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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction

King Township has prepared an update to its 2015 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to reflect continued growth in its communities, changes to policies across multiple levels of government, and to continue to be responsive to travel needs in the Township by a variety of modes of transportation.

With a heightened focus on transportation's role in climate change and updated transportation data, the Township has refined the 2015 TMP to better suit their needs to the year 2031. The intent of the 2020 TMP is to review the planned improvements to identify gaps in the multi-modal transportation network and propose a plan to address the gaps.

The TMP was conducted under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process for master plans and fulfills Phases 1 and 2 of this process, namely, the identification of an Opportunity Statement, the assessment of multiple alternatives, and public consultation.

In response to King Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency and to align with the Township's Climate Action Plan, the TMP focuses on enhancing active transportation opportunities and transit connections. To encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, cycling and transit, the TMP has been designed around the following three action items:

1. Implement an active transportation network that provides a viable and sustainable alternative to the automobile;
2. Improve connections to the GO train station for walking, cycling and bus service, including yearround maintenance of active transportation facilities providing access to this station; and
3. Consider the development of goods movement routes around Nobleton and King City to enhance the quality of life, and support active modes of travel by reducing congestion, in turn reducing greenhouse gases.

## Existing Context

The existing conditions analysis reviewed population, employment and land use data, and current travel behaviour in King. The majority of people travel by car and the modal split has remained constant in the last 10 years. The most popular destinations for trips are within King and then to surrounding cities of Vaughan, Newmarket and Aurora, with Toronto as another popular destination.

## Vision and Public Engagement

Public engagement has been an essential part of the development of the 2020 TMP. The Vision Statement (Opportunity Statement) developed for the TMP and presented for review and comment by the public reads:

King Township envisions active transportation facilities, transit routes and roads that support the growth of vibrant communities and enhance the quality of life for residents. The multi-modal transportation network should provide mobility and connectivity that is sustainable, accessible and affordable for residents of all ages and abilities to the year 2031.

The vision statement and multi-modal plans to implement the vision were taken to the public for comment at a series of open houses in early October 2019. Public open houses were held at community centres in King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg. Additionally, project team members staffed a booth at the Holland Marsh Soupfest on October 5, 2019 and engaged with hundreds of residents and visitors.

Through these activities, the following themes were heard:
$\rightarrow$ Greater connectivity is desired in the road, active transportation and transit networks;
$\rightarrow$ Environmental concerns with select proposed roads; and
$\rightarrow$ General support for active transportation and transit, and desire for improved, safer facilities.

## Roads

To meet the requirements of Phase 2 (alternatives assessment) of the MCEA process, the year 2031 forecast trips were overlaid on the existing transportation network to determine if the existing network would be sufficient. The second alternative was to add the recommended improvements from the 2015 TMP. The third alternative, which is the preferred alternative in this TMP, was to address any identified remaining gaps and plan for appropriate additional improvements.

The road network analysis included updates to road classifications, road widenings, proposed rights-of-way, the proposed goods movement network, and identified roads for potential upload to York Region. The recommendations for these various elements are shown on a series of maps in Figure 4-15 through Figure 4-29.

## Active Transportation

The existing and previously proposed active transportation (walking and cycling, but also including any other modes of active movement such as skateboarding and rollerblading) network was reviewed to identify gaps and potential areas where infill links can enhance network connectivity and complete missing routes. Potential infill links for the Township's active transportation network were identified based on several considerations, including:
$\rightarrow$ Completing gaps between existing routes / facilities;
$\rightarrow$ Connections to regional trail systems;
$\rightarrow$ Enhancing connectivity surrounding and within the Township's villages and hamlets;
$\rightarrow$ Connecting to existing transit services including YRT and GO Transit;
$\rightarrow$ Reflecting popular cycling routes as noted by residents, stakeholders and Township staff; and
$\rightarrow$ Connecting to key destinations such as libraries, schools, recreational areas and community centres.

The proposed active transportation routes by facility types are presented in Figure 5-6 through Figure 5-9.

## Transit

York Region Transit and GO Transit presently provide transit services within King Township. These are expected to continue and are proposed to be expanded over time with increased service and increased coverage. An analysis was conducted to identify gaps in the transit network. The gap analysis identified the following network or service gaps:
$\rightarrow$ Currently, the Township has one transit service that connects all three urban villages and the existing King GO station, the MOR King Local; this service only operates on weekdays during the morning and afternoon rush hours and does not operate weekends, holidays, or weekdays offpeak;
$\rightarrow$ With the planned increased frequency of GO trains from 30 minutes to 15 minutes throughout the day, this will result in higher traffic congestion at the at-grade railway crossing on Dufferin Street due to the increase in train traffic. Road/rail grade separation should be considered at this location; and
$\rightarrow$ There will be an increase in whistles blowing as the rail expansion program is implemented and train service is increased. Whistle cessation programs should be explored.

The recommended improvements to the transit network are illustrated in Figure 6-7.

## Costing

High-level costs for road projects and active transportation projects have been included in the TMP. As transit services are provided by others, improvements to transit services have not been costed.

From a capital expense perspective, the recommended road improvements costed as part of the TMP only include the construction of new Township-owned roads and are expected to cost on the order of \$650,000 ( 2019 dollars). It is assumed that the costs for all new roads within the future developments will be collected as part of the developers' applications; thus, these roads are not costed. Other road improvement costs, such as paving the remaining unpaved roads, have already been initiated outside of the TMP and have been budgeted separately.

The TMP identifies improvements to the Township's active transportation network. The expansion over time of more than 250 kilometres of facilities is estimated to cost about $\$ 53$ million. The cost would be divided between the Township, York Region, and others. The total cost to the Township for full implementation is about $\$ 29$ million, as shown in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1: Estimated Capital Costs for Proposed Active Transportation Facilities

| FACILITY TYPES | UNIT PRICE PER KM | Township |  | REGION |  | OTHER JURISDICTIONS |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Kм | COST | Kм | COST | Kм | COST |  |
| Off-Road Trail | \$350,000 | 44.7 | \$15,660,000 | 0 | \$0 | 44.7 | \$15,660,000 | \$31,310,000 |
| In- <br> Boulevard <br> Pathway | \$325,000 | 12.7 | \$4,120,000 | 0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$4,120,000 |
| Bike Lane | \$53,000 | 0 | \$0 | 3.2 | \$170,000 | 0 | \$0 | \$170,000 |
| Paved Shoulder | \$150,000 | 17.0 | \$2,550,000 | 55.8 | \$8,370,000 | 0 | \$0 | \$10,920,000 |
| Signed <br> Route | \$1,200 | 54.8 | \$70,000 | 8.9 | \$20,000 | 0 | \$0 | \$80,000 |
| Sidewalk | \$300,000 | 21.5 | \$6,460,000 | 0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$6,460,000 |
| Total | - | 150.7 | \$28,860,000 | 67.9 | \$8,560,000 | 44.7 | \$15,660,000 | \$53,060,000 |

## Summary of Recommendations

The 2020 TMP contains important recommendations that include physical infrastructure projects, new services or programs, and additional studies to enhance the Township's multi-modal transportation network and make the Township more resilient to changing travel trends. An implementation strategy has been devised to group the recommendations into three horizons:
$\rightarrow$ Short-term (generally the next two years);
$\rightarrow$ Medium-term (to the year 2026); and
$\rightarrow$ Long-term (to the year 2031).

## Short-term Recommendations

Roads

1. Establish a rational road classification to guide future planning and capital works, as provided in Figure 4-15 to Figure 4-18;
2. Update the Township's Official Plan to reflect the right-of-way needs and ensure that sufficient property is available to accommodate roadway components as per the Township's design standards;
3. Conduct studies to assess the potential impacts of the GTA West Corridor on the villages of Nobleton and King City. The Township should also consider working with the Region and neighbouring municipalities to assess any land use impacts and implement land use policies to mitigate any potential impacts;
4. Commence dialogue with York Region regarding the uploading of roads in the short and medium term in accordance with York Region's policy, and obtain Council's approval, as may be required; and
5. Liaise with York Region to better understand the timing to commence the $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad Environmental Assessment in King City, west of Keele Street.
6. Update the functional design and parking capacity report for the King Road and Keele Street intersection and move towards implementation of recommendations.

## Active Transportation

7. Establish a terms of reference / scope of work for the development of an Active Transportation Master Plan, which will include an Implementation Plan to prioritize and phase the recommended network;
8. Work with Metrolinx and York Region to improve opportunities for active transportation users on Keele Street near the King GO Station;
9. Prioritize for implementation and maintenance walkable pathways to key destinations such as Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA), community centres, schools and other facilities;
10. Work closely with York Region on the implementation of new Regional Road pedestrian crossings at identified locations within the urban areas of King City, Nobleton and Schomberg to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and mobility;
11. Utilize web mapping services, to advertise active transportation routes; and
12. Work with Smart Commute and York Region on behaviour change programs to encourage active transportation and transit to replace drive-alone car trips during peak periods, such as getting to and from the King GO Station.

Transit
13. Liaise with York Region and YRT to increase the service hours of the Mobility On-Request King Local to accommodate all day travel, seven days a week. If demand increases, King should advocate for the Mobility On-Request service to be converted into a fixed-route service.

## Medium-term Recommendations

Roads

1. Work with the Region to consider development of the proposed goods movement routes identified in Figure 4-28.

Active Transportation
2. Partner with York Region to add signage for the York Region Cycling Tour Routes within King for economic and tourism development;
3. When roads are next scheduled for reconstruction, rehabilitation or resurfacing, where possible, widen roads with sufficient road base width to include up to two-metre paved shoulder and/or cycling facilities; and
4. Understand full lifecycle costs of new infrastructure to support long-term sustainability of the network through an asset management plan.
Transit
5. As part of the TPAP process for the twinning of the Barrie rail line, Township staff has formally advised Metrolinx in writing the Township requires the necessary infrastructure for whistle cessation be included in the project. King staff will continue to meet and follow up with Metrolinx staff; and
6. Promote the provision of direct transit services along King Road, Highway 9 and Davis Drive West into the Region's Frequent Transit Network.

## ES-6

## Long-term Recommendations

## Roads

1. Work with York Region to investigate the feasibility and impacts of extending and widening $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad between Highway 400 and Bathurst Street.

Active Transportation
2. Consider establishing "cycling loops" within King City, Nobleton and Schomberg, and branding these loops with signage to direct people to trails, parks, community centres, attractions and other local amenities to generate interest in cycling for recreation, commuting, and tourism.

Transit
3. Work with Metrolinx and the Region to explore the feasibility of converting the at-grade rail crossing at Dufferin Street to a grade-separated crossing.
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## INTRODUCTION

A Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is a visionary document that includes plans, policies and strategies for transportation infrastructure and services for walking, cycling, transit and roads. The plan guides staff, stakeholders and decision-makers on the transportation development and is typically updated every five years to address the changes in population, employment, travel trends or policy direction.
The Township of King undertook its first TMP in 2015 to develop sustainable, functional, and optimized transportation network within the Township. The 2015 TMP assessed and recommended improvements to the roads, active transportation and transit networks to meet the projected population and employment growth to 2031. The Township is undertaking an update to their 2015 TMP to incorporate updated population and employment forecasts and to guide the further development of the Township's multi-modal transportation network to the year 2031. This chapter will discuss the purpose of this study and how it was completed.

## STUDY PURPOSE

The Township's 2015 TMP was designed to evaluate the Township's unique characteristics and transportation needs, including consideration for environmental and land use planning. Strategies were developed to improve policies, infrastructure and services required to support the growth of the Township.

With new policies across multiple levels of government including a heightened focus on transportation's role in climate change, new population and employment growth projections, affordable housing, and updated transportation data, the Township has refined the 2015 TMP to better suit their needs to the year 2031. The intent of the 2020 TMP is to review the planned improvements to identify gaps in the network and propose a plan to address the gaps. Part of the plan will require additional studies to address in detail the community's goals. The Township of King 2020 TMP aspires to:
$\rightarrow$ Plan transportation infrastructure that accommodates all users of all abilities;
$\rightarrow$ Promote alternative modes of transportation to the private vehicle to address the impacts on climate change;
$\rightarrow$ Create sustainable and comfortable streets that are safe for pedestrians and cyclists; and
$\rightarrow$ Provide a road classification system to guide future planning and capital works. The road system identifies:

- Hierarchy of roads;
- Number of travel lanes;
- Rights-of-way;
- Priority gravel roads for paving;
- Goods movement network; and
- Roads that serve a regional function.


### 1.2 GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

King Township is located in York Region. It is bound by the Towns of East Gwillimbury, Newmarket, Aurora and the City of Richmond Hill to the east and the City of Vaughan on the south. To the north are the Towns of New Tecumseth and Bradford West Gwillimbury, and to the west is the Town of Caledon, as shown in Figure 1-1.

The Township is comprised of three villages and seven hamlets:

| Villages | Hamlets |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\rightarrow$ King City | $\rightarrow$ Laskay | $\rightarrow$ Lloydtown |
| $\rightarrow$ Nobleton | $\rightarrow$ Snowball | $\rightarrow$ Ansnorveldt |
| $\rightarrow$ Schomberg | $\rightarrow$ Kettleby | $\rightarrow$ Graham Sideroad |
|  | $\rightarrow$ Pottageville |  |

TOWNSHIP OF KING 2020
TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

. Now

- GO Bus Stop
(1) GO Train Station
$\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rail Line


## Road Network



### 1.3 MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The 2020 TMP has been developed as a collaboration between the Township and WSP (commissioned consulting team), and included input and engagement with community residents, local stakeholders and interest groups, and governmental agencies.
The 2020 TMP was developed in accordance to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process. Master Plans are required to complete Phases 1 and 2 of the five-phased MCEA process, which include:
$\rightarrow$ Development of an opportunity statement, objectives and an overall TMP vision (Phase 1);
$\rightarrow$ Alternative scenarios development and evaluation, leading to a preferred alternative (Phase 2); and
$\rightarrow$ Engaging public representatives and stakeholders at least twice over the course of the study.
Completion of Phases 1 and 2 allows the Township to move on to implementation of any Schedule A, A+ or B projects and allows the Township to continue to Phase 3 (Assessment of Design Alternatives) for the recommended projects that fall under Schedule 'C' of the Class EA Document. Further consultation will be required for any Schedule ' $C$ ' projects.
The TMP process was divided into four stages with three engagement rounds. An overview of the process used to prepare King's 2020 TMP is described in Table 1-1.

## Table 1-1: King Township 2020 Transportation Master Plan Development Process

## Stage 1. - Project Commencement:

$\rightarrow$ Identify King's transportation challenges and opportunities

$\rightarrow$ Identify what has changed in infrastructure and population and employment forecasts
$\rightarrow$ Research key background information

Stage 2. - Needs Assessment:
$\rightarrow$ Review previously planned projects to determine if sufficient to meet forecasted demand
$2 \rightarrow$ Identify potential gaps in transportation networks
$\rightarrow$ Identify potential alternatives to address identified network gaps

Stage 3. - Evaluation and Selection of Preferred Alternatives:
$\rightarrow$ Evaluate identified alternatives and recommendations
$3 \rightarrow$ Gather input from the community and various stakeholders to inform preferred alternative and recommendations
$\rightarrow$ Select preferred alternative and set of recommendations


Public Engagement \#2: Three Public Information Centres


Public Engagement
\#2: Holland Marsh Soupfest

Stage 4. - Create a Plan:
$\rightarrow$ Develop a strategy to put into action preferred transportation recommendations to the year 2031
$\rightarrow$ Present outcomes to Council and the public


Public Engagement
\#3: Council Presentation and
Notice of Study
Completion

### 1.4 ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE

In June 2019, King's Council declared a Climate Emergency and set a goal of a 45 percent reduction in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by 2030 as part of the Township's Climate Action Plan. The Township will endeavour to meet this goal through a variety of initiatives, and the actions of the TMP directly contribute to this goal.

The TMP focuses on enhancing active transportation opportunities and improving the roads and networks to keep transit vehicles and cars moving. This in conjunction with the Township's drive to provide access to alternative fuel options, more specifically, the installation of electric vehicle charging stations at various municipal facilities throughout the Township is a contributor to GHG reduction opportunities.
To encourage people to get out of their cars and using more sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, cycling and transit, the TMP has been designed around the following three action items:

1. Implement an active transportation network that provides a viable and sustainable alternative to the automobile;
2. Improve connections to the GO train station for walking, cycling and bus service, including year-round maintenance of active transportation facilities providing access to this station; and
3. Consider the development of goods movement routes around Nobleton and King City to enhance the quality of life, and support active modes of travel by reducing congestion, in turn reducing greenhouse gases.

### 1.5 STUDY METHODOLOGY

The 2020 TMP assesses the current transportation conditions and context of the community, with the goal of determining gaps and opportunities for future improvements.

The 2020 TMP was launched July 2019 to address four key questions:
1

What has changed in infrastructure?
Initial review of the existing conditions and understanding what has changed since the 2015 TMP

2 changed?
Identify the demographic and socio-economic trends to understand mobility characteristics and where growth will occur

## Will previously planned projects meet future needs?

3 Review planned projects for walking, cycling, transit and roads to determine opportunities integrate with other projects and if the infrastructure is sufficient for forecasted demands

## Where are the gaps in the network?

4
Assess and recommend opportunities for improvement to walking, cycling, transit and roads networks

With the increased interest in developing sustainable and complete communities to help address a variety of concerns, including climate change, this TMP promotes the development of a multi-modal system that provides users with viable and accessible travel options. This approach is supported by multiple levels of government and draws on York Region's Transportation Master Plan to adapt a "made in King Township" solution.

A comprehensive review of the existing road, active transportation and public transit networks is required to understand the function of the transportation infrastructure. The study focused first on establishing a comprehensive road network and classification system. The active transportation and transit aspects of this study focused on the gaps in the existing network to be further analyzed for detailed improvement strategies.

Input from residents of the community, people outside of the Township, and local stakeholders were considered and incorporated to better reflect the current mobility usages. Feedback on the existing transportation infrastructure is vital to understanding where challenges and desired connections are, including those that link to surrounding municipalities.

## EXISTING CONTEXT

The 2020 TMP is shaped by three key conditions:
$\rightarrow$ The people. Those who live, work and play within the Township who utilize the transportation system and travel within, between and to surrounding municipalities.
$\rightarrow$ The community. The land-use and development trends due to the growth that King is experiencing.
$\rightarrow$ The transportation system. The system that allows people to move to and from key destinations throughout the Township, to surrounding areas and to regional destinations.
This chapter will provide details about the Township's population and employment, land-use and development, and travel trends.

### 2.1 THE PEOPLE: POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

King City, Nobleton and Schomberg are the three villages where King Township is forecasted to experience most of the population growth and all employment growth within the next twenty years. The Township has developed population and employment forecasts that provide an overall growth vision for the intensification areas. As directed by the 2010 York Region Official Plan, the Township is forecasted to:
$\rightarrow$ Increase population to 34,900 residents by 2031, a 37 percent increase from 2016; and
$\rightarrow$ Increase employment to 11,900 jobs, a 20 percent increase from 2016.
Table 2-1 summarizes the Township's population and employment forecasts between 2011 and 2031.

Table 2-1: Township's Population and Employment Forecasts

| Service Area | POPULATION |  |  | EMPLOYMENT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 | 2016 | 2031 | 2011 | 2016 | 2031 |
| King City | 4,100 | 6,900 | 15,500 | 2,000 | 1,950 | 2,950 |
| Nobleton | 3,200 | 5,700 | 6,750 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,850 |
| Schomberg | 2,000 | 2,900 | 3,100 | 1,600 | 2,150 | 2,250 |
| Countryside (including all lands outside of Villages) | 10,600 | 10,000 | 9,550 | 2,550 | 4,800 | 4,850 |
| Total | 19,900 | 25,500 | 34,900 | 7,150 | 9,950 | 11,900 |

Note: The totals may not add up due to rounding.
Source: Township of King Planning Department, 2019

## 2.2

## THE COMMUNITY: LAND-USE STRUCTURE

The Township is predominantly rural with its residents concentrated in three villages (King City, Nobleton and Schomberg) along with seven hamlets (Laskay, Snowball, Kettleby, Pottageville, Lloydtown, Ansnorveldt and Graham Sideroad). The Township is most commonly known for its picturesque countryside that include the rolling hills and natural areas of the Oak Ridges Moraine and the Greenbelt. The Township is also well known for its horse and produce farms; a significant portion of the Holland Marsh is located within the Township.
Each of the three villages contain a Core Area surrounded by low density residential, commercial and employment areas. The hamlets consist mostly of residential and commercial land-uses with some industrial and institutional areas. The land-use schedules from the Township's adopted Official Plan (Council adopted September 23, 2019) for the three villages and seven hamlets are provided in Appendix A.

## THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM: TRAVEL TRENDS

One of the key aspects of transportation planning is to understand how people travel to ensure that adequate transportation networks are provided to meet demand. Travel behaviour is monitored in the Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS), which is a comprehensive travel survey conducted by the University of Toronto Transportation Research Institute. The survey is conducted in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) every five years since 1986 and is funded by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO), Metrolinx, Toronto Transit Commission (TTC), and municipalities in the GGH. The data collected during the survey is maintained in a database and utilized to make transportation planning and investment decisions within local, regional, provincial and transit agencies, among others.
The Township supports an inter-connected network for various transportation modes and trip types. This system of roads, bridges, sidewalks, trails, and cycling routes supports the trips from residential nodes to employment, commercial and recreational destinations. This section analyzes these trip patterns in terms of how people travel (commuter modal split), as well as where they are travelling (trip distribution).
To determine how people are travelling, 2016 TTS modal split data was obtained to assess the morning peak period travel behaviour; the morning peak period (7:30 to 9:30 a.m.) typically represents the Township residents' trips travelling from home to work or school. Often, commuters taking one mode of transportation in the morning peak period will take the same mode of transportation for the return trip in the afternoon peak period. The morning peak period data was analyzed in the sections below.

## HOW PEOPLE TRAVEL: COMMUTER MODAL SPLT

Based on the 2016 TTS data, the most utilized mode of transportation used by the residents of the Township is auto (includes people traveling as auto or taxi passengers) at 85 percent, as illustrated in
Figure 2-1. Travel by school bus is the next most frequently used transportation mode, with a limited number of trips by walking, cycling, or transit.
A review of the 2011 TTS data illustrates minimal change in travel behaviour within the Township in the last five years, also illustrated in Figure 2-1. While the Township is working towards improving its transit and active transportation infrastructure, the travel patterns assessed still demonstrate a heavy reliance on personal automobiles for day-to-day trips.

Figure 2-1: Morning Peak Period Commuter Modal Split

2016 TTS


Source: 2016 and 2011 TTS data

2011 TTS


### 2.3.2 WHERE ARE PEOPLE TRAVELLING: TRIP DISTRIBUTION

To determine where people are going, origin-destination surveys from the 2016 TTS were utilized to assess the morning peak period travel behaviour. The distribution of trips originating from the Township in the morning peak period is illustrated in Figure 2-2. It should be noted that these trips include all forms of travel such as auto, taxi, transit, walking, cycling and school buses.

Figure 2-2: 2016 Morning Peak Period Trip Distribution


Source: 2016 TTS data
Approximately 30 percent of trips remain within the Township, which is considerably higher than trips to any one of the surrounding municipalities or regions. Vaughan and Toronto are the next most popular destinations. Trips head in all directions from King during the morning commuting period.

## VISION AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

This chapter introduces the process to develop the "Vision Statement" for King's 2020 TMP and summarizes the feedback received from the public who helped to inform the recommendations in this document. The TMP was prepared using a collaborative process to increase the impact of decision making on the Township's transportation network.
3.1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE TMP VISION STATEMENT

The intent of the King 2020 TMP is to build upon the existing transportation system, the funded improvements, and previously proposed recommendations to provide a proactive and context specific approach to future planning, design and implementation. To achieve this, the TMP was crafted by community planning principles, best practices and public input.
King's transportation vision was shaped by numerous stakeholders including residents, technical agencies, local Councillors and Township staff responsible for implementing and monitoring transportation affairs for the Township. The Vision reflects multi-faceted principles that will guide decision-making and prepare for future growth that the Township will anticipate to the 2031 horizon year. The development of a vision statement, also called an opportunity statement, meets the requirements for Phase 1 of the MCEA process for master plans.
3.1.1

### 3.1.2

## TMP VISION STATEMENT

King Township envisions active transportation facilities, transit routes and roads that support the growth of vibrant communities and enhance the quality of life for residents. The multi-modal transportation network should provide mobility and connectivity that is sustainable, accessible and affordable for residents of all ages and abilities to the year 2031.

KEY PRINCIPLES
When analyzing the various transportation improvements that could be recommended for King, the study team used six overarching principles. The study team considered "Does the transportation improvement:
$\rightarrow$ Support accessible and active transportation;
$\rightarrow$ Support goods movement;
$\rightarrow$ Support transit;
$\rightarrow$ Limit environmental impacts;
$\rightarrow$ Relieve congestion; and
$\rightarrow$ Provide connectivity.

### 3.2 ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

Public consultation is an integral component of the MCEA process for transportation master plans. To meet this requirement, a public consultation and stakeholder engagement program was designed to obtain feedback from the residents and key staff members from King Township. This section provides an overview of the approach and methods used throughout the engagement process as well as a summary of key themes.

The Township applied an audience-focused consultation approach adopted from the International Association of Public Participation's (IAP2) standard for developing strategies to increase in-person and online engagement opportunities. IAP2 has five levels of participation, illustrated in Figure 3-1. Following this spectrum, the Township objective was to empower local stakeholders and residents to provide feedback that directly impacted the decisions made in the TMP.

Figure 3-1: IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum
Consult Inform

Source: International Association of Public Participation

A process of four main stages was adopted as part of the public consultation and engagement strategy．Figure 3－2 summarizes the steps of the consultation methods adopted for King Township＇s 2020 TMP．

Figure 3－2：Consultation Methods


## 3．3 OUTREACH AND ADVERTISING

During the Fall of 2019，a series of events were held to present the proposed multimodal transportation improvements to the public．
The 2020 TMP was formally launched in September 2019， through a Notice of Study Commencement．The Notice，as seen in Figure 3－3 was published September 19， 2019 online on the Township＇s website（http：／／www．king．ca／）and in the local newspaper．This Notice included information on the Public Information Centre drop－in event locations and an overview of the study．

Figure 3－3：Notice of Study Commencement


## ABOUT THE STUDY

King Townstip is updating is Transportation Master Plan（TMPI to guide is transportation network to the year 2031 and beyond．The plan and its vision will include strategies to improve different modes of travel including walking，cyccing，transit and car．The pubicic information centres provide residents an opportunity to comment on issues with travelling around the Township and provide input on ways to improve the mult－modal on issues weth rivelling a
tanspontation network．

DROP BY AT ANY ONE OF OUR MEETINGS


Visit our booth at Soupfest on Saturday，October 5， 2019 $\int_{\text {Ansnorveldt Patk }}^{12: 00 \mathrm{am}-3: 00 \mathrm{pm}}$
18997 Dufferin Street．Ansnorveltat，o
Cannot attend？For more information about the Transportation Master Plant please vist：tmp．king．ca

Throughout the study, several promotional methods were used to ensure that the public was well informed of the project and the engagement events. This includes:


Project Contact Information

## Social'Media

The Township developed tmp.king.ca as a central hub for information and updates on the study, including a digital copy of the boards used at the public information centres.

Contact information of the project team was included on the webpage and all consultation materials provided. This was used to collect additional questions or feedback received throughout the TMP process.

Through the Township's existing social media, updates and materials were advertised to promote the events and other opportunities for input.

### 3.4 ENGAGEMENT AND MATERIALS

Engagement events were held between October 1 and 8, 2019. Residents were advised to input comments by Friday, October 18, 2019 for the project team to process and incorporate into the 2020 TMP. In total, there were four events held by the Township.

## DROP-IN EVENTS

Three public information centres were held on three different dates and venues to provide alternative times to accommodate Township residents. The three locations were strategically selected in each of the three villages where the population densities are the highest:


King City
Tuesday, October 1, 2019
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm
King City Arena, Upstairs Hall
25 Doctors Lane, King City, ON L7B 1G2


Nobleton
Wednesday, October 2, 2019
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm
Nobleton Community Hall, Downstairs Hall
19 Old King Road, Nobleton, ON LOG 1NO


Schomberg
Tuesday, October 8, 2019
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm
Trisan Centre, Multi-Purpose Room A 25 Dillane Drive, Schomberg, ON LOG 1T0

These sessions were formatted as a drop-in open house displaying information on the project and the proposed improvements. The King City and Schomberg events are shown below in Figure 3-4. Project team members were available to answer any questions and compile input. Almost 50 people attended the centres across the three nights.

Figure 3-4: Participants at the King City (left) and Schomberg (right) Events


Source: WSP

## SOUPFEST

In addition to the drop-in events, consultation was also held at the Holland Marsh Soupfest on Saturday, October 5, 2019 from 11:00 am to 3:00 pm. The event was held at Ansnorveldt Park and drew in hundreds of attendees. The TMP project team attended the event and had a booth, shown in Figure 3-5, to promote the study and collect feedback from attendees.

Figure 3-5: Participants at the TMP Soupfest Booth
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### 3.4.1 PANELS

At the four events, information panels were used to explain the objectives and present the proposed transportation network improvements identified through the data-driven process. The format of the panels is included in Table 3-1. A total of 22 panels were presented to the public, as shown in
Figure 3-6. All panels are provided in Appendix B.
Table 3-1: Summary of Panels

| Panel | Description | \# OF <br> Panels |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welcome and Introduction | Includes the list of drop-in events and an introduction on what a transportation master plan, the importance of updating the TMP, and describes the MCEA process | 2 |
| Existing Conditions | Describes the projected population growth, travel patterns, and the conditions of transit, active transportation and roads | 1 |
| Vision and Alternative Solutions | Presents the vision statement and the three alternative solutions to address Phases 1 and 2 of the MCEA process | 1 |
| Proposed Improvements | Displays the 2031 proposed improvements for the road, active transportation and transitnetworks | 17 |
| Next Steps and Contact Information | Describes the next steps in the TMP process and the contact information for the project team | 1 |

Figure 3-6: Display of Panels and Example of Comments
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## COMMENT SHEET

At each of the events, comment sheets were available for participants to provide additional feedback or reference for information on the project. Comment sheets, as illustrated in Figure 3-7, included a summary of the project, a link to the project website, and the contact information to the project team leads.

Figure 3-7: Comment Sheet for Additional Feedback


## SUMMARIZING THE FEEDBACK

A word cloud, Figure 3-8, was generated to highlight the key words based on the number of times the word appeared within the comments. This is a visual representation of the key issues and opportunities as identified by the attendees.

Figure 3-8: Word Cloud of Public Comments


### 3.5.1 ROADS

The engagement process allowed for multiple perspectives and comments to be collected on the proposed road network improvements and road classifications. The most commonly heard comments were regarding the lack of alternative routes due to the gaps and dead ends in the network. For example, in Nobleton the public identified that the only routes out of the village are King Road and Highway 27, causing these streets to be congested during peak hours. Roads that contribute notable gaps in the network include:

```
-> 7th Concession;
 8th Concession (to Vaughan);
 15th Sideroad;
- 17th Sideroad; and
-> 18th Sideroad.
```

Another common concern from the public is regarding the environmental impact of the new proposed roads. A few of the roadway linkages were proposed across environmentally sensitive areas and wetlands. The public would like a thorough environmental assessment and review of the proposed alignment.

