



To: Public Works and Transportation Committee **Date:** May 1, 2002
From: Gordon Chan, P. Eng. **File:** 6360-12-01
Director, Transportation
Re: **NEIGHBOURHOOD PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ENHANCEMENT - PACEMORE AVENUE WALKWAY**

Staff Recommendation

1. That the proposed installation of a pedestrian walkway on Pacemore Avenue between Number 1 Road and Elsmore Road be deferred to allow residents the opportunity to pursue a Local Improvement Program process to install concrete sidewalks with curb and gutter.
2. That staff report back on the outcome of the Local Improvement Program process and whether or not the proposed pedestrian walkway should proceed as planned.

Gordon Chan, P. Eng.
Director, Transportation

Att. 1

FOR ORIGINATING DIVISION USE ONLY		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Engineering	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	

Staff Report

Origin

In late 2001, a number of residents in the vicinity of Pacemore Avenue contacted the City expressing concerns regarding pedestrian safety, particularly for school children walking along Pacemore Avenue to Gilmore School. Staff subsequently conducted a review of the traffic conditions in the area and identified a series of measures that could enhance traffic safety in this neighbourhood. At the regular Council meeting on March 11, 2002, Council approved the following staff recommendations to address the identified traffic and pedestrian safety concerns:

- installation of a pedestrian walkway on the south side of Pacemore Avenue between Number 1 Road and Elsmore Road;
- continued speed and parking enforcement; and
- motorist education of school zone traffic safety through various initiatives.

Since that council meeting, staff undertook a public consultation process via a mail-back survey of the residents on Pacemore Avenue regarding the installation of the proposed walkway and other traffic safety enhancement measures. This report presents the results of the mail-back survey and discusses the feedback received from the residents.

Analysis

1. Survey Results

Mail-back surveys asking residents to indicate their support or non-support of the proposed walkway were sent to all residences on Pacemore Avenue where the walkway would be constructed (between No. 1 Road and Elsmore Road). The survey results are summarized in the table below.

Response	South Side of Pacemore Avenue (Location of Proposed Walkway)		North Side of Pacemore Avenue	
	# Responses	% Response	# Responses	% Response
Agree	3	13 %	2	14 %
Disagree	11	50 %	1	7 %
No Reply	9	37 %	11	79 %
<i>Total Residences</i>	22	100 %	14	100 %

2. Concerns of Area Residents and Questions Raised

The survey provided residents an opportunity to identify concerns and/or pose questions about the proposed traffic safety measure. The major concerns raised by some of the residents are discussed below and a full list of the comments is contained in Attachment 1.

2.1 Desire for a Concrete Sidewalk with Curb and Gutter instead of an asphalt walkway

- *Issue* – 10 residents out of a total 17 respondents expressed a desire for a concrete sidewalk with curb and gutter instead of an asphalt walkway.
- *Response* – The cost to construct a City standard road with street lighting and boulevard trees in addition to a concrete sidewalk and curb and gutter on both sides of the road is estimated

at \$567,000. (The construction costs for constructing one side of the road to this standard is only estimated at two-thirds of the full cost.) As this type of road improvement on a local residential road is usually not funded from the City's capital works program, Pacemore Avenue residents can seek the construction of the desired improvement through the Local Improvement Program (LIP) process. Local residents, however, are responsible for 100% of the construction costs for any improvements carried out under the LIP. A petition to Council from the residents for a LIP would require that at least two-thirds of the property owners, representing at least one-half of the assessed value of the properties benefiting from the LIP, sign in favour of the work.

2.2 Location of the Proposed Walkway?

- *Issue* – Why is construction of a walkway limited to Pacemore Avenue?
- *Response* – Pacemore Avenue acts as a minor collector roadway for the “Mores” subdivision and directly links a four lane arterial, No. 1 Road, to the “Seafair” subdivision. A walkway is recommended on this roadway to provide a direct pedestrian connection from Number 1 Road to an existing sidewalk, which ends at Elsmore Road near Gilmour School.

2.3 Drainage Concerns

- *Issue* – Potential impact of the proposed walkway on drainage in the area.
- *Response* – The installation of the proposed walkway would be at the existing grade and sloped back toward the property line similar to the way drainage is achieved in the existing boulevard. Drainage chambers would be relocated behind the walkway where required and would address the issue of rainwater runoff from the walkway.

2.4 Unightly Environment and Tree Damage

- *Issue* – There was also a concern raised that the walkway would be unsightly and/or cause damage to existing trees.
- *Response* – The walkway would be constructed at the existing grade and would be routed through existing boulevard trees with minimal impact on tree root systems. Any trees that are identified as a potential hazard would be removed and a replacement tree planted. The boulevard would be restored to an acceptable level after the project is completed.

2.5 Requirement for Traffic Calming Measures

- *Issue* – There were suggestions that traffic calming measures such as speed humps, traffic circles or traffic diversions be installed to deter drivers from using Pacemore Avenue.
- *Response* – The cited traffic calming measures are used to address speed concerns and may not have a significant effect on traffic volume, which is the primary concern of residents on Pacemore Avenue. Speed humps are not used in residential areas of Richmond for various reasons including that they impact response times for emergency services, noise and vibration. Traffic circles are not recommended near elementary schools as young children have difficulty understanding the traffic flow around a traffic circle. Traffic diversions would only relocate the vehicle volume problem to another road or roads and the diversion would negatively affect all the residents who live in the Pacemore Avenue area.

