

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

June 2, 1967.

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

Gentlemen:

REPORT OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Your Committee would report as follows:

(1) Representative from Burnaby Safety Council

Your Committee has been informed that Mr. Jeff Woolley, 4328 Cambridge Street, has been delegated as the representative of the Burnaby Safety Council to the Burnaby Traffic Safety Committee in place of Mr. Fraser Wilson, who we understand has more pressing commitments at this time.

Your Committee would recommend that Council approve the replacement of Mr. Wilson by Mr. Woolley as the representative from the Burnaby Safety Council to the Burnaby Traffic Safety Committee.

(2) Esmond Avenue from Hastings Street to the lane North of Hastings Street

We received a request for a two-hour parking limit on the West side of Esmond Avenue North from Hastings Street.

At the present time, a one-hour parking limit exists on Hastings Street between Boundary Road and Willingdon Avenue plus the streets in between, except for Esmond Avenue.

We feel the request is justified but would recommend that, instead of a two-hour parking limit on the West side only, a one-hour parking limit between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. be imposed on both sides of Esmond Avenue from Hastings Street to the lane North of Hastings Street.

(3) Traffic Control Measures for School Grounds Used as Playgrounds

We received a petition requesting that streets adjacent to school grounds be provided with the same form of traffic control as those adjoining parks/playgrounds.

In the opinion of your Committee, doing what is requested would be in conflict with the standards used throughout Canada to designate areas where schools exist as schools alone. To use a different type of signing, particularly during the school term, could be confusing to motorists. In addition, if school grounds were classed as playgrounds during school holidays, this may create a driver disrespect that would be detrimental to the actual playgrounds because motorists may wonder about the signing when it is not commonly used. Playgrounds are normally equipped and supervised and therefore attract large groups of children whereas school grounds neither have the equipment or supervision and normally attract relatively few children.

Your Committee concluded that consideration could only be given the request where the Parks and Recreation Commission, with the permission of the School Board, has established a properly organized playfield on school property.

We would therefore recommend that no action be taken on the request for "blanket" treatment of school grounds in the manner indicated but that each school be treated on its own merits, as and when requested by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

(4) Riverside School

Following the previous item, we received a request from the Recreation Director that the "School Zone" sign on the street(s) adjacent to Riverside School be replaced with "Playground" signs during the summer months.

We determined that the Parks and Recreation Commission has established and organized a recreational programme for that site so we would recommend that the streets adjacent to it be designated as a playground until it is time to re-install the normal school signs.

(5) Norland Avenue

We received a request that truck traffic be prohibited from using Norland Avenue.

As Council is aware, the problem of trucks using residential streets is one that is hoped will be solved in the very near future by means of a Truck Routing By-law.

As Council also knows, we have consistently recommended against the posting of "No Trucks" signs on streets because, when the By-law is enacted, no signing will be required to connote the prohibition. Those in place at the present time (which have been authorized by Council) will be removed.

We still feel that signs should not be erected to prohibit truck traffic, even though it is expected that some of the streets under complaint will have a by-law prohibition to this effect.

We were informed at the last meeting that the introduction of the By-law to Council is imminent.

In addition to the request recited above, we were also asked to consider the erection of "Children Playing" signs on the street.

In our view, it should not be the intention of Council to designate street rights-of-way as play areas and therefore such signs should not be erected.

The responsibility for ensuring that children do not play on roadways rests with parents and, of course, motorists are obliged to keep alert in order to observe any child that may be on the road.

We would recommend that no action be taken regarding the installation of either "No Trucks" or "Children Playing" signs on Norland Avenue for the reasons set out above.

(6) "Douglas" and "Grandview Highway" Bus Re-routings

As Council is aware, it approved a re-routing proposal recently involving the "Douglas" and "Grandview Highway" bus routes.

The B. C. Hydro and Power Authority has now written to request that Council approve the bus stop arrangements resulting from the re-routing proposal.

These bus stop proposals have been examined and found to be satisfactory.

We would therefore recommend that they be approved.

A plan showing the precise locations of each one will be available at the Council meeting, should it be required.

(7) Imperial Street East from Nelson Avenue

The Council, on May 8th, authorized the painting of the curb on the South side of Imperial Street East of Nelson Avenue yellow for a distance of 20 feet.

Your Committee feels that Council should be made aware of the precedent which this action is establishing. In this regard, Section 13(2)(b) of the Street and Traffic By-law states:

"No person shall stop or stand a vehicle within 20 feet of the street line of any intersecting street, excepting lanes".

No marking or signing of any kind is used to connote this prohibition.

If this was to be done (e.g. by painting the curb yellow), this could prove to be a costly item if this practice was followed for all corner clearance areas.

In the report which we submitted to Council, we suggested that enforcement of the 20 foot corner clearance regulation should first be tried and, if this failed, then signing be employed. However, if it is the intention of Council to proceed directly to signing the prohibition, we would suggest that a sign reading "No Parking to Corner" be erected on the South side of Imperial Street from Nelson Avenue Eastward a distance of 30 feet.

We would point out that such treatment would not be construed as enforcing the provisions of the By-law by means of signing because the distance suggested is 30 feet whereas the By-law specifies that the corner clearance area be 20 feet.

We feel that this suggestion will achieve the end desired by Council and would therefore recommend that this be done rather than painting the curb yellow, as originally authorized.

(8) McKay Avenue at Hurst Street

Your Committee received a request for either a "Yield" or "Stop" sign on Hurst Street at McKay Avenue.

