

то:	Members of the Planning Committee
FROM:	W.H. Jackson, Director of Utility Services Department
MEETING DATE:	February 28, 2011
SUBJECT:	Report USEC11- 003 Rethinking Subdivisions – Review of Interim Policy Engineering Design Standards

## PURPOSE

A report to update Council on the monitoring and evaluation of the Engineering Design Standards contained within the Interim Policy adopted by Council through Report PLPD07-007.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council approve the recommendations outlined in Report USEC11-003 dated February 28, 2011 from the Director of Utility Services as follows:

- a) That the General Engineering Design Standards as outlined in Schedule 1 to Report USEC11-003 be adopted; and
- b) That staff be requested to prepare any necessary reports, policies and/or procedures to implement the Engineering Design Standards referenced in Recommendation a) and report back to Council as necessary on these matters.

## **BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no immediate budget and financial implications associated with receiving this report.

There will however be future financial implications to the City's Operating and Capital Budget such as increased services for winter operations, street lighting costs, etc. as well as additional future rehabilitation and maintenance costs related to certain aspects of the new subdivision design.

Decisions related to financial support from the Developers/new residents will also impact the overall financial implications of the new subdivision designs.

These costs must be balanced with an evaluation of the additional assessment value that may be achieved with the new subdivision design.

## DISCUSSION

Recent provincial legislation such as 'Places to Grow', and a desire to do more (development) with less (space) has resulted in planned development which is more intense, with less space allocated to public infrastructure but which, nevertheless, has formed the basis for new developments across the Province for 10 years or more.

The test subdivision (Phase I of the Mason "Avonlea" development), as discussed in Report PLPD007-007 (see Appendix A), was to examine the widest possible range of alternative planning and design standards. Unfortunately the subdivision is not entirely complete and therefore ongoing comprehensive field oriented operational review is not practical at this time. Staff feel that the option to wait longer to see how the test subdivision fares when it is fully operational would create concern in the development industry. Accordingly, the review of the various engineering design standards provided below is a combination of technical services review and a limited amount of operational review.

#### 1. <u>Reduced Road Allowance Standard</u>

The Interim policy on this issue is as follows:

"The City will accept a road allowance width of 16.5 metres for local streets in accordance with the draft cross-section illustrated on Figure 1, subject to any utility placement refinements required by the Utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility providers. The City will accept a road allowance width of 14.5 metres for a one-way local residential street in accordance with the draft cross-section illustrated on Figure 2, subject to any utility placement refinements required by the Utility Services Department, in consultation with the Utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility providers. The City will accept a road allowance width of 14.5 metres for a one-way local residential street in accordance with the draft cross-section illustrated on Figure 2, subject to any utility placement refinements required by the Utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility providers". [Note, the Figures referred to above are contained with Report PLPD07-007]

The development of a 16.5m right-of-way (ROW) standard has not been without challenges. The minimum ROW allowed within today's Official Plan is 18.5m. However, the common width used to date has been 20m.

A 16.5m ROW provides narrower pavement and boulevard widths. This, in turn, has resulted in increased parking restrictions and created construction challenges such as:

- reversing from driveways onto a narrower pavement with parked vehicles on the opposite side;
- reduced operational efficiency for waste collection and winter services because giving way to opposing traffic has considerably increased;
- the majority of work within the boulevard must now be done by hand, or vacuum, due to the tightness of underground infrastructure; and
- zero margin of error for initial construction and future reconstruction resulting in a constrained work space.

The driving factor for reduced ROW widths is to combat urban sprawl and thereby reducing adverse environmental impacts of the traditional developments. Increased developer yield also results from reduced ROW's. In a City where smart and/or compact vehicles are currently not the norm, condensed roadways and tighter spaces can be problematic. For efficiency, the City's fleet has increased in physical size which is a challenge in constrained situations. The simple task of installing street signs was difficult in relation to the density of underground utility locations and caused damage to above ground street furniture.

The implementation of a citywide 16.5m ROW design standard will bring with it an increase in capital and operational requirements which will result in an increased tax obligation. Nevertheless, for the benefits provided by limiting sprawl, it is important that the City seriously review this option. To this end, concerted effort by all interested services/utility companies, with compromises for each, has resulted in a 16.5m ROW (see Schedule 1) that could be recommended in certain circumstances.

