



PO Box 1749
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3A5 Canada

North West Community Council
April 22, 2010

TO: Chair and Members of North West Community Council

SUBMITTED BY:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ken Reashor".

Ken Reashor, Acting Director Transportation Public Works

DATE: April 13, 2010

SUBJECT: Margeson Drive Follow-Up

INFORMATION REPORT

ORIGIN

Northwest Community Council February 25, 2010 meeting item 5.1.

BACKGROUND

A staff report was submitted to the March 25, 2010 meeting of the North West Community Council addressing concerns and recommendations regarding the implementation of the proposed Margeson Drive collector road outlined in a letter from the Waterstone Neighbourhood Association. The staff report indicated that further examination would be needed before addressing some of the issues raised by the Association. In the meantime, the Association wrote a second letter with comments on the March 25 staff report.

DISCUSSION

Areas including lands located at the new Highway 101 Interchange have been identified for future land use review which is intended to form part of a new Secondary Planning Strategy for this area. It has been envisioned that new plan policy would, amongst other objectives, be created to facilitate the potential for minor localized enhancements to support the new commuter link function (the new park and ride facility) that has been planned for this location. This process and the creation of the new Secondary Planning Strategy will be informed by the recently completed Community Vision for Middle, Upper Sackville and Lucasville which has identified many issues for future detailed review including Transportation and Active Transportation. It is anticipated that the planning process will commence in the near future.

Staff has reviewed several options to creating an alignment that avoids Cranley Drive. We do not believe there is any viable alternative other than the original alignment. Using the nearby overhead power corridor is not practical, as it could not be accompanied by adjacent residential development. This alignment was selected to create a major four-way intersection on Lucasville Road where investment in turning lane infrastructure could be justified. HRM is not in a position to be able to construct this section of Margeson Drive at its own cost and would require adjacent development to support its construction. Use of the power corridor for the roadway would not allow for adjacent residential development.

The Association and HRM staff agree that making a complete connection between the Highway 101 interchange and Lucasville Road at one time is preferable to building the road in stages. Extending the alignment farther south towards Hammonds Plains Road makes that objective even harder to obtain.

The Association expressed concern with the lack of commitment to a bicycle lane on Margeson Drive in the March 25 staff report. We wish the Association to know that we have now recognized that comment was in error. In fact, the HRM standard for this classification of roadway now requires a bicycle lane be included in the design.

Also, the March 25 staff report did not address the Association's contention that Margeson Drive would contravene HRM's Neighbourhood Short-cutting Policy as it would "introduce collector road traffic to residential streets". The HRM policy recognizes that residential areas are serviced by local streets, collector streets, and sometimes arterial streets. Each of these types of streets has their role to play in the management of the neighbourhood traffic. Margeson Drive is designed to be a collector road for the residential areas around it. The Policy deals with areas "bounded by collectors or arterial roads" and not with the collector roads themselves. Further explanation of the roadway hierarchy is provided in Appendix B of the Policy.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

There are no budget implications.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT POLICIES / BUSINESS PLAN

This report complies with the Municipality's Multi-Year Financial Strategy, the approved Operating, Capital and Reserve budgets, policies and procedures regarding withdrawals from the utilization of Capital and Operating reserves, as well as any relevant legislation.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Neighbourhood Short-Cutting Policy

A copy of this report can be obtained online at <http://www.halifax.ca/council/agendasc/cagenda.html> then choose the appropriate meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 490-4210, or Fax 490-4208.

Report Prepared by:

Report Approved by:



David McCusker, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning, 490-6696.

ATTACHMENT A

Neighbourhood Short-Cutting Policy **APPENDIX B Street Classification**

The objective of an urban street classification system is to group streets according to the level of service they are intended to provide. Street classification closely relates to land use planning, particularly in new development areas. With the proper integration of land use planning and transportation planning, local streets primarily provide access to properties while through traffic and high operating speeds are discouraged. In a complimentary manner the streets in the upper end of the classification hierarchy, such as arterials and expressways, are planned to optimize mobility and circulation within urban areas, while severely restricting or eliminating direct access to adjacent lands.

However, in some older urban subdivisions such as those developed in the grid pattern, the hierarchy of the streets is not as clearly defined; consequently, the logical progression from access to high mobility is not clear. In these areas some definition of the progressive hierarchy is typically established through geometric elements such as number of lanes, street width, vertical alignment, traffic control and access restrictions. However, the desired progression from local streets to collectors to arterials may not always be achieved.

In developed areas where an appropriate street hierarchy is not established, or where the land use has been severely altered over time, retrofitting is often desirable to establish a network which systematically provides a gradation in street function from access to mobility. These retrofits often involve upgrading of collectors and arterials while discouraging or preventing through traffic on local streets.

A street classification system in concert with land use planning considerations establishes a hierarchy of urban streets that provide for the land use and function from access to mobility. A street network with appropriate classification hierarchy which supplements and is consistent with general municipal plans and by-laws, are tools which assist municipal officials in the orderly management of property during development.

The classification system adopted for the 1986 TAC guide has generally served design engineers. However, for urban applications it has shortcomings. Many urban streets function in more than one classification, and others do not readily fall into any particular classification. Recently the Urban Supplement of the Transportation Association of Canada (1995) recognized shortcomings and introduced further subgroups into these classifications. The urban street classification consists of six main groups and a number of subgroups, primarily related to land use. These main groups (as applicable to Halifax Regional Municipality) are expressways, arterials, major collectors, minor collectors, locals and public lanes. Various factors are considered for each classification, such as land use, service function, traffic volumes, flow characteristics, running speed, vehicle type, collections, etc. Additional classifications are created such as industrial collector, neighbourhood collector, etc. The purpose of public lanes and local streets is basically to serve land access and, in most developed areas, give rise to local residential streets, commercial streets and local industrial streets. These classifications provide definitions of different geometric design features in consideration of the significant traffic volume, etc.

Virtually all streets in the urban and suburban portion of Halifax Regional Municipality have been classified by a system such as outlined above in Municipal Planning Strategies, Municipal Development Plans, or similar documents. (Some of the names of the street classifications may vary, but the underlying definitions, including expected traffic volumes, are generally consistent across HRM.) Streets constructed since the applicable document was endorsed by Council are not included, however staff, the consultant (if one), and the Neighbourhood Traffic Committee will be able to determine the appropriate classification.