S7 Tel. (416) 236-2060
E-Mail: ara.toxique@rogers.com

Archaeological Services Inc.
528 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2P9 Tel. (416) 966-1069; Fax (416) 966-9723
E-Mail: archaeology@sympatico.ca; Web Page: www.archaeologicaleservices.on.ca

Archaeological Services Inc.
2289 Fairview St., Burlington, Ontario L7R 2E3 Tel. (905) 639-0193; Fax (905) 639-0317
E-Mail: archaeology@sympatico.ca; Web Page: www.archaeologicaleservices.on.ca

Archaeological Survey of Laurentian University
Anthro. Prog., Ramsey Lake Road, Sudbury, Ontario, P3E 2C6 Tel. (705) 675-1151 ext. 4229; Fax (707) 675-4823
E-Mail: pjm16@nickel.laurierian.ca

Archaeogica Inc.
14 Oxford Street West, London, Ontario N6H 1P9 Tel. (519) 642-7836; Fax (519) 642-7733
E-Mail: jimarch@rogers.com


Archaeological Consultant Companies

Archeoworks Inc.
P. O. Box 45082, RPO Mid-Yonge, Toronto, Ontario M4P 3E3 Tel. (416) 657-2571; Fax (416) 489-7248
E-Mail: k.m.locke@archeoworks.com; Web Page: www.archeoworks.com

Arnold, T.
478 Bluko Street, London, Ontario N6K 2N8 Tel. (519) 471-6504
E-Mail: tarnold@sympatico.ca

B

Ball, I.
248 Ruby Street, Midland, Ontario L4R 2L4 Tel. (705) 526-9518/8035; Fax (705) 526-4541
E-Mail: i.ball@bconex.net

Ballantine, T.
P. O. Box 654, Haliburton, Ontario KOM 1SO Tel. (705) 447-3253
E-Mail: thallantine@sympatico.ca

Borel Heritage Consulting
122 College Street, Thunder Bay, Ontario P7A 5J5 Tel. (807) 345-0154; Fax (807) 345-0154 (call first)
E-Mail: mamelood@baytel.net

Bruce County Museum & Archives
33 Victoria St. North, Southampton, Ontario NOH 2L0 Tel. (519) 797-2080; Fax: (519) 797-2191
E-Mail: dr_dig@canada.com

Brayner, S. A.
Box 612, Emu, Ontario P0W 1E0 Tel. (307) 482-1436
E-Mail: sbrayner@fort-francois.lakeheadu.ca

C

C. R. Murphy Archaeological Consulting
168 Neville Point Road, R. R. #: 2, Erinsville, Ontario K0K 2A0 Tel. (613) 379-2468; Fax (613) 379-2555
E-Mail: c.r.murphy@sympatico.ca

Catarachi Archaeological Research Foundation
370 King Street West, Kingston, Ontario K7L 2X4 Tel. (613) 542-3483; Fax (613) 542-3483
E-Mail: carf@kmo.net; Web Page: www.webutions.com/carf

Critchley, J.
1816 Third Street, St. Catharines, Ontario L2R 6P9 Tel. (905) 687-9398
E-Mail: jocw@law.ca

Cultural Resource Management Group Ltd.
166 Foster Avenue, Fall River, Nova Scotia B2T 1E7 Tel. (902) 860-0511; Fax (902) 860-0522
E-Mail: bptewart@greengroup.nu.ca; Web Page: www.crmgroup.ns.ca
Archaeological Consultant Companies

D

D. M. Gibbs Consulting
10104 Herbert Street, Port Franks, Ontario N0M 2L0 Tel. (519) 243-2077; Cell (519) 329-7409; Fax (519) 243-3320

D. R. Poulton & Associates Inc.
69 Langarth Street West, London, Ontario N6J 1P5 Tel. (519) 434-0319; Toll-Free 1-800-592-1857; Fax (519) 434-0317
E-Mail: dnpoulton@rogers.net

DeRitis Consulting
132 Water Street South, Kitchener, Ontario N2G 1Z5 Tel. (519) 744-7018; Fax (519) 744-5260
E-Mail: garth@golden.net

F

Fisher Archaeological Consulting
452 Jackson Street West, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 1N4 Tel. (905) 525-1240; Fax (905) 525-4683

Fisher, T.
262 Theresa Street, Thunder Bay, Ontario P7A 5P9 Tel. (807) 682-6640
E-Mail: tfisher@mercury.lakeheadu.ca

Fodere
51 Alexandra Street, London, Ontario N6C 2A9 Tel. (519) 434-1547
E-Mail: fodere@xto.net

G

G.M.P. Arch. Consultant
88 Scrivons St., Oshawa, Ontario K2B 6H1; Tel. (613) 828-2813
E-Mail: gmparchconsult@hotmail.com

Glidden, A. H.
211 Leith Street, Thunder Bay, Ontario P7C 1M7 Tel. (807) 622-1518
E-Mail: greywolf@air.on.ca

H

Heritage Quest Inc.
743 Selkirk Road, Kingston, Ontario K7P 1A4 Tel. (613) 384-0947; Fax (613) 384-1265
E-Mail: hquest@on.ca.com

Historic Horizon Inc.
601-267 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario M5R 2P9 Tel. (416) 944-9887; Fax (416) 944-9687
E-Mail: hhenderson@echo-on.net

Historica Research Ltd.
61 Laidlaw Drive, London, Ontario N6G 1T4 Tel. (519) 473-1858; Toll Free 1-877-818-0511; Fax (519) 473-8323
E-Mail: history@golden.net
Archaeological Consultant Companies

J

J. K. Jouppien, Heritage Resource Consultant
R R #1, St. Catharines, Ontario, L2R 6P7 Tel. (905) 684-7968; Fax (905) 684-7966
E-Mail: jouppien@niagara.ca

Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.
2781 Lancaster Road, Suite 200, Ottawa, Ontario K1B 1A7 Tel. (613) 738-0708 ext.315; Fax (613) 738-0721
E-Mail: evarlcy@jacqueswhitford.com

Janusak, S. E.
289 Cameron Lake Road, Tobermory, Ontario N0H 2R0 Tel. (519) 596-8243; Fax (519) 596-8243 (call first)
E-Mail: jsjarrett@hgmte.com

L

London Museum of Archaeology
1500 Attawandaron Road, London, Ontario N6G 3M6 Tel. (519) 473-1360; Fax (519) 473-1363
E-Mail: rmccartrie@uwo.ca; Web Page: www.uwo.ca/museum

Leslie Currie and Associates
66 Rocky Mountain Crescent, Brampton, Ontario L6R 1E7 Tel. (905) 789-1964; Fax (905) 789-9404

M

Mayer Heritage Consultants Ltd.
1615 North Routine Park, Unit 5 London Ontario N6H 5L6 Tel. (519) 472-8100, Toll Free 1-800-465-9990; Fax (519) 472-1661
E-Mail: mayerheritage@bellnet.ca

Mount McAllister Co. Ltd.
679 George Street, P. O. Box 321, Prescott, Ontario K0E 1T0 Tel. (613) 925-3625; Fax (613) 925-1738
E-Mail: mcallister@recorder.ca

N

New Directions Archaeology Ltd.
159 Daniels Street, Ancaster, Ontario L9G 4Y3 Tel. (905) 304-6893; Fax (905) 304-6891
E-Mail: pwoodley@bwcm.org

Northeastern Archaeological Associates
P. O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario L1A 3Z4 Tel. (905) 342-3250; Fax (905) 342-3250
E-Mail: lnortheast@sympatico.ca

O
Archaeological Consultant Companies

O'Conor, M.W.
832 A. Pinoahone Road, Goulais River, Ontario P0S 1E0 Tel. (705) 649-2973; Fax (705) 649-2973

P

Parker Archaeological Consulting
28-279 Sandowne Drive, Waterloo, Ontario N2K 2C1 Tel. (519) 888-0169; Fax (519) 888-6203

Past Recovery Archaeological Services
4534 Bolingbroke Road, R.R. #3, Maberly, Ontario K0H 2B0 Tel. (613) 268-2544; Fax (613) 268-2544
E-Mail: pastrecover@skyniggs.net

Pingwana Consulting
P. O. Box 1825, Sioux Lookout, Ontario, P8T 1G5 Tel. (807) 737-8937
E-Mail: tes@woodlandheritage.com or tedbingnis@hotmail.com

Q

Quaternary Consultants Ltd.
130 Fort Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 1C7 Tel. (204) 944-8325; Fax (204) 944-8325
E-Mail: skrockor@mb.sympatico.ca

R

RGS Archaeological Services
907-981 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1A8 Tel. (905) 524-1384
E-Mail: rgsarch@Interceptor.ca

S

Sattelberger, Peter
502 Lacroix Bay Road, R. R. #1, Westmeath, Ontario K0J 2L0 Tel. (613) 587-4252
E-Mail: psattelberger@webbhart.net

Settlement Surveys Ltd./Woodland Heritage Services Ltd.
P. O. Box 2559, 17 Wellington Street New Liskeard, Ontario P0J 1PO Tel. (705) 647-8833; Fax (705) 647-7025
E-Mail: jpollock@onlink.net

Swayne, K.
R. R. #5, Cobden, Ontario K0J 1KO Tel. (613) 791-4391; Fax (613) 646-2700

T

This Land Archaeology Inc.
2-335 Hyman Street, London Ontario N6A 3P3 Tel. (519) 433-1477; Cell (519) 852-2950
E-Mail: wfinlaya@uwow.ca
The Corporation of the Town of Whitby has retained Dillon Consulting Ltd. to complete a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) for the Town. The purpose of undertaking the TMP is to identify, at a strategic level, an integrated and diversified transportation framework to support long term growth (2031 and beyond) that provides for the efficient movement of people and goods to areas within and to/from the Town. The scope of the TMP is primarily focused on the arterial and major collector transportation system within the Town’s boundary, with the alternatives comprising of:

(i) maximizing the existing mobility system;
(ii) establishing and encouraging non-auto modes of travel;
(iii) identifying road widenings, missing linkages and corridor protections; and
(iv) considering land use strategies.

Public consultation is vital to this Study. Public Information Centres (PICs) are being held to obtain comments from interested and affected individuals on the work completed to date. The dates, times and locations of the PIC are as follows:

**Port Whitby Open House**
**Date:** Thursday, November 5, 2009  
**Time:** Open House 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., presentation at 7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Heydenshore Pavilion, 589 Water Street, Whitby

**Central Whitby Open House**
**Date:** Tuesday, November 10, 2009  
**Time:** Open House 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., presentation at 7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Council Chambers, Whitby Municipal Building, 575 Rossland Road East, Whitby

**Brooklin Open House**
**Date:** Thursday, November 12, 2009  
**Time:** Open House 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., presentation at 7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Winchester Public School, 70 Watford Street, Brooklin

The public will have the opportunity to review display panels illustrating the study process, transportation problems, preliminary recommended solutions, and discuss the material with Town of Whitby staff and their consultant. The input received from the public will aid in finalizing the study recommendations.

Further details on the Transportation Master Plan are available on the Town of Whitby’s website at [www.whitby.ca](http://www.whitby.ca).

If you cannot attend a PIC and wish to comment, written comments may be submitted to the Town of Whitby Public Works Department by:
**Fax:** 905.686.7005  
**Email:** whitbytmp@whitby.ca  
**Mail:** Town of Whitby Public Works Department, 575 Rossland Road E, Whitby, Ontario, L1N 2M8

Personal information is collected under the authority of Section 11 of the Municipal Act, SO 2001 and will be used for information purposes only regarding the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan. Questions regarding the collection and use of personal information should be directed to the Town of Whitby Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Office, Telephone 905-430-4300.
Town of Whitby

Transportation Master Plan Study

Welcome!
Public Information Centre
November, 2009
The Whitby Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Study is a mobility management plan which will identify strategic short and long term transportation system opportunities that will better manage the future travel desires and challenges within Whitby.

• Purpose of this Update:
  – Present study results to date and outline potential future transportation infrastructure and guiding principles for Whitby
  – Receive input to incorporate into the assessment and selection of the preferred solutions and long term implementation plan

• The scope of this presentation includes:
  – Study Purpose and Objectives
  – Study Process
  – Transportation Vision and Goals
  – Identification of Transportation Problems and Opportunities
  – Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Solutions to the Problems
  – Preliminary Preferred Improvement Option
  – Guiding Principles and Next Steps
Need for Transportation Master Plan

- No area wide plan – need a definitive plan and “now” property protection
- Ensure transportation needs, plans and policies are adhered to through an EA approved and defensible mechanism – mitigate future problems
- Need for “big picture” understanding, protection and implementation when reviewing small scale proposals – now and long term
- Land owners, public, and agency understanding and improved certainty of future corridors - financing
- Municipal budgeting, funding, partnerships
Transportation Master Plans (TMP)

• Typically differs from project specific studies (or traditional traffic impact studies)
  – Undertaken as strategic plans
  – Recommend a series of transportation works which are distributed throughout a "large" Study Area and which are to be implemented over a period of time
  – Scope of these studies usually includes a broader analysis of the transportation system in order to identify a framework for future transportation requirements
  – Transportation requirements may be implemented as separate projects as part of a staging or implementation plan; collectively they form part of a larger transportation system management plan
• As each specific project is undertaken, more detailed traffic studies are required to provide specific details regarding operational and physical design requirements
• Approval of the TMP reflects endorsement of the Master Plan and the overall transportation system requirements but does not represent formal approval of any individual element of the transportation system
• Although Master Plan satisfies Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA process, formal detailed approvals can only be granted following completion of the appropriate environmental assessments for each project
A Vision for Transportation in Whitby...

“To move people and goods within and across the municipality safely, conveniently and reliably by providing an integrated, accessible and cost effective transportation system. This system should comprise a range of mobility options which crosses and links into regional and provincial transportation infrastructure, and be integrated with Whitby’s natural spaces and waterfront. It should encourage walking and cycling, the use of transit, and make efficient use of existing and future transportation infrastructure.”

…to be achieved by:

Goals: Establishing, at a strategic level, an integrated and diversified transportation system and policy framework to support long term growth and provide for efficient movement of people and goods to areas within and to/from the Town.

Principles
• An effective, accessible, multi-modal, sensitive and complete transportation system
• An optimized transportation network
• An affordable transportation strategy
• A coordinated land use/transportation strategy

Objectives
• Promote transportation choice
• Reduce reliance on the automobile
• Use infrastructure efficiently
• Develop mobility linkages
• Pursue fiscal partnerships
• Consider long term impacts
• Integrate new opportunities in plans
• Implement complimentary amenities
Study Area and Planning Horizons

**Primary Study Area:**
- Town of Whitby boundaries – limits of recommended solutions

**Secondary Study Area:**
- Region of Durham and beyond – transportation demand forecasting analysis

**Planning Horizons:**
- Now, 2021, 2031 – demand forecasting – understanding protection needs and timing
- Ultimate Town built-out – consideration/verification of protection requirements for urban expansion
Planned Regional & Provincial Road Improvements

Regional:
- Assumes all road segments identified in the Region’s Transportation Master Plan and Development Charges Study improvements

Provincial:
- Assumes proposed and approved improvements to:
  - Highway 407 and West Durham Link
  - Highway 401 widening, new interchanges and reconfigurations
  - Highway 7 widening

The 2021 and 2031 base case transportation system was assessed with the following network improvements in place.
The 2021 and 2031 base case transportation system was assessed with the following network improvements in place.

**Regional:**
- Durham Region Transit
- Metrolinx
- GO Transit

**Provincial:**
- Highway 407 and West Durham Link
Project Schedule and Consultation

STRATEGIC NETWORK ASSESSMENT
Data Collection and Analysis,
Identify and Describe Problems and Opportunities,
Study Notice of Commencement

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1
Display of Need and Justification Findings, and Identification of Alternative Solutions

IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF STRATEGIC ROADWAY ALTERNATIVES

ASSESSMENT OF ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVES

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Display Findings of Alternatives Assessment and Corridor Review

TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN REPORT
Notice of Completion

FUTURE EA REQUIREMENTS
Detailed Design and Construction

Completed to Date

We are Here
(November 2009)

Next Steps
Winter 2010

Additional Steps
(Beyond This Study)
Phases 3 & 4
of the EA Process for individual projects

Phases 1&2
of the EA Process
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Various provincial and regional policies and plans guide the development of the TMP and require conformity. These include:

- The Big Move – Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan
- Places to Grow – Provincial Growth Plan
- 407 East EA
- Greenbelt Plan
- Provincial Policy Statements
- Durham Transportation Master Plan and Official Plan
- Growing Durham

At the same time the TMP must fit in with Town policies and inform Town planning activities such as:

- Official Plan Review
- Secondary Plan Studies (i.e. West Whitby)
- Cycling and Trails Master Plan (ongoing)
Scope and Objectives

The Class EA process considers:
- Transportation Services
- Socio-Cultural Environment
- Economic Environment
- Natural Environment
- Integration with other related plans and studies
- Conformity with Provincial and Regional Policy
- Engineering Feasibilities and Cost

Objectives of the Study are:
- Identify now, interim and longer term solutions to transportation issues facing Whitby
- Identify and protect future transportation corridors
- Identify Guiding Principles for future transportation initiatives
- Identify the cost of transportation services
- Satisfy Phases 1 & 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment
- Evaluate the Town’s transportation system and needs
- Obtain feedback and input from interested agencies and the public
- Establish a strategic transportation network to be protected
- Establish an implementation plan for improvements and guidelines
Transportation Problem Statement

- Existing conditions exceed system capacity along key corridors
- Critical screenlines nearing capacity in the long term even with other significant infrastructure improvements
- Future congestion concern – health and safety, economic prosperity and viability
- More difficult to provide safe and acceptable level of transportation, emergency, and maintenance service to existing and future developments
- Future development potential and community attractiveness compromised
- Deteriorating operating conditions – quality of life

**Conclusion - the Need is Justified to:**
- Further investigate transportation problems and solutions at a Sub Area level
- Identify and assess alternative improvements to solve the “problems”
- Develop and protect a transportation system and strategy to assist in accommodating long term mobility needs and service in a safe and efficient manner
Assess Strategic Solutions

- A broad range of alternatives with the potential of addressing the identified problems while moving the vision forward is an essential component of the EA process were considered.
- Assessment of strategic solutions is an essential component of the EA process.

A. **Do-nothing** - involves no changes to roads, transit or active transportation with the exception of already planned/committed improvements by the Province and Region.

B. **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)** - includes active transportation (e.g. walking, cycling) programs and polices that influence transportation demand so as to reduce the reliance on the automobile and maximize the use of existing infrastructure.

C. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM)** - includes minor physical and operational techniques, such as turn lanes and signal optimization, that increases the efficiency, safety, capacity, or level of service of a transportation facility. This alternative maximizes the mobility “capacity life” of existing infrastructure.

D. **Transit** – encourages increased transit use through “conscious” infrastructure layout and design, and land use planning.

E. **Strategic Asset Expansion** – this involves new and expanded infrastructure.

F. **Blended** - Combination of the above.
## Strategic Alternatives Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Service</td>
<td>Level of service on roadways, connectivity and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Impact on natural environmental features and sensitive lands through removal / disruption and impact on air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Environment</td>
<td>Impact on residents through potential displacement/disruption. Disruption to community / recreation features and impact on future land uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>Impact on business / commercial property and potential impact on desirability of Whitby to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Relative capital cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Blended Solution that provides choice is recommended to solve the transportation problem

- A combination of planned improvements, active transportation solutions, optimization of existing infrastructure, enhanced connections and service to transit, along with asset expansion, is the only mobility strategy which can truly satisfy the expected range of travel demands and user groups within Whitby in a meaningful and fiscally responsible fashion
Town of Whitby Sub Areas

- Primary Study Area was split up into six Sub Areas with unique land use and transportation characteristics

- Transportation characteristics, opportunities and constraints, and capacity and service deficiencies were further refined for each Sub Area
Lakeshore Whitby Sub Area Conditions

Transportation Problems and Opportunities
- Existing and future east-west capacity deficiency between Lake Ridge Road and Brock Street
- Victoria Street/Brock Street intersection constraints
- Future development and land use changes will add transportation demand
- Limited opportunity for transportation infrastructure expansion due to compactness of area and significant environmental features
- Incomplete cycling and pedestrian network to/from the waterfront and existing/future development lands, recreational facilities and GO Station
- Development of Lakeshore Whitby will add significant transportation demand
- New considerations for land use in terms of sustainability and travel requirements/modes will be fundamental to accommodate demand
- Expanded transit amenities will enhance accommodation of future growth travel demands
- Significant truck travel on Victoria Street, particularly near Thickson Road

Area Transportation Characteristics
- Significant employment and goods and services movements to/from the Lakeshore Industrial area
- Whitby GO Station is a major destination
- Iroquois Park Recreational Facility generates significant vehicular and pedestrian traffic on evenings & weekends
South Whitby Sub Area Conditions

Area Transportation Characteristics

- Access to/from Highway 401
- Main commercial areas are Whitby Entertainment Centrum and Power Centre on Thickson Road

Transportation Problems and Opportunities

- Existing and future east-west capacity deficiency between Lake Ridge Road and Brock Street
- Access to/from and across Highway 401 constrained – opportunities for improved/new ramps as part of future planned freeway widening (e.g. ramps to/from Garden Street)
- Limited roadway expansion opportunity in Downtown – enhance other measures (e.g. bicycle routes)
- Established and compact area with a pinch point through Downtown Whitby
- Dundas Street being planned as a Transit Spine across the Region (may be constrained in the Downtown)
- Potential east-west arterial capacity constraints exacerbated if lane reassignment of general purpose lanes completed for transit priorities – could trigger new routes or measures
- Need to provide integrated multi-modal facilities to Downtown, future development nodes and area recreational destinations such as Whitby Entertainment Centrum
- Need to safely accommodate cyclists and pedestrians from Whitby to the waterfront, existing/future development lands and recreational facilities south of Highway 401
- New transportation facilities required to service future development lands in West Whitby south of Dundas Street. Connections to existing infrastructure would be desirable.
East Whitby Sub Area Conditions

Area Transportation Characteristics

- Significant commercial uses along Dundas Street, Brock Street, Thickson Road, and north of Sub Area on Taunton Road
- Major employment trip attractors include Whitby Town Hall, Durham Region Headquarters, & the Provincial Court House
- Auto-dominated Sub Area
  - Very limited cycling facilities although most arterials have sidewalks and transit service
- Dundas Street is identified as a Transit Spine

Transportation Problems and Opportunities

- Future north-south capacity deficiency south of Taunton Road
- Significant traffic generated by the retail uses north of Taunton Road travelling to/from the Sub Area
- Capacity constraints during peak travel periods on the boundary roads create a propensity for “shortcutting”
- Missing east-west links (e.g. Crawforth/Mary, Dryden, Manning/Adelaide) need to be provided to allow for improved transit routing, allow for direct and continuous bicycling and pedestrian routes, and redistribute traffic to reduce shortcutting
West Whitby Sub Area Conditions

Area Transportation Characteristics
• Currently, well served in the central and eastern part of the Sub Area by the existing arterial system, although is limited to primarily autos
• Limited access in the west, southwest parts of the Sub Area, for east-west travel
• Brock Street often used for goods movement to/from the north
• Dundas Street identified as a Transit Spine

Transportation Problems and Opportunities
• Existing and future east-west capacity deficiency between Lake Ridge Road and Brock Street
• Shortcutting and traffic infiltration within west, southwest Sub Area needs to be addressed
• Development of West Whitby community will require new infrastructure
• Travel options to/from the Whitby GO Station needs to be improved
• The West Durham Link and Lake Ridge Road/407 interchange will relieve Brock Street from truck movements
• Missing east-west links. (e.g. Bonacord/Manning) need to be assessed to improve transit routing, increase capacity and improve overall connectivity
Central Whitby Sub Area Conditions

Area Transportation Characteristics
- Heavy commercial use, as well as open space, located north of Taunton Road
- Major commercial component means significant demand on evenings/weekends
- Shopping trips often require automobile use
- Taunton Road is identified as a Rapid Transit Corridor by Metrolinx

Transportation Problems and Opportunities
- Future east-west capacity deficiency between Winchester Road and Taunton Road (east of Brock Street)
- North-south capacity deficiency throughout the existing developed Sub Area
- Taunton Road primarily utilized as regional commuter route during travel peaks and during off peaks, greater localized travel to/from area commercial lands. Both conditions have increased shortcutting on local/collector residential routes
- Limited opportunity for transportation infrastructure expansion due to significant environmental features and presence of conservation areas (e.g. Iroquois Beach, PSW’s, woodlots)
- Need to safely and efficiently accommodate a wide range of auto and non-auto trips
North Whitby Sub Area Conditions

Area Transportation Characteristics

• Growing residential population
• Primary travel uses comprise of east-west commuter trips
• Baldwin Street (MTO Hwy 12) through Downtown Brooklin serves provincial traffic, goods movements, regional and local auto trips, in addition to local all mode trips to/from adjacent shops
• Rural roads within and beyond urban boundary are functioning as commuter routes

Transportation Problems and Opportunities

• Need to resolve conflicts in travel modes and user groups through Downtown (e.g. new routes)
• Further development will require new infrastructure (all modes)
• Existing infrastructure does not safely accommodate all modes – will require upgrading to reflect urban conditions and service needs
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

- TDM are strategies that attempt to reduce travel, congestion and pollution by diverting travelers or changing their mode by influencing travel behaviour.

- Suggested TDM measures include:
  - Increased utilization of public transit
  - Bicycle/pedestrian programs
  - Smart commuting/car pooling
  - Alternative and/or flex work hours and schedules
  - Parking management – pricing and regulation
  - Congestion/road pricing on Highway 407 and West Durham Link
  - Telecommuting
Preliminary Recommendations

Transportation Demand Management Strategies

• Public Transit
  – Encourage enhanced public transit through supportive land use
  – Develop Transit Oriented Development Guiding Principles (e.g. efficient access to transit stops from new subdivisions)
  – Consult with the Region of Durham to ensure transit needs are accommodated (i.e. review of development applications, planning for new roads and network connections, transit review)

• Active Transportation
  – Consider bicycles and pedestrians on new arterial roads
  – Provide grade separated pedestrian/cyclist structures across major barriers (highways, rail, watercourses, arterials) to reach prime destinations (e.g. across Victoria Street to the GO Station)
  – For rebuilt arterials, implement when feasible, facilities for bikes and pedestrians
  – Commit to a dedicated funding program for new and improved facilities
  – Implement educational and promotional programs to encourage active transportation within the community and for developments
  – Expand and dedicate facilities and routes for active travel modes whenever and where possible
Preliminary Recommendations
Transportation Demand Management Strategies

- **Ride Sharing/Increased Automobile Occupancy**
  - HOV lanes
  - Smart Commute – preferred parking incentives
  - Ride home programs – shuttle service, employer sponsored
  - Carpool subsidies, parking pricing

- **Parking Management**
  - Parking requirements, ratios, pricing
  - Shared parking for mixed developments
  - Incentives at parking lots for car pooling – to driver, to operator
  - “Smart” parking lots and communications

- **Land Use Management**
  - Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit-friendly land use planning and site design (e.g. access, signage, routings, multi-modal connections)
  - Design street layouts and connection points so as to reduce the potential need for traffic calming (accommodate traffic where it should be and wants to go)
  - Identify opportunities to develop Mobility Hubs in strategic locations
Transportation System Management (TSM)

TSM are minor physical and operational measures implemented that attempt to reduce travel, congestion and pollution by maximizing the person carrying capacity of existing mobility corridors.

