

# City of Peterborough

# Sidewalk Strategic Plan

## 2018 Update



Project Lead:  
Susan Sauvé  
Transportation Demand Management Planner

Geographic Information Analysis and Mapping:  
Charmalee Sandanayake  
Spatial Data Analyst

# City of Peterborough Sidewalk Strategic Plan 2018 Update

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Background .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Sidewalk Strategic Plan Purpose.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Process to Update the Plan .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Criteria for Ranking Sidewalks.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Review of Criteria .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Description of Criteria.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>GIS Application of Criteria.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Sidewalk Data Analysis .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Progress from 2008-2016 .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Addressing Remaining Sidewalk Gaps .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Other Sidewalk Strategic Plan Applications .....</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>Appendix A – 2016 Priority 1 and 2 Missing Sidewalk Segments.....</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Appendix B – GIS Analytical Results Map of Missing Sidewalk Segments.....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Appendix C – Sidewalks Constructed 2009-2016 .....</b>	<b>20</b>

# City of Peterborough

## Sidewalk Strategic Plan – 2018 Update

### 1.0 Introduction

#### 1.1 Background

Through the Official Plan, Transportation Plan Update, and the Access Plan, the City of Peterborough has expressed a clear commitment and desire to support walking as a mode of travel and recreation. In 2016, the City was awarded a Silver Walk Friendly designation by Walk Friendly Ontario, citing the Sidewalk Policy, Sidewalk Strategic Plan, supportive programming through Active and Safe Routes to School and Shifting Gears as key initiatives that have contributed to enhancing the walkability of the community. The Sidewalk Policy and Sidewalk Implementation Procedure state that sidewalks should be provided on both sides of all streets and describe how to go about providing sidewalks along streets where there has not been one previously.

Sidewalk infrastructure is a key component of urban design that supports walking. Sidewalks separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic and contribute significantly to creating a pedestrian friendly environment. Ramps on sidewalks at crossing points are critical for persons with a mobility disability and beneficial to those who have difficulty with curbs, including people with strollers and elderly people. The provision of sidewalks and sidewalk ramps can be a factor in determining whether a citizen can access public transit. All transit users are pedestrians at the beginning and end of every trip.

#### 1.2 Sidewalk Strategic Plan Purpose

The purpose of the Sidewalk Strategic Plan is to create a process to prioritize the provision of new sidewalks within the City of Peterborough. The scope of this project includes missing sections of sidewalk in existing developments throughout the city. The project does not include sidewalk repairs, which are handled through the Public Works Division.

This comprehensive analysis of sidewalk needs has proven to be an important tool in guiding sidewalk capital expenditures within the City. The Plan facilitates maximum benefit derived from capital expenditures on pedestrian facility investments made by the City over the short and long term, while creating efficient and accessible pedestrian linkages throughout the community.

### **1.3 Process to Update the Plan**

Recognizing that there are limited resources to address sidewalk gaps, the Sidewalk Strategic Plan uses a multi-variate spatial data analysis to prioritize the importance of missing sidewalk segments in the pedestrian network.

The process for updating the Sidewalk Strategic Plan included:

1. Updating sidewalk data in corporate GIS system to ensure it accurately reflects locations of existing sidewalks and sections of no sidewalk.
2. Reviewing the criteria for ranking segments of no sidewalk.
3. Updating the criteria data and incorporating the data into the GIS system if it is not yet there.
4. Testing the data analysis to determine its effectiveness. Rankings should reflect expected pedestrian demand and road safety factors.
5. Applying the criteria using GIS to the City's existing sidewalk map and undertaking data analysis. The results are shown in a table of ranked sidewalks and a map showing missing sidewalks according to level of priority for development.
6. Creating a report incorporating the maps and tables produced in the GIS analysis.

## **2.0 Criteria for Ranking Sidewalks**

### **2.1 Review of Criteria**

The initial project team for the 2008 Sidewalk Strategic Plan developed a set of criteria to reflect pedestrian demand and risk. These criteria were designed to reflect where higher pedestrian volumes are expected based on adjacent land uses and safety considerations such as traffic volume and speed. Based on input from staff and stakeholders, new criteria were tested and two new ones were added in the 2012 review:

- beaten paths along arterial and collector roads; and,
- added points for an arterial road with more than two travel lanes.

