

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

December 16, 1966

HIS WORSHIP, THE REEVE,
AND MEMBERS OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Gentlemen:

REPORT OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Your Committee would report as follows:

(1) Parking Adjacent to Schools

Your Committee received a number of requests that parking be permitted on streets adjacent to certain schools.

The reason for the requests was that the by-law which Council recently passed to prohibit parking adjacent to school properties would have applied at the locations mentioned.

The following are the locations:

(a) Marlborough Avenue between Sanders and Dover Streets
(Marlborough Avenue School)

In this case, the Principal of the School indicated that:

- (i) Present parking facilities on the school site can only handle eight vehicles, some of whom park in violation of fire regulations.

There are eighteen regular staff members at the School and other persons associated with the School often visit, thus augmenting the number of spaces which would be required for parking.

- (ii) The Royal Oak Junior Secondary School is in the process of being constructed on the West side of Marlborough Avenue and parking would normally be prohibited there as well.

Investigation of the situation revealed that, because of the construction of Royal Oak Junior Secondary School, there is a scarcity of parking facilities on the West side of Marlborough Avenue. This street is constructed to a gravel standard and is only about 24 feet wide, with the result it would be hazardous to allow parking on both sides of it.

It was also noted that there are two lots at the South-East corner of Marlborough Avenue and Dover Street which are owned by the School Board. They seem suited for off-street parking use in that:

- (i) they have no large objects on them which would pose a clearing problem;
- (ii) there is an existing vehicle crossing off Marlborough Avenue to the lots.

We have been given to understand by the School Board that it is proposed to cancel the subject portion of Marlborough Avenue at some time in the future.

In view of this and the apparent availability of the two lots mentioned above, we feel that the parking problem at the subject location could be resolved if the School Board used the two lots for off-street parking purposes.

(Cont'd) ...

We would therefore recommend that no action be taken on the request recited in the early part of this report but that it be suggested to the School Board that it develop the two lots at the South-East corner of Marlborough Avenue and Dover Street for off-street parking purposes.

(b) Lane adjacent to the North side of the 12th Avenue School

An on-site investigation was made and it revealed that there is an off-street parking area at the rear of the School which should be able to accommodate up to 14 cars.

The Principal of the School indicated that space is required for eleven staff members, plus others who visit the School frequently.

It was also noted that the "lane" mentioned is in reality just a driveway along the East side of the School and it travels between 12th Avenue and the rear of the School. It also connects to the lane South of 12th Avenue and is probably used by residents abutting this lane for access, although these people could enter on the lane West of Grandview-Douglas Highway.

Since the driveway (which is not a dedicated lane) is on the School property, the Municipality has no jurisdiction. However, we would suggest that perhaps the School Board could allow parking on the East side of the driveway, which would still leave space for access to the lane South of 12th Avenue and also to the School parking area.

(c) Peripheral Streets serving Riverside School

Investigation revealed there is an off-street parking area in front of the School that can accommodate approximately 10 vehicles. The School has a permanent teaching staff of five and other persons associated with schools make frequent visits there. However, there is little likelihood of conflict in obtaining a vacant parking spot because these visits are not made at the same time.

We would therefore recommend no action on the request.

(d) 1st Street between 16th Avenue and 17th Avenue (2nd Street School)

Investigation on four separate occasions disclosed that at no time was there less than five vacant parking stalls on the parking lot of the School. It was also noted that there was very little parking on 1st Street.

The School also has a parking lot off 16th Avenue and it was found to contain space for 20 vehicles. However, in a discussion with the Principal of the School, we were informed that this lot is to be converted into a play area for the children attending the School.

Notwithstanding, we would recommend that no action be taken on the request to permit parking on 1st Street between 16th Avenue and 17th Avenue because of the apparent lack of a parking problem.

We would, however, suggest that the School Board reconsider the matter of eliminating the present parking area off 16th Avenue because it may in time be needed for that purpose.

(2) Rumble Street, East from Patterson Avenue

Several complaints have been received within the last few months regarding cars parking on the South side of Rumble Street East from Patterson Avenue.

Initial investigation revealed the presence of a number of maple trees and, as Council is aware, it authorized the removal of these trees in order that pedestrians would have a safer means of travel.

A further complaint was received concerning pedestrians having difficulty walking Eastward past the bus stop at the South-East corner of Rumble Street and Patterson Avenue. Upon investigation, it was found that the walking area was obstructed by two parked cars. The police were requested to inform the owners of these cars (who occupy the adjacent homes) that they were parked in violation of the Motor Vehicle Act and would therefore need to move them.

One of the owners subsequently wrote to your Committee and claimed that this action of the police was discriminatory in that the regulation which they were enforcing was not being applied on all other streets in the municipality.

Your Committee would point out at this juncture that this type of parking violation is normally enforced when such parking causes a hazard or obstruction. The police determine whether this type of situation exists and, if it does not, no action is taken to enforce the law. If it does warrant action, the owners of the offending vehicles are informed they must park elsewhere.

