

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

February 1, 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) Elgin Avenue and Irving Street

A request was received for a stop sign at this intersection.

Investigation revealed there have been a few accidents at the intersection over the past years. In almost every case, speed seemed to be the contributing factor.

It was also noted that the South-west corner of the intersection presents somewhat of a view obstruction as a result of a high embankment and a hedge. The removal of this hedge, however, would improve the situation very little because the embankment itself is about 8 foot high; also, few of the accidents at the intersection involved vehicles which would be approaching on the sides where the view obstruction exists.

We also considered whether yield signs were justified, and found they were not.

The intrinsic problem is caused by motorists using the Irving-Bryant-Stanley route as a means of travelling between Sperling Avenue and Royal Oak Avenue. At the present time, this traffic is required to stop at Gilley Avenue and to yield at Waltham Avenue. Accidents have been recorded along this route at various other intersecting Avenues, but most of them were due to driver inattention. If it could be determined that yield signs were justified at Elgin Avenue, then the same treatment should be accorded other intersecting Avenues along the entire route.

This solution would not only be unjustified because warrants for yield signs are not met, but it would cause problems when such signs were removed after the creation of the Oakland diversion between Royal Oak Avenue and Sperling Avenue becomes a reality. This route, as Council is aware, is the one that is planned to accommodate through East-West travel in the area.

In view of the foregoing, we would recommend against the installation of either stop or yield signs at Elgin Avenue and Irving Street.

(2) Stanley Street and Brantford Avenue

Twice during the past four months we have reported on a request for a stop sign at the Stanley-Brantford intersection.

On both occasions, the Council concurred with our views that such an installation should not be made because:

- (a) warrants for such a device are not met;
- (b) the municipality should not create an indication of a through street system for Stanley Street.

The situation here is identical to that mentioned in the previous report; viz., that motorists are using Stanley-Bryant-Irving Streets as a through route from Sperling Avenue to the Royal Oak Avenue areas. As indicated in that report, Oakland Street is destined to serve the area for east-west travel.

We received a further request for either a stop sign or a yield sign on Stanley Street at Brantford Avenue.

We would point out that our previous report took into account the possibility of both a yield sign and a stop sign, but in both cases it was considered unjustified.

A re-examination as a result of this latest request has in no way altered our original view.

We would therefore recommend that Council take no action with respect to the latest request.

(3) Bus Stop in front of 5179 Rumble Street

Your Committee has, during the past year, twice reported on a request to relocate the above mentioned bus stop.

In both cases, the Council concurred with out views that the stop should not be relocated, essentially for the following reasons:

- (a) from a transit service standpoint, the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority would prefer that the stop remain because it is in a position where it best serves the people in the area,
- (b) if the stop was moved, this would not only inconvenience transit patrons but it would likely disturb the merchants in the area of the new stop position.
- (c) The bus stop is in a farside position, which is in accordance with policy.

We have again recieved the same request and also a suggestion that, if the bus stop could not be relocated, a commercial loading zone be established immediately West of the bus stop.

The matter was investigated for the third time, and the most significant point noted was that the merchants in the Royal Oak-Rumble area have now indicated they would support the relocation of the bus stop. These people, when approached last year in regard to the matter, almost unanimously felt that the relocation of the bus stop would have some detrimental effect on their businesses.

However, because we still bore in mind the fact that the municipality has an obligation to the residents living to the North and East of Royal Oak Avenue, discussions were held with representatives from the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority at the subject location in an effort to find a solution to the problem.

It was decided that the bus stop could be moved to a point 50 feet to the West of its existing position and re-established as a bus zone while, at the same time, the existing bus stop on Rumble Street at MacGregor Avenue could be moved West to Arthur Avenue. This would then allow space in front of 5179 Rumble Street for a loading area, which was one of the points concerning the person making the request for the bus stop relocation. It should be added here that this person has no access from a lane and therefore must depend on deliveries from the street.

We would recommend that the existing bus stop in front of 5179 Rumble Street be relocated to a point approximately 50 feet to the West and established as a bus zone, and that the bus stop on Rumble Street at MacGregor Avenue be relocated West to Arthur Avenue.

