

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 1 of 13

### Segment A (Governor)

#### Right-of-Way / Alignment

##### From Workshop Tables:

- Concern about impact on St. Paul's church property through Alt #2 or #3
- Which side of the roadway are you taking property from?
- Concern about noise (can we use rubber wheels?)
- Concern about new alternatives being introduced at this stage → new alternatives seem to go against the LRT philosophy proposed last year
- Only way to increase LRT acceptance is to limit traffic lanes
- Hate to see Tasty Tomato go
- Prefer whatever option that is safest for pedestrians
- Consider North alignment but only 2 lanes of traffic
- Many Grosvenor community members believed the 2 lane option was the only consideration. Bait and switch technique
- Have you looked at South side alignment and is there a cost difference?
- Suggest lowering speed limit for cars along the whole route
- Concerned about accidents at 104<sup>th</sup> and 142<sup>nd</sup> street
- Traffic capacity question – how many cars on the roads?
- Where would bikes go? Bike lanes one side or another
- Concern for left turns off 104<sup>th</sup> and 142<sup>nd</sup>
- Concern for the expropriation of St. Pauls
- One traffic lane each way a concern to one person
- North alignment "might be" safer
- Consider pedestrian overpasses
- The alternative with least expropriation is best
- What is the cost to tax payers for expropriation?
- Fellow developing land currently shown in Red (map), need decisions
- Support more traffic on alternative routes (e.g. 107) and provide one lane each direction on SPR
- What about the width of the trackway?
- Station parking and residential parking concerns
- Visual intrusion of overhead wire
- LRT and passenger vehicles are not mutually exclusive
- Have proper supporting roadways
- Need balanced system
- Park and ride is important
- Compare parking and cost of fares
- Bus turnaround?
- Elevated or buried across 142<sup>nd</sup> / 149<sup>th</sup>?
- Closure of SPR from 149 to 124 to vehicles except for bicycles, scooters, segways, pedestrians, etc
- Steep grade on 149<sup>th</sup> street intersection
- Avoid conflicts with separate train and roadway intersection (like University Ave)

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## **Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St**

May 12, 2010

Page 2 of 13

- Technology? Could it be a monorail?
- People's homes and churches more important than commuter traffic
- Could add a counterflow lane on 107<sup>th</sup>?

### Alt #1

- Preferred because less impact on neighborhood/community/church
- Concern of WMD traffic still use SPR, therefore west end traffic will be worst
- Consider using one track instead of two tracks to save space through this area
- Not a problem to reduce lane here because people would change route to get to DT or modal shift
- 101 Ave / 142 street EBLT would be required
- Bus service to the neighborhood; how would it be impacted?
- Adjacent neighborhood roads are narrow and may not be able to accommodate busses
- Wider road decreases the incentive for people to take transit and is bad for environment
- Keep it, this is what Council voted on in November 2009

### Alt #2

- Never option 2! It won't force people into LRT, too many traffic lanes
- Concern for noise
- Property loss of church
- Parasitic parking around stations
- Pedestrian safety/ wider road to cross
- Access to Jasper Gates, especially West bound
- Complex intersection at 142<sup>nd</sup> street, not want repeat of 51 Avenue

### Alt #3

- 3 lane option less safe, more confusing for vehicles because it changes at different times
- limited access for commuters to the North onto SPR (Grovenor)
- Viewed as a negative for Grovenor
- Viewed as a positive for neighborhood south of SPR
- If heavy snowfall comes, how would snow removal be done?
- Need to be fair to existing businesses. They pay taxes too and should be considered
- Impact to accesses between 148<sup>th</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup> street North side of SPR in the North running option
- Concern for cul de sacs, people cannot cross tracks
- Business access
- Concern for area in front of church

### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

- If heavy snowfall happened how would snow removal be done?

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 3 of 13

### Segment A (Governor)

#### Stations

##### From Workshop Tables:

- Concern for train operations under severe weather
- Future bus service?
- What is the capacity of the station?
- How about a larger shelter?