Returning to the case at hand, the complainant suggested that, to alleviate the problem which gave rise to the action of the police, the following could be undertaken:

- (a) The existing 4100 Block Rumble Street could be relocated 5 to 7 feet to the North so that it would be in a direct line with the 4000 Block. He pointed out that this would not only straighten the street but it would provide an ample shoulder for both vehicles parking and pedestrians walking.
- (b) The construction of a sidewalk on Rumble Street.
- (c) The widening of Rumble Street up to the property lines on both sides plus the construction of curbs and/or sidewalks on both sides.

Investigation of the points made by the complainant disclosed the following:

- (a) The property of the complainant plus the next two to the East (all of whom were asked by the R.C.M.P. to not park on the boulevard) all have secondary access - a lane.
- (b) Because of the shoulder of Rumble Street, if a car is parked on the area used by pedestrians, they are forced onto the roadway because of the slope between the car and the private property.

The pedestrians, being compelled to use the roadway, endanger themselves to vehicular traffic. This situation does not prevail in the rest of the Block further East.

With regard to the suggestions made by the complainant, we would offer the following views on them:

A Local Improvement scheme was presented to the property owners in 1963 for the 4100 and 4200 Blocks Rumble Street and it was defeated by them. If it had been approved, the result would have been pavement 44 feet wide with curb sidewalks on both sides. Needless to say, if Council was to construct such work now out of general funds, this would not only be contrary to the Local Improvement policy but would obviously be discriminatory insofar as the property owners in Burnaby are concerned.

The complainant enquired as to whether he would be permitted to park in front of his property if he constructed a retaining wall on the property line. He claimed this would leave approximately 15 feet of shoulder which, after deducting the necessary width for the car, would leave ample space for pedestrian traffic.

Your Committee would point out that the subject matter of this report is one involving enforcement of the law. If either we or Council indicated that the construction of the retaining wall would obviate the need to prohibit parking, this would really be tantamount to indicating to the R.C.M.P. that it no longer had to enforce the pertinent law.

We do not believe that Council should so indicate this to the R.C.M.P., nor make any promises to the complainant, because the Municipality should not dictate to

the police when laws should be enforced.

As mentioned earlier, this particular law will be applied at the discretion of the R.C.M.P. whenever circumstances so require.

(3) Peripheral Streets of Parkcrest School

A request was received for a number of measures for the captioned streets which were felt would make it safer for children travelling to and from Parkcrest School. The following are the specific requests which, for easier understanding, have our views immediately following each one:

- (a) A school sign on Halifax Street West of Parkcrest School, to alert motorists that they are approaching a School.

Such a sign is warranted and one will therefore be installed.

- (b) A sidewalk on the North side of Halifax Street between Fell Avenue and Warwick Avenue.

Sidewalk construction here will be dependent upon the installation of storm sewers. An elaboration of this situation will be covered under Point (d) below.

- (c) A crosswalk on Halifax Street at Warwick Avenue.

Such an installation will need to await a sidewalk on the North side of Halifax Street.

Vehicle counts taken on Halifax Street do not indicate there is a serious problem insofar as crossing gaps are concerned.

- (d) A sidewalk or gravelled area on the South side of Halifax Street between Warwick Avenue and Holdom Avenue.

As Council is aware, concrete sidewalks are constructed as Local Improvements. Because of the "tight money" situation, no capital works are being undertaken at this time. However, approval has been granted for the installation of a storm sewer on Halifax Street which will eliminate the ditch between Warwick Avenue and Holdom Avenue. This work will be completed in 1967 and should result in a fairly wide gravel shoulder being provided for pedestrian traffic.

- (e) School signs on Holdom Avenue to warn motorists that school children are crossing Holdom Avenue at Halifax Street.

- (f) A crosswalk on Holdom Avenue at Halifax Street.

Counts were taken at the intersection of Holdom Avenue and Halifax Street to determine whether traffic control devices were warranted. Only a few children crossed, and they did this rather intermittently instead of in groups. Traffic volumes were light. We were informed by the Principal of the School that a total of 71 pupils live West of Holdom Avenue. As the School catchment area extends from Grant Street to Broadway, these children West of Holdom Avenue would need to cross five intersections on their way to and from school. Because of the distance between Grant Street and Broadway plus the fact the School is $1\frac{1}{2}$ blocks East of Holdom Avenue, it is felt the placing of School signs would contribute little to the safety of children.

We would therefore recommend that no such signing or a school crosswalk be installed on Holdom Avenue at Halifax Street.

In summation, Items (b) (c) and (d) are contingent upon the installation of storm sewers on Halifax Street which, as mentioned above, is slated for early 1967.

Item (a) will be given attention, as indicated above, and Items (e) and (f) are not recommended because the devices requested do not meet warrants.

(4) 6th Street and 12th Avenue

We received a request for a pedestrian crosswalk at the above location.

It was also suggested that a stop sign be erected on 6th Street at 12th Avenue in order that pedestrians can cross more easily and safely.

With regard to this suggestion, we cannot recommend it under any circumstances because 6th Street is the through street in the area and, to stop it at this point when there is a traffic signal at 10th Avenue would produce a problem of rear-end collisions and congestion on 6th Street in both directions.

