

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURHADY

November 17, 1967

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

Gentlemen: REPORT OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Your Committee would report as follows:

(1) Sullivan Heights Area

As Council is aware, your Committee has reported many times on traffic situations involving the main streets in the Sullivan Heights area. These streets are Hoel Drive, Lyndhurst Street, Bell Avenue and Cameron Street. Lately, Still Creek Street has been the subject of requests for traffic control measures.

The most recent requests which your Committee received have been for:

- (a) stop signs on Lyndhurst Street at Hoel Drive,
- (b) a crosswalk on Still Creek Street,
- (c) "No Through Traffic" signs on Hoel Drive.

Your Committee has, at all times, recognized that the main flow of traffic between the Coquitlam and the Vancouver areas travels via Lyndhurst Street-Hoel Drive-Bell Avenue-Lougheed Highway. This pattern of travel is preferred to the North Road-Lougheed Highway, or North Road-Government Street-Lougheed Highway route because of the congestive problems that motorists experience when using either of these two latter routes.

Returning to the Sullivan Heights area, one fact has been evident as a result of every investigation that was made for some form of traffic control device on the main streets in the area. That is that none of the requests were based on an accident history because there have been almost none. Instead, the fear was expressed that there may at some time be a serious accident. In some respects, this fear was founded because of the volumes of traffic on these streets and the continuing increase in these volumes.

With respect to this point concerning traffic volumes, we would point out that the two-way volume on Bell Avenue North from Lougheed Highway has risen from 3,039 vehicles per day in 1963 to 5,374 vehicles per day in 1967.

In 1963, a total of 2,399 vehicles per day were recorded on Lyndhurst Street just West of North Road. Almost all of these people were commuters between Coquitlam and points West. The volumes on Lyndhurst Street increased rapidly until 1965 when 2,801 vehicles per day were recorded. However, since then, the increase has only been 81 vehicles per day. The reason for this is that Still Creek Street was opened in 1965 and a great volume of the traffic that formerly used Lyndhurst Street is now using Still Creek Street. This street now carries approximately 1,105 vehicles per day and it is expected that this figure will continue to rise rapidly. Traffic that formerly used Lyndhurst Street is now travelling on Still Creek Street because:

- (a) of the difficulty experienced in attempting to enter the North Road-Clarke Road intersection at Lyndhurst Street;
- (b) in using Still Creek Street, motorists have a direct route to North Road and to Como Lake Road and then to Clarke Road where a traffic signal exists.

As mentioned earlier, there have been very few accidents in the area. The seven intersections which are actually within the Sullivan Heights area have recorded a total of five accidents, of which only two were right-angled collisions. This is an incredibly good record, considering the volumes of traffic involved, and can be attributed to the fact that six of the seven

(Cont'd) ..

intersections are "T" ones. Not only does this type of intersection have fewer points of conflict than normal intersections, but motorists on the "stem" leg usually treat traffic on the cross street as having the right-of-way.

Traffic on both the Bell-Hoel-Lyndhurst and Bell-Hoel-Still Creek routes is required to stop at both Loughcad Highway and at North Road.

In addition:

- (a) stop signs are in place on Cameron Street at Bell Avenue;
- (b) at either end of the Lyndhurst-Bell route are signs prohibiting truck traffic;
- (c) standard playground and school signs are erected at appropriate locations, when applicable;
- (d) a school crosswalk exists on Lyndhurst Street adjacent to the school there;
- (e) 30 m.p.h. signs have been posted on the Lyndhurst-Hoel route;
- (f) a checkerboard has been installed at the intersection of Lyndhurst Street and Hoel Drive.

With respect to the requests presently at hand, we would offer the following on them:

(a) Stop Signs at Lyndhurst Street and Hoel Drive

The placing of a stop sign here would be unwarranted due to the fact that only one right-angled collision has occurred here during the past six years.

