

# Davidson Creek/Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Project

---

## Open House and Online Survey Results

**Prepared by Debbie Rawson**

Results of the Online Survey and Open House undertaken to understand resident preferences for traffic calming options for Clarkdale Meadows and Davidson Creek.

## Executive Summary

This report summarizes the results of the second phase of public engagement for the Davidson Creek/Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Project. Feedback from 85 residents representing 76 households was compiled to understand resident preferences for the traffic calming options presented.

### *Resident Preferences for Traffic Calming Options*

#### Davidson Drive at the Trail Crossing

Support for Option B (Median Island with Pedestrian Beacons) was highest among residents with 26% of residents preferring Option A, 41% preferring Option B and 33% having no preference.

#### Davenport Drive at the Playground

Support for Option A (Do Nothing) was highest among residents with 42% of residents preferring Option A, 38% preferring Option B and 20% having no preference.

#### Darlington Drive

Support for Option A (Permanent Speed Boards) was highest among residents with 54% of residents preferring Option A, 20% preferring Option B and 26% having no preference.

#### Davenport Drive east of playground zone to Clarkdale Drive

Support for Option A (Permanent Speed Boards) was highest among residents with 53% of residents preferring Option A, 19% preferring Option B and 27% having no preference.

#### Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive

Support for Option B (Pedestrian Beacons) was highest among residents with 24% of residents preferring Option A, 46% preferring Option B and 30% having no preference.

#### Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent

Support for Option A (Curb Extensions) was highest among residents with 32% of residents preferring Option A, 19% preferring Option B and 49% having no preference.

#### Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace

Support for Option A (Curb Extensions) was highest among residents with 34% of residents preferring Option A, 15% preferring Option B and 51% having no preference.

#### Meadowview Drive at the Trail Crossing

Support for Option B (Median Island with Pedestrian Beacons) was highest among residents with 30% of residents preferring Option A, 34% preferring Option B and 37% having no preference.

Feedback summarized in this report will be used to inform the development of final recommendations for traffic calming. These plans will be presented to Council in May 2017.

## Contents

1.0 Introduction .....	3
1.1 About the Davidson Creek/Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Project .....	3
1.2 What this report provides .....	3
2.0 Methodology .....	4
2.1 Recruitment for workshop and online survey .....	4
2.2 Open House and Online Survey Structure .....	4
3.0 Results .....	4
3.1 Participation and location of residence of participants .....	4
3.2 Analysis .....	4
3.3 Davidson Drive Trail Crossing .....	6
3.4 Davenport Drive at the Playground .....	8
3.5 Darlington Drive .....	10
3.6 Davenport Drive east of playground zone to Clarkdale Drive .....	14
3.7 Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive .....	17
3.8 Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent .....	19
3.9 Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace .....	21
3.10 Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing .....	24
4.0 Conclusion .....	27
4.1 Next Steps .....	27
Appendix One: Open House Survey Tool .....	28
Appendix Two: Resident Comments .....	29


## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 About the Davidson Creek/Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Project

Several collector roads in Davidson Creek/Clarkdale Meadows are nearing time for regularly scheduled rehabilitation. Residents have expressed concerns with traffic speed and pedestrian safety in both of these subdivisions in the past. In some locations, the Traffic Engineering and Safety branch of Transportation and Agriculture Services has collected speed data that indicates traffic speeds in excess of the 50 km/h speed limit. In addition, a new school is planned to Davidson Creek that will change traffic patterns in the neighbourhood. For these reasons, a traffic calming project has been initiated for these roads.

Strathcona County is committed to working with residents and other stakeholders to develop a solution that is economically viable, technically feasible, environmentally compatible and publically acceptable. Public engagement for this initiative is being conducted at the “Listen and Learn” level. Figure One provides a summary of the process/timeline to be used for this traffic calming initiative.

Figure 1: Davidson Creek/Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Project Timeline



### 1.2 What this report provides

This report provides the results of the second phase in the public engagement process for this project. On March 23, 2017, an Open House was held to present residents with traffic calming options for the neighbourhood that had been developed to address engineering and resident concerns. An online survey was available for residents from March 24 – April 5, 2017 to provide residents another opportunity to provide feedback to the proposed options.

## **2.0 Methodology**

### **2.1 Recruitment for workshop and online survey**

Residents of Strathcona County were all provided with an opportunity to participate in the workshop and online survey, although those in the neighbourhoods of Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows were most aggressively recruited.