### 3.5.2 ACTVE TRANSPORTATION

Overall, the public was supportive of active transportation, especially off-road trails through natural areas. The public would like more trails, especially throughout the Oak Ridges Moraine area for recreational use. Cyclists were more attracted to off-road trails, which facilitated a more comfortable experience compared to on-road facilities. The current paved shoulders, particularly on high-volume and high-speed corridors, posed a challenge to cyclists.

### 3.5.3 TRANSIT

Similar to active transportation, the public was generally supportive of the transit, noting that more transit is desired west of Highway 400. There are few routes that facilitate east-west movement throughout the Township and to connect the villages. In particular, the public would like a regular bus service connection between Schomberg and the Highway 400 GO Bus stop as well as between Nobleton and King City.
Another common theme with residents that use the GO rail is that it is difficult to find parking at King City GO. Residents often must drive to the GO stations due to the lack of transit routes that connect between residential areas and transit hubs. As a result, there is a high demand for parking spaces at these stations.

## ROADS

Based on the 2016 TTS data, 85 percent of trips originating in the Township of King in the a.m. peak hour are made by auto. Given the sizable dependence on auto, it is important for the Township to maintain its road network and to provide acceptable level of service and efficient travel for the movement of goods and people.
As part of this TMP, the Township's road network was assessed for current and potential future network deficiencies. This section of the report provides a summary road network assessment which includes an investigation of the existing and future forecasted operations of the road network, a review of planned road improvements by the Township and other agencies, and a comparison of assessment alternatives, as required by the MCEA process for master plans. Based on the results of the assessment, several improvements and recommendations are proposed and a future 2031 road network is determined.

### 4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

To identify improvements, recommendations and strategies for the Township's road network, it is important to understand the current context. The conditions of the existing road network serve as the base case to assess future conditions and proposed improvements to the network. The Township's current road classification system, roadway surface conditions, and traffic operations were reviewed.

## EXISTING ROAD CLASSIFICATION

A road network performs most efficiently and safely from both traffic operations and road safety perspectives if roads are designated and operated to serve their intended purposes. A road classification system designates streets/roads into different groups or classes according to the type of service each group is intended to provide. Grouping roads with similar functions can improve transportation planning, road infrastructure design, maintenance, traffic and road operations.
The road network in the Township of King currently comprises a hierarchy of roadways classified as provincial highway / freeways, Regional roads, and Township roads, as shown in Figure 4-1.
Descriptions of the recognized roadway classifications within the Township of King are provided below:
$\rightarrow$ Provincial highways / freeways fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) and include Highway 400 and Highway 9 west of Highway 400. Freeways are limited-access high-capacity roads where traffic movement is the primary function.
$\rightarrow$ Regional roads fall under the jurisdiction of York Region. These roads are mainly arterial roads where their primary function is to provide through routes across and within the Township.
$\rightarrow$ Township roads fall under the jurisdiction of the Township of King. These roads include roads that function as collector roads connecting Regional roads and neighbourhoods, as well as local roads that provide local access to abutting properties such as residential communities and agriculture lands.
The current road classification system is focused on the roadway jurisdictions. The road classes are not defined based on the road service functions upon which typical geometric design standards are defined. The system does not account for the roadway settings such as urban and rural areas. The rural areas dominantly occupy most of the Township areas.


## EXISTING ROADWAY SURFACE AND ROAD DISCONTINUITIES

The primary land uses in the Township of King are mainly located in several urban villages while the other large areas are in the rural areas with agriculture land uses or being undeveloped. Figure 4-2 presents the existing roadway surface types of the roadway network: gravel and paved roads.
Paved (hard top) roads are defined as roads with an asphalt surface, concrete surface, composite pavement, portland cement or surface treatment. Gravel (unpaved / loose top) roads are defined as roads with gravel, stone or other loose material surface. Based on a review of current agency practices and literature, the most common factors used for selecting a road surface treatment include:
$\rightarrow$ Traffic volumes;
$\rightarrow$ Commercial traffic;
$\rightarrow$ Road function;
$\rightarrow$ Adjacent land use / development; and
$\rightarrow$ Agency costs.
According to the Township's 2016 Road Needs Report, approximately $30 \%$ of the Township's 300 km road network are gravel roads. King Township Council has directed that all gravel roads be paved in the next four years.

Figure 4-3 presents the number of through lanes on the existing road network. As indicated in both Figure 4-2 and Figure 4-3, there is significant discontinuity in the road grid as well as discontinuity between paved and unpaved roads. The supporting grid of rural concession roads are lower in capacity than the Regional roads due to pavement surface and geometric discontinuities. Discontinuous links change travel patterns and result in relatively high traffic volumes on the Regional or Provincial roads. However, it is noted that many of these discontinuities are a result of environmentally sensitive areas and private land ownership that impact road construction.
King Road, $19^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad / Lloydtown-Aurora Road, and Highway 9 are the only continuous east-west roads and have interchanges with Highway 400 within the Township's boundaries and consequently carry heaw traffic including goods movement trucks. $16^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad is only the Highway 400 crossing. Due to the distant spacing of the current Highway 400 interchanges and many discontinuous eastwest road segments, King Road is heavily relied on for vehicle and truck traffic destined to and from Highway 400 . As a result, relatively high volumes of traffic pass through the core of King City and Nobleton.
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### 4.1.3 EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

A screenline analysis was conducted to examine the capability of the road network to support the existing transportation activity, as well as to determine the surplus capacity available in the existing roadway network. The screenline approach identifies the variation in routing choice and effectively makes use of the concept of supply and demand. Supply is the overall screenline capacity and demand is the total vehicular volumes crossing the screenline. The screenline analysis recognizes that, while one roadway may be projected to operate at capacity and below service standards, an adjacent road may have significant reserve capacity to divert traffic.
The auto capacity of the existing road/street network was evaluated by using a series of imaginary north-south and east-west screenlines to measure auto capacity and traffic volumes at key strategic locations. The following six screenlines (refer to Figure 4-5 or Figure 4-6) were established, which were primarily based on the York Region screenlines:

1 North Boundaries:
1A South of Highway 9, West of Highway 400; and
1B North of Highway 9, East of Highway 400;
2 West of Highway 400;
3 West Boundary;
4 East Boundary;
5 South Boundary; and
6 East of Highway 400.
To understand the current roadway conditions and to set a baseline for the roadway analysis, the most recent weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour counts available were collected from the Township of King, York Region, and the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO). The data available were surveyed between 2011 and 2019. The counts were grown to 2019 volumes by applying a compound annual growth rate of $2.1 \%$, which was derived from the Township's population growth data. Existing 2019 a.m. and p.m. peak hours are shown in Figure 4-4. The lane capacities of the roadways were based on the York Region's Emme Model.
The resulting relationship between supply and demand is expressed as a volume-to-capacity ratio $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c})$. Based on findings and thresholds adopted by other jurisdictions in the Greater Toronto Area, a screenline v/c ratio threshold of 0.9 was used. Screenlines with a v/c ratio of less than 0.9 are considered to have adequate capacity, whereas screenlines at 0.9 or above should be considered for transportation improvements.
Figure 4-5 and Figure 4-6 present the v/c ratios at the analyzed screenlines as well as the individual roads with capacity deficiencies.

TOWNSHIP OF KING 2020
TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Waterbody
Park / Open Space

## Existing Road Classification

Regional Road
— Township Road

Other Transportation Network Features
A-GO Train Station
$\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rail Line
XXX (XXX) AM Peak Hour Volumes (PM Peak Hour Volumes)
(2.5



Figure 4-7 and Figure 4-8 present the overall traffic volumes versus the total capacity at each screenline during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.

Figure 4-7: Screenline Assessment, Existing (2019) AM Peak Hour


Figure 4-8: Screenline Assessment, Existing (2019) PM Peak Hour


Overall, the total traffic volumes are below the total capacity at all screenlines during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively, and the screenline $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are less than 0.9 . However, the following individual links in the existing network experiences $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ greater than 0.9 in the peak hours:
$\rightarrow$ The westbound traffic along King Road across Screenline No. 3 (West Boundary) operates at a v/c of 0.96 in the a.m. peak hour and 0.94 in the p.m. peak hour. Similarly, the eastbound traffic operates at a v/c of 1.05 in the p.m. peak hour;
$\rightarrow$ The westbound traffic along $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad across Screenline No. 4 (East Boundary) operates at a v/c of 1.13 in the a.m. peak hour. Similarly, the eastbound traffic operates at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of 0.98 in the p.m. peak hour;
$\rightarrow$ The northbound traffic along Highway 27 across Screenline No. 5 (South Boundary) operates at a v/c of 1.06 in the a.m. peak hour. The southbound traffic operates at v/c 0.94 in the p.m. peak hour; and
$\rightarrow$ The southbound traffic along Highway 400 across Screenline No. 5 (South Boundary) operates at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of 1.05 in the a.m. peak hour. Similarly, the northbound traffic operates at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of 1.06 in the $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. peak hour.

The results of the existing screenline analysis reveal that overall the network has capacity to accommodate the traffic demand within the boundaries of the Township. However, there are roadways that are significantly preferred over others and thus operate near capacity. These roadways typically are higher classification roadways such as Regional roads and Provincial highways.
The detailed $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ calculations for each screenline and its crossing individual links are provided in Appendix C.
Additional traffic assessments were completed for the major Township roads within the three villages. To encapsulate the growth in traffic experienced by each village, the derived population growth rate for each respective village: King City (5.5\%), Nobleton (1.4\%), Schomberg and Lloydtown (0.5\%), were applied to adjust the current traffic counts to the year 2019. It was found that peak hour volumes on these roadways are relatively low and the analysis reveals that all roadways operate within capacity. A summary of the analysis is provided in Appendix C.

## PLANNED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Several transportation improvements were recommended within the Township of King boundaries or adjacent by a variety of organizations, including York Region and MTO. The recommended improvements were considered in the assessment of the Township's future transportation network.
The following sections summarize the recommended roadway improvements by horizon year 2031, as well as beyond 2031.

## MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION OF ONTARIO

The MTO Southern Highway Program (2016) outlined various planned projects on MTO jurisdictional highways from 2016 to 2020. As per the program, MTO plans to widen Highway 400 from Major Mackenzie Drive to King Road from six to eight lanes by 2020 to accommodate high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. The widening of Highway 400 will continue north to Canal Road beyond 2020. This improvement is expected to increase the capacity of the Highway 400.
The York Region TMP (2016) recommended to widen Highway 9 from two to four lanes between Highway 27 and east of West Canal Bank Road by 2027-2039. Highway 9 provides access to Highway 400 and is one of the only major continuous east-west road that currently carries significant traffic volumes.

As shown in Figure 4-9, the proposed GTA West Corridor directly south of the Township will have an impact on the future traffic patterns. MTO presently is conducting an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the GTA West Corridor. The study is investigating a proposed new highway corridor that will extend from Highway 400, between Kirby Road and King-Vaughan Road, to Highway 401/407 ETR in Milton. The corridor may feature a transitway and potential goods movement priority features. As per the York Region TMP (2016), the GTA West Corridor is planned for horizon year 2027-2031. As shown in Figure 4-9, there will be three potential interchange locations directly south of the Township's southern boundary that would have potential effects on the Township.

Figure 4-9: Preferred GTAWest Corridor Intersection Locations, East Section of Study Area


12 Highway 27 interchange - Aligns with Technically Preferred Route for Section 8
13 Pine Valley Drive Interchange or Partial Interchange at Weston Road: Partial interchange at Weston
Road preferred

- An interchange to the west of Highway 400 provides a desirable connection with the municipal road network
- Pine Valley Drive is not continuous north or south of the study area and there are no planned urban growth centres along Pine Valley Drive
- Weston Road provides a connection to a planned urban growth centre

Highway 400 freeway-to-freeway interchange - Aligns with Technically Preferred Route for Section 9

The GTA West Corridor would provide an increased accessibility to west GTA for the Township residents. The Corridor could potentially result in long-term benefits for the Township, including reduced travel time for the Township commuters and more efficient goods movements.

The planned interchange at Highway 27 will be directly south of the village of Nobleton. This may result in additional traffic along the Highway 27 corridor and through the core of Nobleton. As documented in the York Region TMP (2016), there are plans to widen Highway 27 from two lanes to four lanes between Major Mackenzie Drive and Highway 9 by 2022-2041.
The GTA West Corridor could potentially change travel patterns on the east-west roads parallel to the Corridor, such as King Road that currently carries high volumes of local and inter-regional traffic. It is important to note that King Road passes through the core of two major Villages in the Township Nobleton and King City.

A partial interchange at Weston Road would potentially increase traffic along this corridor. Weston Road is a Regional road that currently carries high volumes of local, and inter-regional traffic. Weston Road is recommended by York Region to be widened from two to four lanes between King Road and Teston Road by 2027-2041.

The construction of a new major freeway would encourage development by the interchanges as well as along roads leading to the interchanges, such as Highway 27 and Weston Road. As mentioned in Figure 4-9, a planned urban growth centre is proposed to be connected to the proposed partial interchange at Weston Road. The growth in development will generate additional traffic and change the land use of the surrounding areas. The Township should consider working with the Region and neighbouring municipalities such as Vaughan to assess any land use impacts and implement land use policies to mitigate any potential impacts.

To the north of the Township's boundaries, the Bradford By-pass highway was initially proposed by the MTO, but is not presently programmed for construction. The Bradford By-pass has been previously proposed as a four-lane highway that will provide an east-west connection between Highway 400 in Bradford West Gwillimbury and Highway 404 in the Town of East Gwillimbury. This new highway could help reduce the east-west traffic in the Township travelling to Highway 400.

A summary of the MTO planned roadway projects within and near the Township by horizon year 2031 is provided in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1: MTO Planned Highway Improvements by 2031

| Road | FRom | To | Improvement | Phase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Highway } \\ & 400 \end{aligned}$ | Major Mackenzie Drive | King Road | Highway400 Lane Expansion Project, HOV lanes | 2016-2020 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Highway } \\ & 400 \end{aligned}$ | King Road | Canal Road | Highway400 Lane Expansion Project, HOV lanes | Beyond 2020 |
| Highway 9 | Highway27 | east of West Canal Bank Road | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes. | 2027-2039 |
| GTA West Corridor |  |  | Potential new east-westhighwaysouth of the Township. Several potential interchanges proposed as part of the corridor may impact traffic in the Township. | 2027-2031 |
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### 4.2.2 YORK REGION

The York Region TMP (2016) recommends roadway improvements up to horizon year 2041. This section summarizes the Region's recommended improvements within the Township by horizon year 2031 and 2041.

Although the planning horizon year of this TMP update is 2031, road improvements beyond 2031 within the Township boundaries are also documented to indicate the future planning that has taken place. By reviewing the Region's plan, it would help to identify the needs on the Township roads in response to the future network changes.
Previous studies have recommended specific improvements to the King Road and Keele Street intersection, and the area to enhance the quality of life and improve multi-modal traffic flow. In July 2017, York Region carried out a functional design and parking capacity study of this intersection and in October 2018, the Township prepared the Core Areas Parking Study that also addressed this intersection. The findings and recommendations documented in the associated reports should be revisited in the short term with an eye towards next steps for implementation of recommended improvements that include improving intersection capacity by reducing parking and implementing dedicated northbound and southbound left-turn lanes.
4.2.2.1 BY 2031

Table 4-2 lists York Region's recommended improvement to the roads located within the Township of King by 2031.

Table 4-2: Region Recommended Road Improvements by 2031

| Road | From | To | Improvement | Phase |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Highway27 | Major Mackenzie Drive | King Road | Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes | $2022-2026$ |
| Jane Street | 200 metres north of King Road | East Humber River Bridge Rehabilitation | 2020 |  |
| King Road | 800 metres east of Highway400 | King Horn Bridge Rehabilitation | 2020 |  |

## Source: York Region 2016 Transportation Master Plan and 2019 York Region 10-year Capital Construction Program

Based on the York Region TMP, Highway 27 was recommended to be widened from two to four lanes between Major Mackenzie Drive and King Road by 2022 to 2026. Highway 27 is a major north-south arterial road that runs through Nobleton and serves as alternative roadway to Highway 400. It experiences relatively high volumes of traffic and the additional capacity south of King Road will benefit Nobleton residents.
Based on the York Region's 10-year Capital Construction Program, two bridge rehabilitation projects are planned on Jane Street near King Road and King Road near Highway 400.

### 4.2.2.2 BEYOND 2031

York Region recommends widening many of the Regional roads within the Township, namely roadways serving King City and Nobleton. Widenings of existing two lanes roads to four Ianes are expected at Dufferin Street, Jane Street, Weston Road, King Road, $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad, and Highway 27. York Region also has indicated a new interchange on Highway 400 at $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad by 2041. However, this interchange may potentially be impacted by the recommendations of the freeway-tofreeway interchange in the GTA West Transportation Corridor Study. It will be confirmed by the future Mid-York East-West Corridor Study.

A summary of the recommended improvements between 2032 and 2041 is provided in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3: Region Recommended Road Improvements Beyond 2031

| Road | FRom | To | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15th Sideroad | Highway400 | Bathurst Street | New construction (Jane to Keele Street); Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes |
| 15th Sideroad | West of BathurstStreet |  | Barrie GO rail grade separation |
| 15th Sideroad | Highway400 |  | Future interchange |
| Dufferin Street | North of King Road |  | Barrie GO rail grade separation |
| Highway27 | King Road | Highway9 | Widen from 2-3 lanes to 4 lanes |
| Dufferin Street | Teston Road | 15th Sideroad | Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes |
| King Road | Caledon-King Townline | Highway400 |  |
| King-Vaughan Road | 7th Concession | Bathurst Street |  |
| Jane Street | King-Vaughan Road | 15th Sideroad |  |
| Weston Road | King-Vaughan Road | King Road |  |

[^3]
### 4.2.3 TOWNSHIP OF KING

The Township has identified several capital road projects, which include upgrading Township gravel roads to asphalt and repaving several asphalt roads. A summary of these planned projects by the Township is provided in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4: Township Planned Road Projects

| Roadway | From | To | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10th Concession | King Road | 15th Sideroad | Upgrade gravel road to asphalt |
| 10th Concession | 17th Sideroad | 19th Sideroad |  |
| 18th Sideroad | 11th Concession | 10th Concession |  |
| 18th Sideroad | 8th Concession | 10th Concession |  |
| 18th Sideroad | 8th Concession | 7th Concession |  |
| LaskayLane | Entire length of the roadway |  |  |
| Mill Street | Entire length of the roadway |  |  |
| Old Bathurst Street | 19th Sideroad | BathurstStreet |  |
| Old Church Road | Entire length of the roadway |  |  |
| South Canal Bank Road | Highway9 | Jane Street |  |
| 15th Sideroad | 10th Concession | Highway27 | Repave asphaltroad |
| 19th Sideroad | West of 7th Concession |  |  |
| 7th Concession | Lloydtown/Aurora Road | 18th Sideroad |  |
| 7th Concession | Lloydtown/Aurora Road | 19th Sideroad |  |
| 8th Concession | Highway9 | 18th Sideroad |  |
| Bell Lake Road | Entire length of the roadway |  |  |
| Centre Street | Rebellion Way | Church Street |  |
| Centre Street | Rebellion Way | 0.1 km West of Rebellion Way |  |
| Centre Street | 0.1 km West of Rebellion Way | 0.2 km West of Rebellion Way |  |
| Dearbourne Avenue | Off Keele Street 750m | Off Jane Street 1120m |  |
| Dr. Kay | Main Street | Highway27 |  |
| Dufferin Street | 18th Sideroad | 19th Sideroad |  |
| Keele Street | Kettleby Road | 19th Sideroad |  |
| King Street | Keele Street | Drainage Canal |  |
| Lloydtown Road | Highway27 | Rebellion |  |
| Lockhart Lane | Entire length of the roadway |  |  |
| Queen Street | Rebellion Way | 10th Concession |  |
| Rebellion Way | Lloydtown/Aurora Road | Centre Street |  |
| Rebellion Way | Centre Street | Queen Street |  |
| Victoria Street | Rebellion Way | EastEnd |  |

## FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Similar to existing screenline assessment discussed in Section 4.1.3, a screenline assessment was also completed with the 2031 forecasted volumes to identify any potential capacity issues in the future. Note that the assessment is based on hypothetical volumes predicted for the future and are not actual values.

The future 2031 traffic volumes were forecasted by the following approaches:
1 The existing peak hour traffic counts of the different count survey years on roads outside the three villages were adjusted to the year 2019 by applying a compound annual growth rate of $2.1 \%$, which was derived from the Township's population growth forecast.
2 To reflect the changes in traffic resulting from the regional road network changes, as well as the forecasted population and employment growth in the Township, the difference in the forecasted a.m. peak hour volumes from the York Region Travel Demand Forecasting (YRTDF) Model for the base year and the future year 2031 were added to the adjusted traffic counts to obtain the future 2031 a.m. peak hour traffic volumes.
The YRTDF Model was built using the EMME/2 software by Inro Inc., and is predominantly used by the Region to evaluate network improvements and travel-related behaviour changes. Note that the YRTDF Emme Model was run with the most current population and employment forecasts provided by the Township. The Emme network assumptions included the recommended improvements by the Region and MTO.
3 As the YRTDF Model only modelled the a.m. peak hour traffic, it was assumed that the p.m. peak hour travel behaviour was the reverse of the a.m. peak hour. The difference in the a.m. peak hour traffic volumes forecasted by the York Region's Emme Model was reversed by direction of travel along the link and were added to the p.m. traffic counts to obtain the future 2031 p.m. peak hour traffic volumes.
The forecasted 2031 a.m. and p.m. peak volumes hours are shown in Figure 4-12.
The YRTDF model is a commuter-based model. Since the forecasted traffic volumes include trucks, the lane auto capacities from the Emme model were factored up by $5 \%$ to estimate the lane mixedtraffic capacity. In the case of Highway 400, the lane auto capacity was factored up by $10 \%$ to account for the additional capacity for truck traffic.

As shown in Figure 4-10 and Figure 4-11, the overall screenline a.m. and p.m. traffic volumes are below each respective screenline's capacity. The a.m. and p.m. peak hour v/c ratios of the screenlines are also summarized in Figure 4-13 and Figure 4-14, respectively.
Overall, the screenline $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are less than 0.9. However, the following links are forecasted to experiences $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ greater than 0.9 by horizon year 2031:
$\rightarrow$ The westbound traffic along $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad across Screenline 4 (East Boundary) would operate at a v/c of 1.13 and 0.93 in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. The eastbound traffic would operate at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of 0.92 and 0.98 in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. It should be noted that York Region recommends widening $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad from two to four lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should discuss and consider widening the road prior to 2032.
$\rightarrow$ The southbound traffic along Highway 27 across Screenline 5 (South Boundary) would operate at a v/c of 0.95 in the a.m. peak hour. The northbound traffic would operate at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ 1.07 in the p.m. peak hour. The screenline assessment considers the widening of Highway 27 from two to four lanes between Major Mackenzie Drive and King Road. Despite the widening, Highway 27 is forecast to operate near or over capacity in the peak hours. The Township plans to pave the gravel road on $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession from King Road to $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad.

This would add additional capacity at the screenline and provide an alternative road for some traffic diverting off Highway 27.
$\rightarrow$ The southbound traffic along Weston Road across Screenline 5 (South Boundary) would operate at a v/c of 1.03 in the a.m. peak hour. York Region recommends widening Weston Road from 2 to 4 lanes between King Road and Teston Road by 2032-2041.

The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ calculations for each of the screenline links are provided in Appendix $\mathbf{C}$.
Figure 4-10: Future 2031 Traffic Volumes versus Capacity at Screenlines, AM Peak Hour


Figure 4-11: Future 2031 Traffic Volumes versus Capacity at Screenlines, PM Peak Hour


Additional traffic assessments were completed for the major Township roads within the three villages. To encapsulate the growth in traffic experienced by each village, the population growth rate for each respective village was applied to the traffic counts to estimate future 2031 traffic volumes. The following compound annual growth rates were applied for each village: King City (5.5\%), Nobleton (1.4\%), Schomberg and Lloydtown ( $0.5 \%$ ). It was found that peak hour volumes on these roadways are relatively low and thus the analysis results reveal that all roadways would operate well below capacity. A summary of the analysis is provided in Appendix C.
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## ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

To complete Phase 2 of the MCEA process for master plans, one of the major objectives of the TMP is to determine whether if the existing roadway network is capable of support the current and future traffic in the Township, as well as to determine if the currently planned improvements are sufficient or additional improvements may be needed. To systematically assess these items, the following three groups of alternative solutions were assessed:

$\rightarrow$ Alternative 1 - "Do Nothing": Section 4.1 provides the assessment of the existing conditions of the "Do Nothing" road network in the aspects of traffic conditions, road classification, network connectivity, and road surface.
$\rightarrow$ Alternative 2 - "2015 TMP": In Section 4.2, planned roadway projects as well as a summary of the 2015 King TMP recommendations were discussed. Section 4.3 provides the screenline assessment of the future 2031 traffic conditions of the road network, which included all the planned improvements and the 2015 TMP recommended collector roads. This alternative was the baseline for the 2020 TMP and identify any potential issues that may require additional improvements.
$\rightarrow$ Alternative 3 - "2020 TMP": The proposed road network in this TMP is presented in Section 4.5, which includes the proposed roadway classification, number of vehicle lanes, rights-of-way, roadway surface upgrade, goods movements, and road upload to Region. The screenline assessment of the future 2031 traffic conditions for this alternative is provided in Appendix C.
Based on the assessments of the scenarios completed, it is evident that the Township still faces significant transportation challenges in Provincial, Regional and Township roadway networks within the Township boundaries. Circuitous street connectivity and conventional road classification systems reflect several transportation challenges that exist today. Road alignment discontinuity, local road access to arterials, arterial to collector connections, and few continuous roadways across the Township boundaries are reflected in automobile dependent land uses. The three villages will experience additional future growths. Furthermore, the forecasted future 2031 traffic conditions are expected to experience some capacity issues on Regional Roads even with the currently planned improvements in place.
Therefore, it is proposed that the "2020 TMP" scenario is the preferred alternative. The next section of this report discusses the proposed improvements and recommendations to address the issues identified.

### 4.5 PROPOSED ROAD NETWORK

As identified in Sections 4.1 to 4.4, the current and future planned Township's road network has several deficiencies. This section summarizes road improvements and a recommended 2031 future road network to address the issues identified.

### 4.5.1 ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION

As the Township of King continues to face growth, a sound road classification is an essential requirement. A road classification system is required to guide the design and construction of new roadways as well as to provide guidance on appropriate changes for existing road facilities.
A roadway hierarchy will also benefit the Township by providing:
$\rightarrow$ Priorities for road maintenance and snow clearance;
$\rightarrow$ Priorities for improving active transportation (trails, sidewalks, bike paths); and
$\rightarrow$ Priorities for emergency vehicles.
The objective of this TMP is to arrive at a functional classification of roads that balances the land access and mobility needs and supports user choice of a full range of travel modes. Available industry standards and best practices of classification systems of other municipalities were reviewed. This classification is proposed based on the guidelines recommended in the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC). The TAC classification system classifies roads based on differences in traffic service, land service, design features and operational needs associated primarily with adjacent land use. A separate classification system is identified for the different roadway settings: urban and rural.
The proposed Township road classification criteria for rural and urban roads are provided in Table 4-5 and Table 4-6, respectively. Any roads located within the villages of King City, Nobleton, Lloydtown or Schomberg are defined as urban roads. The definitions of each category include:

1 Rural Arterial Roads:
Their primary functions are to provide regional vehicular movement, goods movement, transit priority and active transportation to support residential, commercial and industrial (suburban) uses. Features include cycle tracks or multi-use paths, rapid transit, goods movement supportive, limited private access (consolidation of accesses), and moderate to high road speeds. These roadways are potential candidates to be uploaded to Regional roads as they essentially perform regional functions.
2 Urban Collector Roads:
The primary function of collector roads is to connect local areas to arterials roads. Urban collector roads are typically used by local traffic with limited through traffic. Trucks are sometimes permitted during the day. Private accesses and parking can also be permitted if required. Urban collector roads also accommodate the needs of pedestrians and cyclists through the provision of footways, cycling facilities, and other associated infrastructure.
A signature collector road is a subset of the urban collector road classification. This subset applies to collector roads within the urban built boundary with unique geometry, intersection designs, and varying cross-sections (including pedestrian and cycling facilities, asphalt widths and rights-of-way). The variation in these elements contribute to a unique roadside environment and hence the 'signature' feel to the road. In these circumstances, the signature collector road classification is applied to recognize and protect the character of the existing community.

3 Rural Collector Roads:
Their primary functions are to provide regional and inter-regional vehicular movement, goods movement, active transportation to support agricultural, institutional, industrial and open space uses. Features include goods movement and farming supportive design measures, paved shoulders or multi-use paths, and higher road speeds. Rural collector roads are typically located outside the villages of King City, Nobleton, Lloydtown or Schomberg.
4 Urban Local Roads
Local roads mostly serve local traffic. Trucks are permitted for local deliveries only and there are usually no bus routes. Cyclists share road space with vehicles and pedestrian facilities can vary depending on the environment. Given the low traffic volumes on these roads, cycle lanes are not necessary. Private accesses are permitted and intersections are typically controlled by stop or yield signs. This type of roads would be a subclass of York Region's Rural Hamlet road classification, together with Collector Roads.
5 Rural Local Roads
Rural local roads serve similar functions to urban local roads; however, they are located outside the villages of King City, Nobleton, Lloydtown or Schomberg.

