

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

March 17, 1966.

HIS WORSHIP, THE REEVE AND
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL:

Gentlemen:

REPORT OF TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Your Committee would report as follows:

(1) Rumble Street and Royal Oak Avenue.

We received a report from the Municipal Engineer indicating that one of the six warrants which are used to determine the need for traffic signals is presently met at the subject intersection, while the other five are very close to being met. The warrant which exists now is the one relating to "Accidents Experienced", an extremely important one.

We feel that a traffic signal should be installed on Rumble Street at Royal Oak Avenue but, because vehicular and pedestrian volumes at the intersection are not of the order where they would justify a traffic signal, the installation should be vehicular-activated. Such an installation will also provide for pedestrian activation of the signal.

We would therefore recommend that Council authorize the installation of a traffic signal on Rumble Street at Royal Oak Avenue and that it be the type which will be vehicular-activated.

The Municipal Engineer will, of course, determine precisely the type of signal which will be required.

(2) Gilpin Street and Rowan Avenue.

Your Committee submitted a report to Council on March 7th recommending that no additional signing be installed, or any other traffic control measures provided, at the above intersection.

The Council, however, felt there might be merit in instituting a parking prohibition on one or both sides of Gilpin Street at, and in both directions from, Rowan Avenue.

It was suggested by Council that, though the alleged view problem for motorists using the two streets in itself might warrant a prohibition of the kind mentioned, there is a strong possibility when work commences on the Justice Building that such a parking prohibition will be necessary.

Your Committee re-examined the alleged problem at the intersection in the light of the contention of Council. Our opinion as a result is that a parking prohibition is unnecessary because any vehicles which may be parked in a legal manner do not create a view obstruction to traffic. The only problem which could be created by parked cars would be on the south side of Gilpin Street east of Rowan Avenue for a distance of less than 100 feet; however, this has never been considered a problem since cars have never been observed parked in this section.

We are aware that, during construction of the Justice Building, there might be a need for some form of parking control.

The Municipal Engineer has indicated that he expects this situation to develop and intends to exercise the power vested in him under the Street and Traffic By-law to institute parking restrictions during the construction period.

We would re-affirm our previous recommendation that no additional signs be installed, or any other traffic control measures provided, at and near the captioned intersection until there is justification for such treatment. This, as mentioned earlier, will likely be when the Justice Building is being constructed.

(3) 19th - 20th Diversion and Stride Avenue.

Requests were received for:

- (a) walking facilities on the above two streets;
- (b) the painting of the centre line on the 19th - 20th Diversion to indicate that no passing is allowed.

It was suggested that conditions in the subject area are hazardous for pedestrians and that these two measures would improve the situation.

With respect to the question of walking facilities, neither of the two streets are included in any currently planned Local Improvement programmes for sidewalks because most property in the area is not developed and there is therefore little justification for recommending the construction of sidewalks when there are many other locations in Burnaby where sidewalks are more urgently needed.

As regards the question of centre lining, there is at the present time a double painted white line on the 19th - 20th Diversion at points where it is felt passing would be dangerous. It is the normal policy of the Corporation to paint only one solid white line down the centre of the road to denote that, though passing is not prohibited, it should only be done after exercising caution. However, it was observed that the old markings on the 19th - 20th Diversion were in need of repainting so arrangements have been made by the Municipal Engineer to do this work by painting a solid single white line in the centre of the Diversion.

Apart from this, we would recommend that no action be taken with respect to the above two requests.

(4) Patterson Avenue and Moscrop Street adjacent to Wesburn Park.

Approximately one year ago, the Council instituted a "No Parking Anytime" prohibition on the captioned streets. Prior to this, a speed limit of 20 m.p.h. existed on the two streets during the summer months because they were adjacent a Park. This limit was retained even after the new parking prohibition.

Your Committee feels that the 20 m.p.h. limit is not necessary due to the parking prohibition and also because both of the subject streets are through streets.

We would therefore recommend that the 20 m.p.h. speed limit on both Moscrop Street and Patterson Avenue adjacent to Wesburn Park be cancelled.

(5) Constitution of Traffic Safety Committee.

Councillor Herd submitted a report to Council on February 14th recommending that the Traffic Safety Committee be reconstituted in accordance with Section 181 of the Municipal Act and given powers to dispose of those matters coming to its attention without submitting recommendations on them to Council, but that recourse to Council be available to anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Committee.

Council deferred action on the proposal to allow the Traffic Safety Committee an opportunity to express its opinion on the recommendation.

We have now had this opportunity and would submit the following as our opinion on the matter.

The Council representatives on the Committee mentioned that, from their point of view, there is a great deal of duplication between what the Committee does and what Council is later asked to approve.

Your Committee appreciates this situation and is naturally aware that, because our present terms of reference forbid us from being anything but a recommendatory body, each one of our decisions must be approved by Council.

We were advised of Section 181 of the Municipal Act and noted that it permits Council, by by-law, to delegate authority to a standing committee to exercise any of the executive or administrative powers of Council.

We also know that, in such a by-law, provision is to be made for the appointing as members of the Committee persons who are not members of Council, but in no case shall the number of those persons appointed exceed the number of Council members on the Committee.

This point received considerable discussion because, at the moment, your Committee consists of the following:

- (a) Three members of Council, one of whom is the Chairman;
- (b) Representatives from the Burnaby Parent-Teacher Council, Burnaby Ratepayers Council, Burnaby Chamber of Commerce, and the Burnaby Safety Council;
- (c) Representatives from the B. C. Hydro & Power Authority, School Board, R. C. M. P., Planning Department and Engineering Department.

All of these members have the right to vote on matters coming before the Committee.

We feel that the ones mentioned under (c) could (and perhaps should) be appointed as advisory members only, with no power to vote. Those presently representing those agencies expressed no disagreement with the possibility of becoming advisory members only.

The real point of concern was whether one more Councillor should be appointed to the Committee to equal the number of representatives from those agencies listed under (b), or one of the representatives eliminated and three Councillors left.

During discussion, it was mentioned that the Burnaby Ratepayers Council no longer exists so, technically speaking, the person representing it is on the Committee unlawfully. The person involved is one of the more experienced members of the Committee and we would like to retain him. Being of this mind, we tentatively arranged to have him represent the Burnaby Safety Council rather than the Burnaby Ratepayers Council. The person representing the Safety Council indicated he was prepared to withdraw in favor of the other man.

We next considered the question of what powers should be delegated to the Committee.

It was the consensus of opinion that this matter should not be given consideration until we first determine whether Council subscribes to the principle that the Committee should be reconstituted...

In conclusion, we would recommend that Council approve the principle of reconstituting the Traffic Safety Committee in accordance with Section 181 of the Municipal Act on the basis of the following membership:

- (1) Three members of Council, one of whom shall be Chairman.
- (2) Representatives from the Burnaby Parent-Teacher Council, Burnaby Safety Council, and Burnaby Chamber of Commerce.

These six shall all be voting members.

- (3) Representatives from the B. C. Hydro & Power Authority, School Board, R. C. M. P., Planning Department and Engineering Department, who shall be advisory members only and shall therefore not be allowed to vote.

If Council concurs with this approach, we would respectfully suggest that it ask us to prepare terms of reference for the newly constituted body. Our report would, of course, be submitted to Council for consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

EW:ah

J. Dailly,
Chairman,
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE .