

WEST LRT Workshop #1 - Comment Summary

Lewis Estates to Meadowlark

May 6, 2010

Segment A

Right-of-Way / Alignment	<p>Alternative #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic can go west on 156 Street/87 Avenue• Intersection of Meadowlark Road/ 87 Avenue will get congested• Safety of the Meadowlark Road/ 87 Avenue intersection• Meadowlark road will get congested• Additional lanes on Meadowlark Road? Why 4 lanes near 87 Avenue?• How will we access library?• Access for Elmwood an issue; cannot go left, need to have exit points• Need more traffic light intersections• Road construction an issue; 87 Avenue is a main corridor for the community• Better width due to service roads• Restricts access to Meadowlark Mall• New potential roadway [through Meadowlark Mall] not sure we need it• Need traffic light at 159 Street and 83 Avenue• Need additional signal on 87 Avenue• Do the 156 Street and 90 Avenue intersection more north <p>• Concern of noise for condos along new access road through Mall property</p> <p>• [Need] a signal at 156 Street and 89 Avenue</p> <p>• Existing delay for condo owners coming out of parkade in the AM peak hours</p> <p>• Parking concerns/parking shortages for the Meadowlark Professional Building staff and clients (northwest corner of 87 Avenue/Meadowlark Road)</p> <p>• Consider reducing traffic lane on 87 Avenue and leaving parking on service roads</p> <p>Alternative #2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Station will serve [only] existing development• Will affect fewer residents• Access to the mall for eastbound vehicles on 87 Avenue? [A must have]• [Must have] Access to 159 Street/ 87 Avenue from Elmwood district North and East• Station area has no crosswalk• [Must maintain] Fire Hall access• More impact to facilities (i.e. Fire Hall and library)• Last stop on ETS to University on 156 Street impacted• More impact on intersections than Alternative #1• Concern about access to Mall – wouldn't be able to make left turn into the Mall• Blocks/impacts both the 156 Street and 159 Street intersections, creating more congestion for North/South traffic coming from Whitemud Drive and surrounding communities
---------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts access to Lynnwood and Elmwood • Concern about pedestrian crossing on 87 Avenue – are crosswalks being removed • Would we have grade separation/pedway overpass for both options? <p>GROUP SUPPORTS OPTION #1</p>
Stations	<p>Alternative #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are we serving at Meadowlark Station? • More pedestrian activity on 156 St. and 87 Avenue • Mall has blank wall on this side (North?) • Concern about station safety (late hours) <p>Alternative #2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station in mall area • Single platform • Explore station on 87 Avenue • Station on 87 Avenue will provide access to the mall • Strong support for this alternative • Less impact to residential <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 high schools – no access for kids – need station on 163 Street for kids to use • This does not encourage usage if run like a regular LRT with fewer stops • Seniors can't walk to station, currently taking bus #1, this doesn't work for them either • Want to see more stops • Don't like the LRT traveling in front of people's properties at front doors; reduces property value so doesn't matter if you need to acquire land • Feel like the City is scrambling to fit LRT in; squeeze it somewhere • Want to use Whitemud Drive; take it out of residential area • Like the cut across on Stony Plain Road and 156 Street and not going through intersection – move ETS terminal on Stony Plain Road here too • 95 Avenue staggered option makes the most sense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about parasitic parking problems near stations • Concern about people/kids jumping from one platform to the other in a side platform scenario • [What about] snow removal at platforms • Center platform viewed as safer • Center platform – pedestrians would not be sandwiched between the traffic and train tracks • Alignment concern that removing the service road on 87 Avenue would remove/limit the alley access (alley on north side of 87 Avenue between 163 Street and Meadowlark Mall) • Consider shelter for winter riders

<p>Neighborhood / Business Access</p>	<p>Alternative #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snow removal [a concern] • Emergency vehicles should have priority • [Need] pedestrian access to library • Parking on neighbourhood streets • Elmwood access – [need light on 159 Street/83 Avenue • Access at 169 Street –[need] left turn to 87 Avenue • Maintain access to the mall • Option #1 is better because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not limit mall access to Lynnwood via 156 Street • Does not limit access to Lynnwood via 156 Street <p>Alternative #2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More access is available to pedestrians • Signal at station for access • Serves business well • Redevelopment at intersection? • [Will there be] wire hanging on cross street left turns? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to extend 83 Avenue straight to 170 Street – one way out • Move Library and Fire Station and use the space for LRT because parking will be an issue • Make 156 Street Bridge accessible to Whitemud Drive • Provide access ramp northbound off Whitemud Drive on 149 Street • Locate a station at 87 Avenue and 165 Street for access to hospital and high school leading to increased riders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would condo residents get home when traveling south on 156 Street (because they can't turn left into Library/condo area.) Condo residents don't want the access road • Parking for the Meadowlark Professional Building and removal of service roads would remove extra parking and two handicap stalls • Poor alley condition in winter/removal of service road would limit parking for residents (long back alley) • Running LRT down the center of Meadowlark Road would be better because both sides of the street would have right in/right out access
--	---