Concerning the request for a painted crosswalk on 6th Street and 12th Avenue, we cannot recommend this because, as mentioned above, there is a signalized intersection at 10th Avenue where the crossing movement should be made.

We are of the opinion that painted crosswalks provide little protection at night and pedestrians (particularly the very young and very old) have a false sense of security by using the crosswalk when they are installed at unjustified locations.

Your Committee feels that the crossings in this area should be made at 10th Avenue and would therefore recommend that no action be taken on the request for one on 6th Street and 12th Avenue.

(5) Drantford Avenue and Stanley Street

We submitted a report to Council on October 3rd dealing with a request for stop signs on Stanley Street at Drantford Avenue.

We recommended against the installation because:

- (a) warrants for such a device are not met;
- (b) we felt the Municipality should not create an indication of a through street system for Stanley Street. In elaboration, we pointed out that the traffic pattern being established in the area indicates a large number of motorists are using Stanley-Bryant-Irving Streets as a through route from the Sperling Avenue area to the Royal Oak area. We advised Council that the future through street pattern in the area does not include the route described; instead, Oakland Street is the one that has been selected for this through East-West route.

The Council concurred with our views and thereby resolved to not erect stop signs on Stanley Street at Drantford Avenue.

We subsequently received another request for a stop sign at the subject intersection.

In addition, the applicant suggested that Drantford Avenue be centre-lined.

With regard to the request for a stop sign, no evidence has been adduced which would lead us to change our views so we would recommend that the request not be granted.

Respecting the matter of centre-lining Drantford Avenue, we feel that this must also be denied because such treatment is not warranted under the centre-lining policy of the Corporation.

- (6) (a) Kingsway and Wilson Avenue
- (b) Kingsway and Kathleen Avenue

We received a request for pedestrian crosswalks at the captioned locations.

The views of both our Engineering Department and the Department of Highways were solicited on the request and the following are these opinions, respectively:

"It was felt that, if there was any justification for a pedestrian crosswalk on Kingsway in the vicinity of Wilson Avenue, it should be located at Chaffey Avenue but only if a pedestrian activated signal was installed in conjunction with the crosswalk."

"It would be undesirable to paint crosswalks at the two locations because, if this was done, there would be equal justification for crosswalks at numerous other locations on Kingsway. The effect of painting all of these crosswalks would be a disruption in the traffic flows on Kingsway."

With regard to Kathleen Avenue, the pedestrian crosswalk on the East side of Willingdon Avenue at Kingsway is to be relocated to the West side, which is only 300 feet from Kathleen Avenue. There should be no need to install another crosswalk on Kingsway at Kathleen Avenue."

As can be seen above, the Department of Highways feels that a painted crosswalk is undesirable on Kingsway at either Wilson Avenue or Chaffey Avenue.

We would recommend that no action be taken to install crosswalks on Kingsway at either Kathleen Avenue, Wilson Avenue or Chaffey Avenue.

(7) Gilpin Street and Royal Oak Avenue

It was suggested to your Committee that there is a need for signing of some sort to warn Westbound motorists on Gilpin Street that they are approaching a dog-legged intersection at Royal Oak Avenue.

At the present time, Westbound motorists on Gilpin Street approaching Royal Oak Avenue are compelled to stop. Also, because of the jog in the Gilpin Street alignment, a checkerboard sign has been installed on the West boulevard of Royal Oak Avenue facing the Westbound Gilpin Street traffic.

A check of accident records indicate that some have occurred at the subject location during the past few years but none were attributable to any lack of warning signs for the Gilpin Street movement approaching Royal Oak Avenue.

We feel that the captioned intersection is adequately signed for any motorist who drives with due care and attention and would therefore recommend against the provision of any further signing.

(8) Boundary Road from Norfolk Street to Dominion Street

A number of requests were received for a one-hour parking restriction at the captioned location.

Investigation revealed the justification for such action so we would recommend that a one-hour parking prohibition, between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., be instituted on the East side of Boundary Road from Norfolk Street to Dominion Street.

(9) 6th Street and 19th Avenue

Our attention was drawn to an alleged hazard at the captioned location.

An investigation revealed that pedestrians crossing 6th Street from Edmonds Street Southward do encounter some difficulty. Although there may be a potential hazard, there should be no problem if motorists turning South on Edmonds Street do not exceed the speed limit. A check was made of the safe stopping sight distance required by vehicular traffic turning South off Edmonds Street onto 6th Street. At 30 m.p.h., under the worst weather conditions, a motorist requires 196 feet to stop. The actual sight distance from Edmonds Street to 19th Avenue is 250 feet.

(Cont'd) ...

The parking situation was also examined and it was found that there are a number of violations. As this involves law enforcement, we would suggest that the attention of the R.C.M.P. be directed to the situation.

In conclusion, although vehicle volumes are high at the subject location, we would recommend no measures other than normal law enforcement because no serious problems should present themselves if motorists obey the speed limit and the parking violations are eliminated.

Respectfuly submitted,

J. Dailly,
CHAIRMAN,
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE.

EV/dew