

## Agenda

**Tuesday, September 29, 2015**

**Burgoyne Woods Room at 5 p.m.**

### **Members:**

Councillor Bill Phillips, Chair  
Councillor Sal Sorrento  
Councillor Sandie Bellows

Diane Foster (Co-Chair, Accessibility Advisory Committee)  
TBD (Chair, Town and Gown Advisory Committee)  
Robert Hillier (Chair, Active Transportation Advisory Committee)  
Dave Gerow (Chair, Recreation Facilities and Programming Master Plan Implementation Advisory Committee - RFPMP)

Dan Dillon, Director of Transportation and Environmental Services  
David Oakes, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services

### **Staff Liaisons:**

Diana Lecinski (Accessibility Advisory)  
Todd Rogers (Town and Gown Advisory)  
Peter Leyser or Brian Applebee (Active Transportation Advisory)  
Kristen Sullivan (RFPMP Advisory)  
Leanne Kurek (Pillar Committee)

---

1. **Call meeting to order: Chair, Councillor Bill Phillips**  
*5pm*
2. **Motion to approve the SSC agenda**
3. **Motion to adopt the SSC minutes of the previous meeting**
  - *Thurs, May 14, 2015*
4. **Motion to approve presentations (invited guests)**
  - *none*

**5. Business arising from the minutes**

- *none*

**6. Business**

**6.1 Accessibility Advisory update ~ Diane Foster (see attachment)**

**6.2 Town and Gown Advisory update ~ Todd Rogers**

**6.3 Active Transportation Advisory update ~ Robert Hillier**

**6.4 RFPMP Advisory update ~ Dave Gerow**

**6.5 AODA training for staff/council/volunteers ~ Diana Lecinski**

**7. Date of next meeting**

- Tuesday, January 19, 2016

**8. Motion to Adjourn**

**Attachments:**

- **Sidewalk Action Statement (Accessibility Advisory)**



---

## Memorandum

---

**To:** Mayor and Members of Council  
**Cc:** Chief Administrative Officer and Heads of Departments  
**From:** The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Accessibility (MACOA)  
**Date:** March 24, 2010  
**Subject:** Sidewalk Action Statement:  
Sidewalk retention and ensuring pedestrian connectivity

---

### **PURPOSE:**

To ensure that the City of St. Catharines creates a pedestrian network throughout the community that does not create barriers or preclude the participation of people with a disability with respect to sidewalks, or lack thereof.

The purpose of this advocacy is founded in the need for independence, safety and personal autonomy in travelling throughout the City as a pedestrian with a disability, however all pedestrians benefit from this sidewalk action statement; children, adults, older adults, people who walk dogs, people who push baby buggies, people who walk, jog or roll – everyone.

A comprehensive network of connected sidewalks is paramount in the overall creation of inclusion. Citizens should not be required to walk on the roadway, regardless of it being a 'quiet street' or having lesser volumes of traffic, any more than a person who uses a mobility device or a person who is blind and uses a guide dog or white cane. There are sidewalk sections within the City that have missing stretches and therefore lack connectivity. These missing linkages must be addressed as a priority to ensure a functional and connected sidewalk system. The fact that new or existing development home-owners, groups, or area residents do not wish to have a sidewalk traverse the public easement at their property should not preclude its benefits to others or its future legacy.

### **BACKGROUNDER:**

Previously, in September 2008 and again in September 2009 (Appendix A) MACOA has consistently provided support for pedestrians linkages to be placed and maintained on new and existing roadways. Additionally private properties, such as malls and plazas could create increased business by becoming safely accessible to pedestrians through the installation of connecting pedestrian routes.

Previously members of the community have approached Council in a public forum to specifically request the deferral or deletion of sidewalk installations. This is contrary to foundation documents such as the Official Plan and Site Plan Manual. Both of these documents are currently undergoing a review and update to become more comprehensive in areas such as environmental stewardship and global accessibility. These requests only provide Council with a current situational aspect from an extremely small percentage of the community. Requests to remove sidewalks from plans of subdivision do not provide a legacy to future residents or pedestrian users of a particular roadway.

Additionally, the deferral or deletion of sidewalks from plans of subdivision (further to creating barriers and becoming inaccessible) create a greater requirement for vehicular traffic as pedestrians are

forced to use vehicles instead of walking. In this era of green and environmental alternatives, public transit and pedestrian access has become a conduit to achieve this. Council has indicated its support of a “walkable community”.