- Suggested TSM measures include:
  - Intersection turn lanes – new and improved
  - Signal timing/phasing improvements
  - Audible signals and count down timers
  - Pedestrian signals
  - Mid block centre turn lanes
  - New roundabouts
## Roadway Analysis and Evaluation Criteria

### Methodology
- Simulation model for capacity deficiencies identified up to 2031
- Servicing and network needs also considered up to and beyond 2031
- Corridor alternatives developed and evaluated
- Sustainable modes of travel considered prior to increasing roadway capacity
- 15% reduction in auto demand assumed for each alternative as identified in the Region of Durham’s TMP and used in the Region’s transportation model
- Options that are capable of solving capacity deficiency were moved forward and evaluated
- Group rankings of key trade-offs were highlighted and a recommended alternative identified for each problem area
- Options that address missing links and servicing issues were identified for future corridor protection
- Transportation capacity, servicing and access were all considered in the review and identification of recommended solutions

### Criteria Evaluated (but not limited to)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Service</th>
<th>Natural Environment</th>
<th>Social Environment</th>
<th>Economic Environment</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Change in level of transportation service</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on terrestrial environment</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on residences</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supportiveness of alternative transportation modes</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on aquatic environment</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on community features</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on planned land uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficiency of use of existing infrastructure</td>
<td>• Potential for improvement to cross area of known rare species</td>
<td>• Potential for impact on community character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network connectivity</td>
<td>• Potential impact to PSWs, woodlots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The accommodation of access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Cost

- Economic Environment
  - Potential for impact on businesses
  - Potential for impact on planned land uses

- Natural Environment
  - Potential for impact on terrestrial environment
  - Potential for impact on aquatic environment
  - Potential for improvement to cross area of known rare species
  - Potential impact to PSWs, woodlots

- Social Environment
  - Potential for impact on residences
  - Potential for impact on community features
  - Potential for impact on community character

- Economic Environment
  - Potential for impact on businesses
  - Potential for impact on planned land uses

- Estimated Cost
Arterial Roadway Improvement Options

Lakeshore Whitby / South Whitby / West Whitby

Problem: Long term east-west capacity deficiency and transportation servicing

Options Assessed:

Widening of:
- Rossland Road (RR28) (4 to 6 lanes)
- Dundas Street (RR2) (4 to 6 lanes)
- Brock Street centre turn lane (portions)
- Henry Street (RR45) (2 to 3/4 lanes)

Extension of:
- Bonacord Avenue (4 lanes), Twin Streams Road (2 lanes)
- Burns Street West and East (4 lanes)
- Water Street, Harbour Street, Galt Street (2 lanes)

Construction: New Hwy 401/Annes Street crossing and connection to Gordon Street

* Potential road alignments subject to further study
Arterial Roadway Improvement Options

East Whitby / Central Whitby (north-south)

**Problem:** Long term north-south capacity deficiency and transportation servicing

**Options Assessed:**

- **Widening of:**
  - Brock Street (Hwy12), Thickson Road (RR26) (4 to 6 lanes)
  - Anderson Street (2 to 3/4 lanes)
  - Garden Street (2 to 4 lanes)

- **Extension of:**
  - Garden Street, Dryden Boulevard
  - Mary Street/Crawforth Street/CP grade crossing

* Potential road alignments subject to further study
Central Whitby (east-west)

**Problem:** Long term east-west capacity deficiency and transportation servicing

**Options Assessed:**

**Widening of:**
- Taunton Road (RR4) (4 to 6 lanes)
- Winchester Road (RR3) (3 to 4 lanes)

**Extension:** Conlin Road, Cochrane Street

**Construction:** Mid-Block Arterial, Highway 407/Cochrane Street interchange

* Potential road alignments subject to further study
North Whitby

**Problem:** Long term east-west capacity deficiency and transportation servicing

**Options Assessed:**

**Widening of:**
- Lake Ridge Road (RR23)
- Columbus Road (2 to 4 lanes)
- Carnwith Avenue (2 to 3/4 lanes)
- Cochrane Street (2 to 4 lanes)

**Extension:** West Durham Link, Carnwith Drive, Vipond Road

**Construction:** Hwy 407/Cochrane Street Interchange

* Potential road alignments subject to further study
Protecting Future Town Mobility Corridors

- Protect future corridors and right-of-ways to improve overall connectivity in the network, increase ease of transit and cycling use, and address future capacity deficiencies and servicing
- Regional improvements beyond Durham Region TMP (dashed line)
- Preferred Town corridor protection (solid line)
- Identify local centre turn lanes as warranted
- Project timings will be influenced by Highway 407 and West Durham Link implementation
- As traffic volumes warrant, and/or new development “triggers”, implement widenings/ extensions/ new roads and/or other forms of person carrying capacity. Staging of implementation is anticipated

- Further focused transportation studies for:
  - Brooklin
  - Lakeshore Whitby
  - West Whitby
  - Downtown Whitby
Protecting Future Town Mobility
Corridors

Committed Provincial and Regional Road Improvements
Road Improvements and Corridor Protection
Given the strategic nature of the work undertaken as part of this TMP, there will be a need for future detailed analysis of the transportation system to be completed in conjunction with the review of individual projects and development proposals.

General principles should be considered in the context of finalizing projects, some of these include, but are not limited to:

- Maximize existing transportation infrastructure before new transportation infrastructure is constructed
- Maximize use of non-auto modes in the provision of mobility services
- For all new developments, TDM opportunities should be maximized
- In the context of good transit and traffic network planning, spillover traffic from new communities should minimize its impact on adjacent subdivisions
- New facilities shall be adequate to achieve an acceptable standard of safety and service for the various modes
Preliminary Guiding Principles

- Internal road systems shall provide for a safe and convenient internal circulation system and be complimentary to abutting arterials
- New road networks should endeavour to be in a grid fashion to optimize efficiency in travel flows, access and maintenance
- Modify and implement truck routes as new highways/arterials are built to reduce heavy vehicles through Downtowns and heavy residential and pedestrian districts
- Context sensitive designs should be utilized to minimize property/proximity impacts of infrastructure to residential properties and sensitive environmental features – e.g. Iroquois Beach, PSWs
- Develop parking management strategy and long term plan for the Downtowns
- A high degree of non-auto usage should be encouraged by optimizing access between development and transit
- A pedestrian and bicycle system should be established to achieve pleasant, convenient and safe access to and between all major land uses, transit stations, parking areas, public streets and recreational destinations
Preliminary Guiding Principles

- Pedestrian and cycle network should be integrated and compliment other agency mobility systems to provide seamless transportation across municipal boundaries
- Use of open spaces, utility corridors and unopended road allowances for pedestrian and cycle linkages should be maximized
- Pedestrian and bicycle system should be orientated and developed to encourage maximum use of the transit system
- Intersections and roads should be designed to be attractive, safe and inviting for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles which must share the space
- Development should incorporate amenities which will encourage bicycle use by employees and patrons
- Protect new linkages to provide strategic connections that maximize mobility opportunities for people and goods
Next Steps

• Update assessment of alternatives based on feedback
• Establish recommended solutions and cost estimates
• Identify property protection requirements and implementation strategy
• Prepare implementation timing strategy and action plans for the property, EAs, design, approvals and construction
• Prepare the Study Report
Your comments on the information presented are useful and appreciated

Please fill out a comment form and leave it in the comment box

-OR-

Contact us to discuss your ideas

Study Website: www.whitby.ca
Study E-mail: whitbytmp@whitby.ca
Session Details
Public Information Centre (PIC) #2 consisted of three sessions as follows:

Port Whitby Open House
Date: Thursday, November 5, 2009
Time: Open House 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., presentation at 7:00 p.m.
Location: Heydenshore Pavilion, 589 Water Street, Whitby

Central Whitby Open House
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2009
Time: Open House 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., presentation at 7:00 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers, Whitby Municipal Building, 575 Rossland Road East, Whitby

Brooklin Open House
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2009
Time: Open House 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., presentation at 7:00 p.m.
Location: Winchester Public School, 70 Watford Street, Brooklin

Notification
A notice advertizing the Public Information Centres was published in the Whitby This Week newspapers on October 21st, October 28th and October 30th, and in the Brooklin Town Crier on October 23rd and November 7th. The notice was also posted on the Town of Whitby website at www.whitby.ca.

Project Team Attendance
Representatives from the Consultant and Town of Whitby staff were available to present information and respond to questions and/or concerns. The following members of the Project Team were in attendance:

Town of Whitby: Suzanne Beale, Director of Public Works
Greg Hardy, Manager of Engineering Services
Tara Painchaud, Transportation Project Engineer
Aftab Salam, Traffic Technician

Consultant: Heinz Schweinbenz, Senior Transportation Planner
Claudio Covelli, Partner
Dennis Kar, Associate
Tamas Hertel, Transportation Planner

ROGG Americas, LLC: Peter Spratt, Facilitator
Public Attendance
Upon arrival, individuals were asked to sign in to record their attendance. The PIC’s were attended by the public as follows:

Port Whitby – Nine (9) people signed in.
Central Whitby – Eighteen (18) people signed in.
Brooklin – Seventeen (17) individuals signed in

Information Presented
The purpose of these PIC’s was to present the following:

- Study results to date and outline potential future transportation infrastructure and Guiding Principles for Whitby
- Receive input to incorporate into the assessment and selection of the preferred solutions and long term implementation plan.

Summary of Comments
The following questions (Q) and comments (C) were asked/provided by residents, and answered (A) by the Consultant or Town of Whitby staff.

C: Any extension of Water Street should not be for vehicular traffic.
A: The Transportation Master Plan identified rights of way that should be protected as mobility corridors. This may not include vehicular traffic. Further study would be required.

_Council has adopted as of March 8, 2010 that the proposed Water Street extension be removed from the draft Transportation Master Plan for the Town of Whitby and the Region of Durham be requested to remove it from the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Official Plan._

An extension of the trail system in the form of twinning is being recommended as part of the TMP to address pedestrian/cyclist capacity needs and associated safety issues with overcrowding.

Q: Was a Front Street extension to the east considered?
A: A Front Street extension was not identified for corridor protection.

C: Improved traffic signal coordination is needed.
A: The Transportation Master Plan does not specifically address traffic signal coordination, however, recommendations for operational improvements to the network, including signal optimization and coordination, has been included in the TMP.
Q: Improvements are needed at the South Blair Street rail crossing. Has a crossing treatment similar to Hopkins Street been considered?
A: Some roadway improvements approaching the rail crossing have been undertaken by the Town of Whitby. However, the crossing condition immediately at the rail can not be undertaken by the Town of Whitby due to jurisdiction.

GO Transit is currently undertaking an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Lakeshore East Train Service extension from Oshawa to Bowmanville and a maintenance facility in Whitby. The maintenance facility in Whitby will include a grade separation at South Blair Street.

C: The restriction of u-turns on Brock Street south, south of Victoria Street should be implemented for safety.
A: Brock Street is under the jurisdiction of the Region of Durham. This concern has recently been forwarded to Regional staff for consideration.

Q: Is a Burns Street extension to Dundas Street being considered?
A: A west-to-north Burns Street extension, from its present terminus near Michael Boulevard to Dundas Street, is being identified for corridor protection in the TMP.

Q: There is no reference to property value in the Transportation Master Plan. The Vision statement should include text such as “not unduly affected” so that residents are not paying the bill.
A: The Vision will be reviewed and the wording modified. The desire to not lower values will be identified/incorporated. Town staff want to make Whitby a better place to live and the intent is to add value.

*The statement has been amended to include reference regarding societal and economic impacts.*

Q: Bonacord Avenue is an east-west route and will be a transit hub. However, there is no transit into existing Whitby and there is a need for better transit now on Bonacord Avenue.
A: The request for transit on Bonacord Avenue will be forwarded to the Region for their review and approval as they are the regulating body for transit service in Durham. In regards to the TMP, an extension of Bonacord Avenue is being “protected only”. There are no plans to widen the existing section of Bonacord Avenue. Further environmental assessment/secondary planning studies will be required prior to any widening or extensions. These studies would examine the need for noise attenuation, property impacts, etc.
Q: Is the shortcutting of tractor trailers between Brock Street and Lake Ridge Road, through West Whitby, being considered?
A: Only corridor protection at this time and there is no anticipated timing for construction. Widening or extension would be triggered by development or as demand warrants. A well planned arterial road system (e.g. Taunton Road and Rossland Road) would minimize the impacts of shortcutting.

C: Residents from Almond Village area are unclear about what is happening with the various projects and would like to present comments to the appropriate level of government. There are also water related concerns as the Village will be surrounded by roads of varying volumes and vehicle classifications.
A: Town staff have requested to the MTO a meeting with Almond Village residents. The meeting will be coordinated by MTO and will include staff from the Town of Whitby (Public Works and Planning Departments), Region of Durham, MTO, and residents from the Almond Village.

Q: Many Almond Village residents do not get notification of upcoming meetings. Resident would like all the Almond Village residents to get notified of meetings.
A: Town staff relies on newspapers, the Town’s website, and mailing lists (approx. 400) for notification.

C: Many residents in the Almond Village do not get the newspaper delivered.
A: Comment noted.

C: Transit seems to have forgotten about Almond Village. The safety of the residents is compromised due to lack of sidewalks to/from Highway 2. In addition, vehicles speed along Lake Ridge Road all the time. If you want resident so get out of their cars then bring transit to them.
A: Transit comment/requests will be forwarded to Durham Region Transit as they are the governing body for transit.

Q: More lanes on the road invites more traffic. Should be considering dedicated lanes, such as lanes that accommodate electric vehicles.
A: Town of Whitby is adding more bike lanes to our roadways. Last year we added 4km’s and this year we’ve added over 1km. The Town is also completing a cycling and leisure trail plan that is expected to be complete in 2010.

The TMP will be looking at mobility corridors which would include bike lanes. Sidewalk (pedestrian/cycling facilities) requirements along Dundas Street will be included by the Town in it’s planning for the area.
Q: Is a By-pass of Brooklin being considered?
A: Town staff would like to protect for a future extension of the West Durham Link (WDL) so that motorists do not have to drive through Downtown Brooklin to access Highway 7/Highway 407. East-west routes may be a Columbus Road or Carnwith Drive westerly extension.

Q: These extensions would be to alleviate Winchester Road traffic?
A: The road extensions could provide additional routes for truck traffic. This would remove the truck traffic from the Downtown area. In addition, the new routes would serve future development.

Q: Can the new routes/extensions be designated as a truck route?
A: Further study is required regarding the designation of a truck route.

C: Thickson Road was once supposed to be a by-pass for Downtown Brooklin.
A: When reviewing the need for new roads/extensions all roads would have to be considered. Town staff requested that MTO not preclude an extension of the WDL during their design of the interchange. This would not just be a by-pass but would be another service connection.

Q: Is the Bonacord Avenue extension a sure thing? It is being shown as a double line on the map.
A: At this time, the TMP is identifying corridor protection. The timing of any construction would be development dependent. The Project Team will be looking at the possible timing as the Study proceeds. Further EA/secondary plan studies are required prior to any extensions.

Q: Was the extension of Conlin Road considered?
A: An extension of Conlin Road westerly is not being recommended as part of this TMP.

C: Downtown transportation does not appear to be addressed.
A: Downtown Whitby is a challenge as there are limited opportunities for road widening. In this area we need to make better use of what we already have and complete missing links. Possible improvements might include a centre turn lane on Brock Street, the Region is studying bus rapid transit along Highway 2, and a Burns Street extension would provide relief to Dundas Street.

Q: How are the public comments being incorporated into the Study?
A: All comments will be reviewed and considered.
Q: With the proposed extensions of Columbus Road and Carnwith Drive, it is recommended that Way Street not be closed.

A: Individual environmental assessments are required for proposed roadway extensions. The EA process would include an area assessment to confirm need and determine alignment. Public consultation would also form part of the EA process.
Your Comments (please print clearly):
The Town of Whitby welcomes your comments regarding the Transportation Master Plan:

We want
commercial

Not
employment land

Dundas

Lake Ridge

Please submit your comments by November 30, 2009.

Contact Information:
Name:
Address:
Postal Code:

Privacy Statement

The personal information in this form is collected under the authority of Section 11 of the Municipal Act, SO 2001 and will be used for information purposes only regarding the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan. Questions regarding the collection and use of personal information should be directed to the Town of Whitby Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Office, Telephone 905-430-4300.

Communications:

Persons may obtain information of the Transportation Master Plan on Whitby’s website at www.whitby.ca and at the Whitby Public Works Department, Level 6, Whitby Municipal Building, 575 Rossland Road East, Whitby, ON, L1N 2M8, during regular working hours, Monday to Friday, 8:30 am to 4:30 pm; telephone 905-430-4307.

You may submit your written comments to the Town of Whitby Public works Department by:
Fax: 905-686-7005
Email: whitbyTMP@whitby.ca
Mail: Town of Whitby Public Works Department, 575 Rossland Road E., Whitby, Ontario, L1N 2M8
Your Comments (please print clearly):
The Town of Whitby welcomes your comments regarding the Transportation Master Plan:

- U-turns are occurring on Brock St. South and it is dangerous. Vehicles are also turning around on the grass shoulder adjacent to the park on Watson Street.
- Better signal coordination at Brock St./Victoria Street and adjacent intersections. The EG left queue is not be adequately addressed.
- Not enough done at rail crossing. Has the treatment that is used at the Hopkins St. at-grade crossing been considered? (seems to be a rubber mat?)
- Consider the protection of the Front Street extension row.

Please submit your comments by November 30, 2009.

Contact Information:
Name: ___________________________
Address: _________________________
Postal Code: ____________ Phone: ______________ Email: _______________

Privacy Statement

The personal information in this form is collected under the authority of Section 11 of the Municipal Act, SO 2001 and will be used for information purposes only regarding the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan. Questions regarding the collection and use of personal information should be directed to the Town of Whitby Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Office, Telephone 905-430-4300.

Communications:

Persons may obtain information of the Transportation Master Plan on Whitby’s website at www.whitby.ca and at the Whitby Public Works Department, Level 6, Whitby Municipal Building, 575 Rossland Road East, Whitby, ON, L1N 2M8, during regular working hours, Monday to Friday, 8:30 am to 4:30 pm; telephone 905-430-4307.

You may submit your written comments to the Town of Whitby Public works Department by:
Fax: 905-686-7005
Email: whitbyTMP@whitby.ca
Mail: Town of Whitby Public Works Department, 575 Rossland Road E., Whitby, Ontario, L1N 2M8
2009-11-25

To Whom It May Concern:

With respect to the TMP PIC slides dated November, 2009, I have the following comments:

1  Whitby GO Station and Iroquois Park

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the Whitby GO Station and Iroquois Park is hazardous. Improvements are being made, but pedestrians still face the real and ongoing threat of being struck by vehicles when crossing Henry Street or Victoria Street West. Additional sidewalks on these streets are needed. It is our understanding that a sidewalk will be constructed on the east side of Henry Street north of Victoria Street West. In addition, a sidewalk is needed on the south side of Victoria Street West, between Charles Street and the Sailwinds Condominiums driveway east of Watson Street West. Cyclists tend to ride on sidewalks along Victoria Street West, due to the large amount of fast-moving traffic (especially trucks). Improvements including signals, signage, lighting, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes must be provided to improve safety, and to encourage active transportation to Whitby GO Station and Iroquois Park.

As stated on the TMP PIC p.24 slide, a grade separated pedestrian or pedestrian/cyclist structure across Victoria Street West to the Whitby GO Station, either at Watson Street West or formerly Rowe Street, would greatly benefit commuters from the existing Sailwinds, Yacht Club, and Rowe Condominiums, and future condominiums to be built on Charles Street.

2  Water Street / Harbour Street / Galt Street

There appears to be a grade separation proposed for South Blair Street (see p.21 of http://www.gotransit.com/PUBLIC/en/news/ea/howmanville/Revised_Panels_for_Open_House_GO_Expansion_June15.pdf). Also, the TMP PIC p.8 slide shows this grade separation. If this separation is made, it will finally eliminate the constant sound of train horns that has been very bothersome to South Whitby and Lakeshore Whitby residents. However, the TMP PIC p.28 slide shows Galt Street connecting to Victoria Street. This would require a new crossing. If this is to be a level crossing, then train horns will still be heard, and they will be even closer to Lakeshore Whitby residents. If there is to be grade separation added for Galt Street then there is no problem. If not, then Galt Street should not cross the tracks. Instead, traffic from Harbour Street should continue to access Victoria Street East via Watson Street East and South Blair Street.
3 New West Whitby GO Station

The Whitby GO station is already overloaded, and the resulting traffic problems in the South Whitby and Lakeshore Whitby communities are significant. There should be serious consideration given to adding a station in the vicinity of Lakeridge Road / West Durham Link.

4 Victoria Street East Realignment

It was my understanding that Victoria Street East was to be realigned and widened between Thickson Road South and South Blair Street. However, this is not shown on the slides. Is this still in the plan?

5 Garden Street

With the pending closure of public schools on Garden Street, it seems to me that the speed limit north of Dundas Street could then be increased from 40 km/h to 50 km/h.

There is a major bottleneck on Brock Street through downtown Whitby. Improvements could be made to have Garden street four lanes (eventually) and continuous from Baldwin Street South down to the 401. A full or partial interchange could be built at the 401, to provide improved connection to Garden Street to/from eastbound 401. A full interchange with connection to South Blair Street would provide truck traffic with a better way to access the industrial area south of the 401, keeping these trucks away from residential areas south of Victoria Street.

Best regards,
TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE

Agenda

Purpose:

a) To outline guiding principles for the study, and potential future transportation infrastructure requirements

b) To seek input from the community that will be incorporated into the assessment and selection of preferred solutions and a long-term implementation plan

6:30 p.m. Open House
7:00 p.m. Welcome & Introductions
Presentation (Dillon Consulting)
Forum: Questions & Answers
8:30 p.m. Closing

Notes:

While I understand this program is strategic, I would like to ensure short term developments are consistent with the concept of "Active Transportation." There is much that can be done now at relatively little cost - paint & signage can go a long way to help promote & educate motorists & cyclists in a much more bicycle-friendly community (eg St Catharines turned 300 M of bicycle lane into 20 KM in 2 years at a cost (apparently) of about $20,000. To develop a serious bike plan one must start from the viewpoint that bicycles are serious transportation vehicle, not toys and that they have no place on sidewalks. To encourage bicyclists to move off sidewalks and on to roads, roads must be made safe.

Received Nov 5 @ Heydenshore PAC
My area of interest are the commuter and public transportation patterns. The ability for commuters to get to their jobs, effectively, is obviously very important. Those remaining at home, the Seniors, are my area of concern.

In the near future, the Senior population will become a larger percentage of the whole than at present. Our health care will add longevity and the “BABY BOOMERS” will shortly add quantity. I don’t have the demographic numbers to establish a valid percentage, but I can certainly see a very large portion of our population being Seniors in the not too distant future.

Seniors don’t commute to work. Their destinations are very different: shopping plazas, Senior Activity Centers, gyms, theatres, friends, etc. These are all locations within the boundaries of Whitby, not long distant commutes. Just to add complications, time passing will cause the increase of walking aids: canes, walkers, scooters, and even wheelchairs. These add difficulties for the public transportation systems.

Another area to consider is the Senior’s usage of their own vehicle. Certainly many have vehicles and many drive. However, as time passes, their willingness to drive in foul weather will dramatically decrease, thus adding a load to the public system. And, in the foul weather, the Senior’s ability, or willingness, to walk any distance will also decrease. Thus public transportation stops need to be located properly and, possibly, relatively close together. No Senior is going to walk a couple of blocks to get a bus and then walk a couple more blocks to get to the activity of their choice. Rain, sleet, snow and ice, these are all dangerous weather conditions for Seniors. We need to ensure they can get to their activity under any weather conditions. Being stuck at home is no life to look forward to.
From:
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2009 6:43 PM
To: Whitby Transportation Master Plan
Subject: Comments re: Whitby Transportation Master Plan

Re: Village of Brooklin West

To Consulting Company:

On behalf of the residents of Montgomery Avenue in Brooklin, we wish to ask you to please strategically study the impact of the widening of Carnwith and Columbus (both east west routes) on Montgomery Avenue which runs north south.

Montgomery avenue is the only street that runs north – south within a village of almost 6000 plus residents and it is already over capacity. It is currently dangerous for even school children and cyclist and pedestrians to use the street. While Ashburn runs in the same direction, 90% of residents from collector streets are using Montgomery instead of Ashburn during their daily commute.

In designing your master plan to accommodate the safe, reliable effective movement of people in this growing subdivision, it is important you seriously look at the following options:

(A) Re-open Way Street (Between Vipond and Carnwith) to lift some of the north south traffic off Montgomery
(B) Open up Ferguson street to lift some of the north south traffic off Montgomery
(C) Re-design Montgomery street to encourage more pedestrian friendly and cyclist friendly streets, as it's straight design promotes dangerous speeding within a school zone
(D) Through design, recommend strategies to enhance the use of the underused Ashburn Street to ease the dangerous North south traffic off Montgomery

Impact of increasing #s in subdivision
In another 5 years, the number of residents within this subdivision will increase beyond 10000 and Montgomery Avenue, simply cannot take on this capacity with a school already contributing to high pile ups on mornings.

Impact of Community Centre
In another 1 year, a new and enhanced community library and centre will be opening up off Montgomery, again increasing volumes on the street. This is another reason for the town to look into re-opening Way street which is situated next to this community centre to ease some of the north south congestion for residents situated on the east side of Carnwith or the east side of Hwy 12.

Montgomery needs to be, pollution free, accessible and safe to Children, pedestrians, cyclists & walkers. At this time, speeding, high volumes, pollution and traffic congestion on mornings and afternoons are taking over and affecting the quality of RESIDENTS life.

12/04/2009
Both Way Street and Ferguson must be looked at, with recommendations to have them re-opened to address these problems on Montgomery.

I am hoping your plan and recommendations, will contribute to and create the 21st century green, safe, pedestrian friendly communities in the Village of Brooklin West.

