

Strategic Priorities Committee

May 19, 2020 9:00 am Video Conference Click the following link: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCzuUpFqxcEl8OG-dOYKteFQ

Pages

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

3. AMENDMENTS AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the May 19, 2020 Strategic Priorities Committee agenda be accepted as presented.

4. STRATEGIC PRIORITIES REVIEW

4.1 PW 20-2020 Sidewalk Infrastructure Review

RECOMMENDATION

THAT PW 20-2020 Sidewalk Infrastructure Review report be received; and

THAT Council direct staff to consider the proposed sidewalk plan when preparing future capital plans.

5. CLOSED SESSION

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council move into a session that is closed to the public at _____ am as authorized under the *Municipal Act*, Section 239(2)(c) a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board.

5.1 PW 19-2020 CONFIDENTIAL Industrial Land Servicing Strategy Project Update

6. RISE AND REPORT

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council rise from a closed session at _____ am / pm.

7. NEXT MEETING

June 16, 2020 - 9:00 am, Council Chambers

8. ADJOURNMENT

RECOMMENDATION

THAT this meeting of the Strategic Priorities Committee adjourn at _____ am / pm.



Subject:	PW 20-2020 Sidewalk Infrastructure Review
Date of Meeting:	19 May 2020
Prepared by:	Jeff Wolfe, Asset Management and Engineer Specialist
То:	Chair Strathdee and Members of Strategic Priorities Committee

PURPOSE

This report presents a holistic review of the Town's sidewalk infrastructure and related policies to develop a comprehensive plan for sidewalk infrastructure improvement investment.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT PW 20-2020 Sidewalk Infrastructure Review report be received; and

THAT Council direct staff to consider the proposed sidewalk plan when preparing future capital plans.

BACKGROUND

At the Special Meeting of Council on March 19, 2019 Council received a report regarding a potential capital project to install new sidewalk on Maxwell Street. Council discussed the options presented and agreed that a more comprehensive review of the entire Town road network is needed prior to making a capital funding decision on Maxwell Street. Council then made the following motion:

Resolution 2019-03-19-04

Moved By Councillor Craigmile, Seconded By Councillor Hainer

THAT PW 18-2019 Maxwell St. Pedestrian Facility Review be received;

THAT Council direct staff to review the entire road network and prepare a report back to Council comparing the existing road network and its pedestrian facilities to the Town design standards and bringing forward recommendations on ways to improve the overall safety of pedestrian crossings

REPORT

Sidewalks are a designated space for pedestrians within the road allowance. They are an important aspect to a community's transportation system, allowing for a separated safe path of travel to the most vulnerable roadway users. Walking is healthy, environmentally friendly and can reduce the dependence on automobiles. Walking also increases the opportunity for socializing in the community, contributes to recreation, promotes independence, and facilitates economic activity. New sidewalks must be inclusive, meeting the requirements of the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA).

While sidewalks act as an asset in many ways to the community, they can become a liability if not maintained properly. There is a high probability of litigation related to sidewalk networks as our society becomes more litigious. The majority of claims received by the Town are related to slip and falls, with a typical frequency of one claim per year from slips and falls in Town road allowances. Each claim costs the Town \$15,000 in deductible payments.

As such, it is important to ensure proper pedestrian facilities are provided where necessary, and that the sidewalk network is maintained to an appropriate standard.

Engineering Design Guidelines and Sidewalk Policy

The Town publishes engineering design guidelines in order to consistently communicate the detailed infrastructure requirements for development and reconstruction projects within the Town. The guidelines are an amalgamation of the various Town infrastructure policies. From the pipe material specifications of watermain to the mix of concrete used in sidewalks, the guidelines provide almost all of the details associated with municipal infrastructure construction.

The guidelines (sidewalk excerpt Attachment 1) compliment the Town's Sidewalk Policy, which was adopted in 1996 and amended in 2005 (Attachment 2). Staff utilize the guidelines and sidewalk policy documents to assist in decision making related to sidewalk investments. The guidelines and sidewalk policy are designed to ensure the Town provides pedestrian facilities that consider community benefit, operational efficiencies, economic constraints and engineering best practices. Decision making, such as prioritization of investment and determining which side of the street to install sidewalk is heavily influenced by these documents.

Some requirements from the guidelines and sidewalk policy that are relevant to this discussion include:

- Sidewalk required on both sides for arterial and collector streets. Sidewalk required on one side on local streets and cul-de-sacs with 12 or more lots
- New sidewalks are preferred on downtown side of street or match existing configuration adjacent to construction zone (ie. on a consistent side of the street)
- Avoid building "curbface" sidewalk unless absolutely required (because grass boulevards provide improved pedestrian safety and winter snow storage)
- Reconstruction of sidewalk should line up with adjacent road reconstruction projects unless road reconstruction is not contemplated in the following 5 year capital program
- Commercial establishments, schools, hospitals nursing homes, senior's complexes and recreation facilities generate a high volume of vulnerable pedestrians and should be prioritized
- Single family homes generate a moderate volume of pedestrians and should be assigned medium prioritization
- Industrial complexes generate low volumes of pedestrians with a low percentage of vulnerable users and should be assigned a low priority

Council has made significant investment in recent years to improve the safety and accessibility of the Town's pedestrian network. These include Level 1 PED stop light crossing at St. John St. and Queen St., PXO buttons in the downtown, new PXO on James St. S. at DCVI, new accessible sidewalks on Victoria St., Warner St., Brock St., and St. George St. N, as well as numerous spot repair and ramp tactile plate installations throughout Town.