Table 4-5: Proposed Township Road Classification Criteria, Rural Roads

| FACTOR | RURAL LOCALS | RURAL COLLECTORS | RURAL ARTERIALS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic service function | Traffic movement secondary consideration | Traffic movement and land access of equal importance | Traffic movement primary consideration |
| Land service | Land access consideration | Traffic movement and land access of equal importance | Land access secondary consideration |
| Desirable connections | Locals, collectors | Locals, collectors, arterials | Collectors, arterials freeways |
| Number of vehicle lanes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Two | Two | Two to four |
| Traffic daily traffic volumes in both directions (veh/day) | Carry low volumes of traffic $(<1,000)$ | Carry medium volumes of traffic (1,000-5,000) | 5,000-12,000 AADT |
| Flow characteristics | Interrupted flow | Interrupted flow | Uninterrupted flow except at signals |
| Design speed (km/h) | 50-110 | 60-110 | 80-130 |
| Average running speed (km/h) (free flow conditions) | 50-90 | 50-90 | 60-100 |
| Vehicle type | Predominantly passenger cars, light to medium trucks and occasional heavy trucks | All types, up to $30 \%$ trucks in the 3 to 5 tonne range | All types, up to 20\% trucks |

[^4]Table 4-6: Proposed Township Road Classification Criteria, Urban Roads

| FACTOR | LOCALS |  | COLLECTORS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Residential | INDUSTRIAL / COMMERCIAL | RESIDENTIAL | INDUSTRIAL / COMMERCIAL |
| Traffic service function | Traffic movementsecondary consideration |  | Traffic movement and land access of equal importance |  |
| Land service / access | Land access primaryfunction |  | Traffic movement and land access of equal importance |  |
| Desirable connections | Locals, collectors |  | Locals, collectors, arterials |  |
| Typical daily traffic volume in two | Carry low volumes of traffic |  | Carry medium volumes of traffic |  |
| dir | < 1,000 | < 3,000 | 1,000-8,000 | 3,000-12,000 |
| Number of vehicle lanes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | One (one-way streets) or two |  | Two to five |  |
| Flow characteristics | Interrupted flow |  | Interrupted flow |  |
| Posted speed | 40 or less |  | 40-50 |  |
| Transit service | Generally, not provided |  | Permitted |  |
| Accommodation of cyclists | No restrictions or special facilities |  | Special facilities considered |  |
| Accommodation of pedestrians | Sidewalks normallyon one or both sides | Sidewalks provided where required | Sidewalks normallyon both sides | Sidewalks provided where required |
| Parking (typically) | No restrictions or restrictions one side only |  | Few restrictions other than peak hours |  |
| Min. intersection spacing (m) | 60 |  | 60 |  |

Source: Table 2.6.5-Characteristics of Urb an Roads, Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, Transportation Association of Canada (TAC), 2017.
a. The number oflanes include HOV or bus lanes and a centre two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL), and excludes bike lanes.

The existing and future AADT of the Township roadways, as well as the adjacent land uses were reviewed to determine the proposed road classification. The future 2031 AADT volumes on the Township's roads were forecasted by applying a compound annual growth rate of $2.1 \%$, which was derived from the Township's population growth forecast, to the existing AADT volumes. The roadway hierarchy was developed by examining how roadways currently operate within the Township's road network.

Figure 4-15 to Figure 4-18 illustrate the proposed classification of the Township's road network. This plan formalizes how existing roads are currently used and is not intended to change the current physical design or increase traffic volumes on these roads.
It is also important for the Township to note that the change of a roadway's classification will not require any immediate changes. This should be adequately articulated to the residents living adjacent to these roadways.
Details of the rationale for the proposed classification of the Township's roads are provided in Appendix C.
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## PROPOSED NUMBER OF VEHICLE LANES

As discussed in Section 4.2, all planned roadway widenings within the Township by horizon year 2031 are on Regional roads and Provincial highways. A summary of these planned road widenings and the changes in number of vehicles lanes (widenings and new roads) in the Township's road network are provided in Figure 4-19 to Figure 4-22. The ultimate total number of vehicle lanes are provided in Figure 4-23 to Figure 4-26.

## TOWNSHIP ROADS

The proposed road capacity improvements to the Township roads include:
1 Proposed new roads (collector roads, local roads) to improve network connectivity and support the new developments within the three villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg. These new roads also include:

- Those already proposed by the current development applications in the northeast of King City and in Nobleton, in the southeast of Russel Snider Drive and Sheardown Drive;
- Extension of $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession to $19^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad in Lloydtown; and
- Other new linkages.

Note that the proposed new roads are subject to change through the development process.
2 Upgrading gravel to asphalt: It is important to note that the road surface upgrade of gravel to asphalt would add additional road capacities to the Township network, which are not presented in all the road network maps.
The current gravel roads are proposed to be upgraded to asphalt pavement roads. The roadway surface upgrade would make the road accessible and friendly to traffic, increase roadway capacity significantly, and provide alternative travel routes for traffic. For example, the current gravel road on $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession from King Road to $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad is proposed to be paved, which would add additional capacity at the screenline and provide an alternative road for some traffic diverting off Highway 27.
In addition, the intersection improvement on 15 Sideroad at Highway 27 is proposed by eliminating the offsets on the eastbound and westbound approaches on 15 Sideroad.

## REGIONAL ROADS

It is acknowledged that Regional roads are in the jurisdiction of York Region and their improvements had been addressed in the Region's TMP (2016). The widening of 15th Sideroad from two to four lanes between Highway 400 and Bathurst Street was identified for 2032-2041. As indicated in the 2031 future screenline assessment in Section 4.3, there would be capacity deficiencies at the screenline by 2031, which are due to the forecasted 2031 future traffic volumes and the major developments in King City. The Township and the Region should consider advancing the timeline of this recommended road widening project prior to 2031. In addition, as the road section is within an environmentally sensitive area, a further study and analysis is required.
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### 4.5.3 PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY

The required road right-of-way (ROW) should consider the needs of future roadway improvements and ensure that sufficient road ROW is protected to accommodate roadway components as per the Township's Design Standard.

The proposed ROW is based on the proposed road classification and the Township's standard crosssections defined in the Township's Design Criteria and Standard Detail Drawings Manual (2019). The Design Manual requires collector roads to have a ROW of 26 metres, and local roads to have a ROW of 20 metres. The proposed ROW for the roadways within the Township is illustrated in Figure 4-27.

The ROW for Regional roads shown in Figure 4-27 are based on the York Region's Official Plan (2010). Township roads with potential to be uploaded to the Region are protected for a ROW of 36 metres to be consistent with the current minimum ROW standard for a Regional road.

Note that the constrained ROW due to abutting properties and other constraints were not assessed in this TMP. Furthermore, the Township may require additional lands at intersections to provide exclusive turn lanes, bus queue jump lanes, transit stop amenities, and other special treatments during the construction of bridges, overpasses and underpasses, and possible parking bays. These would be determined through development applications, individual EA studies, if required, or during detailed design of the roadway.
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### 4.5.4 PROPOSED GOODS MOVEMENT NETWORK

The Township is close to several major truck traffic generating activities such as quarries, industries, warehousing, farms, and intermodal terminals. Truck traffic uses any of the Regional roads, Highway 9 and Highway 400 to transport goods to key industrial/construction areas in neighbouring municipalities. The Township experiences heavy truck volumes on Regional roads within its boundaries as well as many of its roads. King Road is a major link for traffic from outside of the Township to access Highway 400, resulting in significant truck traffic in Nobleton and King City.
The York Region TMP (2016) recommended a hierarchy of truck routes within the Township as shown in Figure 4-28. It identified Highway 400 and rail lines as Tier 1 goods movement corridors; major arterial roads, such as Highway 9 / Davis Drive West, Highway 27, and King Road, as Tier 2 primary goods movement corridors. King Road was classified as an interim primary goods movement corridor which is to be replaced by the future $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad once it connects to Highway 400 . All other Regional roads were classified as Tier 3 secondary goods movement corridors.
All roads without special restrictions are allowed for heavy vehicles, regardless of whether it is a planned goods movement corridor or not. Roads identified as part of the goods movement corridors are expected to experience higher volumes of truck traffic and should be designed as truck-friendly.
To limit the impacts of truck traffic on the Township's communities and ensure proper connections with the Region recommended network, York Region's recommended goods movement network within the Township was reviewed to consider potential improvements to promote truck traffic on routes that offer direct connections to the provincial and inter-regional road networks. The following additional goods movement corridors are proposed, as shown in Figure 4-28.
$\rightarrow$ Miller Sideroad and Dufferin Street (Miller's Sideroad to Davis Drive West): The roadways experience relatively high volumes of traffic including heavy vehicles as many vehicles bypass portions of Davis Drive West to access Highway 400.
$\rightarrow$ Keele Street (Davis Drive West to $18^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad), 17 $^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad (Jane Street to Dufferin Street), Caledon King Town Line South ( $17^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad to Township south limits): The roadways essentially operate as arterial roads. As discussed in Section 4.5.5, they have potential to be uploaded as Regional roads.
$\rightarrow$ 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad (Caledon King Town Line South to Highway 27): The goods movement network on the mid-west section of the Township lacks east-west connections.
$\rightarrow$ "Nobleton Loop" - 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad (Highway 400 to $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession), $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession ( $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad to King Road), $8^{\text {th }}$ Concession ( $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad to King Road), $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession (King Road to King Vaughan Road): This loop is proposed to reduce truck volumes on King Road that pass through Nobleton. The Township of King and the City of Vaughan could consider extending the route along $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession to King Vaughan Road to improve the goods movement network connectivity and help divert some of the heavy vehicle traffic on King Road to King Vaughan Road via the $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession and to the GTA West Corridor. Any required intersection improvements to accommodate truck traffic, such as possible improvements to the intersection of $8^{\text {th }}$ Concession and King Road, should be reviewed at the same time.
$\rightarrow$ "King City Bypass" - King Vaughan Road (Jane Street to Keele Street): This bypass is proposed to reduce trucks passing through King City via the intersection of Keele Street and King Road to enter / exit Highway 400. This intersection is the centre of the King City community and currently experiences high levels of congestion in the peak hours. Providing a bypass would help in community building and would enable different uses of the right-of-way in this historic downtown centre. The Township of King and the City of Vaughan could consider diverting truck traffic heading north on Keele Street destined for Highway 400 to use King Vaughan Road to access Jane Street and King Road to connect to the highway.

## 61

Similarly, truck traffic heading south to connect to Highway 400 can use $17^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad to connect to Jane Street and then King Road to access the highway. This diversion will alleviate truck traffic at the King Road and Keele Street intersection. On-street parking, turn lanes and other aspects of the road network in the King/Keele intersection area can be revisited if through trucks are re-routed. Signage and education would need to be enacted to inform the trucking industry of the desired bypass for trucks.
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## FUTURE ROADWAYS TO UPLOAD TO REGION

As the surrounding areas and the Township of King continue to grow, more and more trips of regional and inter-regional nature use the Township roads. As part of the 2020 TMP, Township roads that are currently heavily travelled by regional and inter-regional traffic have been identified as potential roads to be uploaded to York Region.

The Regional Road assumption policy, adopted on June 26, 2014, outlines the requirements for adopting new Regional roads. A summary of the policy is provided in Table 4-7.

## Table 4-7: Considerations for the Interjurisdictional Transfer of a Road

### 1.1 Regionally Significant Transportation Network Criteria

To form part of the Regional Road system, the road must support the Region's transportation plans and objectives as defined by (but not limited to) the Transportation Master Plan, Regional Official Plan and Vision 2051.
Additionally, to form a part of the Regional Road system, the road must meet one of the following functions:
a. Perform a cross-boundary, inter-regional or inter-municipal function;
b. Provide a logical connection in the Regional Road network and will fill a gap where one currently exists;
c. Provide a direct link to the Provincial highway system; or
d. Support an existing or planned rapid transit route or connection to a major transit hub.
1.2 EXISTING CORRIDOR AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AND ISSUES

It is necessary to assess the existing conditions of the road and any issues related to the road, including:
a. The environmental conditions of the road (such as a Phase 1 environmental site assessment);
b. Whether there an any issues with drainage, traffic noise, or access;
c. The condition of the pavement, and streetscape and trees, and any structures, culverts, and retaining walls associated with the road; and
d. Whether there are any outstanding legal issues.

Any significant existing corridor and environmental conditions or issues may require additional analysis or assessment by the Region or the local municipality before a recommendation is made concerning whether to transfer jurisdiction of the road.

### 1.3 FINANCIAL AND Operational COSTS

Consideration shall also be given to the following financial and operational matters:
a. Anticipated long-term operating and capital costs of the road (asset management/life cycle costs);
b. Short-term maintenance costs taking into consideration the condition of the road;
c. Impact of road operational plans and facilities; and
d. Development charges and asset replacement reserves to be transferred by the local municipality.

Source: York Region Regional Road Assumption Policy (June 2014)

It should be noted that identifying existing corridor and environmental issues, as well as financial and operational costs is beyond the scope of this TMP. Therefore, the road segments were solely assessed against the regionally significant transportation network criteria in the policy, as summarized as item 1.1 in Table 4-7.

Based on the policy guidelines and consultation with the Township, the potential candidate road segments to be transferred to York Region and their rationale are identified and summarized in Table 4-8.

Table 4-8: Potential Candidate Road Segments for Transfer to York Region

| Roadway | From | To | Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caledon King Townline | 17th Sideroad | Township's South Limits | $\rightarrow$ Performs a cross-boundary, inter-regional or inter-municipal function. |
|  |  |  | $\rightarrow$ Performs like an arterial road (current and forecasted future AADT > 5000 veh). |
| Caledon King Townline | Highway 9 | 19th Sideroad | $\rightarrow$ Performs a cross-boundary, inter-regional or inter-municipal function. |
| Miller's Sideroad | Dufferin Street | BathurstStreet | $\rightarrow$ Performs like an arterial road (current and forecasted future AADT > 5000 veh). |
|  |  |  | $\rightarrow$ Provides a logical connection in the Regional road network and will fill a gap where one currently exists. Connects to Green Lane West in Newmarket, which is a Regional road. |
| 17th Sideroad | Jane Street East | Dufferin Street | $\rightarrow$ Performs like an arterial road (current and forecasted future AADT > 5000 veh). |
|  |  |  | $\rightarrow$ Provides a logical connection in the Regional road network and will fill a gap where one currently exists. Connects to several Regional roads:16th Sideroad to the east, and crosses Janes Street, Keele Street, and Dufferin Street. |

There are additional roadways that currently do not necessarily meet the thresholds of the Region's policy, but are potential candidates to be transferred to the Region based on the future Region recommended road network and the proposed goods movement corridors in this TMP. A summary of these road segments and their rationale are provided in Table 4-9.
Figure 4-29 provides a visual summary of all the proposed roadways with potential to be uploaded. For these road segments identified, it is proposed that the Township begin discussions with the Region on their transfer to Regional control due to the high level of regional and inter-regional traffic using these segments.

It should be noted that any potential road transfer proposed in this TMP is subject to future review and approval by York Region, and Council's approval as may be required by York Region, in accordance with the Regional Road Assumption Policy.

Table 4-9: Road Segments for Transfer to York Region to Consider (for future discussions)

| ROADWAY | FROM | TO | RATIONALE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15th Sideroad | 10th Concession | Keele Street | $\rightarrow \quad$ 15th Sideroad from Bathurst Street to Highway 400 is proposed as a primaryarterial goods movement corridor in York Region's TMP (2016). Furthermore, an interchange at Highway 400 and 15th Sideroad is proposed for horizon year 2032 to 2041. Therefore, 15th Sideroad will provide a direct link to the Provincial highway system. <br> $\rightarrow$ To prevent high east/westheavy vehicle traffic passing through Nobleton via King Road, the primary arterial goods movement corridor along 15th Sideroad should be proposed west to 10th Concession. <br> $\rightarrow$ In addition, to prevent heavy north/south heavy vehicle traffic from passing through Nobleton via Highway27, 10th Concession and 8th Concession from 15th Sideroad to King Road should also be part of York Region's goods movement network. It should be noted that stop signs along $8^{\text {th }}$ Concession should not be used as a deterrent to prevent north-south traffic. |
| 10th <br> Concession | 15th Sideroad | King Vaughan Road |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 8th Concession | 15th Sideroad | King Road |  |
| Dufferin Street | Miller Sideroad | Davis Drive West | $\rightarrow$ Provides connectivity between Miller's Sideroad and Davis Drive West, which are Regional roads experiencing high volumes of traffic. To also be proposed as part of the goods movement network. |
| Keele Street | 18th Sideroad | Davis Drive West | $\rightarrow$ Keele Street to the south of 18th Sideroad is currently a Regional road. The segment provides a logical north-south connection between two Regional roads (Davis Drive Westand 18th Sideroad). |
|  |  |  | $\rightarrow$ The current traffic on the roadway is comprised of approximately $5 \%$ heavy vehicles. |



## PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the following roadway recommendations are proposed for the Township's consideration to guide the planning, design, implementation and operations of its road network:

1 Establish a rational road classification to guide future planning and capital works, as provided in Figure 4-15 to Figure 4-18;

2 Update the Township's Official Plan to reflect the right-of-way needs and ensure that sufficient ROW is protected to accommodate roadway components as per the Township's design standard;
3 Work with the Region to consider development of the proposed goods movement routes identified in Figure 4-28;
4 Conduct studies to assess the potential impacts of the GTA West Corridor on the villages of Nobleton and King City. The Township should also consider working with the Region and neighbouring municipalities such as Vaughan to assess any land use impacts and implement land use policies to mitigate any potential impacts;
5 Work with the Region to commence an environmental assessment study for $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad to investigate the feasibility and impacts of extending and widening the road between Highway 400 and Bathurst Street. Special studies may be required for this proposed project as it is within an environmentally sensitive area;
6 Commence dialogue with York Region regarding the uploading of roads in the short and medium term in accordance with York Region's policy, and obtain Council's approval, as may be required; and
7 Update the functional design and parking capacity report for the King Road and Keele Street intersection, and move towards implementation of recommendations.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Active transportation (AT) refers to any form of human-powered transportation that facilitates active living, including:
$\rightarrow$ Walking, jogging, running;
$\rightarrow$ Cycling;
$\rightarrow$ In-line skating;
$\rightarrow$ Skateboarding;
$\rightarrow$ Cross-country skiing and snowshoeing; and
$\rightarrow$ Using a wheelchair.
Active transportation is supported by the Township of King and Region as an integral component of a multi-modal transportation system to enhance mobility options and accessibility for people of all ages and abilities. Active transportation can also provide cost-effective travel options that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and mitigate climate change impacts. In addition to active transportation for the purposes of regular travel, the Township's extensive trail system, a section of which is shown in Figure 5-1, helps support local and regional tourism initiatives and accommodates active forms of recreation such as hiking and off-road cycling, particularly in the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt areas.
As part of developing the Township's 2020 TMP, a process was undertaken to review, refine and identify a preferred active transportation network. The following sections provide an overview of key components for the active transportation network including the current conditions in King, recommendations identified in previous planning documents, gaps and infill links, facility types and potential enhancements. The information contained in the following sections is intended to be used as a reference for Township staff when addressing the future planning of active transportation infrastructure.

Figure 5-1: King Township Municipal Centre


Source: WSP

### 5.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Based on information from the 2016 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS), approximately $3 \%$ of residents in the Township cycle and walk as their primary mode of transportation. These trips are typically originating in the Township's most populated areas including King City, Nobleton and Schomberg, where there are higher number of residents and community destinations.
Research shows that a typical walking distance, such as to transit, is 400 metres ( 5 minutes) to 800 metres ( 10 minutes), and average cycling distance can range from 1 kilometre ( 4 minutes) to 5 kilometres ( 20 minutes). As the distance increases, it is more difficult to attract people to walk and ride a bicycle. The Township should strive to provide high quality walking and cycling facilities that are comfortable and convenient to a wide range of users to maximize return on transportation investments. The Township's three villages, King City, Nobleton and Schomberg, are considered to have higher potential for walking and cycling, as the urban boundaries are less than 1.5 kilometres from the centres. For further distances where transit may be more appropriate, such as the King City GO Station, active transportation is typically used as a first or last-mile connection. First and last-mile trips refer to the beginning and end of transit trips between stations or stops to homes.
In total, there are over 300 kilometres of existing active transportation facilities. These include routes under the jurisdiction of York Region, The Township of King, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Table 5-1 summarizes the different facility types and lengths.

Table 5-1: Summary of Existing AT Facilities

| FACILITY | LeNGTH (KM) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sidewalk | 85.7 |
| Off-Road Trail | 136.3 |
| Bike Lane | 2.7 |
| Paved Shoulder | 73.2 |
| Signed Route | 21.9 |
| Total | 319.8 |

This table summarizes the length
of existing facility types located
on roads and lands under the jurisdiction of the Township, Region and Conservation Authorities.
It is recommended that a future study, such as a separate Active
Transportation Master Plan, be undertaken and as part of this scope, organize geo-spatial information (GIS data to include jurisdiction information) regarding existing routes and facilities. The
Township should engage the
Region's Sustainable Mobility Section when undertaking this future study.

Source: 2019 King Township GIS Datab ase
Figure 5-2 to Figure 5-5 illustrate the existing active transportation network by facility type. Table 5-2 provides an overview for each facility type included in the Township's active transportation network.
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Table 5-2: Summary of Existing AT Facilities

| FACILITY TYPE | Cross Section | DESCRIPTION | CONTEXT | RECOMMENDED WIDTH | EXAMPLES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk |  | A space within the boulevard which accommodates pedestrians. | Urban | 1.8 m | $\rightarrow$ Burns Boulevard (King Road to Station Road) <br> $\rightarrow$ Mactaggart Drive (Sheardown Drive to Highway27) |
| Off-Road Multi-Use Trail |  | A separated space typicallythrough a natural area or corridor that accommodates pedestrians and cyclists. The surface type can range from natural surface to asphalt depending on the surrounding environment and expected type of uses. | Rural Urban | 3.0 m | $\rightarrow$ Oak Ridges Moraine Trail <br> $\rightarrow$ King City Trails System <br> $\rightarrow$ Cold Creek Conservation Area <br> $\rightarrow$ Nobleton Trail System <br> $\rightarrow$ Pottageville Park Trail <br> $\rightarrow$ Centennial Park Trails <br> $\rightarrow$ Happy Valley Forest <br> $\rightarrow$ Thornton Bales Conservation Area |
| Bike Lane |  | Cyclists are provided with a designated space which is identified by pavement markings and signage. Bike lanes could include green painted treatment along key corridors. When approaching an intersection dash lines to allow for passing. | Urban | Lane $1.5-2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\rightarrow$ Bathurst Street (19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad to Davis Drive West) |


| FACILITY TYPE | Cross Section | DESCRIPTION | CONTEXT | RECOMMENDED WIDTH | EXAMPLES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paved Shoulder |  | Cyclists are provided with a shared space on the road platform. The route is signed as a bicycle route and could include supplementary share the road signage in select locations. In rural areas, bicycles would share the same shoulder space with farming equipment (tractors). | Rural | $1.5-2.0$ m | $\rightarrow$ Jane Street (King-Vaughan Road to King Road) <br> $\rightarrow$ 15th Sideroad (Keele Street to Bathurst Street) <br> $\rightarrow$ King Road (Caledon-King Townline to $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road) |
| Signed Bike Route |  | Motorists and cyclists share the same vehicular travel lane. Bicycle route signs are used to provide route guidelines. Could be supplemented bya Share the Road Sign in select locations (poor sightlines). | Rural Urban | Shared lane | $\rightarrow \quad$ 19th Sideroad (Keele Street to Bathurst Street) <br> $\rightarrow$ Dr. Kay Drive (Main Street to Cooper Drive) <br> $\rightarrow$ Cooper Drive / Main Street (Dr. Kay Drive to Highway 27) |

### 5.2 PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS

The Town's active transportation network is intended to build upon routes that are already existing and routes that have been previously identified in other planning documents, or routes identified by other agencies. The following is a detailed description of the various jurisdictions and elements that provided input into the strategic direction of the Township's active transportation network:

| York Region's 2016 TMP identified areas of improvement, focusing <br> on the regional gateways and connections between municipalities. <br> Along Regional roads, the TMP proposed sidewalk improvements <br> within Nobleton, King City and Schomberg to fill in gaps. Key <br> corridors within King that had recommended improvements include: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | North-South |
|  | $\rightarrow$ Highway 27 |
| REGIONAL ROUTES | $\rightarrow$ Weston Road |
|  | $\rightarrow$ Jane Street |
|  | $\rightarrow$ Keele Street |
|  | $\rightarrow$ Dufferin Street |
|  | $\rightarrow$ Bathurst Street |

LSRCA and TRCA both have jurisdiction over several natural areas with trails located within the Township. LSRCA manages the northern area of King, specifically the conservation areas of Thornton-Bales and Tyrwhitt. There are current no planned trail expansions.
TRCA released a draft Trails Strategy in November of 2018. This included six significant trail projects in King:
$\rightarrow$ Humber-Don Connection (3.2 kilometres)
$\rightarrow$ Humber Trail (20.3 kilometres)

- High priority
- Connects Nashville Conservation Reserve to Bolton
$\rightarrow$ Moraine Corridor Park Trail (3.3 kilometres)
- Medium priority
$\rightarrow$ Oak Ridges Corridor Park Trail (2.2 kilometres)
- High priority
$\rightarrow$ The Meadoway (King) (10.2 kilometres)
$\rightarrow$ The Meadoway (King-Vaughan) (12.9 kilometres)
TRCA also suggests destination capital projects that support local trails tourism and connect to the Township including Hills of the Headwater, Humber Valley Wilderness and Kettle Lakes.



## LOCAL ROUTES

The Township's 2015 TMP included recommendations that were considered and incorporated into this TMP. The recommendations proposed were to focus on co-ordination with York Region to define networks that better connect to key destinations, such as schools, community centres and transit hubs.
The Township of King also has a Trails Master Plan, which has a high-level review of the existing trails network. Recommendations from the Plan include:
$\rightarrow$ Upgrades to existing trails;
$\rightarrow$ New trails for increased accessibility and connectivity;
$\rightarrow$ Enhanced signage, wayfinding and trailheads;
$\rightarrow$ Recommendations for maintenance and operations; and
$\rightarrow$ Strategies for increasing awareness of trails.
Large-scale subdivision developments have proposed the implementation of active transportation routes. Most notably, the King City East development at the south-west section of Dufferin Street and 15th Sideroad has proposed sidewalks on one side of most of the new planned roads. Multi-use paths are also planned along one side of the planned roads that link to $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad and Dufferin Street.

### 5.3 GAPS

Building upon existing and previously proposed routes, the Township's active transportation network was assessed to better understand current gaps and potential areas where infill links can enhance network connectivity and complete missing routes within King. To support the TMP objectives, infill links were identified to help enhance opportunities for active transportation and recreation within the Township, and to support the integration of walking, cycling and other active forms of travel into the overall transportation system for the Township.
The selection of potential new infill links reflects current best practices related to the planning and design of multi-modal transportation systems including Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18: Cycling Facilities (2013 and forth-coming update) and Book 15: Pedestrian Crossings (2016) as well as York Region's Transportation Master Plan (2016). Potential infill links for the Township's active transportation were identified based on several considerations including:
$\rightarrow$ Completing gaps between existing routes / facilities;
$\rightarrow$ Connections to regional trail systems;
$\rightarrow$ Enhancing connectivity surrounding and within the Township's villages and hamlets;
$\rightarrow$ Connecting to existing transit services including YRT and GO Transit;
$\rightarrow$ Reflecting popular cycling routes as noted by residents, stakeholders and Township; and
$\rightarrow$ Connecting to key destinations such as libraries, schools, recreational areas and community centres.

Potential new infill links can be grouped into three categories: on-road links, off-road links and sidewalks. Sidewalks were typically identified in locations where:
$\rightarrow$ There is a gap between existing sidewalks on the same side of the road (or in some locations, a gap between an existing sidewalk and off-road trail); and
$\rightarrow$ In locations where a sidewalk only exists on one side of the road and results in out-of-way travel to reach a key destination.
Table 5-3 provides an overview of each proposed infill link by category.
Table 5-3: Overview of Proposed Infill Links for the Active Transportation Network

| Infill Links - On Road |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROAD NAME | FROM | TO | LOCATION | LENGTH (KM) |
| Carmichael Crescent | Keele Street | Jenkinson Grove | King City | 0.6 |
| Jenkinson Grove | Carmichael Crescent | Tawes Trail | King City | 0.23 |
| Burton Grove | Keele Street | McBride Crescent | King City | 0.26 |
| McBride Crescent | Burton Grove | Elizabeth Grove | King City | 0.35 |
| $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad | $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession | $7^{\text {th }}$ Concession | Nobleton | 6.14 |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ Concession | $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad | King Road | Nobleton | 2.16 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 9.74 |


| Infill Links - Off Road |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTE NAME | FROM | TO | LOCATION | LENGTH (KM) |
| Proposed extension of King City Trail that terminates at Manitou Drive | Manitou Drive | 140 metres south / west of Manitou Drive within vacant land parcel | King City | 0.14 |
| Proposed connection to Cold Creek CA Trail along Bluff Trail | Cold Creek CA Trail along Bluff Trail | 170 metres north / eastto existing off-road trail | Nobleton | 0.17 |
| Proposed off-road trail from Gilbert Fuller Drive | Gilbert Fuller Drive | Existing crushed limestone trail south of Farmcrest Court | Nobleton | 0.31 |
| Proposed off-road trail from Sheardown Drive to King Road | Sheardown Drive (at Mactaggart Drive) | King Road (at Henry Gate) | Nobleton | 0.5 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 1.12 |


| INFILL LINKS - Sidewalks |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTE NAME | FROM | TO | LOCATION | LENGTH (KM) |
| King Road and driveway into Township municipal centre | Burns Boulevard | Driveway entrance into the Township of King municipal centre | King City | 0.57 |
| Keele Street | Burton Grove | Sculptors Gate | King City | 0.22 |
| King Road | Wellington Street | Henry Gate | Nobleton | 0.51 |
| King Road | Lynwood Crescent | Woodhill Crescent | Nobleton | 0.42 |
| Main Street | Highway9 | 100 metres south to existing sidewalk | Schomberg | 0.1 |
| Highway27 | Dr. Kay Drive | Main Street | Schomberg | 0.63 |
| Dr. Kay Drive | Foodland driveway | Highway27 | Schomberg | 0.08 |
| Main Street | Petro-Canada driveway | Highway27 | Schomberg | 0.02 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 2.55 |

In total, an additional 13 kilometres of new routes are proposed as part of this TMP to complete the Township's active transportation network. All new infill links were further assessed to determine a preliminary recommendation for an appropriate facility type.

### 5.4 PROPOSED NETWORK BY FACILITY TYPES

Infill links were assessed to determine the most appropriate facility type based on the roadway characteristics including traffic volume and operating speeds. The proposed facility types are meant to achieve a network that can accommodate all ages and all abilities and can help to enhance opportunities for active travel and recreation in the Township of King.
The proposed active transportation routes by facility types are presented in Figure 5-6 to Figure 5-9 and summarized in Table 5-4. In total, there are 263 kilometres of proposed active transportation facilities in the Township. This includes routes that were previously proposed in other planning documents (see Section 5.2) as well as new infill links (approximately 13 kilometres - refer to Section 5.3) identified through this study.
Majority of the proposed facility types already exist within the Township; the only new proposed facility type is the In-Boulevard Pathway or Multi-Use Path. Multi-Use paths provide safe off-road areas for a variety of user groups to travel. While developing them in urban corridors is ideal, special limitations may prohibit the development and may require creative planning and implementation to provide continuous links to key transportation nodes.