Letters were mailed out to all households in both neighbourhoods, informing them about the upcoming engagement opportunities and inviting them to participate in the open house or survey. In addition to the resident mail out, the open house and survey were promoted through the Sherwood Park News, Facebook, and Twitter. The event was also promoted through the County's Public Engagement e-newsletter, which was sent to just under 1800 residents, as well as to residents who had signed up to receive the project newsletter.

### **2.2 Open House and Online Survey Structure**

Based on feedback received in the December workshops and online survey and on engineering concerns, traffic calming measures were proposed at eight locations in the project area.

During the Open House, residents were provided with information on community and engineering concerns at each location, as well as comparative information the proposed options. Residents were then asked to indicate their level of support of each option on a five point scale (Strongly Support (5), Support (4), Neutral (3), Do Not Support (2), Strongly Do Not Support (1)). See Appendix One for the survey tool used at the workshop. Average ratings were determined for each option. Resident preference was determined based on comparative analysis of ratings.

The Open House materials were then translated into an online survey format. Residents were provided with the same maps and information as those who attended the Open House, then asked to indicate their support for the options. The online survey was available for 13 days.

## **3.0 Results**

### **3.1 Participation and location of residence of participants**

In total, 76 households participated in this stage of the engagement process. Fifty-four responses were received through the online survey. Another 30 residents attended the workshop, representing 20 households. One resident gave their input via the telephone. All residents who participated indicated they resided in either Davidson Creek or Clarkdale Meadows.

### **3.2 Analysis**

For the purposes of analysis, the study area has been split into three zones: Davidson Creek, Clarkdale Meadows North and Clarkdale Meadows South, as results differed significantly between the zones. In total, 22 households from Davidson Creek, 23 households from Clarkdale Meadows North and 31 households from Clarkdale Meadows South participated in this phase of the engagement.

Figure 2: Davidson Creek Zone Map (credit: Imagery©2017Google, Map data©2017Google)




Figure 3: Clarkdale Meadows North Zone Map (credit: Imagery©2017Google, Map data©2017Google)





Figure 4: Clarkdale Meadows South Zone Map (credit: Imagery©2017Google, Map data©2017Google)





When determining resident support for traffic calming options, analysis started with the inclusion of all responses. Where this result was inconclusive, closer analysis was performed with focus on residents who would be most affected by the implementation of traffic calming.

### 3.3 Davidson Drive Trail Crossing

#### *Community Concerns*

Pedestrian Safety- due to speed and visibility concerns caused by parking

Speeding

#### *Engineering Concern*

Pedestrian Safety - Due to traffic volume, visibility and the high number of pedestrians

#### *Proposed Options*


Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 5: Proposed Options for Davidson Drive Trail Crossing

Option A: Median Island



Option B: Median Island with Pedestrian Beacons



### Evaluation Criteria

Addition of Pedestrian Beacons will add approximately \$17,000 to the cost of the project.

### Resident Support for Options

Support for Option B was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.47 (n=62)
- Average rating for Option B: 3.77 (n=68)

Support for Option B was also highest amongst Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows North resident when results were broken out (i.e. excluding the results from Clarkdale Meadows South residents).

Figure 6: Resident Ratings for Option A at Davidson Drive Trail Crossing (n=62)




Figure 7: Resident Ratings for Option B at Davidson Drive Trail Crossing (n=68)







Figure 8: Resident Preference at Davidson Drive Trail Crossing (n=68)



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two.

### 3.4 Davenport Drive at the Playground

#### *Community Concerns*

Speeding

Parking - some concern with parking too close to the median islands near Dorian Way causing congestion

#### *Engineering Concern*


None

#### *Proposed Options*

Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 9: Proposed Options for Davenport Drive at the Playground

Option A: Do Nothing



## Option B: Speed Humps



### *Evaluation Criteria*

Estimated Cost of Speed Humps (Option B): \$7,500

Speed humps will not take away from parking on the street, as they do not require any parking restrictions.

