

Suggestions in italics were provided in the feedback process and were not reviewed by the whole community through the newsletter. Only those attending the meeting provided feedback on these suggestions.

I Saskatchewan Drive - University Avenue to 116 Street

I.1 Driving

I.1.a Lower traffic speed to 40 km/h at most possibly 30 km/h

Positive 23-slower (58%) / 3-30 km/h (6%) / 11-40 km/h (22%) 37-Total (76%)

- Slow traffic in the neighbourhood and make it less appealing to shortcutting commuter looking to speed up their commute
- Reduce traffic speeds to improve pedestrian safety accessing the Saskatchewan Dr. multi-use trail and river valley
- With traffic humps and other calming measures, 30 km/h could work, but without them you will not get compliance. 30 km/h is really, really slow for that road, so I think 40 km/h would be better. In fact without traffic calming measures, ***any*** desired lowering of actual traffic speed (as distinct from the posted limit) anywhere in Belgravia will be aspirational only and compliance will be low. Note that speed bumps also deter cyclist from staying on the road because they are hazardous. Cut outs should be made to allow cyclists uninterrupted passage through the bumps.

Negative 12 (24%)

- Unposted limit of 50 km/h is sufficient.
- Do we have any evidence this will deter short cutters? in general, if the current speed limits are not adequately enforced then how will a lower speed limit improve this?
- I believe that this implementation would be difficult to enforce without having cameras installed throughout the neighbourhood.

I.1.b Install traffic humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) primarily north of 76 Ave. but possibly south as well

Positive 28 (57%)

- Slow traffic in the neighbourhood and make it less appealing to shortcutting commuter looking to speed up their commute
- Reduce traffic speeds to improve pedestrian safety accessing the Saskatchewan Dr. multi-use trail and river valley
- but not more than one or two to help lower speed.
- North not south
- Speed bumps will slow traffic down more than a speed limit. Many drivers will break the speed limit. Not all will fly over speed bumps.

- Traffic calming must be included south of 76 Ave. There is ***lots*** of speeding along that long stretch.
- We support the idea of traffic bumps on Sask. Dr. to slow down the shortcutting community as it may make this route not so fast for them. Besides these bump, we could also have a sign on that corner of Univ. Ave and Sask. dr, that says local traffic only.

Negative 21 (43%)

- Speed bumps are likely as frustrating for Belgravia traffic as they are for shortcutting traffic
- Speed bumps are also likely to drive the same traffic onto adjacent roads that lack bumps
- While speed humps may require you to slow down, will this deter a significant volume of traffic to make it worth the pain for residents all the time?
- Please no speed humps (I drive once in a while too though not usually at rush hour. I do not want to contend with speed bumps. We should not punish the people who go slow in the neighbourhood. Speed bumps are not good for emergency vehicles either - are they going to extend across the bike lanes as well ...Speed humps are not good for cyclists and if they do not cross the bike lanes it will encourage the short cutter to drive with two wheels in the bike lane.
- Do not add speed bumps. In winter it will cause more problems for graders. The bumps will need constant repairs.
- I am against installing traffic humps as it penalizes all of us, those who drive old cars can find them a problem, they are problematic for cyclists travelling at speed or with a child carrier.
- Traffic humps interfere with ploughing and road maintenance.
- Traffic humps are a nightmare for street plowing. Motorists will be constantly speeding up and braking which increases noise.
- The more traffic stops the more pollution
- These are annoying and hard on low vehicles & bikes.
- Traffic humps are a nightmare for cyclist, motorist and street plowing. Motorists will be constantly speeding up and braking which increases noise to nearby residents.
- I DO NOT support speed bumps. As Belgravians we will have to live with these every day and in my experience they just don't work, rather they just cause short cutters to speed-up and slow-down between them.
- bumps will not solve underlying issues.

I.1.c Eliminate turning lane off University Ave. for traffic entering Belgravia

Positive 10 (22%)

- Slow traffic in the neighbourhood and make it less appealing to shortcutting commuter looking to speed up their commute

- Reduce traffic speeds to improve pedestrian safety accessing the Saskatchewan Dr. multi-use trail and river valley

Negative 35 (78%)

- I don't support eliminating this - we still have to be able to get home somehow
- I rely on that turning lane to be able to get home when 114 St is clogged with traffic
- Not sure how this would reduce shortcutting
- I use the turning lane to enter the neighbourhood so I need the turn lane during rush hour
- This would offer less encouragement to shortcutters, but perhaps not enough to justify removal
- I need more information on how this will deter traffic. All I see it will mainly slow traffic on University Ave. as cars continue to turn into Belgravia and slow traffic being them, so I can't support this.
- Please do not eliminate our access.
- Often only way to get into neighbourhood when traffic piles up on University Ave.
- Taking away the turning lane will not keep commuters from coming into our neighbourhood.
- Eliminating the turn off Univ. Ave. for traffic entering Belgravia will move the problem to 119 St.
- we strongly oppose the removal of the right turn lane off University Ave. onto Sask Dr. Doing so will only reduce safety for all drivers, especially those trying to legitimately enter our neighbourhood.
- I don't support eliminating this - we still have to be able to get home somehow!
- Access to the neighbourhood is already difficult enough.
- If the turning lane at Univ. Ave. is eliminated it makes it very awkward for residents to access the community. No body uses that entrance as a shortcut.
- Do not eliminate the turning lane to get into our neighbourhood.
- This will make access for residents very bothersome, including me.
- With the volume of traffic going east in the evening, the elimination of the turn lane would create one of a bottleneck and create delays for us in entering Belgravia
- It's hard enough to get into Belgravia, the city has built good turning lane, don't change it.
- But, this lane is crucial for safe exiting from the too speedy traffic on University Ave, with speeds routinely 60 km/h+, despite signage. This intersection instead desperately needs a traffic light for pedestrians to cross between Belgravia and Windsor Park) and Belgravia drivers and cyclists entering and existing safely onto University Ave. This intersection is waiting for an accident to happen (T-bone).
- Eliminating the turning lane off of University Ave. for traffic entering Belgravia will complicate the life of the Belgravia residents who are coming home. Blocking off another access into the neighbourhood may keep people out but we will suffer as well That still would not fix the problem of all that extra

