



# PLEASANTVIEW COMMUNITY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

Public Consultation Report  
October and November, 2015  
Community Workshops

January 18, 2016



# Table of Contents

## **Table of Contents**

1. Executive Summary
2. Project Introduction
3. What We Heard – Details
  - a. October 29, 2015; 109 Street Session
  - b. November 19, 2015; 106 Street Session
  - c. November 26, 2015; Community Workshop



## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

Public feedback from the three workshops indicates an overall concern with the trial traffic management measures, a desire for them to be removed and a return of the roadways to their pre-trial design with a lower speed limit and an enforcement plan.

Meeting attendees feel the trial measures have negatively impacted their community by creating driver, cyclist and pedestrian safety risks and increasing traffic volumes and congestion on residential streets.

Respondents are most concerned with increased congestion and safety issues caused by traffic being diverted onto 105 Street. The City Project team suggested closing 105 Street at 51 Avenue as a solution, however, 86% of respondents surveyed at the November 19, 2015 workshop do not feel comfortable with this measure. The majority of comments indicate the solution to 105 Street issues is to return 106 Street to a two-way design.


Respondents indicate a concern with the curb extensions all along 109 Street with 58 Avenue being mentioned most often. They feel curb extensions add to the safety risks of 109 Street by narrowing the road and increasing the potential for conflicts between cars, buses, cyclists and pedestrians. They report the narrow road is causing congestion and frustration for drivers, near misses as opposing traffic is squeezing closer to each other, cyclists to ride on the sidewalk interfering with pedestrians and pedestrian safety and concerns as drivers are distracted by the curb extensions and not focused on pedestrians waiting to cross.

Many comments left by respondents at the October 29, 2015 workshop support the removal of the median at the intersection of 109 Street and 54 Avenue as they consider it to be a safety hazard that caused shortcutting and frustration. However, there is now a concern that the stop sign installed at the intersection is not a safe enough solution as drivers are missing it and not stopping. Some respondents suggest a four-way stop may be more effective; others suggest speed bumps at the intersection might help. Respondents also suggest that lowering the speed limit and providing enforcement along 109 Street would be a solution to the issues on that corridor.

Along 106 Street, respondents report drivers are ignoring or unknowingly travelling the wrong way on the one-way portion of the corridor. They have observed drivers illegally going through the 51 Avenue intersection modification and turning the wrong way onto 106 Street off of 56 Avenue. Another concern with the intersection of 106 Street and 56 Avenue is with the restricted visibility and winter driving conditions on the hill causing a safety issue with left turns at this location.

Speed was also mentioned as a concern specifically on 106 Street, 105 Street, 55 Avenue and 56 Avenue. Respondents suggest lowering the speed limit in the entire community as a solution.

Respondents from Pleasantview as well as in nearby communities report they are experiencing increased travel times with the indirect routes.



The few supportive comments received regarding the trial measures indicate traffic speed has reduced on 109 Street (5) and 106 Street (2) and that traffic volumes are reduced on 106 Street (3) and on 109 Street (2). There are a few respondents who believe that the trial measures need more time to be assessed properly.

Comments also indicate a concern with the public engagement process, feeling that the trial measures may have been put in place in response to the desires of a minority group. They are concerned that recent public engagement revealed the majority of the public as being not supportive of the trial measures and that the City is not listening to them.



## **2. PROJECT INTRODUCTION**

The City of Edmonton has developed a Community Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to address community safety concerns as a result of speeding, higher than expected traffic volumes and non-local shortcutting in the community of Pleasantview.

In the fall of 2013 the City of Edmonton began working with a volunteer based Traffic Advisory Committee from the community of Pleasantview on a traffic management planning process. Following extensive dialogue within the community a number of traffic management trial measures were installed in July 2015 with a plan to provide ongoing evaluation. In September 2015 City Administration determined the median on 109 Street and 54 Avenue needed to be removed as a result of illegal activity - primarily U-turns - that were causing safety concerns and impacting the private property of residents adjacent to the traffic measure. After approximately three months of the trial measures being in place, the City connected with residents to gather their thoughts on how the traffic measures, as well as the public engagement process, have been working and to determine if any changes should be considered in the future.