Existing Conditions and Maintenance Activities

The Town owns and maintains 46km of sidewalk within municipal right of ways. These sidewalks sometimes overlap with the Loop Trail but this quantity does not include Town trail infrastructure outside of the road allowances. The sidewalk network was last inspected by a third party consultant in 2014 (R.J. Burnside and Associates). The sidewalk network currently has an overall condition of "Fair", with a 2020 replacement cost of roughly \$5.7M. Sidewalks are assumed to have a 40 year useful life in the Town's Asset Management Plan. Attachment 3 shows the location of the Town's existing sidewalk network.

Public Works staff maintain the sidewalk network in the winter months with snow and ice clearing operations and in the summer months with various construction and maintenance activities. The Town's maintenance program is designed to maintain the sidewalk infrastructure to an acceptable level of service and to reduce the risk of pedestrian injury by following the provincial maintenance standards. Every year all municipal sidewalks are inspected by municipal staff for deficiencies. The findings assist staff with determining where maintenance activities should be focused. There are typically five (5) methods to sidewalk maintenance that the Town utilizes to address deficiencies. These include:

- Marking the deficiency with paint to make pedestrians more aware of hazards
- Grinding small trip hazards
- Lifting sunken sidewalk panels
- Filling spalls or cracks with cold patch asphalt
- Replacing damaged concrete panels with new concrete

Each hazard is documented and reviewed by staff to determine the most appropriate method of repair. When work occurs on ramps at intersections, they are upgraded with AODA compliant tactile plates. The Town spends \$60,000 on winter maintenance and \$30,000 on summer operational maintenance per year on the sidewalk network. The capital requirement for replacing a proportionate amount of sidewalk network on an annual basis is \$143,000. These capital and operational costs (total lifecycle costs) across the total length of sidewalk network results in an annual cost of approximately \$5,000/km/yr. In order to maintain the existing infrastructure deficit, Council theoretically needs to increase annual tax revenue by \$5,000 for every km of sidewalk added to the network.

"Excessive" Sidewalk Infrastructure

There have been times in the past where sidewalk was installed in excess of the Town's guidelines and sidewalk policy. These locations include local roads where sidewalk was installed on both sides. These locations are depicted in Attachment 4. The exact reason for these extra sidewalks is unknown but appear to mostly have related to churches. The Town incurs an unnecessary cost to continue owning and maintaining these additional sidewalks. In some cases these extra sidewalks are in very poor condition, segmented or appear to provide little additional benefit. There are approximately 1.8km of these "excessive" sidewalks.

Staff suggest that an approach be adopted to eliminate these additional sidewalks over time. This approach will allow existing operational budget to absorb installation of new sidewalk in areas where there is a sidewalk deficit. Some additional sidewalks that are either segmented or in poor condition could be removed immediately, while others could be removed as their condition degrades or the road is reconstructed. Attachment 4 depicts the proposed approach to eliminating this excessive sidewalk infrastructure. Attachment 5 includes the proposed approach in table form.

"Deficient" Sidewalk Infrastructure

Sidewalk infrastructure is expensive to both construct and maintain. Additional investment in sidewalks typically results from public request or during changing conditions (i.e. A neighbourhood changes demographics or a new high pedestrian-generating facility is introduced). Areas that do not meet the requirements of the design guidelines or sidewalk policy are considered "existing non-conforming" similar to the way buildings might be treated in the light of new zoning or planning requirements.

The locations where there are no sidewalks that theoretically are required by the policy are shown in Attachment 6. The data is presented in a table as Attachment 8. Further details on the sidewalk class and prioritization are discussed later in this report. The total length of new sidewalk that would be

required to meet the sidewalk policy is 28.7km. Much of this new sidewalk would be scarcely used and the expense would be difficult to justify in the foreseeable future.

From an asset management perspective, Council can consider the existing sidewalk network as the existing level of service provided to the community. The difference between the theoretical amount of sidewalk required by the Town's sidewalk policy and the actual amount of sidewalk provided by the Town can be considered the sidewalk network deficit.

Addressing the Network Deficit

The Town does not enjoy the freedom of unlimited financial capacity, and in fact has a significant (\$670,000) annual infrastructure deficit. As such, a meticulous, financially responsible plan must be implemented to prioritize system improvements.

Utilizing the prioritization criteria from the Sidewalk Policy, staff have assigned classifications to the sidewalk network (depicted in Attachment 6) and developed a long term plan for sidewalk network improvements. The plan is illustrated in Attachment 7 and shown in table form in Attachment 8. The plan categorizes sidewalk construction or reconstruction into four options.