Sidewalks act as physical safety separations between vehicles and pedestrians. Sidewalks that are setback from the roadway (providing a gap, generally grass, between the road and sidewalk) are more favourable than curb-faced sidewalks (located adjacent to the edge of the road). Sidewalks located at the curb-face are problematic for mobility devices and baby buggies in that, sidewalks need to dip at driveways from the elevation of the sidewalk to the elevation of the road to provide ramp access for vehicles to enter. This creates a cross-slope angle when mobility devices traverse these dips. Some slopes can be significantly steep and create a danger of tipping. MACOA advocates for sidewalks that are setback but if space does not allow a setback there may be no alternative but curb-faced sidewalk installation (more common on arterial and collector roadways). Curb-faced sidewalks should be installed with a concrete “apron” that spans around the ramped area to avoid the constant up and down of navigating straight along the cross-slopes.

Roadway intersections can often be barriers to access if they do not have properly constructed curb ramps installed, however this has been proactively addressed by the City for many years and few, if any, remain. Intersections that are ramped however may still create poor access if the radius area is completely sloped and not clearly imprinted with good directional tactile strips. People who are blind (using either a white cane or a guide dog) rely on ‘feeling’ these strips and the direction they indicate to safely cross the road. Full radius curbing does not provide ideal access to people with vision impairments as much as from the clear directional indication from two curb ramps separated with a curb-face between them. As well, people who use mobility devices may be in danger of tipping if the slope or cross-slope is too steep. This is particularly an issue if they are not crossing the road, but following the sidewalk through the turn, which puts them on a cross-slope angle for the entire radius of the turn. Ideal access in all situations is to have a flush transition at curb ramps. Additionally, settling or heaving over the years tends to create transitional bumps between the roadway and curb ramp when crossing intersections.

#### **TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS:**

The existing Official Plan (excerpt) states that sidewalks shall be provided on;

- both sides of arterial roads
- at least one side of all local streets and collector streets except cul-de-sacs, unless they lead to a pedestrian node such as a school, park or shopping area and to be installed on the side of the street presenting the most logical direct pedestrian route to the major road or facility.

The existing Official Plan is undergoing an update and public review process. The new draft Official Plan (excerpt) state that sidewalks shall be provided on;

- both sides of the street on arterial roads
- both sides of the road on collector roads
- both sides of the road, except cul-de-sacs, unless they lead to a pedestrian node such as a school, park, or shopping area.

MACOA supports the new draft Official Plan’s sidewalk placement requirements.

Sidewalk widths need to be wide enough to accommodate mobility devices, and particularly need to be wide enough for these devices to turn around or pass other pedestrians. Currently, the City’s standard width on municipal roadways for setback sidewalks is 1.2 m on local roads, 1.5 m on arterial roads and 1.8 m for curb-faced sidewalks (Note: there are separate criteria for private development). These measurements are based on engineering and design manuals, and MACOA advocates for a consistent measurement of 1.8 m that facilitates inclusion.

The Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) adopted by Council in April 2006 state in part that;  
*The minimum clear width for exterior routes shall be 1.22 m; and where space is required for two wheelchairs to pass, it shall be 1.83 m. Every accessible route less than 1.83 m wide shall be provided with an unobstructed space of not less than 1.83 m in width and 1.83 m in length, located not more than 30 meters apart. Accessible routes shall have a running slope not steeper than 1:25 and have a cross slope not steeper than 1:50.*

Further and more legislatively binding, the pending Built Environment Standard (under the *Provincial Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005*) proposes an 1.8 m width for an exterior accessible route. Once enacted the Built Environment Standard will be an Ontario Regulation and supercede FADS.

Therefore, to be inclusive and more consistent MACOA suggests that sidewalks consistently be a minimum of 1.8 m wide. The City's current practices for curb-faced sidewalks are currently 1.8 m wide and remain in agreement with MACOA's statement. Private sites (e.g. plazas, etc.) with accessible parking spaces and doors that swing out onto the sidewalk are a minimum of 2.0 m wide and should remain so. Sidewalk width should be clearly indicated in City design standards such as the Site Plan Manual, or the future Urban Design & Development Manual or any other documents that indicate the requirements for a sidewalk. Also, a requirement and reference to FADS, Sec. 4.1.10 (curb ramps) shall also be included within the above-noted documents.