traffic at rush hour. Commuters will soon learn to take the 119 St. access into the neighbourhood as an alternative, which already is point o entrance of other neighbourhood residents, and will become the same for any residents if the Sask Dr access is closed. That increase local and shortcutting traffic would end up disturbing residents on that street as well, which not only already has considerate traffic volume, but most if it with faster speed than expected for a residential street.

I.1.d Install traffic calming circle at the intersection of Saskatchewan Dr and 76 Ave

Positive 24 (56%)

- Slow traffic in the neighbourhood and make it less appealing to shortcutting commuter looking to speed up their commute
- Reduce traffic speeds to improve pedestrian safety accessing the Saskatchewan Dr. multi-use trail and river valley
- A possibility to slow traffic at that intersection.

Negative 10 (44%)

- I thought the city was eliminating traffic circles because drivers don't know how to use them properly. Wouldn't a traffic circle require a lot of space? (more than what is currently publicly available.
- Not sure that this would make much speed difference
- Circle seems unnecessary as long as there are cross walks
- This intersection could work better but a traffic circle there seems just silly.
- Not enough traffic to call for a traffic circle.
- A lot of work, time & \$ for very little gain.
- A traffic circle would only add to the confusion.
- not enough room
- Traffic circles are nothing but problems in Edmonton, are it a 3-way stop instead constant with the presence of new marked crosswalks.

I.2 Walking

I.2.a Provide three marked crosswalks around the traffic circle and 76 Avenue and Saskatchewan Dr.

Positive 36 (80%)

- Enable pedestrians to safely access the Saskatchewan Dr multi-use trail and river valley at the currently used access points
- Great ideas

Negative 9 (20%)

- I don't believe that crosswalks around a traffic circle are any safer than ordinary crosswalks - maybe install pedestrian operated traffic lights instead.
- will slow traffic but will not discourage short cutters.

I.2.b Provide a marked crosswalk at the alley south of 79 Ave.

Positive 29 (78%)

- Enable pedestrians to safely access the Saskatchewan Dr multi-use trail and river valley at the currently used access points
- Great ideas

Negative 8 (22%)

- Will slow traffic but will not discourage short cutters.
- Better to install a sidewalk along the east of Sask dr.

Possibly

• A few years ago I read Edmonton has more pedestrian crossing than other major Canadian cities and yet also has one of the highest number of pedestrian accidents. I think that, on smaller roads, pedestrians should take more responsibility for waiting until there is an appropriate break in traffic and date crossing, rather than expecting vehicles to suddenly come to a halt, sometimes when there is not other traffic in sight and sometimes in icy winter conditions! My comments here to for other pedestrian crossing recommendations for residential street in later sections of the survey. To support my reasoning I have added information from a Washing State Dept of Transport website at the end of these comments.

I.2.c Provide a marked crosswalk at 74 Ave

Positive 35 (85%)

- Enable pedestrians to safely access the Saskatchewan Dr multi-use trail and river valley at the currently used access points
- Definitely needed with a speed bump to slow down fast traffic around the curve on Sask Dr, north of 74 Ave.
- Great ideas

Negative 6 (14%)

- will slow traffic but will not discourage short cutters.

I.2.d Reduce fast bicycle traffic on the shared use trail by making the roadway a sharrow.

Positive 23 (55%)

- Make the multi-use trail more comfortable for the elderly, young pedestrians and dog walkers by giving faster moving cyclists another alternative.

Negative 19 (45%)

- It is already a sharrow.
- Sharrows are dangerous for cyclists. Need a separate path or lane for cyclists.
- other measures to remove fast cyclists from the multi-use path should be satisfactory.

- Bicycles can already use the road if they wish
- Or just make trail wide so fast bikes can still stay on, because really any bike is faster than a pedestrian or elderly person.
- Better to add a dedicated bike lane beside the existing trail
- Make the shared use trail wider adding a lane for cyclists
- I don't want the bikes moved to the road unless there is a physically separated lane. Otherwise add a sidewalk to the east side of Sask Dr. or add a walking path alongside the existing bike path.
- I disagree with making a distinction between "slow" and "fast" cyclist traffic because the trails are multiuser. While I agree that fast moving bikes are scary sometimes, I see the move as placing a divide between pedestrians and bikes, and I think non-motorized commuters should work together. There is no one to police who counts as "fast" and "slow".
- Sharrows do not work and are dangerous for cyclists. Consult with Edmonton Bike Club. There needs to be a separated path or lane for cyclists.
- I agree that there are some cyclists moving too fast on the trail, but have always wondered why they don't use the road right adjacent to it like I do. If Sask. Dr is made more 'calm' (and with recognition of the needs of cyclists,) then signposting can be placed to direct cyclists soon to the road for that stretch.
- I think it would be better to put a separated bike path on the road on the west side of Sask. Dr. As well as providing a safe place for bikes, this would also serve to narrow Sask. Dr. and discourage speeding and shortcutters.

