

Jim Common Drive Traffic Calming Project

Open House and Online Survey Report

Prepared by Debbie Rawson



Results of the Open House and Online Survey undertaken to understand resident preferences for traffic calming options on Jim Common Drive North and South.

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the results of the final phase of public engagement for the Jim Common Drive (JCD) North and South Traffic Calming Project. In total, 140 residents gave their input into this process, representing 129 households. Ninety usable responses were received through the online survey. Another 49 residents attended the open house, representing 38 households. One resident gave input via the telephone. Feedback was analyzed to understand resident preferences for the traffic calming options which were developed to address resident and engineering concerns on Jim Common Drive.

Resident Preferences for Traffic Calming Options

Jim Common Drive South at Crystal Lane

Support for Option B (median island) was highest among residents with 30% of residents preferring Option A, 44% preferring Option B and 26% having no preference.

Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive

Support for Option A (roundabout) was highest among residents with 64% of residents preferring Option A, 18% preferring Option B and 18% having no preference.

Jim Common Drive South at Brower Drive

Support for Option A (roundabout) was highest among residents with 50% of residents preferring Option A, 19% preferring Option B and 31% having no preference.

Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (north of Jim Common Drive South)

Support for Option B (curb extensions with flashing beacons) was highest among residents with 19% of residents preferring Option A, 39% preferring Option B and 42% having no preference.

Jim Common Drive North at Clover Bar Park

Support for Option A (crosswalks with curb extensions at Canyon/Cimmaron) was highest among residents with 35% of residents preferring Option A, 28% preferring Option B and 37% having no preference.

Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (near Crimson Drive)

Support for Option A (do nothing - paint only) was highest among residents with 49% of residents preferring Option A, 30% preferring Option B and 21% having no preference.

Feedback summarized in this report will be used to inform the development of final recommendations for traffic calming on JCD North and South. These plans will be presented to Council in March 2017.

Contents

Executive Summary..... 1

1.0 Introduction 3

 1.1 About the Jim Common Drive Traffic Calming Project 3

 1.2 What this report provides..... 3

2.0 Methodology..... 3

 2.1 Recruitment for the Open House and Online Survey 3

 2.2 Open House and Online Survey Structure 4

3.0 Results..... 5

 3.1 Participation and location of residence of participants..... 5

 3.2 Jim Common Drive South at Crystal Lane 6

 3.3 Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive..... 9

 3.4 Jim Common Drive South at Brower Drive 13

 3.5 Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (north of Jim Common Drive South)..... 16

 3.6 Jim Common Drive North at Clover Bar Park..... 19

 3.7 Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (near Crimson Drive)..... 22

 3.8 General Comments 24

4.0 Conclusion..... 24

 4.1 Next Steps 24

Appendix One: Open House Survey Tool (“Passport”) 25

Appendix Two: Resident Comments..... 28


1.0 Introduction

1.1 About the Jim Common Drive Traffic Calming Project

Jim Common Drive (JCD) South and North are scheduled for rehabilitation in 2017. Residents have expressed concerns with traffic speed and pedestrian safety on both of these roads in the past. The Traffic Engineering and Safety branch of Transportation and Agriculture Services collected speed data that indicates traffic speeds in excess of the 50 km/h speed limit. For these reasons, an engineering-driven 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 to be used for this traffic calming initiative.

Figure One: Jim Common Drive Traffic Calming Project Timeline



1.2 What this report provides


This report provides the results of the January 2017 open house and online survey which were undertaken to understand resident preferences for the traffic calming options which were developed to address resident and engineering concerns on Jim Common Drive.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Recruitment for the Open House and Online Survey

All residents of Strathcona County were provided with an opportunity to participate in the open house and online survey; although those in the neighbourhoods of Cloverbar Ranch and Charlton Heights, as well as nearby condominium complexes off JCD South, were most aggressively recruited. Letters were mailed to all households as indicated by the red line in Figure Two.

Figure Two: Mailout area for JCD Traffic Calming Project



In addition to the resident mail out, the open house and survey were promoted through the Sherwood Park News, Facebook and Twitter. They were also promoted through the County's public engagement e-newsletter and through the Community Living Advisory Committee. A project e-newsletter was also set up from the Jim Common Drive Traffic Calming webpage. A reminder about the open house and online survey was sent to all those who signed up for the newsletter, as well as those who provided their contact information at the October workshops.

2.2 Open House and Online Survey Structure

Based on feedback received in the October workshops, online survey and on engineering concerns, traffic calming measures were proposed at six locations (three on JCD North and three on JCD South).

During the open house, residents were provided with information on community and engineering concerns at each location, as well as comparative information on 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, and then were asked to indicate their support for the options. The online survey was available from January 20-29, 2017.

3.0 Results

3.1 Participation and location of residence of participants

In total, 140 residents gave their input into this process, representing 129 households. Ninety usable responses were received through the online survey. Another 49 residents attended the open house, representing 38 households. One resident gave input via the telephone.

Not everyone who participated in the engagement chose to share their address, so exact residence of participants cannot be precisely determined. However, it is estimated that about 3/4 of participants live in Charlton Heights, Cloverbar Ranch or Durham Town Square.

About 20% of participants indicated that they resided in Lakeland Ridge. About 5% reported residence in more distant neighbourhoods of Strathcona County.

3.2 Jim Common Drive South at Crystal Lane

Community Concerns

- *Pedestrian Safety - many particularly vulnerable pedestrians, lack of marked crosswalks, vehicles passing those stopped to turn or for a pedestrian
- Traffic management - vehicles negotiating down to one lane, congestion due to signal timings at Sherwood Drive
- High traffic speeds with vehicles coming off Sherwood Drive


Engineering Concern

- Pedestrian Risk (high number of vulnerable road users)

Proposed Options

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

Figure Three: Proposed Options for JCD South at Crystal Lane



Evaluation Criteria

Based on community and engineering concerns at this location, each option was evaluated according to its impact on pedestrian safety, speed, short cutting, traffic noise, traffic flow and cost.

Table One: Option A Evaluation: JCD South and Crystal Lane

| Option A – Corner Islands | 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: \$60,000 (\$44, 000 construction plus \$16, 000 for flashing beacons) | | | | | |

Table Two: Option B Evaluation: JCD South and Crystal Lane

| Option B – Median Refuge Islands | 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: \$65,000 (\$41,000 construction plus \$24, 000 for flashing beacons) | | | | | |

Resident Support for Options

Support for Option B was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 2.65
- Average rating for Option B: 3.12

Figure Four: Resident Ratings for Option A: JCD South and Crystal Lane




Figure Five: Resident Ratings for Option B: JCD South and Crystal Lane





Figure Six: Resident Preference for JCD South and Crystal Lane



Comments received on these options tended to vary between residents who wanted more aggressive options and residents who were concerned about traffic management concerns and flow at this location. All comments are available in Appendix Two.