Table 5-4: Overview of the Active Transportation Network by Facility Type

| FACILITY TYPE | EXISTING | PROPOSED | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-Road Trail | 136.3 | 89.4 | 225.7 |
| In-Boulevard Pathway (Multi-Use Paths) | 0 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
| Bike Lane | 2.7 | 3.2 | 5.9 |
| Paved Shoulder | 73.2 | 72.8 | 146.0 |
| Signed Route | 21.9 | 63.7 | 85.6 |
| Sidewalk | 85.7 | 21.5 | 107.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 1 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 3 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 3 . 1}$ |

The proposed facility that form part of the Township's active transportation network are intended to be consistent with existing guidelines and standards. All active transportation facilities along existing or proposed Regional roads should adhere to the Region's Pedestrian and Cycling Planning and Design Guidelines. In addition, it is recommended that the following be used and referred to as the most applicable resources for AT facility design in the Township of King:
$\rightarrow$ Ontario Traffic Manuals Books 18 (Cycling Facilities) and 15 (Pedestrian Crossings); and
$\rightarrow$ Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) Bikeways Design Manual.
These resources can be supplemented by several existing guidelines including:
$\rightarrow$ National Association of City Transportation Officials Urban Bikeway Design Guide;
$\rightarrow$ Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads;
$\rightarrow$ Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Bikeway Traffic Control Guideline for Canada; and
$\rightarrow$ Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act - Built Environment Standards.
These guidelines are recommended to be used by Township staff and its partners when moving forward with the planning, design and implementation of future active transportation facilities in King.
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FIGURE 5-8 IOBLETON RECOMMENDED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
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## NETWORK COMPONENTS

In addition to the proposed routes and facilities, there are two network components that have been identified to help increase a user's sense of comfort and safety, and to encourage more people to engage in active forms of travel and recreation. These network components are illustrated in Figure 5-6 to Figure 5-9 and include:

## $\square$ Crossing Enhancements

Crossing enhancements have been proposed for system connectivity where there is a pedestrian or cycling desire line at a Regional road and a need for safer and more convenient crossing facilities. Intersections can be vulnerable locations for active transportation users, as this is the most common place where different modes interact.
There are six potential crossing enhancement locations identified on Figure 5-6, including:
$\rightarrow \begin{aligned} & \text { Keele Street at Sculptors Gate, King } \\ & \text { City }\end{aligned}$
$\rightarrow$ Midblock crossing of King City Trail at Keele Street / E Humber Drive, King City
$\rightarrow$ King Road at Henry Gate, Nobleton
$\rightarrow$ Highway 27 at Ellis Avenue / Parkview Avenue, Nobleton
$\rightarrow$ King Road at Woodhill Avenue, Nobleton
$\rightarrow$ Highway 27 at Main Street, Schomberg
There are several design treatments that can help to improve a pedestrian's ability to cross a roadway or intersection: uncontrolled crossing ("wait for gap"), pedestrian crossover (PXO) and traffic signals.
Specific improvements should be reviewed and determined through future detailed studies to address the unique challenges and opportunities experienced by the particular location. It is recommended that the Township review and explore with York Region opportunities to provide safe mid-block pedestrian and active transportation crossings according to their Pedestrian and Cycling Planning and Design Guidelines.

These are intended to be all ages and abilities bicycle loop routes of between five to ten kilometres within the Township's villages of King City, Schomberg and Nobleton to connect cycling routes and destinations. The loops could contain wayfinding signage including the green Bicycle Route Marker sign and branded signage to direct users to surrounding trails, parks, community centres, attractions and other amenities for residents and visitors. In addition to cycling loops, "Discovery Walks" can be identified through wayfinding / branded signage to highlight the unique natural and cultural heritage of the area.
Examples of branded loop routes are illustrated below:


North Scarborough Green Loop, Toronto Source: Scarb orough Cycles


Waterloop Trail, Waterloo
Source: City of Waterloo

### 5.5 PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the Active Transportation component in the Township's TMP is to guide next steps and future work to integrate active transportation into King's overall transportation system, and to enhance opportunities for active travel and recreation. The following recommendations have been identified to guide the planning, design, implementation and operations of active transportation:

1 Develop an Active Transportation (AT) Master Plan to review the recommended active transportation facility types identified in this TMP at a site-specific level, and identify strategies to inform supportive programs, policies, implementation tools and initiatives that support the Township's vision and objectives for active transportation.
As part of the AT Master Plan, prioritize and phase the recommended network to implement the plan in a strategic and fiscally-responsible way. Many of the facilities require partnerships. Having an AT Master Plan will help leverage funding opportunities such as the York Region Pedestrian and Cycling Municipal Partnership Program, and the Ontario Municipal Commuter Cycling Program. An AT Master Plan also helps provide a mechanism for funding and implementing as part of the development process.
2 Work with Metrolinx and York Region to improve opportunities for active transportation users on Keele Street near the King City GO Station, as part of recommended improvements scheduled to start and end in 2020.

3 Prioritize for implementation and maintenance walkable pathways to key destinations such as Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA), community centres, schools and other facilities;
4 Work closely with York Region on the implementation of new pedestrian crossings of Regional Roads at identified locations within the urban areas of King City, Nobleton and Schomberg to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and mobility. New pedestrian crossings require thorough analysis and careful consideration using engineering tools and data, and should also consider potential new design solutions such as pedestrian crossovers (PXOs) that are detailed in Ontario Traffic Manual Book 15: Pedestrian Crossings.
5 Work with web mapping services, such as Google Maps, to advertise active transportation routes by adding existing on and off-road infrastructure that can be viewed publicly. Township staff may also consider creating / enabling Google street view for all trails in King.

6 Work with Smart Commute and York Region on behaviour change programs to encourage active transportation and transit to replace drive-alone car trips during peak periods, such as getting to and from the King City GO Station.
7 Establish "cycling loops" within King City, Nobleton and Schomberg, and branding these loops with signage to direct people to trails, parks, community centres, attractions and other local amenities to generate interest in cycling for recreation, commuting, and tourism.

8 Partner with York Region to sign York Region Cycling Tour Routes within King for economic and tourism development. Signage placement should be consistent with the Region's cycling wayfinding guidelines and can be installed along routes including: Village Roundabout, Tour de Holland, and All-Terrain Ride. Consider implementing a pilot project using York Region's Pedestrian and Cycling Wayfinding Guidelines.
9 Support emerging active transportation technologies, such as e-bikes and e-scooters, by passing by-laws for usage and safe operations.

10 When roads are next scheduled for reconstruction, rehabilitation or resurfacing, where possible, widen roads with sufficient road base width to include up to two-metre paved shoulder and/or cycling facilities.

11 Understand full lifecycle costs of new infrastructure to support long-term sustainability of the network through an asset management plan. Pedestrian and cycling facilities should be considered as assets and appropriately managed by including maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement in the capital and operating budgets.

## TRANSIT

Transit is a basic mobility service that provides residents access to employment, community resources, medical care facilities, and recreational activities within the Township and beyond. Integrating transit planning into broader economic and land use planning helps to reduce sprawl, and creates a sense of community by increasing street presence which enhances neighbourhood safety and security. A frequent, connected and reliable transit network also can help reduce road congestion, travel times and air pollution, all of which benefit both riders and non-riders.
To support the forecasted growth and create a more sustainable community, the Township needs to continue to engage York Region Transit (YRT) and GO Transit to enhance viable and accessible transit services for residents. Recognizing the challenge of providing quality transit over the Township's vast service area with moderate demand, the Township will need to continue working closely with these transit providers to develop a comprehensive transit strategy.

### 6.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Currently, the Township is served by several local YRT bus routes and GO Transit services. YRT operates fixed-route bus services on King Road, Keele Street, $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad and Bathurst Street; Mobility On-Request (MOR) service is available within King connecting King City, Laskay, Nobleton, Schomberg, Pottageville and Kettleby. GO Transit also operates regional bus services within the Township in addition to the train service along the Barrie line; three GO bus services are provided including two regular service and one express service. A summary of the various YRT and GO Transit services within the Township along with service frequencies are provided in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1: Existing Transit Services


Source: York Regional Transit \& GO Transit
Notes: GO Bus 66 onlyoperates in the SB direction during weekday early mornings; GO Train Barrie Line only operates in the SB direction during weekday mornings and in the NB direction during PM peak periods; GO Bus 63 only operates in the NB direction during weekday early mornings; GOBus 68C only operates in the NB direction during weekday PM peak periods.

Most transit services within the Township operate during the weekdays with few services operating on the weekends.

### 6.1.1

6.1.2

## GO TRANSIT

GO Transit operates both the Barrie commuter rail line and regional bus services in the Township. Three bus routes, \#66, \#63, and \#68C currently operate within the Township limits. Out of the three routes, only Route \#66 is designed to be a standalone route to support the service. It operates five days a week, Monday to Friday, connecting the Yorkdale subway station to the Newmarket bus terminal, with a stop at the Highway 9 at Highway 400 Park and Ride. The other two routes are designed to be complements to the Barrie Rail line, replacing train service during off peak periods and on weekends.
Currently, the King GO Station on the Barrie Line is the only train station that connects the Township to Downtown Toronto. It provides train services seven days a week with a focus on peak commuting directions. On weekdays, the southbound service stops by 3 p.m. and resumes around 9 p.m., with an a.m. peak hour headway of 15 -minutes. The northbound service is available starting at 10:20 a.m., with a p.m. peak hour headway of 30 -minutes. On weekends, service for either direction is available after 10 a.m.
Besides the Mobility On-Request service provided by Route \#61, currently only two routes provided by YRT provide connecting service to the King City GO Station - Route \#22 and \#96. Commuters alighting the YRT buses and boarding the Barrie Line in the mornings consistently experience wait times around 15 minutes before the next train arrives. In the afternoons, commuters transferring from the GO train to the YRT buses also face similar challenges, although slightly shorter wait times.

The existing transit network within the Township is illustrated in Figure 6-1.
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## 6.2 <br> PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS

Several service and infrastructure improvements have been previously proposed by Metrolinx, York Region, YRT, and the 2015 King TMP. These improvements are discussed in the following sections.

### 6.2.1 METROLINX

In 2015, Metrolinx announced its signature project in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) region - GO Rail Expansion. The GO Rail Expansion is meant to be a transformative initiative to provide faster and more frequent service on the GO Transit rail network. As illustrated in Figure 6-2, under this program, the King City GO Station on the Barrie Rail Line will have15-minute two-way service during the weekday rush hours, mid-day, and evening periods. The improvements outlined in the Rail Expansion program are expected to be in place by 2026. The program is expected to more than double GO Rail's peak service and quadruple its off-peak service, which is expected to in turn increase ridership demand and increased transit modal split throughout the GTHA.

Figure 6-2: Rail Expansion along Barrie Rail Corridor


Source: Metrolinx Barrie Line Website (http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/rer/rer_barrie.aspx)

Furthermore, the Rail Expansion program has also identified several potential new stations that are to be confirmed through detailed studies. Figure 6-3 shows the anticipated GO Rail service network and levels for the planned Rail Expansion program. On the Barrie Line, three potential new stations have been identified, including the Kirby GO Station south of King City GO Station.
In the same document, Metrolinx has also identified the role of transit in ensuring adequate station access. It highlights the importance of a direct, high frequency, local transit route with seamless transfer to GO rail.

Figure 6-3: Anticipated GO Rail Service Levels


[^5]Also included in the document were several station improvements Metrolinx intends to explore for the King City GO Station, prioritized for the following time periods:

Short-term (2017-2021):
$\rightarrow$ Encourage the Township of King to consider expediting the implementation of approximately four kilometres of proposed pedestrian infrastructure within a one-kilometre walking distance of King City GO;
$\rightarrow$ Consider implementing the modified reserve parking program on all existing parking spaces at this station (approximately 640 spaces); and
$\rightarrow$ As part of the planned improvements to the east station site, consider the following improvements:

- Implementing a pedestrian connection along the east-west alignment of the signalized intersection;
- Aligning the bus stops and shelters on the east and west side of Keele Street;
- Incorporating a new pick-up/drop-off facility adjacent to the north end of the east station platform;
- Configuring the vehicle waiting area as short-term parking; and
- Providing dedicated access from this facility to Station Street.

Medium-term (2022-2026):
$\rightarrow$ Encourage YRT to consider enhancements to frequencies for routes that serve high concentrations of GO passengers to align with planned GO rail service levels;
$\rightarrow$ Encourage York Region and the Township to consider expediting the planned implementation of cycling infrastructure along Keele Street and King Road;
$\rightarrow$ Consider ride-sourcing partnerships to provide options for Park ' $n$ ' Ride customers to connect to this station;
$\rightarrow$ Consider providing information about available peer-to-peer parking options around this station to GO rail customers;
$\rightarrow$ As part of the planned redevelopment of the east station site, consider expanding parking by 850 spaces using a combination of surface and alternative parking solutions. If these solutions are not feasible, consider developing a conventional parking structure; and
$\rightarrow$ As part of the planned improvements to the east station site, consider installing bike shelters at the northern end of the main east GO station site to include covered bicycle parking and a bike repair stand.

As part of the Rail Expansion initiative, Metrolinx proposed to convert several rail corridors within the GO Transit network from diesel to electric propulsion, including the Barrie corridor from Parkdale Junction to Allandale GO Station. Metrolinx and Hydro One completed the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the GO Rail Network Electrification project in October 2017, filing the Notice to Proceed in December 2017. The increased services and electrification of the corridor is expected to be implemented by 2025.

### 6.2.2 YORK REGION

The Region's 2016 TMP includes several infrastructure improvements in King and the surrounding municipalities that will help King increase its transit ridership. The proposed network builds on investment in the Toronto-York Spadina Subway Extension, the first wave of vivaNext rapidways, Regional Express Rail and YRT/Viva Frequent Transit Network service expansion. The key recommended improvements include:
$\rightarrow$ vivaNext bus rapid transit (BRT) along Yonge Street between the Richmond Hill Centre Terminal to Gamble Road is currently under construction with the expected completion in December 2020. The BRT is recommended to be extended north to Davis Drive in Newmarket by 2031 with the addition of seven new viva stations along the seven-kilometre stretch;
$\rightarrow$ Frequent transit along Highway 27 (between Steeles Avenue East and King Road) and Bathurst Street (between Steeles Avenue East and Davis Drive West); and
$\rightarrow$ Potential GO station at $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad and Bathurst Street.
The proposed transit network up to 2031 for the entire Region is illustrated in Figure 6-4.
Figure 6-4: Proposed York Region Transit Network to 2031


[^6]In the 2016 TMP, the Region also identified "Creating a World Class Transit System" to be one of its five objectives by 2041. The Region seeks to meet this objective by creating a seamless interconnected system of subways, rapidways, a frequent transit network and other services to meet the varying demands throughout the Region. Several Ridership Growth Strategies were identified to enhance transit performance and ridership, including:
$\rightarrow$ A Low Demand Transit Strategy;
$\rightarrow$ Integration with GO Transit;
$\rightarrow$ A Frequent Transit Network; and
$\rightarrow$ Regional Integration.

## LOW DEMAND TRANSIT STRATEGY

Building on YRT's new Mobility On-Request service, of which King is currently participating in, the Low Demand Transit Strategy will define boundaries between low-demand and high-demand areas in each municipality. The Strategy will offer a combination of services in low-demand areas (areas defined as rural, suburban or urban areas were low levels of transit demand exist) such as conventional services, Mobility On-Request routes and zones, and Mobility Plus services. It will also explore innovative solutions such as sharing economy technology, partnerships, and enhanced information and communications channels to promote travel options. YRT is planning a review of the Mobility On-Request services in the Township of King, including consideration for integration and connections with YRT and GO Rail services in the area.

## INTEGRATION WITH GO TRANSIT

As discussed in Section 6.2.1, the King City GO Station is planned to have15-minute two-way service during the weekday rush hours, mid-day, and evening periods by 2026 as part of the GO Rail Expansion program by Metrolinx. By 2026, the Richmond Hill GO service is also expected to increase to $15-m i n u t e$ service in the peak direction between Richmond Hill and Union Station during the morning and afternoon/evening periods. To ensure an integrated and seamless regional transit network, YRT/Viva will coordinate its services to align with the service improvements and new GO schedules.

With the significant changes to GO infrastructure and services as part of the Rail Expansion program, the Region has initiated a Transit Optimization Program (TOP) intended to facilitate collaboration between the Region, Metrolinx and local municipalities with respect to the development, implementation and operation of the Rail Expansion. The TOP initiative will address coordination efforts for road/rail grade separations and level crossings, existing and new GO Stations, YRT/Viva service increases to support Rail Expansion and fare integration. The TOP also creates a framework for the Region, Metrolinx and Transport Canada to work to address and mitigate impacts due to whistles blowing as the Rail Expansion program is implemented and GO rail service increases.
Currently, GO Transit provides highway bus service on serval 400 Series highways, including Highway 400, 404 and 407, which are primarily designed to provide services in place of GO trains during off-peak periods. As discussed in Section 4.2.1, MTO plans to widen Highway 400 between Major Mackenzie Drive and King Road from six to eight lanes by 2020 to accommodate two HOV lanes; the widening of Highway 400 will continue to Canal Road beyond 2020. The introduction of HOV lanes on Highway 400 will significantly improve the viability and attractiveness of highway bus services. In the interim conditions, the Region proposed allowing buses to travel along the paved shoulders on Highway 400 and 404 to avoid traffic congestion; the Region is working with MTO to explore the feasibility of this proposed interim solution. The Region's TMP also recommends YRT/Viva utilizing the highways to enhance bus services and connectivity where feasible.

## FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK

The TMP proposed the development of a Frequent Transit Network (FTN) specifically in urban areas within the Region. Positioned in key corridors, FTN routes are expected to offer reliable services that are too frequent to require a schedule connecting the BRT, subway stations and future GO stations. FTN routes would continue to be complemented by other YRT Local, Express, Shuttle and Community Bus services. Over the next five years, YRT/Viva will transition existing services into the FTN, ultimately offering service frequencies of 15 minutes or less throughout the day, seven days a week. According to the York Region Transit Network map illustrated in Figure 6-4, Highway 27 from Steeles Avenue West to King Road is planned to be part of the FTN by 2031.

## REGIONAL INTEGRATION

Road networks within the GTHA are seamlessly connected without barriers between municipal jurisdictions; the demand for seamless transit connectivity between York Region and the rest of the GTHA is only increasing, most notably to and from the City of Toronto, and Peel and Durham Regions. York Region is actively working with Metrolinx on their fare integration strategy to provide cohesive route and fare structures to facilitate cross-border travel throughout the GTHA.

## OVERALL ACTION ITEMS

From these Ridership Growth Strategies, several actions were identified and presented in the TMP to support the creation of a world class transit system in York Region. The ones most relevant to King include:
$\rightarrow$ Implementing a Low Demand Transit Strategy that clarifies and improves the family of services offered by YRT in low demand areas;
$\rightarrow$ Through the established TOP, work with Metrolinx/GO Transit to ensure the successful introduction and integration of the Rail Expansion improvements;
$\rightarrow$ Restructure existing YRT/Viva services to improve access to GO Transit stations, supporting GO Transit's all-day schedules and the Rail Expansion program;
$\rightarrow$ Work with Metrolinx/GO Transit to coordinate the delivery of highway bus services while recognizing these services have potentially lower cost recovery ratios than conventional YRT services; and
$\rightarrow$ Develop service and fare integration agreements with Brampton Transit (Region of Peel), Durham Region Transit (Region of Durham) and Metrolinx.

### 6.2.3 YORK REGION TRANSIT

In its 2016-2021 Strategic Plan, YRT has identified "Connection with GO Transit" to be one of its key strategies in achieving its objective of Service Delivery. To support GO Transit's Rail Expansion program, existing services will be restructured to provide new services and improve access to GO Transit. Over the next five years, YRT plans to improve regional mobility by providing routes and connections that align with GO Transit's schedules. Currently, there are no planned service improvement for King Township by 2021.

### 6.2.4 KING TOWNSHIP

To capitalize on the Region's investment in rapid transit, the 2015 TMP recommended for the Township to continue working with YRT to develop direct bus routes that provide connectivity between the three villages and the Yonge Street BRT and King GO Station. High-level concepts were developed for these routes as seen in Figure 6-5. Further examination and refinement will be necessary through continued discussions with YRT.

Figure 6-5: Proposed Transit Network Improvements in the 2015 King TMP


Source: Township of King 2015 Transportation Master Plan

## 6.3

GAPS
Both York Region and Metrolinx have invested and are planning to invest significant resources into various infrastructure and service improvements within King and surrounding municipalities to enhance transit mode options. With the arrival of Rail Expansion project by Metrolinx on the Barrie Line and full BRT on the Yonge Street corridor, the Township will have more access to various transit options throughout the day. Additionally, the York Region TMP includes a new GO station at $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad and Bathurst Street intersection. The existing and previously proposed transit network improvements within King are illustrated in Figure 6-6.
These proposed improvements to the transit network within King will result in the following network or service gaps:
$\rightarrow$ Currently, the Township has one transit service that connects all three urban villages and the existing King GO station, the MOR King Local; this service only operates on weekdays during the morning and afternoon rush hours;
$\rightarrow$ With the increased frequency of GO trains from 30 minutes to 15 minutes throughout the day, this will result in higher traffic congestion at the at-grade railway crossing on Dufferin Street due to the increase in train traffic; and
$\rightarrow$ There will be an increase in whistles blowing as the Rail Expansion program is implemented and train service is increased.

The next section will provide some recommendations to address the identified gaps.
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### 6.4 PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

With the arrival of Rail Expansion program by Metrolinx on the Barrie Line and full BRT on the Yonge Street corridor, the following improvements are recommended to enhance the previously proposed transit network and services. The Township should:

1. Liaise with the Region and YRT to increase the service hours of the Mobility On-Request King Local to accommodate all day travel, seven days a week. If demand increases, King should advocate for the Mobility On-Request service to be converted into a fixed-route service;
2. Work with Metrolinx and the Region to explore the feasibility of converting the at-grade rail crossing at Dufferin Street to a grade-separated crossing;
3. As part of the TPAP process for the twinning of the Barrie rail line, Township staff has formally advised Metrolinx in writing the Township requires the necessary infrastructure for whistle cessation be included in the project. King staff will continue to meet and follow up with Metrolinx staff; and
4. Promote the provision of direct transit services along King Road, Highway 9 and Davis Drive West into the Region's Frequent Transit Network.
A review of the demand and available resources from YRT should be conducted to confirm the feasibility of these recommendations, which are illustrated in Figure 6-7.
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$\longleftrightarrow$ Township Road (Linkage)
$\overbrace{}^{N} 0 \quad 2.5 \quad 5^{5}$
K
KING
III)
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## COSTING

This section of the 2020 TMP provides high-level cost estimates for the proposed network improvements including new multi-modal network connections. The costs will require confirmation as the projects approach implementation through assessment and detailed design of the facilities.
Projects costings are outlined as short-term, medium-term and long-term based on when the future development is recommended for implementation.
A detailed overview of the indicative capital costs of the TMP projects is provided in Appendix $\mathbf{D}$.

The projects that are costed as part of this TMP only include the construction of new Townshipowned roads. It is assumed that the costs for all new roads within the future developments will be collected as part of the developers' applications; thus, these roads are not costed. Given that the Township has identified all gravel roads to be eventually paved, per Council direction, the Township has budgeted separately for these improvements and are also not costed in the 2020 TMP.
The estimated capital costs of the new Township roadway construction projects are evaluated at approximately $\$ 650,000$ (2019 dollars) based on a preliminary assessment of the transportation infrastructure requirements identified in this plan. The costs presented are in the 2019 dollars and include $10 \%$ construction contingency, $10 \%$ soft cost and $1.67 \%$ HST. It should be noted that the costs presented are Class D estimates and thus may vary significantly based on item quantities. The costs are for functional design purposes only and do not include additional costs that may result from environmental concerns and/or land acquisition.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

The estimated cost to implement the proposed active transportation network has been developed to help inform future budgets and decision making. The capital costing information is based on a set of unit prices that:
$\rightarrow$ Do not include the cost of property acquisitions, signal modifications, utility relocations, major roadside draining works, or costs associated with site-specific projects such as bridges, railway crossings, retaining walls, and stairways, unless otherwise noted;
$\rightarrow$ Assume typical environmental conditions and topography; and
$\rightarrow$ Do not include applicable taxes and permit fees - which are considered additional.
The unit prices and assumptions are presented in Table 7-1. Using the unit costs, preliminary capital costs were calculated. Table 7-2 summarizes the estimated costs for routes located on roads and lands under the Township of King, York Region and other jurisdictions. Reference should be made to York Region's TMP - Background Report D (Pedestrian and Cycling Plan Development Report) for details on routes located on roads and lands owned by the Region.

Table 7-1: Unit Cost Assumptions for Proposed Active Transportation Facilities

| FACILITY TYPES | UNIT PRICE PER KM | UNIT Price Assumptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-Road Trail | \$350,000 | 3.0 m wide hard surface pathway (asphalt). Price depends ofs cale / complexity of project. |
| In-Boulevard Pathway | \$325,000 | 3.0 m wide hard surface pathway (asphalt) within road right of way (no utility relocations). Price depends ofs cale / complexity of project and if existing sidewalk is being removed (crushing of existing sidewalk and compacting for trail base). |
| Bike Lane | \$53,000 | Conventional $1.5 \mathrm{~m}-1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ bike lane by adding markings and signs. Price for both sides of the road, includes signs, stencils and edge line. |
| Paved Shoulder | \$150,000 | 1.5 metre paved shoulder on both sides of the road. Assumes cycling project pays for additional granular base, asphalt and painted line. Price mayvary from \$100,000 to \$200,000 depending on work needed to improve platform . |
| Signed Route | \$1,200 | Price for both sides of the road, assumes one sign a minimum of every 500 metres in the direction of travel. Price assumes that signs will be mounted on an existing post. |
| Sidewalk | \$300,000 | Price for 1.8 m concrete sidewalk. Includes site preparation, select utility relocation, minor drainage modifications / traffic control. |

The total estimated capital cost, provided in Table 7-2, to implement the active transportation network is approximately $\$ 53$ million. This includes the cost for on and off-road routes that are located on roads and lands under the jurisdiction of the Township, Region and other agencies.

Table 7-2: Estimated Capital Costs for Proposed Active Transportation Facilities

| FACILITY TYPES | UNIT PRICE PER KM | TOWNSHIP |  | REGION |  | OTHER JURISDICTIONS |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Kм | COST | KM | COST | Kı | Cost |  |
| Off-Road Trail | \$350,000 | 44.7 | \$15,660,000 | 0 | \$0 | 44.7 | \$15,660,000 | \$31,310,000 |
| In- <br> Boulevard Pathway | \$325,000 | 12.7 | \$4,120,000 | 0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$4,120,000 |
| Bike Lane | \$53,000 | 0 | \$0 | 3.2 | \$170,000 | 0 | \$0 | \$170,000 |
| Paved Shoulder | \$150,000 | 17.0 | \$2,550,000 | 55.8 | \$8,370,000 | 0 | \$0 | \$10,920,000 |
| Signed Route | \$1,200 | 54.8 | \$70,000 | 8.9 | \$20,000 | 0 | \$0 | \$80,000 |
| Sidewalk | \$300,000 | 21.5 | \$6,460,000 | 0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$6,460,000 |
| Total | - | 150.7 | \$28,860,000 | 67.9 | \$8,560,000 | 44.7 | \$15,660,000 | \$53,060,000 |

For off-road routes, it has been assumed that $50 \%$ of the capital costs would fall under the Township's jurisdiction and the remaining $50 \%$ of the capital costs would fall under the jurisdiction of other agencies. It is recognized that the proposed off-road trails are located on lands that are owned by several agencies including the Township, York Region, Conservation Authorities (Toronto Region Conservation Authority and Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority) and private land-owners. For example, a significant portion of the Oak Ridges Trail is owned by private land-owners with easements for the trail.

It is recommended that Township staff continue working with it partners to guide the future planning and implementation of all routes that form the active transportation network. In addition, Township staff are encouraged to reference existing resources (such as the TRCA's Trails Strategy, 2019) to inform future decision-making regarding costing and partnerships.
This information is not intended to be prescriptive and should only be used by staff as a starting point to inform future decision making. It is recommended that future studies be undertaken to confirm specific details / facilities to better inform future investments and prioritization of projects.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2020 TMP contains important recommendations throughout several sections that include physical infrastructure projects, new services or programs, and additional studies to enhance the Township's multi-modal transportation network and make the Township more resilient to changing travel trends. However, not all recommendations are required immediately or at the same time. Based on population and employment forecasts and to establish a feasible timeline that can be achieved, the following timeframes have been set for the proposed improvements:
$\rightarrow$ Short-term (generally the next two years);
$\rightarrow$ Medium-term (to the year 2026); and
$\rightarrow$ Long-term (to the year 2031).
To ensure efficiency, a road that is scheduled for road and active transportation improvements should have all improvements constructed at one time - this would be more cost effective than to build an active transportation improvement only to have to go back shortly thereafter and construct a road improvement. This section collects all the recommendations in one place and groups them into the above noted timeframes.

### 8.1 SHORT-TERM (GENERALLY NEXT FEW YEARS TO 2022) ROADS

1. Establish a rational road classification to guide future planning and capital works, as provided in Figure 4-15 to Figure 4-18;
2. Update the Township's Official Plan to reflect the right-of-way needs and ensure that sufficient property is available to accommodate roadway components as per the Township's design standards;
3. Conduct studies to assess the potential impacts of the GTA West Corridor on the villages of Nobleton and King City. The Township should also consider working with the Region and neighbouring municipalities to assess any land use impacts and implement land use policies to mitigate any potential impacts;
4. Commence dialogue with York Region regarding the uploading of roads in the short and medium term in accordance with York Region's policy, and obtain Council's approval, as may be required; and
5. Liaise with York Region to better understand the timing to commence the $15^{\text {th }}$ Sideroad Environmental Assessment in King City, west of Keele Street.
6. Update the functional design and parking capacity report for the King Road and Keele Street intersection and move towards implementation of recommendations.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

7. Establish a terms of reference / scope of work for the development of an Active Transportation Master Plan, which will include an Implementation Plan to prioritize and phase the recommended network;
8. Work with Metrolinx and York Region to improve opportunities for active transportation users on Keele Street near the King GO Station;
9. Prioritize for implementation and maintenance walkable pathways to key destinations such as Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA), community centres, schools and other facilities;
10. Work closely with York Region on the implementation of new Regional Road pedestrian crossings at identified locations within the urban areas of King City, Nobleton and Schomberg to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and mobility;
11. Utilize web mapping services, to advertise active transportation routes; and
12. Work with Smart Commute and York Region on behaviour change programs to encourage active transportation and transit to replace drive-alone car trips during peak periods, such as getting to and from the King GO Station.

## TRANSIT

13. Liaise with York Region and YRT to increase the service hours of the Mobility On-Request King Local to accommodate all day travel, seven days a week. If demand increases, King should advocate for the Mobility On-Request service to be converted into a fixed-route service.

## 8.2

MEDIUM-TERM (GENERALLY BY 2026)
ROADS

1. Work with the Region to consider development of the proposed goods movement routes identified in Figure 4-28.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

2. Partner with York Region to add signage for the York Region Cycling Tour Routes within King for economic and tourism development;
3. When roads are next scheduled for reconstruction, rehabilitation or resurfacing, where possible, widen roads with sufficient road base width to include up to two-metre paved shoulder and/or cycling facilities; and
4. Understand full lifecycle costs of new infrastructure to support long-term sustainability of the network through an asset management plan.

## TRANSIT

5. As part of the TPAP process for the twinning of the Barrie rail line, Township staff has formally advised Metrolinx in writing the Township requires the necessary infrastructure for whistle cessation be included in the project. King staff will continue to meet and follow up with Metrolinx staff; and
6. Promote the provision of direct transit services along King Road, Highway 9 and Davis Drive West into the Region's Frequent Transit Network.

