



## STAFF REPORT ACTION REQUIRED

### **Pedestrian Crossing Protection Not Recommended – on Ellesmere Road at Parkington Crescent**

<b>Date:</b>	May 21, 2010
<b>To:</b>	Scarborough Community Council
<b>From:</b>	Director, Transportation Services, Scarborough District
<b>Wards:</b>	Ward 38 – Scarborough Centre
<b>Reference Number:</b>	P:\2010\Cluster B\TRA\Scarborough\sc1067 D10-3667643, D09 330446 Ellesmere Parkington pxo

#### **SUMMARY**

---

This staff report is about a matter for which the Community Council does not have delegated authority from City Council to make a final decision.

The purpose of this report is to advise on the feasibility of installing pedestrian crossing protection in various forms at this intersection in Ward 38.

It is recommended that no pedestrian crossing protection be installed at this intersection.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**Transportation Services, Scarborough District, recommends that Scarborough Community Council recommend that City Council:**

1. Not approve the installation of pedestrian crossing protection in the form of a pedestrian refuge island at the intersection of Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent since the road is not wide enough and it would block access.
2. Not approve the installation of pedestrian crossing protection in the form of a pedestrian crossover at the intersection of Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent since the road has too many lanes to cross.
3. Not approve the installation of pedestrian crossing protection in the form of traffic control signals at the intersection of Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent.
4. Not pass or amend the appropriate by-law(s) accordingly.

## **Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact associated with this report; however, the highest financial cost of installing a pedestrian crossing protection, by way of traffic control signals, is approximately \$150,000.00 . Funding for traffic control signals is not available in the Transportation Services 2010 Operating Budget, within the Division's Capital Works Budget under Project No. CTP710-01 at this time.

## **ISSUE BACKGROUND**

Further to a request from the local Councillor, Transportation Services staff reviewed the feasibility of installing pedestrian crossing protection controls at Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent.

Transportation Services staff has studied this location for a pedestrian refuge island, pedestrian crossover and traffic control signals. None of these pedestrian crossing protection controls are warranted at this time.

## **COMMENTS**

Several characteristics describing the subject intersection of Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent include:

- The regulatory speed limit on Ellesmere Road is 60 Km/h.
- Adjacent traffic control signals are located approximately 377 metres to the east at Bellamy Road North and approximately 444 metres to the west at McCowan Road.
- The south side of Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent is comprised of single family residential dwellings. The north side of Ellesmere Road is a mix of warehouses, some assorted businesses and a place of worship.
- The Toronto Transit Commission transit stops are located on both near-sides of Ellesmere Road at Parkington Crescent.
- Ellesmere Road at Parkington Crescent has a pavement width of approximately 15.5 metres.

## **Pedestrian Refuge Island Study**

Transportation staff reviewed this intersection for a pedestrian refuge island. However, this site is not suited to the placement of an island. Eastbound left-turn motorists require a left turn lane median area to access the industrial and commercial facilities along the north side of Ellesmere Road. Similarly, westbound motorists accessing Parkington Crescent would be blocked by an island on the east side of the intersection. The placement of an island on the west side of this intersection would require a left-turn prohibition to be enacted at the driveways to the north of Ellesmere Road. Such a left-turn prohibition could create injurious affection claims from the affected businesses. The placement of an island on the east side of this intersection would create loss of arterial road access to this community.

In addition, pedestrian volume crossing Ellesmere Road is not sufficient to justify the installation of a Pedestrian Refuge Island. The minimum required eight-hour volume is 100 pedestrians. During a study on June 18, 2009, 96 pedestrians were recorded in our eight-hour study period. A more recent a study on May 11, 2010, 86 pedestrians were recorded in our in our eight-hour study period, confirming this finding. In addition, Ellesmere Road is not wide enough at 15.5 metres to accommodate this device. The minimum required width is 16.4 metres.

### **Pedestrian Crossover Warrant Study**

The intersection of Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent has been reviewed four times since 2001 for the placement of a pedestrian crossover. Each time the required technical warrants have failed to be met. These findings are shown in the following table:

Pedestrian Crossover Warrant	February 20 2001	May 13 2003	June 18 2009	May 11 2010
Warrant 1: Pedestrian Volume	36%	30%	48%	39%
Warrant 2: Pedestrian Delay	3%	22%	39%	51%

To support the installation of a pedestrian crossover, both warrants must be satisfied to the extent of 100 %. In order for the pedestrian delay warrant to be met, a minimum of 200 pedestrians must be observed crossing the roadway, of which 119 must be delayed beyond 10 seconds when crossing Ellesmere Road. Given these observations, a pedestrian crossover cannot be supported at this time.

### **Traffic Control Signal Warrant Study**

Transportation staff reviewed this intersection for a traffic control signals four times since 2001. However, each time the required technical warrants have failed to have been met.

Traffic Control Signal Warrant	Compliance Level			
	February 20 2001	May 13 2003	June 18 2009	May 11 2010
Minimum Vehicular Volume	16%	18%	12%	12%
Delay To Cross Traffic	27%	33%	39%	39%
Collision Hazard	0%	0%	0%	0%

For traffic control signals to be numerically justified, one of the “Minimum Vehicular Volume” or “Delay to Cross Traffic” warrants must be 100% satisfied or any two of the three warrants must be at least 80% satisfied. Our current review of the Collision Hazard is based on the previous three-year (2007 – 2009) collision history.

As outlined in the above table, the most current study and the previous years of studies show the traffic volumes do not satisfy the requirements to install traffic control signals. Nonetheless, although not currently warranted, traffic control signals are the only feasible form of pedestrian crossing protection at this intersection that would enhance pedestrian safety and not restrict area access.

### **Collision History**

In recent years (from January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2009) there have been no recorded collision at this intersection potentially preventable by the installation of traffic control signals or involving pedestrians crossing Ellesmere Road.

In summary, traffic control signals are not justified and should not be installed at the subject intersection. The Toronto Transit Commission has been consulted for their opinion regarding traffic control signals and concurs with this finding.

### **CONTACT**

Marko A. Oinonen, P.Eng.  
Manager, Traffic Operations, Scarborough District  
Tel: 416-396-7148  
Fax: 416-396-5641  
E-Mail: moinone@toronto.ca

### **SIGNATURE**

---

Peter J. Noehammer, P.Eng.  
Director, Transportation Services, Scarborough District

JAB: ca\lab

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Location Plan (Ellesmere Road and Parkington Crescent – Location Map)