For the 2016 review, several new criteria were added to refine the analysis further:

- slope data was incorporated effectively for the first time;
- sidewalk gaps within 100 metre of a crossing guard location;
- senior activity centres were added to the retirement home criteria;
- the occurrence and frequency of pedestrian collisions along a corridor;  
and
- short gaps in the existing sidewalk network.

The addition of new criteria has resulted in a more robust and comprehensive analysis, but it does mean that the points attributed to the priority rating of sidewalk had to be increased to reflect that the total number of point attributed to any given sidewalk gap can be higher. For example, in the 2012 analysis, a sidewalk was ranked as a priority 1 if it had 105 or more points. In the 2016 analysis, the points for a priority 1 sidewalk is 145 points and higher.

## 2.2 Description of Criteria

The criteria and the source of the data to apply the criteria are described in the following table. Criteria added in 2016 are identified with an asterisk '\*’.

**Table 1: Description of Criteria**

Variable	Description	Assigned Value	Source of Data
<b>1 .Type of Road<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(RD)</i>	Arterial - more than 2 motorized vehicle travel lanes	25	Layer in corporate mapping system, automatically updated
	Arterial - 2 motorized vehicle travel lanes	15	
	Collector	10	
	Local	0	
<b>2. Major Pedestrian Generators</b>	Within 500 m of a hospital, transit terminal, library, Wellness Centre, Y <sup>1</sup> <i>(MAJ)</i>	10	Corporate mapping system
	Within 500 m of: <sup>2</sup>		
	• Senior Housing/ Activity Centre (retirement residence, long term care, social housing, affordable housing, senior activity centre*) <i>(SENIOR)</i>	5	Age Friendly Mapping - Age Friendly Peterborough Coordinator (Social Services), Housing Division, Corporate mapping system

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible housing complex (ACC)</li> </ul>	5	Housing Division (Social Housing Directory, Rebecca Morgan-Quinn list from Affordable Housing Program), Ben Taylor (community living)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density housing (HIGHD)</li> </ul>	5	Tax assessment, 7 + units
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major medical clinic, health unit (MED)</li> </ul>	5	Sue Sauve (phone book, Google)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arena (ARENA)</li> </ul>	5	Corporate mapping system
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major tourist attraction, public building where the public is invited (art gallery, museum), community centre (TOUR)</li> </ul>	5	Sue Sauve, Nicole Schleifer, Mary Gallop
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Place of work over 200 employees (PWORK)</li> </ul>	5	GPAEDC, Nancy Fischer, Peterborough This Week Article
<b>3. School Zones<sup>1</sup> (SW)</b>	Within designated walking zone of an elementary school with 200+ walkers	20	Student Transportation Services of Central Ontario, individual maps for each school showing walking polygon and potential walkers being bussed
	Within designated walking zone of an elementary school with less than 200 walkers	15	
	Within designated walking zone of a secondary school with 200+ walkers	15	
	Within designated walking zone of a secondary school with less than 200 walkers	10	
	Within 1 km of a college or university	10	
<b>4. Students Bussed Within School Walking Zones<sup>1</sup> (SB)</b>	Within designated walking zone of an elementary or secondary school with 20+ students being bussed from an area	20	Student Transportation Services of Central Ontario, individual maps for each school showing walking polygon and potential walkers being bussed, Document providing Hazard missing sidewalks causing students to be bused
	Within designated walking zone of an elementary or secondary school and 10-19 students being bussed from an area	10	
	Within designated walking zone of an elementary or secondary school with 1-9 students being bussed from an area	5	