3.3 Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive

Community Concerns

- *Visibility - due to fence on southwest corner and curve of road
- *Pedestrian Safety - lack of marked crosswalk, vehicles passing those stopped to turn or for a pedestrian
- Traffic management - lack of clarity on number of lanes
- Speeding
- Traffic Noise
- Traffic Volumes


Engineering Concern

- Speed, Sightlines (just meet minimum standard)

Proposed Options

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

Figure Seven: Proposed Options for JCD South at Cranford Drive



Evaluation Criteria

Based on community and engineering concerns at this location, each option was evaluated according to its impact on sightlines, pedestrian safety, speed, short cutting, traffic noise, traffic flow and cost.

Table Three: Option A Evaluation: JCD South and Cranford Drive

| Option A - Roundabout | 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 | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | | | X |
| Minimize traffic noise? | | | | X | |
| Estimated Cost: \$152,000 | | | | | |

Table Four: Option B Evaluation: JCD South and Cranford Drive

| Option B - 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 | | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | X | | |
| Minimize traffic noise? | | | X | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$150,000 | | | | | |

Resident Support for Options

Support for Option A was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.59
- Average rating for Option B: 2.18

Figure Eight: Resident Ratings for Option A: JCD South and Cranford Drive




Figure Nine: Resident Ratings for Option B: JCD South and Cranford Drive





Figure Ten: Resident Preference for JCD South and Cranford Drive



Comments received on these options tended to be in support of the roundabout option. Several residents did suggest a four-way stop as their preferred option. All comments are available in Appendix Two.

Four-Way Stop Evaluation

While there was strong support from some residents for stop signs along Jim Common Drive South, there was also strong support from many residents to maintain traffic flow along this main collector road. In addition, many residents who reside right along Jim Common Drive South noted that traffic noise was a major concern. The addition of stop signs would create a significant increase in traffic noise along Jim Common Drive South.

Lastly, the benefits of the 4-way stop would be dependent on compliance, whereas the options presented are self-enforcing. For all these reasons, a four-way stop was not presented as an option on Jim Common Drive South.

3.4 Jim Common Drive South at Brower Drive

Community Concerns

- *Pedestrian Safety - vehicles not yielding to pedestrians
- *Speeding
- Visibility - due to curve of road
- Traffic Noise
- Traffic Volumes


Engineering Concerns

- Speed, Collision History

Proposed Options

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

Figure Eleven: Proposed Options for Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive



Evaluation Criteria

Based on community and engineering concerns at this location, each option was evaluated according to its impact on sightlines, pedestrian safety, speed, short cutting, traffic noise, traffic flow and cost.

Table Five: Option A Evaluation: JCD South and Brower Drive

| Option A - Roundabout | 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 | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | | | X |
| Minimize traffic noise? | | | | X | |
| Estimated Cost: \$152,000 | | | | | |

Table Six: Option B Evaluation: JCD South and Brower Drive

| Option B - 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 | | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | X | | |
| Minimize traffic noise? | | | X | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$131,000 | | | | | |

Resident Support for Options

Support for Option A was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.40
- Average rating for Option B: 2.41

Figure Twelve: Resident Ratings for Option A: JCD South and Brower Drive




Figure Thirteen: Resident Ratings for Option B: JCD South and Brower Drive





Figure Fourteen: Resident Preference for JCD South and Brower Drive



Comments received on these options tended to be in support of the roundabout option. Several residents did suggest a four-way stop as their preferred option. All comments are available in Appendix Two.

3.5 Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (north of Jim Common Drive South)

Community Concerns

- Pedestrian Safety - vehicles not yielding to pedestrians, poor pedestrian visibility
- Speeding

Engineering Concern

- Speed

Proposed Options

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

Figure Fifteen: Proposed Options for JCD North at Trail Crossing (North of JCD South)



Evaluation Criteria

Based on community and engineering concerns at this location, each option was evaluated according to its impact on visibility, pedestrian safety, speed, short cutting, traffic flow and cost.

Table Seven: Option A Evaluation: JCD North at Trail Crossing (North of JCD South)

| 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 | | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | X | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$22,000 | | | | | |

Table Eight: Option B Evaluation: JCD North at Trail Crossing (North of JCD South)

| Option B - Curb Extensions with Flashing Beacons | 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 | | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | X | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$38,000 (\$22,000 construction plus \$16,000 for flashing beacons) | | | | | |

Resident Support for Options

Support for Option B was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 2.88
- Average rating for Option B: 3.21

Figure Sixteen: Resident Ratings for Option A: JCD North at Trail Crossing (North of JCD South)




Figure Seventeen: Resident Ratings for Option B: JCD North at Trail Crossing (North of JCD South)





Figure Eighteen: Resident Preference for JCD North at Trail Crossing (North of JCD South)



Several residents indicated in the comments section that they would rather see flashing beacons only and no curb extensions. All comments are available in Appendix Two.

3.6 Jim Common Drive North at Clover Bar Park

Community Concerns

- Speeding
- Pedestrian Safety
- Parking - amount of parking and parking on the crosswalks

Engineering Concern

Speed (during playground effective hours)

Proposed Options

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

Figure Nineteen: Proposed Options for JCD North at Clover Bar Park



Evaluation Criteria

Based on community and engineering concerns at this location, each option was evaluated according to its impact on visibility, pedestrian safety, speed, short cutting, traffic flow and cost.

Table Nine: Option A Evaluation: JCD North at Clover Bar Park

| Option A – Crosswalks with Curb Extensions at Canyon/Cimmaron | 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 | | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | X | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$80,000 | | | | | |

Table Ten: Option B Evaluation: JCD North at Clover Bar Park

| Option B - Crosswalks with Curb Extensions at Canyon/Cimmaron plus speed humps | 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 | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | X | | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$83,000 | | | | | |

Resident Support for Options

Support for Option A was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.14
- Average rating for Option B: 2.77

Figure Twenty: Resident Ratings for Option A: JCD North at Clover Bar Park




Figure Twenty-One: Resident Ratings for Option B: JCD North at Clover Bar Park





Figure Twenty-Two: Resident Preference for JCD North at Clover Bar Park



Several residents indicated in the comments section that they would rather see flashing beacons only (plus/minus speed humps) and no curb extensions. All comments are available in Appendix Two.

3.7 Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (near Crimson Drive)

Community Concerns

- Speeding
- Pedestrian Safety

Engineering Concern

- None

Proposed Options

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

Figure Twenty-Three: Proposed Options for JCD North at Trail Crossing near Crimson Drive



Evaluation Criteria

Based on community and engineering concerns at this location, each option was evaluated according to its impact on visibility, pedestrian safety, speed, short cutting, traffic flow and cost.

