

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

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

July 14, 1967

Gentlemen:

REPORT OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Your Committee would report as follows:

(1) 18th Avenue and 2nd Street

We received a request for an investigation of the traffic situation at the above intersection with a view to implementing measures that would make it safer for both pedestrian and vehicular movements there.

The location is adjacent to Robert Burnaby Park and, of course, there has been a substantial increase in traffic movements in the area during the summer. Volumes are, however, sporadic.

Notwithstanding, the pattern and volume of traffic do not warrant the installation of traffic control devices. Moreover, there have been relatively few accidents at the intersection which, in itself, suggests there is no need for any control.

There is a slight view obstruction at one corner but it is not serious enough to warrant any action.

Reference was made in the letter which we received to the lack of sidewalks in the area.

Your Committee is pleased to report that, as a result of a recent successful Council initiation, sidewalks are to be constructed on both sides of 2nd Street between 17th Avenue and Wedgewood Street. 18th Avenue lies between 17th Avenue and Wedgewood Street.

In conclusion, we would recommend against any action to install traffic control devices at 18th Avenue and 2nd Street; however, we would suggest that the R.C.M.P. be requested to make more patrols in the area during the times when traffic volumes can be expected to be heavy.

(2) Roy Street

We received a request for a parking prohibition on Roy Street beside the properties owned by two companies there.

Roy Street is a dead-end gravelled road on a 33 foot right-of-way. The Great Northern Railway right-of-way abuts the south side of the Street and a number of industrial developments lie on the north side.

Upon investigation, it was found that the south side of the road allowance was being fully occupied by not only parked vehicles but by material from one of the firms in the area.

In order to relieve the congestion problem being encountered by three of the industries on Roy Street, instructions were issued to the company that was using the road allowance for the storage of materials to remove such materials from the right-of-way.

Signs were also erected prohibiting parking along the south side of Roy Street in those sections where difficulty was being experienced by truck traffic attempting to leave and enter the street from the various industrial properties.

We would recommend ratification of the action taken respecting the parking prohibition and the Order to the company alluded to above which was storing material on the street.

(3) Willingdon Avenue and Victory Street

A complaint was received concerning a view obstruction at the captioned intersection.

No traffic control devices are in place at this intersection and accident records disclose that there have been very few over the past few years.

There is somewhat of a view problem at the southerly corners of the intersection.

At the southeast corner, there is some bush on the boulevard. This will be removed by the Municipality.

The other corner (the southwest one) has a thick growth of bush on the private property but it does not create much of a problem and does not warrant any ~~any~~ action to have it removed.

Apart from the removal of the bush at the southeast corner of Willingdon Avenue and Victory Street, we would recommend that no other action be taken with respect to the complaint because, like many other minor residential uncontrolled intersections, they should be approached with a certain degree of caution by motorists.

(4) 5900 Block Beresford Street

A request was received for a parking prohibition in the 5900 Block Beresford Street because of the congestion caused by parked vehicles.

The portion of Beresford Street from Gilley Avenue west to the end of the cul-de-sac is a gravelled road within a 33 foot right-of-way. Parking is allowed on both sides of the street, except for short sections on the north side where restrictions were instituted opposite private crossings in order to facilitate the maneuvering of large vehicles. In the remaining parts of Beresford Street where vehicles are allowed to park on both sides, moving traffic is restricted to a single lane which sometimes causes congestion as a result.

We feel the condition warrants treatment and would therefore recommend that a "No Parking Anytime" prohibition be instituted on the north side of Beresford Street from Gilley Avenue west to the end of the cul-de-sac.

We would also recommend that an identical prohibition be instituted on the south side of the Street from the cul-de-sac easterly a distance of approximately 100 feet.

(5) Beresford Street from Mission Avenue to Gilley Avenue

Our attention was drawn to a parking problem on the north side of the above portion of Beresford Street.

Investigation revealed that there is a concentrated parking condition on that portion of Beresford Street between Hedley Avenue and Mission Avenue. Although this parking does not impede

moving traffic on Beresford Street, some of the parked vehicles were there illegally. The precise locations were on the south boulevard of Beresford Street between Hedley Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue and also on Mission Avenue within 50 feet of the railway tracks.

It was assumed that these vehicles were owned by employees of the major industrial firm in the area, with the result the employee parking facilities on the property of the company was inspected. We found that the area intended for off-street parking at the corner of Hawthorne Avenue and Beresford Street was being used to the maximum but another area at the south end of Hawthorne Avenue usually had quite a number of vacancies.