<b>5. Transit Routes<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(TRAN)</i>	Roads that are transit routes	20	Corporate mapping system (inclusive streets only, not streets touching)
<b>6. Commercial Areas<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(COM)</i>	Within the downtown (central area)	20	Corporate mapping system, Official Plan Schedule I
	Within 500 m of a major shopping centre	15	Corporate mapping system, Official Plan Schedule I
	Within 250 m of any other OP designated commercial area (includes special purpose retail, neighborhood centre, service commercial), C1 zoning and a convenience store	10	Corporate mapping system, Official Plan Schedule I, Zoning By-law (C1 designation), plus any convenience stores not covered by C1 zoning, Convenience Stores from Health Unit Tobacco Vendor Data
<b>7. Trails<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(PARK)</i>	Within 500 m of a trail or within 250 m of a park	10	Corporate mapping system pedestrian network major trails, corporate mapping system for parks (Regional, Community, Neighbourhood Parks)
<b>8. No sidewalks on either side<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(BOTH SIDE)</i>		20	GIS data analysis, does not apply to cul-de-sacs
<b>9. Beaten pathway along side of road<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(PATH)</i>	Along side an Arterial Road with missing sidewalks	20	Data captured using Aerial Photography, Google Streetview and site visits (Susan Sauve) to locate beaten paths on Arterial and Collector roads
	Along side an Collector Road with missing sidewalks	10	
<b>10. Crossing Guard</b> <i>*(CROSS)</i>	Within 100 metres of route leading to a crossing guard location	20	List of Crossing Guard Locations for 2016 from Todd Nancekivell, Traffic Division

<b>11. Slope*</b> <i>(SLOPE)</i>	>8%	20	2015 LiDAR data, GIS spatial analysis tools, some manual checking
	3-8%	10	
<b>12. Collision*</b> <i>(COLLISION)</i>	1-3 pedestrian collisions on corridor	20	Collision Data compiled by Traffic Division from Police reports
	4+ pedestrian collisions on corridor	30	
<b>13. Gap*</b> <i>(GAP)</i>	If the missing sidewalk is a gap between existing sidewalks along a block < 500 metres and on a arterial or collector road and not a dead end or surrounded by other no sidewalk lines	20	Manual checking , some GIS analysis
	If the missing sidewalk is a gap between existing sidewalks along a block < 500 metres and on a local road and not a dead end or surrounded by other no sidewalk lines	10	

In the development of the criteria, consideration was given to land uses and pedestrian traffic, recognizing that children and seniors are vulnerable age groups. To reflect this, there are three categories that include schools. One is the school-walking zone. Within this zone, school bus transportation is not provided and students are expected to walk to school. The second category identifies where students are bussed due to the lack of a sidewalk on an arterial or collector road. The third one is a new one; it assigns points to a missing sidewalk that is within 100 m of a school crossing guard location. Retirement homes, nursing homes and senior centres are within the major pedestrian generator category.

High pedestrian generators are assigned cumulative points. If there is a hospital, beside a retirement home and next to multi-residential housing, points accumulate within a 500 m buffer. Highest points are assigned to the hospital, the transit terminal, the library, the Sport & Wellness Centre and the Y.

Arterial and collector roads are assigned priority over local roads because traffic volumes and speeds are higher, creating potential risk for pedestrians where there is no sidewalk. Transit routes are included as criteria because transit users need sidewalks to access bus stops.



Roads where there is no sidewalk on either side are assigned 20 points, recognizing that the provision of a sidewalk on one side is generally better than no sidewalk. In some cases, roads with a sidewalk on one side still rank very highly due to the accumulation of points in other categories. On arterial and collector streets, there may not be a safe place to cross for some distance. Cul-de-sacs have lower volumes of traffic and are therefore not assigned points when there is no sidewalk on either side. In this way, cul-de-sacs are given less priority than other streets. Cul-de-sacs of less than 30 homes with no through walkway are not included in the analysis because they are not included in the Provision of Sidewalks Policy due to the low levels of pedestrian and vehicle volumes anticipated to use these streets.

Commercial areas, parks and trails are criteria due to the pedestrian traffic associated with them. The downtown area is assigned the highest number of commercial points, followed by major shopping centres, then other commercial areas designated in the Official Plan, as well as areas with a convenience store.

Slope data is one of the new criteria added in this review of the Sidewalk Strategic Plan. A road with a slope has shorter sight lines and more chance of a vehicle being out of control in snowy or icy conditions. Until now, the slope data did not reflect well the actual slopes of streets, so this is the first time this criterion has been incorporated.

In the last few years, the most requests for sidewalks that were not a priority 1 or 2 were sidewalk gaps within 100 metres of a crossing guard location. As a result, this has been added as criteria. With the high volume of vehicle traffic at school times and the high volume of children walking at the same time, sidewalks leading to school crossing guard locations were identified as important.