Option A proposes to leave the crossing as it is (paint only), and thus no change is expected to traffic conditions in the area.

Table Eleven: Option B Evaluation: JCD North at Trail Crossing near Crimson Drive

| Option B - Raised Crosswalk | 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 | | |
| Maintains traffic flow? | | | X | | |
| Estimated Cost: \$24,000 | | | | | |

Resident Support for Options

Support for Option A was highest among residents.

- Average rating for Option A: 3.58
- Average rating for Option B: 2.94

Figure Twenty-Four: Resident Ratings for Option A: JCD North at Trail Crossing near Crimson Drive




Figure Twenty-Five: Resident Ratings for Option B: JCD North at Trail Crossing near Crimson Drive





Figure Twenty-Six: Resident Preference for JCD North at Clover Bar Park



Resident comments for this location were quite evenly split between those who feel this location is already well-calmed and those who feel speed and safety are an issue. All comments are available in Appendix Two.

3.8 General Comments

A few residents commented on the project generally. Residents spoke to the general concept of traffic calming, other locations of concern and feedback about the Open House in these comments which 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 on JCD North and South. These plans will be presented to Council in March 2017.

Appendix One: Open House Survey Tool (“Passport”)

Additional Comments:

[Empty text box for 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 to ensure that only one reply is received per household and to illustrate support for this initiative. If you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of your personal information, contact Debbie Rawson, Traffic Safety Liaison Advisor, at 780-416-6726.

**Thank you for participating in our
Jim Common Drive Traffic Calming Open House.**

Remember to leave your passport at the final station!

Further information:
Transportation and Agriculture Services
780-417-7100
www.strathcona.ca/trafficcalming



Welcome to the Jim Common Drive 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 ▲ Background and Information
- Station A Jim Common Drive South at Crystal Lane
- Station B Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive
- Station C Jim Common Drive South at Brower Drive
- Station D Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing A (north of Jim Common Drive South)
- Station E Jim Common Drive North at Clover Bar Park
- Station F Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing B (near Crimson Drive)
- Station ● Wrap up/Passport Drop Off

Please leave your passport at the final station.

Station A - Jim Common Drive South at Crystal Lane

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Option A: Corner Islands | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |
| Option B: Median Refuge Islands | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |

Comments:

Station B - Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Option A: Roundabout | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |
| Option B: Curb Extensions | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |

Comments:

Station C - Jim Common Drive South at Brower Drive

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Option A: Roundabout | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |
| Option B: Curb Extensions | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |

Comments:

Station D - Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing A

(north of Jim Common Drive)

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Option A: Curb Extensions | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |
| Option B: Curb Extensions with Flashing Beacons | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |

Comments:

Station E - Jim Common Drive North at Clover Bar Park

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Option A: Crosswalks with Curb Extensions at Canyon/Cinnaron | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |
| Option B: Crosswalks with Curb Extensions at Canyon/ Cinnaron plus speed humps | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |

Comments:

Station F - Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing B
(near Crimson Drive)

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Option A: Do nothing (paint only) | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |
| Option B: Raised Crosswalk | 1 Strongly do not support | 2 Do not support | 3 Neutral | 4 Support | 5 Strongly Support |

Comments:

Appendix Two: Resident Comments

Jim Common Drive South at Crystal Lane

- Should be a lot more police enforcement (radar)
- This corner is not really a concern to us.
- Crosswalks will not slow down traffic
- Bus stops too close to Sherwood Drive
- I don't understand why you wouldn't have all four crossing marked and available for crossing...this solution only solves one of the problems....speeding is a huge problem along with that terribly timed light at jim common dr and sherwood drive. having the 2 lanes merge immediately after the intersection is also an issue...there is simply too much congestion in that small area...it won't take away the congestion to put in a cross-walk..
- Since putting in a turning light coming from the Bethel Transit Centre turning left onto Sherwood Drive in the mornings traffic is already backed up past this intersection as traffic has to wait for this turning light to finish. By using option A traffic will be backed up even more! Option B doesn't really solve anything. The lights at Sherwood Drive are less than a block away. This is where pedestrians should be crossing Jim Common Drive S. Drivers coming off Sherwood Drive turning onto Jim Common Drive S. are going to have to immediately merge left to get into the lane to turn left at Crystal Lane or go straight and then also watch for pedestrians at the same time this does not seem like a very safe driving practice or situation to me especially in the evenings coming home from work when it is dusk.
- We don't feel anything is needed at this spot in the road
- There is no need for a crosswalk here as people can walk a short block to Sherwood drive and cross at the existing traffic lights to go to the Husky Station. This would be a waste of tax payer money.
- I think more needs to be done to narrow the road or clearly delineate the "parking lane" on Jim Common Dr. South. People often pass on the right side and treat the road as a 4 lanes.
- Need 4 way stop and flashing lights
- We need better options. People literally race thru Jim Common, they even use it to cut thru instead of using baseline. It needs to have a hard stop somewhere along Jim Common Dr. North. Forcing them to stop with causing noise at startup is the question? As revving engines is a issue too.
- This section of Jim Common is too close to Sherwood drive to have this amount of "calming."
- Only the most westerly Island Refuge should be installed along with the N-S crosswalk & beacons in the above photo. For safety & reduced confusion, you want people crossing Jim Common at the one location only for this intersection (on the west edge of Crystal), not two.
- the corner islands will cause traffic build up worse than it is now. Left turning traffic will back up and cause big hold ups for traffic going east and west. IF you make it a proper 4 lane road with pedestrian blinking lights without medians to squeeze cars closer together it would work better
- Do not 4 traffic irritants