Your Committee appreciates that the existing off-street parking facilities of this company do not provide the capacity for all of their employees; notwithstanding, there should still be no excuse for the violations mentioned above.

The R.C.M.P. representative on your Committee informed us that the company involved was approached and advised that the parking violations would be enforced. Periodic patrols were made by the R.C.M.P. afterwards and it was found that not once were there any violations.

Your Committee concluded that, other than the R.C.M.P. patrolling the area to observe violations, there is no need for any further action in regard to the parking situation on the subject portion of Beresford Street.

We would recommend that Council concur with this opinion.

(6) Imperial Street and Mandy Avenue

Your Committee has twice, during the past eight months, submitted a report on the request for a parking prohibition on the south side of Imperial Street at Mandy Avenue.

Both times the Council has adopted our recommendation that no action be taken on the request.

The following are the reasons that supported our recommendation:

- (a) the problem for the residents on the south side of Imperial Street opposite Central Park is not a constant one inasmuch as the Park is not used too frequently during the winter months.
- (b) though there are no off-street parking facilities for the miniature golf course in Central Park, this should be remedied shortly with the construction of a parking lot adjacent to the golf course; however, it is possible that many patrons of the golf course might find it more convenient to park on Imperial Street.
- (c) all homes on Imperial Street between Mandy Avenue and Joffre Avenue have off-street parking facilities.
- (d) it is expected that, when Central Park is developed to its optimum, there will be a great demand for parking on all perimeter streets of the Park because;
 - (i) only a limited amount of off-street parking can reasonably be provided in the Park.
 - (ii) people want to park opposite the facilities they are patronizing.

- (c) any parking prohibition on the subject portion of Imperial Street would obviously apply to those residing there plus any guests that may be visiting them.

Because of the anticipated future heavy parking demand mentioned in (d) above, it was felt any action taken today will set a precedent for parking control in the area.

Your Committee was again asked to review the request. The following were the points made in the submission which we received:

- (a) the residents on the south side of Imperial Street in the subject area should, because of their domicile, have certain rights as regards the parking of their vehicles adjacent to their properties.
- (b) the City of Vancouver had a similar problem on streets adjacent to the Pacific National Exhibition grounds and resolved it by posting signs reading "No Parking In This Block Except For Residents".

Your Committee reviewed the matter at hand in the light of the latest submission.

As regards the point concerning the situation in the City of Vancouver, we found that the City had placed two types of signs giving special parking concessions to privileged groups. They were:

- (i) "Parking Limit - 3 hours 8:00a.m. to 6:00p.m., except abutting residents".
- (ii) "Parking for Residents of 2800 Block Pandora Street Only".

We were given to understand, however, that these signs were erected in spite of strong objections from the Engineering Department for the City. In any event, it is our opinion that the erection of these signs by the City does not in itself make them justified.

Apart from that aspect, the regulations on both types of signs are enforceable only upon complaint because the police have no ready way of distinguishing those who have parking rights and those who do not.

In the case of the first type of sign, a person has to wait three hours before lodging his complaint. The police then have to mark the vehicle and wait another three hours to enforce the regulation. Since the basic problem only involved vehicles parking for two or three hours and not those who parked all day, the signing has little effect.

With respect to the second type of sign, guests would not be allowed to park on the street because it is reserved for residents only. This, we are certain, would not suit those on Imperial Street who made the request for a parking prohibition.

Aside from the exceedingly difficult enforcement aspects of the types of signing in the City of Vancouver, there are other undesirable attributes.

For example, the residents of a street signed as in (i) above become the sole judge as to who can park along the street and who cannot. It would even be possible for any resident not requiring the parking space in front of his home to rent it.

In conclusion, your Committee, although appreciating the possible inconvenience to residents on the south side of Imperial Street at and near Mandy Avenue, must recommend against any parking prohibition on this portion of Imperial Street for the reasons cited above.

(7) (a) East Side of Boundary Road from Grandview-Douglas Highway to Clydesdale Street

(b) Clydesdale Street from Boundary Road to the Freeway

We received a request for a limited time parking prohibition on the above streets. The person making the requests was not too specific but the matter was investigated, with the result the following was observed:

- (a) the existing northbound part of Boundary Road in the subject area consists of two moving lanes and a curb lane for parking. At its intersection with Clydesdale Street, the south leg of Boundary Road is comprised of two through lanes, a left-turn lane and a curb lane for parking. Recent traffic counts indicate just under 10,000 vehicles a day travel on this portion of Boundary Road. The existing lanes are sufficient to handle this volume.
- (b) the portion of Clydesdale Street from Boundary Road to the Freeway has, at the present time, a "No Parking" restriction between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and also between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. This prohibition permits the use of two moving lanes in each direction during the peak hour flows. Information gleaned from traffic counts does not indicate there is a warrant for a full time parking prohibition on this street.

