

# Preferred Alternative Design Option 2



# Summary of Preferred Design - Option 2

## (Extension of Deer Run Avenue to Winston Churchill Boulevard)

- Convert temporary emergency access way into a public highway.
- Consistent with Active Transportation Master plan
- Allows for the future connection to Winston Churchill Boulevard, with an emergency access until lands to the east are developed.
- Promotes connectivity for all modes to the rest of transportation network.

# Summary Evaluation of Alternative Solutions

Evaluation Criteria	Description	Option 1A	Option 1B	Option 1C	Option 1D	Option 1E	Option 2	Option 3	Do Nothing	Comments
Operational Impacts	Need for large maintenance vehicles to complete multi-point turns or reverse down Deer Run Avenue	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Deals with safety – therefore highest weighting. Also considers impacts associated with large vehicles using residential driveways to turn around.
Consistent with Active Transportation Master Plan	Is it consistent with the Active Transportation Master Plan?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Option 2 & 3 included a connection to Winston Churchill Blvd from Deer Run Ave.
Consistency with original planned vision of approved development plan	Is it consistent (yes/no)?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1a through 1e score the same because they assume a temporary cul-de-sac which would still allow the area to develop as originally envisioned. Option 3 gets full marks because it is the original concept for the lands. 75% for do nothing because the assumption was that "something" would be at the end of Deer Run (not just a dead end).
Connectivity	Promotes connections for all modes to the rest of the transportation network (yes/no)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Options 2 & 3 promote connections east and west for all modes of transportation.
Access to Clarkson GO	Changes in travel time to Clarkson GO as compared to installation of barricades	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Important criterion based on public input.
Air Quality	Changes in travel distance to Beryl Road and Winston Churchill Boulevard as compared to installation of barricades	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Important criterion based on public input
Maintenance costs	Cost to plough, repave/repair road; maintain/protect other infrastructure and town assets (trees)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Options 2 and 3 score higher because only one maintenance vehicle is required for winter maintenance.
Cost of construction	Materials, labour	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Weighting increased. Cost is an important factor in the decision-making process. *Cost can be found in the August 14, 2015 report and does not include cost of land.
		\$40,000*	\$95,000*	\$100,000*	\$97,000*	\$122,000*	\$250,000*	\$750,000*		
Relative Land Costs	Impact to land costs	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Weighting increased. Cost is an important factor in the decision-making process.

Ease of implementation	Ease of implementation – measured by time required to construct (land acquisition, permits, design, construction).	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Options that do not require land are easiest to implement. Options 2 & 3 are larger than the cul-de-sac.
Impacts to utilities	Need to move utilities or extend lines as a result of construction of the alternative design.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1a, 1c and do nothing do not require utilities to be relocated
Impacts to sewers and watermains	Need to move pipes or to extend pipes as a result of construction of the alternative design	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Watermain replacement anticipated with options 2 & 3
Conformity with design standards	Conforms with design standards	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Deals with safety – therefore higher weighting. 1a is marginally better than "do nothing".
Area of tree growing habitat and canopy	Area of tree growing habitat	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Option 3 allows for more street trees to be planted.
Impacts to adjacent properties owners and existing land uses	Impacts to driveways and access points	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Revised criterion based on review of staff report of June 2015 and comments received at PIC.
Impacts to development potential of undeveloped properties	Increases or decreases ability to develop lands, measured by change in area of developable land from existing conditions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1a through 1e score higher because they assume a temporary cul-de-sac which would still allow the area to develop as originally envisioned.
Impacts to existing vegetation	Amount of existing vegetation to be removed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	All construction projects have potential to disrupt vegetation.
Impacts to terrestrial and aquatic species	Direct and indirect impacts to habitat, corridors, or movement. Impacts to Species at Risk or Endangered Species.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	All construction projects have potential to disrupt habitats. No endanger or "at risk" species are at risk.
	Score	63	59	64	56	61	71	65	67	