I.2.e Provide sidewalks on the east side of Saskatchewan Dr.

Positive 34 (77%)

- Provide comfortable pedestrian access to the homes along Sask. Dr., particularly seniors and children, can move between the homes.
- Provide those, not comfortable with the off leash dogs, with a sidewalk to use on the other side of Sask. Dr.
- !!
- Yes I support this... however, while it would be welcome, I'm not sure the expense is justified. The biggest issue I see is the lack of any sidewalk or path along Sask Dr. from where the multi-use trail descends to the river alley to 74 Ave. A sidewalk along the east side of Sask Dr. from 76 Ave to 74 Ave would address that.
- !!!
- and for walking on leash dogs
- ensure it also includes the east side of Sask Dr. between 74 Ave and 76 Ave.

Negative 10 (23%)

- I do not think it is necessary to add a sidewalk on the east side of Saskatchewan Dr, and would rather have the loss of "roadway space" be taken by the bike path.
- Residents along the drive have already completed landscaping on the city property where a sidewalk would go
- Residents would have to do additional snow clearing

- Not necessary to place sidewalks on both sides of Sask Dr.
- Enough walking space on the west side.
- why not provide a sidewalk next to bike path. It doesn't affect people's landscaping on Sask. Dr. and it will be way more cost effective.
- There is lots of space on the multi-use trail. Make it wider if you need to.

I.2.f Extend the multi-use trail all the way to the pedestrian bridge over Belgravia Road.

Positive 41 (87%)

- Provide better access all along the drive, particularly in the winter.
- South of the trail down into the river valley, there are not sidewalks along Sask. Dr., which means all people, dogs, children & strollers must go on the road.
- !
- There does need to be something added on the drive between 74 Ave and 75 Ave (currently a narrow mud path on the west side)
- good idea

Negative 6 (13%)

- How much extra will this cost for snow removal though
- There are lots of paths & trails south along Sask Dr. and 71 Ave.
- The multi-use trail only needs to be extended from where it ends to 74 Ave. Beyond that there is a sidewalk.
- Only extend the multi-use path to 74 Ave. (from Univ. Ave.) There is no need for a long multi-use path from 74 Ave to the pedestrian bridge as there are numerous trail/paths along Saskatchewan Drive and 71 Ave.

I.2.g Make multi-use trail pedestrian only

Positive 2 (33%)

- *The "multi-use" trail should be renamed. It should be a "pedestrian only" trail. All Bikes should be kept out of the dog off leash area.*

Negative 4 (67%)

- *Not unless there are bike lanes on Sask. Dr.*

I.3 Cycling

I.3.a Make Saskatchewan Drive a sharrow for fast moving cyclists.

Positive 26 (63%)

- Give fast moving cyclists an alternative to using multi-use trail since it is used heavily by the elderly, slower moving family groups and dog walkers.
- May provide some additional traffic slowing.
- !

Negative 15 (37%)

- I've used Sask. DR. to cycle on for over 40 years without the "sharrow" designation, the same as I use my car there.

- I do not think it necessary to add the sharrow bike lane along Saskatchewan Dr. but would suggest one of the 1.3.c or 1.3.d.
- This already happens i.e. road use with groups of fast moving cyclists - no need for expensive signing
- Bike lanes on a busy road don't work for me. I think the situation is OK as is
- Sharrows are not safe for cyclists, either have separate lane or multi-use trail for cyclists to use. You need separation between vehicles and bikes. Sharrows have not been effective in Edmonton or Calgary and they are covered in snow for a good part of the year.

I.3.b Put in a bike curb from the road at the top of the paved trail going down into the river valley.

Positive 33 (89%)

- Allow access to river valley from the road instead of forcing bikes through a congested area on the multi-use trail.

Negative 4 (11%)

- Just do't this this would work.

I.3.c *Widen multi-use trail or develop 2 separate trails to separate cyclists from other users.*

Positive 12 (92%)

•

Negative 1 (8%)

I.3.d *Create a bike only path on the west side of the road separated by a curb from that used by vehicles.*

Positive 2

- *Eliminate sharrows, use separate lane or path for cyclists safety*
- *Is there room on Saskatchewan Dr. for dedicated bike lanes both sides in addition to the parking on the east side. That would provide more incentive for the bikes to stay off the trail away from dogs, children and seniors.*

Negative

I.3.e *Align ramps onto the multiuser trail with 74 Ave. and 76 Ave.*

I.3.f *Put in ramp on 76 Ave on the north side of the intersection so cyclists going north onto the multi-use trail don't have to cross 76 Ave.*

II 115 St. - University Ave. to 76 Ave.