### *Resident Support for Options*

Support for Options was almost identical when analyzed using all respondents (3.00 versus 2.99), so sample was reduced to those most affected. Among Davidson Creek and Clarkdale North residents, support for Option A (Do Nothing) was highest, although neither option was strongly supported.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.05 (n=42)
- Average rating for Option B: 2.68 (n=44)

Figure 10: Resident Ratings for Option A at Davenport Drive at the Playground (n=42)




Figure 11: Resident Ratings for Option B at Davenport Drive at the Playground (n=44)





Figure 12: Resident Preference at Davenport Drive at the Playground (n=45)



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two. The majority of residents who chose to comment spoke against the addition of speed humps.

### 3.5 Darlington Drive

#### *Community Concerns*

Speeding

Increased traffic volumes with construction of school

#### *Engineering Concern*

Speed

#### *Proposed Options*


Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 13: Proposed Options for Darlington Drive

Option A: Permanent Speed Boards



Option B: Speed Humps



### Evaluation Criteria

Table One: Option A Evaluation: Darlington Drive

Option A – Speed Display Boards	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improves pedestrian safety?				X	
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Discourage short-cutting?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?			X		
Minimize traffic noise?			X		
Estimated Cost: \$20,000					

Table Two: Option B Evaluation: Darlington Drive

<b>Option B – Speed Humps</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improve walkability/pedestrian safety?				X	
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Discourage short-cutting?				X	
Maintain traffic flow?		X			
Minimize traffic noise?	X				
Estimated Cost: \$14,000					

### *Resident Support for Options*

Support for Option A (Permanent Speed Boards) was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.57 (n=69)
- Average rating for Option B: 2.57 (n=67)

Support for Option A was even higher amongst most affected residents (those residing on Darlington Drive, Davy Crescent and Davenport Place) (n=11).

Figure 14: Resident Ratings for Option A at Darlington Drive (n=69)




Figure 15: Resident Ratings for Option B at Darlington Drive (n=67)





Figure 16: Resident Preference at Darlington Drive (n=70)



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two. The majority of residents who chose to comment spoke against the addition of speed humps.



### 3.6 Davenport Drive east of playground zone to Clarkdale Drive

#### *Community Concerns*

Speeding

Pedestrian Safety – lack of marked crosswalk, vehicles passing those stopped for a pedestrian

#### *Engineering Concern*

Speed (eastbound)

#### *Proposed Options*

Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 17: Proposed Option for Davenport Drive east of playground zone to Clarkdale Drive

Option A: Permanent Speed Board



Option B: Speed Humps





## Evaluation Criteria

Table Three: Option A Evaluation: Darlington Drive

<b>Option A – Speed Display Boards</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improves pedestrian safety?				X	
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Discourage short-cutting?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?			X		
Minimize traffic noise?			X		
Estimated Cost: \$10,000					

Table Four: Option B Evaluation: Darlington Drive

<b>Option B – Speed Humps</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improve walkability/pedestrian safety?				X	
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Discourage short-cutting?				X	
Maintain traffic flow?		X			
Minimize traffic noise?	X				
Estimated Cost: \$3,000					

## Resident Support for Options

Support for Option A (Permanent Speed Boards) was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.45 (n=70)
- Average rating for Option B: 2.53 (n=72)

Support for Option A was even higher amongst Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows North residents when results were broken out (i.e. excluding the results from Clarkdale Meadows South residents).

Figure 18: Resident Ratings for Option A at Davenport Drive east of the Playground (n=70)




Figure 19: Resident Ratings for Option B at Davenport Drive east of the Playground (n=72)





Figure 20: Resident Preference at Davenport Drive east of the Playground (n=73)



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two. Comments received were generally from residents who were strongly opposed to the speed humps or the speed display boards.

### 3.7 Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive

#### *Community Concerns*

Pedestrian Safety- due to sightline concern caused by vegetation

Speeding

#### *Engineering Concern*

Ensure vegetation does not impair sightlines

#### *Proposed Options*


Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 21: Proposed Options for Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive

Option A: Do Nothing (Trim Vegetation Only)



Option B: Pedestrian Beacons



#### *Evaluation Criteria*

Addition of Pedestrian Beacons in Option B will add approximately \$17,000 to the cost of the project.

### *Resident Support for Options*

Support for Option B was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.34 (n=70)
- Average rating for Option B: 3.87 (n=71)

Figure 22: Resident Ratings for Option A at the intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive




Figure 23: Resident Ratings for Option B at the intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive





Figure 24: Resident Preference at the intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two.

