## **Subject: RE: Riverside Drive Speed Humps**

**Date:** Fri, 7 Dec 2001 06:03:47 -0800

From: Ernie Crist < CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

To: "'John Lane'" <mail@johnlane.ca>, Phil.Holland@attglobal.net

CC: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

## Dear Mr. Lane:

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of the e-mail you have sent to Mr. Holland re the Riverside Speed humps. While this matter in my opinion is primarily a matter for the Residents on Riverside Drive and adjacent streets themselves to decide, from Council's vantage point, it would help if the residents through their own co-operative efforts could come to a compromise.

The vehicle to accomplish this might be the SVCA which though not perfect at the moment could and should be used to discuss this matter. Our staff would be more than willing to assist in such an effort. This at least is my personal opinion. To make the SVCA a vehicle for discussion could also be useful in addressing other important neighborhood and community issues including potentially large scale proposed developments in the Maplewood area which among others will greatly impact traffic to and from Seymour.

## Yours truly,

## Ernie Crist

> ----Original Message-----

```
John Lane [mailto:mail@johnlane.ca]
> From:
> Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 11:04 PM
> To: Phil.Holland@attglobal.net
> Cc: Council@district.north-van.bc.ca
> Subject:
             Riverside Drive Speed Humps
> Firstly, please feel free to circulate this note to all of the area
> residents if you wish. In fact, I encourage you.
> I have lived on Edgewater Lane since 1993. I am aware of the debates and
> the traffic calming measures that have been discussed over the years. I
> have read many of your status updates on the Riverside Speed Humps. I
> must congratulate you on the thoroughness of your research into the
> various council reports and the time and effort you have taken to develop
> the retorts to each and every point therein. With all due respect, I
> sense a certain amount of obsessiveness in your position on the speed hump
> issue. To be bluntly frank, the subject of this debate is four bumps
> along a residential street. Contrary to the tone the opening line of your
> December 4th letter, I am personally glad that our Mayor and District
> Council are focusing their attention on more important issues. I will
> leave the discussion of the accuracy and interpretation of the the Council
> reports to you and the bureaucracy of the government.
> I must admit that I have not thoroughly read each and every one of your
> notes. That being said, I am somewhat mystified at the consequences of
> the speed bumps that have raised so much ire. Perhaps it is taking thirty
> to sixty seconds longer to reach Mount Seymour Parkway by driving along
> Riverside Drive due to the speed humps. Whatever the impact on a driver's
> time, I don't see a lot of value in debating how many seconds it is or is
> not. Perhaps there is potential damage to one's car. I think most of us
> can slow down, as is intended, to cruise over the humps without causing
> extraordinary wear and tear on our vehicles. I will leave the debate of
> how many centimeters the speed humps should be lowered to you.
> I have two children attending schools in our neighborhood. Over the years
> they have occasionally commented on the risky speed of some of the cars
```

1 of 2

> along Riverside drive. I have personally witnessed the same thing on a
> number of occasions. Particularly, turning onto Riverside drive from
> Swinburne, as I do daily. I personally would prefer that we space the
> speed humps wider apart starting to the north of the intersection of
> Swinburne and Riverside
>
> To me this issue can be simplified to a comparison of costs and benefits.
> Is the injury to one child from a speeding vehicle less important than the
> additional seconds it may take all of us to drive down Riverside drive?
>
> I respectfully suggest that your time, effort and dollars could be spent
> on more significant community issues.
>



**Type:** application/ms-tnef **Encoding:** base64

2 of 2