II.1 Driving

II.1.a Lower traffic speed to 40 km/hr at most, possibly 30 km/hr

Positive Slower 20 (49%) / 30 km/h 3 (7%) / 40 km/h 8 (20%) / Total 31 (76%)

- Major stretch of roadway into and out of Belgravia with no traffic restrictions so speeding is common.
- This narrow roadway is a heavily used cycling access to the University.
- Pedestrians cross this roadway regularly to access the LRT and local businesses.
- The opportunity to speed is incompatible with the safe use of this section of road by cyclists and pedestrians.
- This is the main route out of the neighbourhood at rush hour, due to traffic back up at the train tracks

Negative (24%)

- The unposed limit of 50 km/h is fine, the real problem is drivers illegally travelling at 60-80 km/h
- If current speed limits are not adequately enforced then how will a lower speed limit improve this?

II.1.b Install traffic humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit)

Positive 23 (61%)

- Major stretch of roadway into and out of Belgravia with no traffic restrictions so speeding is common.
- This narrow roadway is a heavily used cycling access to the University.
- Pedestrians cross this roadway regularly to access the LRT and local businesses.
- The opportunity to speed is incompatible with the safe use of this section of road by cyclists and pedestrians.
- But minimal number at intersections at most (to help lower speed)

Negative 15 (39%)

- Traffic humps would be at least as discouraging to Belgravia residents as they would to short-cutters.
- I'm not really opposed to traffic humps, but would 4 way stops be a better alternative? Which is more effective at reducing speeds?
- no speed humps please
- Do not add speed bumps. In winter it will cause more problems for graders. The bumps will need constant repairs.
- Traffic humps are exceptionally annoying (low cars, bikes etc.)
- Traffic humps create street plowing issues, motorist speeding up and breaking which creates noise issues for local residents. Has a one way northbound been considered.

II.1.c Separate straight and left turning traffic from the right turning traffic (2 lanes) leaving Belgravia at the north end of 115 St.

Positive 36 (88%)

- Right turners exiting Belgravia on 115 St. often cannot go because traffic either backed up to the east or left turners out of the Edmonton Clinic believe they have right of way and cut off right turners.
- Left turners out of Belgravia, in order to avoid getting caught behind the right turners and missing the infrequent light, often go into the oncoming lane to turn left.
- Yes please! this is a very dangerous area for drivers and pedestrians.
- Adding to the vehicles jostling for position are pedestrians and cyclists who also don't want to miss their infrequent opportunity to cross University Ave. and may cross unsafely with all the unpredictable traffic.
- !
- May have advantages if the intersection can be properly designed.
- I'm not sure if this is possible given the width of 115 St.
- II.1.c and its sister recommendation V.1.d is my SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE. If nothing else is done, I'd like to see this. We talk a lot about how we can make things more difficult for drivers (rightly so for short-cutters) but this is a change that will make a huge difference for us Belgravians. In conjunction with this change, the timing of the traffic light MUST be altered to reduce the incredibly long waiting teams and the routing of left-turners from the Edmonton Clinic must be addressed.

Negative 5 (12%)

- There is not enough space on 115 St. to install 3 dedicated lanes. The problem only presents itself for 30-60 minutes each day. Calls for 3 dedicated lanes at this corner would only lead to calls to widen or expand 115 St., which is not what we need.
- There is probably not enough room for this perhaps overhead arrow? Seems most drivers who block this are unaware.
- There does not seem to be enough road to accommodate all the lanes required..

II.1.d Take cycle route and parking off 115 St. to make it a main north south corridor from 73 Ave. to University Ave.

Positive 1 (12%)

• .

Negative 7 (82%)

- *115 St. must be crossed by pedestrians accessing the LRT, local businesses, and McKernan School, clearing the way to allow drivers to go more quickly does not make sense.*
- *The total time to drive the total length of 115 St. in Belgravia is currently between 1.5 and 2 minutes. There is no reason to change the street so traffic can go more quickly.*
- *No! Children live on this street and it is major pedestrian route/crossing for LRT.*
- *Will overflow 4 way stop at 76.*

II.2 Walking

II.2.a Provide a sidewalk on the east side of 115 street for the entire length

Positive 39 (91%)

- Provide comfortable pedestrian access to the homes along 115 St. particularly for seniors and children.
- Sidewalk on both sides of 115 St. would reduce the number of pedestrians crossing to the east side of the street at the confusing intersection with University Ave.
- I agree that the sidewalk on 115 St. could be improved.
- !
- If the cost is negligible, then I'll support this, however I'm not sure it's justified. Perhaps a sidewalk along the east side of 115 St from 80 Ave to University Ave will mitigate the concern of congestion at the Univ Ave intersection
- very good idea

Negative 4 (9%)

-

II.2.b Provide marked pedestrian crosswalks at 76 Avenue, 78 Avenue, 80 Avenue and before the University Avenue service road.

Positive 35 (88%)

- Crosswalks would remind drivers to slow down & provide pedestrians with safer crossings. Pedestrians frequently cross 115 Ave. to access the LRT, McKernan School and local businesses.
- I think a crosswalk at 76 Ave and 78 Ave should be sufficient
- very good idea

Negative 5 (12%)

- I believe it is safer to route cyclists on the path to the west of the LRT tracks, separated from vehicle traffic.

II.2.c. Provide a larger safe island for pedestrians on the southeast corner of the intersection of 115 Street and University Avenue.

Positive 36 (88%)

- Currently there is not enough room for the number of pedestrians that are frequently waiting to cross on the southeast side of the 115 Street and University Avenue intersection.
- Make the pedestrian traffic signal more accessible for cyclists
- very good idea

Negative 5 (12%)

- If anything needs to be larger/more prominent, it would be the pedestrian island on the west.