It is true that a stop sign would act as a deterrent to the use of this route by the heavy volumes of traffic, but those vehicles would only transfer to Still Creek Street.

In addition, by protecting one leg of this intersection, the speed of traffic on that leg would likely increase.

For these reasons, we would recommend against the installation of stop signs at the intersection.

(b) School Crosswalk on Still Creek Street

As was previously indicated, traffic volumes on Still Creek Street are in the neighbourhood of 1,100 vehicles per day. However, during the times when children are travelling to and from school, volumes are light.

These volumes do not warrant the installation of a marked crosswalk so we would not recommend one.

School advance warning signs, plus 20 m.p.h. tabs, are in place on this street, and this is felt to be sufficient.

(c) "No Through Traffic" Signs

The installation of such a sign would not only be an improper use of this device but it would be almost impossible to enforce.

We would therefore recommend against the installation of this type of sign.

Your Committee would emphasize that our objective in not supporting the installation of additional traffic control devices on streets in, or designating right-of-ways for the major flows through, the Sullivan Heights area is because we are trying to discourage more traffic from using the already overburdened street system.

(Cont'd) ..

We also realize that, if an alternate route is not found in the very near future, the municipality will be compelled to institute some form of traffic control at Bell Avenue and Loughheed Highway. This, in itself, will likely produce a sharp increase in the traffic volumes presently using the Bell-Hoel-Lyndhurst (or Still Creek Street) route.

The obvious solution to the traffic problem in the Sullivan Heights area is either the development of suitable alternate routes or the physical prevention of traffic from using the streets that have been mentioned.

Regarding the first alternative, your Committee was informed that there is a plan afoot to extend Como Lake Road in a Southwesterly direction from North Road to connect with Gagliardi Way.

SECRETARY'S NOTE: This is the subject of a report that was submitted by the Manager to Council on November 13th and tabled until this meeting for consideration in conjunction with the Committee's report.

The creation of this major road will, by design, attract traffic to it and, since the bulk of this traffic is that presently using the Still Creek Street (or Lyndhurst Street)-Hoel-Bell route, volumes on these routes will obviously decrease.

This plan involves the acquisition of several privately-owned parcels of land or portions thereof, and the construction of approximately 2,000 feet of road between Como Lake Road at North Road and Gagliardi Way. The road would involve the expenditure of Provincial Government funds to construct an overpass across Gagliardi Way and two ramps as the initial phase of the proposed interchange and municipal arterial route.

As regards the barricading scheme, we would point out that this involves the installation of temporary physical deterrents, in the form of reflectorized concrete barricades, at certain intersections in the area to re-route traffic from easily passing through the neighbourhood. To be effective, in addition to a barricade on the "through" street, it would be necessary to install barricades at street intersections removed from the normal route of "through" travel and thereby affect the travel habits of local residents on streets currently unaffected by the "through" traffic.

This solution, although beneficial to the neighbourhood with regard to eliminating "through" traffic, would likely create an inconvenience and annoyance to neighbourhood residents, who would need to re-adjust their normal travel pattern; thus the scheme would require the co-operation and approval of the majority of residents in the neighbourhood.

In addition, the effect of re-routing traffic from the area north of Sullivan Street will result in traffic increasing on Cameron Street - a residential collector street. Cameron Street does not currently have sidewalk facilities, nor is the street improved beyond the 20-foot strip pavement. Thus the impact of the barricade scheme would also result in street improvements which may not have been required for at least several years hence.

Plans illustrating the effect of creating the Westward extension of Como Lake Road plus the barricading proposal have been prepared and will be on display at the Council meeting when this item is being considered.

Your Committee, at this time, does not wish to express an opinion on either the major road proposal or the barricading one because we realize that:

- (a) in the first case, the creation of this major road is a costly venture;
- (b) in the second case, such measures would likely cause residents in the Sullivan Heights area great concern.