- Just put in flashing walk lights. I work with transit and it will make a huge noise concern with one lane and because of congestion and busses and this is truck country and this will make the ventury effect and create more accidents and noise. And let's not forget increasing gas with slowing down and then speeding up till next intersection. So Sherwood parks environmental concerns will increase with fuel use and noise
- too many angles to watch for cars with the corner islands. there are many special needs and seniors who cross here.
- I would be concerned that adding the corner boulevards in Option A would create a traffic backlog on JCD South between Crystal Lane and Sherwood Drive, due to the high volume of cars that turn right from Sherwood Drive onto JCD South and also approach JCD South from the Bethel Transit Centre
- People short cut from Base Line to Sherwood Drive Via Bower Drive. Come up with a plan that discourages short cutting through this route. Option 1 is going to cause problems for east bound traffic at Sherwood Drive and Jim Common as there are two east bound lanes and the right lane usually tries to horn their way in past the proposed traffic calming. Eliminate the right hand east bound lane at the Sherwood Drive and Jim Common intersection.
- Add a green advance left arrows both ways at the same time onto Sherwood Drive. Photo radar for speed and red light violations. Longer pedestrian crossing times for at risk pedestrians. I can't get across during the time allowed in my power wheelchair.
- The traffic coming from the north entrance of the husky is also a problem, there is a fence that you can nor see past until you are on the sidewalk. Also turning left is almost impossible during rush hour making for some risky driving and potential drivers and pedestrians
- The cost is prohibitive. Traffic will slow at that particular point but not further along the road. More cost effective would be flashing yellow pedestrian activated lights.
- We feel that the flashing beacons will be a helpful 4 for pedestrians crossing, without reducing the traffic flow significantly.
- Option B only changes 1 factor slightly- not worth the money. Option A - not sure if worth the price.
- Why doesn't the county put in speed bumps in addition . Also, the corner of Jim Common & Jim Common has a terrible blind spot when crossing heading north!
- Consideration of snow removal has to be a priority.
- I dont think either plan will reduce traffic or clam it effectively without the implementation of large speed bumps in conjunction with either of the prospective designs .
- I think better management of police resources should be utilized if speed is an issue. Instead of constructing an outrageously priced piece of concrete put up flashing pedestrian lights. Traffic calming becomes an issue for anyone with large recreational camping trailers
- Flow of traffic still needs to be important
- Option B appears to have only marginal improvement
- Why not better lighting at that corner? It is VERY dark there.

- This is or should be an arterial feeded and Option A totally eliminates that making it one from Sherwood Park road when traffic is impeded. Option B is a good compromise and meets the need of improving pedestrian safety and maintaining traffic flow.
- I believe only flashing beacons are necessary. Put in the pedestrian lights but it us ridiculous to add islands or corner islands. People chose to back onto this road when they bought and the noise comes with a busy road. I don't think speed is a problem.
- Left turning traffic onto Crystal Dr will halt all the traffic behind them.
- Option B has very little effect on the intersection for the money that would be spent.
- Option A would be disruptive for transit as we use the right lane to cross the Sherwood Drive intersection and proceed to the transit stop just after Crystal Lane. Making that lane into a right turn only lane would mean that busses would have to use the left lane to cross Sherwood Drive, which would slow traffic flow and would slow transit service. Option B is better for transit and for traffic flow, as well as solving the pedestrian safety issue with the lights, which is my concern.
- I do not 4 speed reduction and believe it will lead to an increase in frustration rather than solve problems at hand.
- I feel both of the options would further congest the intersection in particular the east and west bound traffic.
- Both of these options will not just slow traffic, but they will stop traffic! during busier times, it will only take 1 vehicle that intends to turn left onto Crystal Lane (when going East on Jim Common S) to STOP traffic behind them while they wait for oncoming traffic. At busier times of the day, this will back traffic up all the way to (A MUCH BUSIER) Sherwood Drive.
- Both aren't overly great options to reduce speed. After you go through either, a person will just speed back up for the rest of the road heading East.
- I have personal experience with similar "solutions" elsewhere in the province and can state with certainty this is NOT the way to deal with this issue.
- Still depends on drivers giving the right of way to pedestrians crossing
- I do use this area , not able to make a decision
- Try not to slow down the traffic but control it correctly. Slowing down traffic without reason makes people angry and prone to jackrabbiting after lights etc.
- Pedestrian safety is greatly enhanced in Option A
- With all your traffic calming in the county you keep making it worst for the people that are driving. The reason a lot of people cut thru that area is to get to the bus depot and out of the bus depot. The planners did not do their homework on that one. You built nice wide roads to cut them down and spend a lot of money repairing them every year because of the snowplows.
- i understand the need to control traffic, but when is it too much, it is getting very hard to get around sherwood park in a decent amount of time i find myself traveling around the out side on the highways to any place i need and also if the timing on these lights is as bad as the rest of the park it will be another disaster. option b is better as option a looks like island that cut off traffic flow and force you where you don't want to go like the crazy turning only no straight thru on lakeland and clover bar roads

- In my opinion , one of the main reasons that we need so many traffic calming measures in residential areas throughout Sherwood Park, is that people cut through neighbourhoods to avoid unnecessarily long waits at lights with protected left hand turns rather than permissive left hand turns in areas such as Clover Bar Road and Lakeland Boulevard; Clover Bar Road and Baseline Road; Lakeland Boulevard and Sherwood Drive; and Lakeland Boulevard and Broadmoor Boulevard. Due to the excessive waits at these and the corresponding waits for residents exiting neighbourhoods entering on to the major routes, drivers will turn right on to the main roads and then take a permitted left turn into the next residential area they can cut through to reach their destination in a reasonable, timely manner. Rather than spending so much time and money mitigating increased traffic in residential areas, deal with a primary cause of said traffic...the lack of smooth traffic flow on the major roadways in Sherwood Park (much of which is caused by the unreasonable waits at traffic lights).
- Corner Islands too hard for snow removal
- Better time on east/west lights on Baseline would reduce shortcut traffic on JCD South
- Not enough rooms for 4 lanes and island and corner islands are a danger.

Jim Common Drive South at Cranford Drive

- Option A takes care of bad sight lines for left turns. Opt B does not address speed on JCD
- Making a right hand turn from Cranford Drive onto Jim Common South can be very scared as you cannot see the oncoming traffic due to the curve of Jim Common South. The speed of the traffic east bound on Jim Common South is very fast as vehicles travel in two lanes and then narrow to one lane thus drivers are speeding up to get past other vehicles and by the time they get around the curve they are travelling at a very high rate of speed. The driver of the vehicle turning from Cranford Drive has to stop half way into the intersection or exceleerate fast to avoid a collision.
- Gunning from stop signs
- speed is the biggest problem that impacts pedestrian safety; i feel roundabouts are a bit of a money waster as they won't solve any of the other problems. why can't you install speed bumps and increase policing...put some lit cross-walks in; how about a mix of measures that would eliminate most of the problems and not just one of the problems
- My biggest concern at this intersection is pedestrian safety. I have almost been hit several times at this location by traffic turning right onto Jim Common Drive S. from Jim Common Drive N. If you put a round a bout at this intersection you are just going to increase traffic at Brower Drive. One reason the traffic is so heavy on Jim Common Drive S. is because people from Lakeland Ridge are avoiding the traffic circle on Crimson Drive.
- Minimize stops
- I strongly agree with a large round about here because when I've had to use that road I fear that I might wait to long for the traffic to be clear from the west and not looked the second or third or fourth time to the east. It's a terrifying corner.
- Between Sherwood Drive and Crimson Drive there are fences all along the road separating residences from the traffic except for Corner Stone Village where no children reside. I see no need to slow traffic along this secondary bus route. I also feel 4 way stops are not necessary and

will only slow the flow of traffic and increase the probability of rear end collisions, especially in winter months.

