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SIGNATURE:

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the General Manager of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to bring forth a revised Sidewalk Policy for New Development.

(b) That staff be authorized and directed to meet with the development industry, stakeholders, affected City departments, utility companies, Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities and community groups for the purpose of discussion, consultation and input toward a sidewalk policy which represents the needs of the Community and the vision of the City.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Report is to seek direction on the development of a revised sidewalk policy for new development. This revision to the existing policy has been initiated from recommendations made by the City’s Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities (ACPD) in order to raise the level of service and public safety in fully developed urban areas as required by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act and align the City’s Sidewalk Policy for New Development with the intent of the Pedestrian Network Strategy of the City’s Transportation Master Plan and the Committee’s Accessibility Plan.
Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.

Values: Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork

FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL IMPLICATIONS (for Recommendation(s) only)

Financial: If approved by Council, the proposed sidewalk policy will result in installation of additional sidewalk. The initial cost to install the sidewalk will be paid by the subdividing landowner; however, once the sidewalk is assumed by the City, maintenance of the sidewalk will be at the cost of the City.

Staffing: None

Legal: None

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND (Chronology of events)

On April 23, 2003 Council adopted a policy for installation of sidewalks in new residential developments for the amalgamated City of Hamilton. At that time, the policy attempted to take into consideration policy variations which existed between the former local municipalities regarding sidewalk installation. This existing policy represented a balance between areas in the City, where no sidewalk was installed on new residential streets and areas which had full sidewalk installation. The resulting policy required sidewalks on only one side of local residential streets and no sidewalk on courts of less than thirty (30) residential units and crescents of less than sixty (60) units and a combination of courts off of a crescent of less than one hundred and ten (110) residential units, unless the court or cul-de-sac was used as a connecting link to a public facility such as parks, schools or commercial sites. Arterial and collector roads required sidewalks on both sides of the street and the requirement for sidewalks on industrial streets was not considered.

When the 2003 Sidewalk Policy was originally presented to the Hearings Subcommittee, a concern regarding sidewalk exemptions on courts and crescents and installation of sidewalk on only one side of local streets was raised. The policy was recommended for approval by Council, provided Development staff made a presentation of the policy to the City’s Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities (ACPD) for their review and input on the policy. The ACPD is a committee that has been established by the City through legislation passed by the Province under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. The Act requires that each municipality establish a committee made up of members with disabilities to develop a plan and standards for the community to improve accessibility and to advise its Council about the requirements and implementation of the accessibility plan.
After a presentation by development staff on August 5, 2003, the ACPD recommended that the City’s policy be revised to reflect the accessibility plan, which proposed that, as a matter of public safety, sidewalk be installed on both sides of all streets within residential developments such that persons with disabilities would benefit from a continuous and uninterrupted network of sidewalk upon which to travel, that is separate from the vehicular road surface. The Advisory Committee’s recommendations also included installation of sidewalk on all courts and crescents (see Appendix ‘A’ to Report PED11030).

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

A survey of other municipalities’ sidewalk policies in new developments was carried out by staff, the results of which are shown on Appendix ‘B’ to Report PED11030.

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

(include Performance Measurement/Benchmarking Data, if applicable)

From a survey of various municipalities within the surrounding area of Hamilton it was found that sidewalk policies vary from one municipality to another with only one City (Kitchener) requiring sidewalks on all residential streets regardless of street classification.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:

(include Financial, Staffing, Legal and Policy Implications and pros and cons for each alternative)

Alternatives for consideration regarding adoption of a sidewalk policy for new development will be presented to the Committee in the third quarter of 2011 following review and consultation with the development industry stakeholders.
Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.