2.6 Street Lighting

- *Issue* – Request for additional street lighting.
- *Response* – If the residents choose to proceed under an LIP, then full street lighting would be installed.

2.7 Cost Effectiveness

- *Issue* – Is the project justified since there are very few children in the area who use Pacemore Avenue to get to and from school and any other pedestrian traffic on Pacemore Avenue would be in the evenings when traffic volume is lower?
- *Response* – The benefit of the project will be realized when the walkway is installed and the risk of injury to pedestrians is reduced. Similar applications in other neighbourhoods in the City have proven to be very effective in terms of enhancing pedestrian traffic safety.

2.8 Parking Concerns

- *Issue* – Potential impact of the project on existing on street parking in the area.
- *Response* – Since the walkway will be no closer to the road than 2.0 metres, there will be no loss of existing shoulder parking. Any impact of the proposed walkway would be felt by residents who currently have vehicles parked where their driveway would intersect with the proposed walkway. The City's Traffic Bylaw would assist to ensure that the walkway is kept clear for safe pedestrian passage.

3. **Petition from Residents**


Concurrent with the public consultation process, the City received a petition on April 22, 2002 with 28 signatures from Pacemore Avenue residents requesting the installation of concrete sidewalks with curb and gutter rather than an asphalt walkway. This petition prompted staff's recommendation to suggest that a LIP process, funded 100% by area residents, be undertaken on Pacemore Avenue and to defer the implementation of the proposed walkway until the LIP process is completed.

Financial Impact

The construction cost of the proposed walkway along the south side of Pacemore Avenue, with routing to preserve existing boulevard trees, is estimated at \$75,000. The funding source for the improvement would be the 2001 Neighbourhood Traffic Safety Program. The construction cost for a full City standard street from No. 1 Road to Elsmore Road is estimated at \$567,000, which is typically carried out under the Local Improvement Program (LIP), if supported by the residents in the area. The construction costs of any LIP project, however, would be borne fully by those area residents benefiting from the completed road improvements.

Conclusion

Feedback from Pacemore Avenue residents obtained via a mail-back survey and a petition forwarded to the City from the residents indicates that the majority of residents would prefer the upgrade of Pacemore Avenue to a full City standard road with concrete sidewalks and curb and gutter and full boulevard treatment rather than installation of an asphalt walkway as originally proposed. Therefore, staff recommend that the construction of the proposed walkway be deferred to provide local residents the opportunity to pursue a Local Improvement Program (funded 100% by area residents) process to upgrade Pacemore Avenue to the desired standard. Staff will report back on the results of the LIP process and on whether or not the proposed walkway should proceed as planned.



Doug Newton
Traffic Technician I

DN:lce

**PACEMORE AVENUE WALKWAY SURVEY
SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM RESPONDENTS**

1. Many residents requested curb and gutter with sidewalk rather than the walkway.
2. Why just on Pacemore Avenue and not on all the roads in the subdivision?
3. Will on-street parking be retained?
4. Concern about the extent of landscaping post construction, will it a good job unlike the water works job in 2001.
5. Drainage was mentioned many times, some residents say that the drainage is not adequate right now and are worried that the walkway will make matters worse. Swale is insufficient to deal with run off.
6. Some residents suggested that the installation of traffic circles or speed humps would solve the problem as they do not think it is a pedestrian problem but a speed problem.
7. Recommend that the school parking lot on Kelmore Avenue be expanded to provide more parking and a pick up and drop off lane. Additionally restrict Pacemore Avenue to force traffic to use Kelmore Avenue and the parking lot.
8. Some residents did not want curb and gutter with sidewalk or a walkway as this would increase traffic on Pacemore Avenue. No reason given why they came to this conclusion.
9. There was a question, on whether is this part of a master plan for the area or is it going to be a patch work of solutions.
10. Many indicated that they felt the walkway will be unsightly, usually linked to the request for curb and gutter with a sidewalk.
11. The walkway would be unsightly and would reduce property value.
12. The walkway will reduce available parking on driveways as it will have to be kept clear at the point the walkway crosses the driveway.
13. Pedestrians and cyclists will damage cars which are parked on the driveways close to the point where the walkway crosses the driveway.
14. Put the walkway on the north side of Pacemore Avenue as it only effects 14 residences as opposed to 22 on the south side of the road.
15. The proposed walkway will be under utilized. Few pedestrians will use it except for a few children during school hours. Most people will still walk on the roadway as generally there is no traffic and it is more open than the walkway.
16. Insufficient lighting. The walkway is too close to trees and shrubs, when it is dark pedestrians will feel insecure.
17. Walkway looks cheap, wants curb and gutter with sidewalk, make the area look more prestigious like Terra Nova.
18. Walkway will corrupt (damage?) roots of trees and they may fall over endangering home owners and pedestrians.
19. One resident would prefer to have a walkway similar to the walkway on Saunders Road, along the edge of the road with extruded curb.
20. How will parking along the shoulder or on or across the walkway be enforced.
21. Ensure the landscaping is better than the job they did after the water main was put in.
22. Will there be an additional levy or increase in property tax.