- 1. **Priority** Construct or reconstruct as a stand-alone project, not dependent on other inputs. This approach addresses an existing concern or priority when a reconstruction and/or adjacent development is not anticipated.
- 2. **Road Reconstruction**. Construct or reconstruct in conjunction with an adjacent road reconstruction project. Sidewalk would not be constructed until the time of a planned road reconstruction project.
- 3. **Dependent on Development** Construct or reconstruct at the time of development in the area. The plan attempts to minimize the financial burden by designating some potential sidewalk locations as "dependent on development". These locations would either be paid directly by new development or by development charges in the future. This approach is appropriate as pedestrian volumes in those locations typically would not warrant a sidewalk until development occurs.
- 4. **Non-Priority** Sidewalk unlikely to be constructed based on available information at this time.

	Short Term (1-5yr)	Medium Term (6-10yr)	Long Term (11-25yr)	Very Long Term (>25yr)
Priority Locations	1.3KM, \$152,000	1.4km, \$165,000	1.4KM, \$165,000	0.8km, \$97,000
Road Reconstruction	0.6KM, \$77,000	0.3KM, \$35,000	1.9KM, \$226,000	0.1KM, 15,000
Dependent on Development	0.9KM, \$110,000	0KM, \$0	6.1KM, \$740,000	4.1KM, \$487,000
Non- Priority	0KM, \$0	0KM, \$0	0KM, \$0	9.8KM, \$1,176,000
TOTAL	2.8KM, \$340,000	1.7KM, \$200,000	9.4KM, \$1,131,000	14.8KM, \$1,775,000

The following is a summary of the proposed plan

On average, the plan would require roughly \$30,000 per year for the first 10 years to address "priority" sidewalks where development and road reconstruction is not anticipated. In addition to the initial capital investment, this extra infrastructure would require roughly \$15,000 per year being collected in taxes to pay for the operating, maintenance and replacement costs of the new assets.

Planned road reconstruction projects will incorporate an additional \$112,000 in new sidewalk investment over that 10 year period. This will result in an additional \$5,000 per year required from taxes. Sidewalks to be constructed as part of development will result in another \$5,000 increase in tax revenue requirement over that time period.

Pedestrian Crossings

Pedestrians entering the roadway represents a significant opportunity for conflict between vehicular and pedestrian traffic. As such, it is important to ensure crossing conditions are consistent and predictable. Municipalities in Ontario follow the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) when installing pedestrian crossings to ensure consistency and predictability to make the condition as safe as possible. Level 1 crossings such as stop signs and traffic lights provide the highest level of prioritization for pedestrians over vehicles. However, Level 1 Crossings disrupt vehicular traffic flow, can have unintentional impacts on traffic patterns, and can create an unpredictable condition for motorists if used inappropriately.

The OTM was updated in 2015 and includes additional options for Level 2 pedestrian crossings. The Town implemented a Level 2 Class B pedestrian crossing on James St. S. at DCVI in 2019. The crossing replaced an existing crossing guard, provides 24-hour service, and represented a four year return on investment. The Town intends to incorporate a Level 2, Class D pedestrian crossing for pedestrians on the Grand Trunk Trail when Wellington Street North is extended into the Thames Crest Farms development. Level 2 pedestrian crossing provide an additional level of safety for pedestrians through signage but still require pedestrians to ensure vehicles have yielded. Their advantage is lower installation & operational costs then level 1 and a lower disruption to traffic flow as vehicles can proceed immediately after a pedestrian has left the roadway.

When determining whether or not to install a mid-block Level 2 Crossing, a warrant process is to be undertaken. The warrant process uses standard engineering practice to determine whether a crossing is required in a particular location. There are no locations in St. Marys where the pedestrian counts would warrant a mid-block crossing. As a result, the installation of additional crossings would need to be driven by a specific concern of Council generally focus around a pedestrian traffic generator, ie school or recreation facility. The installation of additional mid-block crossings has not been considered in this review because warrants are not met.

Notable Concerns or Priorities

There was one reoccurring public concern that staff attempted to address and incorporate into the plan:

- East Ward Traffic Patterns

Staff have been monitoring a situation in the east ward for several years where local roads are being used as if they are collector roads. This appears to be the result of the inappropriate use of stop signs along Huron Street when the Little Falls Elementary School was built. The additional stop signs on Huron St. result in north-south traffic using Rogers Ave. and Waterloo St. S. to get through to Queen St. E. Staff are receiving frequent complaints from residents on Waterloo Street due the increased traffic flow that has been diverted to Waterloo St. as a result of the extra top signs placed on Huron St.