From the City's perspective, one of the larger compromises that will need to be addressed is the inability to maintain sidewalks on both sides of the street within a 16.5m ROW. This differs from the pilot project tested because further investigation identified that the watermain beneath the road surface was impractical. Studies have found that utility cuts and patches on our roads reduce the life expectancy of our roads by 35%. The life reduction factor and increased overlay requirements result in significant rehabilitation costs to the City.

Although a sidewalk on only one side of the road is contrary to the City sidewalk policy, it does **not** contradict existing accessibility legislation. From the accessibility perspective we will need to ensure safe access is provided from one side of the road to the other where sidewalks are proposed. The most cost effective solution is to ensure that the non-

sidewalk lots have driveways to access the road and cross over. The 16.5m ROW standard will also increase operational and capital costs.

To allow reduced ROW's, a specific City policy (including an Official Plan Amendment) is required. A 16.5m ROW is best utilized on certain roads such as cul-de-sacs, crescents and minor connecting streets where underground services are generally shallower and require less space for maintenance or reconstruction. Other ideal uses for 16.5m ROW's are for single loaded roads where a local road runs adjacent to an arterial road thereby providing additional space on the adjacent ROW. Less ideal is the use of a 16.5m ROW for local residential and minor collector streets.

Implementation of a 14.5m ROW outside of rear laneways dictates a one-way operation of the roadway. One issue that has been reported with the existing one-way street in Phase I is travel against the direction of travel. This short isolated case will only be exaggerated in a full build scenario. Enforcement of the one-way regulation would be difficult and one-way operations also impact the City's own forces.

The 18.5m ROW is allowed within today's Official Plan although in 2009 and 2010 the common width used was a 20m ROW. This standard allows for sidewalks on each side of the road, wider pavement widths, and deeper infrastructure at lower maintenance, operational, and capital costs. If the pavement width is sufficient, it also allows for street parking on both sides of the road within the City parking by-law provisions. Additional snow storage is provided in the boulevard which reduces the frequency for snow <u>removal</u> from the site. This right-of-way width provides some support to the new urbanism designs but also eliminates the most severe drawbacks to the 16.5m ROW.

#### 1.1 <u>Conclusion</u>

Although a 14.5m ROW could operate from a traffic viewpoint if the street is made one-way, it should not be accepted as a roadway standard in the City of Peterborough. A 14.5 ROW is too narrow to effectively and efficiently maintain. The one-way operation typically fails with increased pressure on the Police for enforcement.

A 16.5m ROW can move the characteristics of the new subdivision design forward but it comes with additional operational and maintenance costs. Ideal uses would be in areas of minimal impact such as cul-de-sacs and single loaded streets. Acceptable uses would be for local residential streets with special attention given to the location of sidewalks especially as they relate to accessibility needs.

An 18.5m ROW is already allowed within the City's Official Plan so there is no impediment to its use as a local residential road.

For all other roads, the existing Official Plan designations and ROW's are still applicable.

#### 2. Sidewalk Policy

The Interim policy on this issue is as follows:

"The City will continue to require the provision of sidewalks on both sides of local streets in keeping with the Official Plan policy regarding the provision of sidewalks. The City will only accept minor refinements to this policy where it is satisfied that all accessibility issues are adequately resolved."

Section 1 provided some detail with respect to reduced ROW widths and sidewalks and the City's current sidewalk policy. Placing sidewalks within each boulevard on a substantially reduced road allowance creates potential liability concerns the City needs to consider. For example, placing the sidewalk over a watermain, as would be required in the 16.5m ROW shown in Figure 1, could create liability issues related to water valve movement. These concerns, together with reduced snow storage, limits sidewalks on 16.5m ROW's to one side.

#### 2.1 <u>Conclusion</u>

Section 1 discussed the physical constraints to continuing with the City's existing sidewalk policy given the various right-of-way widths under consideration. An 18.5m ROW, will allow continuance of this policy whereby a 16.5m ROW will not. Accordingly, the sidewalk policy will have to be amended to account for narrower ROW's.