- Not sure this is practical and realistic for the short time this is required each day when university is in session.

II.2.d Provide elevated crosswalks instead of speed humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) at 76, 78 and 80 Avenues.

Positive 3 (60%)

- .

Negative 2 (40%)

-

II.2.e Move pedestrians to the west side of the intersection at 115 St. and University Ave

Positive 1

- .

Negative

- .

II.3 Cycling

*II.3.a Put a greenbox in front of **straight and left turning** vehicles for cyclists going across University Ave.on 115 St*

Positive 26 (68%)

- Currently no safe place for cyclists to be with the jostling vehicles at the intersection of University Ave. & 115 St. & they don't belong with pedestrians.
- Although it is a good idea, I don't know if enough drivers will stay back far enough if they want to creep ahead and turn right on University Ave. when they have a red light.

Negative 12 (32%)

- How will vehicles turn right on re if that is there?
- No, at this corner, it is appropriate for bicycles to cross with pedestrians.
- No green box - there is not enough room! Cyclists should dismount and walk with pedestrians...better to be away from cars at that intersection
- Needs more explanation as this could be very congested. Does the mean cyclists right be blocking access to service road? I would dispute that this is a "heavily " used bike route from my observations.
- Better to event the existing bike lane at 114 north across Univ Ave rather than using all into this 115 St. intersection
- Shares in Belgravia should be eliminated and separate lanes or path for cyclists should be the preferred option.
- Very busy with multi directions

- This is one I really don't like. I commute to work on 115 St. by bicycle. I also use this as a main exit from eh community by car. A group of bicycles in the green box would prevent mw making a right turn on the very long red light.

II.3.b Maintain existing sharrows

Positive 27 (77%)

- Suggested traffic slowing measures will improve the safety on this heavily used bike route.
- Yes, keep as sharrows; but no don't put any money into maintaining markings on the roadway
- The shadow markings are poorly maintained and almost invisible, especially when roads are wet or dirty. We need these and bike lanes markings to be maintained better.

Negative 8 (23%)

- Sharrows are dangerous for cyclists need separate path or lane for cyclists.
- Parking should be further restricted so cyclists don't get pushed into traffic.

II.3.c Add actual bike lanes along 115 Street

Positive 8 (89%)

- .

Negative 1 (11%)

- .

II.3.d Remove bikes from 115 Street

Positive 1 (12%)

- .

Negative 7 (88%)

- .

III Belgravia School / Community Hall / Playground / Sports Fields

III.1 Driving

III.1.a Maintain a traffic speed restriction of 30 km/hr 24 hours on 74 Avenue and 73 Avenue in the current school zone

Positive 31 (79%)

- The school is not the only facility in the area that is accessed by children. All year round, throughout the day and evening children are accessing the playground, community hall, skating rink and sports fields.
- By keeping the speed at 30 km/hr at all times, there won't be a tendency for drivers to forget to slow down

- Yes, these types of restrictions and modifications are much easier to support and justify when they are in front of a school.

Negative 8 (21%)

- Is speeding a problem here? Pedestrian crosswalks and existing signage should be adequate. I think stronger justification is needed than “won’t be a tendency for drivers to forget to slow down.
- Prefer the entire community at 40 km/h too confusing with playground zones in other parts of the city.
- No keep it consistent with other school zones in the city.
- Keep the speed limit consistent with other school zones in the city.

III.1.b Install traffic humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) directly in front of the school between 115 street and 118 Street

Positive 26 (68%)

- One of the main sources of traffic in front of the school is parents dropping children off that are often in a hurry to get to work. Speed humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) will remind them to slow down.
- Yes, these types of restrictions and modifications are much easier to support and justify when they are in front of a school.

Negative 12 (32%)

- NO SPEED HUMPS!!!! NO SPEED HUMPS!!!! We have them out at the cain and they are AWFUL!!!!
- Speed humps to “remind” parents to slow down? These are their own kids.
- Traffic humps cause problems for street plowing
- no humps
- Traffic humps cause problems for street plowing. Southgate shopping centres removes most of theirs in the winter time.

III.1.c Install lay-bys on the south side of 74 Avenue for drop-offs in front of the school and the north side of 73 Avenue for dropping off people to the school, playground or community hall

Positive 30 (91%)

- Yes, I support this. This sounds like a good idea, but do we have evidence this will work? Is parking eliminated with lay-bys.
- Long overdue!
- good idea
- big enough for DATS van.

Negative 3 (9%)

- Worried about the location, size and look of the lay-bys. Do not want it to become community parking lot for hall parties.

- Maybe more people could just walk to the community school like my kids did for 6 years. This will impact the environment and likely take out trees.

III.1.d Used raised pedestrian crossings instead of speed humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit)

Positive 3

- .

Negative

- .

III.1.e Install solar speed indicator on 74 Avenue by the school.

Positive 2

- Provide a visual reminder to keep speed in check.
- .

Negative

- .

III.2 Walking

III.2.a Provide a marked pedestrian crossings on 74 Avenue on both sides of 116 Street with curb extensions

Positive 36 (88%)

- This location sees a lot of pedestrians; elementary school students, adults with young children going to the playground and community hall, adults and seniors accessing the community hall and people of all ages accessing the sports fields. It is difficult to see around parked cars to cross safely.
- good idea

Negative 5 (12%)

-

III.2.b Make the pedestrian crossings raised.

Positive 3

- .