(4) Lane between 3800 Blocks Triumph and Pandora Streets

As a result of a request from the St. Helen's School Board for signs at each end of the above lane to warn motorists that children may be in the area, the standard school advance warning signs were erected in the lane because it bisects property used by the school.

We would recommend that this action be ratified.

(5) Bus Stop in front of 4178 Smith Avenue

We reported to Council last October on a request that the bus stop in front of 4178 Smith Avenue be relocated.

Council concurred with our views that the request should not be granted because the bus stop is located in a position that is dictated by the bus stop policy of both the municipality and the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority.

It was reported then that the bus stop in question had been moved northward some months earlier when the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority encountered a car parking problem in front of 4178 Smith Avenue but, when this was brought to the attention of the municipality, the bus stop was relocated to its present position.

Your Committee again received a request from the owner of the property at 4178 Smith Avenue that the matter of moving the bus stop be reconsidered.

A review indicates that there is no justification for altering our previous opinion so we would recommend that no action be taken to relocate the subject stop because of the bus stop policy and the fact no special conditions exist which would dictate the need to relocate the stop.

In order that Council may again be aware of the points made by the person desiring the bus stop relocation, we would enumerate them hereunder:

- (a) the bus now stops close to the windows of some suites in the apartment and causes a disturbance to the tenants there.
- (b) with the bus stop in front of the door to the premises, patrons waiting litter paper and other similar things. This litter plus dirt finds its way onto the private property and is often tracked into the building.
- (c) The owner of the apartment proposes to extend his lawn area to improve the appearance of the building.
- (d) many bus patrons wait inside the entrance to the building.
- (e) the position of the bus stop permits cars to park between the stop and the lane, which creates a hazardous situation for persons entering Smith Avenue from the lane. This could be overcome by prohibiting parking altogether in front of the apartment.

- (f) the presence of the bus stop prevents tenants parking to unload goods which they purchase.

Your Committee feels that some of the points of complaint do not truly involve the location of the bus stop. The other points, though perhaps pertinent, do not in themselves justify the relocation of the bus stop.

(6) Sixth Street and Edmonds Street

We submitted a report to Council on December 19, 1966, dealing with traffic movements on Sixth Street from Edmonds Street Southward.

The report contained the results of our investigation of traffic movements in a Southward direction but made no reference to movements in the opposite direction.

We recommended at that time that no measures, other than normal law enforcement, be implemented because no serious problems should present themselves if motorists obey the speed limit and the parking violations mentioned in the report were eliminated.

The Council referred the subject of our report back to us for our views on whether traffic hazards exist as a result of the Northward bound movement on Sixth Street approaching Edmonds Street.

We would point out that our previous report was primarily concerned with the traffic situation on Sixth Street at 19th Avenue, which is one block South of Edmonds Street. The problem alleged here was that pedestrians had difficulty crossing Sixth Street because of the speed of vehicles turning off Edmonds Street onto Sixth Street and proceeding South.

The investigation which was made in connection with the North-bound movement on Sixth Street disclosed that volumes are slightly less in the morning rush hour than the Southbound evening rush hour volumes. Sixth Street is a main artery and most of the rush hour volumes travelling in one direction return via the same route.

Although volumes are high, we feel that a cautious pedestrian can cross Sixth Street safely if he does not rely solely on the hypothetical safety features of a painted crosswalk.

As regards the intersection on Sixth Street and Edmonds Street, the main flow of traffic travelling in both directions here is continuous. The sharp bend at the junction of these two streets necessitates traffic reducing speed to something less than 30 m.p.h. To install crosswalks in the vicinity of this bend would be quite hazardous when it is borne in mind that there are high volumes of traffic on the street. The crossing situation at 19th Avenue is slightly less hazardous than at Edmonds Street and this is where pedestrians should cross.

In view of the foregoing, we would not recommend the painting of marked crosswalks on Sixth Street at either Edmonds Street or 19th Avenue.

As mentioned in our previous report, the R.C.M.P. will be giving attention to the parking situation on Sixth Street in order to eliminate violations in that regard.

(7) Rumble Street in the vicinity of Buller Avenue

We received a complaint concerning traffic speeding on Rumble Street in the vicinity of Buller Avenue.

