## The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes

## Council Report

## Report Number ENG2017-003

Date: March 21, 2017
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Ward Community Identifier: 4

Subject: Request for Traffic Control - Portage Road and Kirkfield Road
Author/Title: Joseph Kelly, Senior Engineering Technician
Signature:

## RECOMMENDATION(S):

RESOLVED THAT Report ENG2017-003, Request for Traffic Control Portage Road and Kirkfield Road, be received;

THAT an all-way stop be installed at the intersection of Portage Road and Kirkfield Road;

THAT the necessary By-law for the above recommendations be forwarded to council for adoption; and

THAT the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute any documents and agreements required by the approval of this application/agreement/decision.


## Background:

The City of Kawartha Lakes Engineering Department has received several requests/complaints regarding the Portage Road (CKL Rd 48) and Kirkfield Rd (CKL Rd 6) intersection in the hamlet of Kirkfield. The majority of the complaints are with respect to the overall perceived level of safety at the intersection with requests for the installation of an all-way stop or traffic control signal.

This report addresses those concerns.
Both roads are classified as arterial roads. Kirkfield road, running north/south, is currently stop controlled. A key map can be seen in Appendix A.

A justification review was carried out to determine if implementing an all-way stop or traffic light would be an appropriate action. For justification purposes, Portage road is considered the major road and Kirkfield road is considered the minor road.

An eight hour peak traffic count was performed on May 15, 2015, the Friday of the Victoria Day long weekend. It was expected to experience greater than average traffic volumes by up to $20 \%$ and was chosen purposefully to obtain data representative of peak summer months. Results of the count can be seen in Appendix B.

## All-way Stop Warrants:

The Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) has two methods to determine if an all-way stop is warranted.

## 1) All-way Stop Minimum Volume Warrant (Major Roads)

The OTM suggests that an all-way stop control may be considered on major roads where conditions are met for all of the foliowing:
a) Total hourly vehicular volume on all approaches must exceed 500 per hour; AND
b) Combined vehicle and pedestrian volume on a minor street must exceed 200 units per hour; AND
c) Average delay to traffic on minor street must exceed 30 second; AND
d) Volume split does not exceed 70/30

With a total volume averaging 422 vehicles per hour ( $84 \%$ ), a minor street combined volume of 122 units an hour ( $62 \%$ ) and a volume split of $73 / 27$, the Allway Stop Minimum Volume Warrant (Major Roads) is not met. Results can be seen in Appendix C.

## 2) All-way Stop Collision Warrant

An all-way stop control may be considered on an intersection with a high accident frequency. For the purpose of this warrant, a high accident frequency is an average of four collisions per year over a three-year period. Only those accidents susceptible to relief through multi-way stop control must be considered.

The intersection has a reportable collision average of 0.7 collision per year over the last three years of available data. Therefore, the All-way Stop Collision Warrant is not met (Appendix C).

## Sight Distance

All-way stops may be used where the minimum sight distance is not achieved. There is a convenience store located at the southeast corner of the intersection. Parking utilized in the boulevard in front of the store on Portage Road presents a temporary hazard by reducing the sight distance for the south approach to substandard levels. East of the intersection there is a hill which affects drivers' behavior at the stop sign. During the eight hour count, while multiple cars, trucks, and delivery trucks utilized the boulevard in front of the store, staff witnessed three near misses at the intersection. It should be noted that the parking spaces at the south side of the store on Kirkfield Road appear to be underutilized. A site picture and sight distance estimates can be seen in Appendix D.

Interviews with staff at the Kirkfield Service Centre revealed that no-parking signs have been attempted in the past but had a high non-compliance rate and were not enforced. It is unknown if this was before the latest parking By-law. CKL Bylaw 2012-173 (Parking By-law) prohibits parking within 9m of an intersection without signage and up to a distance of 30 m with signage. With signage, it is within the scope of the By-law to prohibit parking on the boulevard without further amendment.