The City conducted three public engagement activities:

1. October 29, 2015 - workshop to gather feedback specifically on the 109 Street measures (34 Attendees)
2. November 19, 2015 – workshop to gather feedback specifically on the 106 Street measures (59 Attendees)
3. November 26, 2015 – community workshop to gather feedback on the entire project (173 Attendees)

This report provides an overview of what was heard from attendees of the three public workshops. It also includes verbatim feedback gathered from workshop notes and sticky note comments left by participants.

## **3. WHAT WE HEARD - DETAILS**

### **3.a. October 29, 2015 – 109 Street Workshop**

**Attendance: 34**

**Evaluation Forms received: 18**

Attendees at the workshop were asked to think about the trial measures installed on 109 Street and offer their opinions and insights as to what they are experiencing with the trial measures, what issues they could identify and what solutions they would suggest. Comments were collected on sticky notes related to the two questions: What are the Issues? and What are the Solutions?



## Question 1. What are the Issues?

Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 99 themed comments. The following highlights the most frequently mentioned issues.

### **Intersection - 109 Street and 54 Avenue (Centre median/stop sign) (21)**

The centre median (barricade) located on 109 Street and 54 Avenue was generally thought of as a hazard that caused shortcutting and frustration and the attendees feel the removal is a positive move. One attendee feels that it was not in long enough to be assessed.

Attendees are now concerned about the safety of the intersection of 109 Street and 54 Avenue reporting that drivers are ignoring the stop sign and proceeding through the intersection without stopping. They suggest this is not an intuitive place to stop and that there is no warning that a stop sign is approaching and a four-way stop may help the issue.

### **Curb Extensions - (16)**

The attendees indicate no support for the curb extensions in general citing they are a hazard that narrows the roadway, causes cycling/car/pedestrian conflicts and makes turning difficult for both cars and transit. The curb extension at 109 Street and 58 Avenue was mentioned most often as an issue.

### **Shortcutting/Traffic rerouted (11)**

Comments indicate an issue with increased shortcutting. They suggest the measures cause an increase of traffic to be diverted onto residential streets.

Other issues identified less frequently are:

**Speed** - Comments indicate issues with vehicles speeding on 109 Street.

**Congestion** - Comments indicate traffic volumes are high on 109 Street.

**Parking** - Attendees indicate some parking issues at the school and with LRT users parking in the community.

**Resident's impact** - Two comments indicate the residents of Pleasantview are inconvenienced with less direct routes and additional travel time.

**Other** - Single comment issues with 109 Street include: pedestrian safety at 57 Avenue and no stop sign at 52 Avenue.


**Public engagement process** - Comments were left concerning the public input process and the perceived limited reach.

**Questions** - Some attendees have questions regarding the traffic data such as the timing of the measurements and some want to know if it is possible to find out who the shortcutters are.

**Suggestions** - Two suggestions were left to return to the original 106 Street design.

## Question 2. What are the solutions?

Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 87 themed comments. The following highlights the most frequently mentioned solutions.



### **Intersection revisions - 109 Street and 54 Avenue (17)**

Several solutions are suggested for revising the intersection of 109 Street and 54 Avenue including: add a traffic circle (4), close access completely (4) and most commonly mentioned is the addition of a four-way stop (9).

### **Speed bumps - Add (13)**

Speed bumps are suggested as a solution in general on 109 Street but mentioned most often for the 54 Avenue intersection.

### **Speed limit - reduce(9)/enforce(6)**

Respondents would like the community speed limit reduced to 40km/hr or even 30km/hr. In addition to the speed reduction, they suggest an increase in speed enforcement.

Other solutions offered less frequently are: Close accesses completely at 52, 54, 57 or 61 Avenues (8), remove curb extensions (5).

Following the workshop, 18 respondents submitted an evaluation form where 72% identify themselves as living adjacent to 109 Street and the remaining 28% as living within the Pleasantview Community. The majority agree or strongly agree that their concerns were understood, their voice was heard and that attending the meeting was a good use of their time.

## **3.b. November 19, 2015 – 106 Street Workshop**

### **Attendance: 59**

Attendees of the November 19, 2015 workshop were asked to focus their input on the 106 Street trial measures. Comments were collected on sticky notes related to the following three questions

#### **Question 1.a. What level of comfort do you have for the proposed short term change of closing 105 Street and 51 Avenue?**

The City presented the attendees with a potential adjustment that would close access to 51 Avenue from 105 Street in order to address the increased traffic volume on 105 Street. Attendees were asked to indicate on a scale of 1-5 where 1 is low and 5 is high, their level of comfort for the proposed short term change that would close 105 Street at 51 Avenue.