Sincerely,
November 27, 2009

The Town of Whitby
Public Works Department
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, ON
L1N 2M8

Via email:  whitbytmp@whitby.ca

To Whom It May Concern:

Re:  Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan
      Our File No. PAR 15536

We have received notice of Town’s Transportation Master Plan. TransCanada has two high pressure natural gas pipelines crossing the northern section of Whitby. TransCanada reviews all development within 200 metres of its facilities to ensure that it does not affect the safety and integrity of those facilities.

We ask that you provide us with detailed information as it becomes available and we will provide additional comments should the proposed Plan impact TransCanada’s facilities.

Until such time, please be advised of the following TransCanada and National Energy Board requirements for any development in close proximity to the pipeline for consideration in the Plan:

1. All crossings of the pipeline right-of-way by any facility as defined by the National Energy Board (NEB) Regulation 112 must have TransCanada’s prior written authorisation. A crossing facility may include but is not limited to driveways, roads, access ramps, trails, pathways or utilities. In accordance with the NEB Act, the owner may be required to enter into a crossing agreement with TransCanada prior to the construction of any facility. The owner agrees to meet all clearances and design requirements outlined in the crossing agreement and the NEB Pipeline Crossing Regulations.

2. Roads or streets designed to run parallel to the pipeline right-of-way may not have any portion of the road allowance limits located within the right-of-way.
3. Paving and parking are not permitted on the pipeline right-of-way, except at authorised crossings.

4. Vehicle barriers, of a design acceptable to TransCanada or as may be required by law, shall be installed across the width of the right-of-way, where public roads cross the right-of-way. The location of these barriers must be approved by TransCanada.

5. Any grading not otherwise permitted by the NEB Act or Crossing Regulations, that will affect the right-of-way or drainage onto it, regardless of whether or not the grading is conducted on the right-of-way, must receive TransCanada’s prior written approval. Grading activities on the right-of-way will only be permitted when a TransCanada representative is present to inspect and supervise them.

6. Section 112 of the NEB Act requires that anyone excavating with power-operated equipment or explosives within 30m of the pipeline right-of-way must obtain leave from the pipeline company before starting any work. To satisfy this NEB requirement, you may send your request for leave directly to TransCanada with supporting information explaining how the work will be carried out. Once you obtain written approval for your excavation request, you must notify TransCanada at 1-800-827-5094 or Ontario One Call at 1-800-400-2255 15 business days before the start of any excavation using power-operated equipment and 30 business days before the use of explosives within 30m of the pipeline right-of-way limits.

7. Notice must be given to TransCanada directly (1-800-827-5094) or through Ontario One Call (1-800-400-2255) a minimum of 15 business days before the start of any construction on or within 30m of the pipeline right-of-way and 30 business days before conducting any work involving explosives.

If you have any questions, please contact our office.

Sincerely,
To: Whitby Public Works

Re: Extension of Water Street
from Heydenshore Park to Thickson Road
in the Whitby Transportation Master Plan

I am gravely concerned that designating this route for “future development” could open the door to cars and trucks someday. I request that you spell out clearly in your new plan that this route will never be expanded for motorized vehicles.

Many citizens of Whitby and Friends of the Waterfront Trail have battled hard over the years to ensure that Water Street not be extended, in order to keep the peace and natural beauty of this special area. Every Whitby councillor in the last decade has gone on public record with their commitment never to extend Water Street. Councillor Don Mitchell made a motion in council that “future Water Street” be removed from the Town of Whitby official plan.

To leave this question open now, and say that this route should be developed according to “future needs” means that citizens may have to fight forever to protect this precious natural resource, rather than celebrating the enlightened decision taken by Whitby Council.

Reasons for concern
The Lake Ontario shoreline is a major migration corridor for millions of Canada’s birds in spring and fall. Every raptor migrating south from our northern woods and tundra reaches the lake and turns west. Countless songbirds follow the same route, as do ruby-throated hummingbirds, monarch butterflies, and several species of dragonfly. Every scrap of natural habitat we can protect and enhance for them is precious.

In spring thousands of migrating songbirds fly across the lake and pause to rest and feed on Whitby’s shores, gathering strength to continue their journey. Whitby Scouts and local naturalists went to great effort on Earth Day several years in a row to plant trees on this stretch of shoreline that the Town of Whitby in a wonderful visionary move has chosen to keep natural.

People from across southern Ontario travel to the area because it’s the most beautiful part of the Waterfront Trail for recreation. To introduce car and truck traffic would ruin it.

Bottom line: make it clear in your transportation master plan that “Water Street” will never be extended for vehicle traffic. I suggest you remove any Water Street designation from that area and call it the “Whitby Waterfront Trail” only.
The Corporation of the Town of Whitby  
575 Rossland Road East  
Whitby, ON L1N 2M8

Attention: Ms. Tara Painchaud

Dear Madam:

Subject: Whitby Transportation Master Plan  
Authority IMS No.: PSSG244.

Authority staff has had an opportunity to review this draft document and is pleased to see that the Town is able to meet with traffic demand requirements while at the same time avoiding areas of environmental significance and concern noted by the Conservation Authority in our previous discussions. While it is inevitable that some environmental areas will be impacted by an expanding transportation network, for the most part the proposed network avoids the more significant environmental features within the Municipality and we applaud the efforts made. We do have some comments and recommendations however and they are noted as follows:

Section 1.4.3 Natural Environment Constraints,  
Page 9; Areas of Hydrologic Significance are stated to include a number of watercourses including Carruthers Creek. Neither Carruthers Creek nor its drainage area are located within Whitby. Also, it is noted that these creeks ‘support a diverse warm/cool fish community.’ It should also be noted that some of these watercourses support a coldwater fishery, and that most are managed for a coldwater fishery, important information as timing for in-stream works and buffers will differ from warm water systems. In light of this, it is suggested that the above

What we do on the land is mirrored in the water
wording be revised to: ‘support a diverse fish community and is managed as a cold water fishery’.

While the creeks are areas of Hydrological Significance, we would suggest that areas with high water tables and High Volume Recharge Areas also be considered hydrologically significant. It is important to include and identify these areas as they could impact on future road design in order to mitigate or limit impacts to groundwater levels, and they could influence stormwater management considerations for new roadway quality treatment facilities.

Regarding Stormwater Management considerations, the report makes no specific reference to a requirement for treating road runoff. We would recommend that this be included as a requirement for all new roads, and be investigated for opportunities when existing roads are upgraded or expanded.

Exhibit 1-4: Provincial Environmental Constraints,
This Map attempts to show known environmental constraints within Whitby, however recognizing that redside dace habitat has been identified beyond the limits portrayed as aquatic species at risk (DFO), and as other environmental features may also change, to keep this more of a living document we would recommend a note stating that limits are approximate only and subject to change, and that the appropriate agency/authority should be contacted for confirmation.

Section 5.7.1 Sub-area 1 – Lakeshore Whitby
Page 40, Existing Transportation and related Land Use Characteristics does not identify Lynde Shores as a significant recreational feature, but does recognize it as a significant environmental feature. Considering the use of the Conservation Area for hiking, fishing, bird watching and general outings, and as intensification and population growth in near vicinity is likely to increase demand on this area, should it be included as a significant recreation area as well? Would this have implications for roads and infrastructure?

Section 5.7.2 Sub-area 2- South Whitby
Page 44, Significant Issues and Constraints, last bullet point notes soil conditions near Pringle Creek flood plain east of Hopkins Street. Should this be Corbett Creek?

Section 10.2.2 Other Network Improvements and Future Corridor Protection,
Page 91, the Burns Street extension to the west at Michael Boulevard would entail passing through flood plain and a Provincially Significant Wetland. These factors would have to be considered in any future design. The Town is reminded that the PPS states that when planning for significant transportation corridors, consideration must be given to significant natural heritage resources, including PSWs. Also, some previous documentation reviewed outside of this project has suggested that Highway 401 might need to shift northward in this general
location to accommodate a Lakeridge Road intersection. If this were to be necessary, it would make sense to limit the number of disruptions in the wetland by undertaking the Burns extension during the same period of time.

Page 91-92 identifies a Twin Streams Drive extension west to Coronation and Lakeridge Road for protection to facilitate east-west movements. An extensive area of flood plain is within the shown routing, as are two areas of Mature Woodland (identified in Whitby Official Plan)/Key Natural Heritage Features (Durham Region Official Plan). The implications of these features to a future road crossing and vice versa would need to be evaluated prior to this extension going forward.

Page 92, North Whitby Point 1, refers to protecting for a full interchange at Highway 407 and Cochrane Street. As it is planned in the future that the main entrance to Heber Down Conservation Area will be located off of Cochrane Street south of Winchester Road, we would like to see that future road/interchange design in this area accommodate this.

Page 93, Point 3 recommends protecting two collector road alignments for the extension of Vipond Road and Carnwith Drive west to Country Lane and the proposed By-pass. Tributaries that would be crossed include those identified as redside dace habitat, and therefore the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources would be required to review any proposed crossings for compliance with the Endangered Species Act. It might be advisable to contact them at this time to receive input as to the feasibility of allowing 2 crossings as opposed to a single crossing.

Page 107, in discussing north south deficiencies and the timing around proposed widening’s for both Baldwin and Anderson Streets, notes that Anderson Street was identified for widening first partly owing to a need to service new residential development near Conlin Road. This residential area designation remains in question at this time. If the residential node so mentioned does not come to fruition is the widening of Anderson Street still required and or the preferred option over the others evaluated?

Section 12 describes a number of items and sets timelines for when studies/policies should be commenced and/or enacted. As some of the proposed transportation network expansions/additions are likely to impact environmental areas, it would be good to have a preliminary assessment of impacts associated with the recommended network undertaken early on in order that pre-construction mitigation might be undertaken where appropriate, thereby limiting impacts when the works actually move forward.

Section 14, Guiding Principles
We are encouraged to see that design is to be sensitive to impacts on environmental features. However, we would like to see this identified as a separate principle (current statement includes residential area impact reference as well) and expanded upon to include references to maintaining a connected functional natural heritage system including both aquatic and terrestrial species.
It is also important that in the TMP, the need to implement opportunities for wildlife connectivity through road alignment, design and construction be identified as an important element in the consideration of road construction and design. Consideration and accommodation of wildlife movement in road design will not only decrease wildlife road mortality but would also reduce what can be dangerous collisions between wildlife and vehicles and which may result in injuries and/or death to drivers and passengers.

As noted previously the Authority would like to see expansions and/or additions to the road network include provisions to treat runoff and limit pollution to receiving watercourses. A guiding principle of maintaining and where possible enhancing/improving the quality of runoff from municipal roads would seem appropriate.

Once again we applaud the Municipality and consulting team for the works and direction taken to date, and thank you for the opportunity to comment and provide input into this draft document. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Ted Aikins
Planner
TA/

Cc: R. Short, Town of Whitby, Planning
Cc: E. Belsey, Town of Whitby, Planning
Cc: S. Beale, Town of Whitby, Public Works
Cc: G. Hardy, Town of Whitby, Public Works
Cc: L. Trombino, Regional Municipality of Durham
Cc: J. Brooks, Regional Municipality of Durham

G:\planning\planning\comments\2010\whitby tmp comments
May 17, 2010

Suzanne Beale, P. Eng., PTOE,
Manager of Engineering Services
Town of Whitby
575 Rossland Rd E,
Whitby ON L1N 2M8

RE: TSS Comments:
Transportation Master Plan
Town of Whitby
Class Environmental Assessment
Response to Notice of Completion

Dear Ms. Beale,

This letter is our response to the Notice of Study Completion for the above noted project. The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) has been reviewed and we have the following comments with respect to the proposed undertakings:

- Under Section 2.3, Strategic Objectives, the objective of the first bullet of the "Accessible" principle is unclear. Please elaborate on what kind of developments exist are or planned that are not transit supportive however essential for personal accessibility needs and economic viability, and why they are essential.

- The Whitby TMP refers to the Region of Durham’s Official Plan Amendment (OPA) No. 128. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) has provided a draft decision notice with proposed modifications to the OPA. A letter from the MMAH to the Region of Durham dated March 12, 2010 outlines the proposed modifications, some of which will affect the Whitby TMP. For example, Durham’s employment numbers are in excess of the Growth Plan; additional employment lands have been added to the Official Plan without justification; and concern with the size of urban expansion areas and the impact this will have on transit-supportive development. The Town of Whitby should modify the TMP according to the approved OPA if any changes in the final approved OPA affect lands in Whitby.

- It is unclear in Section 9 what year was chosen as the base year for the auto reduction target of 15% by 2031. Please include this information in this section.

- The recommended Screenline Capacity Improvements and other Sub-area Network Improvements and Future Corridor Protection have the potential to significantly impact sensitive environmental features including cold water fisheries, woodlands and provincially significant wetlands. Further study will be required at the Class EA project planning stage for each project to determine whether these proposed improvements are the optimal alternative.
solution to meet Whitby's transportation system objectives. Detailed hydrogeological investigations and surface water investigations are recommended for these proposed projects. If road extensions or expansions are chosen as the preferred alternative, stormwater management plans should be prepared. An enhanced level of protection is recommended for any watercourses affected by the proposed projects.

- Macedonian Village may have an overall increase in traffic noise from the West Durham Link. This may be an area of concern in the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Should you or any members of your project team have any questions regarding the above, please contact me at (416) 326-5745.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dorothy Moszynski
Environmental Resource Planner and EA Coordinator
Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning

c. Dave Fumerton, York Durham District Office, MOE
Central Region EA File
A & P File
May 26, 2010

Tara Painchaud, P.Eng
Town of Whitby Public Works Department
575 Rossland Road E.
Whitby, ON  L1N 2M8

Re:  Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan – Draft Report, April 2010

Dear Ms. Painchaud:

Thank you for providing the Ministry with the opportunity to review the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Draft Report. We have completed our review and offer the following comments for your consideration.

The TMP was assessed for clarity and comprehensiveness as well as consistency with provincial policy. Provincial policy documents taken into consideration included the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan, Transit-supportive Land Use Planning Guidelines, and Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan (The Big Move). This review is structured to co-ordinate with the Parts in the Plan. The Ministry comments are as follows:

**Part 1**

**Planning Context**

The *Provincial Policy Statement* and *Transit-Supportive Land Use Guidelines* should be referenced under ‘Provincial Strategies and Initiatives’ in Section 1.3.3. There should be a brief discussion as to how the TMP addresses and meets the objectives of the provincial policies in relation to the transportation strategies recommended in the document.

All environmental factor specific areas are to be identified, assessed and evaluated as part of the Environmental Assessment process when considering road improvements. Built heritage, cultural landscapes, archaeology, First Nations, waste and contamination, noise and air quality are issues that should be included under Environmental Considerations (Section 1.4).

**Provincial Highways**

The ministry’s Highway 407 project is to be referred to as the “407 East Extension” and its corridor as the “407 East Transportation Corridor”, within the written portion of the document and on all exhibits.

The following are changes to be made to Section 4.1.5:

- Change title of Subsection a. to “Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) 407 East Transportation Corridor Extension from Brock Road (Pickering) to Highway 35/115 (Clarington)”
• Subsection a.1, add the words “lane ultimate” to “two planned six (6)”, so that the sentence reads “…with two planned six (6)-lane ultimate link connections to Highway 401…”
• Subsection a.2, revise this paragraph to: ‘MTO completed the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) Study and documentation in January 2010 for the highway/transitway extension. At the time of preparation of this report, the final decision on the IEA from the provincial Ministry of the Environment has not yet received. A federal-provincial agreement identified a completion date of 2013 for the 407 East Transportation Corridor; however, no decisions have been made about its implementation.’
• Subsection a.4.i:
  - Second bullet: What does “2031 planning horizon base case model – 4 lanes” refer to?
  - Fourth bullet: replace Brock Street with Baldwin Street
  - Fifth bullet point: The statement “Highway 7 to fly under the mainline” is valid for the Highway 7/West Durham Link crossing. East of Cochrane Street, Highway 7 crosses over the mainline
  - Include a bullet that mentions Transitway stations at Lake Ridge Road, Baldwin Street, and Thickson Road
• Subsection a.4.ii:
  - Second bullet: What does “2031 planning horizon base case model – 4 lanes” refer to?
  - Include a bullet that mentions Transitway stations at Dundas Street, Rossland Road, and Taunton Road
• Subsection c, some of the expectations of the work MTO will review and consider (i.e., sidewalks and bike lanes, Burns Street, Lake Ridge Road interchange, etc) are beyond the scope of the 401 Preliminary Design. The 401 study will determine the interim (staged) and ultimate improvements. The list of issues should be described in a general perspective.
• Subsection d, revise wording to state “This project is presently on hold until the outcome of the 407 East IEA is known, at which time it will be reassessed.”

Part 2

Population and Employment Forecasts
Section 5.2 shows two set of forecasts; ROPA 128 forecast is in compliance with Places to Grow at the Regional level, while the other (Transportation Model Forecast) is not. Appendix E contains the detail, and it appears that what’s used in the model is from an earlier set of forecasts from the Region (2003 DC Review), which had higher population for the Region (e.g. 2031 population of 1.022 mill compared to 0.960). Employment figures are comparable in both sets.

The use of higher population could result in over-stating future travel demand (or in timing/staging of when forecasts would materialise). However, the level of over assuming population is lower in Whitby compared to other municipalities in Durham.

Travel Demand Forecasts
Demand forecasting has been done using a “simplified model” which does not have sophisticated multi-modal modelling capability. However, forecasts have been refined to manually lower auto demand by 15% to account for policy objectives and other initiatives such as TDM, transit promotion, etc. The 15% reduction in auto demand region-wide would result in transit modal split for the region in line with the Metrolinx’s forecast under the Big Move.

In Appendix E, model development and approach refers to (E-3) applying a growth factor of 1.12 on 2021 to obtain 2031 demand forecasts. It is not clear why this was done while 2031 land use (population and employment) inputs could have been used to obtain 2031 travel demand forecasts.
Transportation System Performance
This is limited to level-of-service analysis at the screenline level, comparing demand against capacity for each road. While it is good that the “entire” road network is addressed, there is no focus on “town” roads.

Provincial Highways
Under Section 5.6.7.b.6, include the following statement: ‘The 407 East IEA did not protect (seek approval) for an interchange at Cochrane Street. Any interchange at this location will be subject to its own class EA (completed by others) and MTO approval.’

Part 3
Transportation Demand Management Strategy
Use stronger wording to give emphasis to the application of the TDM strategy. Replace ‘should’ with ‘will’ in Sections 7.12. a and b.

MTO commends Whitby’s initiative to be a ‘leading example’ in the development of a trip reduction program for the Municipal Offices and supports the Town’s efforts to establish Mobility Hub designations in the downtown area and around the Whitby GO Transit station.

Transit
Section 8 e 2 (ii) refers to “planned Light Rail Transit” and “planned Bus Rapid Transit.” It should refer to “proposed higher order transit” only, as nothing has been planned yet for those corridors.

Section 8 e 2 (iii) refers to the Long Term Transit Strategy “identifying” Light Rail Transit corridors. This should be toned down to “propose”

Section 8 e 4 iv last bullet point talks about “implementation of exclusive or semi-exclusive bus only lanes.” Please clarify that this is not at the province’s expense.

Crossings of Provincial Highways
The following are changes to be made to Exhibit 9.1:

- Revise exhibit to clearly distinguish between work desired by Whitby/others and work protected by the 407 East IEA (i.e., extension of the West Durham Link north of 407 is not protected for under the 407 East IEA)
- MTO must be consulted about and review any proposed changes to municipal roadways in the vicinity of MTO infrastructure (i.e., Burns Street extension)
- The exhibit shows a potential grade separation at 407 East and Garrard Road. The 407 East IEA does not seek approval for this crossing. This work is subject to a separate class Environmental Assessment by others and MTO approval
- Ensure these comments are applied to other exhibits and cross-referenced in Table 10.6
- Show road closures (i.e., cul-de-sacs)

The capacity and service need requirements of new local roads crossing 401 fall under the responsibility of the municipality, not MTO. Any new municipal crossings of the highway must be approved and agreed to by the ministry. If a new structure is being considered for an existing crossing, the ministry must review the need to provide additional capacity and/or bike lanes and/or sidewalks, in consultation with the Town and the Region. The recommendation to have the ministry assess the capacity and service need requirements for municipal road crossings is not appropriate unless it involves an interchange or it be done as part of municipal or Regional upgrades to the roadway (Section 9.2.2.2 b).

Section 9.2.2.6.a makes reference to “… Garden/Baldwin Streets…” This should be changed to “… Baldwin Street…”

Page 3 of 5
Goods Movement

The TMP recognizes the value of viewing a focused Goods Movement Strategy through a multimodal lens that allows for the integration of the modes of transportation. The reference to the Durham Region’s strategic direction in Section 9.5.e., which notes that “the region has identified a shift to rail based goods movement from road based goods movement as a top priority in an effort to reduce congestion on regional roads” and that this will affect truck volumes within the Town of Whitby is not an appropriate goal for any level of government in a deregulated, competitive market environment in which shippers should be free to make their modal choice that best suits their needs. Congestion is better addressed through more integrated, coordinated and accessible transit services.

Section 9.5.j 1 makes reference to an interchange at Lake Ridge Road. The 407 East IEA seeks approval for an interchange at Highway 401 and Lake Ridge Road, however, implementation of this interchange has yet to be determined. All plans that show the Lake Ridge Road/Highway 401 area should contain a note reflecting this.

MTO looks forward to the Goods Movement Study that Whitby plans to undertake with the Region.

Part 4

Implementation
Under the Roadway Improvements (section 10.4, table 10.7), it should be clearly stated that new alignments, widenings and extensions will include the strategies to reduce single occupant vehicle travel and to make better use of the existing transportation system. As they are worded in the document, both sections imply that all the roadway improvements will be auto oriented, despite the good intentions in the TMP.

Section 10.4 should include an acknowledgement that there will be future improvements to Highway 401 and that the Town will consult with MTO regarding roadway improvements, future expansion plans and any development proposals adjacent to and any crossings of the 401 corridor.

A consultation strategy should be part of the implementation process.

Provincial Highways
The following are changes to be made to Table 10.6:
• There is no mention of the extension of Bonacord from its existing west terminus to Lake Ridge Road.
• Confirm the labels for the Burns Street Connection (east) and Burns Street Connection (west) extensions? They may be reversed.
• Any extension of Burns Street is subject to ministry review, due to its proximity to ministry infrastructure (Highway 401, West Durham Link)
• Annes Street:
  • The Annes Street crossing of Highway 401 is subject to ministry review and review of impacts to the provincial highway facility
  • The Annes Street crossing will likely not be reviewed under the 401 PDR unless specifically requested by Whitby, as it is beyond the scope of the current assignment
• The Twin Streams Connection is subject to MTO review
• Highway 407 Interchange at Cochrane Street
  • Change road name to “407 East Interchange at Cochrane Street”
• Make note in the table that the interchange is not precluded, subject to a separate Class EA (by others) and ministry approval. The 407 East IEA does not protect for an interchange at this location

• New Brooklin North/South Route
  • Under the From column, change to “407 East at Cochrane or West Durham Link”
  • Make a note in the table that this route is subject to ministry review

On Table 10.7, Coronation Road, make a note in the Remarks/Status column that this is subject to further cost-sharing discussions between the ministry and the Town of Whitby.

Part 5

The following are changes to be made to Exhibit 4.2:

• The exhibit needs to clearly distinguish between work desired by Whitby/others and work protected by the 407 East IEA (i.e. extension of the West Durham Link north of 407 is not protected for under the 407 East IEA)

• MTO must be consulted about and review any proposed changes to municipal roadways in the vicinity of MTO infrastructure (i.e., Burns Street extension)

• The exhibit shows a potential grade separation at 407 East and Garrard Road. The 407 East IEA does not seek approval for this crossing. This work is subject to a separate Class Environmental Assessment by others and MTO approval

• Ensure these comments are applied to other exhibits and cross-referenced in Table 10.6

• The proposed ultimate condition of Highway 401 is a core-collector system to the West Durham Link and 10-lanes east of the West Durham Link

Exhibit 4.3 needs to clearly distinguish between work desired by Whitby/others and work protected by the 407 East IEA (i.e. South Blair Street Grade Separation). In the Legend, replace “Highway 407 Transitway (Metrolinx)” with “407 Transitway”.

Exhibit 9.2 shows several options for Burns Street extension, including a Transit only route. Add a note that MTO must be consulted about and review any proposed changes to municipal roadways in the vicinity of MTO infrastructure.

Several maps in the Appendix do not include the 407 East Transportation Corridor. Please revise to include the facility.

The Ministry comments noted above will provide for further clarification to the document, especially with respect to commitments related to provincial facilities. It is recommended that these comments be addressed and incorporated into the final document prior to approval. Should you wish to discuss any of the comments provided please do not hesitate to contact Darlene Proudfoot at (416) 585-6040.

Yours truly,

Joe Perrotta MCIP, R.P.P
Manager, Provincial Planning Office

cc: PPO Project File
Good Morning Tara,

This email is further to our conversation on Friday, May 28, 2010. The ministry has had the opportunity to review the proposed locations for Whitby's Mid Arterial roadway south of Brooklin and has the following comment.

As you may be aware, The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has completed the 407 East Environmental Assessment (EA) study to address long-term transportation needs in the Region of Durham and surrounding areas. The recommended design for the transportation corridor (highway / transitway) extends Highway 407 easterly from Brock Road in Pickering to Highway 35/115 in Clarington, with two north-south links connecting the proposed extension to Highway 401, one in West Durham and one in East Durham. On August 28th, 2009, the Ontario Ministry of Transportation, completed and submitted the provincial 407 East EA Report to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval.

Should the ministry receive approval for this project, the Town of Whitby will need to discuss the location of proposed signalized intersections of the Mid Arterial at both Baldwin St and Thickson Rd with the ministry, as they may fall within the ministry's Controlled Access Highway right-of-way.

If you have any questions regarding the 407 East Environmental Assessment or Preliminary Design, please feel free to contact me at information provided below or Dan Remollino at 416-235-5576.

Sincerely,

Rita Venneri, M.Eng. P.Eng. | Project Engineer
Planning & Environmental Office | Central Region | Ontario Ministry of Transportation
3rd Floor, Building D | 1201 Wilson Avenue | Downsview, Ontario | M3M 1J8
Tel: 416-235-5006 | Fax: 416-235-3446

File(s) will be available for download until 06 June 2010:

File: MID ARTERIAL OPTION 1.pdf, 59,914.67 KB [Fingerprint: 84037f393ccc20c4939cc9d628954065]
File: MID ARTERIAL OPTION 2.pdf, 59,939.63 KB [Fingerprint: e2555311990cb9d08c4f861b84837a89]

You have received attachment link(s) within this e-mail message sent via Enterprise Attachment Transfer Service. To retrieve the attachment(s), please click on the link(s).

Accellion File Transfer

Confidentiality Warning: This e-mail contains information that is confidential and is intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, copying or distribution of this transmission is strictly prohibited. Please contact the Town of Whitby immediately if you have received this transmission in error and delete this message.
Hi Tara,

Please see comments below re. TMP Draft Report, April 2010:

Pg. 24
Subsection 4, please include bullets that mention transitway stations under the Hwy 407 mainline and the West Durham Link.