Huron Street is a collector road, and is intended to carry larger amounts of traffic. It is staff's opinion that the Town should be taking action to reinstate Huron Street as a collector, and remove the increased traffic from Waterloo Street (a local road). This can be done by strategically removing the stop signs at Elizabeth St. and Elgin St., and relocating a stop sign to Rogers Ave. This approach will result in a safe Level 1 condition for pedestrians to cross Huron St. while re-distributing traffic to Huron Street where it

was originally intended. This also allows for school bus turning to have yield conditions on Huron St. Sidewalk network improvements are required in the area to accommodate this plan.

Trail Network Integration

The Town's trail network and the Town's sidewalks work in conjunction to provide an active transportation network across the Town. Trails will, at times, augment the need for sidewalks and sidewalks will sometimes provide integral connecting links for the various sections of trail. The Town's Green Committee is currently working through an Active Transportation Study that will categorize trails and prioritize active transportation network investments. Throughout the analysis contained in today's report, trails were sometimes utilized to augment the need for sidewalks in road allowances when the road allowances did not allow for sidewalk. If a trail utilized a road allowance as a connecting link, but the road allowance was without a sidewalk, this was considered during prioritization. Attachment 9 shows locations where the road network is utilized for trail connectivity and also indicates which of those sections is currently without sidewalk.

Construction Considerations

When the time comes to execute the plan, there are issues that typically arise with local residents that Council should be aware of:

- Tree Conflicts and Extra Costs Due to Utilities

When a section of sidewalk is selected for construction or replacement, staff ensure that the location of the new sidewalk is located in an optimal area of the road allowance to improve pedestrian safety, reduce future operational issues, and avoid existing obstacles. Existing obstacles such as hydro poles, fire hydrants, telecommunication pedestals and mature trees are all considered prior to locating the new sidewalk. Conflicts are often unavoidable and sometimes utilities must be moved or trees must be cut down to accommodate the new sidewalk. Future considerations for potential road widening also play a factor in sidewalk location.

- Driveway Conflicts

Driveways are also impacted when sidewalks are constructed as residents cannot park across a sidewalk .This is less of an issue in newer sections of Town where zoning setback requirements theoretically result in suitable parking space on private property. However, many of the locations without sidewalk are located in older areas of Town where houses may have been built with less stringent zoning requirements, resulting in a high probability of conflict.

It is also desirable from both a maintenance and accessibility perspective to maintain a consistent colour and texture for the area designated for pedestrians. As a result, sidewalks cross driveways rather than terminate at them. Some residents who are either very particular about their property or who have invested in an upgraded driveway material often are very unhappy about new sidewalks cutting through their driveways. Unfortunately, this is unavoidable when carrying out this type of work.

- Grading Conflicts

Sidewalks are installed with a crossfall of 2-4%. This allows for positive drainage while maintaining a comfortable experience for the pedestrian using the facility. St. Marys has a lot of properties where front lawn grade changes exceed 4%. When the sidewalk is installed in these areas, it results in a steeper lawn adjacent to the sidewalk to make up for the minimal grade change across the width of the sidewalk. This sometimes requires cutting back into lawns to properly transition the change in grade.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This report shows that there is the potential for unsustainable investment in the Town's sidewalk network. The Town is currently experiencing an infrastructure funding deficit and further network improvements without a financing strategy would further increase the Town's funding deficit. As part of the Town's Asset Management Program, a Financial Plan will be developed in the next two years for Council to make decisions on how to narrow the funding gap while addressing aging infrastructure in the future. The proposed plan would maintain the current operating expenses for the first two years and only install priority sidewalk quantities that replace "excessive sidewalks" that are to be removed. After that time, Council will have had an opportunity to adopt a financial plan to address sidewalk network improvements in the future.

SUMMARY

The Town of St. Marys owns and maintains 46 km of sidewalk. The Town's Engineering Design Guidelines and Sidewalk Policy outline details of how and where sidewalk is to be prioritized and installed. This report presents a review of the existing short-comings of the Towns sidewalk network and presents a long term plan for network improvements. Staff are recommending that the plan be considered in future annual budget deliberations.

The plan includes the following:

- Immediate removal of 90m of "excessive" sidewalk
- Future removal of 1.8km of "excessive" sidewalk when the condition of those sidewalks degrade
- \$30,000 per year (on average) for 10 years to invest in new sidewalks in locations where development and road reconstruction is not anticipated, totaling 2.7km in new sidewalk.
- \$10,000 per year (on average) for 10 years to invest in new sidewalks as part of road reconstruction projects, totaling 0.9km in new sidewalk
- Require 0.9km of development driven sidewalk be constructed as part of anticipated developments.
- For every kilometer of sidewalk added to the Town's network, an additional \$5,000 in revenue is required on an annual basis to cover the new asset's operating, maintenance, and replacement costs.

STRATEGIC PLAN

- This initiative is supported by the following priorities, outcomes, and tactics in the Plan.
 - Pillar #1 Developing a Comprehensive and Progressive Infrastructure Plan:
 - Outcome: St. Marys is committed to developing a progressive and sustainable infrastructure plan that meets the infrastructure needs of today and tomorrow.
 - Tactic(s): Identify immediate needs in the community. When developing the Annual Capital Plan, have regard for infrastructure needs identified in the asset management plan before considering new builds or renovations that represent significant service level improvements.