### 3.8 Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent

#### *Community Concerns*

Pedestrian Safety

Speeding

#### *Engineering Concern*


Pedestrian Safety - Due to traffic volume and park location. Desire to provide an upgraded crossing to support Active and Safe Routes to School.

#### *Proposed Options*


Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 25: Proposed Options for Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent

Option A: Curb Extensions



Option B: Curb Extensions with Raised Crosswalk



## Evaluation Criteria

Table 5: Option A Evaluation: Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent

<b>Option A – Curb Extensions</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improves pedestrian safety?				X	
Improve visibility?					X
Reduce speeds effectively?			X		
Discourage short-cutting?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?			X		
Minimize traffic noise?			X		
Estimated Cost: \$55,000					

Table 6: Option B Evaluation: Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent

<b>Option B – Curb Extensions/Raised Crosswalk</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improve pedestrian safety?					X
Improve visibility?					X
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Discourage short-cutting?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?		X			
Minimize traffic noise?		X			
Estimated Cost: \$60,000					

## Resident Support for Options

Support for Option A was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.15 (n=71)
- Average rating for Option B: 2.76 (n=72)

Results were almost identical (3.12 and 2.78 respectively) amongst Clarkdale Meadows residents when results were broken out (i.e. excluding the results from Davidson Creek residents).

Figure 26: Resident Ratings for Option A at Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent




Figure 27: Resident Ratings for Option B at Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent





Figure 28: Resident Preference at Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent (n=74)



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two.

### 3.9 Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace

#### *Community Concerns*

Pedestrian Safety- due to lack of pedestrian facilities to access park

Speeding



## Engineering Concern

Pedestrian Safety - Due to traffic volume and park location

## Proposed Options

Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 29: Proposed Options for Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace

Option A: Curb Extensions

Option B: Curb Extensions with Raised Crosswalk



## Evaluation Criteria

Table 7: Option A Evaluation: Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace

Option A – Curb Extensions	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improves pedestrian safety?				X	
Improve visibility?					X
Reduce speeds effectively?			X		
Discourage short-cutting?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?			X		
Minimize traffic noise?			X		
Estimated Cost: \$43,000					

Table 8: Option B Evaluation: Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace

<b>Option B – Curb Extensions/Raised Crosswalk</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improve pedestrian safety?					X
Improve visibility?					X
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Discourage short-cutting?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?		X			
Minimize traffic noise?		X			
Estimated Cost: \$45,000					

### *Resident Support for Options*

Support for Option A (Curb Extensions) was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.25 (n=68)
- Average rating for Option B: 2.83 (n=71)

Results were almost identical (3.27 and 2.86 respectively) amongst Clarkdale Meadows residents when results were broken out (i.e. excluding the results from Davidson Creek residents).

Figure 30: Resident Ratings for Option A at Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace




Figure 31: Resident Ratings for Option B at Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace





Figure 32: Resident Preference at Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two.

### 3.10 Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing

#### *Community Concerns*

Pedestrian Safety- due to visibility concerns caused by curve and parking

Speeding

#### *Engineering Concern*

Pedestrian Safety - Due to traffic volume, location on a curve (decreases sight lines) and park location

#### *Proposed Options*

Based on community and engineering concerns, the following options were proposed for this location:

Figure 33: Proposed Options for Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing

Option One: Curb Extensions with Pedestrian Beacons



Option 2: Median Island with Pedestrian Beacons



*Evaluation Criteria*

Table 9: Option A Evaluation: Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing

<b>Option A – Curb Extensions</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improves pedestrian safety?					X
Improve visibility?					X
Reduce speeds effectively?			X		
Maintain traffic flow?			X		
Minimize traffic noise?			X		
Estimated Cost: \$70,000 (\$53,000 construction plus \$17,000 for pedestrian beacons)					

Table 10: Option B Evaluation: Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing

<b>Option B – Curb Extensions/Raised Crosswalk</b>	Significantly worse than current situation	Somewhat worse than current situation	About the same as current situation	Somewhat better than current situation	Significantly better than current situation
Improve pedestrian safety?					X
Improve visibility?				X	
Reduce speeds effectively?				X	
Maintain traffic flow?		X			
Minimize traffic noise?		X			
Estimated Cost: \$45,000 (\$28,000 construction plus \$17,000 for pedestrian beacons)					

### *Resident Support for Options*

Support for Option B (Median Island with Pedestrian Beacons) was higher among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.06 (n=67)
- Average rating for Option B: 3.23 (n=69)

Results were almost identical when analyzed for Clarkdale South residents only, all Clarkdale residents and all residents, with a very slight preference for Option B.