Subsection a. 4. i.
2031 planning horizon base case model for Hwy 407 mainline from West Durham Link to Thornton Rd. is 8 lanes.

Subsection a. 4. ii.
2031 planning horizon base case model for West Durham Link is 6 lanes.

Subsection c. 1. ii., Given the proximity of the interchange of the West Durham Link and Hwy 401, a new interchange at Lake Ridge Rd. might be inadvisable. The ministry will review the potential for this interchange.

Pg. 25
Subsection d. The EA Study of Hwy 401 widening from Brock St. to Stevenson Rd. is presently on hold until the outcome of the 407 East IEA is know, at which time it will be reassessed.

Pg 76
Subsection 9.2.2.2. a. 2
The proposed extension of Burns St. westerly and then to the north may be in conflict with the Hwy 401 widening and the West Durham Link (WDL) interchange design. Similarly, the proposed transit connection that is to go under the Link to connect to the Hwy 407 transitway is also in conflict with the Hwy 401/ WDL interchange. The ministry will consider alternatives to these requests.

Subsection 9.2.2.2. b. 1
The new proposed Hwy 401 crossing at Annes St. is beyond the scope of the Hwy 401 Preliminary Design. New municipal crossings are the responsibility of Whitby and/or Durham and must be agreed to and approved by the ministry.

Subsection 9.2.2.2. b. 3
The ministry does not assess the capacity and service needs requirements for Hwy 401 crossings. The need for crossing improvements should be initiated or identified by a municipality and/or region unless it is an interchange.
Exhibit 9.1
The exhibit shows several new “potential interchanges” along Hwy 407 and the WDL. The 407 East IEA did not seek approval for these interchanges. This work is subject to a separate class Environmental Assessment by others and MTO approval.

The alternatives for Burns St. extension and a transit route should be identified as potential alternatives, at this time.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Charlie Petro
Corridor Management Section
Ministry of Transportation
7th Floor, Building D
1201 Wilson Avenue
Downsview, ON M3M 1J8
Tel: 416-235-3509
Fax: 416-235-4267
Email: charles.petro@ontario.ca

Confidentiality Warning: This e-mail contains information that is confidential and is intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, copying or distribution of this transmission is strictly prohibited. Please contact the Town of Whitby immediately if you have received this transmission in error and delete this message.
May 19, 2010

Tara Painchaud, P.Eng.
Transportation Project Engineer
Town of Whitby
Engineering and Development Services
Public Works Department
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, ON L1N 2M8

Re: Whitby Transportation Master Plan – Draft Report

Further to your circulation of the “Whitby Transportation Master Plan – Draft Report” dated April 2010, the Planning Department and Durham Region Transit have reviewed the draft document and offer the following comments for your consideration:

Section 1.3 – Planning Context

- Section 10.2 only provides a "land use" planning context. This section should be balanced with an overview of the "transportation planning" context. Some of this context is buried within section 4 of this report.
- It is important to recognize that significant changes occurred to the transportation policies and designations of the Regional Official Plan through amendment 114 (the Region’s Official Plan review). While Growing Durham and Amendment 128 responded to the Provincial Places to Grow Plan, this amendment did not address the transportation infrastructure that will be required to support the planned urban growth and intensification. As such, the Region’s transportation network, policies and programs will be reviewed on a comprehensive basis through the Region’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update in 2011. It is likely that an amendment to the Regional Official Plan will follow the TMP update.
- Key Transportation Planning elements that should be included in this planning context are:
  - the Metrolinx Act which provides direction for the preparation of Transportation Master Plans;
  - the Transportation Planning Policy Statement that is being prepared by the Ministry of Transportation;
  - the Transit Supportive Land Use Guidelines that are being reviewed by the Ministry of Transportation;
the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan, the Big Move;
the Region of Durham Transportation Master Plan;
the Region of Durham Cycling Plan;
the Region of Durham Setting the Stage for TDM and TDM Strategy;
the Region of Durham Arterial Corridor Guidelines;
the hierarchy of documents should be presented in the reverse order – i.e. federal/provincial, regional, local municipal.

Section 1.4 – Environmental Considerations

This section appears to be misplaced, given that there has been no previous discussion on the Environmental Assessment (EA) process up to this point. This section would be better placed following the EA context provided in section 3.
Some of the categories listed in exhibits 1-3 and 1-4 do not seem to be reflected in text of the document (e.g. Rural economy – agriculture, aggregate extraction, ANSI’s).

Section 2 – A Vision for Transportation in Whitby

Most of the objectives appear to focus on the movement of people. To provide greater balance, the addition of the following strategic goods movement objective should be considered:

Goods movement related land uses are better integrated within the municipality resulting in greater reliability of the regional goods movement network (integrated).
Industry and government will be engaged in the development and implementation of strategic directions for urban freight (sustainable).
Increased transportation options for moving goods will be offered by increasing intermodal efficiency and removing barriers (balanced).
Improved information about the state of the transportation network, including incidents, congestion and time of day travel, will be available for trip planning (optimized).
Conflicts between goods movement and other modes will be reduced (co-ordinated).
Section 3.2 – The Transportation Study Approach

- The objectives of the plan focus on a multi-modal, balanced approach. However, the analysis undertaken takes a more traditional approach to travel demand forecasting, focused upon vehicular modes (in particular the auto mode). Consideration should be given to other data sources and analyses to support multi-modal improvements such as the Bicycle Compatibility Index, Bicycle Level of Service, Cordon Count truck data, pedestrian counts, etc.

Section 3.3.2 – External Agency Involvement

- The Region’s involvement to this point has been limited. The current draft is the only the second version that the Region has seen to this point.

Section 4.1.1 – Existing System, Road Network

- Appendix C is only a page and half long and would be better incorporated into the body of the TMP document. A column could be added to this table indicating traffic count information.
- The Town of Ajax also included information related to existing traffic controls. This may be an element that the Town of Whitby may wish to consider, given section 10.2.
- The following existing Arterial Road sections are missing from the exhibit:
  - Carnwith Drive, between Ashburn Road to east of Cachet Boulevard - show all as a Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
  - Cachet Boulevard, between Columbus Road and Winchester Road - show as a Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
  - Anderson Street, north of Conlin Road - show realigned Anderson Street(not St. Thomas Street) as a Type B Arterial, 2 lanes
  - Lyndebrook Road, east of Coronation Road - show as Type B Arterial, 2 lanes
  - Dryden Road, between Anderson Street to east of Deverell Street - show as Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
  - Rossland Road/Coronation Road area - show the Rossland Road realignment, not the old Rossland Road crossing of the C.P. Rail Line
  - Annes Street, south of Dundas Street and section north of Victoria Street - show as Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
  - Burns Street, east of Thickson Road - show as Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
- Taunton Road should be shown as 4 lanes the entire way through Whitby
- Brock Street between Roassland and Taunton Road is mostly 2 lanes, not 4 lanes wide

**Section 4.1.2 – Existing Network, Transit Network**

- The description of the existing transit service in Whitby should be expanded to:
  - include a map of current DRT routes; and,
  - identify service hours and frequencies for each route.
This information can be easily obtained from the [www.durhamregiontransit.com](http://www.durhamregiontransit.com) website.

**Section 4.1.3 – Existing Transportation - Active Transportation**

- The description of the existing active transportation network should be expanded to include a map of key facilities (e.g. 92 km of multi use trails and 9 km of existing bicycle paths/lanes).
- The current practice for the provision of sidewalks/pedestrian facilities (e.g. one side of the street, both sides) and cycling facilities should also be described in this section.
- Are there any significant pedestrian and cycling amenities? If so these could also be detailed in this section.
- Should the reference to the Town of Whitby OP, the Town of Whitby Working Draft Bicycle Plan, the Regional Cycling Plan and the Regional Trail Network be moved to later section under Planned System and Initiatives?

**Section 4.1.4 – Planned System and Initiatives**

- This section should be limited to network elements. As noted previously (see section 1.3 comments) key transportation planning documents should be discussed in the Planning Context section. This helps to provide a balanced perspective between liveability objectives (land use planning focused) and mobility objectives (transportation planning focused), and illustrates the interconnectedness between these objectives.
- This section notes that "there are a number of significant Provincial and Regional planned and committed improvements to the transportation network in Whitby anticipated to be in place by 2031" which are illustrated in Exhibit 4.2. However, the Region’s TMP has not been updated to 2031, and transportation improvements to support the urban lands added through the amendment 128 have not been incorporated into the Regional Official Plan at this time. Exhibit 4.2 should clearly indicate the
source of the information used to derive each of the network elements illustrated in this exhibit.

- In Exhibit 4.2, the Consumers Drive extension should be illustrated as new road construction, the Victoria Street realignment should also be included as new road construction, and the Hopkins Street widening should be extended to Victoria.

Section 4.1.5 – Provincial Roadways

- Subsection c) should indicate that the widening and realignment of Highway 401 to ultimate 12 lane express-collector system west of the West Durham link, and 10 lanes east of the West Durham link through Whitby.

Section 4.1.6 – Regional Roadways

- The document notes in reference to the Region’s TMP, that “a number of recommendations were made to improve the Region’s overall transportation network in response to planned growth. These recommendations have been taken into account in the development of the Town of Whitby’s Transportation Master Plan.” However, no further discussion is made as to “how” these recommendations have been taken into account or “where” they have been taken into account (e.g. cross reference to other sections?).

Section 4.1.7 – Transit Network

- The transit network identified in Section 4.1.7 should refer to the current Regional Official Plan, not the Growing Durham Growth Plan.
- The reference to the Long Term Transit Strategy Study should be revised to note that the study is complete and has been submitted to both federal and provincial governments for review.
- Exhibit 4.3: The following changes are required to better reflect the Rapid Transit Network developed through the LTTS:
  - Bus Rapid Transit on Brock Street should extend south to Victoria Street;
  - Bayly/Victoria/Bloor should be identified as a "Protect for Future Rapid Transit" corridor; and,
  - Winchester Road, west of Baldwin, should be identified as an "Enhanced Conventional (Priority) Transit" corridor.
- The Long Term Transit Strategy Study (LTTS) also includes the following study deliverables:
  - TOD Strategy and Guidelines
  - Goods Movement Strategy
o TDM Strategy and Action Plan

o A Preferred 2031 Transit Network and Implementation Strategy

We expect these deliverables will have a direct bearing on many of the objectives and policies contained in the draft report.

Section 5 – Travel Demands and Future Growth

o When this TMP was initiated, the Region was requested to provide access to Region's Model for Town's consultant to assist the development of the TMP. At that time, Region provided the EMME/2 networks for each horizon (2006, 2012 and 2021) and related auto-driver OD matrices to the consultant. That Region's model has the following main features:

  o the model adopted the structure of GTA simplified model, and was focused on auto only;
  o the transit mode splits were treated as inputs, but the model merely used the status quo mode splits (2001 TTS) for future horizons when the future matrices were provided;
  o the land use in the model was essentially the forecasts used in 2003 DC study and no 2031 pop/emp numbers by traffic zone were provided from the Region (neither was Growth Plan reflected); and,
  o the network assumption was based on Region's 2003 DC road program; in that 2003 DC model, the 407 extension was only assumed with 4 lanes in 2021.

o According to the modeling approach described in the Town's TMP report, land use forecasts in 2021 were based on the Region's 2003DC forecasts, and 2031 forecasts (by traffic zone) were obtained by applying the simple Regional growth factor (1.12 from 2021 to 2031) onto 2021 by traffic zone. With the Region's Growth Plan allocation at the municipal level approved by Council in June 2009 (which differs from the 2003 DC forecasts), the consultant should at least conduct an analysis (e.g. Frator approach) using the municipal based land use scenario from Growing Durham Study.

o The assumption for 407 extension and the two links (e.g. number of lanes) should be tested using the outcome of 407 ESR, which will impact the recommended road improvement plan accordingly.

o The recommended road improvement plan in the report and associated fiscal implications should be revised / adjusted upon
the following: OPA 128; Region's Infrastructure and Fiscal Impact Study; and, Region's TMP update / new DC study.

- In addition, through the Region's recent Long Term Transit Strategy, Highway 2 and Taunton Road were identified as potential rapid transit routes that will require dedicated right-of-way. The impact of these potential rapid transit facilities need to be incorporated into the Town's analysis. These assumptions may have an impact on future E/W capacities, impacting the screenline analysis undertaken by the Town.

**Section 5.3 – Demand Forecasting Approach**

- Exhibit 5-1, "Transportation Screenlines" - The arrows are not needed for this diagram, as it is just showing the screenlines; otherwise, the title should include wording such as "Showing Peak Direction of Travel (P.M. Peak Hour)."

**Section 5.4 - Existing Transportation System Performance**

- Exhibits 6-1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.5 in Appendix G should indicate P.M. Peak Hour. To be consistent, Exhibits 5.1 to 5.7 should add P.M. Peak Hour in the titles.

**Section 5.5 – Future Transportation System Performance**

- The Region has adopted a region-wide auto reduction target for 2021 of 15%? Why has a 15% auto reduction target been adopted for the Town of Whitby for 2031? What is the justification? How will this be achieved? What are the specific targets that were set for each of the non-auto modes? How would these targets be achieved, what programs are required to support these targets?

**Section 5.6 – Town Wide Screenline Need and Justification Summary**

- During the consultation process, truck/freight issues were identified in several of sub areas, however, there does not appear to be any data to substantiate these claims. Further work should be undertaken to understand the impact of goods movement and the best means to improve the network to accommodate future growth in goods movement.

- Section 5.6 is presented as a detailed review of each-sub area, yet there is little, if any, discussion of transit issues (e.g. service reliability, pedestrian/cycling access, poor road conditions). We
would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and/or your consultant to provide input on these issues.

Section 6.1 – Strategic Alternatives

- The list of improvements associated with each of the alternatives should be listed in the body of this section.
- The description of Alternative 3 – Transit Expansion should be expanded by identifying each affected route/corridor and how the service was changed. This will assist us in comparing Alternative 3 with the various LTTS scenarios.
- An alternative should be included which reflects the Regional Official Plan’s network (road, transit, goods movement) and policy provisions. This may reflect the blended alternative referred to 6.3.b.4.

Section 6.2 – Evaluation of Strategic Alternatives

- The criteria that are described in table 6-1 should be detailed more fully. For example:
  - Transportation Service should include more than just the level of service on individual roadways, but should also consider mode choice, network efficiencies, connectivity and integration, safety, etc.
  - Natural Environment should indicate the type of features that may be impacted such as ESAs, ANSIs, Wetlands, Fisheries, Wildlife Habitat (rare and endangered species), water resources (ground and surface water), air quality, etc.
  - Socio-cultural Environment should include impact on properties with significant heritage and architectural features, cultural landscapes, scenic views and vistas, and the promotion of healthy environments and lifestyles, etc.
  - Economic Environment should consider both business attraction and retention.
  - Should other costs be examined (e.g. triple bottom line approach).
  - An explanation should be provided as to how these criteria are to be measured (including data sources) and to be weighted in the evaluation process.
- Table 6.2 is a summary of the conclusions of the assessment (e.g. minimal potential impact on natural features). Where are the details of the assessment (e.g. which features were examined and how were they impacted)? It is unclear where the
information for table 6.2 was derived and why Alternative 4 is the preferred approach.

- It is unclear if there is any weighting to the criteria which would have influenced the evaluation. The Town may wish to consider balancing the reasoned argument approach with an arithmetic approach. More justification to the evaluation and preferred solution is recommended.

Section 6.3 – Preferred Strategic Solution

- For the purposes of the Whitby TMP, the Town has extended the Region’s 2021 auto reduction to 2031. The Town should provide a more comprehensive analysis as to why the target is appropriate for the Town and how the Town proposes to achieve the 15% auto reduction target within this timeframe.
- Additional information should be provided to support the conclusion that Alternative 3 will not achieve the 15% reduction in auto mode share. (Please note that the LTTS featured the development of a transportation model that was key in comparing the various scenarios.) Perhaps other combinations of TDM and transit improvements can achieve the target.

Section 7.1.1 – Managing Transportation Demand – Region of Durham

- The Region has also: completed Setting the Stage for TDM in Durham (May 2006); a TDM Market Assessment (February 2007); a TDM Study Report (May 2007); and, a Regional Cycling Plan (October 2008).
- As previously noted, the March 2010 Long Term Transit Strategy Study (LTTS) prepared for DRT includes a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy and Guidelines, and a TDM Strategy and Action Plan.

Section 7.1.2 – Managing Transportation Demand – Town of Whitby

- With respect to the TDM objectives identified for the Town:
  - Objective 1 - The Region and Metrolinx currently expend considerable effort through the Smart Commute initiative on Ride Sharing opportunities. The Town should coordinate its efforts with the Smart Commute program by leveraging existing services such as the online ridematching service Carpool Zone.
  - Objective 2 – The Town should consider the development of a parking management strategy, rather
than addressing this matter on an ad hoc basis. Details should be incorporated into the strategies that follow in this section and added to section 10.1.1 of this plan.

- Objective 3 – The Town may wish to examine potential strategies that are outlined in the Region’s recent Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy.
- Objective 4 – Add the Region of Durham (Cycling Network) and Smart Commute Durham (TDM) to this objective.
- With respect to the TDM strategies identified for the Town:
  - The strategies should be listed in a manner that corresponds to the objectives listed previously.
  - Strategy 1 – the Town may also wish to consider adding references to promoting active transportation, promoting alternative work arrangements (staggered shifts, compressed work week), and establishing satellite work centres to the TDM policy.
  - Strategy 3 - This objective is undertaken through the Smart Commute initiative. The Town’s assistance in encouraging local business to become members of the Smart Commute Durham program would be greatly appreciated. The Town however, may also wish to focus on school trip reduction, which is beyond the mandate of Smart Commute. The Town of Ajax is moving forward with a program in this regard that the Town may be interested in learning about.
  - Strategy 4 – Further investigation would be required prior to the designation of Whitby GO Station as a Mobility Hub in accordance with policies 7.15 and 7.16 of Metrolinx’s Big Move.
  - Strategy 5 – The incorporation of TDM through planning should not be limited to just the secondary plan process, but should also follow through the implementation of zoning and approval of site plans.
  - A Strategy should be added to expand upon the development of a Parking Management strategy.

Section 7.2 – Active Transportation Strategy

- Initiative 4 of the Active Transportation Strategy makes reference to the introduction of bike racks on buses as an important component. As such racks are currently on all DRT and GO transit buses, we suggest this measure does not merit inclusion in the strategy. A similar reference to bike racks on buses on page 64 should also be removed.
Section 8.0 – Encouraging and Facilitating Public Transit

- Subsection ‘b’ advises that transit is planned and operated by Durham Region. This should be changed to Durham Region/Durham Region Transit.

- Subsection ‘d’ noted that “DRT is also currently undergoing a Transit Master Plan...”. This should be changed to reference the recently completed LTTS. A similar change is required on page 91.

- Subsection 2 ii references the Region of Durham LTTS. This should be change to Durham Region Transit LTTS. Similar changes are required in subsection 2 iv at the top of page 69 and subsection 4 iv in the middle of page 69.

- While we support the initiative to develop a Transit Priority Plan, the text should be modified to include the Town, the Region and DRT. This should also be reflected in Table 10.3

Section 9.2 – Managing Transportation Supply- Roadway/Corridor Network Improvement Plan

- We strongly support the recommended extensions to Burns Street, both eastward and westward. As noted in the text, these initiatives would enable DRT to provide improved transit service to the residents of south and west Whitby.

- Exhibit 9 -2 should differentiate between “existing” and “future”.

- Table 2 defines local and collector roads however neither classification is illustrated in Exhibit 10-2.

- Exhibit 9-2 is not consistent with the Regional Official Plan. The changes to the arterial network proposed through this master plan, along with changes contemplated by other neighbouring municipalities, will be considered comprehensively through the review of the Region’s TMP and a future ROP amendment to address the transportation needs to support the Region’s Growth Plan conformity exercise. The following inconsistencies are noted:
  - Thickson Road should be illustrated as continuous in the vicinity of Brawley Road, consistent with the ROP.
  - The realignment of Columbus Road to meet Concession Road 7 in the City of Pickering should be illustrated.
  - The ROP designates Montgomery Avenue from Columbus Road to Carnwith Drive as a Type C arterial, however this is not illustrated in Exhibit 9-2.
Section 10.2.4 - Goods Movement Strategy

- Section 10.2.4 and 9.5 indicate that the Town will prepare a Goods Movement Strategy, however there is no indication of the timing or phasing of this study. Although Section 9.5 indicates that the strategy will be undertaken in cooperation with the Region, the TMP does not indicate what the role of other stakeholders will be, including the Region. Throughout the Whitby TMP there is no reference to goods movement data (e.g. cordon count, turning movement counts, survey data, etc.) that may be required to quantify future demand, or indicators to be monitored.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Jeff Brooks
Principal Planner
Transportation Planning and Research

c. Doug Robertson, Regional Works Department
   Neil Killens, Durham Region Transit
The ROP designates Carnwith Drive from Ashburn Road to the Oshawa border as a Type C arterial, however the planned section east of Cachet Boulevard is not illustrated in Exhibit 9-2.

The ROP does not designate Carnwith Drive as a Type C arterial west of Ashburn Road.

The ROP does not designate the connection of Garrard Road to Cache Boulevard. Garrard is shown as a continuous arterial to Winchester in the ROP.

The ROP does not designate a new Type C arterial connecting Columbus Road and Brittania Avenue in Oshawa.

Exhibit 9-2 designates Coronation Road north of Taunton Road as a Type B arterial. This arterial is not designated in the Regional Official Plan.

The ROP designates Conlin Road from Anderson Street to Lake Ridge Road as a continuous future Type B arterial.

The ROP designates Baldwin Street from the Ashburn Road connection to Highway 407 as a Type C arterial not a Type B Arterial.

The ROP does not provide for a continuous Type C arterial (Twin Streams) from Coronation to Lake Ridge Road.

The ROP does not provide for a continuous Type C arterial (Bonacord) from Coronation to Lake Ridge Road.

The ROP designates a continuous Type C arterial (Burns Street) from Coronation to Lake Ridge Road, however this is not illustrated in Exhibit 9-2.

The ROP designates Thickson Road south of Victoria Street to the future Water Street connection as a Type C arterial.

The ROP designates Water Street from South Blair Street to Thickson Road as a Type C arterial.

The Type C designation for Water Street west of South Blair should be retained until such time as Arterial Parkway criteria have been considered.

The Arterial Parkway north of 407 connecting with Baldwin Street is not designated in the ROP.

Section 9.2.1 – Managing Transportation Supply- Screenline Capacity Improvements

The ROP does not have provisions for 6-lane Type B arterials. This section refers to two 6-lane arterials: Rossland Road from...
Brock Street to Lake Ridge Road; and, Baldwin Street from Taunton Road to Highway 407.

Section 9.2.2 – Managing Transportation Supply- Other Sub-Area Network Improvements and Future Corridor Protection

- This section examines network deficiencies within defined sub areas of the Town and examines opportunities to overcome these deficiencies. Not all of the network changes (both additions and deletions) listed in our comments in section 9.2 are detailed in this section. This section should include justification and rationale for all elements of the planned transportation network that are being included (e.g. Garrard Road extension, etc) or excluded (e.g. deletion of Water Street extension, etc.).
- The words mid-block collector should be changed to mid-block arterial in section 9.2.2.5 b.

Section 9.3 – Mitigating Traffic Infiltration in Local Neighbourhoods

- The traffic calming process should include collaboration with DRT on the identifying and mitigating impacts to current and future transit operations.

Section 10.2.3 - Road Classification System

- The previous draft of the TMP included provisions for the classification of roads within the Town which were not consistent with the classification criteria contained in the Regional Official Plan. However, the classification system has been removed from the current draft, and the TMP now indicates that "all road classifications should be reviewed and updated as part of any Official Plan updates".
- Reference is made to a new arterial road classification called an "Arterial Parkway". However, there is no indication of what the design characteristics and classification criteria for this type of Arterial may be.
- The LTTS has suggested the implementation of a Type "T" arterial, for higher-order transit corridors. The Region will be examining the implementation of this new type of arterial and its incorporation into the Regional Official Plan arterial road hierarchy.
May 20, 2010

Corporation of the Town of Whitby
Works Department
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, Ontario
L1N 2M8

Attention: Ms. Tara Painchaud, P.Eng.
Transportation Project Engineer

Dear Ms. Painchaud:

Re: Whitby Transportation Master Plan
Draft Report, April 2010

The Whitby Transportation Master Plan Draft Report, received from you on April 30, 2010, has been reviewed by Regional Works Department staff. The following comments are provided for your consideration in finalizing this report:

- 2.3 – There is little mention of goods movement in the listed Strategic Objectives. Objectives that specifically address goods movement should be added, particularly under the following Transportation Principles: Effective, Integrated, Multi-modal, Balanced, Optimized and Coordinated.

- 3.1(a) – Exhibit 3.1 is referenced, but is not included in the report.

- 3.3.2(a) – Regional Works staff received notices for the Transportation Master Plan Study, but had little direct involvement in the study prior to review of the draft report. Regional Works provided background information for the study, but was not consulted on the development of the recommendations.

- Exhibit 4.1 – The following errors were noted on the map of the existing road network:
  - Thickson Road is a Type C arterial south of Victoria (not Type A).
  - Gordon Street is a Type C arterial north of Victoria.
  - Henry Street is a collector road, not a Type C arterial.
  - Hopkins Street is a Type B arterial south of Consumers to Highway 401.
  - Rossland Road has been realigned to eliminate the kink where it crosses the CP Rail tracks between Coronation and McQuay.
The existing portion of Lyndebrook Road (Coronation to Country Lane) should be shown as a Type B arterial.

Coronation Road is not designated as an arterial north of Taunton Road.

Halls Road does not currently exist between Rossland and Taunton.

The portion of Carnwith Drive east of Thickson is a Type C arterial, not a Type B.

Cachet Boulevard is a Type C arterial, not a Type B.

- There are a few discrepancies between the arterial road designations in the Town of Whitby and Regional Official Plans. These should be noted in the report, and the source for the arterial road designations shown on Exhibit 4.1 should be noted. The discrepancies include:
  - Garden Street south of Dundas is a Type C arterial in the Regional OP, but is a collector road in the Whitby OP.
  - Halls Road is not designated as an arterial road in the Regional OP, but it is a Type B arterial in the Whitby OP.
  - Baldwin Street between Thickson and Brawley is a Type C arterial in the Regional OP, but is a Type A arterial in the Whitby OP.

- Section 4.1.1(b), (c) & (d) – The description of road jurisdiction is confusing, as not all major roads are included, and jurisdiction over some roads varies from section to section. It would be preferable to present this information in a map, with roads colour coded by jurisdiction.