OTHERS CONSULTED

Transportation Association of Canada – Geometric Design Guideline for Canadian Roads (2017)

Municipal Engineers Association – Municipal Works Design Manual (1984

RJ Burnside & Associates – Town of St. Marys Sidewalk Assessment Study (2014)

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 Town of St. Marys Engineering Guidelines Excerpt
- Attachment 2 Town of St. Marys Sidewalk Policy
- Attachment 3 Existing Sidewalk Network Map
- Attachment 4 "Excessive" Sidewalk Map
- Attachment 5 "Excessive" Sidewalk List
- Attachment 6 Sidewalk "Deficit" Map
- Attachment 7 Sidewalk Plan Map
- Attachment 8 Sidewalk Plan List
- Attachment 9 Loop Trail and Sidewalk Network

REVIEWED BY

Recommended by the Department

Jeff Wo

Asset Management/Engineering Specialist

Recommended by the CAO

Brent Kittmer CAO / Clerk

Jed Kelly Director of Public Works

TOWN OF ST. MARYS ENGINEERING DESIGN GUIDELINES EXERPT

2.6 SIDEWALKS AND WALKWAYS

All sidewalks are to be with a minimum of 1.5 m wide 140 mm thick concrete (exposure class C-2), constructed in accordance with the appropriate OPS specifications. Wider Sidewalks may be required in high pedestrian areas and/or where required by the Town. The location of the sidewalk(s) shall be confirmed with the Town prior to commencing the detailed design and in general sidewalks shall be located on the "Downtown side of the street" and the exterior side for crescents. All local streets and cul-de-sacs (more than 12 lots) shall have a sidewalk on one side with all other streets requiring sidewalk on both sides and are to be continuous through all driveways including industrial, commercial and institutional driveways. Walkways are to extend through sidewalk and terminate at curb depression.

Sidewalk ramps are to be installed in accordance with the appropriate OPS drawings and all designs must satisfy the requirements of the applicable provincial legislation for accessibility. The crossfall for all sidewalks shall be a minimum of 2% and a maximum of 4%, with no steps allowed. Entrance tactile plates shall be clay red in colour and shall be cast iron. Tactile Walking Surface Indicators shall comply with O. Reg. 191/11 Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005, OPSD 310.039 and meet the following requirements.

Standard	Property	Minimum Result
ASTM A 8	Tensile Strength	Class 30B
ASTM C 1028	Slip Resistance	Dry 0.8 min, wet 0.65 min
ASTM C 501-84	Wear Resistance	Wear Index: >15

The truncated domes shall be of uniform size and shape. Units shall be uniform in texture, be free from pouring faults, sponginess, cracks, blowholes, and other defects, and have clean-cut and well-defined edges. All surfaces shall be uniform and free of flaking rust or mounts of rust or debris. Tactile walking surface indicators shall have ribs cast to the underside of the unit, have vent holes, and have a minimum plate thickness of 5 mm. Tactile Plate colour shall be "clay red".

Installation

Tactile walking surface indicators shall be set and pressed into wet concrete to final elevation according to OPSD 310.033 and as per the manufacturer's recommendations. Remove any wet concrete that may spill onto tactile walking surface indicator surface.

Walkways as shown on the approved Engineering Drawings are to be constructed with concrete sidewalks on a compacted base, per the standards for sidewalks.

Walkways within park areas shall be located as directed by the Town.

The Town requires that all concrete walkways be constructed as indicated on the approved Engineering Drawings, prior to preliminary acceptance.



TOWN OF ST. MARYS AMENDED SIDEWALK POLICY

Purpose of the Policy is – To establish a standard method of setting clear and fair priorities for spending the annual sidewalk budget in the best interest of taxpayers.

Considerations for Policy

- Sidewalk is only necessary in areas of pedestrian traffic.
- Areas of larger volumes of pedestrians should be areas of higher priority for sidewalk expenditures.
- Generally, commercial establishments, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, senior's complexes and recreation facilities generate highest intensity pedestrian traffic. Large industrial complexes usually generate motor vehicle traffic and not much volume of pedestrians – certainly not young or infirm pedestrians.
- Single-family dwellings generate moderate concentrations of pedestrian traffic.
- Road classifications also affect sidewalk considerations. Roads with high traffic volumes (arterials and collectors) become difficult and even unsafe to cross, especially for children and handicapped pedestrians.
- Areas of both high pedestrian and high motor vehicle use are natural high priorities for sidewalks.
- Reconstruction of sidewalks should not take place in zones that are scheduled on the five-year forecast for road reconstruction.

Physical Standards/Policy

Sidewalk requirements

Sidewalk both sides for arterial and collector streets and one side for local streets and cul-de-sac of 12 lots and more.