We do feel, however, that, if arrangements were made to have the Planning Director and Municipal Engineer address the people in the Sullivan Heights area on the overall situation respecting traffic movements on the Bell-Hoel-Lyndhurst (or Still Creek Street) route, we believe this might placate those

in the area who are perpetually seeking one form of traffic control measure or another.

We would therefore recommend that:

(a) the actions recommended above concerning the requests for

- (i) a school crosswalk on Still Creek Street
- (ii) a stop sign at Lyndhurst Street and Noel Drive
- (iii) "No Through Traffic" signs on Noel Drive

be adopted;

(b) it be suggested to the people in the Sullivan Heights area, through the Lyndhurst-Cameron Parent-Teacher Association, (this is the agency which has been the most active in traffic matters) that the Planning Director and Municipal Engineer would be pleased to attend a meeting to explain the situation outlined above regarding the major route and the barricading of certain streets in the Sullivan Heights area.

We appreciate, of course, that pursuit by the people in the area of the question regarding the creation of the major route will place Council in a position where it will need to determine whether funds for the expenditure entailed in creating such a road should be appropriated.

(2) (a) Bus Stops - Grandview-Douglas Highway and Kensington Avenue

(b) Bus Stop Shelter - Gilpin Street West of Grandview-Douglas Highway

The Council received a letter on September 25th requesting, among other things, that bus stops be provided at Grandview-Douglas Highway and Kensington Avenue.

A suggestion was also made by Council that consideration be given the question of providing a proper type of bus stop shelter for those attending Century Gardens on Gilpin Street West of Grandview-Douglas Highway.

Both matters were referred to your Committee, on the understanding that we would solicit the views of the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority plus the Engineering and Planning Departments on the matters.

This was done and, in a letter from the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority on the matter of bus stops at Grandview-Douglas Highway and Kensington Avenue, the Authority agreed the proposal deserved consideration. However, it was mentioned that the present structure of the roadways, and traffic volumes on them, preclude the placement of bus stops close to the intersection without causing conflict with general traffic and exposing transit patrons to hazards.

The Authority concluded by advising that it considered the present stop arrangement could not be supplemented at this time.

The Operations Engineer advised that three bus routes pass the Kensington-Grandview intersection. He added that transfers are possible at Kensington Avenue and Sprott Street, although there is often a long wait if patrons are transferring to or from the S.F.U.-Edmonds bus.

He suggested that one solution would be to ask the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority to consider re-routing the Southbound S.F.U.-Edmonds Bus through the Municipal Hall area. The other solution, he indicated, would be to re-arrange the schedules for the three bus routes to enable a ready transfer to be made at Sprott Street.

Regarding the question of a bus stop shelter on Gilpin Street West of Grandview-Douglas Highway, there is at the present time no bus stop there but, upon completion of the paving of Grandview-Douglas Highway and the construction of the new connector road between the Highway and Gilpin Street, bus service to the Municipal complex should be reviewed.

(Cont'd) ..

The question of providing a shelter at any bus stop would be a new venture for the municipality. All existing benches and bus stop shelters have, to our knowledge, been provided by private groups. However, because this is a public administration centre, perhaps the Municipality should consider bus stop shelters there.

In conclusion, we would recommend that:

- (a) consideration of the matter of providing a bus stop shelter at the location mentioned be deferred until the Grandview-Douglas Highway improvements are completed and permanent bus stops have been established in the area;
- (b) the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority be requested to re-arrange its schedules for the S.F.U.-Edmonds and the No. 31 and No. 32 bus routes in such a way that ready connections and transfers can be made from one to the other at Sprott Street and Kensington Avenue.

(3) Sperling-Duckingham-Burrjs Route

In January 1965, the Council directed the Traffic Safety Committee to consider the desirability and feasibility of closing Buckingham Avenue at Sperling Avenue, or at some other point along its length between Sperling Avenue and Burrjs Street. The following information was conveyed to us in support of this proposal:

"The closing of Buckingham Avenue at Sperling Avenue would eliminate the through traffic that uses the Sperling-Duckingham route quite extensively at the moment.

This arrangement should not inconvenience the residents in the area involved too greatly because there are other alternate means of travel to and from their homes nearby.

Insofar as fire protection is concerned, the Fire Hall on Edmonds Street serves the area and the dead-ending of Buckingham Avenue poses no problems for the fire vehicles.

A traffic control signal was soon to be installed on Grandview-Douglas Highway at Burrjs Street and this in itself should attract motorists to use these two streets when travelling through the area."

The Committee submitted a report to Council on March 1, 1965, regarding this proposal. The following is the substance of that report:

"As we understand it, the chief purpose in the proposal is to reduce the amount of traffic that is currently operating on Buckingham Avenue. There is no doubt in our mind that this physical severance would achieve this end but the following conclusions were reached as to the problems that can be anticipated as a result of the closure:

- (a) Since Deer Lake is located South of Grandview-Douglas Highway, all traffic from the South destined to Deer Lake would be required to perform two left-turning movements - one from Burrjs Street onto Grandview-Douglas Highway and the other from the Highway onto Sperling Avenue. However, when motorists using this route find it is not too satisfactory, they may find it more convenient to leave their cars on Buckingham Avenue near Sperling Avenue and walk to the Lake via a pedestrian access. This would no doubt cause irritation to the local residents.
- (b) The difficulties that will be experienced by service and delivery vehicles will no doubt be extensive and will likely generate more internal traffic movements.

(Cont'd)

- (c) Because the residential area will be virtually divided into two sections, it will be a common occurrence for people not being able to find the correct address. This is especially serious for emergency vehicles.
- (d) While a development pattern based on cul-de-sacs will preclude through traffic, it appears that such a scheme will also eliminate the convenience of accessibility and services. In this regard, the Municipal Solicitor advised your Committee that, if the plan to close Buckingham Avenue at Sperling Avenue is implemented, one result might be a rash of actions against the Municipality by certain property owners in the area alleging injurious affection.

We feel that the traffic movements in the subject area will change considerably after the traffic control signal is installed on Grandview-Douglas Highway at Burris Street. As a matter of fact, one of the principal reasons for the signal was to redirect some of the traffic from Buckingham Avenue to Burris Street.

Another point is that the traffic control signal which existed on Grandview-Douglas Highway at Sperling Avenue was chiefly responsible for developing the traffic movement pattern along Buckingham Avenue.

We would add that there is no accident record for Buckingham Avenue between Burris Street and Sperling Avenue.

In conclusion, we feel that the effect of the traffic control signal that is to be installed on Grandview-Douglas Highway at Burris Street must be assessed before a positive conclusion can be reached with respect to the proposal to close Buckingham Avenue at Sperling Avenue.

We would urge that Council share this view and therefore take no action at this time with respect to the closing proposal."

The Council concurred with the views of the Committee.

We recently received a letter complaining about the volume of vehicular traffic using the Sperling-Buckingham-Burris route.

The investigation which was made as a result of this complaint revealed that:

- (a) though the traffic signal on Grandview-Douglas Highway at Burris Street was installed (on October 29, 1965) the relief from traffic which was experienced by the residents on Buckingham Avenue was temporary because persons South of Deer Lake continued to use Burris Street and Buckingham Avenue to reach Deer Lake. These streets provide a shorter, more direct travel route with less traffic movements and lower travel speeds than are encountered when travelling via Grandview-Douglas Highway;
- (b) Buckingham Avenue provides an "escape" route for motorists Northbound on Burris Street who wish to avoid a possible delay at Grandview-Douglas Highway and Burris Street. These drivers sometimes experience a short delay on attempting to enter the Highway from Sperling Avenue but this deterrent does not seem to be causing any detraction in the use of the Burris-Buckingham-Sperling route while travelling in the Northbound direction;
- (c) the Southbound movement from Grandview-Douglas Highway encounters virtually no delay when it enters Sperling Avenue to travel along the same route;
- (d) in examining the residential development pattern in the area, steps were taken by the Planning Department toward the implementation of a road system which had as its objective the elimination of through traffic movements on Buckingham Avenue. This road pattern, which was made possible as a result of a subdivision of land at the North-