- Use four-way stop signs instead.
- It is fine the way it is. Curb extensions at the intersections invite large vehicles such as campers and buses to park or wait and obscure sight lines. When people park cars in them, they are often too far from the curb making two lanes one
- I strongly believe there needs to be periodic curb extensions along Jim Common North and South to reduce traffic speed and maintain single lane traffic.
- Flashing lights pedestrian crossing and maybe a 4 way stop and speed bumps Narrow the street to slow traffic
- I think a Roundabout would help slow things down and will be less noisy
- Traffic circles move traffic better than any other option. More awareness about how to drive a circle would be needed in Strathcona County though.
- Jim Common South is a feeder road. It is meant to move traffic quickly. These options with slow traffic substantially and cause delays whenever one person wants to turn.
- This is a treacherous corner for sightlines travelling north on Jim Common. The only way I see this improving is by the roundabout. We have curb extensions at Jim Common and Crimson Drive. When buses are turning, everything stops, everyone has to wait. I think it's more dangerous and I could see the same thing happening with this location.
- Roundabout will improve safety for pedestrians crossing J.C. Dr S and for motorists crossing northward from Cranford to J.C. Dr N (by slowing eastbound traffic on J.C. Dr S) whereas the curb extentions may not slow this traffic. The roundabout hampers traffic flow somewhat, but given the poor original design (short sightlines looking westward from Cranford along J.C. Dr S), this may be the best compromise.
- The roundabouts and narrowed streets you created at Crimson Drive and Campbell Drive are unsafe. People often don't move over and hog the lane, coming down the street where you made it so narrow .The turn off Jim Common onto Crimson and visa versa ,it feels like your vehicle is going to be hit by vehicles making the corner. especially if its a larger vehicle. What a mess you have made there. The big vehicles drive right over the bricks at the roundabout because you made it so tight a circle. Honestly, what ever happened moderation with common sense .Don't make the same mistake at this new proposed site- or accidents will happen . with the increased traffic there. I don't appreciate all the money you want to spend for these solutions that will make things more dangerous
- Traffic irritants do nothing for traffic calming
- I think you should come and ride a bus and see how much fuel we will use and damage the environment more. Add lights for pedestrians and don't design intersections with curves any more or blind cross walks. They are all over the park. It's a design flaw and a bandage is not the solution. Come talk to Transit. Also I am a person that uses these roads daily personal and I like how open and safe these road openings are. Closing them up is a way to cause more issues then good and again more fuel use and that what Sherwood park is trying to be greener. But really you are making it worse

- JC is such a busy road curb extensions will not decrease the left turns across path for cars and trying to get across JC to go to Superstore is always challenging with the volume of traffic
- I hate roundabouts - but curbs aren't going to slow anybody down. The risk at roundabouts is people who drive over the circle trying to drive straight through them
- In my opinion this spot does not have the bulk of the traffic. I have not seen much coming down Cranford
- Again, cost is prohibitive! Erect STOP signs at all of the intersections with pedestrian activated yellow crosswalk lights. And enforce the speed limit!
- I would like the curb extensions option if there were flashing pedestrian lights involved.
- We feel that the curb extensions will meet the need without obstructing traffic significantly.
- Based on the data provided, the roundabout improves more of the concerns and if it improves the flow, then I think it would be better. However, for the longest time there was no speed sign up (EB) between Sherwood Drive and Cranford Drive. I'm sure the sign that is now up helps. The sight line is bad approaching from south due to turn in the road- it's dangerous.
- Truck apron should be built higher than at other intersections I've seen around my area due to the ability of most cars and SUV'S to simply drive through over the apron at a normal rate of speed .
- People in Sherwood park already don't know how to properly use the traffic circles we have. Waste of money. Curb extenders are also a horrible idea. How is anyone with a trailer supposed to have sufficient space to turn. I agree the sightline is horrible. However that road is not intended for through traffic and there are many other options to take to get through. Again if anything should be done I would recommend putting up pedestrian crossing lights
- A 4-way stop would also work and be cheaper
- Curb extensions are STUPID in winter they are traffic hazards. Traffic circles are even more nonsense as the one on Crimson, Chatwin et. al. become skating rinks in winter with vehicles going all over the place. How is that safer? Put in Crosswalks with signals and fine the ___ out of the infractions.
- We hate, hate, hate curb extensions as pedestrians and drivers. They are not wide enough to allow 2 cars to comfortably move down the street together.
- We have a roundabout in Lakeland Ridge and people continually blow through yield signs without looking, do not seem to know how to drive in them and I find it way MORE dangerous. The Curb extensions I understand but as an arterial feeder they again inhibit traffic flow when vehicles plug the left turn lane. The cost is also a non-starter for me. Govt's need to stop spending money needlessly.
- If you HAVE to do something, do the roundabout. Curb extensions will not work on Jim common. IF you do the roundabout do NOT plant a bunch of stuff inside the circle or at the corners. The one currently at Trillium has overgrown vegetation making it very hard to see the pedestrians approaching the circle and actually has made sight lines WORSE. You should be addressing your two existing roundabouts in Lakeland ridge and the hazards you've created with reduced sight lines before you go throw in 2 more.

- When drivers are entering the roundabouts currently in place, especially the one in front of the Trillium Centre, they do not look to yield upon entering, they enter fast and expect others to yield to them. More roundabouts will only make this problem worse and increase accidents.
- Roundabout keep traffic moving and reduce the chance of collisions. Again with curb extensions left turning traffic will hold up traffic following.
- Roundabouts work well but more enforcement is needed. I do not walk through the roundabout at Lakeland Ridge School because I have been very close to being hit while walking and hear many people saying the same thing. The roundabout itself is safe but drivers don't pay enough attention (or are in too big of a hurry).
- traffic circles effect transit negatively, causing physical strain on drivers, and slowing service. they also cause more braking and accelerating, which is hard on vehicle maintenance and uses excessive fuel which is bad for the environment and goes against strathcona's efforts towards a greener community. curb extensions are problematic because they do not solve much and cost a lot, they narrow lanes which many drivers are uncomfortable with and often cross over into oncoming lane space. it also prevents quick and non-obstructive right hand turns. i think the best solution would be pedestrian crossing lights.
- Maintenance for roundabouts is a concern in the winter. They get extraordinarily slippery and the county does not seem to upkeep methods to reduce this issue.
- If a round about is built it can't have tall shrubs or growth. That exists in other round about and it prevents you from seeing the cars from other directions which in itself is a safety hazard. Crossing Jim Common going northbound on Cranford is quite difficult at times.
- Roundabout should be used to slow traffic! They slow traffic, but do not stop traffic. Traffic will continue to flow. It should be the same size as the one on Crimson Drive and Chitin Road.
- Curb extensions will do nothing for speed or short-cutting.
- Extensions are not an effective method of slowing traffic. This was done in the Bonnie Doon area (College St.Jean) and failed miserably
- Traffic circles work to slow traffic but only increase pedestrian safety if drivers know how to use them.
- An issue with roundabouts is that people are usually too busy looking for traffic preventing them from entering that they fail to notice pedestrians
- Roundabouts are proven to save money on gas, and are much better for the environment and flow of traffic.
- Increasing pedestrian safety, visibility and speed are what most residents in the area are requesting. \$\$ are very comparable but Option A is the best to address these concerns.
- Roundabout not used right in Sherwood park. You are just slowing down more traffic and make more congestion on baseline road. The country has cause a lot of their own problem by letting to much development in the area across from Jim common road.
- i 4 traffic circles is they are built big enough considering busses and bigger delivery trucks makes mr laugh when you see tire tracks all over the paving stone surrounding the circle and not on the road because busses truck and crazy people drive over the curbs and stones people need to be educated on how to drive the laws of traffic circles to me curb extensions area place looking

