

RE: INTERSECTION OF RUMBLE AND PATTERSON AVENUE
(Report of the Traffic Safety Committee Dated
1984 September 10, Item A)

MUNICIPAL MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the recommendation of the Director Engineering
be adopted. * * * * *

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER 84 10 10
FROM: DIRECTOR ENGINEERING

SUBJECT: REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING 1984 SEPTEMBER 10, TRAFFIC
SAFETY COMMITTEE REPORT, ITEM "A", REQUEST FOR THE
INSTALLATION OF A TRAFFIC SIGNAL - INTERSECTION OF
RUMBLE AND PATTERSON AVENUE.

SUMMARY:

On 1983 November 28, the Traffic Safety Committee passed a motion requiring specific actions to be taken regarding the intersection at Rumble Street and Patterson Avenue. When Council received the Committee's report on 1984 September 10, Council approved the recommendation that a semi-actuated traffic signal be installed at this intersection, and on this occasion, asked for additional information on funding for the signal, relocation of a power pole and why a hedge hadn't been trimmed to enhance visibility. The requested information is contained in the following report.

REPORT:

At the captioned Council Meeting we were requested to provide answers to a number of enquiries. The enquiries and the attendant responses are as follows:

1. Why was a Council directive of 1983 11 28 to trim the hedge on the southeast corner not complied with?

The growth on the immediate corner is composed of junipers that have a depth of approximately 15". The only course of action that we could have taken would be to have them removed entirely. However, it was concluded that they did not constitute a serious enough problem to justify their complete removal.

Approximately two metres south of the south property line of Rumble Street, immediately behind the Municipal sidewalk but still well into the Patterson Avenue right-of-way, is a laurel hedge. The end of this hedge is behind the shoulder of a driver stopped at the stop sign and was not considered to be a view problem at all.

For Council's clarification, we have shown the subject hedge and junipers on the attached sketch. As noted, both are on the road allowance and could be ordered to be removed as was the hedge at Portland Street and Sussex Avenue last year; however there are countless cases of growth

on road allowances where we attempt to use discretion in ordering their removal unless there is a significant enough hazard involved in leaving them in place.

Staff did not report back on this single item before the expiration of the six month period because it is only one of three items on which Council requested feedback, and it was considered desirable to report on all three items at once at the end of the six month review period.

2. Investigate the possibility and costs involved in relocating the power pole on the southeast corner 20 or 30 feet away (in addition to the signal installation).

We spoke to B.C. Hydro and they advised, as noted in our report to the Traffic Safety Committee of 1984 07 10, that it could not be relocated because it is at the intersection of two crossing primary transmission lines as well as secondary lines. To move the pole 20 or 30 feet away as now directed would result in one direction of lines creating an aerial trespass. The only way it could possibly be done would be to install two poles, one east of and one south of the intersection. The one on Rumble would support Rumble lines while the one on Patterson would support the Patterson lines. We discussed this possibility with B.C. Hydro, who advised us that they were not prepared to change the existing arrangement because of the technical difficulties and the extremely high costs involved in such a change.

3. Confirm that funding for the signal installation is available for this project.

Monies are available in our Traffic Management budget to cover the cost of this signal. Design work has now been completed and Council approved the Work Order at its Meeting of last week (1984 October 09).

Again, staff believed that the matters of the hedge, the B.C. Hydro pole and related matters including the review of traffic volumes were all integrated to the extent that Council wished a comprehensive report to be submitted embracing all three matters in one report after the six month review period. The review was conducted at the expiration of the six month period and the comprehensive report was prepared on 1984 July 10 for the July Traffic Safety Committee Meeting. The July Meeting was cancelled, so the report was not considered by the Committee until its next meetings held on 1984 August 28. The Committee's recommendations were sent to the next following Council Meeting, held on 1984 September 10.

In retrospect, it would have been possible and preferable to have submitted a report to Council regarding the hedge and the pole as soon as the information on those matters became available, a course of action which will be followed in future matters of this type.

In addition to the three items already covered above, there was an enquiry as to why the staff recommended against the installation of a traffic signal. In our report to the Traffic Safety Committee, it was pointed out that the intersection failed to meet either the Canadian warrant or the warrants suggested by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

ITEM 5
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 64
COUNCIL MEETING 84/10/15

Failure to meet either warrant, and lack of any evidence that the safety of the intersection would be significantly improved left us no recourse but to recommend against the installation of a signal.

The Traffic and Safety Committee's recommendation to install a signal was based largely on their anticipation of a future warrant that the Willingdon Avenue connection to Patterson Avenue would possibly generate.

The above report is for the information of Council.

HB:cf

cc: () Traffic Supervisor

EE Olson
DIRECTOR ENGINEERING

ACCIDENTS SINCE
JANUARY 1982

CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
DIVISION

DESIGNED BY _____
DRAWN BY _____
CHECKED BY _____
APPR'D. BY _____

SCALE 1" = 20'
DATE 1984 SEPT.
DRWG NO. _____

ITEM 5
MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 64
COUNCIL MEETING 84/10/15

111