#### 3. <u>Rear Laneways</u>

The Interim policy on this issue is as follows:

"The City <u>will</u> accept the inclusion of rear laneways, with a minimum width of 9 metres, on the basis that the laneway is under private ownership, particularly condominium ownership. The City <u>may</u> accept rear laneway not less than 9.0 metres in width under public ownership only where the developer provides the City with a financial and assumption proposal, acceptable to the City, to satisfy operational concerns, future replacement costs and ongoing maintenance expenses. The financial proposal may include a special area charge for abutting properties, to reflect the enhanced level of municipal service."

The rear laneway product is a staple in new urbanism designs. The rear laneway has been around for many years (centuries in some jurisdictions) and is not new to Peterborough as we currently have approximately 5.9km of travelled laneways in the City.

Rear lanes can duplicate City infrastructure and increase our operation, maintenance, reconstruction and street lighting costs. The additional City costs for such items as snow **removal** in place of snow ploughing, the frequency of replanting trees and the issues with

respect to any emergency or reconstruction efforts with private structures and roof overhangs only inches away from the public infrastructure must be dealt with. Unless there is a condominium development with the required Board to manage the maintenance of the condominium infrastructure, rear lanes should be under the jurisdiction of the City and financial assistance should be provided by the Developer to offset the increased costs to the general taxpayer. A special area charge for abutting properties has also been used in some jurisdictions to reflect the increased municipal service charges.

The rear laneway product generally has private structure and roof overhangs within inches of public property or infrastructure. As currently proposed, the width is only 9 metres wide from one edge of the City owned laneway to the other. This width combined with the proximity of private infrastructure prohibits the City from completing any underground rehabilitation efficiently and without a dramatic increase in liability. Accordingly, no municipal underground infrastructure should be installed in rear laneways beyond lighting for safety concerns. The rear laneway widths are not conducive to the operation of our larger vehicles and as such, garbage collection, for an example, cannot be provided from the rear laneways. Based on these considerations, laneway products should front onto municipal roads in order to rely on City services. In addition, given the rear laneway widths, the intersection of two rear laneways will create an impediment to the movement of most City maintenance equipment. Accordingly, rear laneways should not intersection with one another.

It will also suggest that storm drainage parameters will be crucial to provide a safe environment for those who reside here. To properly accommodate storm drainage, rear laneway lengths should be restricted to 170m.

Classification of rear laneways needs to be considered carefully. If classified as a public highway, the City must operate under regulated minimum maintenance standards. Also, given the public highway designation and minimal width, a one-way operation of the lane would be in order with the inherent operational difficulties and complaints. The classification aspect of these rear lanes requires additional study and Council should expect further information on this matter over the rest of 2011.

The larger issue with respect to rear lanes that must be acknowledged is the existance of 5.9km of rear lanes in the City. These lanes vary in widths and condition but have in common the fact that none receive any City servicing. The present report is intended to deal only with new lanes designed and built through applications for devleopment thereby allowing City input to the charisteristics of the lanes

#### 3.1 <u>Conclusion</u>

Rear lanes appear to be a necessary ingredient for the new urbanism designs to be successful from a streetscape viewpoint. Under the premise that new development designs will continue to be a part of Peterborough's future, the City will have to acknowledge and plan for additional rear lanes.

Properties with rear laneways will need to have frontage on a municipal road in order to rely on municipal services. A maximum length of 170m for rear laneways should be implemented to ensure proper drainage and protect the residents from adverse impacts. Furthermore, the connection of two laneways cannot be endorsed because of the resultant limited maneuverability for emergency or operational vehicles.

Further study is required to consider alternative designations for the rear lanes and it is suggested that the additional costs related to these rear lanes be partially borne by the Developer or new residents.

#### 4. Non-standard Street Lighting

The Interim policy on this issue is as follows:

"Non-standard street lighting fixtures must be approved by the Utility Services Department and Peterborough Utilities Services Inc. and will be subject to a financial payment made by the developer to account for future maintenance and/or replacement".

For any new non-standard lighting fixture, it is important we are assured of its longevity and lighting ability because the City will end up owning the street lighting infrastructure.