Senior activity centres were added to the retirement home criteria to support older adults striving to build walking into their day and to reflect that fewer older adults drive and rely on transit for transportation. They need the sidewalks to get to and from the transit stops.

Another criterion was added for the occurrence and frequency of pedestrian collisions along a corridor. Sidewalks contribute to reducing vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

To most effectively expand upon the existing sidewalk network, short gaps in the existing sidewalk network were added as criteria. Along some streets, there is a sidewalk with a short gap. It is these short gaps that have been identified and assigned points, recognizing that addressing these gaps will lead to more use of the existing sidewalks in that area.

## 2.3 GIS Application of Criteria

Each of the criteria listed above are applied to all segments of missing sidewalks within the City using spatial data analysis. For example, one missing section of sidewalk may be assigned points in this way:

- if it is on a transit route, 20 points are assigned;
- 20 for being on a 2-lane arterial road;
- 20 for being in the downtown, etc.

Two products are created through the GIS analysis:

- i) a table that ranks all sections of no sidewalk and indicates when points are assigned, and;
- ii) a map that shows all sections of no sidewalk and assigns a priority of one to four.

The table shows the results with a row for each missing segment of sidewalk and a column for each criterion. The full table is too large to include in the report, but is found on-line. The data can be sorted in many different ways, such as by number of points, priority or street name. Appendix A shows all the priority 1 and 2 sidewalks sorted by number of points assigned.

On the map, each segment of missing sidewalk is shown and categorized into one of five levels of priority according to the number of points assigned in the GIS analysis, as shown below. In this update, a fifth priority rating was added for cul-de-sacs, reflecting that the Sidewalk Policy does not apply to cul-de-sacs with less than 30 homes and no walkway. The number of points for assigning priorities was increased reflecting that with the new criteria, there are more potential points for each missing sidewalk. Below are the points for each priority rating. The map is shown in Appendix B.

Priority 1	145+	points
Priority 2	105-140	points
Priority 3	75-100	points
Priority 4	0-75	points
Priority 5	cul-de-sacs with less than 30 homes and no walkway	

A complete update of the data sets and analysis was undertaken for the 2016 Review and this has not been done for the 2018 update due to the short period of time since the last review.

## 3.0 Sidewalk Data Analysis

The following tables illustrate the length of sidewalks and no sidewalks along City streets by street type, along transit routes and by priority according to the results of the GIS spatial analysis. The percentage of roads that are reported as having sidewalks is related to the length of curb lane for a road. In other words, a 1 km

length of road would have 2 km of sidewalks (one on each side) for it to have 100% of its sidewalks.

**Table 2: No Sidewalks by Level of Priority**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Length (km)</b>	<b>% Priority by Length</b>
Priority 1	3.8	1.0%
Priority 2	21.9	6.0%
Priority 3	143.2	39.0%
Priority 4	179.3	48.8%
Priority 5	19.3	5.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>367.5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 3: Sidewalks by Road Classification**

<b>Road Classification</b>	<b>Sidewalks (km)</b>	<b>No Sidewalks 2016 (km)</b>	<b>% With Sidewalks 2016</b>
<b>Arterial</b>			
Priority 1		3.3	
Priority 2		13.9	
Priority 3		31.6	
Priority 4		25.0	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>114.3</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>Collector</b>			
Priority 1		0.5	
Priority 2		5.1	
Priority 3		23.9	
Priority 4		21.9	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>94.3</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>Local</b>			
Priority 1		0.0	
Priority 2		3.0	
Priority 3		87.4	
Priority 4		13.2	
Priority 5		19.3	

Sub-Total	187.9	241.3	44%
Total	403.8	367.5	52%

**Table 4: Sidewalks Along Transit Routes**

	Sidewalks (km)	No Sidewalks (km)	% with Sidewalks 2016
Transit Routes	149.1	66.9	69%

This data provides an analytical tool for evaluation and comparing sidewalk need. The data has limitations and individual assessments are still required when sidewalk segments are considered for construction. Examples of limitations of the data include curves in the road and existing conditions that impact desire for construction or cost (such as mature trees the in zone of construction or embankments along the edge of the road).