Of the 50 respondents who answered the question, the majority (43) indicate they have a low level of comfort with the proposed change. Only two indicate a high level of comfort.

#### **Question 1.b. Do you have any alternate solutions that should be considered for the short term to deal with the concerns raised by data presented?**

Attendees were asked to offer alternate ideas to address the issue of increased traffic volume on 105 Street. Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 85 themed comments. The following highlights the most frequently mentioned solutions.



### **Trial measures/return to original design (44)**

Forty-four comments indicate a desire from attendees to remove the trial measures on 106 Street and return it to its previous design of a two-way road; some adding that they would like to see a reduced and enforced speed limit as well.

Other solutions were mentioned far less frequently such as removing the bike lanes from 106 Street (4) reducing and enforcing speed limit (4) and adding speed bumps to 105 Street (3). Ten comments were left in the form of a question or a general statement and other solutions were only mentioned once or twice.

## **Question 2. Considering your experience using roadways in the 106 Street area, what actions would you suggest that could address your concerns?**

Attendees were asked to suggest actions that would address their concerns on 106 Street. Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 91 themed comments. The following highlights the most frequently mentioned suggestions.

### **Trial measures/return to original design (46)**

There are 46 comments that suggest that reverting 106 Street to its previous configuration would address attendees concerns.

### **Speed limit - reduce/enforce (11)**

Eleven responses indicate they would like speed reduced and/or enforced if reverted to the original configuration.

### **Speed bumps - Add (8)**

Eight suggestions mention adding speed bumps to either 105 Street or 106 Street

### **Trial measures retained (4)**


Four comments support the changes and would like to see them maintained.

### **Bike lanes (4)**

Four comments suggest removing the existing bike lanes

Twelve comments were left in the form of a question or a general statement and other suggestions were only mentioned once or twice.





### **3.c. November 26, 2015 – Community Workshop**

**Attendance: 173**

**Evaluation forms received: 105**

Attendees at the Community Workshop were asked to provide their input regarding what they feel has worked well with the trial measures, what have been the issues and what solutions they would suggest to address the issues. Participants used sticky notes placed under the question headings and also filled out an evaluation form.

#### **Sticky Note Responses**

##### **What has your experience been with the trial measures?**

###### **Question 1.a. What has worked well?**

Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 46 themed comments.

Twenty-eight comments indicate a negative experience with the trial measures and did not provide a comment on what worked well. Thirteen of those indicate nothing has worked well and others indicate specifically that traffic has increased on 105 Street.

Those who did provide positive feedback on what worked well indicate traffic speed has reduced on 109 Street (5), 106 Street (2), 53 Avenue (1) and one who believes community traffic speeds have reduced as a whole. Others suggest traffic volumes reduced on 106 Street (3), on 109 Street (2) and one mention each for 53 Avenue and the Queen Alexandra Community.

###### **Question 1.b. What have been the issues?**

Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 272 themed comments. The following highlights the most frequently mentioned issues.

###### **Traffic increased/rerouted/congestion (46)**

The most common issue indicated by respondents is the increase in traffic volume they are experiencing on Pleasantview's residential streets most specifically 105 Street. Participants indicate the additional traffic on 105 Street has impacted and disrupted their community and increased the concern for the safety of residents and pedestrians in the area.

###### **Trial measures/return to original design (28)**

Respondents feel the trial measures as a whole are not working. Many comments indicate the trial measures make their community less safe for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians and they desire the removal of the measures returning the roadways to their original design (before the measures), with the exception of lowering the speed limit and adding additional enforcement.



### **Curb extensions - (19)**

Respondents indicate the curb extensions installed on 109 Street have narrowed the road adding to traffic safety concerns. They report traffic has less room to maneuver causing near misses between cars, buses and cyclists. They also report the barriers are distracting causing visibility and safety issues for pedestrians.

### **Intersection - 106 Street and 56 Avenue (16)**

Respondents highlight the intersection of 106 Street and 56 Avenue as an area of safety concern specifically with visibility and the left turn near the crest of the hill.

### **One-way - drivers going wrong way (15)**

Respondents indicate drivers are either ignoring or unknowingly travelling the wrong way on the one-way portion of 106 Street. Respondents report observing drivers going straight through the intersection modification at 51 Avenue and also turning the wrong way onto 106 Street off of 56 Avenue.