Values: Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN (Linkage to Desired End Results)


APPENDICES / SCHEDULES

Appendix ‘A’ – Recommendations of the Advisory Committee for persons with Disabilities

Appendix ‘B’ – Survey of Municipalities’ Sidewalk Policy for New Development

MI:tl
Attachs. (2)
REVIEW OF SIDEWALK POLICY FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

Appendix “A” to Report PED11030

CITY OF HAMILTON
2005 ACCESSIBILITY PLAN

Division: Development & Real Estate

Mandate:
- Working cooperatively with business and the public to provide an open, effective and timely development and engineering review process. Bylaws, standards, and guidelines, consistent with regulatory requirements, which contribute to quality development, quality of life and the protection and enhancement of the health, property and environment of our community.

2004-2005 CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Organization Consulted</th>
<th>Topic/Barrier Identified</th>
<th>Actions Resulting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPD</td>
<td>Sidewalk Policies</td>
<td>Recommend that sidewalks be constructed on both sides of the road in all residential areas to avert future problems; that sidewalks be included in all cul de sacs and that sidewalks be elevated and not level with the roadway; that sidewalk policy be submitted to ACPD for comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SURVEY RESULTS OF OTHER MUNICIPALITIES’ SIDEWALK POLICY FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Sidewalk on One Side</th>
<th>Sidewalk on Both Sides</th>
<th>No Sidewalk</th>
<th>Sidewalk on 18m ROW</th>
<th>Sidewalk in Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Local Residential</td>
<td>Local Residential</td>
<td>Cul-de-sac less than 30 units</td>
<td>one side</td>
<td>Both sides Industrial Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leading to high pedestrian uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collector Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant</td>
<td>Local Residential and Industrial</td>
<td>Collector Residential</td>
<td>cul-de-sacs</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>one side Collector Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Residential Cul-de-sacs</td>
<td>Local, Collector and Arterial Streets</td>
<td>Short Cul-de-sacs</td>
<td>Both sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Local roads with ROW 18m wide and above</td>
<td>All ROW 20m wide and above</td>
<td>Sometimes cul-de-sacs</td>
<td>one side</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>Local Residential cul-de-sac longer than 500ft</td>
<td>Collector streets</td>
<td>cul-de-sacs (less than 500ft to bulb)</td>
<td>one side</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Hills</td>
<td>local residential crescent street</td>
<td>Local, collector and arterial roads</td>
<td>cul-de-sacs (unless leads to public area, then sidewalk one side)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>both sides of street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All Residential Roads</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Both Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>secondary collectors and locals if the street serves 40 residential units or more</td>
<td>primary collectors and arterials, both sides where a school fronts</td>
<td>Streets serving less than 40 residential units</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>on one side only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All Residential Roads</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Both sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>local residential streets</td>
<td>collector roads</td>
<td>Cul-de-sac less than 22 units</td>
<td>sidewalk is 2.1 m off the street line</td>
<td>one side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SURVEY RESULTS OF OTHER MUNICIPALITIES’ SIDEWALK POLICY FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Sidewalk on One Side</th>
<th>Sidewalk on Both Sides</th>
<th>No Sidewalk</th>
<th>Sidewalk on 18m ROW</th>
<th>Sidewalk in Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oshawa</strong></td>
<td>Local Residential Roads</td>
<td>Arterial and Collector Roads</td>
<td>cul-des-sacs (unless leads to public area, then sidewalk one side)</td>
<td>one side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vaughan</strong></td>
<td>local residential through streets</td>
<td>primary, feeder, collector and arterial roads</td>
<td>cul-des-sacs of less than 40 units (unless leads to public area, then sidewalk one side)</td>
<td>17.5m ROW with sidewalk on one side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterloo</strong></td>
<td>projected traffic volume will be less than 500 AADT</td>
<td>arterial roads and collector roads</td>
<td>cul-des-sacs (unless leads to public area, then sidewalk one side)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welland</strong></td>
<td>local residential streets and on inside length of crescents</td>
<td>collector and arterial roads</td>
<td>cul-des-sacs (unless cul-de-sac is longer than 100m to bulb or leads to public area, then sidewalk one side)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>no sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whitby</strong></td>
<td>Local Residential</td>
<td>Collector and Arterial Streets</td>
<td>Cul-de-sacs (unless leads to public area, then sidewalk one side)</td>
<td>One side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>