- Exhibit 4.2 – The following planned Regional road improvements are not shown accurately on this map:
  - Victoria Street is to be realigned and widened from South Blair to west of Thickson, and is to be widened only from there easterly.
  - The Hopkins Street widening should be extended south to the road’s intersection with the new alignment of Victoria Street.
  - The six-laning of Thickson Road should be extended southerly to Victoria Street.
  - Consumers Drive should be shown as new road construction from just east of Thickson Road to Thornton Road.

- Section 4.1.4 – Any previously-planned Town road improvements should
be included in this section and on Exhibit 4.2.

- Section 4.1.7(c) – The proper name for the LTTS is the “Long Term Transit Strategy”. References to routes along Highway 7 should be revised to refer to Highway 7/Winchester Road, as the Highway 7 designation follows Baldwin Street north from Winchester Road.

- Section 4.1.7(e) – GO Transit has not committed to a specific in-service date for the rail service extension to Bowmanville. The plan shown in Appendix D has been revised. GO is not planning to grade separate the existing CP Rail crossing of Thornton Road (a new GO track crossing Thornton is to be grade separated). The proposed new GO station is now on the west side of Thornton Road at its intersection with the Consumers Drive extension.

- Exhibit 4.3 – The “Existing Commuter Rail” should end at the existing Oshawa GO station (Thornton Road South), and the existing Oshawa GO station should be included on the map. The “Potential Commuter Rail” should be modified to show GO’s planned connection from the CN to the CP corridor west of Thornton Road.

- Section 5.3(b) – This paragraph gives the impression that all of the modelling was done using the Region’s EMME/2 model, while the details provided in Appendix E make it clear that a number of significant modifications were made to the model for this study. The description of the demand forecasting approach should be expanded to clarify that a modified version of the Region’s model was used and list the key modifications/assumptions used.

- Section 5.3(c) – Consideration should be given to adding screenlines in the northern part of the Town to support assessment of capacity deficiencies in this area.

- Exhibits 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 – There are discrepancies between the screenlines shown on these maps and the screenline summaries provided in Appendix E. The following issues were noted:
  - The east-west screenlines as shown on the maps do not include Myrtle Road, but Myrtle Road is included in the screenline summaries.
  - The north-south screenlines are shown as extending across Thornton Road in Oshawa and Audley Road in Ajax on Exhibits 5.2 and 5.3, but the screenline summaries show that the screenlines should end at Lake Ridge Road and Garrard Road/Kendalwood Road.
o For Screenline 7 (north-south, south of Columbus Road), Coronation Road, Cochrane Street, Cedarbrook Trail, Thickson Road and Cachet Boulevard are not included in the screenline summary.

- Exhibit 5.1 – On the north-south screenlines map, the labels for Brock Road and Thickson Road are on the wrong roads.

- Section 5.4(a) and (c); Exhibits 5.2 and 5.3 – The assessments of screenline deficiencies refer to “level of service”, which appears to be defined in relation to volume to capacity ratios (v/c). Levels of service are typically assigned on a scale from “A” to “F” on the basis of delay. The report should describe the methodology used to assign level of service for this study, and use of an alternative term should be considered if it was not based on delay.

- Section 5.4(b) – The screenline east of Brock Street is listed here as operating at/beyond capacity, but the corresponding map (Exhibit 5.2) shows this screenline below capacity and the screenline west of Brock Street at capacity.

- Section 5.5 – The results of the 2031 screenline deficiency assessment indicate generally better system performance than under existing conditions, particularly in the southern portion of the Town. The report should include some discussion to explain this result, including the effects of key assumptions such as the auto trip reduction factor and Highway 407 configuration. Sensitivity testing should be completed to show the effects of variations in the key assumptions.

- Section 5.6(f) – The list of actions should include identification of improvements and linkages required to facilitate efficient goods movement within and through the Town.

- Section 5.6.1(c) – Each exhibit should include all of the screenline segments within or bordering the Sub-Areas shown. This would provide readers with a more complete picture of the transportation network performance in relation to each Sub-Area.

- Section 5.6.2 – Whitby Town Council’s direction to remove the Water Street link to Thickson Road (Paragraph a.9) contradicts the discussion in other paragraphs of this section regarding the need for additional connectivity and alternative routes south of Victoria Street. In particular, the Water Street link could help to alleviate truck traffic demand on Brock Street, which is identified as a concern of the local residents (Paragraph a.10). Given the limited opportunities for road network
improvements in this Sub-Area, it appears to be premature to remove the Water Street connection from the TMP and Official Plan without a detailed technical assessment of the effects this would have on the remainder of the existing and planned transportation network.

- Section 6.1(c) – Given the nature of strategic alternatives, we recognize that the descriptions have to be fairly broad and generic. However, some additional details in the descriptions would be helpful to better distinguish the alternatives from each other and improve the context for the subsequent assessment of the alternatives. The following changes should be considered for each strategic alternative:
  
  o Alternative 1 – Note which specific road and transit improvements are included (e.g. by reference to the appropriate exhibits) and state whether this alternative also includes implementation of existing Town and Region policies on TDM, active modes, etc.
  
  o Alternative 2 – Clarify the extent to which the TDM measures are expected to include physical infrastructure, such as building new HOV lanes and parking facilities, in comparison to policy/promotion measures and indicate how much of a change this alternative would represent in comparison to existing Town and Regional policies.
  
  o Alternative 3 – Provide additional description of the extent of transit improvements included and how this alternative relates to the improvements proposed in the Region’s Long Term Transit Strategy and the Metrolinx “Big Move” plan.
  
  o Alternative 4 – Provide some detail on the extent of roadway improvements that are assumed to be included.

- Section 6.1(c)(1) – Alternative 1 should be called “base case” or “business as usual”, rather than “do nothing”, because it includes a significant number of road and transit improvements compared to the existing condition.

- Section 6.2 – The evaluation of the strategic alternatives should relate back to the vision for transportation in Whitby that was established in Section 2. The evaluation criteria and descriptions should be expanded as necessary to indicate how well the strategic alternatives address the Strategic Objectives (Section 2.3).

- Section 6.2, Table 6.2 – Additional information should be provided on the methodology used for the evaluation of the strategic alternatives, including key data, assumptions, etc. Without this information, there is no traceable basis for many of the conclusions and recommendations summarized in Table 6.2.
• Section 7.2(c) – There appear to be some words missing from the last sentence of this paragraph. This section should make reference to other Regional initiatives related to active transportation planning, including the Regional Cycling Plan and promotion activities carried out by Smart Commute Durham.

• Section 8(d) – This section should be revised to recognize the recommendations of the recently completed Long Term Transit Strategy (LTTS) by Durham Region Transit (DRT). References to a "Transit Master Plan" here and in Section 10.1.3(d) are incorrect and should be removed.

• Section 8(e)(1) – This section should refer to the TOD strategy that was prepared as part of the recently completed DRT LTTS. Key recommendations from this TOD strategy should be reflected in the TOD strategy recommendations in the Whitby TMP.

• Section 8(e)(2)(iii) – The future 407 West Durham Link transitway also presents an opportunity for transit supportive development in West Whitby and should be referenced here.

• Section 9.2 – Detailed analysis and assessment of alternatives was completed only for the seven improvements listed in Section 9.2.1(e), as documented in Appendix G. For all of the other improvements shown on Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2, there appears to have been minimal analysis to determine benefits or impacts and little or no consideration of alternatives. There is also no explanation of how the conceptual alignments shown on the exhibits were determined. We are concerned that the level of assessment documented in the report does not provide sufficient technical back-up for many of the network improvement recommendations.

• Section 9.2 – It should be noted that implementing recommendations for protecting new corridors, changing existing road designations and deleting previously planned roadway connections will require changes to the Whitby and/or Regional Official Plans. Exhibits should be added to show the recommended changes to the transportation schedules in the Whitby and Regional Official Plans.

• Exhibit 9.1 – The map includes a combination of existing corridors to be protected for widening, new corridors to be protected, previously planned facilities and existing facilities. The legend and map should be modified to clearly distinguish among these various conditions, so that readers
can easily determine what new facilities and corridors are proposed as a result of the TMP recommendations.

- Exhibit 9.2 – Existing and proposed facilities should be shown with different symbols on this map.

- Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2 – The proposed locations of some new corridors and connections shown on Exhibit 9.1 and 9.2 do not appear to be consistent with the arterial intersection spacing criteria in the Regional Official Plan (Schedule E, Table E-7). For example, the proposed connection of Burns Street to Dundas Street and the proposed realignment of Coronation Road result in intersection spacings along east-west arterials that would not permit effective coordination of traffic signals. This is inconsistent with the TSM recommendations in the report, as it will compromise the capacity of these arterials. Proposed new arterial road intersections should be located in accordance with the Regional spacing criteria wherever possible to maximize the effectiveness of the new infrastructure.

- Section 9.2.2.1(b) – This section should include a discussion of the proposed deletion of the Water Street connection between South Blair Street and Thickson Road, as proposed by Whitby Council. Additional explanation is required for the proposed “arterial parkway” designation, including a set of criteria that would apply to this designation and an explanation of why the current Type C arterial designation is not appropriate.

- Section 9.2.2.2(a) – The Region supports the proposed easterly and westerly extensions of Burns Street for the reasons noted in the report. Additional study will be required to determine an appropriate and feasible intersection location for the connection to Dundas Street. In order to avoid confusion regarding the status of potential connection configurations, we recommend showing a dashed circle with a note such as “Connection location to be determined through additional study”, rather than the three specific routes shown on Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2.

- Section 9.2.2.5 – The discussion of the Garden Street extension and mid-block arterial should include a summary of the detailed assessment of options for these roads that is included in Appendix G.

- Section 9.2.2.6 – An extension of Garrard Road across Highway 407 to connect with Cachet Boulevard is shown in Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2, but is not included in the discussion of the North Whitby Sub-Area (or elsewhere in the report).
• Section 9.2.3 – A summary of the proposed changes to roadway classifications should be included, with a brief rationale for each proposed change.

• Section 10.4(a) and Table 10.7 – The projects listed in Table 10.7 are a small subset of the overall recommended transportation network improvements. There should be some explanation as to why only certain projects were included in the cost estimates.

• Section 10.4(d) and Table 10.7 – Costs for any proposed improvements to Regional facilities, such as sections of Rossland Road and Baldwin Street, should be identified separately from the Town’s costs.

• Section 12(d) – The list of performance measures in Appendix H was not included in the version of the report that we received.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions regarding these comments. Thank you for this opportunity to provide input to the development of Whitby’s Transportation Master Plan.

Yours truly,

Doug Robertson, P.Eng., PTOE
Project Manager, Transportation Infrastructure
Transportation and Field Services Branch

cc Steve Mayhew - Transportation Infrastructure
Paul Gee - Transportation Design
Amanda Spencer - Traffic Engineering & Operations
Jeff Brooks - Regional planning Department
I would like to make the following comments on the town's proposed transportation master plan. I'd be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email, and let me know what happens to these comments and any response to them (do they form part of a final report?).

* Under the description of current transit network (page 21), the report fails to highlight that many areas of southern Whitby (i.e. south of Taunton) do not have a two-way bus route passing within walking distance. For example, Cochrane St between Dundas and Bonacord has no bus route while there is only one-way service along all of Country Lane, all Garrard St, large parts of Cochrane St (north of Bonacord), large parts of Thickson Rd (north of Manning) and most of Brooklin. Further, the services along Thickson Road and to Brooklin only operate during peak hours.
* Although transit is a regional responsibility, the report fails to recommend what sort of bus network the town should lobby for.
* The "Transit Oriented Development Policy" would do little to influence existing development, and the report fails to suggest any measures to promote transit use to existing destinations, such as improving pedestrian access. The report should also have considered other potential measures (such as the Town improving bus stops facilities, funding additional publicity, encouraging local employers to promote transit, etc) and then recommending which the Town should adopt.
* The report makes numerous recommendations that additional road capacity be added (either through new connections or additional lanes) with the aim of reducing congestion. However, despite the modelling work alluded to in the report, the reports fails to quantify what level of congestion reduction these works would achieve. The report should give existing and predicted traffic volumes and congestion levels along affected roads as they are now, as they will be in 2031 without the new road/lanes and as they will be in 2031 with the new road/lanes. The report should also discuss any non-traffic impacts. Only then can it be judged whether or not the positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts.

Appendix E (Transportation Modelling Approach)
* The transport model used consistently underestimates traffic flow. (It is under on every single screeenline, by an average of 20% of northbound/eastbound screenlines, and by an average of 31% on southbound/westbound screenlines).
* The transport model focuses on roads only, and does not actually model transit usage. Instead a certain percentage shift is assumed, whereas traffic levels affect transit usage. There is no evidence that the land use is modelled (and hence its effects on trip demand and mode split).
* Although a certain percentage shift to transit is assumed, there appears to be no consideration of the level of transit service that would be required to support this split.

Regards,
To Whom It May Concern:

I do apologize for not writing sooner as I have been so busy. Anyways, hopefully my ideas are not too late.

I would love to see the transportation in the Town of Whitby more attractive. Most people do drive, however, there are those who do not or may not have access to a vehicle in the daytime. Also, for those who wish to add more exercise to their day. Every little extra step helps to keep you fit.

The place where people need to go most is the grocery store or to the Drs. Office. Therefore, I would love to see a shuttle bus run along Gerrard to the Kendalwood Plaza than head back to Gerrard and go to McNichol to The Whitby Mall and than across to the A&P Mall, than back up to Thickson and back around to Gerrard.

I am not sure how often the bus should run - depending on demand. Also, when I grew up in Pickering years ago you could call in for your bus and they would pick you up at your home and take you to the main malls.

They also need to make the bus station safe and build more bus shelters for safety, comfort and in case it rains/snows.

If you require further information please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.
Too many heavy trucks in south Whitby

April 30, 2010

To the editor:

Our Port Whitby community has battled the issue of heavy industrial traffic traversing through our residential neighbourhood for years.

Before the GM slowdown, I counted 150 trucks traversing Brock Street between Victoria and Water Street within five hours. Many waterfront visitors have experienced crossing the little bridge on South Brock with industrial traffic whipping by within a foot or two of them. This is a very busy pedestrian area which needs to be addressed for public safety.

Finally, we saw some improvement toward redirecting industrial traffic to the industrial area on the horizon in the form of the long-awaited Water Street extension. Unfortunately, Whitby had long ago designated an industrial area adjacent to the waterfront. If we want to encourage business growth in the industrial area, we have to address an additional egress now.

The Brock Street and Hwy. 401 intersection cannot support the expected population growth around the GO Transit hub along with supporting the industrial traffic. A sustainable residential Port Whitby community cannot thrive with excessive industrial traffic traversing through it. We need to satisfy many concerns with few options. It is completely irresponsible for council to turn down the Water Street extension plan without providing a viable alternate solution.
Dear Whitby Intensification Planning team,

Having attended and participated in the workshops and the Open House I want to compliment the Planning Dept and the consultant on a thorough study that included public participation. Although there is a great deal of work to implement a plan like this I have a lot of confidence that with a similar approach, everyone should feel satisfied with the results.

Having some interest in specific areas for future development, I am only making a comment in regard to the development of the corridors as it will be imperative to adequately service the intensification areas.

The corridors of concern, in addition to the increased traffic expected on Dundas St. because it services the central area of Whitby, is Manning, Mary, Burns, Consumers and even Victoria. These streets being secondary will ultimately relieve the volume on Dundas, as they already do, have some challenges as they are incomplete in many cases. I believe considerable investment is needed to extend them and link with other north-south roads. Although there is a desire and need to improve public transit, auto traffic will never totally abate for where it is now.

I thank you for your time and hope to be able to participate in future public input to the Intensification Study and Whitby’s Official Plan.

Thanks,

Confidentiality Warning: This e-mail contains information that is confidential and is intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, copying or distribution of this transmission is strictly prohibited. Please contact the Town of Whitby immediately if you have received this transmission in error and delete this message.
Kar, Dennis

Subject: FW: LOCAL BUSES

From: Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 10:22 AM
To: Whitby Transportation Master Plan
Subject: LOCAL BUSES

To Whom It May Concern:

I really do believe it could make a difference if there was more bus shelters along Gerrard across from Harold Street by the St. Paul's School. This would create a sense of comfort, warmth and safety. Also, it would be great to see a bus go straight up to the Kendalwood Mall from Gerrard rather than turning into Manning than having to take a transfer. Just like they have buses going into the Oshawa Mall - it would be handy and more desireable to get people out of their cars.

The business is mostly in the Malls so I do believe it would make good sense to have the bus go into the Mall for pick-up and drop off.

Any new routes coming up?
May 20, 2010

Whitby Municipal Building
Public Works Department
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, ON
L1N 2M8

Attention: Ms. Tara Painchaud, P. Eng., Transportation Project Engineer

Dear Madam,

RE: Transportation Master Plan: Draft of the Final Transportation Master Plan Report
Northwest Corner of Anderson Street and Conlin Road
TBG Project No. 2484

Our office represents 1631057 Ontario Inc., the applicant for a Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA), Whitby Official Plan Amendment (LOPA), Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZBA) and Draft Plan of Subdivision to allow for a residential development at the northwest corner of Anderson Street and Conlin Road in Whitby (the Subject Site). The proposed development comprises 221 detached units with an average density of 17 units (50 residents) per net hectare. The site is comprised of 24.70 gross hectares (61.04 acres) and approximately 18.70 developable hectares (46.21 acres). For your convenience, please see Figure 1 depicting the location of the Subject Site in relation to the surrounding area.

Figure 1: Site Location Map
We have had a chance to attend the Special Council Meeting held on April 29th, 2010 with respect to the Whitby Transportation Master Plan and have reviewed the *Whitby Transportation Master Plan: Draft Report* (Draft Report), prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited, as it relates to the Subject Site. We have the following observations and comments with respect to the recommendations of the Draft Report, as it relates to the Subject Site.

**Figure 2: Recommended Protected Corridors**

Upon reviewing the Draft Report it is evident that a Mid-Block Arterial Road is planned between Conlin Road and Winchester Road West to alleviate the long term east-west capacity deficiency. This proposed Mid-Block Arterial Road bisects the northern portion of the Subject Site (see Figure 2 for further details).

It appears that the proposed alignment of the Mid-Block Arterial Road will not have a significant impact on the proposed residential development on the Subject Site as it will bisect the Subject Site just north of the proposed residential lots (see Figure 3 for further details).
Please note that we have no objections to the proposed Mid-Block Arterial Road so long as its alignment does not encroach on or jeopardize the residential lotting of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision at the northwest corner of Conlin Road and Anderson Street.
Thank you for your review and consideration regarding these matters. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

THE BIGLIERI GROUP LTD.

Rita Kostyan, B.A.(Hons.), B.U.R.Pl.
Planner

Cc: Mr. Philip Lucchese, Highmark Homes.
    Mr. Joseph Messina, Highmark Homes.
    Mr. Leo Longo, Aird & Berlis
May 20, 2010

Whitby Municipal Building
Public Works Department
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, ON
L1N 2M8

Attention: Ms. Tara Painchaud, P. Eng., Transportation Project Engineer

Dear Madam,

RE: Transportation Master Plan: Draft of the Final Transportation Master Plan Report
360 Columbus Road West, Whitby
TBG Project No. 28155

Our office represents Hillcrest Developments, the co-owner of 360 Columbus Road West, Whitby. The Subject Site is located on the northwest corner of Columbus Road West and Cedarbrook Trail and has an area of 38.7 hectares (95.63 acres). For your convenience please see Figure 1, depicting the location of the Subject Site in relation to the surrounding area.

Figure 1: Site Location Map
We have had a chance to attend the Special Council Meeting held on April 29th, 2010 with respect to the Whitby Transportation Master Plan and have reviewed the *Whitby Transportation Master Plan: Draft Report* (Draft Report), prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited, as it relates to the Subject Site. We have the following observations and comments with respect to the recommendations of the Draft Report, as it relates to the Subject Site.

**Figure 2: Recommended Protected Corridors**

Source: Excerpt from Exhibit 9.1 of the Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan – Recommended Protected Corridors
Upon reviewing the Draft Report, it is evident that there is a potential for the extension of the West Durham Link northerly to Highway 12 north of Brooklin, potentially bisecting the northern portion of the Subject Site (see Figure 2 for further details). Speaking to Whitby Works Staff and further reviewing the Draft Report it is our understanding that there are other options under review for the northerly extension of the West Durham Link, to help and reduce heavy movements through Downtown Whitby and Brooklin. One option being to extend the West Durham Link northwest and connect it into Lake Ridge Road, another option being investigated is to the extend the West Durham Link northward, connecting it into Columbus Road East.

In our professional planning opinion the best option, for the extension of the West Durham Link, is to extend it northwest and connect it into Lake Ridge Road, as this would allow for the continued, unconstrained development of Brooklin and for heavy traffic to bypass Brooklin altogether. Whereas the extension of the West Durham Link northerly to Highway 12, north of Brooklin, could potentially limit Brooklin’s development to the northwest. Also, as Brooklin expands a northeast extension of the West Durham Link into Highway 12 may potentially bisect Brooklin’s expanded residential neighbourhood rather than bypassing the town completely.

Thank you for your review and consideration regarding these matters. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

THE BIGLIERI GROUP LTD.

Rita Kostyan, B.A.(Hons.), B.U.R.Pl.
Planner

Cc: Mr. George Lysyk, Hillcrest Developments
May 20, 2010

Whitby Municipal Building
Public Works Department
575 Rossland Road East
Whitby, ON
L1N 2M8

Attention: Ms. Tara Painchaud, P. Eng., Transportation Project Engineer

Dear Madam,

RE: Transportation Master Plan: Draft of the Final Transportation Master Plan Report
4650 Garden Street, Whitby
TBG Project No. 28153

Our office represents Midhaven Homes, the owner of 4650 Garden Street (Subject Site), a 16.3 hectare (40.27 acre) property located north of Taunton Road on the east side of Garden Street in Whitby. For your convenience please see Figure 1, depicting the location of the Subject Site in relation to the surrounding area.

Figure 1: Site Location Map
We have had a chance to attend the Special Council Meeting held on April 29th, 2010 with respect to the Whitby Transportation Master Plan and have reviewed the *Whitby Transportation Master Plan: Draft Report* (Draft Report), prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited, as it relates to the Subject Site. We have the following observations and comments with respect to the recommendations of the Draft Report, as it relates to the Subject Site.

**Figure 2: Recommended Protected Corridors**

Upon reviewing the Draft Report, we understand that the Garden Street corridor is recommended to be protected and is planned to be extended from its present limit to the proposed Mid-block arterial north of Conlin Road (see Figure 3 for further details). On behalf of our client, we are in support of this proposed extension as it will help to alleviate the current congestion on the arterial road network and add a logical north-south connection for vehicular traffic and active transportation.

The Description of Works for the Garden Street extension, on page 97 of the Draft Report, notes that the extension would entail 2 to 4 lanes. To alleviate north-south
congestion, in our professional opinion, it would be beneficial to add a fifth lane for left and right turning movement.

Thank you for your review and consideration regarding these matters. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

THE BIGLIERI GROUP LTD.

Rita Kostyan, B.A.(Hons.), B.U.R.Pl.
Planner

Cc: Mr. Peter Saturno
June 1, 2010

Ms. Tara Painchaud
Town of Whitby
Public Works Department,
575 Rossland Road East,
Whitby, L1N 2M8

DELIVERED VIA EMAIL: painchaudt@whitby.ca

05-1522

RE: Brooklin North Landowners Group Comments
Town of Whitby Transportation Master Plan

On behalf of the Brooklin North Landowners Group (BNLO) I attended the Town’s April 29th, 2010 Council Meeting to consider the Whitby Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and supporting Draft Report. The land ownership of the group is located generally west and north of Brooklin. Accordingly, this letter provides our comments on the TMP focused on Sub-Area 6 (North Whitby), the recommendations of which are contained in Section 9.2.2.6 of the Town consultant’s report.

As a general comment, we are pleased to see the Town proceeding with the TMP and request your confirmation that this work will constitute Phase 1/2 of the environmental assessment (EA) process when it is adopted into the Official Plan through a future Official Plan Amendment. The group supports the Town’s completion of any necessary studies in timely fashion so that study requirements for new road infrastructure in North Whitby will be completed (Phase 3/4 of the EA process) prior to or concurrent with the Secondary Plan process for this area.

Highway 407 Interchange at Cochrane Street
As noted in prior BNLO submissions to the 407 East EA team, Durham Region, and the Town (and subject to the lands surrounding the interchange being included in the urban boundary by both the Region and Province as part of ROPA 128), we strongly support an interchange of Highway 407 at Cochrane Street. However, we also assert that the protection for such an interchange should not have the effect of sterilizing the use of land near to the potential interchange, particularly if the timing of the interchange has not been settled.

Accordingly, we believe that the environmental assessment required for such an interchange should be commenced in the near term, and request that the Town’s TMP specifically address how the interchange would be funded and the timeframe for its construction.

Comments on Road Functions and Alignments
Figure 1 on the next page is an excerpt of Exhibit 9.2 from the consultant’s report, which provides a context for our comments on road functions and alignments. The group has been in the process of conducting initial analysis of land use, servicing and transportation in North Whitby. After reviewing the TMP recommendations for this area we have the following comments:
1) New Brooklin North/South Route

The Report identifies a conceptual alignment for a New Brooklin North/South Route connecting 407 northerly to Highway 12. Given the long-standing issues with traffic in Brooklin, and the potential for increased traffic resulting from new Living and Employment areas to the west and north, we concur with and support the notion of a new Brooklin bypass or new North/South Route. We believe that such a route has the potential to divert traffic travelling through the municipality and heavy truck traffic away from Baldwin Street, and to potentially alleviate some of the commuter traffic along Winchester Road.

Figure 1 – Excerpt of Exhibit 9.2, Whitby TMP Report
On our review of the proposed alignment, we recommend that, although conceptual, the alignment of this new route should be shown in such a manner as to make maximal use of existing road infrastructure. Consequently, we request that the alignment be shown to travel along Brawley Road (at the southern limit of the Greenbelt Plan) or further north along Myrtle Road (at the southern Limit of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan) for as great a distance as possible.

Concomitant with this requested change, and any similar change that would affect roads currently under the jurisdiction of the Region and Province, we also believe that the TMP should address the way in which such roads would be realized in cooperation with higher levels of government. In addition, the group requests further information and would like to attain a better understanding for the nature of an Arterial Parkway, particularly the cross-sections, its access restrictions/intersection spacing, and right of way. The group also believes that the intersection and potential jog-elimination of the North-South Route (as proposed in this letter), Baldwin and Thickson should be reviewed and addressed by the TMP.