Figure 34: Resident Ratings for Option A at Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing




Figure 35: Resident Ratings for Option B at Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing





Figure 36: Resident Preference at Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing



Comments received on these options are available in Appendix Two.

## 4.0 Conclusion

### 4.1 Next Steps

Feedback summarized in this report will be used to inform the development of final recommendations for traffic calming. These plans will be presented to Council in May 2017.



# Appendix One: Open House Survey Tool

Additional Comments:

What is your address: \_\_\_\_\_

Personal information is being collected under the authority of s.33(c) of the FOIP Act and will be used for analysis only during the Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming project. Survey responses will be anonymized and summarized in the report and will not be linked to your address. If you have any questions regarding the collection, use or disclosure of your personal information, contact the Traffic Safety Liaison, Transportation Planning and Engineering, Strathcona County at 780-464-8279.

**Thank you for participating in our Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Open House.**

**Remember to leave your passport at the final station!**

Further information:  
Transportation Planning and Engineering  
780-464-8279  
www.strathcona.ca/trafficcalming

## Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming

STRATHCONA  
COUNTY

Open House March 23, 2017

### Participant Passport

Welcome to the Davidson Creek and Clarkdale Meadows Traffic Calming Open House. We look forward to your feedback on the various options located at the stations around the room. Please have a look and let us know what you think.

#### INSTRUCTIONS

Start at the Background and Information station, then visit each of the seven stations. Examine the options at each station and tell us the degree to which you support or do not support the options presented.

#### VISIT US

- Station A Background and Information
- Station A Davidson Drive Trail Crossing
- Station B Davenport Drive at the playground
- Station C Darlington Drive
- Station D Davenport Drive from Davenport Place to Clarkdale Drive
- Station E Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive
- Station F Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent
- Station G Clarkdale Drive at Lilac Terrace
- Station H Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing
- Station H Wrap up/Passport Drop Off

**Please leave your passport at the final station.**

#### Station A - Davidson Drive Trail Crossing

Option A: Median Island	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Median Island/ Pedestrian Beacons	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station B - Davenport Drive at the playground

Option A: Do Nothing	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Speed Humps	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station C - Darlington Drive

Option A: Permanent Speed Display Boards	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Speed Humps	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station D - Davenport Drive from Davenport Place to Clarkdale Drive

Option A: Permanent Speed Display Board	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Speed Humps	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station E - Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive

Option A: Do Nothing (trim vegetation)	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Pedestrian Beacons (trim vegetation)	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station F - Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent

Option A: Curb Extensions	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Curb Extensions /Raised Crosswalk	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station G - Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace

Option A: Curb Extensions	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Curb Extensions /Raised Crosswalk	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:

#### Station H - Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing

Option A: Curb Extensions /Pedestrian Beacons	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support
Option B: Median Island/ Pedestrian Beacons	1 Strongly do not support	2 Do not support	3 Neutral	4 Support	5 Strongly Support

Comments:



## Appendix Two: Resident Comments

### *Davidson Drive Trail Crossing*

- High traffic location used by many children (7-11), going to playground, and also commuting to school. Better to have another layer of safety to protect pedestrians.
- My daughter and I were almost hit in this crosswalk, Something definitely needs to be done here.
- Beacons would make pedestrian safety better since people normally park in that area and drivers may not see pedestrians.
- I do not feel the requirement for a median is appropriate.
- I would be interested in knowing what the recommendation is and why - just seeing these two options without other data isn't really helpful
- I think residential speeds are too high especially in this neighborhood with 2 (potentially 3) elementary schools. The speed should be 30 km/hr. Plus residentially parking hinders line of sight for both drivers & pedestrians. No parking zones should be expanded around intersections in the area around 7-11
- Why not just put a brighter crosswalk and lower the speed limit on Davidson drive. Speeding is the biggest concern of all. Lower the speed and that will help.
- I am not sure why you need a median island if you just put up pedestrian beacons, that would save money and also solve the problem with pedestrians crossing there.
- Warning signs required
- This is an imagined problem. What do you have to offer in the way of higher pedestrian traffic and higher motor vehicle traffic. You are putting the cart before the horse.
- We use this intersection often and it's not safe to cross. The lack of clear markings does not give a chance for motorists to slow down.
- I walk my dog there every day and have not ever felt traffic was an issue
- Prefer with beacons
- The Beacons might not be totally necessary, but if that school is going to be just down the street from there? Maybe there are?
- Is it possible to only put in flashing lights? Why is the median necessary?
- Don't plant bushes in the median
- Would rather see a good street light with raised sidewalk than expensive beacon system
- I think that pedestrian beacons would be more visible. I do not agree on the islands.
- This is not the concern we are interested in. We are interested in the speeders who wind up at Baseline Road and rip down Clover bar Road between the hours of 11:00 pm and 2:00 am. from Thursday to Sunday.
- People pay more attention to pedestrian beacon
- Median with narrow road is hazardous. Just have beacons