Negative

- .

III.32.c Provide a marked pedestrian crossing on 73 Avenue & 116 St, round curb and a bigger sign on 116 St before 73 Ave.

Positive 1

- .

Negative

IV 76 Avenue - Saskatchewan Drive to 114 Street

IV.1 Driving

IV.1.a Lower traffic speed to 40 km/hr at most, possibly 30 km/h

Positive Slower 22 (55%) / 30 km/h 3 (8%) / 40 km/h 10 (25%) / Total 35 (78%)

- This is the main traffic route or shortcutting traffic. In order to discourage shortcutting we need to make it less appealing. Currently shortcutters can go at high speeds up to 115 Street or on some busier days to 116 Street. By limiting their speed they will be less inclined to think that this shortcut will speed up their overall commute.
- We need to specific on the speed limit in the area. The speed limit in the area must be at least 40 km/h.

Negative 5 (12%)

- The un posted limit of 50 km/s is appropriate.
- If the current speed limits are not adequately enforced then ho will a lower speed limit improve this? Regardless, will lower speeds deter short cutters?
- This is a main route for area residents to enter and leave the neighbourhood. Lowering speed limit and humps are not needed

IV.1.b Install traffic humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit)

Positive 23 (51%)

- but minimal number at major intersections (to help lower speed).
- I'm not sure about traffic humps, although they do work well in Pleasantview.
- But ensure that cyclists don't have to go over them, they are a hazard.

Negative 22 (49%)

- Speed bumps will be just as annoying to local traffic, if not more so.
- Traffic humps would be frustrating, and again I'm not sure this would deter a sufficient number of short cutters. Would 4 way stops be a better alternative?
- NO NO NO to Speed HUMPS!!!!
- Speed bumps are not the answer.
- Traffic humps are to severe for residents and they are a serous problem for road maintenance.
- Traffic humps are major problems for street plowing
- This is also a popular cycling route and riding over many speed bumps is not pleasant
- I don't think this is a practical solution
- Traffic humps create major problems for street plowing, motorists swerving to avoid them, baking and speeding up.

IV.1.c Combine speed humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) with elevated pedestrian crossings

Positive 5

- .

Negative

- .

IV.1.d Paint centre lines on 76 Avenue

Positive

- .

Negative

-

IV.1.e Install traffic calming extensions of curbs to slow eastbound traffic before 116 St and 115 St.

IV.2 Walking

IV.2.a Improvements for pedestrians will be determined as part of the Engage 106-76 Project

Positive

- .

Negative

-

IV.2.b Marked pedestrian crossing at 119 st. and 76 Ave. (elevated?)

Positive 4

- Marked not elevated.
- agree but not elevated.

Negative 1

-

IV.3 Cycling

IV.3.a Improvements for cycling on 76 Avenue will be determined as part of the Engage 106-76 Project

Positive

- If bicycle lanes on 76 Ave are to remain, remove the pinch curbs at 76 Ave. and 116 St.
- I agree the area is a problem what about pedestrian lights, boulevard to beautify with trees and narrow the old and widening the bike lane and

preventing parking so bikes can actually bike safe. Cyclists should to have to bike with traffic on LHS and parked cars on RHS, this is dangerous.

Negative

.

V General Community Improvements

V.1 Driving

V.1.a Reduce speed limits throughout the neighbourhood to a maximum of 40 km/h and possibly 30 km/h.

Positive Slower 16 (39%) / 30 km/h 3 (7%) / 40 km/h 13 (32%) / Total 32 (78%)

- With the Installation of traffic slowing measures on main roads, this should prevent shortcutters from moving to side roads so they can go faster
- Currently speeds are limited on many f Belgravia side roads by the poor pavement condition After the renewal this will no longer be a limitation
- With the increase in neighbourhood density & associated increase in vehicles there may be more drivers living in the community that do not relate to the traffic needs of a family neighbourhood.
- I agree with lower speed limits proposed, either 30 or 40 is appropriate in our congested area!
- Traffic calming measures are critical to success. However, the traffic calming 'lobes' used to narrow the road at intersections (eg 116 St.) do not work. Traffic merely weaves into the oncoming lane.
- I strongly support a neighbourhood-wide 40 km/h speed limit.

Negative 9 (22%)

- We don't think that reduced speed limits help. Annoyed drivers drive badly. Also time spent watching the speedometer is time not looking at the roadway.
- Unposted limit of 50 km/h is fine. The real problem is traffic that travels at 60 - 80 km/h, regardless of posted speed limits.
- If current speed limits are not adequately enforced then how ill a lower speed limit improve this?
- We oppose the reduction of speed limits in Belgravia s they will be ineffective without proper enforcement while being very inconvenient for all law abiding Belgravia residents. Before considering any new laws the current ones need to be properly enforced.
- I don't think people will adhere regardless

V.1.b Install a traffic calming circle at the intersection of 116 St. and 77 Ave.

Positive 24 (71%)

- With the installation of traffic slowing measures on the main roads, this will provide one more measure to prevent shortcutters from moving to side roads so they can go faster

- This is a very large uncontrolled intersection where yield to the right rules are not always followed as drivers from each direction do not always those coming from the other directions.
- This 116th/77th misalignment has been a problem/complication for over 60 years.
- possibly - however not sure if this will work as it is a strange intersection - how about yield signs on 77 Ave. Also have concern about deep snow in winter before plowing.
- Not opposed to traffic circle, but I think parking & flow of intersection needs to be thoroughly examined
- Not sure on this one. It is a big open area, but rather than just a traffic circle, why not a small micro-park in the middle with a small sculpture, sort of a miniature version of Alexander Circle in Glenora? I could be a really nice thing for that spot and would definitely slow traffic down. Not sure if it's possible but just a thought.

