



Council Report

Report Number: ENG2024-013
Meeting Date: July 23, 2024
Title: Request for Parking Restrictions – Mary St W, Lindsay
Description: In front of Caressant Care Nursing and Retirement Home
Author and Title: Joseph Kelly, Traffic Management Supervisor

Recommendation(s):

That Report ENG2024-013 **Request for Parking Restrictions – Mary St W, Lindsay** be received;

That the preferred option of line painting with limited parking restriction be selected for implementation; and

That the necessary By-law for the above recommendations be forwarded to Council for adoption.

Department Head: _____

Financial/Legal/HR/Other: _____

Chief Administrative Officer: _____

Background:

At the Council meeting of November 21, 2023, Council adopted the following resolutions:

CR2023-592

That the Memorandum from Councillor McDonald, regarding Parking Solutions on Mary Street West, Lindsay, in front of Caressant Care, be received; and

That Staff be directed to investigate the feasibility of prohibiting parking in front of Caressant Care Marty Street West and report back by Q1, 2024.

This report addresses this direction (Memo in Appendix A).

Rationale:

Road Characteristics

Mary Street West, west of Angeline Street South, is classified as an urban collector road which experiences an estimated annual average daily traffic of 2298 vehicles. The intersection with Angeline Street South is signalized. The speed limit is 40 km/hr. This section features institutional and residential use.

Lane Width Requirements

To determine the appropriate use of the cross section of a road, the Transportation Association of Canada's (TAC) Geometric Design Guidelines for Canadian Roads is used to establish lane width requirements based on speed limits, road classification, transit routes and traffic volumes. Figure 1 shows the standard lane width ranges in the guidelines. Due to the presence of buses and larger trucks on this road the recommended minimum lane width is 3.3m with an upper limit recommended lane width of 3.7m. A parking lane is generally 2.4m in the guidelines.

Therefore, the minimum recommended width of road including parking on one side for Mary Street West is 9m (3.3m +3.3m +2.4m) with an upper limit of 9.8m. The measured pavement width of Mary Street West is 9.25m, which satisfies the requirement for on-street parking on one side of a collector road featuring a bus route.

During observations on site, staff noted vehicles widely avoiding the parked cars and encroaching in the oncoming lane. Vehicles would needlessly stop at one end of the length of parked vehicles and wait for oncoming traffic to clear.

The combination of the s-curve with the number of parked vehicles is severely reducing driver confidence to traverse this curve. It is possible that this phenomenon can be attributed to the fact that westbound traffic from the signalized intersection are coming from roads with line painting indicating their travelled lane is abutting the curb. There is no guidance to transition them towards the centre. When they reach the curve with the parked vehicles they are too close to the parked vehicle to properly judge spacing need so they logically stop and wait, or overcorrect into the other lane.

For eastbound traffic, the curve restricts sight lines to the point drivers are not aware that they should shift towards the curb to accommodate oncoming vehicles.

It is noted that in the 10 years of available collision data only one reported collision can be attributed to the presence of the parked vehicles.

Figure 1: Through Lane Widths – Urban Roadways (Table 4.2.3, TAC, 2017)

Table 4.2.3: Through Lane Widths – Urban Roadways

Design Speed (km/h)	Design Domain			
	Practical Lower Limit	Recommended Range		Practical Upper Limit
		Recommended Lower Limit	Recommended Upper Limit	
60 and less	2.7m	3.0m	3.7m	4.0m
70 to 100	3.0m	3.3m	3.7m	4.0m
110 and higher	3.5m	3.7m	3.7m	4.0m

1. Where buses and larger trucks are expected to regularly use a lane, a minimum lane width of 3.3m is recommended regardless of the design speed or traffic volume.

Parking Capacity

The demand for parking is well established in this area. If parking is prohibited, the demand will shift to where parking is permitted. Staff investigated the parking capacity on the Caressant Care property compared to the utilization both on the property and on the street. An illustration of which can be seen in Appendix B.

The inventoried available parking spaces along with the observed utilization is summarized in Figure 2. It should be noted that without information on building access, it is unknown if a visitor can reasonably be expected to use one of the 31 spaces in the rear of the building accessed off of Angeline St S.