Segment B

<p>Right-of-Way / Alignment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons for Choosing [preference for] 156 Street option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Existing activity centers ◦ [Will serve] future development [better] • Potential for re-zoning along corridor? Mixed use? • Bus service along LRT routes? • Did you look at elevated [track] like Vancouver? • What about snow clearance? • What would make the route change? • Parking control for “Park and Riders” [parasitic parking] • Property impacts – [LRT will bring] transients into the area – [need] full time security at night • What about breakdowns with single lane traffic on 156 Street? • [What about] bus traffic [if it can't be] on 156 Street? Through neighbourhoods [is not wanted] • [Need] Fire/Emergency access • 95 Avenue traffic volumes [will be a concern] • Prefer 156 Street, not Meadowlark Road • Improvements on 95 Avenue/160 Street [required] due to traffic volumes that will be increased – 95 Avenue service road [could be] taken for future lanes? • [What] will be the speed of the trains – this is a concern • <u>Send the LRT down 87 Avenue</u> • No room for windrows during snow removal • Build it faster • Concern about left hand access off of Meadowlark Road • Ground in Meadowlark Park is unstable and prone to settlement • Put barriers and crossing gates and signals to allow left hand turns out of the neighbourhoods • 92 Avenue needs a signalization to provide left hand turns out of neighbourhood • 95 Avenue/156 Street is a dangerous intersection • [Address issues about] little school on southwest corner of 92 Avenue/156 Street • 156 Street is very busy and can't accommodate trains • Allow left hand turns out of neighbourhoods at off-peak hours • [Allow] left turns on 97 Avenue at 156 Street • 92 Avenue is a major neighbourhood connector road • 156 Street is a major connection to Whitemud Drive that has limited access already – diverted traffic goes where?
<p>Stations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [What about] snow removal at stations and on 156 Street? • Don't want in [shortcutting in] residential areas • Parking control for “Park and Riders” [parasitic parking] • Shift entire alignment to west into potential property acquisition area for center loading platform • [Need] protective barriers/pedestrian safety • [Address] school crossings and student safety across 156 Street at 92 Avenue • Security concern – [LRT] will bring unwanted elements into the area • Security people, [more] lighting etc • Unwanted activity already at the N/W corner of 95 Avenue/156 Street (Petro Canada station, Church) • Emergency supplies [will be required] (i.e. wheelchair needs to be available at the station) • Amenities? Don't want it to turn into a “long stay” area

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staggered platform keeps movements (left turns) on 95 Avenue (no issues crossing at crosswalk• Alternate bicycle trails that run parallel to LRT, especially where there is only one lane of traffic• [Will there be] Bicycle racks at stations?• Concern about parking around stations (service roads on 95 Avenue will fill up)• Need more stops/stations• 95 Avenue and 156 Street one of the most dangerous intersections now• When you take property, leave some green space• Suggest station north of Meadowlark Mall serving Library – 92 Avenue approximately, and at 97/98/99 Avenue• On 156 Street and at Stony Plain Road – will green space be added?• Split station[s] OK• No concrete – fit [stations] into neighbourhood• Put in infrastructure to add stations later• Stations must be heated• Safety a concern at stations – who will respond• Concern about station not serving the same people as busses will• It is a long distance to walk to the station• Need to re-open 151 Street, 154 Street at 100 Avenue in concert with the project• Offer free “Park and Ride” during construction to mitigate traffic impacts• Need signal at 165 Street/87 Avenue to provide access to the community
--	--