Missing sidewalks on roads with a rural cross-section (these roads have no curb and gutter) are addressed when the road is reconstructed because the road geometry can change enough to require that the sidewalk be reconstructed.

The Sidewalk Plan is a valuable tool for prioritizing sidewalk construction projects, but it does not replace individual assessments prior to construction.

## 4.0 Progress from 2008-2016

Since 2008 when Sidewalk Strategic Plan was approved, 28.3 km of new sidewalks have been constructed representing more than half of the priority 1 and 2 sidewalks. The map in Appendix C shows all the sidewalks that have been constructed from 2009-2016. The change in sidewalk coverage is summarized in Table 5.

**Table 5 – Change in % of Streets with Sidewalks 2008-2016**

Road Classification	% with Sidewalks 2008	% with Sidewalks 2016
Arterial	51	61
Collector	60	65
Local	41	44
Overall	47	52

Implementation of the Sidewalk Strategic Plan is on target with the plan that was developed to implement the Priority 1 and 2 sidewalks in 2008. Council, staff and community support have all contributed to the success of the plan and it demonstrates a strong commitment to becoming a more walkable community. Designing and constructing new sidewalks along existing streets is challenging. The Engineering and Construction Division is credited with the high degree of implementation success achieved.

In the first year of implementation of the Sidewalk Strategic Plan, there was concern that property owners were not given enough notice when new sidewalks are planned along their street frontage and that there was no formal way to respond to concerns. The Sidewalk Implementation Procedure was amended and advance notice is now provided. If significant concerns cannot be addressed at the staff level, the issue is brought to Council. Since this Procedure has been in place, implementation has been more successful.

The challenges experienced constructing new sidewalks in existing developments highlights the importance of the Provision of Sidewalks Policy and providing sidewalks on both sides of all streets at the time of initial development.

## **5.0 Addressing Remaining Sidewalk Gaps**

As per the Sidewalk Implementation Procedure, an average of 3.5 km of Priority 1 and 2 sidewalks are being built each year. Of the 25.7 km of priority 1 and 2 missing sidewalks remaining, 3 km will be addressed through road reconstruction projects on Bethune Street, Sherbrooke Street, McDonnell Street, Donegal Street, River Road and Chemong Road. Some of the priority 1 and 2 sidewalks are not being built now to protect mature trees or due to construction barriers, such as bridges and significant retaining walls.

It is estimated that it will take 8 years to build the most of the remaining priority 1 and 2 sidewalks. Some of the sidewalks remaining to be built are more challenging and costly to build than the ones that have been addressed to date. There are several priority 1 and 2 missing sidewalks that have significant barriers to construction or mature trees. These sidewalks will need to be addressed when major projects are completed, such as a bridge reconstruction or when mature trees die.

## **6.0 Other Sidewalk Strategic Plan Applications**

The criteria were developed in such a way that each one can be used in GIS spatial analysis. This means that the criteria can be mapped and displayed visually. Another important consideration was the ability to readily update the data and the analysis. As new sidewalks are built and schools, commercial

areas and major pedestrian generators change, it is important to update the data and analysis.

The Sidewalk Strategic Plan is used to:

- Prioritize new sidewalk construction projects
- Assess requests for new sidewalks
- To see where sidewalks are provided.
- Assist with planning policy development, site plan evaluations and other planning initiatives
- Determine walking and bussing needs of students (Student Transportation Services of Central Ontario does this work.)

This same type of process could be used to prioritize the reconstruction of existing sidewalks, identify priorities for providing sidewalks ramps at existing sidewalks and determine which transit stops should have benches and shelters.