West corner of Buckingham Avenue and Hazard Street and at Gordon Avenue and Hazard Street, made allowances for the closing of Buckingham Avenue immediately West of Hazard Street to vehicular traffic, while Gordon Avenue was extended Eastward to Hazard Street from Clayton Street.

The circuitous street pattern resulting from the closing of Buckingham Avenue, coupled with improvements to Grandview-Douglas Highway, will be a sufficient deterrent to through and Deer Lake recreational traffic to cause motorists to use Grandview-Douglas Highway.

Your Committee is in complete sympathy with the complaint because we are certain the volume, noise and character of vehicles using Buckingham Avenue is such that it must cause a great deal of annoyance to those residing there.

We would point out that much of this is likely due to vehicles circumventing Grandview-Douglas Highway because of the construction work on it.

It was recommended to your Committee that:

- (a) consideration be given by Council to the closing of Buckingham Avenue immediately West of Hazard Street to vehicular traffic;
- (b) a cul-de-sac be constructed at this location;
- (c) suitable landscaping and tree planting be undertaken by the Parks and Recreation Commission in and around the area to be closed in order to maintain the high amenity standards of the residential area.

Your Committee approves, in principle, these recommendations but would suggest that, if Council concurs with the proposals, it hold a Public Hearing on them and invite all property owners in the area who might possibly be affected in some way by the proposed closure of Buckingham Avenue at Hazard Street.

- (4) (a) Cariboo Road
- (b) Newcombe Street

Our attention was drawn to the following situations respecting traffic conditions on Cariboo Road:

- (a) The two severe curves on this Road, plus the grade of it, make it hazardous for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
- (b) Children attending Armstrong Avenue School are required to cross Cariboo Road during peak hours when cars are passing at the rate of approximately 12 per minute.
- (c) Since the Second Street School boundaries (this catchment area lies to the West) have been altered so that no children need to cross Newcombe Street, the same safety precaution should be observed for the children attending Armstrong Avenue School who need to cross Cariboo Road.
- (d) Although a 30 m.p.h. speed limit is posted, this has little effect on the traffic and cars are often out of control. The noise nuisance at night compounds this problem.

We would offer the following on these four matters:

- (a) Because of the two curves and the grade (which is approximately 5%), there are advance warning signs on Cariboo Road indicating a steep hill, curve advance warning signs, and advisory "No Passing" zones denoted by a solid centre line.

(Cont'd) ..

There is also a concrete sidewalk on the West side of Cariboo Road from Armstrong Avenue to within one block of the Freeway.

- (b) Traffic counts taken during October indicate that the number of vehicles on Cariboo Road during the periods when school children are enroute to and from school average from a low of 3.4 per minute to a high of 8.7 per minute.

The average daily volume of vehicles on Cariboo Road is approximately 5,369, with the peak volumes being the North bound movement in the morning and the Southbound one in the afternoon.

There is, at the present time, a patrolled school crosswalk on Cariboo Road at Armstrong Avenue.

- (c) It would obviously be impossible to have the Easterly boundary of the catchment area for Armstrong Avenue School terminate at the West side of Cariboo Road because there is no other school to the East.

We would point out, however, that the School Board proposes to establish a school in the area East of Cariboo Road when population growth justifies such action.

- (d) This matter deals with violations of the 30 m.p.h. speed limit and should be referred to the R.C.N.P. for attention.

The persons who wrote to your Committee also requested that Newcombe Street be extended through to the Freeway in order that a great volume of the traffic presently using Cariboo Road can have an alternate facility when travelling to and from the Freeway.