### *Davenport Drive at the Playground*

- Not sure if other, better (perhaps more expensive) alternative exists. Do other alternatives exist?
- Remove existing median. It is already a problem. Or don't allow parking within 10m of it.
- Calming circles at both ends would be ideal (like by Lakeland Ridge school)
- Speed humps will just cause congestion and noise.
- Again, what is the recommendation in this situation?
- I feel that most drivers ignore or don't understand the difference between school & playground zones. This location will become a school zone when the new school is built causing more speed confusion. With the number of kids walking to & from the 3 local schools the speed in Davidson should be 30
- How do speed humps affect the clearing of snow? How often do they need to be replaced? Not sure how permanent of a solution this is and how cost effective if they need to be replaced or if they interfere with snow removal. When the school goes in I would like to see pedestrian beacons in 2 locations along Davenport Dr. One at Dorian Way and Davenport Dr. and one at the other end of the park where the school is going to be located.
- I drive this road numerous times a day. The wear & tear on my vehicle would be horrible
- Not necessary at this time. Traffic is moving at a relative pace. Fencing in place protects children. Speed bumps are an annoyance on the road and frustrate drivers.
- I have observed numerous vehicles speeding down this road way. Need to slow it down.
- Speed humps will just increase noise as the meatheads in their rig rockets will accelerate between each bump.
- There must be something else. Speed humps are not a great option
- If speed humps are used build them on a diagonal
- I do not believe speed bumps are a good option.

### *Darlington Drive*

- If they are cheap and solar powered
- Don't see the speed display boards having any effect, especially if nothing is done about the people speeding.
- We do not see this area as being as high of a concern as Davenport drive. So if it comes down to budget, then permanent speed signs would be preferred and budget be used where it is more needed.
- Speed humps will just cause more noise and possible collisions due to people rapidly slowing and speeding up. Also is a concern for me who drives a low car that has troubles going over speed humps.
- I am not in favour of speed humps. It is a permanent "solution" to a temporary issue.
- Darlington Drive seems to be lumped together but there are 2 distinct sections which is confusing
- We have had speed signs posted in the neighborhood before. They are useless. So people slow down for a block big deal. Put in speed mountains like they have by the golf course

- Speeding is always a concern down Darlington Drive. You will also help reduce excessive noise with this solution. Less people racing down the street.
- Speed humps hard on suspension, increased noise, poor for transit and snow plows.
- How do speed humps affect the clearing of snow? How often do they need to be replaced? Not sure how permanent of a solution this is and how cost effective if they need to be replaced or if they interfere with snow removal.
- Again brutal on wear and tear on your vehicles
- City of Edmonton stats are skewed to show what they want them to. They are not led by stats from other jurisdictions that have tried similar controls.
- Display boards are the best method for reminding drivers to slow down
- If you put up the 'your speed' signs make sure there is a speed limit sign with it!
- is it possible to do a combination of the 2
- Speed Display Boards could be useful data for Police but we would like to see a heavier Police presence on the weekends to deter the noise and speeding on Clover Bar road.
- Permanent signs get ignored in time. Rotating might be more effective.