The secondary aspect is the potential need for the City to maintain certain levels of spares (poles, fixtures, light bulbs, photocells) and obviously, the more diverse our lighting plant is the greater number of spares required. The City has experienced failure and spalling of certain decorative light standards in recent years. Those that failed were only 10 years old or younger. The key is choosing the right product and manufacturer. Limiting the number of decorative street lights reduces the potential issues.

#### 4.1 <u>Conclusion</u>

Similar to laneways, provided the costs are identified at the approval process and operational or capital budgets can be supportive of any increased cost, decorative lights within certain parameters would be acceptable.

#### 5. Parking

In an environment where it appears that increased numbers of vehicles per household are not uncommon, issues of parking and long term visitors has surfaced under the current test configuration.

It may be that potential purchasers need to be made more fully aware of the available parking in the subdivision by either the Developer or the City. If this is done, any parking enforcement can be undertaken as a "buyer-beware" process. Beyond that, dedicated street parking, off-street dedicated parking stalls, small parking lots, and permitted parking are all options that can be used in isolation or in conjunction with each other. A determination of the number of parking spaces that should be provided in new residential developments is provided through the Zoning By-law. This matter may need further consideration on a development-by-development basis.

## SUMMARY

An evaluation of new development concepts as represented by Phase I of the Mason Avonlea project has been done. The test development has not operated as a fully occupied, fully functional development to date and accordingly, some of the evaluation has been at a purely technical level.

Reducing urban sprawl is not only an environmental and sustainability beacon, it also has a provincial legislation foundation. All of the proposed engineering designs were evaluated with this in mind. All service providers and field staff have been consulted in the preparation of the comments provided in this report. The contents of this report were also discussed in general terms with the Peterborough Homebuilders Association.

Proposals have been put forth to allow the use of a reduced road right-of-way, rear laneways and decorative street lights. Generally there would appear to be a cost to the municipality however, mitigation measures need to be adopted to minimize this cost.

Submitted by,

W.H. Jackson, P. Eng. Director, Utility Services

Contact Name: Bruno M. Bianco, P. Eng., Manager, Infrastructure Planning, Utility Services Phone 705-742-7777 ext 1756 Fax 705-876-4621 E-mail <u>bbianco@peterborough.ca</u>

Attachments:

Schedule 1 – General Engineering Designs for Subdivision Design Appendix A – Report PLPD07- 007, Rethinking Subdivisions - An Interim Policy

#### SCHEDULE 1

#### **GENERAL ENGINEERING DESIGNS**

#### FOR

#### SUBDIVISION DESIGN

#### 1. Road Right-of-Way

- A road right-of-way of less than 16.5m will not be accepted.
- A road right-of-way of 16.5m (see Figure 1) will be accepted for cul-de-sacs, crescents, minor connecting roads, single loaded roads and local residential streets that the Director of Utility Services may accept.

#### 2. Provision of Sidewalks

• For a road right-or-way of 16.5m, a sidewalk will only be provided on one side of the street (see Figure 1).

#### 3. Rear Laneways

- Rear laneways with a minimum width of 9m will be permitted in the City of Peterborough. No municipal services will be allowed in rear laneways.
- A special area charge for abutting properties, to reflect the enhanced level of municipal service may be implemented at the discretion of the Director of Utility Services.
- Any Developer incorporating rear laneways into their design may be liable for upfront maintenance costs as determined by the Director of Utility Services.
- Properties with rear laneways must have frontage on a municipal road allowance of 16.5 meters or greater in order to rely on municipal services.
- The maximum length of drainage in one direction of a laneway shall not exceed 90 meters from the crest of the laneway to the closest municipal drainage inlet and be graded at minimum 1%.
- The length of a rear laneway shall not exceed 170m.

• The connection of two laneways will not be endorsed.

#### 4. Decorative Street Lights

• Decorative street lights will be permitted in the City of Peterborough as approved by the Director of Utility Services.

#### 5. Parking

• The City of Peterborough's Zoning By-law identifies the number of parking spaces to be provided in each development application. The by-law may be amended as required.

Note: These General Designs are to be read in conjunction with the City of Peterborough Engineering Design Standards for Development.