for an accident to happen too narrow to pass and not visible enough to prevent running into them

- Roundabouts should never be used. People cut across them.
- The current corner has poor visibility now!!
- Put in lights with mostly green east and west and weight trigger going northbound because of blind corner.
- Prefer 4 way stop and save \$150K
- 4 way stop

Jim Common Drive South at Brower Drive

- If both Cranford Drive and Brower Drive had a traffic circle and or a curb extension, I feel that it would slow vehicles done and curb some drivers from taking a short cut.
- We think that 2 roundabouts so close together is not the best solution. Therefore, we 4 a roundabout for the Cranford Drive corner and curb extensions at the corner of Brower.
- Definitely will discourage short cutting
- Get rid of the bushes in the middle of the lane on Brower Drive. Drivers cannot see pedestrians. Put an amber flashing light on top of the stop sign at Brower Drive so drivers see it. I have seen several drivers go right through it.
- What about an all way/ four way stop here. This intersection is busy and often the wait to cross over Jim Common Drive is long. In the winter the road is often icy and at times you have to "gunner" to cross the road because vehicles travelling east or west are driving fast. This may also break up the need for vehicles to speed, it may also be safer for pedestrians to cross the street.
- On this corner I feel we just need to slow down traffic more from the east because the drivers fly through there to get to Sherwood Drive also a short cut or just heavy footed drivers. I think its just speeders. I stopped to compliment police for stopping speeders but that was about 3 or 4 years ago. And they were by the Robin Hood Development. I have not seen them checking speeders for a long time.
- Use four-way stop instead.
- Four way stop signs. Only bad when churches get out.
- Anything that forces them to slow down helps
- As a main feeder road, this is unnecessary.
- I do not travel regularly on this route, so I have no personal experience to share on what would work best. When I've travelled this route, I have never noticed problems.
- This intersection does not have near the visibility problem that the J.C. Dr. S and Cranford intersection has, therefore strongly do not 4 the roundabout (hampers traffic flow). We believe the curb extensions are unnecessary also and will hamper turning at this intersection.
- you will cause more accidents with those curb extensions
- Find another solution maybe lights with sensors on one side when needed and keep the flow going.
- again round about is difficult for pedestrians

- The bulk of the traffic comes from here, the road is wide and there isots of travel on brower and jim common south. Round about makes sense. I also dont see many people walking here
- The curb extensions are significantly less money, and significantly improve pedestrian safety.
- I'm not sure I would like two roundabouts in the area that are that close together. I have no idea how much traffic uses each intersection
- I have watched the traffic where curb extenders exist in the county. In particular, on Crimson Drive, they fail to slow traffic and drivers often ignore pedestrians at poorly marked cross walks.
- Truck apron would need to be built higher than at other intersections around my area that have implemented the use of a traffic circle due to the ability of most vehicles ability to simply drive over the apron at a normal rate of speed .
- We have a roundabout in Lakeland Ridge and people continually blow through yield signs without looking, do not seem to know how to drive in them and I find it way MORE dangerous. The Curb extensions I understand but as an arterial feeder they again inhibit traffic flow when vehicles plug the left turn lane.
- Roundabout only if you HAVE to do something. I don't think anything is necessary and this is a waste of taxpayer money. If pedestrians are the issue put beacons at multiple locations along the road. IF you put in roundabouts don't plant vegetation that makes the sight lines worse. Have a plant in place to keep them trimmed back. Curb extensions are absolutely NOT the solution for thus location.
- Same comments as previous about roundabouts. Drivers do not yield when entering.
- For the money being spent to upgrade the intersection the roundabout make more sense. I am not sure of the traffic volume at that intersection to know if it is necessary but the improvements for pedestrians and speed are worth the money.
- my comments are the same as for the cranford intersect. i do not 4 curb extensions or a circle. having this area regularly patrolled by an officer for speed would be more beneficial and also would be effective, and use pedestrian lights
- This intersection seems much more open than the one at Cranford. I don't see any need for intervention at this time at this location.
- You only need ONE roundabout on Jim Common Drive S. Waste of money to do 2. There are very few homes directly on Jim Common Drive S. Also, pedestrian traffic will always be safer if you put in signal beacons. Those would suffice here at Brower.
- A roundabout is greatly needed here. I drive Brower to Jim Common daily and the speed people going East bound is much too fast.
- As previously stated - curb extensions dont work
- Again, roundabouts are much better for safe traffic flow. Constricting the traffic will make it worse.
- Leave the road the way it is and maybe put in a set of lights
- no no curb extensions they make the road too narrow making accidents to close for comfort
- Roundabouts should never be used People cut across them
- Prefer 4 way stop and save \$150K

- or speed bumps/ped lights

Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing (north of Jim Common Drive South)