The question of extending Newcombe Street to the Freeway, we understand, is to be included in the Long-range Capital Works Programme that is to be considered by Council by January 1969.

As Council is aware, the recommendations contained in that programme will include other major projects of all kinds and an order of priority for each project will need to be determined by Council.

Also, any work performed on the Newcombe extension will involve the Provincial Department of Highways. To date, no approval has been given by that Department for this extension, although it has indicated that the extension of Stormont Avenue North to Gagliardi Way (which is a part of the total road link) should and will precede any road plan involving Newcombe Street.

Returning to the traffic situation on Cariboo Road, it was evident as a result of the counts that volumes are increasing quite substantially (29% over the past 18 months). Despite this, the accident rate at intersections along this route has not increased.

The only recorded one occurred on Cariboo Road at Armstrong Avenue and it was classed as minor.

We would conclude by recommending that no additional traffic control devices be provided on Cariboo Road from Armstrong Avenue to the Freeway.

The request concerning the Newcombe Street extension is being left to Council for a decision.

(5) Imperial Street and Royal Oak Avenue

Because of a high accident rate at this intersection, an investigation was made to determine whether, and what, traffic control measures might improve the situation.

(Cont'd) ..

We examined warrants for both a traffic signal and a four-way stop.

This revealed that:

- (a) Traffic volumes are such that they are within the minimum range for a signal.
- (b) The rate and type of accidents also put the intersection within the same range.
- (c) There are view problems at the intersection, which could be treated as contributing toward signal warrants.
- (d) Warrants for a four-way stop there are exceeded.

We then examined the present road layout and the future one for this intersection.

At the present time, Imperial Street West of Royal Oak Avenue is improved to a 44-foot wide curb standard within a 66-foot right-of-way. East of Royal Oak Avenue, Imperial Street has only a 20-foot interim standard pavement within a 43-foot right-of-way. The future plan is to obtain additional land to widen the allowance to 66 feet and the roadway itself to the same standard as the part West of Royal Oak Avenue.

As it is felt improvements to Imperial Street East of Royal Oak Avenue will be required in the very immediate future, the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection at this time is considered premature.

We would therefore recommend that, as an alternative, a four-way stop be installed at the intersection of Imperial Street and Royal Oak Avenue.

#### (6) Macpherson Avenue between Kingsway and Rumble Street

We investigated a suggestion that the above portion of Macpherson Avenue be classified as a through street.

The following was noted as a result:

- (a) Stop signs are in place at Lane Street. They were installed to give the right-of-way to traffic from Kingsway wishing to enter Imperial Street and turning East. This was necessary because left-turns are prohibited at the intersection of Kingsway and Imperial Street.
- (b) Macpherson Avenue, being located within an industrial area, would seem to merit through street treatment. However, there is a serious accident intersection at Imperial Street and Macpherson Avenue that would cause us to hesitate recommending such treatment for Macpherson Avenue. The following is presented in elaboration of this accident situation:
  - (i) 72 right-angled collisions have occurred at the subject intersection since January 1958, and 55 of these involved Northbound Macpherson Avenue traffic.
  - (ii) Investigation of the intersection at various times over the past ten years resulted in the conclusion being reached that, the first time, it was felt a view obstruction in the form of a Hydro pole, as well as a fence at the Southwest corner, were responsible in part for the accidents. As a result, this pole was relocated to the Southeast corner and the Southwest corner of the intersection was truncated.

(Cont'd) ..

(iii) In spite of these actions, accidents continued at the intersection. Because of this, it was considered that the intersection was not too obvious for Northbound motorists because of the more prominent one at Kingsway a short distance to the North. As a result, and in an effort to remedy the problem, a 30-inch stop sign, plus an advance warning sign, were installed on February 11, 1966 in place of the standard stop sign, which is 24 inches.

