

**From:** Stephen Benjamin  
**To:** Sellors, Chris  
**Date:** 11/4/03 2:21pm  
**Subject:** Fwd: no thru traffic signage

To Chis Sellors of Councillor Michael Walker's office:

With respect to the issues surrounding Balmoral/Farnham/Woodlawn, as well as the streets to the south, I have done some research (including going through records at our Municipal Affairs Reference Library, located on the main floor of Metro Hall) and provide the following information. Much of what took place did so in the 1970's, well before my employee with the City of Toronto (I started with Toronto in 1987, having worked previously for North York since 1972). There are not many employees with the City remaining on staff who would even have a clue respecting these matters due to the fact that many of these things happened 30 years ago and our files have long since been culled of records going that far back (we are required by statute to keep records for 7 years).

Notwithstanding here is some interesting information:

1) Respecting the closures on Cottingham Street and Gange Avenue to the south, these took place in 1974. While [name removed] may be correct that the closures were originally done on a temporary basis, the former City of Toronto Council, by By-law No. 355-74, dated November 1, 1974, did make these closures permanent, as a result of a report (Sept. 10, 1974) from the then Commissioner of Public Works seeking direction from Council as to whether to keep the roads closed or to re-open them. The By-law and Council minutes respecting this matter are contained in the attached document "CottinghamClosure.pdf".

You have asked me to comment on the process to re-open these streets. Under current provincial legislation, Council would have to pass a by-law to re-open the street. Public notice would be required (advertising in the newspapers) and the public must be invited to give deputations before Community Council.

However, prior to staff proceeding to Community Council with a report to recommend the re-opening of these streets, it would be prudent to invite all affected residents to provide their comments respecting this issue, including the residents on Cottingham, Gange, Birch, etc. Perhaps a public meeting might be in order to solicit input. Staff would be available to attend any such meeting.

2) I telephoned one of my colleagues at our Traffic Signal Section to find out when the traffic signals were installed at the intersection of Yonge Street and Woodlawn Avenue. These were installed on October 16, 1978 upon receipt of approval from the former Metropolitan Toronto Council. Our records do not indicate the rationale for installing those signals other than the fact that they met the Provincial Warrants governing the installation of traffic control signals (these warrants do address pedestrian crossing concerns, accident history as well as traffic volumes). This installation would have been handled by staff of the former Metro Transportation Department, many of whom have since retired. Notwithstanding, bearing in mind the presence of schools in the area, as [name removed] has noted, we do not recommend the removal of these signals due to pedestrian safety concerns.

3) I checked back in former City of Toronto Council minutes respecting the original approvals of the speed humps on Balmoral/Farnham/Woodlawn West. Speed humps were approved in 1974 on all three streets by By-law No. 394-74, upon receipt of special approval from the Province of Ontario to allow us to do this on trial basis (no other streets were to receive such approval until the Province granted us the right to install speed humps in 1997 by a special amendment to the City of Toronto Act). The Council Minutes of that time reflect that while approval was granted to install speed humps on all three streets, the local Alderman of the time, an Alderman Vaughan, requested that speed hump installation on Woodlawn W. not proceed due to opposition from residents (according to documents of the time, the issue of speed control device installation was quite controversial, with documentation of letters from residents of all three streets both for and against the installation). It would appear that in 1976, approval was granted by Council not to proceed with speed hump installation on Woodlawn W.

4. The original speed hump design on Balmoral and Farnham was changed in 2000. In this regard, please reference the attached copy of Clause No. 39 in Report No. 9 of the Toronto Community Council, adopted by City of Toronto Council in June of 2000. The reports contained therein are self-explanatory.

5. Respecting the request for "Local Traffic Only" signs, these signs are unenforceable. We do not generally install these signs unless there are other traffic regulations "up-stream" that would prevent motorists from travelling through an area. For example, we have installed these signs at St. Clair E and Mt. Pleasant (and a few other streets off Mt. Pleasant in the vicinity of St. Clair, as there are internal rush hour turn prohibitions which prevent motorists from travelling through the community to/from Bayview. We have tried installing these signs in other locations where no such internal restrictions exist and have found these signs have no impact in the long term on traffic volumes.

6. Respecting the request to install speed humps on Woodlawn West, [name removed] has questioned the accuracy of our traffic counts taken on March 25-27, 2003. We have confirmed that there were no school holidays at this time. The counter machines were installed in the vicinity of No. 53, which is a mid-block location. We were advised that weather conditions were good.

Notwithstanding, to address any concerns that [name removed] may have respecting our counts, I will arrange to have new counts taken ASAP.

7. Finally, [name removed] has asked why residents on her street were not polled respecting the installation of speed humps on Balmoral and Farnham. The speed hump policies in effect at that time, as well as the consolidated policy since adopted by Council in 2002, specify that only residents who live on the street or take direct access (i.e. have a driveway on the street while addressed on another street) or whose sole access is via the street where traffic calming is to be considered are to be polled. Staff followed those conditions in consultation with both former Councillors Ila Bossons and John Adams who represented that area at the time.

I trust that the above answers the bulk of [name removed]' concerns.

Stephen Benjamin  
Manager of Traffic Operations, District 1 - Central;  
17th Floor, Metro Hall  
55 John Street  
Toronto, Ontario M5V 3C6  
Telephone: 416 392-7771  
Fax: 416 392-1920