



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

Municipal Hall
1229 Esquimalt Road
Esquimalt, B.C. V9A 3P1

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 15-429 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Staff Report **Status:** Passed
File created: 9/22/2015 **In control:** Council
On agenda: 9/28/2015 **Final action:** 9/28/2015
Title: Proposed Crosswalk at Saxe Point Park, Staff Report No. EPW-15-023
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments: 1. Staff Report EPW-15-023, 2. Attachment 1_Aerial Map, 3. Attachment 2_Aerial Map

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
9/28/2015	1	Council	approved	

REQUEST FOR DECISION

DATE: September 28, 2015 Report No. EPW-15-023
TO: Laurie Hurst, Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Jeff Miller, Director of Engineering and Public Works

SUBJECT:

Possible configurations for Munro Street/Fraser Street/Bewdley Avenue /Saxe Point Park Intersection.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Option 1 be undertaken with funding coming from the current operation budget and the work carried out in 2015.

RELEVANT POLICY:

N/A

STRATEGIC RELEVANCE:

Healthy and Liveable Community
Well Managed and Maintained Infrastructure

BACKGROUND:

At the May 25, 2015 meeting of Council, Council received a delegation requesting a crosswalk at the intersection of the Munro Street/Fraser Street/Bewdley Avenue/Saxe Point Park (Intersection). Council then directed Engineering to prepare a report on the feasibility and cost of a proposed crosswalk at Saxe Point Park.

The intersection is a five legged intersection. Fraser Street and Munro Street are considered the major roads and Bewdley Avenue (both legs) and Saxe Point are considered the minor roads. Both the Bewdley legs and the Saxe Point leg have traffic control on them (stop signs) The Munro and Fraser legs do not have any traffic control on them. All legs of the intersection do not have any crosswalk markings. The north west, east and south corners have accessibility ramps while the south west corner does not. Please see attachments 1 and 2 for an aerial view.

Due to earlier concerns raised by residents, staff had carried out a warrant analysis of the Intersection. The results of the analysis were that crosswalk markings were not warranted for this intersection based on the traffic volume and Transportation Association of Canada Guidelines (TAC).

Further analysis on the Intersection was carried out in a joint Township/ICBC study (Traffic Control Review, Township of Esquimalt) in 2014. This analysis did not identify that the Intersection required crosswalks. It did recommend that stop lines be added to the Bewdley and Saxe Point legs to emphasize the stop condition at the five leg intersection.

Three options were looked at for modifying the Intersection. They are:

1. Installation of stop lines on the Bewdley and Saxe Point legs.
2. Installation of accessibility ramp (SW corner) and the installation of stop lines on the Bewdley and Saxe Point legs.
3. Installation of pedestrian activated flashing beacon on the major roads and the installation of the stop lines on Bewdley and Saxe Point legs.

The option of adding crosswalk markings has not been included due to the warrant analysis, TAC guidelines and insufficient sight lines for the intersection.

ISSUES:

1. Rationale for Selected Option

When a pedestrian crosses a road they have the right of way in the hierarchy of traffic movements. This ability to cross roads however must be utilized by the pedestrian with respect to traffic volumes and the ability of drivers to see and acknowledge the pedestrian's presence.

The ability of drivers to see and acknowledge the pedestrian's presence is essential in providing a navigable intersection. This is generally accomplished by providing clear sight lines for the drivers to see other vehicles as well other users of the road (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists). At the Intersection the alignments of the major roads do not provide clear sight lines to all the legs of the intersection. Due to this condition if controls are added to the major roads they will have to be of a higher level of sophistication than a normal intersection in order to provide a condition that allows the

pedestrian and vehicle to interact in a safe manner.

Option 1 reinforces the stop conditions that are already present in the Intersection. These conditions provide the pedestrian with the ability to cross the minor roads easily. With movements across the major roads, the pedestrian will have to observe the traffic volumes and decide to cross when there is no traffic. Due to the volumes of traffic that the Intersection experiences this wait time is negotiable.

2. Organizational Implications

The implementation of Option 1 will not impact work loads of Engineering and Public Works. If the other options are implemented, the level of effort to implement the option will increase and will have to be schedule with respect to other initiatives and maintenance programs.

3. Financial Implications

Option 1 is the least cost option. The implementation of this option can be accommodated within the operational budget of Public Works. Option 2 and 3 will have increased impacts on the budget. Option 2 cost is in the range of \$5,000 to \$6,000. The availability of funds will be dependent on the priority of this project with other capital projects and maintenance programs. Option 3 cost is in the \$100,000 range and would require funding to be obtained through the 2016 budgeting process.

4. Sustainability & Environmental Implications

In its current configuration the Intersection allows pedestrian movement within the sidewalk network. The proposed option will reinforce these movements.

5. Communication & Engagement

Once staff receive direction from Council, this direction will be communicated to the delegation representative. At the Intersection, changes in the stop conditions will be shown with new traffic condition tabs for approximately six months.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. That Option 1 be undertaken with funding coming from the current operation budget and the work carried out in 2015.
2. That Option 2 be undertaken with funding coming from capital project monies approved in the current budget and the work carried out in 2015.
3. That Option 3 becomes a capital project funding request in the 2016 budget process with work being undertaken in 2016 if the request is approved.
4. No work is carried out in the intersection in 2015 with additional features being added in subsequent years when other capital project and maintenance programs are active in this

area.