#### *Davenport Drive east of the playground zone to Clarkdale Drive*

- If they are cheap and solar powered
- Same as before, don't think the speed display boards will make a difference.
- People will eventually ignore and get used to the speed signs. Speed bumps would seem to be more effective and be less of a cost.
- Speed humps are not a good option.
- How do speed humps affect the clearing of snow? How often do they need to be replaced? Not sure how permanent of a solution this is and how cost effective if they need to be replaced or if they interfere with snow removal.
- Not a true problem. In this case perceptions does NOT equal reality.
- Speed boards do not work for the individual that is travelling at a high rate of speed. Might work for the slower drivers, but these are less of a concern in my opinion
- People get too accustomed to going over the speed limit over time and don't care
- No permanent boards

#### *Intersection of Davenport Drive and Clarkdale Drive*

- If they are cheap and solar powered
- Perhaps this could be considered to become a 3-way stop. There could be lights.
- again these are choices in a vacuum - is there a concern greater than that of making sure the vegetation is trimmed in light of the increased number of child pedestrians expected?
- Not a major issue. Perception does NOT equal reality. Waste of tax \$\$
- Again people do not respect the 30KM/H zone through here compounded with the vegetation. It looks nice but puts visibility of pedestrians at risk.
- I walk and drive this intersection regularly and have no troubles either way.
- Should be three way stop, like intersections in other rural areas of Sherwood Park

- As a pedestrian that looks both ways before crossing and doesn't run across the road, this isn't an issue. I don't think beacons will help as the people at risk are rushing and won't push the buttons
- At least trim down the vegetation so drivers can see
- motorists are mindful of pedestrians. I don't see the need for improvements here
- Beacons not always necessary. Again give us some bright street lights and raised crosswalks

#### *Clarkdale Drive at Orchid Crescent*

- Leaving near a curb extension, these are VERY EFFECTIVE. Strongly 4.
- The cost seems to outweigh the benefits. Could there just be a crosswalk and some lights instead? Or a speed bump?
- Not sure how a raised crosswalk would work. I have the same concerns with clearing snow and cost of replacing the raised sidewalk. How long would it take to wear down? How raised is it and how does that slow down traffic? Why not but pedestrian beacons at the crosswalk?
- Prefer raised crosswalk. Signs required warning of curb extensions
- This is just down the block from where we live and your proposals are ridiculous. This is not a local issue.
- 30 Km/h speed already here
- "Living on Orchid, I regularly see vehicles travelling at EXTREME speeds up this swooping road. It's Dangerous, and only a matter of time until someone is seriously hurt. The Raise Crosswalks will be the only way to slow them down. In addition I believe you need to look at options at both ends of the part. The highest traffic pedestrian crossing is at the south end of Orchid Cres. This would control speed and give pedestrians options to cross."
- Waste of taxpayer dollars. I walk this intersection regularly. I have no problems.
- Speed limit here is sufficient. With excellent sight lines on this stretch of road, I disagree that safety is an issue with the posted speed limit.
- Why can we put flashing pedestrian lights here?
- The overall curve of Meadowview drive minimizes speed.
- This makes it extremely challenging to follow the garbage trucks, as it is illegal to cross over the solid centre line - yet people do!!!!
- Curb extensions only if they are clearly marked

#### *Meadowview Drive at Lilac Terrace*

- Again not an issue
- It's a squeeze to turn with traffic approaching
- Not needed. Too expensive.
- I think the issue with traffic calming is an issue on Meadowview Drive. As a frequent walker in the greater neighbourhood, it is on Meadowview that I see excessive speeds.
- Why can't we put flashing pedestrian light here?
- Why can't we just have a crosswalk???
- Support Marked Crosswalk

- Snow storms obscure curb visibility

#### *Meadowview Drive Trail Crossing*

- If both are equally effective at improving pedestrian safety, would prefer option that is more aesthetically pleasing, not sure which one that would be.
- Fairly costly solutions
- Really like median islands as a pedestrian
- Not an issue
- There should be no parking 5 cars away from crosswalk
- I cross here often. I have never felt unsafe
- Why not just pedestrian flashing lights?
- Mail boxes will interfere with curb extensions
- People already drive VERY slow here, as they do not understand playground hours
- My vote would be for the speed electronic speed signs.
- I live beside the end of the trail at the south end of Meadowview Dr. The speed of vehicles and the large number of persons crossing the road at this location to head towards Baseline Road is very dangerous. When I wrote in a few years ago suggesting a crosswalk for safety here, I was told very strongly that crosswalks do nothing to make crossing safer!! However, this survey is recommending crosswalks in many areas and has completely missed this dangerous area. I could sit and take many pictures from my front window of persons crossing here every day...
- Support Marked Crosswalk