### 8.3 LONG-TERM (GENERALLY BY 2031)

ROADS

1. Work with York Region to investigate the feasibility and impacts of extending and widening 15th Sideroad between Highway 400 and Bathurst Street.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

2. Consider establishing "cycling loops" within King City, Nobleton and Schomberg, and branding these loops with signage to direct people to trails, parks, community centres,
attractions and other local amenities to generate interest in cycling for recreation, commuting, and tourism.

## TRANSIT

3. Work with Metrolinx and the Region to explore the feasibility of converting the at-grade rail crossing at Dufferin Street to a grade-separated crossing.

### 8.4 ADDITIONAL STUDIES

While this TMP contains several physical and service improvements, these should be complemented with a set of guiding policies. Policies are the "legs" on which the "table top" of a transportation network stands. We recommend developing the following policies to help implement the active transportation, transit, goods movement and road network recommendations summarized in the sections above:
$\rightarrow$ Complete Streets is the concept of designing the transportation network for all modes of transportation and all transportation system users. It is an umbrella policy that guides the remaining policies as well as the planning of the physical transportation network. The Complete Streets concept refers to the transportation network as a system - not every street is designed for every mode. For instance, a local road typically does not have a dedicated cycling facility and is not used as a truck route. The network must be complete in providing alternatives or parallel facilities that are "complete".
$\rightarrow$ Traffic Calming is a series of design, engineering, educational, and/or enforcement measures implemented to reduce the impacts of high motor-vehicle speeds and traffic volumes on local and collector streets. Traffic calming improves the liveability of neighbourhoods for all road users. Measures include physical interventions such as curb extensions or speed humps, and installation of signs, as well as community road watch programs, or police enforcement. Complementary measures also include the application of Complete Streets principles in facility and community design phases, enhancing street conditions for all users. A Traffic Calming policy will provide a framework for commencing, analyzing, reviewing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating traffic calming initiatives for local and collector residential neighbourhood streets. It will also provide a toolbox with practical recommendations.
$\rightarrow$ Transportation Demand Management (TDM) includes policies, programs and services that seek to influence the way people travel and commute to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips, lower carbon emissions, alleviate traffic congestion, and decrease health-related problems due to sedentary lifestyles. These challenges are all tied to a society's travel patterns, and they play an important role in the quality of life and productivity of the community. Through a formal TDM strategy, a Municipality can defer the need for significant capital investments in new road infrastructure, and maximize the use of existing transportation facilities and services. This can be achieved by providing actions, incentives, and policies to encourage walking, cycling, riding transit, and carpooling for utilitarian trips. These are commonly focused on prioritizing moving people (as opposed to cars) with guiding principles to enhance the multi-modality, efficiency, safety, and accessibility of its transportation network.
$\rightarrow$ Future Ready is about unlocking future opportunities by actively identifying and monitoring key trends in the present. A focus on Future Ready now can help the Township become more resilient to change in the coming decades with respect to climate change, technology and travel patterns, and be better positioned to achieve its vision. Technology-driven increases in automation, connectivity and information sharing have enabled more efficient use of resources making many aspects of our life easier and more convenient. From real-time tracking of transit service schedules, online multi-modal trip planners, integrating Uber or taxi services within a transit system, and contactless payment systems such as PRESTO, utilizing
various modes of transportation has become increasingly more effortless. In a data-driven world with an increasing emphasis on connectivity, technology improvements are consistently required to ensure safety and equity. The Township should explore some of the current and emerging trends at the intersection of technology, mobility, and society to best identify the pulse of the sector and better align its resources for the future.
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SCHEDULE 'D3'


## TOWNSHIP OF KING OFFICIAL PLAN

Township of King Boundary
Village Boundary
Built Boundary
Special Policy Area (refer to Section 4.8.2)
Schomberg Water Resource Recovery Facility

## Land Use Designations

Village CoreEstablished Neighbourhood
Neighbourhood


Medium Density Residential
Mixed Use
Commercial
Employment
Institutional
Parks and Open Space
Utility
Natural Heritage System
$\underbrace{N}$
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SCHEDULE 'E2'

## TOWNSHIP OF KING

 OFFICIAL PLAN$\qquad$ Hamlet Boundary
Land Use Designations
Hamlet Residential
Hamlet Commercial
Hamlet Rural Area
Natural Heritage System


| NTNE | Produced by: WSP Sources: Base Data: MNRF, York Region \& Township of King |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| \|) |  |





SCHEDULE 'E6'
HAMLET OF GRAHAM SIDEROAD LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

## TOWNSHIP OF KING

OFFICIAL PLAN

吕
Township of King Boundary
Hamlet Boundary

Land Use Designations
Hamlet Residential
$\square$
$\square$
$\square$
Hamlet Commercial
Hamlet Institutional
Natural Heritage System


| 1 16 | Produced by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Sources: <br> Base Data: MNRF, York Region \& Township of King <br> UTM NAD83 Zone 17 |
| 1151) |  |
|  | 3,2019 |

SCHEDULE 'E7' LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

## TOWNSHIP OF KING OFFICIAL PLAN

$\qquad$ Hamlet Boundary
Land Use Designations
Hamlet Residential
Namlet Commercial
Hamlet Rural Area
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# Appendix B 

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT MATERIALS AND FEEDBACK

## B-1 Notice of Study Commencement Township of King <br> TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

## Notice of Study Commencement

## Come help shape the way forward!

## ABOUT THE STUDY

King Township is updating its Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to guide its transportation network to the year 2031. The plan and its vision will include strategies to improve different modes of travel including walking, cycling, transit and car. The public information centres provide residents an opportunity to comment on issues with travelling around the Township and provide input on ways to improve the multi-modal transportation network.

## DROP BY AT ANY ONE OF OUR MEETINGS

## King City

Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm

King City Arena, Upstairs Hall 25 Doctors Lane, King City, ON L7B 1G2

## Nobleton

Wednesday, October 2, 2019 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm

Nobleton Community Hall, Downstairs Hall
19 Old King Road, Nobleton, ON LOG 1NO

## Schomberg

Tuesday, October 8, 2019 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm

Trisan Centre, Multi-Purpose Room A 25 Dillane Drive, Schomberg, ON LOG 1T0

Visit our booth at Soupfest on Saturday, October 5, 2019!
11:00 am - 3:00 pm
Ansnorveldt Park
18997 Dufferin Street, Ansnorveldt, ON

Cannot attend? For more information about the Transportation Master Plan, please visit: tmp.king.ca

## B-2 Public Information Centre Display Boards

## WELCOME!

Township of King
TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

## Public Information Centre



## Nobleton

Wednesday, October 2, 2019
6:00 pm - 8:00 pm
Nobleton Community Hall, Downstairs Hall
19 Old King Road, Nobleton, ON LOG 1NO

## Schomberg

Tuesday, October 8, 2019
6:00 pm - 8:00 pm
Trisan Centre,
Multi-Purpose Room A
25 Dillane Drive, Schomberg, ON LOG 1 TO

## WHAT IS THE TOWNSHIP OF KING TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN?

## A Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is...

\author{

- A guide for decision making <br> - A multi-modal transportation plan to the year 2031 <br> - A communication tool <br> - A community building asset <br> - An opportunity to support partnerships <br> - A community long-term vision <br> - A strategy for goal implementation <br> - Adata-drivenprocessforsound decision-making
}


## The Municipal Class EA Process

The TMP is being completed consistent with approach 1 of the Municipal Class EA (MCEA) Master Planning process. Phases 1 and 2 of the MCEA process will be completed including:

Identification of problem / opportunity statement


Why Update the TMP?


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

About the Residents．．．


2016
2031
Forecast

How are the Networks Used？


## Existing Transportation Conditions

## Transit

Available transit in King Township is operated by regional and inter－regional transit services．York Region Transit （YRT）and GO Transit provide bus and rail services．

## Walking \＆Cycling

There are over $\mathbf{3 0 0} \mathbf{~ k m}$ of existing active transportation facilities including：

》 Off－road multi－use trails
》 Sidewalks
» Signed routes
» Paved shoulders
» Bike lanes

## Roads

Roads within the Township are currently categorized as：
» Provincial highways／freeways
》 Regional roads
» Township roads

## MOVING KING TOWNSHIP <br> FORWARD

## King Township envisions．．．

active transportation facilities，transit routes and roads that support the growth of vibrant communities and enhance the quality of life for residents．The multi－modal transportation network should provide mobility and connectivity that is sustainable， accessible and affordable for residents of all ages and abilities to the year 2031.

How to Shape King Township Forward


Three groups of alternative solutions were identified：


## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Road Classification and Jurisdiction



## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Road Classification and Jurisdiction



## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Road Classification and Jurisdiction



Current Proposed Development Application

Road Network
Provincial Highway / Freeway (MTO)
$\longrightarrow$ Arterial Road (York Region)
-
$\longrightarrow$ Rural Collector
—— Rural Local

- Urban Collector

U Urban Local

Transit Network
GO Train Station
$\xrightarrow{\longrightarrow}$ GO Train Rail Line
$\dot{A}:$ いい|) KING

## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Road Classification and Jurisdiction

## Schomberg and Lloydtown



1---
Current Proposed Development Application

## Road Network

Provincial Highway / Freeway (MTO)
$\longrightarrow$ Arterial Road (York Region)
ㅍ․․․․․ Arterial Road (Township)
$\longrightarrow$ Rural Collector
—— Rural Local
$\longrightarrow$ Urban Collector

- Urban Local

Transit Network
GO Train Station
$\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rail Line

## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS－ 2031 Number of Vehicle Lanes



| Waterbody | Park／Open Space | Current Proposed <br> Development Application |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bradford By－pass． | Existing Interchange |  |
| Location |  |  |

Proposed Improvements
－－－－－．New 2－Lane Road
$\longrightarrow$ Existing 2 Lanes +2 New Lanes
$\longrightarrow$ Existing 6 Lanes +2 New HOV Lanes

## Other Transportation Network Features

Road with No Change
4．GO Train Station
$\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rail Line

Note：
1．HOV．Nigh－occupancy vehicie
$\phi$
いい｜）KING

## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS－ 2031 Number of Vehicle Lanes

## King City



Current Proposed Development Application

Proposed Improvements
－ー－ー－New 2－Lane Road
$\longrightarrow$ Existing 2 Lanes +2 New Lanes
Existing 6 Lanes +2 New HOV Lanes

## Other Transportation Network Features

Road with No Change
GO Train Station
$\ldots$ GO Train Rail Line

## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Number of Vehicle Lanes



## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Number of Vehicle Lanes

## Schomberg and Lloydtown



Note:

1. HOV: high-occupancy vehicle


## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Recommended Paving



Proposed Paving Improvements
—— New Asphall Road
$\longrightarrow$ Repave Asphall

- Upgrade Gravel to Asphatt


## Roadway Surface

- Gravel Road

Paved Provincial Highway / Freeway
$\longrightarrow$ Paved Regional Road

- Paved Township Road

Other Transportation Network Features
© GO Train Station
$\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rall Line


## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Roads Serving Regional Functions



$1=-1$ GTA West Corridor
U/IIA ${ }^{\text {Pretential }}$ Freeway.to-
(-) Existing Interchange
Potential Interchange
Location

## Road Network

$\longrightarrow$ Provincial Highway / Freeway
$\longrightarrow$ Regional Road
-Township Road

Potential Roads to be Uploaded to Regional Roads
-man Road currently serving regional functions
=|limel $\begin{aligned} & \text { Road that will potentially serve regional functions (for } \\ & \text { further discussion) }\end{aligned}$

Other Transportation Network Features
----- New 2-Lane Road
A. GO Train Station
$\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rail Line
$\dot{d}$


## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Rights-of-Way Network



| Waterbody | Cark / Open Space | Current Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Regional Roads Rights-of-Way

$\longrightarrow$ Up to 30 metres
$\longrightarrow$ Up to 36 metres
Up to 43 metres

Township Roads Rights-of-Way


Other Transportation Network Features

$\longrightarrow$| Provincial Highway/ |
| :--- |
| Freeway |
| Unopened Road |
| Allowance |$\quad \longrightarrow$ GO Train Station

Note:
The ROWs are based on Township's standard cross-section
widths. Additional ROW may be needed at intersections.
grade separated crossings or in consideration the existing ROW are actually greater. ROW will be protected as part of
the development approval process, further refined during the the development approval process, further refined during the
(1) $0^{2}$

## ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031 Goods Movement Network



## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS - 2031



## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS - 2031



| ( | Carpool and Commuter Parking Lot | $\omega$ | Place of Worship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | Library | (0) | Municipal / Community Hall |
| $\pm$ | Elementary School | C | Recreation/Arena/ Community Centre |
| $\pm$ | Secondary School | - | Connection to Surrounding Municipality |
| L | Private School |  | Current Proposed Development Application |
| $\pm$ | Seneca College |  |  |



## Transit Network

| YRT Bus Stop | GO Station |
| :--- | :--- |
| - GO Bus Stop | $\longrightarrow$ GO Train Rail Line |

## Road Network

Provincial Highway/ Townahip Road

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS - 2031



| (P) | Carpool and Commuter <br> Parking Lot | Place of Worship |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Active Transportation Network

Existing Proposed'
$=1$ Sidewalk

- I OHt-Road Irail

N/A I in-Boulevard Pathway
$\square-1$ Bike Lane
$\square=1$ Paved Shoulder

Proposed AT Improvements

## Crossing

Cycling Loop
Regional AT Network
Greenbelt Cycling
Route

## Transit Network

- YRT Bus Stop
- GO Bus Stop

P- 60 station

Road Network
Cons Township Road

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS - 2031

## Schomberg and Lloydtown


\(\left.\begin{array}{llll}(D) Carpool and Commuter \& (4) \& Place of Worship <br>

Parking Lot\end{array}\right)\) Library $\quad$ (4) | Municipal / Community |
| :--- |
| Hall |



## TRANSIT NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS - 2031



## Thank you for participating and contributing to the King Township Transportation Master Plan!

## Contact Information

Additional information, inquiries and comments may be submitted to the Township's Engineering and Public Works Department and the Project Team:

To visit the website,
scan the QR code
using your phone!


Project Information and Updates
Please visit the project website for more information about the Transportation Master Plan:
tmp.king.ca

## WHAT'S NEXT FOR KING'S TMP?

1. Summarize and process inputs received

- Please provide your comments by Friday, October 18, 2019

2. Identify potential transportation alternatives
3. Prepare recommendations
4. Present to the Council

## Township of King

TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

## Public Information Centre

## COMMENT SHEET

King Township is updating its Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to guide its transportation network to the year 2031. The plan and its vision will include strategies to improve different modes of travel including walking, cycling, transit and car. For more information please visit: tmp.king.ca

Personal information on this form is collected under the authority of the

To visit the website, scan the $Q R$ code
using your phone!
 in the development of the Transportation Master Plan. Questions about this collection should be directed to the Engineering and Public Works Department:

## 2585 King Road

King City, Ontario
L7B 1A1
Please print all responses

1. What are your three biggest concerns regarding transportation in the Township?
2. What are the top three transportation improvements that you would like to see in the Township?
3. The Township would like to make it easier for people to walk, cycle and take transit. What do you think are the three biggest challenges or constraints to providing greater transportation choices?

## Township of King <br> TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

4. Do you have any other comments for the study team in terms of what we should study, examples we should consider or other ideas?

To be added to our mailing list and be informed of upcoming Study events, please provide the following information: (Please note that all information submitted will become part of the public record except for personal information. Name, address, postal code and email address will not be traded or sold for any reason.)

Name of Respondent: $\qquad$
Representing (Agency, Municipality, Property Owner, Tenant, etc.): $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
City / Town, Postal Code:
Email Address: $\qquad$

Please submit this comment sheet by Friday, October 18, 2019:

David Van Veen, C. Tech.
Senior Project Manager
t: 905.883.5321 x 4056
e: dvanveen@king.ca

Brett Sears, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
t: 289.982.4752
e: brett.sears@wsp.com

## B-3 Consultation and Engagement Comments

| Discipline | Comment | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roads | I strongly object to the transportation master plan continuing to show a future road linkage between Keele Street and Tawes Trail. I have attached an additional letter explaining my reasons for this objection | Tawes Trail Extension |
| Roads | Concerned with congestion on Keele Street and King Road | Keele Street and King Road |
| Transit | Lack of public parking at GO station | GO Station |
| Roads | Want to extend 15th Sideroad to Highway 400 to alleviate congestion and truck traffic on Keele Street and King Road | 15th Sideroad |
| Transit | Want more parking lots at GO station | GO Station |
| AT | Challenge to increase cycling/walking trail network |  |
| Transit | Challenge to more parking at GO station | GO Station |
| Transit | Challenge for Keele Street Bus Line to run to Vaughan Subway | Keele Street |
| Roads | I would like to add to his stated concern about the suggestion re: the widening of 15 th SDRD to hwy 400 prior to 2031. Given that the required EA for assessing the punch to Jane (i.e. going beyond the current dead end) is not even on the 10 year YR plan I wonder why we would be promoting the uploading of the 15 th and the widening before 2031. | 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | Looking at the map today I wondered why the proposed new roads through the proposed MOK and Bushland subdivisions would be showing the way they are. i) The draft subdivision for NE Landowners group is approved...and on the map their lands are shaded brown. The new roads in MOK and Bushland are marked in with no indication that the development is not approved. And....I question the dotted red line showing the one road going all the way to Manitou....the draft plan going to LPAT shows that there is not a 2 land road but rather an emergency route. | Manitou Drive |
| Transit | GO Station - There are improvements planned for the King GO Station - according to the Metrolinx website, there are plans for upgrades in the near future including 500 new parking spaces, a new kiss and ride drop-off, a new platform, two new pedestrian bridges and bicycle facilities by 2022. If everyone ends up driving alone because there is more parking this will create another problem in the form of traffic congestion to and from the station and surrounding areas during peak travel times. With all the improvements we would propose a GO Station access project to promote active and sustainable transportation to the station by way of incentives and personalized travel planning (carpools, transit, cycling). | GO Station |
| AT | It's great to see there are plans to connect the existing active infrastructure with additional bike paths, lanes and trails. The connectivity for the communities will be a huge opportunity to promote more active travel to work, school, daily life and transit (including the GO Station). Smart Commute can do personalized travel planning with workplaces and the community/community hubs to promote all the great infrastructure as it's being built. We can also work with schools to promote active and sustainable travel as we continue to collaborate with the school boards and public health. |  |
| AT | We can work with the communities during the construction (attend community events etc.) to help them find safe, alternative and sustainable travel options to school, work and within the community. Based on experience, it has been difficult for students living on campus to get into King City, particularly on the weekends as transit is very infrequent. When they implement the new off-road trail leading from $15^{\text {th }}$ side-road into the town, we can certainly promote this infrastructure to students on campus as they are a member business. |  |
| Transit | It was interesting at the ACT conference to hear that Kitchener/Waterloo made the decision to grow up instead of out to protect the way of life and farmlands in the surrounding townships. I'm sure King is facing similar decisions as their population increases. If they do decide to grow up instead of out in terms of development, they will need to look at more transit opportunities so that traffic doesn't take over in the long term. |  |
| AT | Obviously in terms of the active transportation improvements the direction looks good in terms of connecting Seneca College with options as well as the GO Station. The more options available through a connected network as indicated on the Active Transportation Improvements map, the easier it is to actively shift behaviours - we saw this in our work in Aurora at the GO Station where they have a significant challenge and we were able to have significant impact on shifting behaviours. | Seneca College |


| Discipline | Comment | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roads | No alternative routes south besides Regional Road 27, there are 6 concessions or sideroads missing (360m) that prevent them from being a through road which is especially important once the GTA West corridor is built (how to get there) | Nobleton |
| Roads | Widen King Road or provide completion of through roads on 15th or 16th Sideroad. Improve East-West traffic alternatives. |  |
| AT | There are no bicycle paths that connect with other communities such as King City where there is access to transit | Nobleton |
| Roads | Close gap between King-Vaughan Road and Pine Valley Drive | 7th Concession |
| Roads | Upgrade corridor designation to King-Vaughan to facilitate quick access from Nobleton to King GO Station and Highway 400 via Weston and Teston Road | King-Vaughan Road |
| Roads | Potential traffic calming | Kingscross Drive |
| AT | Recreation centre | Northwest of 15th Sideroad and Dufferin Street |
| AT | Potential signalized pedestrian crossing | E Humber Drive and Keele |
| AT | Possible existing trail connection to Dennison Street | Existing trail north of Dennison |
| Roads | Road does not exist today | Tawes Trail Extension |
| Roads | Remove, no ROW. Already agreed to remove this link from plans, see comment 53 in Official Plan response to comments matrix | Tawes Trail Extension |
| Roads | Concern with calling this a collector and implications of doing so | Kingscross Drive |
| Roads | Connection over water? | Proposed Linkage to Church |
| Roads | Remove this link, no ROW | Tawes Trail Extension |
| Roads | Environmental concern | Tawes Trail Extension |
| Roads | This doesn't look correct. The road is crossing environmental feature | E Humber Drive Extension |
| Roads | To be uploaded to York Region as arterial (shouldn't be called a rural collector) | 15th Sideroad |
| AT | Why paved shoulders? Environmental concerns (drainage), paved shoulders are not really needed, should just be a signed route | Kingscross Drive |
| AT | Not a lot of walkers on Kingscross Drive, tend to use trails more | Kingscross Drive |
| AT | Meadow, connection needed from trails to this meadow/park | Norman Drive |
| AT | See: King City Functional Development Plan/OP, wetland and environmental concerns here | Proposed Austin Rumble to Bathurst Trail |
| Roads | Wheres the industry arterial roads feed? |  |
| Roads | Move primary arterial goods movement to King-Vaughan Road and create a King City bypass | King Road |
| Roads | Move interim primary corridor on King Road from Bathurst Street to Highway 400 to King-Vaughan Road | King Road |
| Roads | 15th extension to Highway 400 is essential for traffic improvement | 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | Local | Kingscross Drive |
| Roads | Stop sign at Watch Hill Road, Manitou Drive, Chelsea Lane | Kingscross Drive |
| Roads | Why? | Proposed 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | Why not an interchange here instead | 17th Sideroad and Highway 400 |
| Roads | Dangerous | 17th Sideroad and Keele Street |
| Roads | Horrible | King Road and Jane Street |
| Roads | Horrible | King Road and Keele Street |
| Roads | Nomenclature of urban roads may lead to urban creep |  |
| Roads |  | E Humber Drive Extension |
| Roads | Congestion hotspot | King Road/Keele Street |
| Roads | 175 homes in the neighbourhood | Kingscross Drive |
| Roads | Local | Kingscross Drive |
| Roads | Do not send additional traffic on Kingscross Drive | Kingscross Drive |
| Roads | No, Bushland heights, Mansions on Kingscross development | New local south of Kingscross |
| Transit | More parking needed at GO station | King City GO Station |
| Transit | More east-west transit options |  |
| Roads | We need 4 lanes on Highway 9 to Highway 400 from Highway 27 now | Highway 9 |
| AT | Paving shoulders on north side by 2021 on 15th Sideroad | 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | The draft plan is supposed to be winding rather than straight road to avoid speeding | New developmenet between Sheardown Drive and King |
| AT | TRCA concerns, constructed but not open due to concerns | Existing trail south of 15th Sideroad and 8th Concession |
| AT | Unofficial parking lot for TRCA trails | Southwest of 15th Sideroad and 8th Concession |
| Roads | Existing connection on King-Vaughan Road across 8th Concession |  |
| AT | Narrow paved shoulders, want more trails | Highway 27 |
| AT | Hiking trails - good to have them connected into 1 long trail |  |


| Discipline | Comment | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roads | Not enough room on Highway 400 for exchange at 15th Sideroad | 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | Too close to the King Road interchange? | 15th Sideroad Interchange |
| Roads | Good idea | Bradford Bypass |
| Roads | 8th Concession connection to King-Vaughan Road to eliminate cars from King Road between 8th and 7th Concession | 8th Concession |
| Roads | Connection to King-Vaughan Road | 8th Concession |
| Roads | Davis Drive W from Bathurst missing a sign to turn right | Davis Drive West |
| Roads | Show actual road network as designed please | Mactaggart Drive Development |
| Roads | Whole stretch should be 4 lanes, spotty now | Highway 9 from Caledon King Town Line to Bathurst Street |
| Roads | Caledon King developments - Amazon truck travelling along King Road (E-W corridor) | Caledon King Townline |
| Roads | Bottleneck | King Road and Weston Road |
| Roads | Reduce speed limit on Lloydtown-Aurora Road through Pottageville | Lloydtown-Aurora Road |
| Roads | Gap between 10th Concession and 11th Concession, missing existing connection between east of 8th Concession and east of Highway 27 | King-Vaughan Road |
| Roads | Gap between 8th Concession and King-Vaughan Road and towards Kipling | 8th Concession |
| Roads | Need a right turn lane (NB to EB) at Caledon King Townline and King Road | Caledon King Townline and |
| Roads | Gap in Pottageville | 18th Sideroad |
| Roads | Gap missing between Keele Street and Jane Street | 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | Road network gaps, alternative routes to Highway 27 |  |
| Roads | Gap in 8th Concession (to Kipling?) | GTA West Corridor |
| Roads | Gap south of King Road, connect | 17th Concession |
| Roads | Need alternative routes east-south-west |  |
| Roads | Nice country road | 15th Sideroad |
| Roads | Good roundabout | 18th Sideroad and Keele Street |
| Roads | Dirt | Mill Road |
| Roads | Horrible | King Road and Weston Road |
| Transit | Express service GO from Newmarket to Yorkdale | GO Rail |
| AT | Bicycle routes out east-west to King City GO |  |
| Transit | Need transit |  |
| Transit | Reverse commute transit routes |  |
| Transit | Weekend service, how to get to Toronto via transit |  |
| Transit | Entice people to transit with free rides for limited time |  |
| Transit | Bus service to and from GO stop at Highway 9 and Highway 400 | Highway 9 and Highway 400 |
| Transit | Bus connection with GO station for villages |  |
| Transit | Need more transit in Nobleton | Nobleton |
| Transit | Need transit west of Highway 400 |  |
| Roads | Difficult to get on Highway 400 with congestion/traffic from Barrie | Highway 400 |
| Roads | High collision intersection, especially at sunset (can't see while going westbound) | Highway 9 and Highway 27 |
| Roads | Nice improvements |  |
| Roads | Turtle crossing | Dr. Kay Drive and Cooper Drive |
| Roads | Turtle underpass |  |
| Roads | (See map for drawing of King Road) | King Road |
| Roads | Give Nobleton alternative routes south and east and west. King Road and Highway 27 are the only ways out |  |
| Roads | Speeding and traffic | Graham Sideroad |
| Roads | Speeding, busy, dangerous | Miller's Sideroad |
| Roads | Int | Davis Drive West and Highway |
| Roads | Turning lane at new office |  |
| Roads | Carpool meeting spaces |  |


| Topic | Comment Received |
| :---: | :---: |
| AT | Paved shoulder on 15th Sideroad from 10th Concession to 7th Concession and on 10th Concession from 15th Sideroad to King Road |
| Road Improvements | Planned road projects: <br> - Nobleton: multi use trail on 15th <br> - Nobleview west towards Bolton: future connection sidewalks <br> - Trail: Mill Rd want to complete this connection, shown as trail in the TRCA plan |
| AT | No current trails south of Nobleton |
| AT and Sidewalks | 5. Re sidewalks, paths.....Given recent complaints about paths for getting to GO train station I suggest that TMP classify paths in terms of importance. and hence provide direction on amount of winter maintenance. One could argue that a path through a park to reach GO station is as important as the sidewalks on Keele leading to GO. |
| AT | Bike lanes along Keele to the GO Station. We should try to accommodate e-scooters too. |
| Goods Movement | Improve goods movement texts to explain King Bypass in report. Is King-Vaughan a Regional or City road? There are high volumes of westbound through trucks on King Road to Highway 400. |
| Kingscross Classification | - The text refers to best practices from other municipalities for road classification \& The Transport Association of Canada. <br> -Please can you cite those sources \& identify which would be similar to The Township of King? <br> -Who is The Transport Association of Canada? Who are its members? <br> -Please can you share The definition of signature class collector road \& urban collector road? to what extent does density of housing form influence The definitions please? |
| Signature Collector Road Classification | 1. Although the implications of identifying Kingscross Dr. as a "signature class rural road" are not identified I think it is far better than calling it rural arterial given the topography, the curves and inconsistent pedestrian paths. (I know that lan Hilley, secretary in the local rate payers group spent time with both Peter A and WSP to ensure that the reality of that Drive was understood. <br> I wonder if Collard Drive merits same classification. No pedestrian facility, some curves and some hills. fyi...for your background as to why Collard does NOT have line painting. When it was finally reconstructed, the residents were adamant that there should not be line painting....offended as it would make it look less rural, less "estate like." After a fairly aggressive campaign Mayor \& I persuaded Engineering not to do the line painting.....I can tell you more when face to face. |
| Transit | 2. I am concerned about several of the sections/points about Metrolinx in that it implies King has greater authority than we have and it implies we have not been trying. . <br> i) page 92 of report talks about modifying reserve parking at GO. Not our jurisdiction. (People misunderstand this point....must not perpetuate it! <br> ii) there are several comments about whistle blowing....residents are very upset, frustrated, and some very angry that there has been improvement in last 4 years. (My ward includes west side of tracks/station.) I think the TMP should reference status of getting noise walls, new gates to enable whistle cessation etc. etc. As TMP is written it sounds like we have been doing nothing..see ES-5 \#5 <br> I am not suggesting that TMP should paint a false picture of the reality BUT if one were to read TMP and has not talked/met with Staff or elected officials beforehand they would conclude nothing is being done. |
| 15th Sideroad | 3.15th SDRD Keele to 400 <br> You will undoubtedly meet people wanting to talk this. I believe that this draft satisfies the concern that the environmental sensitivity was not being appropriated identified. I was shocked to see a reco to commence the EA...I gather you mean lobby YR to get started with it. <br> News to me about the YR plan for widen 15th Bathurst-400 in 2031-2040....good to know. <br> Good to see acknowledgment that GTA West could have impact on decisions about 15th. |
| King City Bypass / Goods movement | 4. King City Bypass...page 59 of report. Want to understand further what is being suggested here. |
| Climate Emergency | 6. I am disappointed that there is not attention to climate emergency declared by Township. Yes, there are comments made about an initiative being positive in this regard. But, I think this TMP in terms of priority/urgency is business as usual. I think there should be some actions identified which would make a difference...give the Council and public something to consider as an option. |
| Bradford Bypass | Change Bradford Bypass to 400-404 link |
| Goods Movement | Safety concerns at 8th Concession and King Road intersection. Were these reviewed in the TMP? |
| Whistle Blowing | Clear language that King is already working with the Region/Metrolinx on addressing this. |
| Climate Emergency | Climate change positive impact of the paved roads. More robust paragraph in the intro |
| Road Improvements | Sidewalk on Western Ave -- Yes or No? |
| Mill Road | Topography doesn't support trucks. 7th Concession with the interchange is better for trucks |
| Goods Movement | 17th Sideroad should not be a proposed goods movement route as trucks from the Bolton Bypass will use it to enter King. 17th Sideroad was removed last time. 17th is not uploaded to the Region so we should take it off the goods movement map. 17th Sideroad and 12th Concession intersection has some sightline issues and previous collisions. |
| Road Improvements | Why are we proposing a linking of the 10th? Environmental Concerns |
| Road Improvements | Please reflect that 15th is not a through road. Please keep it that way |