- It is obvious that there are all kinds of people using the crossing. Everyone from elderly people to youths, walking, riding bikes, jogging and pushing baby strollers. Some are not paying attention to traffic and slower moving vehicles could save a life.
- Definitely will encourage pedestrian safety and reducing speed
- i'm not sure why it appears that your not willing to address the rampant speeding
- Curb extensions not quite as effective but would rather have something than nothing in this location
- Overhead Flashing
- Either one would work because once the curbs are in the traffic would automatically slow down and pedestrians could cross
- High speed traffic on Crimson Drive
- Prefer flashing crosswalk
- Traffic goes extremely fast. Slowing the traffic is key
- Either option is good. Currently, the signage is inadequate.
- Little is being done to stop the people from using this inappropriately. Find a way to stop the people pushing strollers from just running onto the road if they feel it is unsafe.
- this has been of concern to me several times as the trail seems to be used often at night and there is not enough visibility to see pedestrians. I have been the driver unable to see the pedestrian at night on several occasions. I think the flashing beacon is a must.
- The sightlines at this crossing are good (visibility is fine), the road is straight and boulevards already exist, therefore we don't feel this crossing is a concern.
- just put flashng lights
- I've lived here for 16 years, travel here 2 to 3 times each way- there is no speeding or issues on this stretch of J.Common Drive north. Leave as is.
- Just add flashing walk lights. Keep it simple
- Without having the flashing beacons they might as well do nothing.
- The curb extensions with flashing beacons are better as this area needs more 4 for safety.
- Flashing beacons is all that is required like the ones on Bethal Drive.
- Flashing beacons only
- Would support beacons due to proximity to the park
- Maybe we need overpasses for the cars and pedestrians.
- I am fine with either of these. I've always considered the section of Jim Common to be residential so these improvements make sense.
- I don't think the beacon is necessary if you do the curb extension. Do either or. How many pedestrians actually cross here? Maybe you should be looking at more beacons closer to trillium where 1500 kids go to school. The beacon you just put up last year doesn't even work when the temperature drops below -20. People aren't out for strolls when the temperatures drop, but kids still go to school. Priority should be beacons near schools.

- I like the idea of installing flashing lights. It's hard to see pedestrians and the lights would draw attention
- Either option will suffice. I prefer the flashing beacons as it is often difficult to predict if the pedestrians intend to cross or are just spending time in the small green space.
- I do not like the idea of curb extensions because drivers often cross the middle into oncoming lane because they are uncomfortable with narrow roadways, and that makes it difficult to maintain traffic flow. I find it frustrating as a transit operator when I cannot go because oncoming traffic do not stay on their side of the road when passing through. It is a hazard more than a solution. Flashing pedestrian lights on their own would be an effective and welcomed solution in my opinion.
- The Curb extensions don't seem to work for me at all. It just seems like something to run into especially in the winter when snow on the road can make curbs difficult to see at times. Pushing a curb to near the middle of the road doesn't seem like a very good idea. I do like the idea of the flashing beacons or I've seen in Edmonton at some intersections they've put reflective tape on the pole of stop signs which draws the attention of drivers. Perhaps the same principle could be used to remind the driver that they are at a crosswalk.
- NO CURB EXTENSIONS. Simply put flashing beacons.
- Use flashing beacons to alert cars to pedestrians. Curb extensions are dangerous especially in the winter. I don't like them anywhere.
- Either works.
- Don't feel that flashing beacons are necessary at this intersection. Drivers must stop to pedestrians and the curb extensions will help reduce speed.
- NO MORE CURB EXTENSIONS PERIOD
- Don't like curb extensions
- Make flashing beacons only
- Put up flashing beacons
- Speed bump with flashing lights

Jim Common Drive North at Clover Bar Park

- Both options look reasonable
- It is very obvious that during the summer months this park is very busy with parents and young children. When children are playing and having fun, they are not paying attention to traffic. When being chased by another child playing tag or any other game they make up, they sometimes run onto the road. Slower moving vehicles would have a better chance of stopping and could again save a child's life. The child is wrong for running out onto the road but he/she could be "Dead Wrong".
- Improves pedestrian safety
- I think the bumps are an extra deterrent but in a one block span not necessary. I've also seen drivers fly over them. We must protect our children.

- I understand the need for traffic calming measures along this roadway as residential homes with children line the drive without the benefit of fences that exist along Jim Common Drive South. In addition there is a large park which is well used by the area children.
- Use three-way stops.
- Speed humps make people speed up after and are dangerous.
- Speed humps slow emergency response vehicles and damage suspension on transit as well as private vehicles. As well, plowing operations will be hindered
- Photo radar if speed is the issue
- 4 the curb extensions at the Canyon Dr intersection, but not at the Cimmaron intersection (overkill). Pedestrian safety is more of a concern at the Canyon Dr. intersection since it is the closest to the spray park/playground whereas the Cimmaron intersection is some distance away. Strongly do not 4 speed humps as they are hard on vehicles, hard to see in the winter (snow covered) and are annoying/unnecessary when the playground is unoccupied which is the majority of the year.
- bad ideas
- Travel this road 2 to 3 times a day and there is no problem now so don't create one.
- Curbs extensions are a hazard Speed bumps will again use more fuel and wear and tear on vehicle suspension
- The playground zone (30km/h) should not be removed.
- Please avoid using speed humps here are roads are bad enough we dont need a speed hump.
- Although I seriously dislike speed humps, we need more than curb extensions to protect the pedestrians. HOWEVER don't make them so high that smaller vehicles bottom out
- I walk my dog and with my family by this park everyday and the speed at which people come whipping through the area is absurd. I strongly 4 putting in speed bumps and even possibly asking a sheriff to sit there to catch people doing 70-100 through the area. Its a big safety hazard in this area. And especially so close to a park and large playing field area. Lots of people use this area. The traffic needs to be slowed down and unfortunately people don't slow down unless there is some enforcement.
- speed humps do not work for those ignorant drivers who will speed regardless, it's a waste of money!!!
- speed bumps are essential to solving the current major safety issues in this road. Anything short of their implementation will be a failure.
- The curb extensions will help without reducing traffic flow so much.
- what about just speed humps?
- Speed bumps vs photo radar. Put in photo radar!
- I think the best option is having the large speed bump it worked perfect. Is cost effective and can be removed in winter to allow plowing
- Flasher only and one bump by the park and add angle parking for spray deck
- I have no concerns with either option.
- Speed bumps is overkill on this road. Do curb extensions if you have to but I don't think it's necessary. What about short cutting down Crimson drive from baseline to cloverbar. Those 2

existing circles do next to nothing except hurt sight lines. Put some speed bumps and beacons on that road if you want to discourage speeding in Lakeland ridge.