It was also mentioned that many motorists fail to yield the right-of-way to persons attempting to cross Rumble Street in the crosswalk there. Particular concern was expressed about this point because most of those crossing are school children.

The entire situation was investigated and it was revealed that, in 1961, a school crosswalk was installed on Rumble Street at Buller Avenue. This was done before the Principal of the school nearby (Clinton Street School) indicated he would supply a school boy patrol. To-day, we ensure that this consent by the Principal is obtained before providing a school crosswalk.

continued

In 1961, the Principal indicated he had no desire to participate in the organization of a patrol for the crosswalk and, as a result, one was not provided.

Because of this latest complaint, we contacted the new Principal of the school and he too expressed reluctance in providing patrol service because the crosswalk is two blocks from the school.

The Principal cannot be compelled to provide the school boy patrol service so we can only recommend that, other than the R.C.M.P. making patrols to observe violations, no other action be taken.

(8) 18th Avenue and 16th Street

A complaint was received concerning a high number of traffic accidents at this intersection.

A check of the accident files indicated that only five have occurred during the past six years. The intersection itself was found to be fairly open and no traffic control devices are in place.

Also noted was the intersection of 16th Street and 17th Avenue. This one, like the other one, has experienced minor accidents.

From an examination of the testimony provided by the drivers involved in all of the accidents at both intersections, it was noted that the one common contributing factor was driver inattention. This attitude can never be improved by installing traffic control devices.

In view of the foregoing, we would recommend against the installation of any traffic signs at the two intersections mentioned.

(9) Traffic signals on Kingsway

It was suggested at the Council meeting on November 21, 1966, that the various traffic signals on Kingsway should be numbered so as to enable motorists to more easily locate intersecting streets.

The views of the Department of Highways were solicited on this matter and it was indicated the Department would not participate in any scheme of that sort, but would assist the municipality in finding locations along Kingsway where we would be permitted to suspend such signs of our own.

In endeavouring to evaluate the justification for such signing, we considered the following points:

- (a) Because the municipality could not use any part of the existing signal system on Kingsway for suspending the numbered traffic signs, we would have to mount them on a cable or a davit pole of our own. This would, of course, be costly. To mount them on existing poles as we do parking signs would only have the same value as the existing street name signs.

- (b) If such signs were to be mounted only at signalized intersections, there would need to be a total of 22 signs installed. Those would only give direction to traffic on Kingsway.
- (c) To be of any value, the signs would need to be at least 12" square, but preferably 18". This could conflict with existing, as well as future traffic control signs, such as "No Left Turns", "Signals Set at 29 m.p.h.", etc.
- (d) The most important factor was the question of just how many people would use such a system. The first problem would be in informing the public as to the meaning of the numbers. The second is that, on rainy nights, there is some doubt as to whether they could be readily seen. It seemed to us that, if a visitor was being referred to a specific street intersecting Kingsway, it would be better to identify the area near the intersecting street by making reference to some significant building, such as Simpsons-Sears, Kelly-Douglas, Dominion Stores, etc.

In conclusion, we feel that any effort on a small scale would have an extremely limited value and would be difficult for the motorists to understand. To do it on a larger scale would naturally be more costly and this we do not consider can be justified.

We would therefore recommend that no action be taken with respect to the suggestion that the traffic signals on Kingsway be numbered.

(10) Sussex Avenue adjacent to the Kelly-Douglas Building

A request was received for a crosswalk from the main building of the Kelly-Douglas and Company Limited plant on the East side of Sussex Avenue to the employees parking lot on the West side.

We feel the crosswalk should not be installed for the following reasons:

- (a) Its location would be within 500 feet of the signalized intersection at Kingsway and Sussex Avenue.
- (b) Vehicle volumes are not heavy on Sussex Avenue.
- (c) Pedestrian traffic is light and would only use the crosswalk for possibly three short periods a day.

In view of this, we would recommend that the request for the crosswalk not be granted.

(11) Noel Drive and Lyndhurst Street

We received a request that the traffic situation on the above streets be investigated to determine what measures could be implemented that would make for safer vehicular and pedestrian traffic movements.