##### Alt #1 (Strong preference for alternative #1)

- Prefer only crossing one lane of traffic
- Bus loop at SPR and 142 on south side could give room for 112<sup>th</sup>, 150<sup>th</sup> routes to stop
- Neighbourhood feeder bus
- 142<sup>nd</sup> street turns, very busy, potential issues with station. Left turns against staggered station might be risky and hazardous
- Highly preferred to have centre loading, non split options

##### Alt #2

- Not too different from Alt #1
- Not desired because too many lanes
- Stations the same as #1, but prefer split stations due to amount of land needed
- Railings for safety?
- Whether there is shelter and is heated?
- Bike racks?
- Noise level of bells?

##### Alt #3

- At 149<sup>th</sup>, prefer centre platform therefore less land required
- Prefer station platform closer to 149<sup>th</sup> street
- How can we access by bus?
- Concern about traffic all filtering to 145<sup>th</sup> street signal
- Makes sense if centre loading non split

- Neighbourhood feeder bus
- Impacts on seniors and persons with disabilities to walk to the stations
- Does ridership justify having so many stations?
- Split platform at major intersections to provide LRT makes sense
- One center platform vs split, one makes more sense and is more economical as well as better use of space
- North running allow for better accommodation of heavy turns in AM + PM PK at 142<sup>nd</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup>
- Concern about access to businesses in NE corner of 149/SPR
- Where the pedway crossings are throughout neighbourhood, long stretch between 142<sup>nd</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup>

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 4 of 13

- Concern about noise impact if we were to use gates and bells for LRT crossing. However, signals are OK
- Concern for crime at stations

### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

None

## Segment A (Governor)

### **Neighbourhood/Business Access**

#### **From Workshop Table:**

- Circulation for emergency vehicles, crossing the traffic
- Traffic signals, coordination problems (example 51 avenue)
- Why along SPR?
- Access to Jasper Gates?
- Alternative #1 is best overall for access for both pedestrians and vehicles
- Alternative #3 is worst, causes barriers
- Parking should blend with surrounding environment
- Why not elevated? This would permit access under the guideway
- High potential for cars cutting through neighborhood, but not high volumes
- 142<sup>nd</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup> too far apart for signals; should provide interim signal (at 145<sup>th</sup> street) to facilitate jug handle movements in and all movements out of neighborhoods (understand no left hand turns required on SPR)
- Coordinate signals at 142<sup>nd</sup>, 145<sup>th</sup>, and 149<sup>th</sup>
- Alt #3 cul-de-sacs are an access barrier, but could calm neighborhood traffic at the same time
- Alley north of SPR west of 145<sup>th</sup> is heavily used
- Access issues and concerns during construction
- Length (time) of impact for construction
- Impact on SPR during construction may help to change travel patterns for vehicles come from WMD / 149<sup>th</sup> street or convince them to shift mode to LRT
- Concern that jug-handle would direct more traffic through NBHD – affected pavement conditions/property value/parking on local street
- Snow removal for the local roads being used for jug-handle
- Center alignment gives better access for businesses west of 149<sup>th</sup> street
- Shortcutting concerns in the Grosvenor NBHD once the lane is reduced on SPR
- Alt #2 has less shortcutting but more property impacts
- Concern for Alt #3 for existing businesses on the north side of SPR, east of 149<sup>th</sup> street (NE corner)
- Alt #3 with 4 lanes not good – not feasible and too expensive
- North running with 2 lanes of traffic preferred because it allows for pk turn movements and have less property impact
- North running not good for N NBHD, impacts access and funnels traffic to a couple of local roads, more impact for those residents
- North running better for NBHD south of SPR and better for Crestwood (less shortcutting)

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 5 of 13

- NBHD south of SPR would likely need signal at 142<sup>nd</sup> St/ 101 Ave to help in access out of NBHD, but need to be careful of signal coordination between 101 Ave and SPR on 142<sup>nd</sup> street
- 101 Ave + 142<sup>nd</sup> street left turn to go North, may need lights at that intersection
- Alt #3 – lights at 144 or 145 is better for traffic flow. Could happen if NnR Alignment used with only 2 lands of traffic not 3 or 4
- Development on S.W corner of 142<sup>nd</sup> street and SPR is very difficult to access on centre alignment
- North alignment preferred but only 2 lands of traffic
- 144<sup>th</sup> or 145<sup>th</sup> intersection must have all direction turns in all alignments
- South right turns off SPR at 142<sup>nd</sup> and 149<sup>th</sup> are rare
- Concern about access to stores N.W corner of SPR and 149<sup>th</sup> street, currently 3 access but need those to remain
- Cutting through neighborhoods an issue
- Narrow streets in Grosvenor south of Stony Plain Road
- Emergency vehicle access and cul de sac?

### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

- Council got approval based on Alt #1
  - For North option, should limit to two lanes
  - Oppose Alt #2 and #3

## Segment B (Glenora)

### **Right-of-Way / Alignment**

#### **From Workshop Table:**

- Have just LRT tracks and bike paths – no roadway
- Consider one way road on SPR, blocked at one end – exit only
- Property values and compensation need to be considered
- Safety for people getting on/off LRT – North versus Centre – which is safer?
- North alignment has better access for property south of SPR
- Centre may be better – left turns with North running options may result in shortcutting from 102 Ave through neighborhood
- Will there still be buses traveling the road where the LRT is? Want busses to be less on SPR (buses only on cross streets or stations)
- Left turns at 142<sup>nd</sup> street (WB to SBL) may back up
- Turn 102 Ave into 2 lanes ( 1 lane each direction) from 142<sup>nd</sup> street to 124<sup>th</sup> street to stop 102 Ave from becoming main through route
- Emergency vehicles – where will they go?
- Residential parking only near stations to avoid parasitic parking
- Property acquisition – further define please
- North alignment restricts residents access to south due to no left turns
- Green space/ park land along LRT route and East of Groat Bridge – no vehicle use
- 102 Ave and SPR are already congested
- Emergency vehicles need good access

## WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

### Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 6 of 13

- “does not go anywhere I need to go”
- Has the City bought property already?
- Have they only considered LRT only on SPR and 102<sup>nd</sup> for traffic?
- Options for school crossings?
- Preference for North alignment (Alt #2)
- More businesses impacted on North side at 142<sup>nd</sup>
- Is 107<sup>th</sup> viable?
- Which is cheaper, C or S?
- Concern about impact alignment may have on vehicle access – need to optimize access (e.g. concern with Alt # 2 North running)
- Pedestrian crossing and pedestrian circulation
- North and South of SPR – students need to be able to cross (East of school crossing out?) What safety mechanisms are at each crossing?
- Time LRT to school zone hours?
- Alt #2, closing off access on North communities will divert into only 134<sup>th</sup> / 136<sup>th</sup> street will be too heavy from traffic that would divert here
- Combined number of kids to two schools on both sides of SPR is greater than a 800 block radius
- Concern about crossing protection – arms and gates
- Don't want bells but kids must be safe
- Slow speeds preferred
- Least amount of property requirements preferred
- Preference for Alt #1 (strong support table wide)
- Alt # 2 is unacceptable
- Concern about loss of access to Vi's for Pies area
- Cross streets for 134<sup>th</sup> / 136<sup>th</sup>, why?
- Median islands on these?
- Don't want walls to separate houses (no barriers)
- How do cars turn eastbound turn North at 136<sup>th</sup> and 139<sup>th</sup> street without backing up traffic? Consider a turning lane in both options
- Has a traffic impact study been done on 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave?
- Concerned about 136<sup>th</sup> North traffic at 107<sup>th</sup> Ave and how this intersection will function safer
- Consider South alignment of LRT line to allow residents access/egress from neighborhood especially morning traffic access to 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave
- Should have bike lane East and West of LRT (104<sup>th</sup> and 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave)
- Should have a bus down 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave in both alternatives
- Stations should be every 3-400 meters not every 1000-1200 meters to be more convenient and accessible
- Consider land-locked implications south of Stony Plain at Glenora Point
- Integrate bus to feed/provide transfer points and to increase efficiency

#### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

- None

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 7 of 13

### Segment B (Glenora)

#### Stations

##### From Workshop Tables:

- Center platform more efficient
- How wide is total width of road + LRT + Station?
- Stations should be at schools
- Better at 136<sup>th</sup> rather than 134<sup>th</sup>
- Prefer North side station at 142<sup>nd</sup>
- Snow removal and EMS?
- Have videos of LRT in operation and sound
- Consider volumes of people using buses at 136<sup>th</sup> street versus 134<sup>th</sup> street
- No protection – people may cross and get hit – consider protection or prevention
- 136<sup>th</sup> street option impacts school (if this option consider pedestrian over/underpass for children crossing tracks)
- Pedestrian activated light at 138<sup>th</sup> street for school children – how does this interact with LRT?
- 136<sup>th</sup> street station better option for junior high student North
- 134<sup>th</sup> street station will be used less than 136<sup>th</sup> street station
- 134<sup>th</sup> street station is more central
- People using 134<sup>th</sup> street station will be community people
- What is the noise due to stop/start at stations?
- Are station platforms long enough to hold all train cars?
- If no bus traveling or stopping along SPR, we will need another station along this corridor or buses on cross streets to pick up riders and feed the station
- Side or centre loading platform west of 136<sup>th</sup> street
- 134<sup>th</sup> street requires parkland – leave parks!
- Need more stops – this is a winter city
- Need better ability to turn left or right onto road
- Too many cul de sacs in Alt #2
- Concern regarding circulation through neighborhoods
- Why not BRT?
- Alt #1 needs another signalized intersection
- Access better on Alt #1
- Need turn lanes at intersections
- Left turn out of neighborhood needed
- How will school access across SPR be handled?
- How will “vision for the corner” be handled?
- How will major disruptions be handled and will information be provided
- What are laws regarding rights of businesses and residents?
- Not sure if access NW of bridge is needed or redundant
- Need to make it aesthetically pleasing
- Should have artist competition for stations
- Don't want increased lighting levels

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 8 of 13

- Concern about crime at stations
- Something to improve stigma of public transit
- No Glenora station needed
- Majority of people in the community will NOT use bus or LRT (some disagreement on this)
- Communities north of SPR use bus, as well as seniors
- If construction of LRT is a disruption to community, would be disappointed if we couldn't use it
- If it is going to happen, do it with the smallest footprint possible
- Stations should be closer to schools
- Alt #2 has too many cul de sacs
- Bikelanes?
- If you need to have one, put it closer to Groat
- Straddle Glenora crescent, there's an empty lot on North and vacant lot for sale right now on South – less footprint but just as convenient and less impact on 134<sup>th</sup> street businesses
- What happens with businesses on 134<sup>th</sup> street – parking for businesses will be taken away and therefore people will park in neighborhood
- Did not know corridor was decided and that we were at that stage
- Station by school is a safety risk! Move it away
- Don't want spread out stations
- Look at congestion at intersections (136<sup>th</sup>/ 134<sup>th</sup>) and impact on pedestrian movements
- Concern about pedestrian exiting LRT station onto road (especially for seniors and mobility challenged)
- Parasitic parking concerns
- Provide room for bikes on train or lockers at stations
- No park and ride please
- Feeder bus lines are not shown, how would they connect to the station?
- How do buses circulate?
- Stations would be underutilized without bus feeder
- Traffic on 102<sup>nd</sup> and SPR will not help walkability
- At 142<sup>nd</sup> street, station should not be staggered – dangerous intersection and busy
- Impeding mobility of existing neighborhood with little benefit
- Make walkability a priority both on 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave and SPR
- Concerns about legal issues and challenges under Public Works
- Concerned both options are dividing the neighborhood and walkability
- Stations must respond to winter climate and be designed as such
- Should be located at 136<sup>th</sup> street Intersection to serve schools
- Neither options preferred

### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

- Side running with cantilevers looks better than wires across cross-section (
  - Put station on East side of 136<sup>th</sup> street on North side
  - 136<sup>th</sup> street station is logical given volume of use by school kids
- Bus stops on SPR (North side) West of 136<sup>th</sup> street is highly used