In view of the foregoing, we would recommend no action on the request.

(8) Lane west of Inman Avenue between Thurston and Bond Streets

A request was received that the captioned lane be closed to through traffic.

It was not possible to make more than a cursory investigation of the situation. However, this did disclose that the vehicles using the lane belonged to those abutting it.

Other requests similar to the one at hand have been received in the past and all of them have been rejected because they create more problems than they solve. It has been found that all lanes, whether they be through or dead-end, have occasional speeding problems. In addition, dead-end lanes create a problem for vehicles endeavoring to back up or turn around to leave. There is also a problem for graders maintaining the lanes because of the awkwardness for the machines and the fact a lot of the work must be done by hand.

We concluded that, in general, dead-end lanes are undesirable so we would therefore recommend against any action to restrict the use of the subject lane other than by enforcing the speed limit regulation.

This would be done if the R.C.M.P. was asked to observe traffic movement on the lane.

(8) Lane between 7000 - 7100 Block Gibson Street and Paulus Crescent

A request was received for either "Slow-Children Playing" or "15 m.p.h." signs at both entrances to the above lane so as to deter motorists from speeding in the lane.

As Council is aware, it is not the policy to post this 15 m.p.h. limit in lanes because of the obvious cost to the municipality in erecting the necessary signs. The regulation is enforced only when violations are observed by the R.C.M.P., either as a result of them investigating a complaint or in the normal course of their duties.

In the view of your Committee, the 15 m.p.h. regulation is almost identical to the standard 30 m.p.h. speed limit on streets. In that case, signs to that effect are not placed on every street. The only time such signs are erected is where a road either intersects with another that has a higher speed limit on it or where a different speed limit exists on a portion of the street.

With respect to the request for a "Slow-Children Playing" sign in the lane, this too should be refused because the erection of such a sign would imply that the municipality approves of children playing in lanes. We are certain that Council does not wish to infer that use.

We would recommend, therefore, that no action be taken on either of the above two requests.

(10) Douglas Road from Loughheed Highway to Springer Avenue

A request was received for parking prohibitions on the south side of Douglas Road along the portion between Loughheed Highway and Springer Avenue. The reason was that view obstruction problems are being experienced because of parked vehicles on this portion of Douglas Road.

Inspection revealed that this situation is occurring and is aggravated because of the variances between the elevation of private properties and the road itself. Another thing is that vehicles travelling east on Douglas Road often are still moving at the same rate of speed that was allowed on Loughheed Highway.

In order to prevent a potentially hazardous situation, we would recommend that a full time parking prohibition be imposed on the south side of Douglas Road from Loughheed Highway to Springer Avenue.

(11) Royal Oak Avenue and Gilpin Street

Your Committee gave consideration to the situation at the dog-legged intersection of Royal Oak Avenue and Gilpin Street.

We felt that, if land was acquired from either the southeast or northwest corner of the intersection for road purposes, this truncation would make for a better alignment and more efficient traffic flows.

We were informed that negotiations have been conducted in the past with representatives of the Forest Lawn Cemetery to obtain a portion of its property at the northwest corner of the intersection for road purposes but no success was met.

As regards the Southeast corner, we determined that no appreciable improvement would result if a truncation was taken there - at least not to the same extent if a portion of the Northwest corner was acquired. Another problem is that there are buildings on the property at the Southeast corner which would be on the portion of property that would be needed.

The land at the Northwest corner (the cemetery) is vacant and, as mentioned earlier, is the more desirable location for a truncation.

We were given to understand that the reason past negotiations failed with the Cemetery Company regarding this truncation was that the matter was part of a general land exchange proposal involving other property owned by the Company.

Your Committee strongly feels that every effort should be made to acquire land from the Northwest corner for the truncation and would therefore recommend that the Lands Department re-approach the Forest Lawn Cemetery Company in an attempt to obtain the necessary land to eliminate the existing jog in the alignment at the subject intersection. We would add that this matter should be treated in isolation and not become involved in other considerations, as was the case in the past.

(12) Kingsway Traffic Signals

An enquiry was made in Council last May as to whether it would be possible to extend the time for the normal operation of the traffic signals on Kingsway. At that time, the signals were being converted to a flashing phase at 12:30 a.m.

The Engineering Department communicated with the Department of Highways in regard to the matter and, by letter dated June 22, 1967, the Department of Highways advised that it would arrange to extend the time for the operation of the signals in question until 1:30 a.m.