(iv) Notwithstanding, accidents are continuing to occur,

To classify Macpherson Avenue as a through route before the problem at Imperial Street is resolved could, in our opinion, produce not only an increase in accidents but also in their severity.

We feel that, rather than such a classification, the proper course of action would be to suspend a standard red flashing light over the intersection. The red would be for the Macpherson Avenue movement and the Imperial Street traffic would have an amber flashing light.

If, after a year of operation, it is found that this installation resolves the accident problem, serious consideration could be given to classifying Macpherson Avenue as a through street between Imperial Street and Rumble Street.

Another reason for deferring the classification of Macpherson Avenue as a through route is to await the results of the Transportation Study by H.D. Lea & Associates Ltd. One of the prime objectives of this Study is to review the entire "through" street pattern in the municipality.

We would recommend that a signal, such as described, be installed.

(7) Imperial Street from Royal Oak Avenue to Kingsway

While dealing with the last two items, we felt that the widening of Imperial Street from Royal Oak Avenue to Kingsway would improve the traffic situation.

In view of that described in these two items, we would recommend that Council consider the early acquisition of land for the widening of Imperial Street between Royal Oak Avenue and Kingsway.

(8) Proposed Traffic Safety Committee By-Law

Your Committee has examined the proposed Traffic Safety Committee By-Law which Council ordered be prepared.

This is the By-Law which would delegate authority to the Committee to exercise all of the executive and administrative powers of Council in respect of all traffic matters.

In scrutinizing the By-Law, it was felt that quite a number of clauses should be amended. Most of these changes were relatively minor but there were quite a number that were not.

Apart from this, it became obvious to us that to enact the By-Law would cause a considerable number of complications for the administration.

Because of this situation, a meeting was arranged between the Municipal Manager, Municipal Engineer, Municipal Treasurer, the Officer-in-Charge of the Traffic Detail, Burnaby R.C.H.P., a representative of the Planning Department, and the Secretary of the Committee.

The general consensus of the meeting was that the Traffic Safety Committee should not be given the powers mentioned above and that the best interests of the municipality would be served by the Committee continuing to act as an advisor to Council. The following are the reasons for this view:

(Cont'd) ..

- (a) The matter of delegation by Council to a Committee presents a rather complex legal problem. In this regard, the By-Law purports to give the Committee power to investigate and make orders in respect of all traffic matters. In actuality, the Committee could only make orders within the framework of policies already established by Council by appropriate By-law.
- (b) The Council may, pursuant to Section 125 of the Motor Vehicles Act, delegate its legislative powers to an officer or employee of the municipality and that person may make orders in respect of traffic matters, as detailed in the Street and Traffic By-Law. This Section of the Motor Vehicle Act makes no provision for delegating this power to a Committee or any other body. The Council has already exercised this power and the Municipal Engineer is the authorized officer named in the Street and Traffic By-law.
- (c) The Committee can have no greater power than it presently enjoys and it should not be set up as an equal authority with the Municipal Engineer in traffic matters.
- (d) The question of budget and staff requirements could pose considerable problems that might require compartmentalization well beyond what exists now. There is also the possibility that there would be a number of indefinite areas which would create real difficulties.

Your Committee appreciates the situation outlined above and would therefore recommend that Council not proceed with the proposed Traffic Safety Committee By-Law.

If Council disagrees, the decisions which we initially made to change parts of the By-Law can be reflected and the By-Law, as amended, could be prepared in final draft form for presentation to Council.

We would suggest that, as an alternative to Council passing the By-Law, virtually the same end originally desired, which was to relieve Council of the volume of traffic business presently requiring its attention, could be attained by merely instructing the Municipal Engineer to exercise the powers presently vested in him under the Street and Traffic By-law. If Council concurs with this view, we would respectfully request that your decision be conveyed to the Committee so that we can determine which matters the Engineer should deal with directly and those which the Committee and Council should continue to handle.

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor J. Dailly,  
CHAIRMAN.

EM/dew