## Traffic Control Signal Justifications:

The OTM has seven signal justification methods. The OTM states "for a traffic signal to be technically justified, at least one of the justifications must be fulfilled. Unless one of more of the signal justifications are met, the installation of signals would not normally proceed as it would likely result in an increase in overall intersection delay and/or have as negative impact on intersection safety."

The following justification methods are deemed most appropriate for this intersection:

- Minimum Vehicle Volumes
- Delay to Cross Traffic
- Combination Warrant
- Collision Experience
- Pedestrian Volume

No justification averaged more than $73 \%$ justified. Results can be seen in Appendix E .

## Rationale:

The Traffic Signal Justification Warrants are not met. The All-way Stop Control Warrants are not met; however, sight distances are intermittently compromised throughout the day. Good engineering judgment should be used to determine if the warrant recommendations are appropriate for this intersection.

On the surface, parking is causing the sight distance deficiency so prohibiting it is one solution. Ideally, drivers would comply with new no parking signs and park on the Kirkfield Road boulevard which is currently underutilized; sight distance would then be restored. In reality we can expect high non-compliance with the no parking signs. This would facilitate a need for barriers such as curbs, bollards, or concrete planters in order to achieve the proper sight distance. There is the risk that whatever barrier is chosen to redirect parking could itself obstruct views.

Driver behavior at this intersection is hesitant. The sight distance deficiency is certainly a factor. Prohibiting the parking via physical barrier will restore the sight distance however it is difficult to gauge how the hill will continue to factor in driver behavior. Technically, at the sight distance required for the speed limit, cars are visible on the hill from the stop. Further east ( 40 m ) cars disappear in the hill for a moment and reappear just before the required sight distance. This may be contributing to driver hesitation.

As a result of the justification review carried out by staff, it is concluded that the installation of an all-way stop at the intersection Portage Road and Kirkfield Road (CKL Road 48 and CKL Rd 6) is recommended due to sight distance deficiencies and anxious/hesitant driver behavior. Sign placement should meet the Ontario Traffic Manual minimum as sees in Appendix F.

## Other Alternatives Considered:

Install physical barriers such as concrete planters to prohibit parking in front of the store. This would restore the sight distance. This alternative is not recommended since the hill 100 m east of the intersection seems to be affecting drivers' behavior at this unique intersection and may continue to affect their behavior after the mitigation of sight distance deficiencies.

A do nothing approach is not recommended.

## Financial Considerations:

The cost is anticipated to be approximatly $\$ 20,000$ for the installation of the all way stop, line and symbol markings and overhead flashing light.

## Relationship of Recommendation(s) To Strategic Priorities:

The City's Strategic Plan outlines Council's Vision of a Vibrant and Growing Economy, An Exceptional Quality of Life and a Healthy Environment.

Providing life safety and protection is a priority objective of the City.

## Review of Accessibility Implications of Any Development or Policy:

There are no accessibility implications associated with the recommended course of action.

## Servicing Comments:

N/A

## Consultations:

Mike Farquhar, Supervisor, Engineering - Technical Services
Aaron Sloan, Manager, Municipal Law Enforcement
Andrew Veale, Councillor - Ward 4
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## Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd



## Comments

Volumes increased due to Firday of a long weekend
(Victoria Day). Parking at store caused sight issue.
Witnessed three near misses.

## Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd




| Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eight Hour Peak Diagram |  |  |  |  |  | Eight Hour Peak <br> From: 8:00:00 <br> To: 16:00:00 |  |  |
| Municipality: CKL <br> Site \#: $\quad 0000000001$ <br> Intersection: Portage Road \& Kirkfield Rd <br> TFR File \#: 1 <br> Count date: 15-May-2015 |  |  | Weather conditions: <br> Clear <br> Person(s) who counted: <br> Leanne Scott |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Non-Signalized Intersection ** |  |  | Major Road: Portage Road runs W/E |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Leg Total: 1017 <br> North Entering 494 <br> North Peds: 18 <br> Peds Cross: [me |  |  |  |  |  | East Leg Total: 2486 <br> East Entering: 709 <br> East Peds: 16 <br> Peds Cross: 8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments <br> Volumes increased due to Firday of a long weekend <br> (Victoria Day). Parking at store caused sight issue. <br> Witnessed three near misses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd

## Total Count Diagram




Location: _Portage Rd (CKL Rd 48) and Kirkfield Rd (CKL Rd 6)



- Minimum Vehicle Volume (Arterial) must be Yes for A, B and C (Just 'A' for local roads)
- Accident Criteria must be Yes for A and B
- Must meet both Minimum Vehicle Volume AND Directional Split, or just Accident Criteria.


## ENG2017-003

## Appendix D-Site Picture



Souce: Google Streetview 2012

ENG2017-003
Appendix D
Sight Distance







## Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd

Count Date: 15-May-2015
Intersection: Portage Road \& Kirkfield Rd
Major Road: Portage Road
Operating Speed of Major Road: $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$

Municipality: CKL
Major Road Runs: ENW one lane each way
Operating under restricted flow conditions

Warrant \#1: Minimum Vehicular Volumes.
A. All Approaches. Not Satisfied

| No. of Lanes | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Lane Each Way |  | 2 Lanes Each Way |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { 3 Lanes } \\ \hline \\ \hline \text { or More } \\ \text { R. Flout } \\ \text { (Code } 5 \text { ) } \end{array}$ | Hours Ending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PercentaceWarrant |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flow } \\ & \text { Condition } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { Lane } \\ \text { (Flow } \\ \text { (Code 1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { Lane } \\ \text { R. Flow } \\ (\text { Code } 2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { Lane } \\ & \text { (. Flow } \\ & \text { (Code 3) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { Lane } \\ \text { R Flow } \\ (\text { Code } 4) \end{gathered}$ |  | 9:00 | 10:00 | 11:00 | 12:00 | 13:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 |  |  |
| 100\% | 480 | 720 | 600 | 900 | 1125 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00\% |
| 80\% | 385 | 575 | 480 | 720 | 900 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No: | x |
|  |  |  | 0\%\% Fulfill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Adoroa- |  |  | 20\% Fulfille |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 |  | 80 |
|  |  | Actual | 加 if Below | 80\% |  | 31 | 42 | 46 | 58 | 62 | 66 | 79 |  |  | 384 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | otal: | 464 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ual Ave | age (To | al(8): | 58\% |

B. Minor Street Both Approaches.


## Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd

Count Date: 15-May-2015
Intersection: Portage Road \& Kirkfield Rd
Major Road: Portage Road
Operating Speed of Major Road: $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$

Municipality: CKL
Major Road Runs: EN one lane each way
Operating under restricted flow conditions

Warrant \#2: Delay to Cross Traffic.
A. Major Street Both Approaches.

Not Satisfied

B. Traffic Crossing Major Street.


## Portage Rd and Kirkfield Rd

Count Date: 15-May-2015
Intersection: Portage Road \& Kirkfield Rd
Major Road: Portage Road
Operating Speed of Major Road: $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$
Municipality: CKL
Major Road Runs: E/W one lane each way
Operating under restricted flow conditions

Warrant \#3: Accident Experience.

| Not Satisfied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. Remortable accidents within a twelve month period averaged over 36 consequtive months susceptible to correction |
| by a traftic signal. |

Warrant \#4: Combination Warrant. (Used if no warrant satisfied 100\%)

Not Satisfied

| Minimum Requirements | Warrant Satisfied 80\% or More | Fulfilled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Two Warrants | Warrant 1 (Minimum Vehicular Volume) | No |
| Satisfled $80 \%$ | Warant 2 (Delay to Cross Traffic) | No |
|  | Warrant 3 (Accident Experience) | No |

Conclusion: Traffic signal not warranted.

ENG2017-003 Appendix F
Recommended Sign Placement


