

**TO:** CITY MANAGER

**DATE:** 1998 07 07

**FROM:** DIRECTOR ENGINEERING

**FILE:**

**SUBJECT:** CLIFF AVENUE LOW PROFILE SPEED HUMPS INSTALLATION

**PURPOSE:** To outline the progress made toward resolving the Cliff Avenue (Halifax to Broadway) low profile speed hump installation controversy.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. THAT the Cliff Avenue speed humps be modified as discussed in this report.
2. THAT copies of this report be sent to residents who attended the recent public meeting regarding this issue.

**REPORT**

**INTRODUCTION**

Council members of the Traffic and Transportation Committee and staff have been working with residents on Cliff, Kincaid and the adjacent residential areas to resolve the controversy that has arisen following the installation in late 1997 of low profile speed humps on those collector streets through the LIP process. The process for resolution on the two projects has proceeded concurrently but separately and the outcomes are anticipated to be different given the concerns of the respective neighbourhoods.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

In early Spring a questionnaire regarding the low profile speed hump installation on Cliff was circulated to area homes. The questionnaire presented various options ranging from complete removal to leaving the existing installation as is. The survey included every property in the immediate area - from midway between Cliff and Sperling on the west to midway between Cliff and Duthie on the east and from Halifax on the north to Broadway on the south - although we had also received protests about the speed humps on Cliff from further afield. The results of the survey (which are summarized on the table attached) indicate general satisfaction amongst Cliff residents but a lack of wider acceptance. As there was no consensus as to what should be done, a public meeting to air the issues and allow residents to hear their neighbours' concerns was held in June at City Hall.

The thrust of the meeting was to find a solution that balances the issues and concerns of all the residents as fairly as possible. It was noted that Cliff residents who had agreed to the speed hump installation through the LIP process would not be charged for this project if it is altered. A variety of concerns were raised and a number of solutions were proposed and discussed. (Meeting minutes are available from the Clerk's Office.) It was proposed that a phased iterative approach to resolving the issue would be undertaken by the City. Any changes that are made will be monitored, and subsequently reviewed with area residents to determine the level of acceptance or satisfaction. If further modifications are required, the nature of those changes would be arrived at through neighbourhood participation, recommended to Council, implemented, monitored etc.

The final consensus at the public meeting was that the four humps at each end of the project (i.e., 8 humps out of 13) should be modified through feathering out the edges of the humps as the first phase. This would preserve the integrity of the project for Cliff residents while "smoothing" access for residents of side streets.

#### DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

The phased, incremental, and participatory approach to modifying the low profile speed hump installation on Cliff appears to best address the potentially divisive concerns regarding these projects. While these issues would normally be dealt with through the Traffic Safety Committee, the proposal for modifying the Cliff installation is being brought directly to Council to expedite the implementation of changes.

W.C.   
DIRECTOR ENGINEERING

PL:lml

Attach.

**Table 1: Survey Response**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SURVEY**

	Cliff			Other Streets			Overall		
	Acceptable?			Acceptable?			Acceptable?		
	Yes	No	No Opinion	Yes	No	No Opinion	Yes	No	No Opinion
1. The humps should be left unchanged (ie. as they are).	17	6	6	22	68	28	39	74	34
2. The humps should be reduced in height (see Diagram A).	1	16	12	19	28	50	20	44	62
3. The humps should be feathered at the edges (see Diagram B).	0	16	13	21	45	51	21	61	64
4. The hump should be slotted to allow for vehicles to track through them (see Diagram C).	1	17	11	12	50	55	13	67	66
5. Every third hump should be removed.	2	14	13	9	49	59	11	63	72
6. Every second hump should be removed.	6	14	9	27	44	47	33	58	56
7. All the humps on Cliff should be removed.	6	16	6	66	50	23	72	66	29

98/05/27