Negative 10 (29%)

- seems like a lot of \$ and traffic circles aren't calming.

V.1.c Install speed humps (designed to be driven over comfortably at the posted speed limit) at the north end of 119 Street to slow potential short cutting traffic avoiding a slower Saskatchewan Drive

Positive 24 (57%)

- Prevent short cutters from viewing other roads in the neighbourhood as good short cutting options.

Negative 18 (43%)

- Speed bumps are as likely to discourage local traffic as anyone else. Bumps may only serve to divert traffic to adjacent streets in the neighbourhood that don't have humps.
- Speed hump at corner could be dangerous - could be placed further down at 79 or 80 Ave.
- Traffic humps are problems for street plowing
- In my experience it is very difficult to access Univ. Ave at high traffic times. I avoid it, I have not seen line-ups at this intersection.
- Traffic humps create major problems for street plowing, motorists swerving to avoid them, braking and speeding up, which causes noise for local residents.

V.1.d Make the service road on the south side of University Avenue between 115 Street and 119 Street one way westbound

Positive 31 (84%)

- This reduces the complexity of the already complicated intersection discussed in II.1.c
- Prevents short cutters from using the service road to get ahead of eastbound traffic on University Ave.
- This has possibilities but will cause access issues

- Excellent idea. This will also improve safety for cyclists on the service road,, who now must negotiate between parked cars and 2-way, of ten impatient vehicle traffic.
- Yes! This requires that the service road be entered from 115 St. rather than 119 St. In addition to preventing short cutters from using the service road to get ahead of eastbound traffic on University Ave., this has two advantages for drivers entering the service road to park or to reach their own homes:
 - There is now a left run bay and a traffic light with a left turn arrow for vehicles westbound on University Ave. that are turning left into 115 St. None of this is present at 119 St.
 - Vehicles accessing the service road at 119 St first run into 199 St. from University Ave, but then must immediately turn left into the service road. But the entrance to the service road is frequently blocked by vehicles northbound on 119 St. waiting to enter University Ave. At 115 St., a right turn is required to enter the service road, so vehicles northbound on 115 St., waiting at the traffic light to turn or cross University Ave, are not an impediment.
- “BUT” not for cyclists. Cyclists exiting Belgravia to the University have few safe places to cross University Ave. without actually going onto the unsafe University Ave itself. A key safe crossing is at 117 St/University Ave., with many cyclists using 117 St. as a safe northbound route. A special marked lane should be made for cyclists going in the opposite direction to the new one-way direction. This has been done in another nearby location (89 Ave between 116 and 117 St.). Otherwise, you will force bicyclists onto the sidewalk or cycle the wrong direction, as University Ave is ***completely*** bicycle unfriendly (speeds way too high, lots of vehicles, including heavy ones etc.)

Negative 6 (16%)

- Eliminating eastbound access to the University Ave. service road will only make resident access more problematic for those who live on or adjacent to University Ave.
- I live on University Ave., do not make the service road a one way.
- If this was one way west bound how would we park.

V.1.e *Traffic calming on other streets (74, 78, 119, 118) where speeding is frequent.*

Positive 4

- .

Negative

-

V.1.f *4 way stop at 119 St. and 76 Ave because of poor visibility created by curve in the road.*

Positive 5 (83%)

- *The site lines at this intersection are rather poor, and eastbound traffic routinely just the corner making this a hazardous intersection. This will also*

help with slowing traffic, especially speeding traffic rounding the corner from Sask Dr. onto 76 Ave.

• .

Negative 1 (17%)

•

V.1.g *Make the intersection at 78 Ave and 119 St. a traffic calming circle.*

Positive 4

• .

Negative

•

V.1.h *Eliminate the right turns at 78 Ave. and 119 St. and 72 Ave. and 119 St.*

Positive 1

- *Eliminate right turning roads that are redundant when there is a proper intersection nearby. Examples include 78 Ave. and 119 St., 72 Ave and 119 St, This would save on road maintenance, and slow removal, and eliminate odd traffic flow for a residential neighbourhood.*

• .

Negative

•

V.1.i *Use more curb extensions than speed humps to slow traffic.*

Positive 1 (33%)

- *Pedestrian are most vulnerable so this is good for them. Can it be modified for cyclists.*

Negative 2 (67%)

- *They are a hazard for cyclist and unseen under a heavy snow fall.*
- *This is challenging for cyclists*

V.1.j *Install more 4-way stops rather than speed humps.*

Positive 4 (57%)

- *Various techniques may be successful in cutting down shortcutting, but may also inconvenience residents in off peak hours. Speed humps and the like can still shake a vehicle up and are possibly a problem in deep snow. Will they impede snow clearing? Also if speed humps is not full width of roadway, people may steer to sides of road to partially avoid it and in doing so occupy cycle lane. Are they best place at intersections or in id block? What about intruding a few more 4 way stops on 76 Ave and some streets.*
- *Yes, better for pedestrians safety.*

Negative 3 (43%)

- *No this is challenging for cyclists*
- *Agree that this is not good for cyclists*

V.2 Walking

V.2.a Maintain existing boulevard trees by diverting sidewalks around trees where necessary

Positive 38 (95%)

- Plant new trees elsewhere.
- within reason. In some instances it will be beneficial to have straight sidewalks rather than diverting around a tree that should or will be replaced in the near future.
- BUT. There are some trees that are too old and are becoming hazards. This is a complex topic, but not all trees should be kept.
- Does this mean sidewalks throughout the neighbourhood are going to be moved? If it means leaving room for windrow, good idea
-

Negative 2 (5%)

- .