#### **SIDEWALK ACTION STATEMENT:**

That the inclusion of sidewalks is paramount to the global creation of community connectivity; and

That sidewalks shall be included in all development (new or retrofit); and

That sidewalks having "missing links" shall be installed as a priority to ensure connectivity; and

That the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Accessibility (MACOA) is opposed to the removal, deferral deletion or waiving of any sidewalk within the City of St. Catharines; and

That sidewalks will have consistent technical requirements of 1.8 m. minimum width on all roadways and include FADS, Sec. 4.1.10 for curb ramp design requirements.

That setback sidewalks should be the preferred and primary installation, with curb-faced sidewalks being installed only where there is no adequate space to install setback sidewalks; and

That if curb-faced sidewalks are installed they shall provide a sidewalk apron of detour around the cross-slope portion of curb ramps; and further

That Council denies all petitions to delete and/or defer sidewalks from plans.

**ACTIONS:**

That all City departments, most specifically Planning Services, are requested to place this Sidewalk Action Statement within any report to Council with respect to removal, deferral or deletion of sidewalk(s).

That Transportation & Environmental Services and Planning Services create the necessary drawings to clearly indicate these sidewalk requirements and adopt them into the guiding documents.

Council is requested to understand the global impact that the removal, deferral or deletion of sidewalk(s) cause to all pedestrians, including people with a disability.

**DEFINITIONS:**

**Mobility device** – means; An assistive device that augments mobility for a person with a disability such as; scooter, manual wheelchair, or power wheelchair.

**Disability** – means;

- “a) any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, a brain injury, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or other animal or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device,
- b) a condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability,
- c) a learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language,
- d) a mental disorder, or
- e) an injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997*; (“handicap”).”

**Barrier** – means;

anything that prevents a person with a disability from fully participating in all aspects of society because of his or her disability, including a physical barrier, an architectural barrier, an information or communications barrier, an attitudinal barrier, a technological barrier, a policy or a practice; (“obstacle”).

---

Resolution of Council – April 12, 2010 (excerpt)

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the Correspondence List for the Mayor and Members of Council dated April 12, 2010, be approved. FORTHWITH.

**MOVED BY COUNCILLOR STEVENS:** That the Correspondence List for the Mayor and Members of Council dated April 12, 2010, be approved;

and that all City departments be directed to consider the views of the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Accessibility as expressed in the Memorandum and the Sidewalk Action Statement, Item Number 7 of the Correspondence List, and be referenced in all future department reports pertaining to sidewalks. FORTHWITH.  
CARRIED FORTHWITH.

MACOA Minutes of 2009 09 23 (excerpt):

Item 5,b,iii - MACOA's sidewalk comment;

Planning Services received a request to defer or delete plans for a required sidewalk at a new residential development on Avery Avenue. A copy of MACOA's discussion and motion from its meeting in September of 2008 was forwarded to staff for inclusion in their report to Council with respect to this request. Planning Services does require sidewalks as part of residential development and MACOA strongly supports this. For the benefit of the newer MACOA members Diana Lecinski, Accessibility Coordinator, read out the motion and was asked to insert an excerpt from that meeting to the Minutes of this meeting. The Committee strongly noted that this continues to be its position and noted that today's residents may not reside there in the years to come, but the legacy of no pedestrian sidewalk will be.

The following is an excerpt from MACOA Minutes of September 24, 2008, Item 4,b,iv: *Sidewalks: Steve Bittner, TES Transportation Technologist also noted that sidewalks in new areas are, as a rule, generally installed. However occasionally residents make requests that sidewalks not be placed. Members of MACOA were unanimous in their concern about sidewalks being removed from development plans as regardless of ability or disability; it is more dangerous to walk on the roadway, it costs more to construct sidewalks after the fact in the future as the dynamics and desires of a neighbourhood changes, it is contrary to the focus on less vehicle use and more use of public transportation. Sidewalk benefits include; user friendly for everyone (aging population, families with strollers, etc.), sidewalks are particularly beneficial for people who are blind and use guide dogs or caning to navigate. Sidewalks are a pedestrian connecting linkage throughout the community and the members support the systematic provision for sidewalks. Steve Bittner reported that costs associated with building sidewalks are part of the development fees.*

Moved by: Shelley Stewart

Seconded by: Jim Demo

*That MACOA advocates for sidewalk placement and curb cuts to be made in all opportunities in the City of St. Catharines for reasons of safety, security and accessibility.*

CARRIED (2008 09 24)