| Topic | Comment Received |
| :---: | :---: |
| Summarizing the Feedback | 7th Concession + 17th Sideroad in Happy Valley Forest needs to stay closed |
| 15th Sideroad | Vehicles should head southbound on Dufferin down to King Vaughan Road or Kirby to get to 400. This is an alternative to 15th Sideroad connection to Highway 400. |
| Kingscross Classification | Kingscross should be designated a local road. Paved shoulders are not needed. |
| 15th Sideroad | 15th Sideroad $=$ Controversial. Bypass of King City + Nobleton - good |
| AT | Figure 5-7 - extend the Mansions of King/Bushlands trail down to King Road |
| Goods Movement | Move goods movement route from Mill to 10th Concession south of King |
| Goods Movement | Make 17th a secondary goods movement route |
| King City East Lands | We noticed that the Committee of the Whole Agenda had a first draft of the Transportation Master Plan. You may not be aware that the Township and the King City East North Landowners Group, with guidance from Burnside who was acting on behalf of the Township, conducted a Class C EA for the King City East lands. It was completed in May 2018. <br> The draft 2020 Master Plan shows an east-west connection between Keele Street via East Humber Drive to Dufferin Street (\#1 on the attached image) as well as one through the King Rocks lands north of the valley (2). Both of these connections were shown in the last Master Plan but eliminated as options through the EA process. <br> The East Humber Drive extension (1) would cross through a PSW near Dufferin Street. The approved Acorn subdivision in this area does not anticipate any permanent connection to Keele Street due to the PSW and local residents' objections. In fact, it has been quite difficult to obtain even a temporary construction access to Dufferin Street and more than 50 units. <br> The second connection to Dufferin Street (2) was also examined in the EA and eliminated as an option due to the crossing of a redside dace inhabited watercourse and limited traffic benefit in comparison to other options. I believe there was to be a trail connection to Country Day School on an existing driveway and the existing crossing may be used as an emergency access or condominium road. <br> I have attached a link to the Class C EA final report for your information. https://private.filesanywhere.com $/ \mathrm{mgp} / \mathrm{fs} / \mathrm{v} . \mathrm{aspx}$ ? $\mathrm{v}=8 \mathrm{a}$ af6678b59a174beae68 I would be happy to meet with you to go over the history of the studies and approvals that eliminated the two roads crossings if you think it would be helpful. MGP, Beacon, Poulos and Chung and SKA conducted the EA. <br> We request the draft Master Plan be updated accordingly to reflect the findings of the Class C EA for the King City East Lands. |
| Bushlands and Mansions of King Road Fabric | There is a concern with regard two roads drawn on the map. <br> I have attached a marked up version of the map showing the areas of concern. <br> 1.An apparent new road shown for the Mansions of King development. <br> -The new road goes from Jane Street by an existing property to which reference is made locally as the "Jilek's" property and passes just south of Kingscross properties including Snowberry Lane, connecting to the sub-division which is located to the south of Kingscross/ Champlain Crescent \& to the west of Manitou Drive. <br> -This road was NOT been subject of the recent planning application \& was never mentioned in the review process or LPAT appeal (January 2020). <br> -This road appears to be the same as what was envisaged in the 1990's when the property it crosses was approved for 2 acre lots. The situation has now changed. Should a road be necessary \& it is not it would need a bridge to span the wetlands behind Kingscross Drive. <br> -The drawing of the road should be corrected. <br> 2.An apparent in/out is drawn from the Bushland Heights development onto Jane Street to the north of the one which was considered in the planning application and a further LPAT appeal. <br> -There was no such in/out subject of the recent planning application \& none was mentioned in the LPAT appeal (November 2019). |
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Appendix C
DETAILED ROAD NETWORK ASSESSMENTS

|  | Population |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service Area | 2016 | 2031 | Growth Rate |
| Schomberg \& Lloydtown | 2,900 | 3,100 | 0.5\% |
| Nobleton | 5,700 | 7,000 | 1.4\% |
| King City | 6,900 | 15,500 | 5.5\% |
| Others | 10,000 | 9,300 | -0.5\% |
| Total: | 25,500 | 34,900 | 2.1\% |



| Screenline \# | Screenline Name | Street Name | Road Surface | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Approach Volumes includes Heavy Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Auto Capacity (vplph) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Link } \\ & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { (vph) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | VIC Ratio | Volumes - <br> includes <br> Heavy <br> Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ (vpl) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | VIC Ratio |  |
| 1A | North Boundary - <br> South of Highway 9, West of Highway 400 | 12 th Concession | Unpaved (gravel) | 14 |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.02 |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | 1 1th Concession | Paved | 113 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.15 | 87 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  | $\frac{10 \text { th Concession }}{\text { Hwy }}$ | Paved | $\frac{12}{983}$ | 2 | $\frac{700}{1,000}$ | $\frac{735}{1,050}$ | 735 2.100 | 0.02 0.47 | 10 | - 1 | $\frac{700}{1,000}$ | $\frac{735}{1,050}$ | 735 2.100 | 0.01 0.24 |  |
|  |  | 8th Concession | Paved | 82 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.11 | 65 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.09 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 1,204 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.24 | 667 | - 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.13 |  |
| 1B | North Boundary - <br> North of Highway 9 , <br> East of Highway 400 | Jane Street | Paved | 200 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.24 | 47 | $\bigcirc 1$ | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.06 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 171 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.23 | 50 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.07 |  |
|  |  | Dufferin | Paved | 219 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.30 | 22 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 590 | 3 |  |  | 2,310 | 0.26 | 119 | 3 | - |  | 2,310 | 0.05 |  |
| 2 | West of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 832 197 | 1 | ${ }_{1}^{1,000}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,050} 1050$ | 2,100 | 0.40 | 895 464 | - ${ }^{2}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,000}$ | 1,050 1050 | $\frac{2,100}{1050}$ | 0.43 |  |
|  |  | Lloydtown Aurora Rd | ${ }^{\text {Paved }}$ | $\stackrel{197}{873}$ | 2 | 1,200 | ${ }_{1,260}$ | 2,520 | 0.35 | 907 | ${ }^{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,050 1,260 | ${ }^{1}, 520$ | 0.36 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 1,902 | 5 |  |  | ${ }_{5,670}$ | 0.34 | 2,266 | ${ }^{5}$ | 1,20 |  | ${ }_{5,670}$ | 0.40 |  |
| 3 | West Boundary | King Road | Paved | 775 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 1.05 | 694 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.94 | York Region plans to widen King Road from 2 to 4 lanes between Caledon-King Townline to Highway 27 by 2032-2041. |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad | Paved | 60 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.08 | 20 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad / Lloydrown Aurora | Unpaved (gravel) | 22 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 | 24 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 |  |
|  |  | Highway 9 | Paved | 344 | 1 | 1,200 | 1,260 |  |  | 956 |  | 1,200 | 1,260 | 1,260 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 1,201 | 4 |  |  | 3,465 | 0.35 | 1,694 | 4 |  |  | 3,465 | 0.49 |  |
| 4 | East Boundary | King Road | Paved | 1,578 | 2 | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.83 | 922 | ${ }^{2}$ | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 15th Sideroad / Bloomington Rd | Paved | 819 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.98 | 572 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.68 | York Region plans to widen 15th Sideroad from 2 <br> to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should discuss and may need to consider widening the road prior to 2032 . |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad / Wellington Rd | Paved | 18 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.02 | 458 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.44 |  |
|  |  | 18th Sideroad | Paved | 409 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.39 | 778 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.74 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad | Paved |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.13 |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.09 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9/Davis Rd | Paved | 1,966 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.78 | 1,996 | ${ }^{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.79 |  |
|  |  | Millers Sideroad | Paved | 319 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.43 | 261 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.36 |  |
|  |  | Graham Sideroad | Paved |  | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.05 |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.10 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 5,247 | 10 |  |  | 9,555 | 0.55 | 5,123 | 10 |  |  | 9,555 | 0.54 |  |
| 5 | South Boundary | Hwy 27 | Paved | 1,122 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1.07 | 989 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.94 | York Region plans to widen Highway 27 from Major Mackenzie to King Road from 2 to 4 lanes by 2022-2026. |
|  |  | Weston | Paved | 442 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.42 | 127 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MTO plans to widen Highway 400 from 6 to 8 lanes (including 2 HOV lanes) from Major |
|  |  | Hwy 400 | Paved | 6,351 |  | 1,000 1 1000 | 2,000 | ${ }^{6,000}$ | 1.06 | 3,976 |  | 1,000 | ${ }_{1}^{2,0050}$ | ${ }^{6,000}$ | 0.66 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | ${ }_{1,576}$ | 2 | 1,000 | $\stackrel{1}{1,050}$ | 2,100 | 0.75 | 363 | 2 | ${ }_{1}^{1,000}$ | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.17 |  |
|  |  | Dufferin Street | Paved |  | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.75 | 371 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.35 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 10,550 | 9 |  |  | 12,300 | 0.86 | 6,466 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  | 12,300 | 0.53 |  |
| 6 | East of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 634 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.30 | 1,376 | ${ }^{2}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.66 |  |
|  |  | Loydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 602 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.57 | 862 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.82 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9 / Davis Dr | Paved | 1,803 3 | $\frac{2}{5}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 5.670 | 0.72 | 1,917 4155 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 5670 | ${ }_{0}^{0.76}$ |  |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Screenline \#} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Screenline Name} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Street Name} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Road Surface} \& \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{NB/EB Direction} \& \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{SB/WB Direction} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Notes} \\
\hline \& \& \& \& Approach Volumes includes Heavy Vehicles (vph) \& Number of Lanes \& Lane Auto Capacity (vplph) \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Lane Mixed \\
Traffic \\
Capacity \\
(vplph)
\end{tabular} \& Link Capacity (vph) \& VIC Ratio \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Volumes - \\
includes \\
Heavy \\
Vehicles (vph)
\end{tabular} \& Number of Lanes \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Lane } \\
\& \text { Capacity } \\
\& \text { (vp1) }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Lane Mixed \\
Traffic \\
Capacity \\
(vplph)
\end{tabular} \& Link Capacity (vph) \& VIC Ratio \& \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{1A} \& \multirow{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
North Boundary - \\
South of Highway 9, West of Highway 400
\end{tabular}} \& 12 12th Concession \& Unpaved (gravel) \& 11 \& \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.01 \& 13 \& \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.02 \& \\
\hline \& \& 11th Concession \& Paved \& 25 \& \& 700 \& \({ }_{7}^{735}\) \& 735 \& 0.03 \& 111 \& \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.15 \& \\
\hline \& \& \(\frac{10 \text { th Concession }}{\text { Hwy }}\) \& Paved \& \(\begin{array}{r}6 \\ 386 \\ \hline\end{array}\) \& 2 \& \(\stackrel{700}{1,000}\) \& \(\begin{array}{r}735 \\ \hline 1,050\end{array}\) \& 2,100 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
0.01 \\
0.18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& \(\stackrel{22}{1,214}\) \& \(\frac{1}{2}\) \& \(\stackrel{700}{1,000}\) \& \(\xrightarrow{735}\) \& 2,100 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
0.03 \\
0.58 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& \\
\hline \& \& 8th Concession \& Paved \& 36 \& \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.05 \& 76 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.10 \& \\
\hline \& \& \& Screenline Total: \& 464 \& 6 \& \& \& 5,040 \& 0.09 \& 1,436 \& 6 \& \& \& 5,040 \& 0.28 \& \\
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{1B} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
North Boundary - \\
North of Highway 9, \\
East of Highway 400
\end{tabular}} \& Jane Street \& Paved \& 8 \& 1 \& 800 \& 840 \& 840 \& 0.01 \& 620 \& - 1 \& 800 \& 840 \& 840 \& 0.74 \& \\
\hline \& \& Keele Street \& Paved \& 31 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735
735 \& 735 \& 0.04 \& 90 \& - 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.12 \& \\
\hline \& \& Dufferin \& Paved Screenline Total: \& 48 \& 3 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735
2.310 \& 0.07 \& 77 \& , \& 700 \& 735 \& 735
2310 \& 0.06 \& \\
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{2} \& \multirow{4}{*}{West of Highway 400} \& King Road \& Paved \& 760 \& 2 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 2,100 \& 0.36 \& 974 \& 2 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 2,100 \& 0.46 \& \\
\hline \& \& Lloydtown Aurora Rd \& Paved \& 463 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.44 \& 204 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.19 \& \\
\hline \& \& Hwy 9/ Davis Dr \& Paved \& 1,151 \& \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 2,520 \& 0.46 \& 1,055 \& \({ }^{2}\) \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 2,520 \& 0.42 \& \\
\hline \& \& \& Screenline Total: \& 2,374 \& 5 \& \& \& 5,670 \& 0.42 \& 2,233 \& - 5 \& \& \& 5,670 \& 0.39 \& \\
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{3} \& \multirow{5}{*}{West Boundary} \& King Road \& Paved \& 660 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.90 \& 428 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.58 \& \\
\hline \& \& 17th Sideroad \& Paved \& 56 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.08 \& 19 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.03 \& \\
\hline \& \& 19th Sideroad / Lloydrown Aurora \& Unpaved (gravel) \& 43 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.06 \& 11 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.01 \& \\
\hline \& \& Highway 9 \& Paved \& 323 \& 1 \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 1,260 \& 0.26 \& 898 \& 1 \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 1,260 \& 0.71 \& \\
\hline \& \& King Road \& Paved Screenline Tota: \& \(\stackrel{1,082}{1,113}\) \& 2 \& 900 \& 945 \& \(\xrightarrow{3,465}\) \& 0.5 \& \(\stackrel{1,356}{1,384}\) \& \({ }^{2}\) \& 900 \& 945 \& 3,465
1,890 \& 0.39 \& \\
\hline \multirow{7}{*}{4} \& \multirow{7}{*}{East Boundary} \& 15th Sideroad / Bloomington Rd \& Paved \& 173
773 \& 2
1 \& 800
800 \& 845
840 \& \% \({ }^{1} 8\) \& 0.59
0.92 \& 1,884

951 \& 2
1 \& 900
800 \& 840 \& 8400 \& 1.13 \& York Region plans to widen 15th Sideroad from 2 to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should discuss and consider widening the road prior to 2032. <br>
\hline \& \& 17th Sideroad / Wellington Rd \& Paved \& 447 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.43 \& 85 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.08 \& <br>
\hline \& \& 18 th Sideroad \& Paved \& 771 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.73 \& 310 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.30 \& <br>
\hline \& \& 19th Sideroad \& Paved \& 63 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.09 \& 72 \& 1 \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.10 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Hwy 9/Davis Rd \& Paved \& 1,508 \& 2 \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 2,520 \& 0.60 \& 1,916 \& ${ }^{2}$ \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 2,520 \& 0.76 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Millers Sideroad \& Paved \& 240 \& \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.33 \& 343 \& \& 700 \& 735 \& 735 \& 0.47 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Graham Sideroad \& ${ }^{\text {Paved }}$ Screenline Total: \& $\xrightarrow{4,927}$ \& 10 \& 700 \& 735 \& $\begin{array}{r}735 \\ \hline 9,555\end{array}$ \& $\stackrel{0.02}{0.52}$ \& 5,092 \& 10 \& 700 \& 735 \& $\begin{array}{r}735 \\ \hline 9,555\end{array}$ \& $\stackrel{0.04}{0.53}$ \& <br>
\hline \multirow{7}{*}{5} \& \multirow{7}{*}{South Boundary} \& Hwy 27 \& Paved \& 529 \& 2 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 2,100 \& 0.25 \& 2,004 \& 2 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 2,100 \& 0.95 \& It is recommended that the gravel road 10th
Concession from King Road to 15th Sideroad to be paved, adding capacity and making it a more attractive north-south road alternative to Highway
27. <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& 1 \& \& \& \& \& \& 1 \& \& \& \& \& York Region plans to widen Weston Road from 2 to 4 lanes between King Road and Teston Road by 2032 -2041 <br>
\hline \& \& $\frac{\text { Weston }}{}$ \& ${ }^{\text {Paved }}$ Paved \& 4.092 \& 4 \& 1,000
1,800 \& 1,050
2000 \& 1,050
8000 \& 0.08 \& 1,084
6,753 \& 4 \& 1,000
1800 \& 1,050
2000 \& 1,050
8,000 \& 1.03 \& by 2032-2041. <br>
\hline \& \& Jane Street \& Paved \& 784 \& , \& ${ }_{1}^{1,000}$ \& 1,050 \& ${ }_{1}^{1,050}$ \& 0.75 \& 326 \& \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& ${ }^{1}, 0050$ \& 0.31 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Keele Street \& Paved \& 422 \& 2 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 2,100 \& 0.20 \& 1,572 \& 2 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 2,100 \& 0.75 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Dufferin Street \& Paved \& 315 \& \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.30 \& 906 \& 1 \& 1,000 \& 1,050 \& 1,050 \& 0.86 \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& Screenline Total: \& 6,227 \& 11 \& \& \& 15,350 \& 0.41 \& 12,645 \& 11 \& \& \& 15,350 \& 0.82 \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{6} \& \multirow{3}{*}{East of Highway 400} \& Kloyg Road Aum Aurora Rd \& Paved \& 1,230
513 \& 1 \& 1,000
1,000 \& 1,050
1,050 \& 2,100
1,050 \& 0.59
0.49 \& $\begin{array}{r}1,677 \\ \hline 140 \\ \hline\end{array}$ \& $\stackrel{2}{1}$ \& 1,000
1,000 \& 1,050
1,050 \& 2,100
1,050 \& 0.80
0.32 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Hwy 9/ Davis Dr \& Paved \& 2.216 \& 2 \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 2,520 \& 0.88 \& 1,115 \& 2 \& 1,200 \& 1,260 \& 2,520 \& 0.44 \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& Screenline Total: \& 3,959 \& 5 \& \& \& 5,670 \& 0.70 \& 3,132 \& 5 \& \& \& 5,670 \& 0.55 \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table C-3b Screenline Analysis - Future 2031 (PM peak hour)
Alternative 2 - 2015 TMP

| Screenline \# | Screenline Name | Street Name | Road Surface | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Approach Volumes includes Heavy Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Auto Capacity (vplph) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | VIC Ratio | Volumes - <br> includes <br> Heavy <br> Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { apacity } \end{aligned}$ (vpl) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | Link <br> Capacity (vph) | VIC Ratio |  |
| 1A | North Boundary South of Highway 9, West of Highway 400 | 12 th Concession | Unpaved (gravel) | 17 |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.02 | 8 | $\bigcirc$ | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | 11 th Concession | Paved | 144 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.20 | 87 | $\square$ | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  | $\frac{10 \text { th Concession }}{\text { Hwy } 27}$ | Paved | 15 1339 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 2100 | 0.02 | 12 |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.02 |  |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { Hwy } 27}{\text { 8th Concession }}$ | Paved | 1,339 | - $\quad 2$ | 1,000 700 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.64 0.13 | 536 65 | - $\quad \begin{array}{r}1 \\ 1\end{array}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 735 | 0.26 0.09 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 1,612 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.32 | 708 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.14 |  |
| 1B | North Boundary - <br> North of Highway 9, <br> East of Highway 400 | Jane Street | Paved | 547 | $\bigcirc$ | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.65 | 33 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.04 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 212 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 |  | ${ }^{3}$ |  | - | 735 | 735 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Paved Screenline Total: | ${ }_{1,340}^{281}$ | - ${ }^{1}$ | 700 | 735 | 735 2,310 | 0.38 <br> 0.58 | 28 98 | 1 | 700 | 735 | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 2,310 } \\ \hline 105\end{array}$ | 0.04 <br> 0.04 |  |
| 2 | West of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 924 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.44 | 863 | - 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.41 |  |
|  |  | Lloydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 210 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.20 | 408 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.39 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9 / Davis Dr | Paved Screenline Total | $\frac{1,218}{2352}$ | - ${ }^{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 5 | 0.48 | $\stackrel{1,208}{2479}$ | - ${ }^{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 5 5 | 0.48 0.44 |  |
| 3 | West Boundary | King Road | Paved | ${ }_{6} 623$ | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.85 | 651 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.89 |  |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad | Paved | 19 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 | 56 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.08 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad / Lloydrown Aurora | Unpaved (gravel) | 28 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.04 | 31 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.04 |  |
|  |  | Highway 9 | Paved | 898 | 1 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 1,260 | 0.71 | 323 | 1 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 1,260 | 0.26 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 88 | - 4 |  |  | 3,465 | 0.45 | 1,061 | - 4 |  |  | 3,465 | 0.31 |  |
| 4 | East Boundary | King Road | Paved | 1,541 | 2 | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.82 | 1,140 | 2 | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.60 |  |
|  |  | 15th Sideroad / Bloomington Rd | Paved | 819 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.98 | 782 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.93 | York Region plans to widen 15th Sideroad from 2 to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should discuss and consider widening the road prior to 2032 . |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad / Wellington Rd | Paved | 15 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.01 | 505 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.48 |  |
|  |  | 18 th Sideroad | Paved | 371 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.35 | 759 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.72 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad | Paved | 99 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.13 | 66 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.09 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9/Davis Rd | Paved | 1,889 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.75 | 2,063 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.82 |  |
|  |  | Millers Sideroad | Paved | 409 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.56 | 335 |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.46 |  |
|  |  | Graham Sideroad | Paved | 49 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.07 |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 5,192 | 10 |  |  | 9,555 | 0.54 | 5,740 | 10 |  |  | 9,555 | 0.60 |  |
| 5 | South Boundary | Hwy 27 | Paved | 2,241 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 1.07 | 1,124 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.54 | It is recommended that the gravel road 10th Concession from King Road to 15th Sideroad to be paved, adding capacity and making it a more attractive north-south road alternative to Highway 27. |
|  |  | Weston | Paved | 717 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.68 | 141 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.13 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 400 | Paved | 6,810 | 4 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.85 | 4,495 | 4 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.56 |  |
|  |  | Jane Street | Paved | 389 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.37 | 663 | $\xrightarrow{1}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.63 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 1,679 | - 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.80 | 440 | ${ }^{2}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.21 |  |
|  |  | Dufferin Street | Paved Screenline Total: | $\frac{882}{12,718}$ | $\frac{1}{11}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | $\frac{1,050}{15,350}$ | 0.84 0.83 | $\frac{363}{7,226}$ | 11 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 15,350 | 0.35 0.47 |  |
| 6 | East of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 819 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.39 | 1,461 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.70 |  |
|  |  | Lloydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 605 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.58 | 623 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.59 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9 / Davis Dr | Paved Screenline Total: | $\frac{1,771}{3,195}$ | $\frac{2}{5}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | $\stackrel{2,520}{5,670}$ | 0.70 0.56 | $\frac{2,162}{4,246}$ | $\frac{2}{5}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | $\stackrel{2,520}{5,670}$ | 0.86 0.75 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total | 3,195 | 5 |  |  | 5,670 | 0.56 | 4,246 | 5 |  |  | 5,670 | 0.75 |  |

Table C-4a Screenline Analysis - Future 2031 (AM peak hour)
Alternative 3-2020 TMP

| Screenline \# | Screenline Name | Street Name | Road Surface | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Approach Volumes includes Heavy Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Auto Capacity (vplph) | Lane Mixed <br> Trafic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | Link <br> Capacity (vph) | VIC Ratio | Volumes - <br> includes <br> Heavy <br> Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | VIC Ratio |  |
| 1A | North Boundary - <br> South of Highway 9, West of Highway 400 | 12 th Concession | Unpaved (gravel) | $\frac{11}{25}$ |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.01 0.03 | $\frac{13}{111}$ |  | 700 | 735 | 735 735 | 0.02 0.15 |  |
|  |  | 11 th Concession | Paved | 25 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 735 | 0.03 | 111 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.15 |  |
|  |  | Hiwy 27 | Paved | 386 | $2^{2}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.18 | 1,214 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.58 |  |
|  |  | 8th Concession | Paved | 36 |  | 700 | 735 |  |  |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.10 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 464 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.09 | 1,436 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.28 |  |
| 1B | North Boundary - <br> North of Highway 9, <br> East of Highway 400 | Jane Street | Paved | 8 | $\bigcirc 1$ | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.01 | 620 | $\bigcirc$ | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.74 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 31 |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.04 | 90 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  | Dufferin | Paved Screenline Total: | 48 87 | 1 <br> 3 | 700 | 735 | 735 2,310 | 0.07 0.04 | 75 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 2,310 | 0.06 0.33 |  |
| 2 | West of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 760 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.36 | 974 | - 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.46 |  |
|  |  | Loydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 463 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.44 | 204 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.19 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9/ Davis Dr | Paved Screentine Total | 1,151 , 1374 | - ${ }^{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.46 | $\stackrel{1}{1,055}$ | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.42 |  |
| 3 | West Boundary | King Road | Paved | 660 | $\bigcirc 1$ | 700 | 735 | , 735 | 0.90 | 428 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | -735 | 0.58 |  |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad | Paved | 56 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.08 | 19 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad / Lloydrown Aurora | Unpaved (gravel) | 43 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.06 | 11 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | Highway 9 | Paved Screenline Total: | ${ }_{1}^{323}$ | - 1 | 1,200 | 1,260 | $\frac{1,260}{3465}$ | 0.26 | ${ }_{1}^{898}$ | - 1 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 1,260 3465 | 0.71 |  |
| 4 | East Boundary | King Road | Paved Screenine Tota: | ${ }_{1}^{1,113}$ | 2 | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.59 | ${ }_{1}^{1,384}$ | 2 | 900 | 945 | ${ }_{1}^{1,8950}$ | 0.73 |  |
|  |  | 15th Sideroad / Bloomington Rd | Paved | 773 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.46 | 951 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.57 | 2019 TMP recommendation - York Region plans owiden 15th Sideroad from 2 to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. Te Township and the Region should disc consider widening the road prior to 2032. |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad / Wellington Rd | Paved | 447 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.43 | 85 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.08 |  |
|  |  | 18th Sideroad | Paved | 771 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.73 | 310 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.30 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad | Paved | 63 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.09 | 72 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.10 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9/Davis Rd | Paved | 1,508 | $\underline{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.60 | 1,916 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.76 |  |
|  |  | Millers Sideroad | Paved | 240 | 1 |  |  | 735 | 0.33 | 343 | - 1 | 700 |  | 735 | 0.47 |  |
|  |  | Graham Sideroad | Paved |  |  | 700 | 735 |  | 0.02 |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.04 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 4,927 | 11 |  |  | 10,395 | 0.47 | 5,092 | 11 |  |  | 10,395 | 0.49 |  |
| 5 | South Boundary | Hwy 27 | Paved | 529 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.25 | 2,004 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.95 | It is recommended that the gravel road 10th Concession from King Road to 15th Sideroad to be paved, adding capacity and making it a more attractive north-south road alternative to Highway 27. |
|  |  | 8th Concession | Paved | 31 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.04 | 417 | - 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.50 | 2019 TMP recommendation - pave gravel road. |
|  |  | 10th Concession | Paved | 6 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.01 | 358 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.43 | 2019 TMP recommendation - pave gravel road. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | York Region plans to widen Weston Road from 2 to 4 lanes between King Road and Teston Road |
|  |  | Weston | Paved | 85 | , | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.08 | 1,084 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1.03 | by 2032-2041. |
|  |  | Hwy 400 | Paved | 4,092 | 4 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.51 | 6,753 | 4 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.84 |  |
|  |  | Jane Street | Paved | 784 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.75 | 326 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.31 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 422 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.20 | 1,572 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.75 |  |
|  |  | Dufferin Street | Paved Screentine Total | $\frac{315}{6264}$ | 15 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.30 0 | $\frac{906}{13.420}$ | 15 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.86 |  |
| 6 | East of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | , 1,230 | , | 1,000 | 1,050 | $\stackrel{\text { 2,100 }}{ }$ | 0.59 | 1,677 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.80 |  |
|  |  | 15th Sideroad | Paved | 431 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.26 | 385 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.23 | 2019 TMP recommendation - York Region plans or widen 15th Sideroad from 2 to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should disc consider widening the road prior to 2032. |
|  |  | Lloydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 513 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.49 | 340 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | ${ }_{1}^{1,050}$ | 0.32 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9 / Davis Dr | Paved | 2.216 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2.520 | 0.88 | ${ }_{1,115}^{3}$ | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.44 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 4,390 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,350 |  |  |