2) Brooklin Arterial/Collector Road Network

We have concerns with the report recommendation that Vipond Road be extended west to Country Lane as an effective means of moving vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians through the growing area of Whitby, these are:

i. The Ministry of Transportation minimum distance separation for intersection spacing with Highway 407 will preclude access onto Vipond Road at Cochrane Street or Country Lane.

ii. The road will terminate at Country Lane, where Country Lane will not cross the 407, nor is any development proposed by 2031 west of this area.

As a result, we recommend that the report not identify an extension of Vipond Road for Town Corridor Protection.

3) New East/West Collector Road

Rather, than utilizing Vipond Road as an east-west collector through Brooklin, we recommend that a new east-west mid-block collector road be shown for corridor protection between Columbus Road and Brawley, connecting the new North/South Route and Baldwin Street. Such a mid-block should be identified and protected as a key transportation connection for the area north of Brooklin.

This new east-west collector would run parallel to the new North-South Route and could function in a similar manner to Bur Oak Avenue in the Town of Markham. In the Markham example, Bur Oak is planned as a predominantly mixed-use street with a pedestrian-scaled level of development travelling through the heart of the new secondary plan areas of Cornell, Greensborough, Wismer and Berczy. Its complementary road, the Don Cousens Parkway, provides for the movement of trucks and commuters through the Town at the perimeter of the urban area, bypassing existing community areas (including Main Street Markham) to connect Highway 407 to Major Mackenzie Drive, where in the future it will be extended west to Highway 404 through North Markham.

Figure 2 on the next page illustrates the relationship of these two roads in the context of east Markham.
4) Protect for Capacity Expansion
We agree that Cochrane Street between Highway 407 and Columbus Road should be protected for capacity expansion. However, we recommend that the potential for expansion should be extended further north up to Brawley Road. This would allow for a local north-south bypass of Brooklin, and could provide a key connection to two new east-west mid-block collector roads: our recommended road between Columbus and Brawley and the report’s recommended road (southerly continuation of Cochrane) between Conlin and Highway 407. In a similar vein, we believe that Coronation Street can be shown to connect north to the new east-west collector road discussed above to provide addition North-South movement through the new areas around Brooklin.
Taken together, the recommendations of our letter as applied to Exhibit 9.2 would appear as shown on Figure 3 below.

**Figure 3 – BNLO Recommended Modifications to Exhibit 9.2, Whitby TMP Report**
We believe these recommendations will enable growth to occur in the new Secondary Plan area north and west of Brooklin in a manner that minimizes traffic impacts on the existing community of Brooklin.

I thank you for this opportunity to provide comment into the public process.

Yours truly,

MALONE GIVEN PARSONS LTD.

Matthew Cory, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner / Project Manager

Cc: Clients;
    B. Short, Planning Department
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### Ministry of the Environment – May 17, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Section 2.3, Strategic Objectives, the objective of the first bullet of the “Accessible” principle is unclear. Please elaborate on what kind of developments exist or are planned that are not transit supportive however essential for personal accessibility needs and economic viability, and why they are essential.</td>
<td>Section 2.3 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Whitby TMP refers to the Region of Durham’s Official Plan Amendment (OPA) No. 128. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) has provided a draft decision notice with proposed modifications to the OPA. A letter from the MMAH to the Region of Durham dated March 12, 2010 outlines the proposed modifications, some of which will affect the Whitby TMP. For example, Durham’s employment numbers are in excess of the Growth Plan; additional employment lands have been added to the Official Plan without justification; and concern with the size of urban expansion areas and the impact this will have on transit-supportive development. The Town of Whitby should modify the TMP according to the approved OPA if any changes in the final approved OPA affect lands in Whitby.</td>
<td>While land use is always/often a dynamic element in any demand forecasting, the analysis for the purpose of the TMP is considered to be sufficiently robust to ensure recommendations to the transportation network are flexible to adapt to fluctuations in population and employment land use and that the affect may be more so in the implementation timing. Notwithstanding this, it is recommended that the TMP be reviewed every 5 years and updated as appropriate to address new transportation elements, including new land use scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unclear in Section 9 what year was chosen as the base year for the auto reduction target of 15% by 2031. Please include this information in this section.</td>
<td>The base year for modeling was 2006 as noted for the model calibration in Appendix E and was based on the start of the TMP in 2007 and used the existing information from the 2006 Transportation Tomorrow Survey and observed traffic counts. Noted in Section 5.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommended Screenline Capacity Improvements and other Sub-area Network Improvements and Future Corridor Protection have the potential to significantly impact sensitive environmental features including cold water fisheries, woodlands and provincially significant wetlands. Further study will be required at the Class EA project planning stage for each project to determine whether these proposed improvements are the optimal alternative solution to meet Whitby’s transportation system objectives. Detailed hydrogeological investigations and surface water investigations are recommended for these proposed projects. If road extensions or expansions are chosen as the preferred alternative, stormwater management plans should be prepared. An enhanced level of protection is recommended for any watercourses affected by the proposed projects.</td>
<td>Noted and identified for future requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian Village may have an overall increase in traffic noise from the West Durham Link. This may be an area of concern in the future.</td>
<td>Noted and will provide to MTO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Context</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Provincial Policy Statement and Transit-Supportive Land Use Guidelines</strong> should be referenced under Provincial Strategies and Initiatives’ in Section 1.3.3.</td>
<td>Section 1.3.3 has been revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a brief discussion as to how the TMP addresses and meets the objectives of the provincial policies in relation to the transportation strategies recommended in the document.</td>
<td>Section 1.3.3 has been revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All environmental factor specific areas are to be identified, assessed and evaluated as part of the Environmental Assessment process when considering road improvements. Built heritage, cultural landscapes, archaeology, First Nations, waste and contamination, noise and air quality are issues that should be included under Environmental Considerations (Section 1.4).</td>
<td>Comment noted and a variety of natural, social, cultural and economic factors were considered in the evaluation of strategic options and supplemental assessment of alternative solutions and corridors (Appendix G). Further assessment with additional criterion and sub factors such as those noted will be incorporated into future environmental assessments undertaken for the individual projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ministry’s Highway 407 project is to be referred to as the “407 East Extension” and its corridor as the “407 East Transportation Corridor”, within the written portion of the document and on all exhibits.</td>
<td>References to Hwy 407 Extension have been revised accordingly throughout the main report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following are changes to be made to Section 4.1.5:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change title of Subsection a. to “Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) 407 East Transportation Corridor Extension from Brock Road (Pickering) to Highway 35/115 (Clarington)”</td>
<td>Section 4.1.5 has been revised accordingly – now Section 4.2.1. Some of the Highway 401 noted issues remained detailed for the purposes of documenting. It recognized further discussions will be required between MTO officials and the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsection a.1, add the words “lane ultimate” to “two planned six (6)”, so that the sentence reads “…with two planned six (6)-lane ultimate link connections to Highway 401…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsection a.2, revise this paragraph to: ‘MTO completed the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) Study and documentation in January 2010 for the highway/transitway extension. At the time of preparation of this report, the final decision on the IEA from the provincial Ministry of the Environment has not yet been received. A federal-provincial agreement identified a completion date of 2013 for the 407 East Transportation Corridor; however, no decisions have been made about its implementation.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsection a.4.i:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second bullet: What does “2031 planning horizon base case model – 4 lanes” refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fourth bullet: replace Brock Street with Baldwin Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fifth bullet point: The statement “Highway 7 to fly under the mainline” is valid for the Highway 7/West Durham Link crossing. East of Cochrane Street, Highway 7 crosses over the mainline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include a bullet that mentions Transitway stations at Lake Ridge Road, Baldwin Street, and Thickson Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsection a.4.ii:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second bullet: What does “2031 planning horizon base case model – 4 lanes” refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include a bullet that mentions Transitway stations at Dundas Street, Rossland Road, and Taunton Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsection c, some of the expectations of the work MTO will review and consider (i.e., sidewalks and bike lanes, Burns Street, Lake Ridge Road interchange, etc) are beyond the scope of the 401 Preliminary Design. The 401 study will determine the interim (staged) and ultimate improvements. The list of issues should be described in a general perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsection d, revise wording to state “This project is presently on hold until the outcome of the 407 East IEA is known, at which time it will be reassessed.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Population and Employment Forecasts**
Section 5.2 shows two sets of forecasts; ROPA 128 forecast is in compliance with Places to Grow at the Regional level, while the other (Transportation Model Forecast) is not. Appendix E contains the detail, and it appears that what’s used in the model is from an earlier set of forecasts from the Region (2003 DC Review), which had higher population for the Region (e.g. 2031 population of 1.022 million compared to 0.960). Employment figures are comparable in both sets.

The use of higher population could result in over-stating future travel demand (or in timing/staging of when forecasts would materialize). However, the level of over assuming population is lower in Whitby compared to other municipalities in Durham.

**Travel Demand Forecasts**
Demand forecasting has been done using a “simplified model” which does not have sophisticated multi-modal modelling capability. However, forecasts have been refined to manually lower auto demand by 15% to account for policy objectives and other initiatives such as TDM, transit promotion, etc.

The 15% reduction in auto demand region-wide would result in transit modal split for the region in line with Metrolinx’s forecast under the Big Move.

In Appendix E, model development and approach refers to (E-3) applying a growth factor of 1.12 on 2021 to obtain 2031 demand forecasts. It is not clear why this was done while 2031 land use (population and employment) inputs could have been used to obtain 2031 travel demand forecasts.

**Transportation System Performance**
This is limited to level-of-service analysis at the screenline level, comparing demand against capacity for each road. While it is good that the “entire” road network is addressed, there is no focus on “town” roads.

**Provincial Highways**
Under Section 5.6.7.b.6, include the following statement: ‘The 407 East IEA did not protect (seek approval) for an interchange at Cochrane Street. Any interchange at this location will be subject to its own class EA (completed by others) and MTO approval.’

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population and Employment Forecasts</td>
<td>Noted. Findings from model and TMP considered to be adequately robust to confirm need and corridor protection requirements throughout the Town. Refinement to population and employment growth forecasts are not expected to affect TMP recommendations regarding corridors to be protected although could affect timing. Future TMP updates will incorporate revised updates to population and employment assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Forecasts</td>
<td>Note that this reduction was done as part of the Durham Master Plan of 2002. It is more than a simple 15% reduction. It was a review of specific corridors and their potential to implement Transit and other TDM initiatives. Specific Origin and Destinations related to corridor were targeted for increases. The result was an overall 15% reduction in autos. Agree that the 15% reduction is in line with Metrolinx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Appendix E, model development and approach refers to (E-3) applying a growth factor of 1.12 on 2021 to obtain 2031 demand forecasts. It is not clear why this was done while 2031 land use (population and employment) inputs could have been used to obtain 2031 travel demand forecasts.</td>
<td>Population and employment forecasts were based on current available information from the Official Plans at the time of developing the model. The land use forecasts contained in the Official Plans are frequently reviewed as a result of changing economic climates. At the time of the forecasting work for the Whitby TMP (2006/7) Provincial forecasts of pop and emp were only available at a regional level. The Region of Durham did not have an allocation of the 2031 forecasts (formal or informal) to a traffic zone level. A traffic zone level was required to develop a 2031 matrix for assignment. To estimate a 2031 matrix the traffic zonal quantities (in/outs) for 2021 were increased by the 1.12 factor to reflect the change in regional pop and emp between 2021 and 2031. The 2021 trip matrix was then multiplied using the new trip end totals for 2031. These forecasts will be revised in any future update to the TMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Performance</td>
<td>We acknowledge that a network perspective was taken. Ultimately the Town can only implement solutions on roads under its jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Highways</td>
<td>Section 5.6.7.b.6 has been revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 3 Transportation Demand Management Strategy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Use stronger wording to give emphasis to the application of the TDM strategy. Replace ‘should’ with ‘will’ in Sections 7.12. a and b.</td>
<td>Noted. Maintained as should – as it’s a recommendation to the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO commends Whitby’s initiative to be a ‘leading example’ in the development of a trip reduction program for the Municipal Offices and supports the Town’s efforts to establish Mobility Hub designations in the downtown area and around the Whity GO Transit station.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Transit**<br>Section 8 e 2 (ii) refers to “planned Light Rail Transit” and “planned Bus Rapid Transit.” It should refer to “proposed higher order transit” only, as nothing has been planned yet for those corridors. | Noted. These technologies are identified in the Durham Region Transit Long Term Transit Strategy. Wording ‘planned’ changed to ‘proposed’.

Section 8 e 2 (iii) refers to the Long Term Transit Strategy “identifying” Light Rail Transit corridors. This should be toned down to “propose” | Wording has been revised from ‘planned’ to ‘proposed’ reflecting the preliminary nature of the strategy. |
<p>| Section 8 e 4 iv last bullet point talks about “implementation of exclusive or semi-exclusive bus only lanes.” Please clarify that this is not at the province’s expense. | Funding for these transit priority improvements has not been identified at this time and will be subject to further study. |
| <strong>Crossings of Provincial Highways</strong>&lt;br&gt;The following are changes to be made to Exhibit 9.1:&lt;br&gt;• Revise exhibit to clearly distinguish between work desired by Whitby/others and work protected by the 407 East IEA (i.e., extension of the West Durham Link north of 407 is not protected for under the 407 East IEA) | Noted – appropriate reference made on exhibit. |
| • MTO must be consulted about and review any proposed changes to municipal roadways in the vicinity of MTO infrastructure (i.e., Burns Street extension) | Reference regarding MTO approval requirements noted in 10.4. |
| • The exhibit shows a potential grade separation at 407 East and Garrard Road. The 407 East IEA does not seek approval for this crossing. This work is subject to a separate class Environmental Assessment by others and MTO approval | Table 10.6 updated to reference future EA requirements and text noted in 10.4. |
| • Ensure these comments are applied to other exhibits and cross-referenced in Table 10.6 | Noted. |
| • Show road closures (i.e., cul-de-sacs). | This exhibit only illustrated recommended road modifications proposed by the Town, and not improvements identified by others (i.e. Region, Province). A summary of all road improvements/corridor protection is illustrated in Exhibit 9.2. |
| The capacity and service need requirements of new local roads crossing 401 fall under the responsibility of the municipality, not MTO. Any new municipal crossings of the highway must be approved and agreed to by the ministry. If a new structure is being considered for an existing crossing, the ministry must review the need to provide additional capacity and/or bike lanes and/or sidewalks, in consultation with the Town and the Region. The recommendation to have the ministry assess the capacity and service need requirements for municipal road crossings is not appropriate unless it involves an interchange or it be done as part of municipal or Regional upgrades to the roadway (Section 9.2.2.2 b). | Noted and edits made to text. |
| Section 9.2.2.6.a makes reference to “… Garden/Baldwin Streets…”. This should be changed to “… Baldwin Street…” | Section 9.2.2.6.a has been revised accordingly. |
| <strong>Goods Movement</strong>&lt;br&gt;The TMP recognizes the value of viewing a focused Goods Movement Strategy through a multimodal lens that allows for the integration of the modes of transportation. The reference to the Durham Region’s strategic direction in Section 9.5.e., which notes that “the region has identified a shift to rail based goods movement | Comment noted. The purpose of this section is to report on the Region’s plan. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from road based goods movement as a top priority in an effort to reduce congestion on regional roads” and that this will affect truck volumes within the Town of Whitby is not an appropriate goal for any level of government in a deregulated, competitive market environment in which shippers should be free to make their modal choice that best suits their needs. Congestion is better addressed through more integrated, coordinated and accessible transit services.</td>
<td>A future goods movement strategy will incorporate MTO’s comments and positions regarding this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.5.j 1 makes reference to an interchange at Lake Ridge Road. The 407 East IEA seeks approval for an interchange at Highway 401 and Lake Ridge Road, however, implementation of this interchange has yet to be determined. All plans that show the Lake Ridge Road/Highway 401 area should contain a note reflecting this.</td>
<td>Section 9.5.j revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO looks forward to the Goods Movement Study that Whitby plans to undertake with the Region.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Roadway Improvements (section 10.4, table 10.7), it should be clearly stated that new alignments, widenings and extensions will include the strategies to reduce single occupant vehicle travel and to make better use of the existing transportation system. As they are worded in the document, both sections imply that all the roadway improvements will be auto oriented, despite the good intentions in the TMP.</td>
<td>Section 10.4 modified accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10.4 should include an acknowledgement that there will be future improvements to Highway 401 and that the Town will consult with MTO regarding roadway improvements, future expansion plans and any development proposals adjacent to and any crossings of the 401 corridor.</td>
<td>Section 10.4 modified accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A consultation strategy should be part of the implementation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following are changes to be made to Table 10.6:</td>
<td>Extension of Bonacord is identified in Table 10.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no mention of the extension of Bonacord from its existing west terminus to Lake Ridge Road.</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirm the labels for the Burns Street Connection (east) and Burns Street Connection (west) extensions? They may be reversed.</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any extension of Burns Street is subject to ministry review, due to its proximity to ministry infrastructure (Highway 401, West Durham Link)</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annes Street:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Annes Street crossing of Highway 401 is subject to ministry review and review of impacts to the provincial highway facility</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly. Town should discuss with MTO officials the Annes Street flyover and inclusion considerations as part of the Highway 401 widening preliminary design study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Annes Street crossing will likely not be reviewed under the 401 PDR unless specifically requested by Whitby, as it is beyond the scope of the current assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Twin Streams Connection is subject to MTO review</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highway 407 Interchange at Cochrane Street</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change road name to “407 East Interchange at Cochrane Street”</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make note in the table that the interchange is not precluded, subject to a separate Class EA (by others) and ministry approval. The 407 East IEA does not protect for an interchange at this location</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Brooklin North/South Route</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Under the From column, change to “407 East at Cochrane or West Durham Link”</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make a note in the table that this route is subject to ministry review</td>
<td>Table 10.6 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Table 10.7, Coronation Road, make a note in the Remarks/Status column that this is subject to further cost-sharing discussions between the ministry and the Town of Whitby.</td>
<td>Table 10.7 revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 5

The following are changes to be made to Exhibit 4.2:

- The exhibit needs to clearly distinguish between work desired by Whitby/others and work protected by the 407 East IEA (i.e. extension of the West Durham Link north of 407 is not protected for under the 407 East IEA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTO must be consulted about and review any proposed changes to municipal roadways in the vicinity of MTO infrastructure (i.e., Burns Street extension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exhibit shows a potential grade separation at 407 East and Garrard Road. The 407 East IEA does not seek approval for this crossing. This work is subject to a separate Class Environmental Assessment by others and MTO approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure these comments are applied to other exhibits and cross-referenced in Table 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed ultimate condition of Highway 401 is a core-collector system to the West Durham Link and 10-lanes east of the West Durham Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 4.3 needs to clearly distinguish between work desired by Whitby/others and work protected by the 407 East IEA (i.e. South Blair Street Grade Separation). In the Legend, replace “Highway 407 Transitway (Metrolinx)” with “407 Transitway”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 9.2 shows several options for Burns Street extension, including a Transit only route. Add a note that MTO must be consulted about and review any proposed changes to municipal roadways in the vicinity of MTO infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several maps in the Appendix do not include the 407 East Transportation Corridor. Please revise to include the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noted. There is no extension of the West Durham Link north of the 407 East Transportation Corridor shown on Exhibit 4.2. All improvements shown are planned or approved by the Region or Province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text and exhibits have been revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is noted in Section 4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 4.3 modified accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This has been added to the text and exhibit of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The name of the Hwy 407 Corridor has been changed to 407 East Transportation Corridor on all exhibits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you may be aware, The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has completed the 407 East Environmental Assessment (EA) study to address long-term transportation needs in the Region of Durham and surrounding areas. The recommended design for the transportation corridor (highway / transitway) extends Highway 407 easterly from Brock Road in Pickering to Highway 35/115 in Clarington, with two north-south links connecting the proposed extension to Highway 401, one in West Durham and one in East Durham. On August 28th, 2009, the Ontario Ministry of Transportation, completed and submitted the provincial 407 East EA Report to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval.

Should the ministry receive approval for this project, the Town of Whitby will need to discuss the location of proposed signalized intersections of the Mid Arterial at both Baldwin St and Thickson Rd with the ministry, as they may fall within the ministry's Controlled Access Highway right-of-way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 10.7 revised accordingly.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ministry of Transportation – Corridor Management Section – June 3, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pg. 24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection 4, please include bullets that mention transitway stations under the Hwy 407 mainline and the West Durham Link.</td>
<td>Section revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection a. 4. i. 2031 planning horizon base case model for Hwy 407 mainline from West Durham Link to Thornton Rd. is 8 lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection a. 4. ii. 2031 planning horizon base case model for West Durham Link is 6 lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection c. 1. ii., Given the proximity of the interchange of the West Durham Link and Hwy 401, a new interchange at Lake Ridge Rd. might be inadvisable. The ministry will review the potential for this interchange.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pg. 25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection d. The EA Study of Hwy 401 widening from Brock St. to Stevenson Rd. is presently on hold until the outcome of the 407 East IEA is know, at which time it will be reassessed.</td>
<td>Section revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pg 76</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection 9.2.2.2. a. 2 The proposed extension of Burns St. westerly and then to the north may be in conflict with the Hwy 401 widening and the West Durham Link (WDL) interchange design. Similarly, the proposed transit connection that is to go under the Link to connect to the Hwy 407 transitway is also in conflict with the Hwy 401/ WDL interchange. The ministry will consider alternatives to these requests.</td>
<td>Noted. The Burns extension westerly to Dundas Street is present in the Region of Durham and the Town of Whitby Official Plans. Further discussion between the Town and the Province should take place to ensure this significant corridor continues to be protected with any new alignments of Highway 401 and the West Durham Link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection 9.2.2.2. b. 1 The new proposed Hwy 401 crossing at Annes St. is beyond the scope of the Hwy 401 Preliminary Design. New municipal crossings are the responsibility of Whitby and/or Durham and must be agreed to and approved by the ministry.</td>
<td>Noted – report revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection 9.2.2.2. b. 3 The ministry does not assess the capacity and service needs requirements for Hwy 401 crossings. The need for crossing improvements should be initiated or identified by a municipality and/or region unless it is an interchange.</td>
<td>Noted – report revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibit 9.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exhibit shows several new “potential interchanges” along Hwy 407 and the WDL. The 407 East IEA did not seek approval for these interchanges. This work is subject to a separate class Environmental Assessment by others and MTO approval.</td>
<td>Noted. The figure revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alternatives for Burns St. extension and a transit route should be identified as potential alternatives, at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning Context

Section 1.2 only provides a "land use" planning context. This section should be balanced with an overview of the "transportation planning" context. Some of this context is buried within section 4 of this report. Description of key transportation planning documents included in Section 1.3 of the report (planning context). This including the Durham TMP, Durham Transit Strategy, Metrolinx Big Move. Key Transportation Planning elements that should be included in this planning context are:

- the Metrolinx Act which provides direction for the preparation of Transportation Master Plans;
- the Transportation Planning Policy statement that is being prepared by the Ministry of Transportation;
- the Transit Supportive Land Use Guidelines that are being reviewed by the Ministry of Transportation;
- the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan, the Big Move;
- the Region of Durham Transportation Master Plan;
- the Region of Durham Cycling Plan;
- Region of Durham Setting the Stage for TDM and TDM Strategy;
- the Region of Durham Arterial Corridor Guidelines;

The hierarchy of documents should be presented in the reverse order - i.e. federal provincial, regional, local municipal.

### ROPA 114

It is important to recognize that significant changes occurred to the transportation policies and designations of the Regional Official Plan through amendment 114 (the Region's Official Plan review). While Growing Durham and Amendment 128 responded to the Provincial Places to Grow Plan, this amendment did not address the transportation infrastructure that will be required to support the planned urban growth and intensification. As such, the Region's transportation network, policies and programs will be reviewed on a comprehensive basis through the Region's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update in 2011. It is likely that an amendment to the Regional Official Plan will follow the TMP update.

### Environmental Considerations

This section appears to be misplaced, given that there has been no previous discussion on the Environmental Assessment (EA) process up to this point. This section would be better placed following the EA context provided in section 3.

Some of the categories listed in exhibits 1-3 and 1-4 do not seem to be reflected in text of the document (e.g. Rural economy -agriculture, aggregate extraction, ANSI's).

### A Vision for Transportation

Most of the objectives appear to focus on the movement of people. To provide greater balance, the addition of the following strategic goods movement objective should be considered:

- Goods movement related land uses are better integrated within the municipality resulting in greater reliability of the regional goods movement network (integrated).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Industry and government will be engaged in the development and implementation of strategic directions for urban freight (sustainable).  
• Increased transportation options for moving goods will be offered by increasing intermodal efficiency and removing barriers (balanced).  
• Improved information about the state of the transportation network, including incidents, congestion and time of day travel, will be available for trip planning (optimized).  
• Conflicts between goods movement and other modes will be reduced (coordinated). | While theoretical volume analysis was auto based, strategic assessment and analysis considered all modes.  
Other data sources may be applicable in monitoring of the performance of the system and/or in the preparation of detail EA work, or operation studies stemming from the TMP. |

**The Transportation Study Approach**
The objectives of the plan focus on a multi-modal, balanced approach. However, the analysis undertaken takes a more traditional approach to travel demand forecasting, focused upon vehicular modes (in particular the auto mode). Consideration should be given to other data sources and analyses to support multi-modal improvements such as the Bicycle Compatibility Index, Bicycle Level of Service, Cordon Count truck data, pedestrian counts, etc.

**External Agency Involvement**
The Region’s involvement to this point has been limited. The current draft is only the second version that the Region has seen to this point.

Regional staff have been consulted during the TMP Study and were most recently invited to meetings on October 21, 2009 and June 5, 2009. Agencies were also provided with public notices, which invited comments and input. Further studies completed for the individual projects will have further consultation with the various agency groups.

**Existing System, Road Network**
The Town of Ajax also included information related to existing traffic controls. This may be an element that the Town of Whitby may wish to consider, given section 10.2.
The following existing Arterial Road sections are missing from the exhibit:

- Carnwith Drive, between Ashburn Road to east of Cachet Boulevard show all as a Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
- Cachet Boulevard, between Columbus Road and Winchester Road -show as a Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
- Lyndebrook Road, east of Coronation Road -show as Type B Arterial, 2 lanes
- Dryden Road, between Anderson Street to east of Deverell Street show as Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
- Rossland Road/Coronation Road area -show the Rossland Road realignment, not the old Rossland Road crossing of the C.P. Rail Line
- Annes Street, south of Dundas Street and section north of Victoria Street -show as Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
- Burns Street, east of Thickson Road -show as Type C Arterial, 2 lanes
- Taunton Road should be shown as 4 lanes the entire way through Whitby
- Brock Street between Rossland and Taunton Road is mostly 2 lanes, not 4 lanes wide

Reference added to 10.2 regarding need for regular Traffic Operations Study. Detailed traffic signal reviews not part of TMP scope.

Exhibit 4.1 has been revised.

**Existing Network, Transit Network**
The description of the existing transit service in Whitby should be expanded to:

- include a map of current DRT routes; and,
- Identify service hours and frequencies for each route.

This information can be easily obtained from the www.durhamregiontransit.com website

Existing Transit service map added.

Commentary on service frequencies updated.

**Existing Transportation – Active Transportation**
The description of the existing active transportation network should be expanded to include a map of key facilities (e.g. 92 km of multi use trails and 9 km of existing bicycle paths/lanes).

Map will be included in future TMP and OP updates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current practice for the provision of sidewalks/pedestrian facilities (e.g. one side of the street, both sides) and cycling facilities should also be described in this section.</td>
<td>Section 4.2 updated accordingly to reflect other comments and reference to key Waterfront cycling route noted in relevant Sub-Area 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any significant pedestrian and cycling amenities? If so these could also be detailed in this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the reference to the Town of Whitby OP, the Town of Whitby Working Draft Bicycle Plan, the Regional Cycling Plan and the Regional Trail Network be moved to later section under Planned System and initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planned System and Initiative**

This section should be limited to network elements. As noted previously (see section 1.3 comments) key transportation planning documents should be discussed in the Planning Context section. This helps to provide a balanced perspective between liveability objectives (land use planning focused) and mobility objectives (transportation planning focused), and illustrates the interconnectedness between these objectives.

This section notes that "there are a number of significant Provincial and Regional planned and committed improvements to the transportation network in Whitby anticipated to be in place by 2031" which are illustrated in Exhibit 4.2. However, the Region's TMP has not been updated to 2031, and transportation improvements to support the urban lands added through the amendment 128 have not been incorporated into the Regional Official Plan at this time. Exhibit 4.2 should clearly indicate the source of the information used to derive each of the network elements illustrated in this exhibit.

In Exhibit 4.2, the Consumers Drive extension should be illustrated as new road construction, the Victoria Street realignment should also be included as new road construction, and the Hopkins Street widening should be extended to Victoria.

**Provincial Roadways**

Subsection c) should indicate that the widening and realignment of Highway 401 to ultimate 12 lane express-collector system west of the West Durham link, and 10 lanes east of the West Durham link through Whitby. The wording in the report has been changed. This configuration was reflected in the model.

**Regional Roadways**

The document notes in reference to the Region's TMP, that "a number of recommendations were made to improve the Region's overall transportation network in response to planned growth. These recommendations have been taken into account in the development of the Town of Whitby's Transportation Master Plan." However, no further discussion is made as to "how" these recommendations have been taken into account or "where" they have been taken into account (e.g. cross reference to other sections?)

Reference back to the Region’s TMP was included in Part III of the report, with specific reference to the Regional recommendations included in Appendix F.

**Transit Network**

The transit network identified in Section 4.1.7 should refer to the current Regional Official Plan, not the Growing Durham Growth Plan.

The reference to the Long Term Transit Strategy Study should be revised to note that the study is complete and has been submitted to both federal and provincial governments for review.

Reference to the LTTS modified to note it has been completed.

**Exhibit 4.3:** The following changes are required to better reflect the Rapid Transit Network developed through the LTTS:

- Bus Rapid Transit on Brock Street should extend south to Victoria Street; Exhibit 4.3 modified and reflected in text of the report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Bayly/Victoria/Bloor should be identified as a "Protect for Future Rapid Transit" corridor;  
• Winchester Road, west of Baldwin, should be identified as an "Enhanced Conventional (Priority) Transit" corridor.  
• The LTTS also includes the following study deliverables:  
  o TOD Strategy and Guidelines  
  o Goods Movement Strategy | The DC model built on the work from the TMP. There was a TDM future matrix (showing 15% reduction) which built on a future base matrix using status quo mode (TTS) splits.  
| | At the time of the forecasting work for the Whitby TMP Provincial forecasts of pop and emp were only available at a regional level. The Region of Durham did not have an allocation of the 2031 forecasts (formal or informal) to a traffic zone level. A traffic zone level was required to develop a 2031 matrix for assignment. To estimate a 2031 matrix the traffic zonal quantities (in/outs) for 2021 were increased by the 1.12 factor to reflect the change in regional pop and emp between 2021 and 2031. The 2021 trip matrix was then fratared using the new trip end totals for 2031.  
| | Traffic zone level 2031 information was not endorsed until June 2009 and not available for consumption until shortly after. All analysis preceded this information release. The TMP used the best available information of the day.  
| | Future TMPs will undergo further revisions to the demand forecasting using the best information of the day.  

Section 5 – Travel Demands and Future Growth

When this TMP was initiated, the Region was requested to provide access to Region's Model for Town's consultant to assist the development of the TMP. At that time, Region provided the EMME2 networks for each horizon (2006, 2012 and 2021) and related auto-driver OD matrices to the consultant. That Region's model has the following main features:

- the model adopted the structure of GTA simplified model, and was focused on auto only;  
- the transit mode splits were treated as inputs, but the model merely used the status-quo mode splits (2001 TTS) for future horizons when the future matrices were provided;  
- the land use in the model was essentially the forecasts used in 2003 DC study and no 2031 pop/emp numbers by traffic zone were provided from the Region (neither was Growth Plan reflected); and,  
- the network assumption was based on Region's 2003 DC road program; in that 2003 DC model, the 407 extension was only assumed with 4 lanes in 2021.

According to the modeling approach described in the Town's TMP report, land use forecasts in 2021 were based on the Region's 2003DC forecasts, and 2031 forecasts (by traffic zone) were obtained by applying the simple Regional growth factor (1.12 from 2021 to 2031) onto 2021 by traffic zone. With the Region's Growth Plan allocation at the municipal level approved by Council in June 2009 (which differs from the 2003 DC forecasts), the consultant should at least conduct an analysis (e.g. Frator approach) using the municipal based land use scenario from Growing Durham Study.

The assumption for 407 extension and the two links (e.g. number of lanes) should be tested using the outcome of 407 ESR, which will impact the recommended road improvement plan accordingly.

The recommended road improvement plan in the report and associated fiscal implications should be revised/adjusted upon the following: OPA 128; Region's Infrastructure and Fiscal Impact Study; and, Region's TMP update 1 new DC study.

In addition, through the Region's recent Long Term Transit Strategy, Highway 2 and Taunton Road were identified as potential rapid transit routes that will require dedicated right-of-way. The impact of these potential rapid transit facilities needs to be incorporated into the Town's analysis. These assumptions may have an impact on future capacities, impacting the screenline analysis undertaken by the Town.

Demand Forecasting Approach

Exhibit 5-1. "Transportation Screenlines" - The arrows are not needed for this diagram, as it is just showing the screenlines; otherwise, the title should include wording such as "Showing Peak Direction of Travel (P.M. Peak Hour)."

Revised.

Existing Transportation System Performance

Exhibits 6-1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.5 in Appendix G should indicate P.M. Peak Hour. To be consistent, Exhibits 5.1 to 5.7 should add P.M. Peak Hour in the titles.

Revised.

Future Transportation System Performance

The base case in the Town’s TMP is 5 years ahead of the Region’s...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Region has adopted a region-wide auto reduction target for 2021 of 15%? Why has a 15% auto reduction target been adopted for the Town of Whitby for 2031. What is the justification? How will this be achieved? What are the specific targets that were set for each of the non-auto modes? How would these targets be achieved, what programs are required to support these targets?</td>
<td>TMP (2006 instead of 2001) and the 15% auto reduction target is based on a reduction from modal split assumptions that exist today. It was considered reasonable and conservative in that this was the Region target for 2021. It was also assumed that most of the initiatives proposed by the Region and the Province to reduce auto mode share have only recently been implemented (i.e. initiation of Smart Commute Durham) or will occur during the next 20 year horizon (i.e. plans for rapid transit expansion and expansion of the active transportation network). Methods to reach the 15% were noted in the Region's TMP. Programs by the Town that will help achieve and potentially exceed the auto reduction targets are also identified in Part III of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Wide Screenline Need and Justification</strong></td>
<td>Goods Movement will be further addressed in a more detailed Goods Movement Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the consultation process, truck/freight issues were identified in several sub-areas, however, there does not appear to be any data to substantiate these claims. Further work should be undertaken to understand the impact of goods movement and the best means to improve the network to accommodate future growth in goods movement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5:6</strong> is presented as a detailed review of each-sub-area, yet there is little, if any, discussion of transit issues (e.g. service reliability, pedestrian/cycling access, poor road conditions). We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and/or your consultant to provide input on these issues.</td>
<td>The need for transit is inherent in all areas and the study focus on those elements of transit control by the municipality such as road and pedestrian structure to accommodate transit. These elements have been included in policy statements and in guiding principles and recommendations. A reference has also been added into the Study to encourage ongoing dialogue between the Town and Region to review development plans and reconstruction plans along with the associated transit services and frequencies to ensure coordination and opportunities are enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 6.1 – Strategic Alternatives</strong></td>
<td>Section 6.1 and 6.2 is a Strategic Level Assessment identifying an overall approach to be followed. A more detailed assessment based on corridors follows in Appendix G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The list of improvements associated with each of the alternatives should be listed in the body of this section. The description of Alternative 3 -Transit Expansion should be expanded by identifying each affected route/corridor and how the service was changed. This will assist us in comparing Alternative 3 with the various LTTS scenarios. An alternative should be included which reflects the Regional Official Plan's network (road, transit, goods movement) and policy provisions. This may reflect the blended alternative referred to 6.3.b.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 6.2 – Evaluation of Strategic Alternatives</strong></td>
<td>Section 6.1 and 6.2 is a Strategic Level Assessment which identifies an overall approach to be followed. A more detailed assessment for a number of the corridors follows in Appendix G which considers many of these specific criterion and assessment factors. Future environmental assessments completed for the individual projects will also require assessment and evaluation considering a wide range of transportation, environmental and cost criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The criteria that are described in table 6-1 should be detailed more fully. For example: -Transportation Service should include more than just the level of service on individual roadways, but should also consider mode choice, network efficiencies, connectivity and integration, safety, etc. Natural Environment should indicate the type of features that may be impacted such as ESAs, ANSis, Wetlands, Fisheries, Wildlife Habitat (rare and endangered species), water resources (ground and surface water), air quality, etc. Socio-cultural Environment should include impact on properties with significant heritage and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architectural features, cultural landscapes, scenic views and vistas, and the promotion of healthy environments and lifestyles, etc.</td>
<td>The base case in the Town’s TMP is 5 years ahead of the Region’s TMP (2006 instead of 2001) and the 15% auto reduction target is based on a reduction from modal split assumptions that exist today. It was considered reasonable and conservative in that this was the Region target for 2021. It was also assumed that most of the initiatives proposed by the Region and the Province to reduce auto mode share have only recently been implemented (i.e. initiation of Smart Commute Durham) or will occur during the next 20 year horizon (i.e. plans for rapid transit expansion and expansion of the active transportation network). Methods to reach the 15% were noted in the Region’s TMP. Programs that will help achieve and potentially exceed the auto reduction targets are also identified in Part III of the report. Comments on monitoring and performance measures have also been added to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment should consider both business attraction and retention.</td>
<td>Text modified accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should other costs be examined (e.g. triple bottom line approach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An explanation should be provided as to how these criteria are to be measured (including data sources) and to be weighted in the evaluation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.2 is a summary of the conclusions of the assessment (e.g. minimal potential impact on natural features). Where are the details of the assessment (e.g. which features were examined and how were they impacted)? It is unclear where the information for Table 6.2 was derived and why Alternative 4 is the preferred approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unclear if there is any weighting to the criteria which would have influenced the evaluation. The Town may wish to consider balancing the reasoned argument approach with an arithmetic approach. More justification to the evaluation and preferred solution is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.3 – Preferred Strategic Solution**

For the purposes of the Whitby TMP, the Town has extended the Region's 2021 auto reduction to 2031. The Town should provide a more comprehensive analysis as to why the target is appropriate for the Town and how the Town proposes to achieve the 15% auto reduction target within this timeframe.

Additional information should be provided to support the conclusion that Alternative 3 will not achieve the 15% reduction in auto mode share. (Please note that the LTTS featured the development of a transportation model that was key in comparing the various scenarios.) Perhaps other combinations of TDM and transit improvements can achieve the target.

**Managing Transportation Demand**

The Region has also: completed Setting the Stage for TDM in Durham (May 2006); a TDM Market Assessment (February 2007); a TDM Study Report (May 2007); and, a Regional Cycling Plan (October 2008).

As previously noted, the March 2010 Long Term Transit Strategy Study (LTTS) prepared for DRT includes a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy and Guidelines, and a TDM Strategy and Action Plan. Managing Transportation Demand – Whitby. With respect to the TDM objectives identified for the Town:

- Objective 1 - The Region and Metrolinx currently expend considerable effort through the Smart commute initiative on Ride Sharing opportunities. The Town should coordinate its efforts with the Smart Commute program by leveraging existing services such as the online ride matching service Carpool Zone.
- Objective 2 - The Town should consider the development of a parking management strategy, rather
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>than addressing this matter on an ad hoc basis. Details should be incorporated into the strategies that follow in this section and added to section 10.1.1 of this plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objective 3 The Town may wish to examine potential strategies that are outlined in the Region's recent Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objective 4 Add the Region of Durham (Cycling Network) and SmartCommute Durham (TDM) to this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the TDM strategies identified for the Town:

| Objective 3 | The strategies should be listed in a manner that corresponds to the objectives listed previously. |
| Strategy 1 -the Town may also wish to consider adding references to promoting active transportation, promoting alternative work arrangements (staggered shifts, compressed work week), and establishing satellite work centres to the TDM policy. |  |
| Strategy 3 -This objective is undertaken through the Smart Commute initiative. The Town's assistance in encouraging local business to become members of the Smart Commute Durham program would be greatly appreciated. The Town however, may also wish to focus on school trip reduction, which is beyond the mandate of Smart Commute. The Town of Ajax is moving forward with a program in this regard that the Town may be interested in learning about. |  |
| Strategy 4 -Further investigation would be required prior to the designation of Whitby GO Station as a Mobility Hub in accordance with policies 7.15 and 7.16 of Metrolinx's Big Move. |  |
| Strategy 5 -The incorporation of TDM through planning should not be limited to just the secondary plan process, but should also follow through the implementation of zoning and approval of site plans. A Strategy should be added to expand upon the development of a Parking Management strategy. |  |

**Active Transportation Strategy**

Initiative 4 of the Active Transportation Strategy makes reference to the introduction of bike racks on buses as an important component. As such racks are currently on all DRT and GO transit buses, we suggest this measure does not merit inclusion in the strategy. A similar reference to bike racks on buses on page 64 should also be removed.

**Encouraging and Facilitating Public Transit**

Subsection 'b' advises that transit is planned and operated by Durham Region. This should be changed to Durham Region/Durham Region Transit.

Subsection 'd' noted that "DRT is also currently undergoing a Transit Master Plan...". This should be changed to reference the recently completed LTTS. A similar change is required on page 91.

Subsection 2 ii references the Region of Durham LTTS. This should be changed to Durham Region Transit LTTS. Similar changes are required in subsection 2 iv at the top of page 69 and subsection 4 iv in the middle of page 69.

While we support the initiative to develop a Transit Priority Plan, the text should be modified to include the Town, the Region and DRT. This should also be reflected in Table 10.3

**Section 9.2 – Managing Transportation Supply – Roadway/Corridor Network Implementation Plan**

We strongly support the recommended extensions to Burns Street, both eastward and westward. As noted in the text, these initiatives would enable DRT to provide improved transit service to the residents of south and west Whitby.

Exhibit 9 -2 should differentiate between "existing" and "future". Exhibit 9-2 is not consistent with the Regional Official Plan. The changes to the arterial network proposed through this master plan, along with changes contemplated by other neighbouring municipalities, will be considered comprehensively through the review of the Region's TMP and a future ROP amendment to

| Differences noted and where applicable Exhibit 9.2 modified accordingly. Other modifications to correct any inconsistencies and to update the local and collector road system will be undertaken as part of the future Official Plan network when the Transportation... |  |

**Exhibit 9-2**

| Differences noted and where applicable Exhibit 9.2 modified accordingly. Other modifications to correct any inconsistencies and to update the local and collector road system will be undertaken as part of the future Official Plan network when the Transportation... |  |

_Dillon Consulting Limited_  
_June 2010_
address the transportation needs to support the Region's Growth Plan conformity exercise. The following inconsistencies are noted:

- Thickson Road should be illustrated as continuous in the vicinity of Brawley Road, consistent with the ROP.
- The realignment of Columbus Road to meet Concession Road 7 in the City of Pickering should be illustrated.
- The ROP designates Montgomery Avenue from Columbus Road to Carnwith Drive as a Type C arterial, however this is not illustrated in Exhibit 9-2.
- The ROP designates Carnwith Drive from Ashburn Road to the Oshawa border as a Type C arterial, however the planned section east of Cachet Boulevard is not in Exhibit 9-2.
- The ROP does not designate Carnwith Drive as a Type C arterial west of Ashburn Road.
- The ROP does not designate the connection of Garrard Road to Cachet Boulevard. Garrard is shown as a continuous arterial to Winchester in the ROP.
- The ROP does not designate a new Type C arterial connecting Columbus Road and Britannia Avenue in Oshawa.
- Exhibit 9-2 designates Coronation Road north of Taunton Road as a Type B arterial. This arterial is not designated in the Regional Official Plan.
- The ROP designates Conlin Road from Anderson Street to Lake Ridge Road as a continuous future Type B arterial.
- The ROP designates Baldwin Street from the Ashburn Road connection to Highway 407 as a Type C arterial not a Type B Arterial.
- The ROP does not provide for a continuous Type C arterial (Twin Streams) from Coronation to Lake Ridge Road.
- The ROP does not provide for a continuous Type C arterial (Bonacord) from Coronation to Lake Ridge Road.
- The ROP designates a continuous Type C arterial (Burns Street) from Coronation to Lake Ridge Road, however this is not illustrated in Exhibit 9-2.
- The ROP designates Thickson Road south of Victoria Street to the future Water Street connection as a Type C arterial.
- The ROP designates Water Street from South Blair Street to Thickson Road as a Type C arterial.
- The Type C designation for Water Street west of South Blair should be retained until such time as Arterial Parkway criteria have been considered.
- The Arterial Parkway north of 407 connecting with Baldwin Street is not designated in the ROP.

Schedule D is updated.

Table 2 defines local and collector roads however neither classification is illustrated in Exhibit 10-2. There is no reference to Table 2 in the report. Exhibit 9.2 modified.

Exhibit 9.2 and Section 9.2.1 not consistent with Region
The ROP does not have provisions for 6-lane Type B arterials. This section refers to two 6-lane arterials: Rossland Road from Brock Street to Lake Ridge Road; and, Baldwin Street from Taunton Road to Highway 407

Exhibit 9.2 modified accordingly. Transportation assessment for TMP assessed potential ultimate capacity/lane requirements for arterials, which included Regional facilities. Adjustments in Regional road classifications not reviewed although may be required in the future and/or modifications to OP. If ultimate lane provisions not implemented, other parallel facility improvements may be warranted or accelerated in implementation timing.

Section 9.2.2 Other Sub-Area Network Improvements
This section examines network deficiencies within defined sub-areas of the Town and examines

Section 9.2.2 modified accordingly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opportunities to overcome these deficiencies. Not all of the network changes (both additions and deletions) listed in our comments in section 9.2 are detailed in this section. This section should include justification and rationale for all elements of the planned transportation network that are being included (e.g. Garrard Road extension, etc) or excluded (e.g. deletion of Water Street extension, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The words mid-block collector should be changed to mid-block arterial in section 9.2.2.5 b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 9.3 - Mitigating Traffic Infiltration</strong></td>
<td>Section 9.3 modified accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic calming process should include collaboration with DRT on the identifying and mitigating impacts to current and future transit operations.</td>
<td>More details added in Exhibit 9.3 and in 9.2.2 individual sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 10.2.3 - Road Classification System</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The previous draft of the TMP included provisions for the classification of roads within the Town which were not consistent with the classification criteria contained in the Regional Official Plan. However, the classification system has been removed from the current draft, and the TMP now indicates that &quot;all road classifications should be reviewed and updated as part of any Official Plan updates&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference is made to a new arterial road classification called an &quot;Arterial Parkway&quot;. However, there is no indication of what the design characteristics and classification criteria for this type of Arterial may be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LTTS has suggested the implementation of a Type &quot;T&quot; arterial, for higher-order transit corridors. The Region will be examining the implementation of this new type of arterial and its incorporation into the Regional Official Plan arterial road hierarchy</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 10.2.4 - Goods Movement</strong></td>
<td>Reference noted is included in statement regarding future Goods Movement Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10.2.4 and 9.5 indicate that the Town will prepare a Goods Movement Strategy, however there is no indication of the timing or phasing of this study. Although Section 9.5 indicates that the strategy will be undertaken in cooperation with the Region, the TMP does not indicate what the role of other stakeholders will be, including the Region. Throughout the Whitby TMP there is no reference to goods movement data (e.g. cordon count, turning movement counts, survey data, etc.) that may be required to quantify future demand, or indicators to be monitored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Durham Region Works Department – May 20, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 – There is little mention of goods movement in the listed Strategic Objectives. Objectives that specifically address goods movement should be added, particularly under the following Transportation Principles: Effective, Integrated, Multi-modal, Balanced, Optimized and Coordinated.</td>
<td>Additional goods movement commentary added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1(a) – Exhibit 3.1 is referenced, but is not included in the report.</td>
<td>Exhibit 3.1 is contained within the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2(a) – Regional Works staff received notices for the Transportation Master Plan Study, but had little direct involvement in the study prior to review of the draft report. Regional Works provided background information for the study, but was not consulted on the development of the recommendations.</td>
<td>Regional staff were invited to meetings in September 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 4.1 – The following errors were noted on the map of the existing road network:
- Thickson Road is a Type C arterial south of Victoria (not Type A).
- Gordon Street is a Type C arterial north of Victoria.
- Henry Street is a collector road, not a Type C arterial.
- Hopkins Street is a Type B arterial south of Consumers to Highway 401.
- Rossland Road has been realigned to eliminate the kink where it crosses the CP Rail tracks between Coronation and McQuay.
- The existing portion of Lyndebrook Road (Coronation to Country Lane) should be shown as a Type B arterial.
- Coronation Road is not designated as an arterial north of Taunton Road.
- Halls Road does not currently exist between Rossland and Taunton.
- The portion of Carnwith Drive east of Thickson is a Type C arterial, not a Type B.
- Cachet Boulevard is a Type C arterial, not a Type B.

Exhibit 4.1 has been updated accordingly.

There are a few discrepancies between the arterial road designations in the Town of Whitby and Regional Official Plans. These should be noted in the report, and the source for the arterial road designations shown on Exhibit 4.1 should be noted. The discrepancies include:
- Garden Street south of Dundas is a Type C arterial in the Regional OP, but is a collector road in the Whitby OP.
- Halls Road is not designated as an arterial road in the Regional OP, but it is a Type B arterial in the Whitby OP.
- Baldwin Street between Thickson and Brawley is a Type C arterial in the Regional OP, but is a Type A arterial in the Whitby OP.

Any discrepancies have been noted and will be addressed as part of the Official Plan update. The TMP has recommended updates to some Town arterials to be considered in future Official Plan updates.

Section 4.1.1(b), (c) & (d) – The description of road jurisdiction is confusing, as not all major roads are included, and jurisdiction over some roads varies from section to section. It would be preferable to present this information in a map, with roads colour coded by jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction map included.

Exhibit 4.2 – The following planned Regional road improvements are not shown accurately on this map:
- Victoria Street is to be realigned and widened from South Blair to west of Thickson, and is to be widened only from there easterly.
- The Hopkins Street widening should be extended south to the road’s intersection with the new alignment of Victoria Street.
- The six-laning of Thickson Road should be extended southerly to Victoria Street.
- Consumers Drive should be shown as new road construction from just east of Thickson Road to Thornton Road.