<p>Neighborhood / Business Access</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Must have] pedestrian/cyclist activated crosswalks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Recommend ped. Crosswalk at 92 Avenue, at Jasper Place Library and at 98 Avenue • For service roads, why remove in some places and not in others vs. on-street parking • No left turn at 156 Street and 93 A Avenue creates <u>major</u> access and egress • What about pedestrian crossings at non-signalized side streets (wheelchair accessible) • Left turns during off-peak hours? • What are noise impacts? Hours of operation? • Safety concern for entire alignment • Safety concern for crossing tracks as pedestrians • Right or left alignment preferred * • Current bus system is better • <u>Bike lanes are needed</u> • If we really want effective [public] transit, why are we so concerned about cars • Concerns that alignment on one side of the ROW or the other will cause access and egress issues [prefer center running?] • Put bike lane within LRT area on roadway • Parasitic parking issue [will] have an effect • Snow removal is a concern • Consider one way traffic both lanes at peak times • Concern about traffic coming through • Concerns about shortcutting –need a physical deterrent • West Jasper Place and Glenwood will be trapped – traffic on 163 and 149 Street will be huge and impossible to turn left onto them • Might need more lights on 95 Avenue to allow residents to turn left onto 95 Avenue • More lights for pedestrian crossings at 95 Avenue/156 Street and 163/149 Street on 100 Avenue • Put roundabouts [traffic circles] in communities • Make this more pedestrian friendly • Must ensure bus routes to collect riders [from LRT] are as convenient as it currently is • 149 Street and 163 Street will need more [traffic signal] lights for cars to access • Parasitic parking [will be an issue] • Concern about shortcutting through alleys • Home-based business traffic access [must be maintained] • Congestion due to “Park and Riders” – [may require] resident permits • Emergency access must be maintained • Surrounding collector roads [will get] congested – lights [needed] at 160 Street/95 Avenue • [There will be] minimal opportunities to turn north up 156 Street • Peak eastbound traffic out of Meadowlark and all of Glenwood on 95 Avenue and 156 Street • 92 Avenue needs a signal • 95 Avenue/156 Street has a lot of accidents • 156 Street is busy and we want more lights • Good planning and go ahead and start the work
--	--

Segment C

<p>Right-of-Way / Alignment</p>	<p>Alignment #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is congestion going to be addressed • <u>What about couplet system with Stony Plain Road and 100 Avenue?</u> • Concerns re business access • How will ambulance/DATS access medical clinics etc? • Business viability/not speaking directly to businesses to discuss compensation ([do] not [talk] to just landowners • Why not run LRT on curb lane and allow turns over • Need another station in between 149 Street and 142 Street • Alternative #2 not preferred; [too much] building impact • Prefer Alignment #1 for businesses west of 156 Street • How will snow removal be handled? • At 149 Street, Alignment #2 impacts buildings – 4 health care businesses may get expropriated – station not a concern • City should inform business owners how to relocate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting improvements required • Bike stands to improve area • <u>Snow storage</u> [will be a problem] if there is only one lane in each direction • [Need access] for emergency vehicles • Cost of land acquisition is a concern • Can pedestrians cross LRT safely? • Land acquisition for parallel routes (100 Avenue?) • North alignment – no access for businesses to the north – will kill business • Loss of businesses • If you want 2 lanes of traffic each way, you will have to buy houses • This will kill Stony Plain Road • Revitalization was happening; LRT will reverse this • Best of the worst is down the center for an alignment • Station spacing is too far apart • How will commuters from Spruce Grove and Stony Plain use this route [with LRT on it]. • Synchronization of LRT and traffic lights [a must] while considering the need for pedestrians to cross
<p>Stations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still need bus service of Stony Plain road for connections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ too far from station, specifically Bus Route #1 and #2 • Staggered station allows left turns – better for business access • Still need bus access to station locations due to no “Park and Ride” • Pedestrians/people with mobility issues will have farther to walk – transit to LRT transfers • <u>Connectivity</u> between Jasper Place Transit Center and LRT station at 156 Street is an important consideration • Consider bus access to Jasper Place transit center • Angled station at 156 Street/ Stony Plain Road may start to initiate redevelopment in the area • Get rid of existing [City] Council • Too far between 149 Station and GM station • Will weather protection be provided – not just a roof on the station? • How will the City deal with the crime? • Preference for staggered station type wherever possible (minimal people on the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> road) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Less impact on vehicular traffic • Would like Alignment #3 @ Stony Plain Road – to add more green space and small commercial TOD • Put more focus on pedestrians
<p>Neighborhood / Business Access</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting improvements; snow removal improvements if parking will now be on <u>side streets</u> (also for pedestrians using side streets) • No U-turns [should be allowed] (too dangerous) • Concerns about parasitic parking; short cutting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o [Implement] Mitigation measures such as speed bumps..... • Loss of business property taxes • Possibly move signal from 154 Street to 153 Street and remove median on 102 Avenue • Can't widen or use alley for parallel route or to make turns • "Certain death" with north alignment; "slow death" with center running alignment • Pedestrians have to walk 4 blocks to cross Stony Plain Road; Jaywalking will be a concern • Can't have storefront cinema nights • Drivers will reroute to residential areas • Traffic that businesses depend upon will not know that the businesses are there • Cutting parking in half-taking away store front parking • Why no answer why 87 Avenue/100 Avenue/102 Avenue/107 Avenue were not considered? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No complaints about these alternatives • Concerned that 4 lanes to 2 lanes would be chaos • Back alley access unrealistic • [Provide]/maintain access for DATS and ambulances • Center running preferred since there would be less cul-de-sacs – this allows for more right-in/right-out turns • Center running does not equal couplet • Why not elevate to reduce impact • Severely restricted business access and parking for vehicles (patients not capable to walk four blocks) • Business will not survive • Existing businesses will not benefit from LRT • More tighter station spacings [are desired]
<p>Other Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space for bike lanes? – should be required • South alignment – would be on the shaded side of the street – more pedestrian friendly activities happen on the sunny side • 156 Street to 149 Street – perhaps investigate business impacts on North alignment vs. south side LRT placement • 153 Street station location would be of benefit if station on 156 Street was located further south to maintain station spacing • Maintain consistent station spacing and flexibility to add stations to provide infrastructure for future stations between proposed stations that are located further apart

