

Decision No. 24405.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

---oOo---

In the Matter of the Application of
 the CITY OF GLENDALE, a municipal
 corporation, for permission to install
 a grade crossing over the tracks of the
 Southern Pacific Railroad Company at
 Graynold Avenue.

ORIGINAL
 Application No. 17512.

Bernard Brennan, City Attorney, and
 Aubrey N. Irwin, Deputy City Attorney,
 for Applicant.

H. W. Hobbs for Southern Pacific Company,
 Protestant.

John R. Berryman for Los Angeles Grade Crossing
 Committee, Interested Party.

BY THE COMMISSION:

OPINION

In this proceeding the City of Glendale requests permission to construct Graynold Avenue at grade across the double track main line of Southern Pacific Company in said city.

A public hearing was held in this matter before Examiner Handford on November 18, 1931, in Glendale, at which time evidence was received and the matter was duly submitted.

The double track main line of Southern Pacific Company between Los Angeles and San Francisco runs through Glendale. At the northerly city limits the right of way of the railroad is adjacent to and west of San Fernando Road, one of the main through arteries to the north of Los Angeles. The Grand Central Air Terminal is situated near the north city limits of Glendale

and immediately west of the railroad.

The channel of the Los Angeles River is located west of the railroad and opposite the proposed crossing. Its east bank is approximately 300 feet west of the railroad. Along the west bank of the river Riverside Drive has been constructed by the City of Los Angeles.

The proposed Graynold Avenue crossing is located immediately south of the property of the air terminal. At present this crossing would serve the material yard and refuse dump of Glendale, located west of the railroad and south of Graynold Avenue. Entrance to these municipal properties from San Fernando Road and the city to the east of the railroad is made over an existing crossing located only approximately 35 feet south of the center line of the proposed crossing.

Applicant has a tentative plan to develop Graynold Avenue as a connection between San Fernando Road and Riverside Drive. This plan contemplates the construction of a bridge across the Los Angeles River, located in the City of Los Angeles, and the paving of Graynold Avenue between the river and the railroad.

Applicant urged that the granting of this application was a necessary part of the program to construct Graynold Avenue, from San Fernando Road to Riverside Drive, which will involve crossing both the railroad and the Los Angeles River. This new connection would attract traffic from the existing heavily used grade crossings over Southern Pacific Company's tracks at both Los Feliz Boulevard and Glendale-Brand Boulevard, both of which are located several miles south of the proposed crossing. In addition, it was contended that the distance from Los Angeles City to points on San Fernando Road to the north of the connection would

be materially shortened; furthermore, a crossing is necessary in this vicinity to reach the city refuse dump.

A witness from the Air Terminal testified that the proposed crossing, in connection with the extension of Graynold Avenue to Riverside Drive, would facilitate traffic between Hollywood and Beverly Hills and the airport. It appears that the crossing for this traffic is unnecessary, as there is now laid out a street (Air Way) parallel to and west of the railroad, which connects with the proposed extension of Graynold Avenue. In the event Graynold Avenue is constructed to Riverside Drive and Air Way is constructed to connect with Graynold Avenue, the Hollywood or Beverly Hills traffic to the airport would not need to cross the railroad.

The through traffic from Los Angeles to points on San Fernando Road north of Glendale would not be benefited by the construction of the crossing, alone, but depends entirely upon the extension of Graynold Avenue to a connection with Riverside Drive, which involves the construction of a bridge across Los Angeles River. It appears from the testimony of applicant that no definite arrangements have been made for the construction of the bridge, which lies within the City of Los Angeles; therefore, for a considerable time at least, the crossing would serve only the material yard and refuse dump of applicant.

A four-day check was made by applicant of the volume of both vehicular and rail traffic over the existing crossing, which is shown in Exhibit No. 1, filed in this proceeding. This exhibit shows that the vehicular traffic between 7:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. consisted of from 80 to 172 trucks and from 42 to 96 autos per day over the tracks and the railroad movements averaged 15 trains during the same period, of which 7 were high-speed passenger trains. For a full 24-hour period, 22 passenger trains pass this point. It is apparent that until such time

as a connection is made with Riverside Drive no material increase in this vehicular traffic will develop.

The Los Angeles Grade Crossing Committee took a neutral position in this proceeding, neither supporting nor opposing the granting of the application.

Southern Pacific Company opposed the granting of this application on the ground that an additional crossing was unnecessary and that the territory could be served by connecting Air Way and Phillis Drive across the city's property, thereby making a through street parallel to and west of the railroad. Access can be had to this street by existing crossings both north and south of Graynold Avenue.

After a review of the evidence in this proceeding, we are of the opinion that public convenience and necessity has not been shown for a crossing at grade. It appears that even if the bridge were constructed across the Los Angeles River, reasonable access to San Fernando Road from Riverside Drive could be had by connecting Air Way and Phillis Drive and thus use existing crossings over the railroad to reach San Fernando Road. This application, therefore, will be denied.

ORDER

A public hearing having been held on this proceeding, the matter having been duly submitted, and the Commission being now fully advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this application be and the same is hereby denied.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 16th day of

January
~~January~~ 1932.

C. S. Sawyer
Leon D. Whittell
W. A. Carr
M. B. Lewis
Frederic G. Stewart
Commissioners.