Other general requirements

- Sidewalk to be 1.5 metres wide (5')
- Wider sidewalks may be required in high pedestrian areas

Sidewalk location placement

- New sidewalks location is preferred on the "downtown side of street"
- Match existing sidewalk configuration placement (sidewalks beyond the construction zone)
- New sidewalk construction conform to the Ontario Provincial Standards (OPS)
- Avoid building 'curb faced' sidewalk (walk adjacent to the traveled portion of road)
- Build barrier free ramps at all intersections where construction takes place

<u>Facets of Work</u>

- 1. Repair: By grinding in areas where walk is good or excellent but an elevation difference (maximum 1") exists; or pad/patch where dangerous sidewalk exists where a road section is being totally rebuilt in near future.
- 2. Replace: Single panels for utility cuts, deep settlements/tree root heaves more than 1" elevation difference.
- 3. Reconstruct: Full-length blocks of work with large percentage of broken, uneven or rough surfaced sidewalk.
- 4. Construct: Any area where sidewalk is required and future roadwork or underground work is not immediately planned.

Policy

A comprehensive sidewalk policy will ensure that all categories – Repair, Replace, Reconstruct and Construct of work are included. It also gives consideration to pedestrian safety and where competing needs exist, and then the higher priority will be given to the section with a larger number of exposures to incidents. A slight priority should be given to reconstructing existing over constructing new.

ⁱ June 28, 2005





TOWN OF ST. MARYS

2020

Official Plan Excessive Sidewalks

 Sidewalks Remaining Sidewalks Not Being Replace - Immediate Sidewalk Removal Town Boundary

0.5

Document Path: S:\Department Shared Folders\GIS\GIS\Projects\Sidewalks_OP_doublesidewalks.mxd

∃Km∣

Town of St. Marys

PW 20-2020 Sidewalk Infrastructure Review Report

<u>"Excessive" Sidewalk</u>							
			Proposed /	Approach			
Local Roads with 2			Length	Length			
Sidewalks	From	То	Remaining (m)	Removed (m)			
Immediate Removal	_	_					
Elgin St E	James St S	50m West	73	44			
Robinson St	Queen St W	25m North	179	48			
TOTAL				92			
Remove when Condition	Degrades - Do not R	eplace					
Widder St E	Water St N	Wellington St N	98	97			
Widder St E	Church St N	Peel St N	103	98			
Widder St E	Peel St N	King St N	101	100			
Church St N	Widder St E	125m North	134	113			
Jones St W	Ontario St S	Thomas St	217	217			
St John St S	DCVI (45m South)	Elizabeth St	98	, O			
Rogers Ave	DCVI (100m West)	Huron St S	201	. 0			
Stoneridge Blvd	Ridgewood Cres	Southvale Rd	161	168			
Stoneridge Blvd	Ridgewood Cres	Ridgewood Cres	65	29			
Stoneridge Blvd	45m South	Ridgewood Cres	50	53			
Elizabeth St	Church St S	Tracy St	33	32			
Elizabeth St	Tracy St	Peel St S	106	99			
Elizabeth St	Peel St S	King St S	90	84			
Elizabeth St	King St S	James St S	75	90			
Wellington St S	Victoria	Park St	157	160			
Wellington St S	St Maria St	Victoria St	177	183			
Jones St E	Peel St S	King St S	100	97			
Jones St E	King St S	James St S	78	71			
Elgin St E	Church St S	Peel St S	100	97			
Church St S	Park St	Elizabeth St	413	0			
Church St S	Elizabeth St	Elgin St E	325	0			
Church St S	Elgin St E	Jones St E	213	0			
Peel St S	Jones St E	Queen St E	197	0			
Peel St N	Queen St E	Timms Ln	108	107			
Peel St N	Timms Ln	15m North	14	10			
TOTAL				1,905			



∃Km



TOWNOF ST.MARYS

New Sidewalk Priority

Short Term (1-5yrs)
Medium Term (6-10yrs)
Long Term (11-25 years)
Very Long Term (>25yrs)
Town Boundary

0.5

Document Path: S:\Department Shared Folders\GIS\GIS\Projects\Loop TrailSidewalkNetworkIntegration.mxd