Figure 2: Observed Parking Utilization (not including accessible stalls or permit parking)

Location	Capacity	Day 1 Occupied Parking Spaces	Day 2 Occupied Parking Spaces
On street in front of building, Mary St W	25 Spaces	12	12
On site in front of building, Mary St W	24 Spaces	11	9
On site, side of building, Angeline St S	14 Spaces	12	8
On site, rear of building, Angeline St S	31 Spaces	15	18

On the observed days, there were just enough available space on site in the front of the facility to fully accommodate vehicles that would have been displaced if parking was prohibited. Leaving ample spaces in the rear for overflow. The grouping of on street parked vehicles near the east entrance of the facility and their reluctance to use on site parking suggest a desire to walk the shortest distance possible due to physical constraints or just preference.

Caressant Care Consultation

In order to establish the baseline on-site parking utilization and deepen our understanding of the situation, staff contacted the Executive Director of the facility on May 15, 2024. Staff inquired for information on staff parking needs, building access logistics, the existence of parking information signage both on the property and in the building, current and future plans related to parking, and for general comments and opinion.

Although generally receptive to participate in the initial communications, staff have yet to receive a reply to a follow up request sent on June 25, 2024.

Enforcement

The Manager of Municipal Law Enforcement and Licensing indicated that should parking be restricted, initial patrols will need to be increased and the impact would be absorbed within current work, therefore service levels will reflect that complaint response are prioritized based on risk and safety, some delay may occur when responding to reported issues.

Recommendation:

For Council consideration, two viable options are presented.

Option 1

Option 1 involves the complete restriction of parking on Mary St W along the s-curve in front of Caressant Care. Observations show there is enough capacity on site to accommodate the displaced vehicles, however the distance from many of the available spots to the entrance is undesirable for the average person, and unrealistic for those with mobility constraints. Compliance levels may be low without heavy enforcement.

The wider available travel lanes will increase speeds to be more in line with the rest of Mary St W.

Option 2 (Preferred Option)

Much of the perceived danger in navigating this s-curve can be addressed by providing guidance through the curve by way of line painting. To accommodate a gentle guided shift, this option will prohibit parking on the inside radii of the s-curve only. This will displace the three spaces closest to the entrance to further west along the road.

Painting will consist of yellow centerline markings and white parking lane markings ensuring a minimum lane width of 3.3m with 2.4m available for parking. An illustration of the lane markings can be seen in Appendix C.

This option removes the major cause of driver confusion. Vehicles should no longer stop and wait for oncoming traffic and will not be forced to over correct into the opposing lane. This option also has regard for the mobility needs of the visitors. Speeds through the curve will remain the same (generally lower than the rest of Mary St W).

This option will require a phased approach. Restricting parking at the riskiest locations can happen as soon as a by-law is passed and signs installed. Line painting can occur in the spring of 2025 as part of Public Works Line Painting program.

Other Alternatives Considered:

Two viable alternatives are presented for Council consideration. A do nothing approach is not recommended.

Alignment to Strategic Priorities

Providing life safety and protection, is a priority objective of the City under the Council Adopted Strategic Plan Goal of An Exceptional Quality of Life.

Financial/Operation Impacts:

Option 1: Installation of new parking signs 14 x \$400 = \$5600 through Public Works Operating Budget

Option 2 (Preferred Option): Installation of new parking signs 3 x \$400 = \$1200 through Public Works Operating Budget and initial/maintenance cost of line painting through the permanent increase of the Public Works Line Painting Program beginning in 2025.

Consultations:

Manager of Municipal Law Enforcement and Licensing, CKL

Executive Director, Caressant Care, Mary Street

Attachments:

Appendix A – Council Memo



Adobe Acrobat
Document

Appendix B – Parking Utilization Observations



Adobe Acrobat
Document

Appendix C – Recommended Option Illustration



Adobe Acrobat
Document

Department Head email: jrojas@city.kawarthalakes.on.ca

Department Head: Juan Rojas, Director of Engineering & Corporate Assets

Department File: Engineering