V.2.b Ensure there are curb ramps on all curbs in the community for wheel chairs, walkers and strollers

Positive 39 (100%)

- ESSENTIAL.
- BUT. The sidewalks in straight stretches should maintain a distinct 90-degree curb, rather than the sloped curbs like done in Windsor Park, which allows cars to easily roll onto the sidewalk. It is common to see cars parked partially or wholly on the sidewalks in those areas.

Negative

-

V.2.c Provide a pedestrian crossing on 71 Ave where the pedestrian overpass over Belgravia Road comes out, between 116 St and the intersection with 71 A Ave

Positive 26 (72%)

- It's a long stretch along that block with no marked opportunity to cross to the sidewalk opposite the bridge walking path. Drivers do not expect pedestrian traffic there and do not wait to allow you to cross even if they do see you.
- And put pedestrian lights is is unsafe.
- good idea

Negative 10 (28%)

- No one will cross that road on a perpendicular crosswalk. Suggest event the path on southside of 71 Ave to the corner of 71A Ave and 71 Ave.
- Insufficient traffic of justify. We use this bridge every day (2 times). If it is best if pedestrians and cyclists look to see if there are any vehicles, rather than blissfully just crossing the avenue.
- This is not a high traffic area. Suggest that pedestrians stop, count to 5 then cross after the only car on the road passes.
- It's not a high traffic area and the visibility is good. I walk there with dogs. I don't see a problem there.
- Insufficient traffic volume to justify a crosswalk. Many cyclists and pedestrians just blissfully cross rather than looking for approaching vehicles first.
- Same reason as my previous comments about pedestrian crossings on residential streets. 71 Ave is *not* a busy wide street that is difficult to cross. My children and I cross here on a regular basis and there is often no traffic at all. Sometimes there may be one or 2 vehicles in sight, so we only have to wait a few seconds before it is clear and safe to cross. Also, as can be seen from the tracks in the snow, a lot of people leave the footbridge path halfway down and cut across the grass to end up opposite the lane access so they would not be crossing at the end of the path anyway.

V.2.d *Eliminate signs placed in sidewalks – particularly a problem in winter with windrows.*

Positive 2

- *I find signs planted in sidewalks extremely annoying as pedestrians need to dodge posts in the sidewalk. This gets worse in winter when some sidewalks aren't fully cleared making passage even narrower.*

Negative

- *So cyclists coming put 119 St. can't go eastbound to access the intersection.*

V.2.e *Convert west side of Saskatchewan Drive to a second multi-use trail, raised from the road and fenced from the park area to separate walkers/runners/cyclists from the road and from dog walkers.*

Positive 1

- .

Negative

-

V.2.f *Where possible add trees on city property in front of homes as part of the replacement landscaping.*

Positive 1

- .

Negative

-

V.2.g *Design sidewalk for pedestrians not cars –flat at driveways and lanes, not sloped*

Positive 2

- *Sidewalks should be for pedestrians, not racing cyclists.*

Negative

-

V.2.h *At corners, slope to road to avoid puddles.*

Positive 1

-

Negative

-

V.3 Cycling

V.3.a *If University Ave service road becomes 1-way west, install an eastbound cycling lane along the service road.*

Positive 6

-

Negative

-

V.3.b *Extend the cycling route along the LRT line at 114 St. across University Avenue at the LRT crossing.*

Positive 4

-

Negative

-

There are too many wants recommended and not suited to a residential area. Saskatchewan Dr. does not require all these “extras”. Who’s paying for all this. It’s bad enough with rising property taxes and increasing cost of living. I have lived in Belgravia for over 30 years and am on a FIXED budget.

There is no mention of back alley way reconstruction and options. Some are badly in need or restoration. The city cannot wash their hands of their, as these are service corridors just as much as the front streets. In fact, in my particular case, the front sidewalk and street are less in need of improvement than the back. Even if funded early by resident on the block, the discussion should be begin. I would gladly give up a new sidewalk in front for a properly constructed laneway, which were never designed for the use they get (e.g. heavy garbage trucks).

Laneways also need clear signage or calming measures, as it is not uncommon to see residents going 30 or 40 km/H along stretches, a clear hazard in all sorts of ways (pedestrians, pets, bicyclists). Installation of hemisphere mirror at T-intersections in laneways also needed.

I support the installation of sidewalks on those areas where none exist. However when they do this they should be installed back from the road with a green strip searing them, so that in winter, windrows can be moved off the road. Really, all our sidewalks should be re-done this way, not sure that is possible but something to consider.

Please improve the street lighting to eliminate the large areas between some lights where it is quite dark, e.g. 115 St. between 76 and 73 Aves. Presumably more modern lights will be more powerful and directed down onto the road/sidewalk, but they should also be placed more frequently and/or on both sides of the street.

Remove all signs. It will force every driver to watch at every intersection.