It was suggested that motorists who are unfamiliar with the "Sullivan Heights" area travel West on Lyndhurst Street and then turn Southerly on Noel Drive without realizing that a residential area lies ahead.

We would point out that, as a result of previous requests for traffic control devices on the subject streets, 30 m.p.h. speed limit signs were installed at both ends and trucks have been prohibited from using the streets. In addition, the portion of Lyndhurst Street adjacent to the school is signed and it has a marked crosswalk to indicate the presence of the school; also, a checkerboard sign has been erected at Lyndhurst Street and Noel Drive to warn Westbound motorists of a change in the alignment of the road.

We feel that the streets are adequately signed and, if the signs are obeyed, no undue problems should occur. If the directions on the signs are not obeyed, then the R.C.M.P. should be asked to give the area attention.

It was also suggested to us that, now Noel Drive has been extended Northward to connect with Still Creek Street, this has aggravated the problem which was alleged to exist.

A search of the accident files failed to reveal any accident history and it is not expected that this extension of Noel Drive will cause any traffic problems.

We would therefore conclude by recommending that no action be taken to provide any additional signing on the streets involved.

(12) North Sea Avenue

We received a request that a centre line be painted on North Sea Avenue. It was contended that, even though the centre-lining policy of the Corporation does not allow for such treatment on the street, there might be justification for one because the area is frequently foggy.

In general, the centre-lining policy decrees that only through streets shall be centre-lined. There are a few exceptions but none of them cover a street like Sea Avenue.

It is evident that, if there was to be a deviation from the policy by centre-lining Sea Avenue, then this treatment should be extended to all other streets where similar conditions exist.

During the field inspection, it was noted that Sea Avenue curves to the North-West as it approaches Highfield Drive and there is a steep embankment. Because of the potential hazard caused by this situation, arrangements were made to install reflectorized delineators around the curve.

We feel that this action is far superior to centre-lining the street, because, in essence, the problem reported to us was that motorists were having difficulty remaining on the road when travelling around the curve during foggy conditions.

We would recommend that no action be taken to centre-line Sea Avenue but that Council ratify the installation of the reflectorized delineators mentioned above.

(13) Hastings Street from West of Springer Avenue to Holdom Avenue

It was suggested to us that there is congestion on the North side of the above portion of Hastings Street between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. due to cars parking there.

The existing pavement on Hastings Street between Springer Avenue and Holdom Avenue is about 33 feet in width. The distance from the existing centre-line to the face of the North curb is 20 feet, of which 18" is a concrete gutter. This means that the effective width of pavement for moving traffic is 18½ feet. Two moving lanes for traffic cannot be reasonably accommodated in a width of 18½ feet.

Because it is desirable to keep the moving traffic in one lane, no parking prohibition should be instituted at the subject location.

The matter can be reviewed when the final full widening of Hastings Street occurs in this area.

In the meantime, we would recommend that no action be taken on the suggestion contained in the first paragraph of this report.

(14) (a) Maywood Street West from Silver Avenue
(b) Silver Avenue between Maywood Street and Imperial Street

We submitted a report to Council on December 5, 1966 dealing with a complaint concerning parking on Silver Avenue between Maywood Street and Imperial Street.

During consideration of this report, it was mentioned that vehicular parking on Maywood Street West from Silver Avenue often causes a view problem.

It was also suggested that the investigation of this situation be made on a Friday evening because that is when the problem most frequently occurs.

In addition, we were asked to check the parking situation on Silver Avenue between Maywood Street and Imperial Street on a Friday evening for the same reason.

With respect to parking on Silver Avenue between Maywood Street and Imperial Street, a check was made twice on a Friday evening (at 7:52 p.m. and 9 p.m.) and it was observed that no one was parked at these times on either side of the street. The following evening, two were parked in front of a house on the West side and none on the other side of the street.

As indicated in our last report, there seems/^{to be}no problem of parking congestion on this portion of Silver Avenue.

Parking on Maywood Street between Silver Avenue and McKay Avenue was investigated at the same time and it was found that all available roadside parking space was occupied. A check of the licence plates of the vehicles parked indicated that the same ones occupied the spaces all evening, which would suggest that local residents were parked there and not shoppers at Simpsons-Soars.