Peterborough

TO:	The Members of the Planning Committee
FROM:	Malcolm Hunt, Director of Planning and Development Services
MEETING DATE:	February 12, 2007
SUBJECT:	Report PLPD07- 007 Rethinking Subdivisions - An Interim Policy

## PURPOSE

A report to recommend the adoption of an Interim Policy for the implementation of alternative planning and engineering design standards in new subdivisions.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council approve the recommendations outlined in report PLPD07-007 dated February 12, 2007, of the Director of Planning and Development Services, as follows:

- a) That the Interim Policy concerning alternative Subdivision Planning and Engineering Design Standards, as outlined on Schedule 1 to Report PLPD07-007 **be adopted**.
- b) That the Draft Plan of Subdivision filed by Mason Homes Limited for approximately 105 units west of Hilliard Street and north of Franklin Drive **be adopted** as the test subdivision in accordance with article 1.1 of the Interim Policy.

## **BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct budget and financial implications arising out of the adoption of the Interim Policy. The objective of the Interim Policy is to evaluate the market acceptance and measure the operational performance of an alternative subdivision design standard. The test subdivision will assist the City in establishing whether there are unique costs associated with the development of the alternative standard that are not already represented by the current subdivision design standards.

## BACKGROUND

At the Planning Committee meeting held on December 4, 2006 the following motion was passed:

That Report PLPD06-087 concerning subdivision design standards be received for information and that staff be directed to prepare a further report outlining the pros and cons of all alternative design standards and a recommended policy approach for Peterborough.

The resolution was the product of a report titled 'Rethinking Subdivisions" The report proposed that the municipality give consideration to the acceptance of alternative subdivision design standards in order to implement an urban form more in keeping with traditional urban development.

This report is the response to the resolution of December 4, 2006 noted above. There are 3 key issues to clarify:

1. A return to 'traditional' planning values impacts much more than the development of new subdivisions. While the planning world struggles to find an appropriate label to characterize 'traditional' planning it is clear that municipalities are not dealing with a trend but rather a holistic philosophy of how urban centres should 'Traditional' planning seeks to achieve more compact development that develop. supports public transit. It attempts to integrate where people work with where people live. It promotes the movement of citizens through neighbourhoods to a range of public and commercial services without the need to use automobiles. It is a planning philosophy that believes that residents truly want to enjoy the interaction of neighbours, not just the solitude of a large backyard in suburbia. In its fullness 'traditional' planning will not only impact subdivisions - it will impact all land-use districts. This report is but a first-step. It focuses essentially on the neighbourhood level only and leaves the balance of the discussion to the future.

2. The range of alternative design standards available for consideration is broad and in constant flux. The return to 'traditional' planning standards is a work in progress. Municipalities all across the province are testing different approaches, attempting to find the right formula for that particular municipality. Over the past 2 months our approach has been to find agreement, across a wide range of departments, to a set of alternative design standards that should be tested and then evaluated. Simply put, it is too early to confidently advance an official Peterborough alternative standard. Accordingly this report outlines an Interim Policy.

**3.** The adoption of an Interim Policy does not require a suspension of existing practice or a freeze on the normal planning process. The City's current subdivision planning and design standards are represented by a mix of Official Plan policies, standard zoning districts, best practices and departmental standards. The adoption of an Interim Policy is regarded to augment the foregoing. This report recommends that the interim standards be applied to a single plan of subdivision only at this time. All other development applications will be processed in accordance with current planning and engineering standards.

### AN INTERIM POLICY: RATIONALE

For several years there has been an effort in the broader land development industry to rethink subdivision design. The industry has been seeking change to develop a product alternative that responds to a new consumer demand. Municipalities have been inclined to accept the principle of change where it can be demonstrated that such change creates better community living environments. Provincial policy has recently reinforced new approaches where the change in approach produces a wiser, more efficient use of urban land.

Rethinking subdivision design does not necessarily represent a major change in *traditional* urban form where "*traditional*" is often represented by communities or neighbourhoods built before 1950. In contrast, the past 50 years of urban development represented a period of major urban expansion driven by demographics, economics, innovation and personal mobility. To land development practitioners, this is "*conventional*" urban form, because it represents the most recent but relatively longstanding practice. Rethinking subdivisions is an attempt to find the right balance between the "*feel*" of traditional urban form with the "*function*" of conventional urban form. Urban form is implemented on the ground by planning principles and engineering design standards. Rethinking subdivisions requires the review of both determinants of urban form.