Page 18 of 22

⊐Km

Town of St. Marys PW 20-2020 Sidewalk Infrastructure Review Report

Sidewalk Plan	Sidewalk Plan							
Name	From	То	Length (m)	Priority	Sidewalk Class	Deficiency Approach	Cost	
Ridgewood Cres	23 Ridgewood Cres	Hawthorn Crt	204	Short Term (1-5yrs)	4	Dependant on Development	\$ 24,505.67	
Ridgewood Cres	176 Ridgewood Cres	Hawthorn Crt	257	Short Term (1-5yrs)	4	Dependant on Development	\$ 30,802.81	
Hawthorn Crt	20m North	Ridgewood Cres	20	Short Term (1-5yrs)	4	Dependant on Development	\$ 2,426.32	
Huron St S	Queen St E	Jones St E	96	Short Term (1-Syrs) Short Term (1-Syrs)	2	Priority	\$ 11,528.61 \$ 11,685.02	
Huron St S	Elgin St E	Elizabeth St	124	Short Term (1-5yrs)	2	Priority	\$ 14,909.72	
Huron St S	Elizabeth St	Rogers Ave	99	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 11,826.05	
Huron St S	Rogers Ave	Sparling Cres (North Leg)	90	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 10,820.79	
Huron St S	Sparling Cres (North Leg)	Sparling Cres (South Leg)	203	Short Term (1-5yrs) Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 9,944.52 \$ 24,418.89	
Maxwell St	Dunsford Cres (East Leg)	Huron St S	72	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 8,662.30	
Maxwell St	Dunsford Cres (West Leg)	Dunsford Cres (East Leg)	77	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 9,234.53	
Maxwell St	James St S	Dunsford Cres (East Leg)	220	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 26,420.05	
Elizabeth St	Brock St S	Waterloo St S	187	Short Term (1-5yrs)	3	Road Reconstruction	\$ 22,461.16	
Waterloo St S	Elizabeth St	Flizabeth St	121	Short Term (1-5yrs)	3	Road Reconstruction	\$ 11,807.32 \$ 14.498.33	
Egan Ave	Wellington St N	Church St N	91	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Road Reconstruction	\$ 10,909.86	
Egan Ave	Church St N	Peel St N	89	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Road Reconstruction	\$ 10,715.69	
Wellington St N	59m North	Egan Ave	59	Short Term (1-5yrs)	2	Road Reconstruction	\$ 7,032.65	
Glass St	lames St N	Edison St	83	Short Term (1-5yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 55,029.56 \$ 9,970.32	
James St N	64m North	Glass St	64	Short Term (1-5yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 7,734.97	
James St S	304 James St S	Pyramid Recreation Centre (111m South)	111	Short Term (1-5yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 13,283.48	
Elgin St W	Pelissier St	Carrall St	264	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	3	Priority	\$ 31,652.99	
Pelissier St	Queen St W	Elgin St W	207	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	3	Priority	\$ 24,824.43	
lames St S	Pyramid Recreation Centre	Municipal Operations Centre (306m South)	306	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	2	Priority	\$ 36.741.85	
Waterloo St S	Jones St E	Elgin St E	99	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	3	Priority	\$ 11,912.56	
Waterloo St S	Queen St E	Jones St E	96	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	3	Priority	\$ 11,534.60	
Wellington St N	Station St	Widder St E	141	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	2	Road Reconstruction	5 16,911.21	
Water St N	Peel St N	King St N	30	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	2	Road Reconstruction	3,545.84 5 15.042.02	
Wellington St N	123m South	Egan Ave	123	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	2	Road Reconstruction	\$ 14,704.54	
Station St	Church St N	Peel St N	101	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	2	Priority	\$ 12,068.56	
Station St	King St N	James St N	117	Medium Term (6-10yrs)	2	Priority	\$ 14,083.80	
Emily St	565m West	Thamesview Cres (East Leg)	565	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 67,820.39 \$ 54,000,70	
Glass St	Emily St	James St N	922	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 110.602.16	
James St N	167m North	Glass St	167	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 19,983.55	
Glass St	Emily St	James St N	829	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 99,433.68	
Queen St W	Thames Rd N	Ann St	669	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 80,306.11	
Queen St W Thames Rd N	Town Limit (405m West)	Thames Rd N	405	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 48,596.54 \$ 63,829.24	
Thames Rd N	Town Limit (532m North)	Queen St W	532	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 63,790.94	
Long St	Carrall St	Admore Ave	234	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Dependant on Development	\$ 28,068.60	
Carrall St	Elgin St W	Long St	399	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Dependant on Development	\$ 47,825.36	
Thomas St	Queen St W	Park St Wastewater Treatment Plant (559m South)	335	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Road Reconstruction	\$ 40,215.70	
Park St	George St	Tracy St	73	Long Term (11-25 years)	1	Road Reconstruction	\$ 07,034.50 \$ 8.794.69	
Park St	Tracy St	King St S	82	Long Term (11-25 years)	1	Road Reconstruction	\$ 9,878.49	
Sparling Cres	Hurons St S	Huron St S	461	Long Term (11-25 years)	4	Dependant on Development	\$ 55,285.90	
Charles St S	Jones St E	Elgin St E	100	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 12,022.68	
Charles St S	Eigin St E Oueen St F	St. Marys Cemetery (76m South)	76	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 9,139.17 \$ 11566.66	
Jones St E	Charles St S	Cain St	182	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 21,876.63	
Cain St	Jones St E	Elgin St E	99	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 11,915.89	
Queen St E	Brock St N	Waterloo St N	192	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Priority	\$ 23,019.61	
Queen St E	Waterloo St N	Charles St N 621 Oueon St E (140m East)	192	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Priority	\$ 23,013.59 \$ 16,916.15	
Station St	Wellington St N	66m East	66	Long Term (11-25 years)	2	Road Reconstruction	\$ 7.872.66	
Ontario St N	Widder St W	Maiden Ln	181	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Road Reconstruction	\$ 21,774.32	
Widder St W	Ingersoll St	Markham St	66	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 7,952.23	
Widder St W	Markham St	Salina St N	75	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 8,968.16	
Widder St W	Saina St N William St	Ontario St N	80	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Priority	\$ 9,635.69 \$ 9.085.37	
Maiden Ln	Salina St N	William St	79	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Road Reconstruction	\$ 9,533.55	
Maiden Ln	William St	Ontario St N	76	Long Term (11-25 years)	3	Road Reconstruction	\$ 9,135.16	
Park St	King St S	James St S	210	Long Term (11-25 years)	1	Road Reconstruction	\$ 25,180.98	
Park St	King St S	James St S St. Manus Comont (265m South)	217	Long Term (11-25 years)	1	Road Reconstruction	\$ 26,073.38	
Water St S	Tennis Courts	520 Water St S (442m South)	442	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	1	Priority	\$ 53,006.55	
Washington St	Water St S	Wellington St S	72	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$ 8,614.29	
Wellington St S	345 Wellington St S	351 Wellington St S (11m South)	11	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Non-Priority	\$ 1,339.80	
lames St N	Timms I n	Oueen St F	124	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	<u>2</u>	Koad Reconstruction	14,842.37 14 296 90 14 1	
Timms Ln	King St N	James St N	62	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$ 7,381.89	
Peel St N	Timms LN	Timms Ln	36	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$ 4,345.05	
Timms Ln	Peel St N	King St N	102	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$ 12,190.69	
James St S	Municipal Operations Centre (679m North)	Enterprise Dr Town Limite (422m South)	679	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 81,523.63	
James St S	407 James St S	21m South	435	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 2,502.82	
James St S	512m North	Given Rd	512	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$ 61,499.59	
James St S	Given Rd	Town Limits (604m South)	604	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 72,489.72	
Given Rd	James St S	228m East	228	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Dependant on Development	\$ 27,319.11	
Given Rd Water St S	172m West St. Marcy Cement	Town Limits (1044m South)	1/2	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Dependant on Development	\$ 20,689.28 \$ 125.305.12	
Water St S	Front St	Town Limits (867m South)	867	Very Long Term (>25vrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 104,037.08	
Water St S	520 Water St	Front St	145	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 17,425.73	
Thomas St	Wastewater Treatment Plant	Town Limits (1121m South)	1221	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 146,530.41	
Thomas St	Stonewillow Inn	Town Limits (1358m South)	1358	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 162,923.82	
Queen St E Queen St F	830 Queen St E	Town Limits (952m East)	952	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Non-Priority	J114,287.52 S 29.413 37	
Timms Ln	James St N	St George St N	67	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$ 8,093.86	
Jardine St	Water St N	Wellington St N	97	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$ 11,592.22	
Church St N	Station St	89m South	89	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 10,670.14	
widder St E Widder St F	St Andrew St N	SLANDREW ST N	295	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Dependant on Development	> 35,416.41 \$ 12 344 44	
Widder St E	Huron St N	Albert St	216	Very Long Term (>25vrs)	3	Dependant on Development	\$ 25,947.10	
Widder St E	Albert St	701 Widder St E (370m East)	370	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Dependant on Development	\$ 44,380.03	
Widder St E	433 Widder St E	701 Widder St E (522m East)	522	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Dependant on Development	\$ 62,592.07	
Glass St	Eaison St Millson Cres (West Leg)	Willson Cres (West Leg)	101	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$ 12,104.65 \$ 12,204.77	

