

Civic Works Committee

June 1, 2017

City of London

via E Mail

Aldersbrook Gate

I have read the agenda for the upcoming June 7, 2017 meeting of the Civic Works Committee regarding the traffic issues at Aldersbrook Gate in London, along with the findings and recommendations made in this agenda item.

I must say for the record, I believe the report and suggestions contained therein, clearly miss the point.

I have a few questions and comments which I ask for consideration by the Civic Works Committee.

When was the traffic study conducted?

Was there more than one study done?

What day(s) was the study conducted?

What time of day was the study conducted?

What methodology was used in the study?

Regardless of the traffic volume data, it is suggested a minimum one hour field observation during the peak hours should be undertaken at the affected street in question, to verify that traffic volumes through this area reflect actual volume and to confirm the necessary adjustment factors for level of any additional calculations or changes that may be required.

The point to be made is simply this: Aldersbrook Gate running from Aldersbrook Road to Fanshawe Park Road is only about **900 feet in length**? To my knowledge there have not been any problems north of Fanshawe Park Road at Aldersbrook Gate.

Again to reinforce the main issue which has to do with the traffic volume cutting through Aldersbrook Gate from Aldersbrook Road to Fanshawe and from Fanshawe Park Road going to Aldersbrook Road.

While there has been a reduction in speed limit on Fanshawe Park Road to 60 kl/m and additional advance street signs have been posted, these have little or no impact on the traffic volume on Aldersbrook Gate.

While well intended, these changes have nothing to do with traffic volumes on Aldersbrook Gate.

The suggestion that there have been minor accidents since the reduction of the speed limit in my view is not correct. Many of the accidents were not minor and resulted in personal injuries and property

damage including the destruction of traffic signals and traffic silencing walls adjacent or close to people's property.

To suggest any remedies implemented to date resolves the problem is mistaken and not supportable.

The opening of Dalmagary was thought to finally provide relief to the issue. It may have slightly alleviated some traffic, but not to the point where it comes close to resolving the issue at hand

Again, it has to be stressed, this street is only **900 feet in length** and was never designed or intended to handle the amount of traffic it now experiences.

The study/suggestion indicates the traffic on Aldersbrook Gate is "in line" with the following comparator locations:

Andover Blvd (7000 vehicles per day)

Jalna Blvd (6000 vehicles per day)

Waterloo St (10,000 vehicles per day)

One only has to look at each comparator location to see that such comparisons are no more than an apples to oranges comparison.

Each of the comparator locations, are much longer than the **900 feet length** of Aldersbrook Gate.

It may be, given their greater length than Aldersbrook Gate, these comparator locations have the capacity and length to handle the volume of traffic they experience. **Aldersbrook Gate does not.**

Therefore, the comparisons made, do not reflect the current situation, and in my view, should not be a factor to be considered regarding this issue.

The other issue of a hidden driveway sign not meeting the criteria is somewhat "baffling" to me. Vehicles making a right turn onto Aldersbrook Gate from Fanshawe Park Road cannot clearly see the driveway on their right. There is a sound barrier wall erected by the city, and this clearly obstructs the view of drivers making the turn.

If one actually visited the property and location, it should be clear the driveway is hidden from vehicles making the right hand turn from Fanshawe Park Road onto Aldersbrook Gate.

It appears to me, the suggestions made to the Civic Works Committee should not be followed because they do not deal with the ongoing issue of traffic volume on Aldersbrook Gate. These suggestions amount to no more than a "band aid" or no solution to an ongoing and serious problem.

Residents on this short street cannot enjoy their property due to traffic issues. Safety concerns are also at play. Residents cannot in many cases get out on into their driveway due to high traffic volumes and vehicles turning in driveways also create additional safety hazards.

Clearly there has to be some reasonable and sustainable solution to this ongoing and increasing problem.

We have suggested restricted turning from Aldersbrook Road and Fanshawe Park Road onto Aldersbrook Gate in the morning rush (7.00am until 9.00am) and in the evening (4.00pm until 6.00pm) Buses excepted.

This will alleviate the issue and provide a sustainable solution. It will not be at great cost to the city and will make this short street more safe for all residents again.

Another solution is to make Aldersbrook Gate a one way street. This will also be a sustainable solution. However, I recognize that public transportation may be slightly affected.

These are but a few suggestions from residents to alleviate this ongoing and safety problem.

I am sure city engineers and planners can also come up with more realistic and sustainable solutions if given the opportunity to deal with the problem, as if it affected them and their property and families personally.

I am asking the Civic Works Committee to take a lead in this issue by first rejecting the recommendations from the Managing Director of Environmental and Engineering Services Engineer placed on the agenda for the June 7, 2017 meeting.

I recommend the Civic Works Committee instruct/suggest further studies or recommendations be made to lead to a reasonable and sustainable resolution related to the traffic volume on Aldersbrook Gate.

Thank you for your assistance and I look forward to seeing some leadership in making this problem reach a final and reasonable resting place.

Alex Mercer

1819 Aldersbrook Gate

London. Ont.

N6G 3M4

519-488-5178

Cc Josh Morgan

Cc Resident Committee