Investigation disclosed that there have been some accidents at this intersection over the past few years and that there has been a sharp increase in volumes over the last eight months. This unusual increase can probably be attributed to the re-opening of McKay Avenue at Imperial Street.

In spite of this increase, we do not feel the accident rate is such to warrant "Yield" or "Stop" signs and would therefore recommend against their installation.

(9) 4200 Block Hastings Street

Our attention was drawn to an alleged pedestrian crossing problem in the above block of Hastings Street which was attributed to the absence of traffic control devices at the two intersecting avenues at the ends of the block.

We communicated with the Department of Highways to obtain its views on the matter. In this regard, the Department advised that:

- (a) the pedestrian crossing situation at the subject location is in no way different than that where extensive commercial developments exist.
- (b) there may be some difficulty being experienced in crossing these streets but, until vehicle volumes justify signals, there is no practical way of improving the situation.
- (c) most pedestrians exercise a considerable degree of care in crossing and the relatively small number of accidents would indicate this system is possibly the most satisfactory
- (d) it is impractical to install signals at all locations similar to the one at hand and the installation of crosswalks, either painted or with signs, would probably cause pedestrians to be less cautious than at present.

Your Committee concurs with the views of the Department of Highways and would therefore recommend that no action be taken as regards pedestrian crossing movements at the subject location.

(10) Kensington Avenue and Kitchener Street

Traffic volumes on the above streets plus the incidence of accidents and the fact that Kensington Avenue is destined to become a through street leads us to recommend that stop signs be placed on Kitchener Street at Kensington Avenue.

We would also recommend that, concurrent with this action, the yield signs on Kensington Avenue at Kitchener Street be removed.

(11) Bus Stop - Burke Street at Willingdon Avenue

The bus enters Willingdon Avenue at Burke Street, then travels South for one block and then East onto Bond Street. There is a bus stop on Willingdon Avenue in the Southbound direction that is located just South of Burke Street. When the bus leaves this location, it is required to move from the curb lane to the centre lane in order to make a left turn onto Bond Street. This manoeuvre was found to be quite hazardous, particularly during peak traffic flows.

In order to solve this problem, the Engineering Department reports it relocated the bus stop to Burke Street just West of Willingdon Avenue. This permits the bus to enter Willingdon Avenue and proceed immediately to the centre lane.

We would recommend that Council ratify the action taken to relocate the subject bus stop.

(12) Gilmore Avenue at Hastings Street

A request was received for some action at the captioned location to relieve a traffic congestion problem.

Investigation disclosed that no serious congestion occurred until approximately 4:30 p.m., and it lasted until 6:00 p.m. The congestion is brought about by:

- (a) a fairly heavy peak hour flow on Gilmore Avenue
- (b) a heavy left-turn movement from both legs of Gilmore Avenue onto Hastings Street
- (c) vehicles being parked on Gilmore Avenue, thus restricting traffic to one lane.

The morning peak period between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. experiences almost the same situation.

At the present time, the only restriction on Gilmore Avenue is a one-hour parking prohibition between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

In view of the investigation, we would recommend that an added restriction of "No Stopping" between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. be imposed on the West side of Gilmore Avenue from Hastings Street to Albert Street and on the East side of Gilmore Avenue from Hastings Street to Pender Street.

(13) Sussex Avenue at Kingsway

The Southbound traffic movement on Sussex Avenue approaching Kingsway has increased, during the evening rush-hour, to the point where some parking restrictions are deemed necessary.

At the present time, parking on the West side of Sussex Avenue from Kingsway to Hazel Street is restricted to a one-hour limit.

Because of the aforementioned increase in vehicular volumes and the delay which is occasioned this movement when attempting to enter Kingsway, we would recommend that, in addition to the one-hour parking limit, a "No Stopping" prohibition be authorized for the West side of Sussex Avenue from Kingsway to Hazel Street between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

(14) Lighting Over Crosswalks

A statement was made in Council late last year that consideration should be given the installation of a canopy-type of overhead lighting for crosswalks to illuminate the road surface below where a crosswalk exists.

A further view was expressed that, apart from the illumination that is provided, the sign itself serves as an indicator to a motorist that a crosswalk lies ahead. This, it was contended, is important in this part of the country because markings on roadways are often difficult to discern due to the heavy rains which frequently occur.

In our opinion, the pavement lighting feature of the canopy-type of crosswalk sign, as it concerns pedestrian safety, is questionable. We believe that a fully illuminated intersection is far superior than a series of lighted corridors.

However, when crosswalks are placed on multi-lane roads, there is some need for a form of overhead signing to warn motorists of their existence. The canopy-type of fixture that is available at the present time would probably serve this purpose quite well due to the fact there are so few in existence they still have a novelty aspect about them. They are also painted a non-standard colour which makes them rather noticeable.

The question of the degree of added safety from a well-marked crosswalk is a contentious one. From studies, it has been found that no matter how elaborate the signing for a crosswalk, the effect is soon lost to the motorist because he pays it less attention due to the multitude of other signs that he encounters. The pedestrian, on the other hand, never seems to lose his confidence in the supposed safety value of the signing. Because of this, we feel that an alert and cautious pedestrian at an unmarked crosswalk is far safer than one who is relying on the hypothetical safety value of a marked and signed crosswalk. This view is shared by others in the field of traffic safety.

In conclusion, we would suggest that the questionable safety value associated with the installation of the canopy-type of lighting over crosswalks is not sufficient to justify the expense involved in making such installations.

If it is intended to provide such devices at crosswalks on multi-lane roads, we would recommend the method of signing prescribed by the Canadian Good Roads Association Annual be employed.

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor J. Dailly,
Chairman.

EW/mb