

**COUNCIL AGENDA/INFORMATION**

<input type="checkbox"/> In-Camera	Date: _____	Item # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Regular	Date: _____	Item # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Info Package	Date: _____	Item # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda Addendum	Date: _____	Item # _____

Dept. Manager	Director	Municipal Manager
------------------	----------	----------------------

**The District of North Vancouver  
REPORT TO COUNCIL**

December 6, 2001  
File: 8620-30/06  
Tracking Number: RCA -

**AUTHOR:** Richard Zerr - Director of Planning, Engineering, Parks  
& Regulatory Services

**SUBJECT: Riverside Drive Traffic Calming - Monitoring Update- Report #3**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that Council provide direction to staff on which option to pursue with the Riverside Drive Working Group.

- 1) Retain the speed humps and continue to monitor and work with the neighbourhood group on solutions;
- 2) Complete monitoring, survey the neighbourhood, host an open house and report back to Council in February 2002; or
- 3) Remove speed humps and work with the neighbourhood group on solutions.

**REASON FOR REPORT:**

To update Mayor and Council with additional results of the Riverside Drive speed humps, which were installed September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2001.

**BACKGROUND:**

See previous reports of: -

- ◆ October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2001, (Attachment #1)
- ◆ November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2001. (Attachment #2)
- ◆ Chronology (Attachment #3)

**ANALYSIS:**

Staff have continued to monitor the street following the implementation, and the latest results are detailed below.

Vehicle Speeds:

Recent traffic count information collected by automatic equipment shows that the speed humps have been successful in reducing the historical 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds.

The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile is the speed, which 85% of the vehicles are travelling at or below. The corollary is that 15% of the vehicles are travelling at speeds above the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. The affect of the speed humps can be seen in the following tables.

**800 BLOCK – NORTH OF GRANTHAM**

DATE	NB Volume (veh/day)	NB – 85% speed (km/h)	SB Volume (Veh/day)	SB – 85% speed (km/h)
March 1999		64.3		65.1
Sept 1999	1202	65.5	1172	67.7
Nov 1999	1045	63.4	1057	63.4
Feb 2001	1096	64.5	1084	64.5
<b>Nov. 8-14, 2001</b>	1085	<b>46.4</b>	1087	<b>49.2</b>
<b>Nov 26-Dec 3, 2001</b>	1055	<b>46</b>	1049	<b>49.1</b>

**1600/1700 BLOCK – NORTH OF SWINBURNE (0.7km north of speed humps)**

DATE	NB Volume (veh/day)	NB – 85% speed (km/h)	SB Volume (Veh/day)	SB – 85% speed (km/h)
Nov 1995	566	57.6	499	57.8
March 1997	523	60.4	580	63.9
Feb 2001	616	61.4	618	61.4
<b>Nov 2001</b>	624	<b>55.4</b>	629	<b>55.7</b>

Height of Speed Humps

Report #2 (attachment #2) stated that the Contractor would reduce the height of the humps by 2cm within two weeks. Unfortunately, the recent weather / temperature conditions have not been suitable for this work to be done, since temperatures of 10 degrees Celsius and rising are required. For this reason, the humps will not be adjusted until late March or early April 2002.

Visibility of Speed Humps

In order to make the humps more visible to Snowplough Operators, temporary reflective flexible delineators (4 ft. high) will be installed at both ends of each speed hump at property lines. In response to residents concerns about the visibility of the humps during rainy and dark conditions, reflector buttons will be installed on the approaches to the humps at the outside and middle edges in Spring 2002. Staff is also investigating a reflective, textured and a durable marking product to replace the original painted triangles on the humps. As reported in report #2, four lease lights have been installed on existing power poles adjacent to the speed humps as previously requested by residents.

Sidewalks

Last Summer the limestone sidewalk was extended north, and additional improvements will be carried out as maintenance funds permit.

Public Involvement

The chronology (Attachment # 3) shows previous interaction with the community. A meeting was held on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2001 with 4 original members of the resident contact group, as well as 6 additional residents, 5 of which do not support the humps. Staff provided an overview of the project and presented preliminary findings from the monitoring period. An open discussion period then followed and the group agreed to meet again on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2001, as a follow up. For the next meeting, this group will be expanded to a total of 14 residents by including additional representation from the middle of Riverside Drive.

**Options:**

That Council instruct staff to:

- 1) Retain speed humps and continue to monitor and work with the neighbourhood group on solutions;
- 2) Complete monitoring, survey the neighbourhood, host an open house and report back to Council in February 2002; or
- 3) Remove speed humps and work with the neighbourhood group on solutions.

Richard Zerr,

Director of Planning, Engineering, Parks  
& Regulatory Services

<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Trans/Public Works <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Services <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Parks <input type="checkbox"/> Eng. Utilities <input type="checkbox"/> Plg. Community Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Plg. Social Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Plg. Permits & Licenses <input type="checkbox"/> Plg. Land <input type="checkbox"/> Plg. Env. Protection	<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Clerk's Office <input type="checkbox"/> Communications <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Fire Services <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input type="checkbox"/> ITS	<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> External Agencies: <input type="checkbox"/> Library Board <input type="checkbox"/> NS Health <input type="checkbox"/> RCMP <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	<u>REVIEWED WITH:</u> Advisory Committees: <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> _____
---	---	---	---