## Appendix A – 2016 Priority 1 and 2 Missing Sidewalk Segments

Side of St.	Street Name	Cross Street 1	Cross Street 2	Road Class	Length (m)	Sum of Points	Priority
Odd	Goodfellow Rd	Stornoway Pl	Clonsilla Av	Collector	150	175	1
Even	Sherbrooke St	High St	Stannor Dr	Arterial	60	160	1
Odd	Bethune St	Charlotte St	Simcoe St	Collector	120	160	1
Odd	Parkhill Rd W	Rubidge St	Reid St	Arterial	84	160	1
Even	Sherbrooke St	Water St	George St N	Arterial	50	160	1
Even	Park St N	Simcoe St	Donegal St	Collector	81	155	1
Odd	Chemong Rd	Wolsely St	Highland Rd	Arterial	145	155	1
Odd	Parkhill Rd W	Stewart St	Rubidge St	Arterial	37	150	1
Odd	Parkhill Rd E	Auburn St	Armour Rd	Arterial	335	150	1
Even	Water St	Marina Bv	Carnegie Av	Arterial	1155	150	1
Odd	Chemong Rd	Old Towerhill Rd	Milroy Dr	Arterial	353	150	1
Even	Bethune St	Hunter St W	Brock St	Collector	129	150	1
Odd	Lansdowne St W	Park St S	Monaghan Rd	Arterial	584	150	1
Odd	Lansdowne St W	George St S	Aylmer St S	Arterial	206	145	1
Odd	Parkhill Rd E	Leahy's Ln	Canal Rd	Arterial	273	145	1
Even	Sherbrooke St	Kenneth Av	High St	Arterial	44	145	1
Even	Sherbrooke St	Denure Dr	Brealey Dr	Arterial	348	140	2
Even	Bethune St	Simcoe St	Hunter St W	Collector	123	140	2
Odd	Parkhill Rd W	Stewart St	Stewart St	Arterial	25	140	2
Odd	Bethune St	Brock St	Murray St	Collector	93	140	2
	Bethune St	Brock St	Murray St	Collector	61	140	2
Odd	Brealey Dr	Sir Sandford Fleming Dr	Stenson Bv	Arterial	390	140	2
Odd	Water St	Sherbrooke St	King St	Arterial	41	140	2
Odd	Clonsilla Av	Dobbin Av	Victory Cr	Local	266	135	2
Even	Fairbairn St	Hillside St	McCrea Dr	Arterial	181	135	2
Odd	Fairbairn St	Hillside St	McCrea Dr	Arterial	136	135	2
Odd	Chemong Rd	Wolsely St	Bennet St	Arterial	93	135	2
Even	River Rd S	Bensfort Rd	Southlawn Dr	Arterial	200	135	2
Odd	Chemong Rd	Bennet St	Bellevue St	Arterial	113	135	2
Even	Sherbrooke St	Grandview Av	Kenneth Av	Arterial	83	135	2
Even	Sherbrooke St	Albertus Av	Grandview Av	Arterial	25	135	2
Even	Parkhill Rd E	Leahy's Ln	Canal Rd	Arterial	359	135	2
Even	Parkhill Rd W	Stormont St	Fairbairn St	Arterial	147	130	2
Even	Water St	Langton St	Marina Bv	Arterial	525	130	2
Odd	Parkhill Rd W	Aylmer St N	Bethune St	Arterial	75	130	2
Even	Parkhill Rd W	Auburn St	Dennistoun Av	Arterial	294	130	2
Odd	Chemong Rd	Aberdeen Av	Wolsely St	Arterial	80	125	2