### **Speed - (15)**

Respondents are concerned with speed throughout the community and specifically on 106 Street, 105 Street, 55 Avenue and 56 Avenue. Two comments indicate concern with Edmonton Transit bus speeds on 109 Street.

### **Public input (14)**

Respondents are concerned that the trial measures are a response to the public input of a small portion of the community. They also indicate concern that the City is not listening to more recent public input telling them the majority of the community does not want the trial measures.

Other issues mentioned less frequently include the additional travel times and inconvenient rerouting that residents and other community members are experiencing, drivers not stopping at the stop sign on 105 Street and 55 Avenue. Respondent comments also include 24 questions and 20 general statements.

### **Question 1.c. What solutions would you suggest to address these issues?**

Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 242 themed comments. The following highlights the most frequently mentioned issues.

### **Trial measures/return to original design (64)**

Respondents feel the solution is to return the area back to its original road design with the addition of a reduced speed limit (20km or 40km) and enforcement to ensure speeds are adhered to.

### **Speed limit - reduce(26)/enforce (7)**

Twenty-six comments indicate a reduction in speed and/or enforcement would address their issues.



Other solutions identified less frequently are:

**Bike lanes (11)** - remove or move to another location

**Speed bumps (11)** - added to streets including 109, 105, 106, 107 and 51/56 Avenue being mentioned

**Arterial roads - fix problems (6)** - suggestions indicate if traffic problems are fixed on 111 Street particularly then 106 Street would have less issues.

**Close accesses (18)** - suggestions were provided to close accesses at 105 Street (6), Pleasantview (4), 109 Street (3), 106 Street (2), Calgary Trail (1), 55 Avenue (1), 60A Avenue (1).

**Curb extensions - remove (6)**

**Four way stop - add (6)** 109 Street and 54/53 avenue; one suggestion for 106 Street and 56 Avenue

Other solutions were mentioned less frequently and include adding stop signs (3), drop off school zones (3), traffic circles (2), maintaining the measures (2) and giving the curb extensions more time (2).

Respondent comments also include 17 general statements and 5 questions.

### Evaluation Form Responses:

The majority of respondents (75) indicate they are residents of the Pleasantview community. Other communities are represented by respondents from: Allendale (12), Queen Alexander (4), Duggan (4), Ermskin (2) and one each from Empire Park, Belgravia, McKernan, Ritchie, Rideau Park and a parent of a student at Mount Pleasant School.

Respondents heard about the workshop mainly from the road side signs (62) followed by a flyer in their mailbox (44).

Attendees were asked to indicate on a scale of 1-5, their level of agreement regarding several statements regarding the workshop and the information presented. (1= strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree).

The majority of attendees indicate:

- the information presented was not useful and informative (55% chose 1 or 2 on the scale).
- the meeting location was appropriate (74% chose 4 or 5 on the scale).
- they do not have a better understanding of the project because of their attendance (51% chose 1 or 2 on the scale).
- they had the opportunity to provide their input at the session (53% chose 4 or 5 on the scale).

When asked about their participation in the session being a good use of their time, attendees were split on their responses with 44% disagreeing (choosing 1 or 2 on the scale) and 43% agreeing (choosing 4 or 5 on the scale).

Respondents were asked to leave additional feedback about the project. Where applicable, each comment was subsequently broken apart into specific themes; there are 96 themed comments. The following highlights the topics mentioned most frequently from those responses:



### **Measures - not working (12)/Revert to original design (19)**

Respondents indicate that they do not believe the trial measures are working and would like to see the area reverted back to its original design. They indicate the measures increase safety risks for all users, cause confusion and increase congestion and shortcutting. Some respondents feel that once the measures are returned to the original design, the speed limit should be reduced and enforced; others believe the bike lanes should be removed. One comment supported the trial measures in place.

### **Curb extensions - remove (11)**

Respondents express concern over the curb extensions along 109 Street and request they be removed. They report the curb extensions have decreased the safety of the roadway by causing right-of-way confusion, pedestrian crossing hazards, cyclists to use the sidewalks to avoid the extensions, a narrowing of the road resulting in traffic congestion and near misses.

### **Public input (19)/Workshop (14)**

Respondents indicate frustration with the engagement process feeling the City is not listening to the majority of the community. They are concerned the workshop was redundant and a waste of their time in that the City does not appear to be listening. Several comments question previous public input and how far it reached into the community.