- Do not 4 speed humps anywhere.
- The speed humps are the key to any traffic calming in my opinion
- Lower the speed limit to 40kms instead of installing speed humps.
- This area is very high traffic and very high pedestrians (at least in the summer) anything that can be done to slow cars down and make it safer is important.
- i do not like curb extensions for the reasons previously noted, i don't like speed bumps because typically you have to slow down much below the 30km/hr limit, then accelerate, then slow again for the next one, they cause a lot of vehicle wear (suspension, brakes) and use more fuel. i think a better solution is have the area patrolled better to enforce the limit, which is more cost effective, and install flashing pedestrian lights.
- Speed humps are awful. I've driven on Glenbrook with speed humps there and they don't "calm" traffic at all. In fact I think they do the opposite. I realize that these proposed humps are at either end of the playground zone and can serve as a reminder of entrance into a playground zone, but the current signs and the playground itself should serve as a reminder rather than being jostled in your own car or having extra wear and tear on your vehicle.
- This makes sense because there are many more houses in the area, AND it is a playground zone!
- Use speed bumps only.
- Speed bumps HIDE traffic issues, they don't make them go away. They just make people angry. Curb extensions are the opposite, it makes it FEEL less safe for the driver, so they slow down. The restricting of movement should be enough. Speed bumps are the worst, and just make things worse. People know that driving 3 times the speed of the design defeats the speed bump for most vehicles.
- Again this will address the resident's concerns living in the area.
- curb extensions are bad
- Extensions are enough
- Don't like curb extensions
- Speed bumps and crossing lights only
- Get police to patrol for 30 km/h
- No curb extensions. Speed bumps and ped lights

Jim Common Drive North at Trail Crossing B (near Crimson Drive)

- Improves pedestrian safety
- I know nothing about this crossing
- AGREE! HIGH SPEED TRAFFIC ON CRIMSON..... HAVE SEEN SEVERAL NEAR MISSES WITH PEOPLE AND BIKES TRYING TO CROSS ROAD AT CROSSWALK AND AT JIM COMMON SOUTH AND CRIMSON DRIV CORNER
- I live right by this crosswalk. It's crazy how fast people drive along that road. I won't even let my kids play in the front yard or in our little culdesac. Anything that could be helped with that road would be GREATLY appreciated!!

- This is already a controlled area. Additional road barriers for drivers are not necessary.
- Both Options seem to offer the same improvements -- why spend \$24,000 for raised crosswalk when you get the same results with a coat of paint?
- Traffic flow is already slowed/hampered by the narrow road. Adding a raised crosswalk would be ridiculous. Do not 4 this idea at all.
- you are going way overboard with a raised crosswalk
- You already cause traffic flow problems don't make it worse
- Paint only
- In My opinion the road should have never been extended from clover bar ranch into Cache Court. End Jim Common North here and you wont need the previous two options. I lived here for 24 years and extending the street through has caused all the traffic problems on this section of Jim Common North.
- Neither is a good option
- I walk near this everyday, it's part of my daily walk with my family. People speed through here as well as down by the park. Something more than paint needs to be in place to be able to effect people slowing down as otherwise it won't happen even with a new painted crosswalk.
- pedestrian activated yellow flashing lights & speed enforcement
- The raised crosswalk will improve the safety for pedestrians.
- I don't have a problem crossing here.
- Flasher only
- Walk/ride with your head up assuming everyone in a vehicle is out to get you.
- I walk this trail often and have never experienced problems here so I am ok with it as is, but also have no concerns with a raised crosswalk.
- Speed humps are not effective. Why not instant flashing lights with the crossing area?
- I am not sure what impact the raised crosswalk will have on pedestrian safety. I don't think it is worth spending the money on at this time.
- a slightly raised crosswalk would be okay as it would encourage drivers to more carefully approach, paint would also encourage this without the added wear or cost.
- It's a clearly marked crossing area. signage should work perhaps with some reflective material. Another raised crosswalk or speed hump is an infuriating idea. As someone who drives this road regularly, and someone who uses the crossing area as a pedestrian the raised crosswalk seems terrible. The crossing distance is already minimal in distance.
- I hate those raised crosswalks. Paint or curb extensions are better.
- Paint on the road will not cause drivers to stop. A raised crosswalk will be much more visible.
- make sure the raised cross walk are well mark and warn drivers
- Paint cannot be seen under the snow

General comments

- Get rid of the bus stop further east (Sherwood Drive/Crystal Lane). No beacons. Might help to have bylaw sit and catch people speeding. Noise level is so high.

- There is a lack of winter maintenance from Brower drive heading east until Crimson Drive. Winter maintenance at roundabouts needs to be improved. Even at 20 km/h vehicles slide to the outside. There are 4 stop situations coming into a traffic circle (crimson/chatwin) and we are really lucky if one stop situation gets sanded/salted.
- Thanks for the work and providing the opportunity for input.
- Definitely impressed with the feedback from resident workshops being incorporated into choices outlined at each station this evening.
- POOR STREET LIGHTING IN FRONT OF 320 JIM COMMON DR.CONDOMINUM COMPLEX,CONCERN FOR PEDISTRIAN SAFTEY AT ENTRANCE TO CONDO COMPLEX.
- Look at minimizing short cutting through Brower. Extend right hand turn at JCD N to sherwood drive
- My concern is cost vs benefit. I'm not aware of any of this area being a high collision area. Less restrictions allow for greater visability. Seems a lot. We need to allow ease for bigger vehicles, trailer, buses and snow clearing. Make it too restrictive and you will get more traffic on cimmaron Way
- Giving station letters on overall map would improve clarity. A good presentation.
- Of the 18 incidents, only 2 resulted in major injuries and included 5 minor injuries. There were also 2 other minor injuries in separate accidents. The remaining 14 incidents were minor, resulting in no injuries and with minimal damage so speed was probably not a factor. I truly believe that drivers must be more attentive and responsible behind the wheel. Erecting more barriers along free flowing roadways will not improve the situation.
- Most dangerous corner is Crimson Drive and Jim Common South. No Legal Crosswalk yet constant cross road pedestrian traffic. High traffic corner with high speed traffic on Crimson Drive, Need Crosswalk with speed bumps on all three sides
- Traffic on the 90 degree turn of Campbell Drive is ALMOST ALWAYS TOO FAST! Lots of kids play in the area, including in the cul-de sac (on the street), especially in spring, summer and fall, at Campbell Point, and are not supervised to watch for fast moving traffic. I would like to see this street looked at as well, before an accident occurs. Vehicles take the corner VERY fast and cut the corner sharp when turning toward Lakeland Ridge School, not staying in their lane. No pedestrian crosswalks lines even exist at this intersection, and children should NOT be playing in the street in the first place. My fear is that one day a child will be injured due to lack of supervision and fast moving vehicles.
- Time the lights in Sherwood Park properly on the main roads, get rid of the NONSENSICAL double red lights at most locations and improve traffic flow so that people do not shortcut. When did turning left need all these double red lights? If a driver cannot safely make left turns then make 3 rights or get off the road. There are so many places one can see for kilometres that there is no traffic around yet drivers are forced to idle increasing our carbon footprint for no good reason. Why do the traffic engineers in Sherwood Park exist if they cannot properly time the lights on Sherwood Drive, Baseline and the Wye main roads? Instead to cover their gross ineptitude we get shortcuts, roundabouts, curb extensions, traffic lights galore, double red left hand turn lights and traffic calming to create even more driving havoc!