The foregoing is submitted for the information of Council because the enquiry referred to above was made by Council.

(13) Willingdon Avenue between Hastings Street and Graveley Street.

As Council is aware, on March 20th it authorized the institution of a:

- (a) "No Parking Anytime" prohibition on both sides of Willingdon Avenue from Hastings Street to Graveley Street on one side and Brentlawn Drive on the other.
- (b) "No Stopping between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. and between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m." prohibition on the east side of Willingdon Avenue between Hastings Street and Pender Street.

Following that action, complaints were received that these parking restrictions were, in total, unwarranted.

Subsequently, the "No Parking Anytime" prohibition on the East side of Willingdon Avenue from Hastings Street to Pender Street was cancelled. The restriction under (b) is, however, still in effect.

The Council felt that the parking prohibitions that are still in force should be reviewed and asked us to do this.

This has been done and the following are our conclusions:

- (a) Vehicles volumes were not used as a basis for the prohibition because we were aware from traffic count data that the volumes during the peak hours were the only ones that would approach a warrant for a parking prohibition.
- (b) The reason was that, if the parking demand on the street was not heavy and there was alternate parking facilities for those who wished to park on the street, then a 24-hour prohibition was reasonable because the ultimate standard of development for Willingdon Avenue is to provide two lanes in each direction for moving traffic.
- (c) Of the 66 properties on Willingdon Avenue between Hastings Street and Gravelly Street, 45 have adjacent side streets, which means that there are 21 that would require off-street parking facilities. These 21 were checked and all were found to have such facilities. Another point was that these 21 properties account for only 19% of the curb space on the entire section of Willingdon Avenue in question.
- (d) The reason the parking prohibition on the East side of Willingdon Avenue between Hastings Street and Pender Street, mentioned above, was to accommodate the parking demands of patrons attending the commercial developments in the area. This was done, however, on the understanding that immediate steps would be taken to have the buildings on the properties moved back to the new widening line for Willingdon Avenue.

Your Committee concluded that to reduce the new four-lane, major North-South route (Willingdon Avenue) to a two-lane facility to accommodate a possible surplus parking problem on 19% of the curb space does not seem justified.

We would therefore recommend retention of the existing parking prohibitions on Willingdon Avenue between Hastings Street and Gravelly Street.

(14) Royal Oak Avenue and McKee Street

A request was received that the Corporation erect a fence around the municipal property at Royal Oak Avenue and McKee Street in order to prevent children who are playing on the property from running onto the road when pursuing objects.

The property in question is a reservoir site and only two-thirds of it is useable as a playground. The total area of the site is approximately 18,390 square feet. At the present time there is no playground equipment on the site and there is every indication that it is being used primarily as a ball-field.

We feel that the site is too small for ball playing and that it would be better suited as a tot lot.

Being of this mind, we contacted the Parks Department and it indicated a willingness to equip the site as a tot lot and prohibit the use of it for ball playing.

If this is done, we would recommend the erection of a 42" high chain link fence along the lane side of the property and half-way along the Royal Oak Avenue side. The total length would be approximately 160' which, at \$4.00 a foot, would cost \$640.00.

We would also recommend that, in conjunction with these improvements, the standard playground signing be erected.

If Council concurs, a formal request should be made to the Parks and Recreation Commission to have the tot lot equipped as a playground.

(15) West Side of Silver Avenue between Beresford and Maywood Streets.

We received a request that parking be prohibited on the above portion of Silver Avenue.

This part of Silver Avenue has had parking problems for some time now because of the congestion caused by dwellers in the new apartments on the East side parking on the street. We found that, although the apartments have supplied one off-street parking stall for every suite, a large percentage of the tenants in the apartments prefer to park on the street. This is caused by such factors as the apartments charging a fee for the use of the stalls and the inconvenience of manoeuvring into some of these stalls.

Because of the unimproved condition of Silver Avenue (i.e. the lack of an adequate pavement width and curbs), the parking congestion has been a particular nuisance to those residing in the single family homes on the West side of the street in that their accesses to the street often are blocked by parked vehicles. This problem has been aggravated because many of these private accesses are difficult to distinguish due to the unimproved nature of the street.

Your Committee concluded that the request recited in the first paragraph was justified and would therefore recommend that a "No Parking Anytime" prohibition be instituted on the West side of Silver Avenue between Beresford Street and Maywood Street, on the understanding that it will be cancelled when the street is improved to a 36-foot wide pavement standard with curbs.

J. G. Lorimer
Acting Chairman
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

EW:mc