Exhibit 4.2 has been updated accordingly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.1.4 – Any previously-planned Town road improvements should be included in this section and on Exhibit 4.2.</td>
<td>Comment noted. As this is the Town's initial TMP, Town road improvements were not included in the base case, as all options were reviewed and not considered pre-approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.1.7(c) – The proper name for the LTTS is the “Long Term Transit Strategy”. References to routes along Highway 7 should be revised to refer to Highway 7/Winchester Road, as the Highway 7 designation follows Baldwin Street north from Winchester Road.</td>
<td>Section 4.1.7(c) has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.1.7(e) – GO Transit has not committed to a specific in-service date for the rail service extension to Bowmanville. The plan shown in Appendix D has been revised. GO is not planning to grade separate the existing CP Rail crossing of Thornton Road (a new GO track crossing Thornton is to be grade separated). The proposed new GO station is now on the west side of Thornton Road at its intersection with the Consumers Drive extension.</td>
<td>Section 4.1.7(e) has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 4.3 – The “Existing Commuter Rail” should end at the existing Oshawa GO station (Thornton Road South), and the existing Oshawa GO station should be included on the map. The “Potential Commuter Rail” should be modified to show GO’s planned connection from the CN to the CP corridor west of Thornton Road.</td>
<td>Exhibit 4.3 has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.3(b) – This paragraph gives the impression that all of the modelling was done using the Region’s EMME/2 model, while the details provided in Appendix E make it clear that a number of significant modifications were made to the model for this study. The description of the demand forecasting approach should be expanded to clarify that a modified version of the Region’s model was used and list the key modifications/assumptions used.</td>
<td>Section 5.3(b) has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.3(c) – Consideration should be given to adding screenlines in the northern part of the Town to support assessment of capacity deficiencies in this area.</td>
<td>The most northern screenline is located just south of Myrtle Road. No screenline deficiencies were identified at this screenline or the screenline located south of Columbus Road. A review of volumes and capacities north of Myrtle Road did not reveal a capacity deficiency in the 2031 time horizon. It is though recognized that local area deficiencies may present themselves and warrant in the longer term infrastructure upgrades. Refinement in the transportation system of the northern part of the Town beyond the existing urban boundary is anticipated to occur over the next 5 to 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 – There are discrepancies between the screenlines shown on these maps and the screenline summaries provided in Appendix E. The following issues were noted:</td>
<td>Exhibits 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The east-west screenlines as shown on the maps do not include Myrtle Road, but Myrtle Road is included in the screenline summaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The north-south screenlines are shown as extending across Thornton Road in Oshawa and Audley Road in Ajax on Exhibits 5.2 and 5.3, but the screenline summaries show that the screenlines should end at Lake Ridge Road and Garrard Road/Kendalwood Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For Screenline 7 (north-south, south of Columbus Road), Coronation Road, Cochrane Street, Cedarbrook Trail, Thickson Road and Cachet Boulevard are not included in the screenline summary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.1 – On the north-south screenlines map, the labels for Brock Road and Thickson Road are on the wrong roads.</td>
<td>Exhibit 5.1 has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.4(a) and (c); Exhibits 5.2 and 5.3 – The assessments of screenline deficiencies refer to “level of service”, which appears to be defined in relation to volume to capacity ratios (v/c). Levels of service are typically assigned on a scale from “A” to “F” on the basis of delay. The report should describe the</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology used to assign level of service for this study, and use of an alternative term should be considered if it was not based on delay.</td>
<td>Section 5.4(b) in the report has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.4(b) – The screenline east of Brock Street is listed here as operating at/beyond capacity, but the corresponding map (Exhibit 5.2) shows this screenline below capacity and the screenline west of Brock Street at capacity.</td>
<td>Section 5.4(b) in the report has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.5 – The results of the 2031 screenline deficiency assessment indicate generally better system performance than under existing conditions, particularly in the southern portion of the Town. The report should include some discussion to explain this result, including the effects of key assumptions such as the auto trip reduction factor and Highway 407 configuration. Sensitivity testing should be completed to show the effects of variations in the key assumptions.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.6(f) – The list of actions should include identification of improvements and linkages required to facilitate efficient goods movement within and through the Town.</td>
<td>Section 5.6 f) has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.6.1(c) – Each exhibit should include all of the screenline segments within or bordering the Sub-Areas shown. This would provide readers with a more complete picture of the transportation network performance in relation to each Sub-Area.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.6.2 – Whitby Town Council’s direction to remove the Water Street link to Thickson Road (Paragraph a.9) contradicts the discussion in other paragraphs of this section regarding the need for additional connectivity and alternative routes south of Victoria Street. In particular, the Water Street link could help to alleviate truck traffic demand on Brock Street, which is identified as a concern of the local residents (Paragraph a.10). Given the limited opportunities for road network improvements in this Sub-Area, it appears to be premature to remove the Water Street connection from the TMP and Official Plan without a detailed technical assessment of the effects this would have on the remainder of the existing and planned transportation network.</td>
<td>Section updated and new comment added in Section 10 to note recommendation to undertake Special Study to deal with potential land use and transportation servicing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6.1(c) – Given the nature of strategic alternatives, we recognize that the descriptions have to be fairly broad and generic. However, some additional details in the descriptions would be helpful to better distinguish the alternatives from each other and improve the context for the subsequent assessment of the alternatives. The following changes should be considered for each strategic alternative:</td>
<td>Section 6.1(c) has been updated accordingly. It should be noted that details on road improvements in Alternative 4 were not provided in this strategic level assessment. Road improvements in Alternative 4 are above and beyond those already approved and would need to go through a more vigorous assessment in the subsequent evaluation. Further analysis on the alternatives from both a capacity, servicing and network connectivity perspective has already been included in the TMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative 1 – Note which specific road and transit improvements are included (e.g. by reference to the appropriate exhibits) and state whether this alternative also includes implementation of existing Town and Region policies on TDM, active modes, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative 2 – Clarify the extent to which the TDM measures are expected to include physical infrastructure, such as building new HOV lanes and parking facilities, in comparison to policy/promotion measures and indicate how much of a change this alternative would represent in comparison to existing Town and Regional policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative 3 – Provide additional description of the extent of transit improvements included and how this alternative relates to the improvements proposed in the Region’s Long Term Transit Strategy and the Metrolinx “Big Move” plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative 4 – Provide some detail on the extent of roadway improvements that are assumed to be included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6.1(c)(1) – Alternative 1 should be called “base case” or “business as usual”, rather than “do nothing”, because it includes a significant number of road and transit improvements compared to the existing condition.</td>
<td>Section 6.1 c) 1) has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Section 6.2 – The evaluation of the strategic alternatives should relate back to the vision for transportation in | Section 6.2 has been updated to more distinguish the strategic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitby that was established in Section 2. The evaluation criteria and</td>
<td>nature of the high level options and that the Do Nothing solution is a base condition to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptions should be expanded as necessary to indicate how well the</td>
<td>from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic alternatives address the Strategic Objectives (Section 2.3).</td>
<td>Section 6.2 has been updated accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6.2, Table 6.2 – Additional information should be provided on</td>
<td>Section 6.2 has been updated accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the methodology used for the evaluation of the strategic alternatives,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including key data, assumptions, etc. Without this information, there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is no traceable basis for many of the conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summarized in Table 6.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7.2(c) – There appears to be some words missing from the last</td>
<td>Section 7.2(c) has been updated accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence of this paragraph. This section should make reference to other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional initiatives related to active transportation planning,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including the Regional Cycling Plan and promotion activities carried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out by Smart Commute Durham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8(d) – This section should be revised to recognize the</td>
<td>Section 8(d) has been updated accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations of the recently completed Long Term Transit Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LTTS) by Durham Region Transit (DRT). References to a “Transit Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan” here and in Section 10.1.3(d) are incorrect and should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8(e)(1) – This section should refer to the TOD strategy that</td>
<td>Section 8(e) has been updated accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was prepared as part of the recently completed DRT LTTS. Key</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations from this TOD strategy should be reflected in the TOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy recommendations in the Whitby TMP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8(e)(2)(iii) – The future 407 West Durham Link transitway also</td>
<td>Section 8(e) has been updated accordingly referenced in Sub-Area 4 West Whitby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presents an opportunity for transit supportive development in West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby and should be referenced here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2 – Detailed analysis and assessment of alternatives was</td>
<td>Rationale of recommended protected corridors has been based on consideration of a number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed only for the seven improvements listed in Section 9.2(c), as</td>
<td>factors premised on the vision, goals and objectives of the Study. The need for protecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documented in Appendix G. For all of the other improvements shown on</td>
<td>corridors has considered capacity analysis (i.e. future volumes), recognizing the need for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2, there appears to have been minimal analysis to</td>
<td>servicing requirements of future development lands, network connectively requirements, as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determine benefits or impacts and little or no consideration of</td>
<td>as the realities that will be faced in building new streets in intensification areas. Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternatives. There is also no explanation of how the conceptual</td>
<td>9 has been expanded to add supplementary notes to this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignments shown on the exhibits were determined. We are concerned that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the level of assessment documented in the report does not provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient technical back-up for many of the network improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2 – It should be noted that implementing recommendations for</td>
<td>Comment Noted and Exhibit 9.2 modified to show proposed edits to Official Plan schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protecting new corridors, changing existing road designations and</td>
<td>associated with TMP recommendations. Further edits to the Official Plan schedules will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleting previously planned roadway connections will require changes to</td>
<td>updated as part of the next Official Plan update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Whitby and/or Regional Official Plans. Exhibits should be added to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show the recommended changes to the transportation schedules in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby and Regional Official Plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 9.1 – The map includes a combination of existing corridors to</td>
<td>Comment Noted and map adjusted to reference just those TMP recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be protected for widening, new corridors to be protected, previously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned facilities and existing facilities. The legend and map should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be modified to clearly distinguish among these various conditions, so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that readers can easily determine what new facilities and corridors are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed as a result of the TMP recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 9.2 – Existing and proposed facilities should be shown with</td>
<td>Comment Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different symbols on this map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 9.1 and 9.2 – The proposed locations of some new corridors and</td>
<td>Comment noted and intersection spacing issues will be addressed as part of future transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connections shown on Exhibit 9.1 and 9.2 do not appear to be</td>
<td>planning and design phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with the arterial intersection spacing criteria in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Official Plan (Schedule E, Table E-7). For example, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed connection of Burns Street to Dundas Street and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed realignment of Coronation Road result in intersection spacings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along east-west arterials that would not permit effective coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of traffic signals. This is inconsistent with the TSM recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the report, as it will compromise the capacity of these arterials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed new arterial road intersections should be located in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accordance with the Regional spacing criteria wherever possible to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximize the effectiveness of the new infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2.2.1(b) – This section should include a discussion of the proposed deletion of the Water Street connection between South Blair Street and Thickson Road, as proposed by Whitby Council. Additional explanation is required for the proposed “arterial parkway” designation, including a set of criteria that would apply to this designation and an explanation of why the current Type C arterial designation is not appropriate.</td>
<td>Section 9.2.2.1 has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2.2.2(a) – The Region supports the proposed easterly and westerly extensions of Burns Street for the reasons noted in the report. Additional study will be required to determine an appropriate and feasible intersection location for the connection to Dundas Street. In order to avoid confusion regarding the status of potential connection configurations, we recommend showing a dashed circle with a note such as “Connection location to be determined through additional study”, rather than the three specific routes shown on Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2.</td>
<td>Map adjusted accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2.2.5 – The discussion of the Garden Street extension and mid-block arterial should include a summary of the detailed assessment of options for these roads that is included in Appendix G.</td>
<td>Section 9.2.2.5 has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2.2.6 – An extension of Garrard Road across Highway 407 to connect with Cachet Boulevard is shown in Exhibits 9.1 and 9.2, but is not included in the discussion of the North Whitby Sub-Area (or elsewhere in the report).</td>
<td>Commentary to North Whitby sub-area has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.2.3 – A summary of the proposed changes to roadway classifications should be included, with a brief rationale for each proposed change.</td>
<td>Section 9.2.3 has been updated accordingly. Supplemental comments provided in Exhibit 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10.4(a) and Table 10.7 – The projects listed in Table 10.7 are a small subset of the overall recommended transportation network improvements. There should be some explanation as to why only certain projects were included in the cost estimates.</td>
<td>Section 10.4 a) has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10.4(d) and Table 10.7 – Costs for any proposed improvements to Regional facilities, such as sections of Rossland Road and Baldwin Street, should be identified separately from the Town’s costs.</td>
<td>Section 10.4 d) and table 10.7 has been updated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 12(d) – The list of performance measures in Appendix H was not included in the version of the report that we received.</td>
<td>Section 12 (d) will be included within the final report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public Comment #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to make the following comments on the town's proposed transportation master plan. I'd be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email, and let me know what happens to these comments and any response to them (do they form part of a final report?).</td>
<td>Section 5.6 revised to add sub-area transit issues. Specific comments pertaining to existing transit issues will be forwarded to the Region for their review and consideration for future service adjustments and modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Under the description of current transit network (page 21), the report fails to highlight that many areas of southern Whitby (i.e. south of Taunton) do not have a two-way bus route passing within walking distance. For example, Cochrane St between Dundas and Bonacord has no bus route while there is only one-way service along all of Country Lane, all Garrard St, large parts of Cochrane St (north of Bonacord), large parts of Thickson Rd (north of Manning) and most of Brooklin. Further, the services along Thickson Road and to Brooklin only operate during peak hours.</td>
<td>Noted. This exercise was completed in the Durham Region Transit Long Term Transit Strategy (2010) which the Town has supported and is committed to working with the Region on this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Although transit is a regional responsibility, the report fails to recommend what sort of bus network the town should lobby for.</td>
<td>Noted and supplemental notes made within the report to address comments. Transit oriented development also deals with infill within existing built up areas, including improvement of pedestrian access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The &quot;Transit Oriented Development Policy&quot; would do little to influence existing development, and the report fails to suggest any measures to promote transit use to existing destinations, such as improving pedestrian access. The report should also have considered other potential measures (such as the Town improving bus stop facilities, funding additional publicity, encouraging local employers to promote transit, etc) and then recommending which the Town should adopt.</td>
<td>Improvements to bus stop facilities are the responsibility of Durham Region Transit and is supported by the Town. The Town also commits to coordinating with the Region on providing new and improved sidewalks in transit areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The report makes numerous recommendations that additional road capacity be added (either through new connections or additional lanes) with the aim of reducing congestion. However, despite the modelling work alluded to in the report, the reports fails to quantify what level of congestion reduction these works would achieve. The report should give existing and predicted traffic volumes and congestion levels along affected roads as they are now, as they will be in 2031 without the new road/lanes and as they will be in 2031 with the new road/lanes. The report should also discuss any non-traffic impacts. Only then can it be judged whether or not the positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts.</td>
<td>The 2031 Base Case provides a description of what traffic will be like without road improvements (besides already approved regional and provincial improvements). The analysis of future conditions also provides further analysis of traffic conditions with the capacity improvements along with a 15% reduction in autos (due to transit improvements and other TDM measures) and is provided in the report in the detail analysis in Appendix E. This analysis has assisted in development of the corridors to be protected as well as guide other policy recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E (Transportation Modelling Approach)* The transport model used consistently underestimates traffic flow. (It is under on every single screenline, by an average of 20% of northbound/eastbound screenlines, and by an average of 31% on southbound/westbound screenlines).</td>
<td>The approach applied for calibration has been undertaken in accordance with accepted principles and typically focuses on the peak directions during the peak time frames. The calibration achieved for the major screenlines in the peak direction being 15-20% is considered acceptable. It is important to note that the model is only one tool in the decision making for establishing network requirements and that future land servicing and network connectivity is also a major consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public Comment #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would love to see the transportation in the Town of Whitby more attractive. Most people do drive, however, there are those who do not or may not have access to a vehicle in the daytime. Also, for those who wish to add more exercise to their day, every little extra step helps to keep you fit. The place where people need to go most is the grocery store or to the Drs. Office. Therefore, I would love to see a shuttle bus run along Garrard to the Kendalwood Plaza then head back to Garrard and go to McNichol to The Whitby Mall and then across to the A&amp;P Mall then back up to Thickson and back around to Garrard. I am not sure how often the bus should run - depending on demand. Also, when I grew up in Pickering years ago you could call in for your bus and they would pick you up at your home and take you to the main malls. They also need to make the bus station safe and build more bus shelters for safety, comfort and in case it rains/snows. I really do believe it could make a difference if there were more bus shelters along Garrard across from Harold Street by the St. Paul's School. This would create a sense of comfort, warmth and safety. Also, it would be great to see a bus go straight up to the Kendalwood Mall from Garrard rather than turning into Manning than having to take a transfer. Just like they have buses going into the Oshawa Mall - it would be handy and more desirable to get people out of their cars. The business is mostly in the Malls so I do believe it would make good sense to have the bus go into the Mall for pick-up and drop off.</td>
<td>Recommendations for active transportation have been put forth in the TMP. Comments relating to transit and shuttle services will be raised with business/development as well as forwarded to the Durham Region Transit for their consideration. Comments forwarded to Durham Region Transit for their review and consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Comment #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Port Whitby community has battled the issue of heavy industrial</td>
<td>An easterly extension of Water Street from South Blair Street to Thickson Road has been identified by Town Council as not being supported and direction has been given to remove from the Town’s TMP and Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic traversing through our residential neighbourhood for years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the GM slowdown, I counted 150 trucks traversing Brock Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Victoria and Water Street within five hours. Many waterfront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitors have experienced crossing the little bridge on South Brock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with industrial traffic whipping by within a foot or two of them. This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a very busy pedestrian area which needs to be addressed for public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally, we saw some improvement toward redirecting industrial traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the industrial area on the horizon in the form of the long-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awaited Water Street extension. Unfortunately, Whitby had long ago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated an industrial area adjacent to the waterfront. If we want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to encourage business growth in the industrial area, we have to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address an additional egress now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brock Street and Hwy. 401 intersection cannot support the expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population growth around the GO Transit hub along with supporting the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial traffic. A sustainable residential Port Whitby community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot thrive with excessive industrial traffic traversing through it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to satisfy many concerns with few options. It is completely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irresponsible for council to turn down the Water Street extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan without providing a viable alternate solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public Comment #4

**Comment**

Having attended and participated in the workshops and the Open House I want to compliment the Planning Dept and the consultant on a thorough study that included public participation. Although there is a great deal of work to implement a plan like this I have a lot of confidence that with a similar approach, everyone should feel satisfied with the results.

Having some interest in specific areas for future development, I am only making a comment in regard to the development of the corridors as it will be imperative to adequately service the intensification areas.

The corridors of concern, in addition to the increased traffic expected on Dundas St. because it services the central area of Whitby, is Manning, Mary, Burns, Consumers and even Victoria. These streets, being secondary, will ultimately relieve the volume on Dundas, as they already do, have some challenges as they are incomplete in many cases. I believe considerable investment is needed to extend them and link with other north-south roads. Although there is a desire and need to improve public transit, auto traffic will never totally abate for where it is now.

I thank you for your time and hope to be able to participate in future public input to the Intensification Study and Whitby’s Official Plan.

**Response**

Comments Noted. The TMP does make recommendations to protect corridors to facilitate servicing to intensification areas. It is recognized that consideration investment of new corridors and links will be required and efforts will be made to partner with the various levels of government for financing to implement the larger more costly initiatives.

### Public Comment #5

**Comment**

Concern related to proposed road extension go through property and home. Questioned process and timing for when the Town would purchase property.

**Response**

Property acquisition for projects is usually completed on a site by site basis. Often if both parties are interested, negotiations can begin. Depending on the timing of when the project is planned, acquisition may not be required immediately. It would be recommended that both parties meet to discuss the matter.
### Biglieri Group – May 21, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon reviewing the Draft Report it is evident that a Mid-Block Arterial Road is planned between Conlin Road and Winchester Road West to alleviate the long term east-west capacity deficiency. This proposed Mid-Block Arterial Road bisects the northern portion of the Subject Site (see Figure 2 for further details). It appears that the proposed alignment of the Mid-Block Arterial Road will not have a significant impact on the proposed residential development on the Subject Site as it will bisect the Subject Site just north of the proposed residential lots (see Figure 3 for further details). Please note that we have no objections to the proposed Mid-Block Arterial Road so long as its alignment does not encroach on or jeopardize the residential lotting of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision at the northwest corner of Conlin Road and Anderson Street.</td>
<td>Noted. It should be noted that refinement of the alignment location will occur during future environmental assessment and preliminary and detail design stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon reviewing the Draft Report, it is evident that there is a potential for the extension of the West Durham Link northerly to Highway 12 north of Brooklin, potentially bisecting the northern portion of the Subject Site (see Figure 2 for further details). Speaking to Whitby Works Staff and further reviewing the Draft Report it is our understanding that there are other options under review for the northerly extension of the West Durham Link, to help and reduce heavy movements through Downtown Whitby and Brooklin. One option being to extend the West Durham Link northwest and connect it into Lake Ridge Road, another option being investigated is to the extend the West Durham Link northward, connecting it into Columbus Road East. In our professional planning opinion the best option, for the extension of the West Durham Link, is to extend it northwest and connect it into Lake Ridge Road, as this would allow for the continued, unconstrained development of Brooklin and for heavy traffic to bypass Brooklin altogether, whereas the extension of the West Durham Link northerly to Highway 12, north of Brooklin, could potentially limit Brooklin’s development to the northwest. Also, as Brooklin expands a northeast extension of the West Durham Link into Highway 12 may potentially bisect Brooklin’s expanded residential neighbourhood rather than bypassing the town completely.</td>
<td>Noted and comments included in the report as to the rationale for the extension as shown. It should be noted that a Special Study will be required involving MTO and Region to confirm a future extension of the link. The Special Study would also determine jurisdiction. In addition, the extension would expect to be of lower order than the West Durham Link and limited at-grade access. It would not preclude and would expect to have other connections to service future development which would/could tie back into the existing road system, including Lake Ridge Road. A new northwest route would also expect to accommodate other active modes of travel and instead of bisecting development, the intent would be two-fold, to support development and act as a route for longer distance travel and heavy vehicles as an alternate to going through downtown Brooklin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon reviewing the Draft Report, we understand that the Garden Street corridor is recommended to be protected and is planned to be extended from its present limit to the proposed Mid-block arterial north of Conlin Road (see Figure 3 for further details). On behalf of our client, we are in support of this proposed extension as it will help to alleviate the current congestion on the arterial road network and add a logical north-south connection for vehicular traffic and active transportation. The Description of Works for the Garden Street extension, on page 97 of the Draft Report, notes that the extension would entail 2 to 4 lanes. To alleviate north-south congestion, in our professional opinion, it would be beneficial to add a fifth lane for left and right turning movements.</td>
<td>The reference to 4 lanes implies 4 “basic” through lanes. Additional intersection and mid block centre turn lane requirements will be protected as deemed required. Additional right-of-way beyond 30 m may be required at certain locations to accommodate turn/centre turn lane requirements depending on what other facilities/services are included in the right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Brooklin North Landowners Group – June 1, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a general comment, we are pleased to see the Town proceeding with the TMP and request your confirmation that this work will constitute Phase 1/2 of the environmental assessment (EA) process when it is adopted into the Official Plan through a future Official Plan Amendment. The group supports the Town’s completion of any necessary studies in timely fashion so that study requirements for new road infrastructure in North Whitby will be completed (Phase 3/4 of the EA process) prior to or concurrent with the Secondary Plan process for this area.</td>
<td>Following municipal approval, the Master Plan will be the basis for, and should be used in support of, future investigations for the specific Schedule B and C projects identified within it. Schedule B projects would require the filing of the Project File for public review while Schedule C projects would have to fulfill Phases 3 and 4 of the Municipal Class EA process prior to filing an Environmental Study Report (ESR) for public review. Other Special Studies, Provincial EAs and updates to the Official Plan and Secondary Plan are envisioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highway 407 Interchange at Cochrane Street**

As noted in prior BNLO submissions to the 407 East EA team, Durham Region, and the Town (and subject to the lands surrounding the interchange being included in the urban boundary by both the Region and Province as part of ROPA 128), we strongly support an interchange of Highway 407 at Cochrane Street. However, we also assert that the protection for such an interchange should not have the effect of sterilizing the use of land near the potential interchange, particularly if the timing of the interchange has not been settled.

Accordingly, we believe that the environmental assessment required for such an interchange should be commenced in the near term, and request that the Town’s TMP specifically address how the interchange would be funded and the timeframe for its construction.

Following approval of the TMP, continuing planning for the interchange will occur over the next 5 years. In terms of funding, it is envisioned that the financing would be multi-partied, the specifics of which would require further assessment in terms of benefits.

**1) New Brooklin North/South Route**

The Report identifies a conceptual alignment for a New Brooklin North/South Route connecting 407 northerly to Highway 12. Given the long-standing issues with traffic in Brooklin, and the potential for increased traffic resulting from new Living and Employment areas to the west and north, we concur with and support the notion of a new Brooklin bypass or new North/South Route. We believe that such a route has the potential to divert traffic travelling through the municipality and heavy truck traffic away from Baldwin Street, and to potentially alleviate some of the commuter traffic along Winchester Road.

On our review of the proposed alignment, we recommend that, although conceptual, the alignment of this new route should be shown in such a manner as to make maximal use of existing road infrastructure. Consequently, we request that the alignment be shown to travel along Brawley Road (at the southern limit of the Greenbelt Plan) or further north along Myrtle Road (at the southern Limit of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan) for as great a distance as possible.

Noted. The alignment of this corridor will be part of a future Special Study and will consider utilization of existing infrastructure where appropriate and logical. It should be noted that Brawley Road has significant physical constraints. The ability to best service the travel desires in addition to impacts to social, properties, residences, the environment, woodlots, development and economic opportunities, goods movement, and so on, will all need to be considered in the future planning of such a route.

Concomitant with this requested change, and any similar change that would affect roads currently under the jurisdiction of the Region and Province, we also believe that the TMP should address the way in which such roads would be realized in cooperation with higher levels of government.

At present, the jurisdiction of the proposed new north-south route extending from the Link has not been identified. If such as route was to become the replacement of Highway 12 (Baldwin Street) through Brooklin, it could be under Provincial or possibly Regional jurisdiction. The route could also be under Town jurisdiction. This issue will require further discussion between the various parties as part of the Special Study that would be commenced in the near term.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition, the group requests further information and would like to attain a better understanding for the nature of an Arterial Parkway, particularly the cross-sections, its access restrictions/intersection spacing, and right of way. The group also believes that the intersection and potential jog-elimination of the North-South Route (as proposed in this letter), Baldwin and Thickson should be reviewed and addressed by the TMP.</td>
<td>This has been included in the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Brooklin Arterial/Collector Road Network</strong>&lt;br&gt;We have concerns with the report recommendation that Vipond Road be extended west to Country Lane as an effective means of moving vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians through the growing area of Whitby, these are:</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The Ministry of Transportation minimum distance separation for intersection spacing with Highway 407 will preclude access onto Vipond Road at Cochrane Street or Country Lane.&lt;br&gt;b. ii. The road will terminate at Country Lane, where Country Lane will not cross the 407, nor is any development proposed by 2031 west of this area.</td>
<td>The extension of Vipond enhances continuity in the road network, increases the potential for transit and active transportation. These are all principles in the TMP. The alignment is currently conceptual, however, will be revised to ensure MTO minimum distance separation criteria are maintained if an interchange is built at Cochrane Street. The extension would provide servicing opportunities for future development and tie back into Country Lane/Carnwith Avenue. It also establishes a grid type pattern. Corridor protection is completed to protect for future uses beyond 2031. It also provides an alternative access road to the terminus of Country Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result, we recommend that the report not identify an extension of Vipond Road for Town Corridor Protection.</td>
<td>Noted. As part of the Special Study for the new northwest route, servicing and capacity issues will be assessed. At this time, it would be anticipated that additional capacity beyond that of a collector, will be required to service these lands. Issues and comments noted will be included in the Special Study. It should be noted that Brawley Road has limited ability without significant impacts to adjacent lands, to be modified to a higher order facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) New East/West Collector Road</strong>&lt;br&gt;Rather than utilizing Vipond Road as an east-west collector through Brooklin, we recommend that a new east-west mid-block collector road be shown for corridor protection between Columbus Road and Brawley, connecting the new North/South Route and Baldwin Street. Such a mid-block should be identified and protected as a key transportation connection for the area north of Brooklin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This new east-west collector would run parallel to the new North-South Route and could function in a similar manner to Bur Oak Avenue in the Town of Markham. In the Markham example, Bur Oak is planned as a predominantly mixed-use street with a pedestrian-scaled level of development traveling through the heart of the new secondary plan areas of Cornell, Greensborough, Wismer and Berczy. Its complementary road, the Don Cousens Parkway, provides for the movement of trucks and commuters through the Town at the perimeter of the urban area, bypassing existing community areas (including Main Street Markham) to connect Highway 407 to Major Mackenzie Drive, where in the future it will be extended west to Highway 404 through North Markham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2 on the next page illustrates the relationship of these two roads in the context of east Markham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Protect for Capacity Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We agree that Cochrane Street between Highway 407 and Columbus Road should be protected for capacity expansion. However, we recommend that the potential for expansion should be extended further north up to Brawley Road. This would allow for a local north-south bypass of Brooklin, and could provide a key connection to two new east-west mid-block collector roads: our recommended road between Columbus and Brawley and the report’s recommended road (southerly continuation of Cochrane) between Conlin and Highway 407. In a similar vein, we believe that Coronation Street can be shown to connect north to the new east-west collector road discussed above to provide additional North-South movement through the new areas around Brooklin.</td>
<td>Noted and will be considered as part of the Special Study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>