Table C-4b Screenline Analysis - Future 2031 (PM peak hour)
Alternative 3-2020 TMP

| Screenline \# | Screenline Name | Street Name | Road Surface | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Approach Volumes includes Heavy Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Auto Capacity (vplph) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Link } \\ & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { (vph) } \end{aligned}$ | VIC Ratio | Volumes - <br> includes <br> Heavy <br> Vehicles (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Lane Mixed <br> Traffic <br> Capacity <br> (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | VIC Ratio |  |
| 1A | North Boundary - <br> South of Highway 9, West of Highway 400 | 12th Concession | Unpaved (gravel) | $\frac{17}{14}$ |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.02 |  |  | 700 | 735 | 735 735 | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | 11 th Concession | Paved | 144 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.20 | ${ }_{12} 8$ | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 27 | Paved | 1,339 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.64 | 536 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.26 |  |
|  |  | 8th Concession | Paved |  |  | 700 | 735 |  |  |  |  | 700 | 735 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 1,612 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.32 | 708 | 6 |  |  | 5,040 | 0.14 |  |
| 1B | North Boundary - <br> North of Highway 9, <br> East of Highway 400 | Jane Street | Paved | $\stackrel{547}{512}$ | 1 | 800 | 840 | 880 | 0.65 | 33 | - 1 | 800 | $\begin{array}{r}840 \\ 735 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}840 \\ 735 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0.04 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 512 | 1 | 700 |  | 735 | 0.70 | 37 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.05 |  |
|  |  | Dufferin | Paved Screenline Total: | ${ }_{1,340}^{281}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | 700 | 735 | 735 2,310 | 0.38 | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | 700 | 735 | 2,310 | 0.04 |  |
| 2 | West of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 924 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.44 | 863 | ${ }^{2}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.41 |  |
|  |  | Lloydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 210 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.20 | 408 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.39 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9/ Davis Dr | Paved Screentine Tota: | $\frac{1,218}{235}$ | $\stackrel{2}{5}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.48 | ${ }^{1,2088}$ | - ${ }^{2}$ | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.48 |  |
| 3 | West Boundary | King Road | Paved | 623 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.85 | 651 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.89 |  |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad | Paved | 19 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.03 | 56 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.08 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad / Lloydrown Aurora | Unpaved (gravel) | 28 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.04 | 31 | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.04 |  |
|  |  | Highway 9 | Paved Screentine Total | ${ }_{1} 5988$ |  | 1,200 | 1,260 | $\frac{1,260}{3465}$ | 0.71 | ${ }_{1}^{323}$ | - 1 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 1,260 3 3 | ${ }^{0.26}$ |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 1,568 | 4 |  |  | 3,465 | 0.45 | 1,061 | - 4 |  |  | 3,465 | 0.31 |  |
| 4 | East Boundary | King Road | Paved | 1,541 | 2 | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.82 | 1,140 | 2 | 900 | 945 | 1,890 | 0.60 |  |
|  |  | 15th Sideroad / Bloomington Rd | Paved | 819 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.49 | 782 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.47 | 2019 TMP recommendation - York Region plans to widen 15th Sideroad from 2 to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should discuss and |
|  |  | 17th Sideroad / Wellington Rd | Paved | 15 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.01 | 505 | - 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.48 |  |
|  |  | 18th Sideroad | Paved | 371 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.35 | 759 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.72 |  |
|  |  | 19th Sideroad | Paved | 99 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.13 | 66 | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.09 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9/Davis Rd | Paved | 1,889 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.75 | 2,063 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.82 |  |
|  |  | Millers Sideroad | Paved | 409 |  | 700 | 7335 | 735 | 0.56 | 335 |  | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.46 |  |
|  |  | Graham Sideroad | Paved |  | 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 |  |  | - 1 | 700 | 735 | 735 | 0.12 |  |
|  |  |  | Screenline Total: | 5,192 | 11 |  |  | 10,395 | 0.50 | 5,740 | 11 |  |  | 10,395 | 0.55 |  |
| 5 | South Boundary | Hwy 27 | Paved | 2,241 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 1.07 | 1,124 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.54 | It is recommended that the gravel road 10th Concession from King Road to 15th Sideroad to be paved, adding capacity and making it a more attractive north-south road alternative to Highway 27. |
|  |  | 8th Concession | Paved | 400 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.48 | 29 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.03 | 2019 TMP recommendation - pave gravel road. |
|  |  | 10th Concession | Paved | 364 | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.43 |  | 1 | 800 | 840 | 840 | 0.01 | 2019 TMP recommendation - pave gravel road. |
|  |  | Weston | Paved | 717 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.68 | 141 | 1 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.13 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 400 | Paved | 6,810 | 4 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.85 | 4,495 | 4 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.56 |  |
|  |  | Jane Street | Paved | 389 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | $\begin{array}{r}1,050 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0.37 | 663 | - ${ }^{1}$ | 1,000 | 1,050 | $\begin{array}{r}1,050 \\ \hline 100\end{array}$ | 0.63 |  |
|  |  | Keele Street | Paved | 1,679 882 |  |  |  | 2,100 1,050 |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{2,100}{1,050}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Durerin Street | Paved Screenline Total: | 13,482 | 15 |  |  | 19,130 | ${ }_{0}^{0.70}$ | 7,266 | 15 |  |  | 19,130 | ${ }_{0}^{0.38}$ |  |
| 6 | East of Highway 400 | King Road | Paved | 819 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.39 | 1,461 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 2,100 | 0.70 |  |
|  |  | 15th Sideroad | Paved | 386 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.23 | 435 | 2 | 800 | 840 | 1,680 | 0.26 | 2019 TMP recommendation - York Region plans to widen 15th Sideroad from 2 to 4 lanes between Highway 400 to Bathurst Street by 2032 to 2041. The Township and the Region should discuss and consider widening the road prior to 2032. |
|  |  | Lloydtown Aurora Rd | Paved | 605 |  | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.58 | 623 | , | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 0.59 |  |
|  |  | Hwy 9 / Davis Dr | Paved Screenline Total: | ${ }^{1,771} 3$ | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | $\xrightarrow{2,520}$ | 0.70 0.49 | 2,162 4,681 | 2 | 1,200 | 1,260 | 2,520 | 0.86 0.64 |  |

Table C-5a Traffic Analysis - Existing (AM peak hour), King City - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Bennet Drive | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Burns Boulevard | 39 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 | 46 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Burton Grove | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 32 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Collard Drive | 76 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Dennis Drive | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 2 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 |
| Dennison Street | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 2 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 |
| East Humber River Drive | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Elizabeth Grove | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 86 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.17 |
| Findlay Avenue | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Hambly Avenue | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| King Cross Drive | 47 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Kingslynn Drive | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Langdon Drive | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Martin Street | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 20 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| McClure Drive | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Melrose Avenue | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Nicort Road | 90 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.18 | 37 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| Norman Drive | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Patricia Drive | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 42 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| Springhill Trail | 63 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 | 82 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Walkington Way | 40 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Warren Road | 3 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Watch Hill Road | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |

Table C-5b Traffic Analysis - Existing (PM peak hour), King City - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Bennet Drive | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Burns Boulevard | 79 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 | 43 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Burton Grove | 33 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Collard Drive | 33 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Dennis Drive | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Dennison Street | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| East Humber River Drive | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Elizabeth Grove | 110 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.22 | 35 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| Findlay Avenue | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Hambly Avenue | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| King Cross Drive | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Kingslynn Drive | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Langdon Drive | 3 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Martin Street | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| McClure Drive | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Melrose Avenue | 16 |  | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Nicort Road | 37 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 42 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| Norman Drive | 10 | - 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Patricia Drive | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Springhill Trail | 38 | - 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 | 39 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| Walkington Way | 22 |  | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 76 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 |
| Warren Road | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Watch Hill Road | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |

Table C-6a Traffic Analysis - Future 2031 (AM peak hour), King City - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Bennet Drive | 28 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 47 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Burns Boulevard | 74 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 | 88 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.18 |
| Burton Grove | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 62 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 |
| Collard Drive | 145 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.29 | 45 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Dennis Drive | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Dennison Street | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| East Humber River Drive | 32 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Elizabeth Grove | 55 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.11 | 164 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.33 |
| Findlay Avenue | 20 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Hambly Avenue | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 32 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| King Cross Drive | 89 | , | 500 | 500 | 0.18 | 45 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Kingslynn Drive | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Langdon Drive | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Martin Street | 36 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 38 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| McClure Drive | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Melrose Avenue | 24 |  | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 44 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Nicort Road | 171 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.34 | 71 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 |
| Norman Drive | 23 | -1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Patricia Drive | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 81 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Springhill Trail | 121 | - 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.24 | 157 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.31 |
| Walkington Way | 76 |  | 500 | 500 | 0.15 | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Warren Road | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Watch Hill Road | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |

Table C-6b Traffic Analysis - Future 2031 (PM peak hour), King City - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Bennet Drive | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Burns Boulevard | 151 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.30 | 82 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Burton Grove | 64 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 | 43 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Collard Drive | 64 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 | 36 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| Dennis Drive | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Dennison Street | 21 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| East Humber River Drive | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 21 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Elizabeth Grove | 210 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.42 | 67 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 |
| Findlay Avenue | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 36 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| Hambly Avenue | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 28 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| King Cross Drive | 47 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 | 45 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Kingslynn Drive | 55 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.11 | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Langdon Drive | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Martin Street | 44 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| McClure Drive | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Melrose Avenue | 30 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Nicort Road | 71 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 | 81 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Norman Drive | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Patricia Drive | 56 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.11 | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Springhill Trail | 73 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 | 75 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 |
| Walkington Way | 42 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 | 145 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.29 |
| Warren Road | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 23 | - 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Watch Hill Road | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |

Table C-7a Traffic Analysis - Existing (AM peak hour), Nobleton - Collector Roads

|  |  |  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | From | To | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| 8th Concession | 15th Sideroad | King Road | 31 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 65 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 |
| 10th Concession | near King Road |  | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| 15th Sideroad | Highway 27 | 8th Concession | 37 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Ellis Avenue |  |  | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Faris Avenue |  |  | 3 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 3 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Greenside Drive |  |  | 66 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 | 212 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.42 |
| Hawman Avenue |  |  | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 67 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 |
| Hazelbury Drive |  |  | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Henley Drive |  |  | 2 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Hill Farm Road |  |  | 200 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.40 | 62 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 |
| Lynwood Crescent |  |  | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Mactaggart Drive |  |  | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Nobleview Drive |  |  | 2 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Norman Avenue |  |  | 18 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Old King Road |  |  | 24 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Park Heights Trail |  |  | 95 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.19 | 46 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Russel Snider |  |  | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Sheardown Drive (e | (east end) |  | 93 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.19 | 70 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 |
| Sheardown Drive (w | west end) |  | 48 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.10 | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Skyline Trail |  |  | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Wellington Street |  |  | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Wilsen Drive |  |  | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |

Table C-7b Traffic Analysis - Existing (PM peak hour), Nobleton - Collector Roads

|  |  |  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | From | To | Approach <br> Volumes <br> (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach <br> Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| 8th Concession | 15th Sideroad | King Road | 82 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| 10th Concession | near King Road |  | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| 15th Sideroad | Highway 27 | 8th Concession | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Ellis Avenue |  |  | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Faris Avenue |  |  | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Greenside Drive |  |  | 100 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.20 | 61 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 |
| Hawman Avenue |  |  | 61 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 | 52 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.10 |
| Hazelbury Drive |  |  | 32 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Henley Drive |  |  | 3 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Hill Farm Road |  |  | 51 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.10 | 108 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.22 |
| Lynwood Crescent |  |  | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Mactaggart Drive |  |  | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 25 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Nobleview Drive |  |  | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 1 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 |
| Norman Avenue |  |  | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Old King Road |  |  | 18 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Park Heights Trail |  |  | 65 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 | 140 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.28 |
| Russel Snider |  |  | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Sheardown Drive (e | east end) |  | 91 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.18 | 82 |  | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Sheardown Drive (w | west end) |  | 30 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 50 | , | 500 | 500 | 0.10 |
| Skyline Trail |  |  | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 20 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Wellington Street |  |  | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Wilsen Drive |  |  | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 24 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |

Table C-8a Traffic Analysis - Future 2031 (AM peak hour), Nobleton - Collector Roads

|  |  |  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | From | To | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| 8th Concession | 15th Sideroad | King Road | 36 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 76 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 |
| 10th Concession | near King Road |  | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| 15th Sideroad | Highway 27 | 8th Concession | 44 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Ellis Avenue |  |  | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Faris Avenue |  |  | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Greenside Drive |  |  | 78 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 | 250 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.50 |
| Hawman Avenue |  |  | 20 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 79 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Hazelbury Drive |  |  | 27 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Henley Drive |  |  | 2 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Hill Farm Road |  |  | 236 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.47 | 73 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 |
| Lynwood Crescent |  |  | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 7 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Mactaggart Drive |  |  | 27 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 16 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Nobleview Drive |  |  | 2 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Norman Avenue |  |  | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Old King Road |  |  | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 30 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Park Heights Trail |  |  | 112 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.22 | 54 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.11 |
| Russel Snider |  |  | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 9 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Sheardown Drive (e | east end) |  | 110 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.22 | 82 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Sheardown Drive (w | west end) |  | 56 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.11 | 30 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Skyline Trail |  |  | 20 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 |
| Wellington Street |  |  | 18 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 18 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Wilsen Drive |  |  | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 11 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |

Table C-8b Traffic Analysis - Future 2031 (PM peak hour), Nobleton - Collector Roads

|  |  |  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | From | To | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| 8th Concession | 15th Sideroad | King Road | 97 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.19 | 34 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| 10th Concession | near King Road |  | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| 15th Sideroad | Highway 27 | 8th Concession | 30 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Ellis Avenue |  |  | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 27 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Faris Avenue |  |  | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 6 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Greenside Drive |  |  | 118 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.24 | 71 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 |
| Hawman Avenue |  |  | 72 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 | 61 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 |
| Hazelbury Drive |  |  | 38 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 | 18 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Henley Drive |  |  | 4 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 |
| Hill Farm Road |  |  | 61 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 | 127 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.25 |
| Lynwood Crescent |  |  | 15 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Mactaggart Drive |  |  | 27 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Nobleview Drive |  |  | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 1 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.00 |
| Norman Avenue |  |  | 26 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Old King Road |  |  | 22 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 |
| Park Heights Trail |  |  | 76 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 | 165 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.33 |
| Russel Snider |  |  | 5 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.01 | 10 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |
| Sheardown Drive (e | east end) |  | 108 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.22 | 97 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.19 |
| Sheardown Drive (w | west end) |  | 36 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 59 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.12 |
| Skyline Trail |  |  | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 24 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Wellington Street |  |  | 19 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 23 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Wilsen Drive |  |  | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 28 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |

Table C-9a Traffic Analysis - Existing (AM peak hour), Schomberg and Lloydtown - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane <br> Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Main Street | 76 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 | 117 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.23 |
| Church Street | 31 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 | 28 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Cooper Drive | 48 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.10 | 27 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.05 |
| Dr. Kay Drive | 90 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.18 | 66 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 |
| Rose Cottage Lane | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 78 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 |
| Roselena Drive | 17 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |

Table C-9b Traffic Analysis - Existing (PM peak hour), Schomberg and Lloydtown - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane <br> Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Main Street | 135 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.27 | 73 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 |
| Church Street | 41 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 | 40 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| Cooper Drive | 50 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.10 | 41 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| Dr. Kay Drive | 84 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.17 | 161 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.32 |
| Rose Cottage Lane | 67 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.13 | 34 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| Roselena Drive | 12 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 | 38 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |

Table C-10a Traffic Analysis - Future 2031 (AM peak hour), Schomberg and Lloydtown - Collector Roads

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane <br> Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Main Street | 80 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.16 | 123 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.25 |
| Church Street | 33 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 | 30 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Cooper Drive | 51 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.10 | 29 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.06 |
| Dr. Kay Drive | 95 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.19 | 69 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 |
| Rose Cottage Lane | 14 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 83 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.17 |
| Roselena Drive | 18 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.04 | 8 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.02 |

Table C-10b Traffic Analysis - Future 2031 (PM peak hour), Schomberg and Lloydtown - Collector RoadsSchoml

|  | NB/EB Direction |  |  |  |  | SB/WB Direction |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane Capacity (vplph) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio | Approach Volumes (vph) | Number of Lanes | Lane <br> Capacity (vpl) | Link Capacity (vph) | V/C Ratio |
| Main Street | 142 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.28 | 77 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.15 |
| Church Street | 43 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 | 42 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |
| Cooper Drive | 53 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.11 | 43 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.09 |
| Dr. Kay Drive | 88 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.18 | 170 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.34 |
| Rose Cottage Lane | 71 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.14 | 36 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.07 |
| Roselena Drive | 13 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.03 | 40 | 1 | 500 | 500 | 0.08 |

Table C-11 Proposed Township Rural Collector Roads

| Road | From | To | Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17th Sideroad | Caledon King Town Line | Highway 27 | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2016 \text { AADT }=2,700 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=3,600 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Provides east-west connection between north-south arterial Regional roads (Highway 27 and Caledon King Townline). |
| 11th Concession | Highway 9 | Township's South Limits | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2017 \text { AADT }=1,300 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=1,600 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Provides north-south connection to major arterial Regional roads (Highway 9, King Road). |
| 8th Concession | Highway 9 | Township's South Limits | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2017 \text { AADT }=1,100 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=1,500 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Provides north-south connection to major arterial Regional roads (Highway 9, Lloydtown/Aurora Road, King Road). |
|  |  |  | - The road is an attractive alternative north-south route to Highway 27 as it does not pass through the Village of Nobleton. |
| Keele Street | 18th Sideroad | King Street | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2017 \text { AADT }=1,900 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=2,500 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Road segment is an extension of the existing arterial Regional road. |
| Dufferin Street | 18th Sideroad | Graham Sideroad | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2017 \text { AADT }=1,500 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=2,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Road is an extension of an existing arterial regional road. |
| 19th Sideroad | Dufferin Street | Bathurst Street | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2017 \text { AADT }=1,200 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=1,500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Road segment is an extension of the existing arterial Regional road. It provides a southern access to the Schomberg Village |
| Graham Sideroad | Dufferin Street | Bathurst Street | - Estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2017 \text { AADT }=750 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=1,000 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - Road is connected to Bathurst Street, an arterial Regional road. |
| Pumphouse Road | Canal Road | Graham Sideroad | - Current and estimated future AADT falls within the rural collector road traffic volume characteristics. $\begin{aligned} & -2016 \text { AADT }=1,500 \\ & -2031 \text { AADT }=2,200 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | - It provides a connection to a Regional Road and Bradford GO Station. |

Table C-12 Proposed Urban Collector Township Roads

| Village | Road | From | To |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King City | Elizabeth Grove | Keele Street | Patton Street |
|  | Patton Street | Elizabeth Grove Street | King Road |
|  | Warren Road | Patton Street | King Road |
|  | Lavender Valley Road | Warren Road | Spring Hill Drive |
|  | Spring Hill Drive | Lavender Valley Road | King Road |
|  | Stan Roots Street | King Road | Tatton Court |
|  | Tatton Court | Stan Roots Street | Dufferin Street |
|  | Collard Drive | Jane Street | Burns Boulevard |
|  | Westgate Boulevard | Jane Street | Kingcross Drive |
|  | Kingcross Drive (1) | Jane Street | Keele Street |
|  | Street A <br> (new development south of 15th <br> Sideroad and east of Dufferin Street) | 15th Sideroad | Dufferin Street |
|  | Street B <br> (new development south of 15th <br> Sideroad and east of Dufferin Street) | Street A | 15th Sideroad |
| Nobleton | Henry Gate | King Road | Ellis Avenue |
|  | Ellis Avenue | Henry Gate | Highway 27 |
|  | Robinson Road | Ellis Avenue | Wikie Avenue |
|  | Township proposed road | Robinson Road | Highway 27 |
|  | Township proposed road | King Road | Sheardown Drive |
|  | Mactaggart Drive | Sheardown Drive | Highway 27 |
|  | Russell Snider Drive | Sheardown Drive | Mactaggart Drive |
|  | Sheardown Drive | Russell Snider Drive | Highway 27 |
|  | Greenside Drive | King Road | Hill Farm Road |
|  | Hill Farm Drive | Highway 27 | Skyline Trail |
| Schomberg \& Lloydtown | Lloydtown Aurora Road | 10th Concession Road | Little Rebel Road |
|  |  | Rebellion Way | Highway 27 |
|  | Rebellion Way | Lloydtown Aurora Road | Queen Street |
|  | Little Rebel Road | Lloydtown Aurora Road | Rebellion Way |
|  | Church Street | Rebellion Way | Main Street |
|  | Main Street | Highway 27 | Highway 9 |
|  | Dr. Kay Drive | Main Street | Highway 27 |
|  | Dillane Drive | Highway 27 | Proctor Road |
|  | Proctor Road | Highway 27 | Dillane Drive |

Note: Roads were proposed as urban collector roads if one or both of the following criteria are satisfied:
i) existing and/or future AADT fall within the urban collector road traffic volume characteristics; or
ii) road provides access to the major roads and provides connectivity to the collector road network.
(1) Roadway is classified as a signature collector.

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \text { TMP } \\ & \text { (GIS Data) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Traffic Counts provided by Township |  | 2016 Road Needs Study |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FID | NAME | FROM_ | то | AADT | Survey_Year | AADT_Total | Survey_Year | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 2016 \\ \text { AADT } \end{array}$ |
| 529 |  | 9 |  | 23460 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 537 |  | 9 |  | 30930 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 540 |  | 9 |  | 30470 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 541 |  | 9 |  | 36310 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 542 |  | 9 |  | 37570 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 509 |  | 27 |  | 13940 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 511 |  | 27 |  | 12530 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 515 |  | 27 |  | 10454 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 559 |  | 27 |  | 9954 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 560 |  | 27 |  | 10454 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 561 |  | 27 |  | 12550 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 562 |  | 27 |  | 10710 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 563 |  | 27 |  | 9330 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 496 | 15th |  |  | 6630 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 497 | 715th |  |  | 3919 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 519 | 915th |  |  | 5450 |  |  | , |  |
| 117 | 175th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | East End | 11 |  |  | 2016 | 164 |
| 99 | 915 th Sideroad | 27-Regional Road 27 | 0.68 km West of Hwy 27 | 21 |  |  | 2016 | 95 |
| 374 | 415 th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | 0.6 km West of 56 -Weston Road | 350 |  |  | 2016 | 529 |
| 114 | 1 15th Sideroad | 0.6 km West of $56-$ Weston Road | 0.2 km East of Concession Road V//V | 350 |  |  | 2016 | 529 |
| 375 | 5 15th Sideroad | 0.2 km East of Concession Road VI/V | Concession R oad VI/VII | 350 |  |  | 2016 | - 529 |
| 116 | 615 th Sideroad | 55-Jane Street | West End | 11 |  |  | 2016 | 15 |
| 216 | 615 th Sideroad | 6 -Keele Street | West End | 343 |  |  | 2016 | 458 |
|  | 615 th Sideroad | Concession Road $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{XI}$ | West End | 21 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{28}$ |
| 376 | 615 th Sideroad | Concession Road VI/VII | 0.4 km West of Concession Road V/V | 293 |  |  | 2016 | 235 |
| 111 | 11 15th Sideroad | 0.4 km West of Concession Road V/V | Concession Road VII/VIII | 293 |  |  | 2016 | 235 |
| 377 | 715 th Sideroad | Concession Road VII/VIII | 0.6 km West of Concession Road VII/ | 856 | 2017 | 428 | 2016 | 642 |
| 108 | 815 th Sideroad | 0.6 km West of Concession Road VII/ | 27-Regional Road 27 | 856 | 2017 | 428 | 2016 | 642 |
|  | 3 15th Sideroad | 6 -Keele Street | West End | 1520 |  |  | 2016 | 458 |
| 423 | 315 th Sideroad | 0.68 West of Highway 27 | Concession Road IX/X | 593 |  |  | 2016 | 95 |
| 229 | 9 16 th Sideroad | 38-Bathurst Street | West End | 16 |  |  | 2016 | 22 |
| 105 | 5 16th Sideroad | Concession Road VII/VIII | 27-Regional Road 27 | 293 |  |  | 2016 | 391 |
| 96 | 616 th Sideroad | Concession Road IX/X | Concession Road X/X1 | 341 |  |  | 2016 | 455 |
| 369 | 9 16th Sideroad | 55-Jane Street | 0.6 km West of 55-Jane Street | 758 |  |  | 2016 | - 1011 |
| 368 | 816 th Sideroad | 0.6 km West of $55-\mathrm{Jane}$ Street | 56-Weston Road | 758 |  |  | 2016 | 1011 |
| 210 | O 16 th Sideroad | Concession Road V/VVII | Concession Road VII/VIII | 294 |  |  | 2016 | 392 |
| 93 | 3 16th Sideroad | Concession Road X/XI | Concession Road XI/XII | 369 |  |  | 2016 | 492 |
| 220 | O 16 th Sideroad | 53-Dufferin Street | 6 -Kele Street | 489 | 2017 | 397 | 2016 | 386 |
| 217 | 716 th Sideroad | 6 -Keele Street | 55-Jane Street | 836 | 2017 | 803 | 2016 | 614 |
| 98 | 816 th Sideroad | 1.0 km West of 27 -Regional Road 27 | Concession Road IX/X | 495 |  |  | 2016 | 64 |
| 285 | 5 17th Sideroad | 55-Jane Street | West End | 142 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{229}$ |
| 209 | 17th Sideroad | Concession Road VII/VIII | 27-Regional Road 27 | 216 |  |  | 2016 | 333 |
| 280 | 017 th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | East End | 128 |  |  | 2016 | 171 |
| 213 | 3 17th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | West End | 21 |  |  | 2016 | 28 |
| 379 | 917 th Sideroad | Concession Road VII/VIII | East End | 111 |  |  | 2016 | 148 |
| 208 | 817 th Sideroad | 27 -Regional Road 27 | Concession Road IX/X | 1986 |  |  | 2016 | 2648 |
| 95 | 5 17th Sideroad | Concession Road $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{XI}$ | Concession Road XI/XII | 1816 |  |  | 2016 | 2421 |
| 288 | 817 th Sideroad | 6 -Keele Street | 55-Jane Street | 4225 |  |  | 2016 | 5632 |
| 207 | 717 th Sideroad | Concession Road IX/X | Concession Road X/X1 | 1919 |  |  | 2016 | 2558 |
| 378 | 817 th Sideroad | 53-Dufferin Street | 0.8 km West of 53 -Dufferin Street | 5176 |  |  | 2016 | 5056 |
| 289 | 9 17th Sideroad | 0.8 km W of 53 -Dufferin Street | 6 -Kele Street | 5176 |  |  | 2016 | 5056 |
|  | 117 th Sideroad | Concession Road XIXXII | Caledon/King Townline South | 1779 |  |  | 2016 | 109 |
| 532 | 218 th |  |  | 10480 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 533 | 318 th |  |  | 9850 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 271 | 118 th Sideroad | 0.3 km East of Conc. Rd. VI/VII | East End | 39 |  |  | 2016 | -197 |
| 381 | 118 th Sideroad | Concession Road V/VVII | 0.3 km East of Concession Road V//V | 49 |  |  | 2016 | 197 |
| 203 | 3 18th Sideroad | Concession Road X/XI | Concession Road XI/XII | 61 |  |  | 2016 | 112 |
| 281 | 118 th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | East End | 32 |  |  | 2016 | 43 |
| 282 | 2 18th Sideroad | 55-Jane Street | West End | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
| 380 | 018 th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | West End | 21 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{28}$ |
| 263 | 3 18th Sideroad | Concession Road VII/VIII | 27 -Regional Road 27 | 177 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{236}$ |
| 206 | 618 th Sideroad | Concession Road IX/X | Concession Road $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{XI}$ | 57 |  |  | 2016 | -76 |
| 256 | 618 th Sideroad | 27-Regional Road 27 | Concession Road IX/X | 248 | 2017 | 157 | 2016 | 291 |
| 270 | 0 18th Sideroad | Concession Road V/VVII | Concession Road VII/VIII | 130 |  |  | 2016 | 134 |
| 227 | 7 19th Sideroad | Concession Road X/XI | Concession Road XI/XII | 141 |  |  | 2016 | 355 |
| 313 | 19th Sideroad | Dufferin Street | Keele Street | 504 |  |  | 2016 | - 764 |
| 383 | 3 19th Sideroad | Keele Street | 0.3 km West of Keele Street | 11 |  |  | 2016 | 15 |
| 264 | 4 19th Sideroad | Concession Road VI/VII | West End | 32 |  |  | 2016 | 43 |
| 304 | 4 19th Sideroad | Hodgson Cres (W Leg) | East End Turnaround | 166 |  |  | 2016 | 222 |
| 384 | 4 19th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | 0.1 km West of 56 -Weston Road | 161 |  |  | 2016 | 215 |
| 307 | 7 19th Sideroad | 55-Jane Street | West End | 21 |  |  | 2016 | 28 |
| 231 | 119 th Sideroad | Concession Road IX/X | Concession Road X/X1 | 177 |  |  | 2016 | 219 |
| 226 | 19th Sideroad | Concession Road XIXXII | Caledon/King Townline | 119 |  |  | 2016 | 131 |
| 303 | 19th Sideroad | 56-Weston Road | Hodgson Cres (W Leg) | 391 |  |  | 2016 | 388 |
| 314 | 4 19th Sideroad | Newmarket Boundary | Dufferin Street | 1213 | 2017 | 1153 | 2016 | - 1192 |
| 232 | 2 19th Sideroad | Little Rebel Way | Conc Rd IX/X | 1012 |  |  | 2016 | 592 |
| 257 | 7 19th Sideroad | 27-Regional Road 27 | Rebellion Way | 925 | 2017 | 464 | 2016 | 481 |
| 317 | 72 2nd Concession Road | Holancin Road | Davis Road | 279 |  |  | 2016 | 372 |
| 392 | 23 rd Concession Road | Graham Sideroad | North End | 10 |  |  | 2016 | 14 |
| 538 | 84 th Concession Road | Hwy. 9 | Drainage Canal | 590 |  |  | 2016 | 1486 |
| 334 | 4 4th Concession Road | Hwy. 9 | Drainage Canal | 740 |  |  | 2016 | 1486 |
| 321 | 1 5th Concession Rd. | Woodchopper's Lane | Edward Ave. | 392 |  |  | 2016 | 523 |
| 462 | 2 adelia Court | Spring Hill Drive | West to End | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 324 | 4 Aileen Avenue | Edward Avenue | Strawberry Lane | 388 |  |  | 2016 | 518 |
|  | 2 Albion Vaughan Road | Vaughan/King Townline | Queensgate Boulevard | 8328 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 385 | 5 Albion Vaughan Road | Queensgate Boulevard | Nunneville Road | 8328 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 5 Albion Vaughan Road | Nunnville Road | 11-King Road | 8328 | 2018 | 8488.6 | 0 |  |
| 458 | 8 Alex Campbell Crescent | King Road | Alex Campbell Crescent | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 421 | 1 Archibald Road, Pottageville | 0.4 km West of Cook Drive | Cook Drive | 53 |  |  | 2016 | 108 |
| 277 | 7 Archibald Road, Pottageville | Cook Drive | 0.4 km West of Cook Drive | 422 |  |  | 2016 | - 563 |
| 275 | 5 Armstrong Crescent, Pottageville | Cook Drive | Cook Drive | 171 |  |  | 2016 | 228 |
| 137 | 7 Aukland Lane, King City | McClure Drive | North End | 128 |  |  | 2016 | 171 |
| 453 | 3 Austin Rumble Court | Burton Grove | South to End | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 272 | 2 Bachly Crescent, Pottageville | Concession Road VI/VII | Concession Road VI/VII | 94 |  |  | 2016 | 126 |
| 177 | Banner Lane, King City | Elizabeth Grove | Warren Road | 323 |  |  | 2016 | 431 |
| 175 | 5 Banner Lane, King City | 11-king Road | 0.3 km South of 11-king Road | 1052 |  |  | 2016 | - 1403 |
| 397 | 7 Banner Lane, King City | 0.3 km South of 11-King Road | North of Bennet Drive | 444 |  |  | 2016 | 592 |
| 460 | Basil Ridge Road | Lavender Valley Road | North to end | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 475 | 5 Bathurst |  |  | 21948 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 517 | 7 Bathurst |  |  | 22103 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 518 | 8 Bathurst |  |  | 19749 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 520 | 0 Bathurst |  |  | 17819 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 1 Bathurst |  |  | 14855 |  |  | 0 |  |