During our investigation, we noted what could be considered a view obstruction at the North-East corner of Maywood Street and McKay Avenue in the form of four large maple trees. However, no accidents have occurred at that location which can be attributed to this possible view obstruction, probably because traffic is compelled to stop before entering Maywood Street. It is also possible that the existence of these trees could be encouraging motorists to exercise the desired caution before entering Maywood Street.

As a result of our investigations, we can only conclude that there are no serious problems at this time on either of the streets mentioned in caption due to parking or view obstructions.

We would therefore recommend that no action be taken in regard to traffic control measures at either of the two locations.

- (15) (a) Hastings Street and Duncan Avenue
(b) Sperling Avenue and Union Street

We received a suggestion that measures be introduced which would enable the school boy patrols at the two captioned locations to discharge their functions with greater safety to themselves and others.

Investigation during the 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. period revealed that there were ample gaps in the traffic flow to allow for the safe crossing of pedestrians. However, it was also noted that there was no school boy patrol at the crosswalk and that one child arrived at 8:05 to cross the street.

During the afternoon inspection, we found that the majority of children crossed between 3 p.m. and 3:25 p.m. The school boy patrol arrived at 3:04 p.m. and left at 3:15 p.m.

With regard to Sperling Avenue and Union Street, virtually the same situation existed there in terms of gaps in the traffic flow. In addition, the school boy patrol was only on duty between 8:42 a.m. and 8:54 a.m. even though the pupils were crossing between 8:10 a.m. and 9 a.m. Though crossings in the afternoon were made without any difficulty, the patrols were on duty only between 2:35 p.m. and 2:50 p.m. and again at 3 p.m. to 3:04 p.m.

From a traffic volume standpoint, there should be no problem at either of the two crosswalks insofar as student crossing movements are concerned.

There are, however, a few points that could improve the situation but it would require the co-operation of both the parents and the school authorities.

From our observations of the traffic volumes at almost all crosswalks in the municipality, these volumes decrease quite noticeably after 8:30 a.m. We feel, in the interest of safety, that parents should arrange their children's departures from their homes so that the children cross streets between 8:30 a.m. and 9 a.m.

The other improvement is in the scheduling and training of the school boy patrols.

As indicated above, their attention to duty seems rather haphazard and certainly not the attitude which has prevailed with school boy patrols for many years. We would hasten to add that the situation observed at the two subject crosswalks is not necessarily typical of that at other crosswalks.

Since it was the Westridge Parent-Teacher Association who made the suggestion contained in the first paragraph of this report, they shall be advised of this situation if Council concurs with our views.

(16) Douglas Road and Gilmore Avenue

Prior to the widening and repaving of Douglas Road between Boundary Road and Halifax Street, there was a painted school crosswalk at Gilmore Avenue.

After this repaving was completed, we wondered whether the crosswalk should be repainted. The Principal of Kitchener School was contacted to determine whether he would provide a school boy patrol at the subject location. His reply was that he was reluctant to establish the patrol but did feel that some form of warning in the form of flashing lights should be installed.

Traffic volumes prior to this repaving were extremely light, although it can be expected that these will increase with the new pavement.

Because warrants for a crosswalk are not met and as the Principal of the School is not prepared to provide a school boy patrol, we would recommend that the crosswalk on Douglas Road at Gilmore Avenue not be repainted and that no traffic control devices be provided there either because they are unwarranted.

We would add that the area will be reviewed from time to time to ascertain whether some measures are required.

(17) Beresford Street from McPherson Avenue to Buller Avenue

Complaints have been received during the last few months regarding the difficulty being experienced by trucks attempting to turn into their loading facilities on the above portion of Beresford Street due to parked cars.

We found that the street is almost impassable because of a combination of these parked cars and the loading operations being conducted.

As the road allowance is only 33 feet wide and is used by two-way traffic, we feel that parking should be restricted on at least one side.

As the Municipality has already prohibited parking on a section of the North side of Beresford Street and, as it is the parkers on this side that create most of the problem, we would recommend that a "No Parking Anytime" prohibition be instituted on the North side of Beresford Street from McPherson Avenue to Buller Avenue.

Respectfully submitted,

J. G. Lorimer
ACTING CHAIRMAN

EW/mb