Side of St.	Street Name	Cross Street 1	Cross Street 2	Road Class	Length (m)	Sum of Points	Priority
Odd	The Queensway	The Parkway	Cameron Pl	Arterial	36	125	2
Odd	Parkhill Rd E	Armour Rd	Curtis Rd	Arterial	91	125	2
Odd	The Parkway	Crawford Dr	Unspecified	Arterial	271	125	2
Odd	Lansdowne St W	Aylmer St S	Park St S	Arterial	201	125	2
Even	Park St N	Bolivar St	King St	Collector	68	125	2
Even	Park St N	Sherbrooke St	Bolivar St	Collector	54	125	2
Even	The Queensway	The Parkway	Cameron Pl	Arterial	37	125	2
Odd	Lansdowne St E	River Rd S	Ashburnham Dr	Arterial	541	125	2
	The Parkway	Crawford Dr	Costco	Arterial	392	125	2
Even	Bethune St	King St	Charlotte St	Collector	139	120	2
Odd	Lansdowne St E	Ashburnham Dr	Consumers Pl	Arterial	415	120	2
Even	Armour Rd	St Luke's Av	Hunter St E	Arterial	179	120	2
	McKellar St	King George St	Chester St	Collector	202	120	2
Even	Stewart St	Townsend St	Wolfe St	Collector	68	120	2
Even	Parkhill Rd W	Crowley Cr	Crowley Cr	Arterial	242	120	2
Odd	Cumberland Av	Royal Dr	Ungava Av	Arterial	214	120	2
Even	Langton St	Water St	Hilliard St	Local	198	120	2
Even	Aylmer St S	Princess St	Prince St	Arterial	55	120	2
Odd	Murray St	College St	Water St	Local	133	120	2
	Water St	George St N	Anson St	Arterial	63	120	2
Odd	McDonnel St	Gilchrist St	Park St N	Arterial	49	120	2
Even	Armour Rd	Dunlop St	Vinette St	Arterial	198	120	2
Odd	Armour Rd	Dufferin St	Parkhill Rd E	Arterial	295	120	2
Even	Braidwood Av	Lloyd Av	Ephgrave Bv	Collector	64	120	2
Odd	Parkhill Rd W	Downie St	Donegal St	Arterial	118	120	2
Even	The Queensway	Queensway Ct	Erskine Av	Arterial	382	115	2
Even	Crawford Dr	Barbara Cr	Stocker Rd	Arterial	337	115	2
Odd	Chemong Rd	Applegrove Av	Summerhill Dr	Arterial	92	115	2
Odd	Fairmount Bv	Kensington Dr	Kawartha Dr	Collector	201	115	2
Even	Armour Rd	Vinette St	Spencley's Ln	Arterial	41	115	2
Odd	Bensfort Rd	Kennedy Rd	Otonabee Dr	Arterial	41	115	2
Even	Armour Rd	Parkhill Rd E	Dunlop St	Arterial	113	115	2
Even	Bethune St	Murray St	McDonnel St	Collector	127	115	2
Even	High St	Maryland Av	Sherbrooke St	Collector	136	115	2
Even	Sherbrooke St	Linden Lee	Hywood Rd	Arterial	123	115	2
Odd	Lansdowne St E	River Rd S	Ashburnham Dr	Arterial	74	115	2
Even	Bensfort Rd	Kennedy Rd	Otonabee Dr	Arterial	50	115	2
Odd	The Queensway	Queensway Ct	Erskine Av	Arterial	379	115	2
Even	Donegal St	Park St N	Hunter St W	Local	51	115	2



Side of St.	Street Name	Cross Street 1	Cross Street 2	Road Class	Length (m)	Sum of Points	Priority
Odd	Monaghan Rd	Anne St	Charlotte St	Arterial	162	110	2
Odd	Armour Rd	Maria St	Maniece Av	Arterial	188	110	2
Odd	High St	Lansdowne St W	St Mary's St	Collector	322	110	2
Even	Aylmer St S	Prince St	Lansdowne St W	Arterial	54	110	2
Even	Fair Av	Weller St	Thornhill Rd	Collector	249	110	2
Odd	Monaghan Rd	Bolivar St	Anne St	Arterial	74	110	2
Even	Cameron St	Erskine Av	Mountain Ash Rd	Local	244	110	2
Even	Romaine St	Lock St	George St S	Collector	154	110	2
Odd	Erskine Av	Barnes Cr	Barnes Cr	Collector	174	110	2
Even	Amundsen Av	Cartier Bv	Seneca Rd	Local	278	110	2
Even	Carnegie Av	Cumberland Av	Heritage Tl	Arterial	305	110	2
Even	Murray St	Stewart St	Rubidge St	Local	122	110	2
Even	Brock St	Bethune St	Stewart St	Local	76	110	2
Even	Dublin St	Aylmer St N	Bethune St	Local	30	110	2
Even	Ashburnham Dr	Maniece Av	Hunter St E	Collector	499	110	2
Odd	Goodfellow Rd	Chamberlain St	Stornoway Pl	Collector	24	110	2
Even	Ashburnham Dr	Neal Dr	Exit 56 Off 115 Hwy S To Ashburnham Dr	Arterial	232	110	2
Odd	Ashburnham Dr	Maria St	Maniece Av	Collector	260	110	2
Even	Cherryhill Rd	Bankside Dr	Moncrief Rd	Collector	173	110	2
Even	Alexander Ct	Hospital Dr	Alexander Av	Local	213	110	2
Odd	Fair Av	Weller St	Thornhill Rd	Collector	291	110	2
Odd	Sherbrooke St	Denure Dr	Brealey Dr	Arterial	179	110	2
Odd	The Queensway	Cameron Pl	Queensway Ct	Arterial	238	110	2
Even	The Queensway	Cameron Pl	Queensway Ct	Arterial	240	110	2
Odd	Carnegie Av	Cumberland Av	Heritage Tl	Arterial	269	110	2
Even	Hunter St E	Ashburnham Dr	Museum Dr	Arterial	174	110	2
Odd	Victory Cr	Charlotte St	Victory Dr	Local	59	110	2
Even	Victory Cr	Charlotte St	Victory Dr	Local	48	110	2
Odd	Wolsely St	Chemong Rd	Chesterfield Av	Collector	34	110	2
Odd	Borden Av	Erskine Av	High St	Arterial	97	110	2
Odd	Bensfort Rd	Guthrie Dr	Kennedy Rd	Arterial	222	110	2
Even	Bensfort Rd	Guthrie Dr	Kennedy Rd	Arterial	247	110	2
Even	Ashburnham Dr	Maria St	Maniece Av	Collector	249	105	2
Odd	St Catherine St	Rose Av	Braidwood Av	Local	63	105	2
Odd	Barret St	Braidwood Av	McGill St	Local	84	105	2
Even	Hall St	Rubidge St	Reid St	Local	79	105	2
Odd	Aylmer St N	Antrim St	Parkhill Rd W	Arterial	30	105	2
Odd	Dalhousie St	Aylmer St N	George St N	Local	64	105	2