Segment D

<p>Right-of-Way / Alignment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A promise was made during original discussions not to have 4 lane vehicle plus 2 lanes for LRT – community would have taken a different position with this option on the table • Options 1 and 2 impact egress onto Stony Plain Road south of Stony Plain Road – true for north side too • Pedestrian access to parks and river valley across Stony Plain Road is reduced – can't go west • Community access concern – 145 Street traffic signal is missing on drawings #1 and #2 – why? – This leads to reduced access- Why? • How will children safely cross to get to schools – <u>need details</u> • Even with the original [proposal], seems impossible to cross [Stony Plain Road] • This is a “deal breaker” • Move traffic to 107 Avenue – upgrade the roadway; don't upgrade Stony Plain Road, just upgrade 107 Avenue • Safe pedestrian access is a common theme – to parks, to schools, through intersections • Not reflective of walkable transit friendly city • Alignment needs to respect “shovel ready” development on 142 Street – it is ready to go; ensure integration like Century Park need to integrate • Concern about pedestrian access from south to station at 142 Street; with double free flow lanes onto Stony Plain Road, drivers will not pay attention [to] pedestrians – a safety issue that requires a pedway • [Need] gates at the tracks on 102 Avenue • St. Paul's Church is important to the community (property requirement is indicated for Alignments #2 and #3) • East of 142 Street (south side of Stony Plain Road) Italian restaurant is good and should stay. • The “Blue Chicago” is vacant and less “embraced” • With two lanes of traffic [this means we] have difficulty getting out of [our] community – with Alignment #1, I will never get out • Can we get a stop light at 145 Street and Stony Plain Road for access/egress on Alignment #1 – lose free flow northwest from 149 Street onto Stony Plain Road – they will go 107 Avenue (still allow right hand turn) • You could widen 149 Street and eliminate barriers for northbound traffic as it crosses Stony Plain Road so traffic from Whitemud Drive would use 107 Avenue (eliminate means grade separate the LRT trains from 149 to 142 Street) • What happens on 107 Avenue west of 124 Street • Need bicycles on all LRT trains all the time if you are taking away the lanes
<p>Stations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use center loading if possible – more economical (construction costs and operations), better for users, safer • Pedestrian safety with having to cross 2 sets of tracks • Alignment #3 at the 149 Street location – if train is in the station, does 149 Street shut down? This is a concern about traffic impacts due to proximity to 149 Street • Pedestrian crossings of double free flow turning lanes is a safety concern near station [at 149 Street] • Move station to between 142 Street and 141 Street (between new development and Crescent Place). Put it where high density is. • Why isn't there a north alignment option with 3 lanes (one (1) lane each way and a peak flow lane)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate station at 142 Street with new development – why not into the building where there is high density • Gates for north bound traffic on 142 Street – if the LRT is in the station, what happens to the vehicular traffic?
<p>Neighborhood / Business Access</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With Options (Alignments) #1 and #2 can't get out to go west for communities south of Stony Plain Road. Adding a light at 142 Street would address this • Elevated LRT over 142 Street/149 Street [will allow] safe access in and out of neighbourhoods • If parcel [of land] at southeast corner of 142 Street/ Stony Plain Road is developed into TOD – how would any eastbound traffic access it? • Need a light at 101 Avenue/142 Street in order to get out of community to the east of 142 Street - 142 Street will be too busy. Also concerned about restricted left [turn movements] at 142 Street and Stony Plain Road • Pedestrian crossings needed – looks like we can only cross at signalized intersections – why is this so restricted • Having four lanes is counter-intuitive and counter-productive to getting people to use transit – and we are “ghetto-izing” downtown (?) community to make it easier for people from the west end to use cars – defeats the purpose of the system • Have 107 Avenue and 102 Avenue – as alternate routes for people to use • If 1 (one) lane, how do emergency vehicles get into/out of the area south of Stony Plain Road • Acquire southwest property at 142 Street and Stony Plain Road for left turn lane south and north (more functional) • Pedestrian crossings on double free flow lanes a concern – pedestrians are often ignored and this is a safety issue • Instead of three (3) plus (+) one (1) traffic lanes, make it two (2) plus (+) one (1) with LRT on north side • Concerned that people using a jug-handle to turn north will result in a lot of shortcutting through communities south of Stony Plain Road