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St

May 12, 2010

Page 9 of 13

### Segment B (Glenora)

#### Neighbourhood/Business Access

##### From Workshop Tables:

- Increased traffic on streets with lights (busier roads due to vehicles crossing LRT)
- Increased traffic within neighbourhoods – less child friendly
- 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave traffic will increase
- Access to key destinations will improve using LRT (West Ed, Hospital, DT, MacEwan)
- Build it fast!
- Reduce 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave to two lanes to prevent impacts to residents along 102 Ave (do not widen 102 Ave)
- LRT will split community and increased traffic on LRT will split community
- Connections across SPR for pedestrians/cyclists at locations other than signalized intersections should be allowed
- No problem with cul de sacs versus RI/RO access
- If we succeed in having SPR as a transit (LRT) and parkland corridor only, would 139<sup>th</sup> street be a thru route N/S (for the North running alignment)
- Center running option provides better access in only one direction – still needs to re-route to signal to go the other direction
- Would pedestrian activation at signals still occur?
- How would snow removal or storage occur
- People will still cut across tracks to make a left turn at locations where there are no signals – enforcement? Education?
- To allow jug-handle movement will back alleys get snow removal?
- How will 134<sup>th</sup>/ 136<sup>th</sup> street connect through 107<sup>th</sup> avenue? Signals may be needed
- Take out traffic circle at 142<sup>nd</sup> / 107<sup>th</sup> to accommodate traffic
- LRT does not service desired destinations – we can't use it
- Downtown does not need to be the hub, it slows down connection to University and elsewhere
- Upgrading/maintaining alleyways to have jug handle access is not wanted
- We do not want alleyways used for circulation
- Do not want to pay for maintaining alleyways
- Both option negatively impacts Glenora
- Additional traffic on 102 Ave is NOT the answer
- Will Cul de Sacs get proper snow clearing?
- 105<sup>th</sup> will become shortcut route
- Should have some speed bumps or four way stops (look at what they did in Sunnydale neighbourhood in Calgary to address shortcutting)
- 136<sup>th</sup> is currently bad and congested in peak hours, but consider impact on 134<sup>th</sup> as well
- Need left-turn lanes at these intersections for North bound or South bound (for communities onto SPR)
- Consider pull in/drop off zone for parents at school (Glenora Elementary) to address drop-off congestion on 136<sup>th</sup>
- Look at rush hour West bound on 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave and consider improvements to encourage car traffic to use that route

## WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

### **Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St**

May 12, 2010

Page 10 of 13

- Consider shutting SPR down to vehicle traffic
- Consider using 107<sup>th</sup> Ave for LRT
- Consider limiting left turns only at peak from SPR to communities during non-peak (so they can be made during non-peak hours as SPR is quiet at this time and so if you could without a left turn bay) for 134<sup>th</sup>/ 136<sup>th</sup>
- Will there be a tax reduction for loss in property value?
- Glenora is a community; planning and design must improve it not dissect it with roads and LRT
- Design should improve community liveability
- 136<sup>th</sup> street and 107<sup>th</sup> ave is going to be an even bigger problem/difficulty getting out of the community
- Concern about public using Glenora, which is a quiet community
- Neighbourhood parking program will not work
- Traffic calming at four way stops need to prevent/stop speeding and shortcutting LRT will create internal to neighbourhood
- Prefer alignment #1 for right in right out as a compromise to community on North and South

#### Alt # 1

- Where is traffic going to go from SPR?
- Is there ridership for Glenora station?
- Concern about shortcutting
- Access to stations for pedestrians – long wait to cross street

#### Alt #2

- Concern about increased traffic in neighbourhood
- School pedestrian concerns
- 105<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be busier
- Don't like increased property impacts
- “slightly worse”
- How are people accessing their garages?
- Not desired as it further complicates access

#### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

We all agree that 107<sup>th</sup> avenue makes much more sense, far fewer issues all around

## Segment C (Westmount)

### **Right of Way/Alignment**

#### **From Workshop Table:**

- Concern about East West connection south of SPR
- Carry further North to 124<sup>th</sup> Street in Alt #2
- Prefer Alt #2 for North running
- Concerns about properties South of SPR (land locked)
- Do not like Alt #1

## WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

### **Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St**

May 12, 2010

Page 11 of 13

- Concern on one way street converted to two way at 127<sup>th</sup> street
- North running LRT please!
- Why choose Stony Plain road instead of 107 ave?
- Pedestrians should have right of way, not trains
- Provide left turn at 127<sup>th</sup> street to get rid of new road
- Keep to the North up to 124<sup>th</sup> street
- Either option, however access concerns during construction (Alt #1 and #2), or what happens during a vehicle collision/breakdown
- Proposed new roadways may create shortcuts through the neighborhood South of SPR
- Concerns about people shortcutting through 126<sup>th</sup> to 129<sup>th</sup> street between SPR and 107 avenue (Alt #1 and #2)
- SW of 127<sup>th</sup> street – want access North along 127<sup>th</sup> + 128<sup>th</sup>. Need more North South access and therefore more signals
- Left hand turn 127<sup>th</sup> street both EBL +WBL Stony Plain Road
- 127<sup>th</sup> Street preferred
- Better access for South pocket at 128<sup>th</sup> street

#### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

- Alt #1 scenario will require more traffic lights on 107 Ave
- 128<sup>th</sup> facing South can a left turn be made?
- Alt #2 I like this scenario at 128<sup>th</sup>

## Segment C (Westmount)

### **Stations**

#### **From Workshop Table:**

- How do you access stations if not able to drive?
- Purpose of LRT? To move people downtown primarily or for local people?
- Concern for safety as schools on each side
- North running LRT please!
- Need more bus service and alternative bus stops to service communities
- Why not BRT?
- Reduce impact at 124<sup>th</sup> street and provide station config with least impact
- Station at 121<sup>st</sup> street
- Station at 116<sup>th</sup> street with major North South traffic
- Concern for safety, 124<sup>th</sup> street will become a zoo
- Traffic calming on new road
- East bound left turn bay is deficient
- Safety at station require some serious thought please
- Why do the cars have priority over the pedestrians when accessing the stations?
- Unsafe for children at crossings
- Seniors complex at 127<sup>th</sup> street is a long way to walk to 124<sup>th</sup> street proposed station

# WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

## **Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St**

May 12, 2010

Page 12 of 13

- Walking light at either end of each platform
- Pedestrian crossings at 3 points on each platform
- No noisy bells please
- Platforms architecturally designed to be specific to the historic character of the neighbourhood

### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

- Why not widen crosswalk at center to make it convenient for passengers unloading/loading
- Time lights after train arrives to ensure pedestrian comes first

Centre running LRT with side loading platform is unnecessary and duplicates infrastructure

## Segment C (Westmount)

### **Neighbourhood/Business Access**

#### **From Workshop Tables:**

- At street crossings where there is no signaling, don't want barriers to pedestrian crossings cyclists (a curb may make it difficult to cross)
- Pedestrian safety at route crossings is important, MUST consider this
- 125<sup>th</sup> street 104<sup>th</sup> road is a bad, potential shortcutting through neighbourhood
- Consider truck ban on 107th ave
- Consider locked in cul de sacs, access left
- Concerns at 124<sup>th</sup> street NBL onto SPR
- N/S access using Connaught Drive
- No one will use Stony Plain Road anymore?
- Suggestion – Purchase land at 129<sup>th</sup>, push train further North, which will give extra room for turning lanes south

Alt # 1

- Multi use trail along LRT Route
- Concern about parking in community
- Allow straight through from cross streets
- Provide bike lanes parallel to LRT
- Resident permits for parking near station location
- Keep green spaces intact – provide good landscape
- Provide u-turns at intersection
- Short cut on 127<sup>th</sup> street to the neighbourhood
- Seniors housing at 126<sup>th</sup> street
- New road will encourage traffic in neighbourhood
- New streets are important to access
- New road is on ravine, may have environmental impacts
- Eliminate new roadway, this will bring traffic to the neighbourhood
- Keep 127<sup>th</sup> street one way

## WEST LRT Workshop #3 - Comment Summary

### **Stony Plain Rd / 149 St to Stony Plain Rd / 124 St**

May 12, 2010

Page 13 of 13

#### Alt #2

- preferred because of cul-de-sacs
- Make 127<sup>th</sup> street as two way (currently one way)
- Stony Plain WB – no left turn, makes the route too long
- WBL left turn arrow shown on figure may be incorrect? How is access going to pocket SW of 128<sup>th</sup> Street
- Cul de sacs need to have pedestrian access to Stony Plain
- Landscaping please, no concrete blocks
- Multi use trail on LRT route
- Preference with this alternative based on access for South neighborhoods – no south access a concern
- Concern about increased traffic on 127<sup>th</sup> street with Alt #2
- More access to properties near bridge
- LRT will restrict pedestrian crossings to lights, please provide pedestrian crossings at un-signalized
- Keep 127<sup>th</sup> street one way – bike lane
- Provide left turn bays at 127<sup>th</sup> street intersection (we prefer this over new road)
- Like the option – close off 129<sup>th</sup> street – less traffic
- 107<sup>th</sup> ave is good alternative to take in this option
- Streets will be calm/less traffic
- Bike access
- Provide pedestrian crossing from new cul de sacs

#### **From other participants (comments recorded at breaks):**

None