|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \text { TMP } \\ & \text { (GIS Data) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Traffic Counts provided by Township |  | 2016 Road Needs Study |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FID | NAME |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {2 }} \begin{aligned} & 2016 \\ & \text { AADT }\end{aligned}$ |
| 329 | Davis Road | South Canal Bank Rd. | 2nd Concession Road | 289 |  |  | 2016 | 386 |
| 325 | Davis Road | 2nd Concession Road | Schomberg River | 289 |  |  | 2016 | 386 |
| 287 | 7 Dearbourne Avenue East | 6-Kele Street | West End | 75 |  |  | 2016 | 100 |
| 286 | 6 Dearbourne Avenue East | 55-Jane Street | East End Turnaround | 96 |  |  | 2016 | 128 |
| 359 | 9 Dennis Drive, King city | Findlay Avenue | Station Road | 306 | 2017 | 162 | 2016 | 408 |
| 399 | 9 Dennison Street, King City | East Humber Drive | 0.2 km South of East Humber Drive | 90 | 2017 | 201 | 2016 | ${ }^{132}$ |
| 165 | 5 Dennison Street, King City | 6-Kele Street | 0.8 km East of 6 -keele Street | 426 | 2017 | 201 | 2016 | ${ }^{132}$ |
| 172 | 2 Dew Street, King City | William Street | King Street | 152 |  |  | 2016 | 203 |
| 168 | 8 Dew Street, King City | William Street | West End | 152 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{203}$ |
| 357 | 7 Di Nardo Court, King City | Carmichael Crescent | West End | 75 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{100}$ |
| 53 | 3 Diana Drive | 27-Regional Road 27 | West End Checkerboard | 268 |  |  | 2016 | 50 |
| 39 | Dobson Court, Nobleton | Sheardown Drive | North End Cul-de-Sac | 64 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{86}$ |
| 173 | 3 Doctors Lane, King City | 11-King Road | South End | 225 |  |  | 2016 | 300 |
| 370 | Dr. Jones Drive, Schomberg | Cooper Drive | Cooper Drive | 342 |  |  | 2016 | 456 |
| 361 | 1 Dr. Kay Drive, Schomberg | 0.1 km East of Main Street | 27-Regional Road 27 | 2440 | 2017 | 2628 | 2016 | 2510 |
| 419 | 9 Dr. Kay Drive, Schomberg | Main Street | 0.1 km East of Main Street | 2668 | 2017 | 2628 | 2016 | $\underline{2510}$ |
| 564 | 4 Dr. Kay Drive, Schomberg | 0.1 km East of Main Street | 27-Regional Road 27 | 2668 | 2017 | 2628 | 2016 | 2510 |
| 499 | 9 Dufferin |  |  | 7709 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 550 | O Dufferin |  |  | 6550 |  |  | - |  |
| 551 | 1 Dufferin |  |  | 4501 |  |  |  |  |
| 552 | 2 Dufferin |  |  | 5210 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 554 | 4 Dufferin |  |  | 8370 |  |  |  |  |
| 312 | 2 Dufferin Street | 16-Lloydtown/Aurora Road | 2.6 km North of 16-Lloydtown/Aurora | 1000 |  |  | 2016 | 1333 |
| 341 | 1 Dufferin Street | King Street | Emma Road | 1756 | 2017 | 1532 | 2016 | 1895 |
| 342 | 2 Dufferin Street | Emma Road | Juliana Road | 1756 |  |  | 2016 | 1895 |
| 362 | 2 Dufferin Street | Juliana Road | Graham Sideroad | 1756 |  |  | 2016 | 1895 |
| 391 | 1 Dufferin Street | Miller's Sideroad | 0.7 km North of Miller's Sideroad | 1756 |  |  | 2016 | 1618 |
| 340 | 0 Dufferin Street | 0.7 km N . of Miller's Sideroad | King Street | 1756 |  |  | 2016 | 1618 |
| 549 | 9 Dufferin Street | 16-Lloydtown/Aurora Road | 2.6 km North of 16-Lloydtown/Aurora | 1580 |  |  | 2016 | 1333 |
| 337 | 7 Dufferin Street | Hwy. 9 | Miller's Sideroad | 1622 |  |  | 2016 | 1253 |
| 100 | OEarlwood Cres, Nobleton Lakes | Nobleton Lakes Drive | South End Cul-de-Sac | 86 |  |  | 2016 | 115 |
| 393 | 3East Gwillimbury/King Townline | 77-Queensville Sideroad | Schomberg River | 470 |  |  | 2016 | 1025 |
| 163 | 33 East Humber Drive, King City | 6-Kele Street | East End | 775 | 2017 | 257 | 2016 | -1033 |
| 367 | 7 Eden Valley Drive | Faiffield Drive | Fairfield Drive | 147 |  |  | 2016 | - 196 |
| 323 | 3 Edward Avenue | 5thConcession Road | West End | 37 |  |  | 2016 | - 50 |
| 322 | 2 Edward Avenue | 5th Concession Rd. | Strawberry Lane | 492 |  |  | 2016 | - 656 |
| 265 | 25 Edward Pottage Crescent, Pottagevil | 16-Lloydtown/Aurora Road | 16-Lloydtown/Aurora Road | 161 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{215}$ |
| 248 | 8 Edwards Mill Lann, Schomberg | Church Street | North End | 11 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{15}$ |
| 64 | 44 Elizabeth Drive, Nobleton | Cross Avenue | North End | 32 |  |  | 2016 | $\square$ |
| 63 | 3 Elizabeth Drive, Nobleton | 11-King Road | Cross Avenue | 186 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{248}$ |
| 190 | Elizabeth Grove, King City | 6-Keele Street | 0.5 km East of 6 -Keele Street | 675 | 2019 | 992 | 2016 | - 900 |
| 191 | 1 Elizabeth Grove, King City | Patricia Drive | North of Banner Road | 135 | 2019 | 992 | 2016 | - 180 |
| 55 | 5 Ellis Avenue, Nobleton | 27-Regional Road 27 | Wellington Street | 807 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{1076}$ |
| 13 | 13 Ellis Avenue, Nobleton | Wellington Street | Henry Street | 912 | 2019 | 440 | 2016 | $\underline{1216}$ |
| 14 | 14 Ellis Avenue, Nobleton | Henry Street | West End Barricade | 402 | 2019 | 440 | 2016 | - 536 |
| 79 | 9 Elm Pine Trail | Mill Road | West End | 43 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{153}$ |
| 245 | 5 Elmwood Avenue, Schomberg | Western Avenue | Castlewood Avenue | 78 |  |  | 2016 | - 104 |
| 345 | 5 Emma Road | Dufferin Street | West End | 167 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{223}$ |
| 222 | 2 Eversley Hall | Faifield Drive | East End Turnaround | 86 |  |  | 2016 | -115 |
| 221 | 1 Fairfield Drive | 53-Dufferin Street | 53-Dufferin Street | 416 |  |  | 2016 | 555 |
| 17 | 7 Faris Avenue, Nobleton | Wellington Street | 0.3 km West | 195 | 2018 | -129.4 | 2016 | - 260 |
| 408 | 8 Faris Avenue, Nobleton | Ellis Avenue | 0.1 km East | 138 | 2018 | 129.4 | 2016 | -184 |
| 440 | F Farm Hill Road | 553 m East of Goodfellow Cres. | Skyline Trail |  |  |  | 2016 | 0 |
| 363 | 3 Farmcrest Court, Nobleton | Woodhill Avenue | West End Cul-de-Sac | 64 |  |  | 2016 | $8^{86}$ |
| 118 | 8 Findlay Avenue, King City | Burns Boulvard | Burns Boulevard | 198 | 2016 | - 254 | 2016 | - 264 |
| 174 | 4 Fisher Street, King city | 11-King Road | South End | 214 |  |  | 2016 | 286 |
|  | 9 Fog Road | Cavell Avenue | North to end | 161 |  |  | 2016 | - 147 |
| 178 | 8 Forde Cres, King City | Bennet Drive | 0.3 km East of Bennet Drive | 214 |  |  | 2016 | 286 |
|  | 6 Forde Cres, , King City | 0.3 km East of Bennet Drive | Bennet Drive | 214 |  |  | 2016 | - 286 |
|  | 3 Forestave Crescent, Nobleton | Noblewood Drive | East End Turnaround | 43 |  |  | 2016 | 58 |
|  | 4 Gilbert fuller Dr | Woodhill Avenue | South End Checkerboard | 27 |  |  | 2016 | - 36 |
| 135 | 5 Gillham Circle, King City | McClure Drive | West End | 43 |  |  | 2016 | 58 |
|  | 8 Glenville Road | Hwy. 9 | 3rd Conc. Rd. | 56 | 2017 | 1927 | 2016 | - 75 |
| 425 | 5 Goodfellow Crescent, Nobleton | Hill Farm Road W. Jct. | 290 m west of Hill Farm Road | 393 |  |  | 2016 | 524 |
|  | 9 Goodfellow Crescent, Nobleton | 290 m west of Hill Farm Rd. W. Jct. | Hill Farm Road E. Jct. | 381 |  |  | 2016 | 508 |
| 349 | 9 Graham Sideroad | Dufferin Street | West End | 167 | 2017 | 743 | 2016 | 223 |
|  | 4 Graham sideroad | Pumphouse Road | 38-Bathurst Street | 1583 | 2017 | 743 | 2016 | $\underline{1344}$ |
| 348 | 8 Graham Sideroad | Dufferin Street | Pumphouse Road | 2060 | 2017 | 743 | 2016 | 1344 |
|  | 5 Greenside Drive, Nobleton | $0.46 \mathrm{~km} \mathrm{North} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{11-King} \mathrm{Road}$ | Hill Farm Road | 1181 | 2017 | 1879.7 | 2016 | $\underline{1912}$ |
|  | 0 Greenside Drive, Nobleton | 11-King Road | 0.46 km North | 2380 | 2017 | 1879.7 | 2016 | 1912 |
|  | Hambley Street, King City | Norman Drive | 0.14 km South of Norman Drive | 225 | 2017 | - 250 | 2016 | -300 |
| 131 | 1 Hambley Street, King City | 30 mN . of Humber Cres. | 50 m S. of Humber Cres. | 225 | 2017 | - 250 | 2016 | 300 |
|  | OHambly Street, King City | 50 m S. of Humber Cres. | South End Cul-de-sac | 54 | 2017 | - 250 | 2016 | -72 |
| 48 | 8 Hawman Avenue, Nobleton | Chinook Drive | Chinook Drive | 166 | 2018 | - 1006.4 | 2016 | 222 |
| 47 | 7 Hawman Avenue, Nobleton | Chinook Drive | East End Turnaround | 570 | 2018 | 1006.4 | 2016 | -760 |
| 415 | 5 Hawthorne Valley Road, Nobleton | Woodhill Avenue | South End Cul-de-sac | 634 |  |  | 2016 | 846 |
|  | 0 Hazellury Drive, Nobleton | Hawman Drive | Wilsen Road | 308 | 2017 | 749 | 2016 | 381 |
| 44 | 4 Hazellury Drive, Nobleton | Wilsen Road | Sheardown Drive | 308 | 2017 | 749 | 2016 | 381 |
|  | 1 Henley Drive, Nobleton | Hawman Drive | Wilsen Road | 98 | 2018 | 8 73.2 | 2016 | $\underline{131}$ |
| 12 | 12 Henry Gate, Nobleton | Ellis Avenue | 11-King Road | 421 |  |  | 2016 | 562 |
|  | 9 Heritage Street, King City | 6-Kele Street | Hambly street | 364 |  |  | 2016 | 486 |
|  | 4 Hilda Road | Diana Drive | North End Turnaround | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
|  | 8 Hill Farm Road, Nobleton | Greenside Drive | North End | 629 | 2017 | 2112 | 2016 | 1654 |
|  | 00 Hill Farm Road, Nobleton | 27-Regional Road 27 | Greenside Drive | 3498 | 2017 | 2112 | 2016 | 1654 |
| 103 | 3 Hilliard Grove, Nobleton Lakes | Loch Erne Lane | Northwest End Cul-de-Sac |  |  |  | 2016 | 115 |
|  | 20 Hillside Drive, Nobleton | Nobleview Drive | West End | 16 |  |  | 2016 | 22 |
|  | 1 Hillside Drive, Nobleton | Cedarwood Crescent | Nobleview Drive | 569 |  |  | 2016 | 70 |
| 305 | 5 Hodgson Avenue, Carrying PI | 19th Sideroad | 19th Sideroad | 225 |  |  | 2016 | 300 |
|  | 6 Holancin Road | Hwy. 9 | 2nd Concession Road | 279 |  |  | 2016 | 163 |
|  | 5 Holden Drive, Nobleton | McTagart Drive | North End | 32 |  |  | 2016 | 43 |
|  | 6 Holden Drive, Nobleton | 0.26 km North of Sheardown Drive | McTaggart Drive | 220 |  |  | 2016 | 294 |
| 411 | 1 Holden Drive, Nobleton | Sheardown Drive | 0.26 km North of Sheardown Drive | 283 |  |  | 2016 | 378 |
|  | 4 Hollingworth Cres, King City | Patton St. | West End | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
|  | Hollingworth Cres, King City | Patton St. | Kingslynn Drive | 120 |  |  | 2016 | 160 |
|  | 2 Hollywood Crescent, Nobleton | 0.13 km East of Noblewood Drive | East End Turnaround | 236 |  |  | 2016 | 315 |
| 406 | 6 Hollywood Crescent, Nobleton | Noblewood Drive | 0.13 km East of Noblewood Drive | 393 |  |  | 2016 | 524 |
| 167 | 7 Hoop Street, King City | 11-King Road | North End | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
| 132 | 32 Humber Crescent, king City | Hambly Street | Hambly Street | 235 |  |  | 2016 | 314 |
|  | 4 Humber Valley Cres, King City | East Humber Drive | East Humber Drive | 452 |  |  | 2016 | 603 |
| 126 | 6 James Street, King city | Charles Street | John Street | 134 |  |  | 2016 | 179 |
|  | 6 Jane |  |  | 7990 |  |  |  |  |
| 487 | 7 Jane |  |  | 6034 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 1 Jane |  |  | 6349 |  |  |  |  |
| 492 | 2 Jane |  |  | 7540 |  |  | , |  |
| 543 | 3 Jane |  |  | 1780 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 544 | 4 Jane |  |  | 1663 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 545 | 5 Jane |  |  | 8826 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 5 Jlane |  |  | 5949 2819 |  |  | 0 |  |


|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \text { TMP } \\ & \text { (GIS Data) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Traffic Counts provided by Township |  | 2016 Road Needs Study |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FID | NAME |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {2 }} \begin{aligned} & 2016 \\ & \text { AADT }\end{aligned}$ |
| 319 | dane Street | Hwy9 | South Canal Bank Road | 0 |  |  | 2016 | 648 |
| 320 | 3 Jane Street | South Canal Bank Road | Woodchopper's Lane | 0 |  |  | 2016 | 870 |
| 59 | 9 Janett Avenue, Nobleton | Crestriew Road | East End Culde-Sac | 96 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{128}$ |
| 161 | 1 Jenkinson Grove, King City | Carmichael Crescent | Tawes Trail | 153 |  |  | 2016 | 204 |
| 371 | 1 Jessop Avenue, Schomberg | Cooper Drive | Cooper Drive | 342 |  |  | 2016 | 456 |
| 125 | 5 John Street, King City | 11-King Road | Melrose Avenue | 144 |  |  | 2016 | 192 |
| 347 | 7 Julianna Road | Dufferin Street | West End | 167 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{223}$ |
| 67 | Kaake Road, Nobleton | Hill Farm Road | South End Cul-de-Sac | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
| 480 | OKeele |  |  | 9120 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 481 | 1 Keele |  |  | 9450 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 482 | 2 Keele |  |  | 8950 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 484 | 4 Keele |  |  | 8980 |  |  | , |  |
| 494 | 4 Keele |  |  | 4080 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 495 | 5 Keele |  |  | 3145 |  |  |  |  |
| 498 | 8 Keele |  |  | 10190 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 339 | 9 Keele Street | Strawberry Lane | King Street | 1157 |  |  | 2016 | 1543 |
| 335 | 5 Keele Street | Drainage Canal | Strawberry Lane | 1065 |  |  | 2016 | 1420 |
| 333 | 33 Keele Street | 19 th Sideroad | 31-Regional Road 31 | 1273 |  |  | 2016 | 1697 |
| 539 | Keele Street | 19th Sideroad | 31-Regional Road 31 | 1450 |  |  | 2016 | 1697 |
| 310 | OKeele Street | Kettleby Road | 19th Sideroad | 1790 |  |  | 2016 | 2090 |
| 309 | 9 Keele Street | 16-Lloydtown/Aurora Road | Kettleby Road | 1577 | 2017 | 1870 | 2016 | 1755 |
| 107 | 7 Keewaydin Drive | 15 th Sideroad | North End Turnaround | 150 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{200}$ |
| 27 | 7 Kehoe Court, Nobleton | Russel Snider Drive | East End Culde-Sac | 64 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{86}$ |
| 143 | Keri Court, , King City | Kingscross Drive | South End Turnaround | 16 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{22}$ |
| 311 | 1 Kettleby Road | Concession Road III/V | 0.8 km West of oncession Road III/ | 708 | 2018 | 940.2 | 2016 | 944 |
| 308 | 8 Kettleby Road, Kettleby | Kettleby West Limit | Kettleby East Limit | 787 | 2018 | 940.2 | 2016 | 1049 |
| 476 | 6 King |  |  | 24889 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 477 | 7 King |  |  | 21394 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 478 | 8 King |  |  | 23020 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 479 | 9 King |  |  | 18405 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 485 | 5 King |  |  | 18690 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 488 | 8 King |  |  | 25842 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 489 | 9 King |  |  | 22120 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 490 | King |  |  | 23400 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 500 | 0 King |  |  | 14930 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 501 | 1 King |  |  | 13443 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 503 | 3 King |  |  | 14830 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 506 | 6 King |  |  | 14334 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 508 | 8 King |  |  | 12470 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 510 | 0 King |  |  | 13160 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2 King |  |  | 11355 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 513 | 3 King |  |  | 12709 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 514 | 4 King |  |  | 12317 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 171 | 1 King Boulevard, King City | 11-King Road | North End | 317 |  |  | 2016 | 423 |
| 283 | 3 King Hills Lane | 55-Jane Street | Spruce Hill Road | 64 |  |  | 2016 | - 86 |
| 343 | King Street | Keele Street | Dufferin Street | 1157 |  |  | 2016 | 975 |
| 215 | 5 King Summit Road | 55-Jane Street | East End Turnaround | 161 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{215}$ |
| 149 | 9 Kings Cross Drive, King City | Manitou Drive | Watch Hill Road | 677 | 2017 | 631 | 2016 | - 681 |
|  | 5 Kings Cross Drive, King City | Watch Hill Road | Westgate Blvd. | 716 | 2017 | 631 | 2016 | -681 |
| 290 | 0 Kings View Cres., Snowball | 17th Sideroad | East/West Turnaround | 214 |  |  | 2016 | ${ }^{286}$ |
|  | Kingscross Drive, King City | 6-Keele Street | Manitou Drive | 977 | 2017 | 631 | 2016 | - 1303 |
| 186 | 6 Kingslynn Drive, King City | Patton Street | Banner Street | 380 | 2017 | 294 | 0 |  |
|  | 5 Kingslynn Drive, King City | Patton Street | West End | 107 | 2017 | 294 | 2016 | - 294 |
| 214 | 4 Kingswood Drive | 55-Jane Street | East End | 64 |  |  | 2016 | $8^{86}$ |
| 152 | 2 Kingsworth Road, King City | Westgate Blvd | Watch Hill Road | 177 |  |  | 2016 | - 236 |
|  | 8 Kinsley Street, Nobleton | Faris Avenue | 11-king Road | 138 |  |  | 2016 | -184 |
| 291 | 1 Lake Road, Snowball | Kings View Crescent | South End | 11 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{15}$ |
| 452 | 2 Langdon Drive | 132 m N . of Walkington Way | Burns Boulevard |  | 2017 | 179 |  |  |
| 122 | 2Langdon Drive | Walkington Way | North End | 140 | 2017 | 179 | 2016 | 278 |
| 84 | 44 Laskay Mills Drive, Laskey | 56-Weston Road | East End Cul-de-sac | 182 |  |  | 2016 | 243 |
|  | 9 Lavender Valley Road | Warren Road | Spring Hill Drive | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 465 | 5 Lilly Valley Crescent | Nicort Road | Nicort Road | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | L Little Rebel Road, Lloydtown | 19th sideroad | Rebellion Way | 1012 |  |  | 2016 | 592 |
| 546 | 6 Loydtown-Aurora |  |  | 8350 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 7 Loydtown-Aurora |  |  | 8031 |  |  |  |  |
| 548 | 8 Lloydtown-Aurora |  |  | 11660 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 Loydtown-Aurora |  |  | 3894 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 102 | 2 Loch Erne Lane, Nobleton Lakes | Nobleton Lakes Drive | North End Cul-de-Sac | 239 |  |  | 2016 | 319 |
|  | L Lockhart Lane, King City | Kingscross Drive | North End Turnaround | 54 |  |  | 2016 |  |
| 356 | 6 Lorne Street, Kettleby | Kettleby Road | North End | 21 |  |  | 2016 | 83 |
|  | 3 Lynwood Crescent, Nobleton | Hill Farm Road | South End | 283 | 2019 | 210 | 2016 | 378 |
|  | 1 Lynwood Crescent, Nobleton | 11-King Road | 460 m North | 350 | 2019 | 210 | 2016 | 467 |
|  | 5 Magnum Road, Schomberg | Proctor Road | East End Turnaround | 819 |  |  | 2016 | - 1092 |
| 293 | 3 Main Street, Schomberg | Church Street | Dr. Kay Drive | 2590 | 2016 | 2242.8 | 2016 | 3453 |
|  | 9 Main Street, Schomberg | 27-Regional Road 27 | Church Street | 2561 | 2016 | 2242.8 | 2016 | 3414 |
| 292 | 2 Main Street, Schomberg | Dr. Kay Drive | Highway 9 | 2986 | 2016 | 2242.8 | 2016 | 3980 |
|  | 7 Manitou Drive, King City | Manitou Drive | East End Culde-sac | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 167 |
| 148 | 8 Manitou Drive, King City | 0.4 km South of Kingscross Drive | South End Turnaround | 161 |  |  | 2016 | -167 |
|  | 6 Manitou Drive, King City | Kingscross Drive | 0.4 km South of Kingscross Drive | 354 |  |  | 2016 | -167 |
| 429 | 9 Mapleton Mill Drive | Waterlily Trail | Wateriliy Trail |  |  |  | 2016 | 593 |
|  | 2 Marchant Circle, Schomberg | Dr. Jones Drive | South End | 118 |  |  | 2016 | 158 |
| 251 | 1 Marlynn Drive, Schomberg | Moore Park Drive | North End Cul-de-Sac | 43 |  |  | 2016 | - 58 |
|  | 7 Martin Street, King City | Melrose Avenue | 180 m North of Melrose Avenue | 268 | 2018 | 356.1 | 2016 | 358 |
| 130 | Martin Street, , King City | 180 mNorth of Melrose Avenue | Hambly Street | 268 | 2018 | -356.1 | 2016 | 358 |
|  | 8 Maynard Drive, Schomberg | 27-Regional Road 27 | Moore Park Drive | 574 |  |  | 2016 | 766 |
| 195 | 5 McBride Cres, King City | Elizabeth Grove | Patricia Drive | 281 |  |  | 2016 | 375 |
|  | 8 McBride Cres, King City | Burton Grove | Patricia Drive | 281 |  |  | 2016 | 375 |
| 133 | 3 McClure Drive, King City | 6-Kele Street | 6-Kele Street | 714 | 2015 | 168.1 | 2016 | $\underline{168}$ |
|  | 9 McCutcheon Avenue, Nobleton | Sheardown Drive | 0.14 km North | 647 |  |  | 2016 | 863 |
|  | 1 McCutcheon Avenue, Nobleton | 0.14 km North of Sheardown Drive | McTagart Drive | 1356 |  |  | 2016 | - 1808 |
|  | 2 McCutcheon Avenue, Nobleton | McTaggart Drive | North End Cul-de-Sac | 21 |  |  | 2016 | 28 |
| 252 | 2 McGuire Court, Schomberg | Roselena Drive | South End Cul-de-Sac | 75 |  |  | 2016 | 100 |
|  | 1 Mckellar Lane, King City | Kingscross Drive | North End Turnaround | 27 |  |  | 2016 | 36 |
|  | 7 McTaggart Drive, Nobleton | West Roundabout | East Roundabout |  | 2018 | - 2537.5 | 2016 |  |
|  | 8 McTaggart Drive, Nobleton | Highway 27 | West Roundabout |  | 2018 | 8 2537.5 | 2016 |  |
|  | 3 McTaggart Drive, Nobleton | Sheardown Drive | 0.32 km North of Sheardown Drive | 222 | 2017 | $7 \quad 602$ | 2016 | 481 |
|  | 4 McTaggart Drive, Nobleton | 0.32 km North of Sheardown Drive | 27-Regional Road 27 | 930 | 2017 | $7 \quad 602$ | 2016 | 481 |
| 124 | . ${ }^{\text {Melrose Avenue, King City }}$ | John Street | West End | 244 | 2018 | -334.9 | 2016 | 326 |
|  | 22 Midway Court, Nobleton | Hillside Drive | South End Cul-de-Sac | 59 |  |  | 2016 | 32 |
| 254 | 4 Mill Dam Court, Schomberg | Roselena Drive | North End Cul-de-Sac | 193 |  |  | 2016 | 258 |
|  | 8 Mill Road | Vaughan/King Townline | Elm Pine Trail | 182 | 2018 | 567.1 | 2016 | 500 |
|  | 7 Mill Road | Elm Pine Trail | 11-King Road | 209 | 2018 | - 567.1 | 2016 | 500 |
|  | 3 Mill Street,Laskey | 56-Weston Road | Second Street | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
| 353 | 3 Miller's Sideroad | 38 -Bathurst Street | Dufferin Street | 2993 | 2018 | - 5432.8 | 2016 | 1057 |
|  | 0 Moore Park Drive, Schomberg | Main Street | South End Cul-de-Sac | 547 |  |  | 2016 | -730 |
| 274 | 4 Munshaw Court, Pottageville | Cook Drive | South End Cul-de-Sac | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 53 |
|  | O Newmarket/King Townline | 38-Bathurst Street | 0.8 km North of 38 -Bathurst Street | 17084 |  |  | 2016 | $\underline{100}$ |
|  | 4 Nicort Road | Spring Hill Drive | Dufferin Street |  | 2018 | 1006.7 | 0 |  |
|  | 1 Nobleton Lakes Drive | 27-Regional Road 27 | East End Cul-de-Sac | 722 |  |  | 2016 | 963 |



|  |  |  |  | 2011 TMP (GIS Data) | Traffic Cou Tow | unts provided by wnship | 2016 Road N | Needs Study |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FID | NAME | FROM_ | T0 | AADT | Survey_Year | AADT_Total | Survey_Year | $\begin{aligned} & 2016 \\ & \text { AADT } \end{aligned}$ |
| 246 | Western Avenue, Schomberg | Elmwood Avenue | Main Street | 631 |  |  | 2016 | 842 |
| 244 | Western Avenue, Schomberg | Church Street | Elmwood Avenue | 458 |  |  | 2016 | 611 |
| 502 | Weston |  |  | 4920 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 504 | Weston |  |  | 3300 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 505 | Weston |  |  | 4115 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 507 | Weston |  |  | 4439 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 516 | Weston |  |  | 2992 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 557 | Weston |  |  | 2369 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 558 | Weston |  |  | 2257 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 566 | Weston |  |  | 2132 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 346 | Wilhelmina Road | Dufferin Street | West End | 167 |  |  | 2016 | 223 |
| 15 | Wilkie Avenue, Nobleton | South End Cul-de-Sac | Ellis Avenue | 226 | 2019 | 440 | 2016 | 302 |
| 373 | Willard Hunt Court, Schomberg | Dr. Jones Drive | North End | 139 |  |  | 2016 | 186 |
| 169 | William Street, King City | Dew Street | North End | 43 |  |  | 2016 | 58 |
| 170 | William Street, King City | 11-King Road | Dew Street | 285 |  |  | 2016 | 341 |
| 306 | Williams Court, Carrying PI | Hodgson Crescent | East End Turnaround | 64 |  |  | 2016 | 86 |
| 52 | Wilsen Road, Nobleton | Hazelbury Drive | 27-Regional Road | 364 | 2017 | 381 | 2016 | 450 |
| 88 | Winter Road | Collard Drive | South Turnaround | 64 |  |  | 2016 | 86 |
| 327 | Wist Road | South Canal Bank Road | Woodchopper's Lane | 127 |  |  | 2016 | 253 |
| 326 | Wist Road | Woodchopper's Lane | 1.1 km North of Woodchopper's Lane | 127 |  |  | 2016 | 170 |
| 31 | Witherspoon Way, Nobleton | McTaggart Drive | Russel Snider Drive | 388 |  |  | 2016 | 518 |
| 29 | Witherspoon Way, Nobleton | Russel Snider Drive | West End Cul-de-Sac | 54 |  |  | 2016 | 72 |
| 331 | Woodchopper's Lane | Jane Street | 1.1 km East of Jane Street | 0 | 2017 | 272 | 2016 | 919 |
| 336 | Woodchopper's Lane | 1.1 km E of Jane Street | Keele Street | 0 | 2017 | 272 | 2016 | 919 |
| 318 | Woodchopper's Lane | Wist Road | Jane Street | 216 | 2017 | 272 | 2016 | 288 |
| 365 | Woodhill Avenue, Nobleton | King Side Road | Farmcrest Court | 528 |  |  | 2016 | 704 |
| 364 | Woodhill Avenue, Nobleton | Farmcrest Court | Hawthorne Valley Road | 792 |  |  | 2016 | 1056 |
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# Appendix <br>  

DETAILED CALCULATIONS OF CAPITAL COSTS

| Road | From | To | Improvement | Length <br> (m) | Classification | Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | New Asphalt Road Unit Cost (\$/m) | New Asphalt Road (Sub-total) | $\qquad$ |  |  |
| 10th Concession Road | 19th Sideroad | Queen Street | New Asphalt Road | 448 | Rural Collector | 1,191 | 534,000 | 116,000 | \$ | 650,000 |

Notes:
eld an 2019 Dollars and indud $10 \%$ contruction contingency, $10 \%$ soft cost and $1.67 \%$ HST
(2) All costs presented are Class $D$ estimates and thus may vary significantly based on item quantities.
(3) Cost for active transportation facilities, such as sidewalks and bike lanes, are not included
(4) Costs to upgrade roads as trucking routes and additional streetscaping costs are not included.
(5) It is assumed that the costs for all new roads within future developments will be collected as part of the developer's applications; thus, these roads were not costed.
() Unit costs assume typical environmental conditions and topography
(7) Right-of-ways are based on the Township's standard cross-section designs. No considerations are given in implementing a "constrained" version of the cross-section. Costs do not include property or land acquisition.
(8) The breakdown of the new construction and reconstruction roadway unit costs is attached. Note that where recent costs were not readily available, cost estimates from the 2014 TMP are inflated to 2019 dollars by applying a $13.7 \%$ inflation factor, as per the non-residential construction price index prescribed in the Development Charges Act.


| Reconstruction cost per metre |  | New construction cost per metre |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$256.06 | 2014 Dollars: | \$1,047.26 |
|  | \$291.14 | 2019 Dollars: | \$1,190.74 |
| Note: Where recent costs were not readily available, cost estimates from the 2014 TMP are inflated to 2019 dollars by applying a $13.7 \%$ inflation factor, as per the non-residential construction price index prescribed in the Development Charges Act. |  |  |  |


[^0]:    Source: WSP

[^1]:    Source: WSP

[^2]:    Source: MTO

[^3]:    Source: York Region 2016 Transportation Master Plan

[^4]:    Source: Table 2.6.4-Characteristics of Rural Roads, Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, Transportation Association of Canada (TAC), 2017.
    a. The numberoflanes include HOV or bus lanes and a centre two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL), and excludes bike lanes

[^5]:    Source: 2016 GO Rail Station Access Plan

[^6]:    Source: York Region 2016 Transportation Master Plan