Side of St.	Street Name	Cross Street 1	Cross Street 2	Road Class	Length (m)	Sum of Points	Priority
Odd	Simcoe St	Reid St	Downie St	Local	81	105	2
Odd	Donegal St	Donegal St	Brock St	Local	116	105	2
Odd	Kirk St	Rubidge St	Reid St	Local	77	105	2
Odd	Bethune St	Dublin St	Edinburgh St	Local	125	105	2
Odd	Barnardo Av	George St N	Church St	Collector	73	105	2
Odd	Fair Av	Cedargrove Dr	Weller St	Collector	183	105	2
Even	Water St	Anson St	Mill St	Arterial	548	105	2
Even	Parkhill Rd W	Crowley Cr	Facendi Dr	Arterial	127	105	2
Even	Townsend St	Aylmer St N	Stewart St	Local	164	105	2
Even	Armour Rd	Paddock Wood	Frances Stewart Rd	Arterial	810	105	2
Odd	Cartier Bv	Amundsen Av	Hopewell Av	Local	87	105	2
Odd	Brock St	Rubidge St	Reid St	Local	78	105	2
Odd	Erskine Av	Crawford Dr	Barnes Cr	Collector	75	105	2
Even	Park St N	Rink St	Townsend St	Arterial	116	105	2
Odd	Rubidge St	Rink St	Townsend St	Arterial	108	105	2
Even	Braidwood Av	Ephgrave Bv	St Catherine St	Collector	32	105	2
Even	Nassau Mills Rd	Armour Rd	University Rd	Arterial	483	105	2
Even	Sherbrooke St	Woodglade Bv	Linden Lee	Arterial	77	105	2
Odd	Fairbairn St	McCrea Dr	Towerhill Rd	Arterial	390	105	2
Even	Fairbairn St	McCrea Dr	Towerhill Rd	Arterial	384	105	2
Odd	Rink St	Aylmer St N	Stewart St	Collector	138	105	2
Odd	Rink St	Stewart St	Rubidge St	Collector	82	105	2
Odd	Rogers St	Maria St	James St	Collector	178	105	2
Odd	High St	Maryland Av	Sherbrooke St	Collector	129	105	2
Odd	Murray St	Bethune St	Stewart St	Local	108	105	2
Odd	Downie St	Brock St	Murray St	Local	123	105	2
Even	Cherryhill Rd	Redwood Dr	Bankside Dr	Collector	235	105	2
Odd	McKellar St	King George St	Chester St	Collector	166	105	2