Name	From	То	Length (m)	Priority	Sidewalk Class	Deficiency Approach		Cost
Glass St	Millson Cres (East Leg)	Guest Crt	93	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$	11,107.52
Glass St	Guest Crt	72m East	72	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$	8,692.18
Glass St	418 Glass St (79m West)	Samuel St	79	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$	9,506.29
Samuel St	Glass St	Carling St	171	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$	20,500.03
Samuel St	Glass St	Carling St	168	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Dependant on Development	\$	20,165.86
Robinson St	Widder St W	Maiden Ln	188	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	4	Non-Priority	\$	22,618.01
Salina St N	Widder St W	Maiden Ln	184	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Non-Priority	\$	22,117.17
Salina St N	Maiden Ln	Queen St W	163	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	1	Non-Priority	\$	19,509.88
Ingersoll St	Widder St W	Maiden Ln	200	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	3	Dependant on Development	\$	23,982.58
Ingersoll St	Maiden Ln	Queen St W	162	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	1	Dependant on Development	\$	19,463.07
Emily St	Town Limits (443m West)	555 Emily St	443	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$	53,186.86
Emily St	Town Limits (442m West)	550 Emily St	442	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	2	Non-Priority	\$	53,092.08
Water St S	Washington St	Lindsportsplex (296m South)	296	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	1	Non-Priority	\$	35,460.21
Water St S	St Maria St	Tennis Courts (350m South)	350	Very Long Term (>25yrs)	1	Non-Priority	Ś	42.021.98



∃Km

Page 21 of 22