Given the importance of the matter the Peterborough response must be carefully positioned. It must be relevant to local consumer preferences, sustainable within municipal operations, and livable for future inhabitants. Accordingly, it is recommended

that the implications of any significant alteration to subdivision planning and design standards be tested on an isolated and limited basis before wholesale policy revisions are considered. This test period will establish market acceptability and operational performance. The development industry and the municipality will jointly evaluate the test period. At the conclusion of the test period the planning and design standards for new subdivisions will be reviewed on a comprehensive basis.

The application of the *interim policy* will meet the following objectives:

- 1. One test subdivision will be selected by the municipality to test a range of alternative planning and design standards.
- 2. The test subdivision should be isolated enough so as not to prejudice adjoining lands or compromise a revision to the planning and design standards, if warranted, after the test period.
- 3. The test subdivision should be of sufficient size to adequately measure the market acceptability and operational performance of the widest possible range of alternative planning and design standards during the test period.
- 4. The developer of the test subdivision will have up to two years to proceed from Draft Plan approval to Final Approval.
- 5. The interim policy will be in effect for approximately 2 years from the date of final approval of the test subdivision, unless modified by Council, in order to provide an adequate period for monitoring and evaluation.

In order to give definition to the Interim Policy, staff has developed a suite of Planning Principles and Engineering Design Standards to guide the development of the test subdivision. These are presented in Schedule 1.

### APPLICATION OF THE INTERIM POLICY

The first phase of the Mason Homes Limited draft plan of subdivision west of Hilliard Street meets all of the objectives of the Interim Policy as noted above. This phase of the overall community plan currently under consideration is defined by open space and natural areas on its west and north edges. The balance of this phase is contained by existing development on the other edges. More importantly the proposed street connection to Franklin Drive will never be a through street and thus the subdivision is considered to be isolated. Furthermore, the subdivision is large enough to accurately gauge the response of the Peterborough market but small enough to readily readapt the plan to a conventional layout if the test period is not successful.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

Malcolm Hunt MCIP, RPP Director of Planning and Development Services

Contact Name: Ken Hetherington MCIP RPP, Acting Manager of Planning, Phone – 742-7777 Ext. 1781 Fax – 742-5218 E-Mail – khetherington@city.peterborough.on.ca

#### SCHEDULE 1

## INTERIM POLICY PLANNING PRINCIPLES AND ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS

#### 1.0 GENERAL

- 1.1 One test subdivision will be selected by the municipality to test a range of alternative planning and design standards.
- 1.2 The test subdivision will be isolated enough so as not to prejudice adjoining lands or compromise a revision to the planning and design standards, if warranted, after the test period.
- 1.3 The test subdivision will be of sufficient size to adequately measure the market acceptability and operational performance of the widest possible range of alternative planning and design standards during the test period.
- 1.4 The developer of the test subdivision will have up to two years to proceed from Draft Plan approval to Final Approval.
- 1.5 The interim policy will be in effect for approximately 2 years from the date of final approval of the test subdivision, unless modified by Council, in order to provide an adequate period for monitoring and evaluation.

#### 2.0 PLANNING PRINCIPLES

# The subdivision planning for the candidate subdivision will be guided by the following principles:

- 2.1 The City will require that the subdivision provides for development densities in keeping with the Province's Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and in particular the expectations for population targets in the Outer Ring.
- 2.2 The City will require that the test subdivision provides for a variety of housing forms and lot sizes and that every effort is made to integrate diversity in product choice throughout the subdivision. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the zoning of the subdivision will be complementary to the character of established development on abutting properties.

- 2.3 The development of the test subdivision will be implemented utilizing flexible zoning standards which promote the incorporation of architectural features, and streetscape designs complementary to a '*traditional'* community design concept. This will include, but not be limited to, a reduction in the typical building setback from the street line, flexible side yard regulations, increased building coverage and limitations on driveway connections to public streets.
- 2.4 At the City's option, the developer of the candidate subdivision may be required to consent to a program of architectural control and site plan control for any or all development within the subdivision.
- 2.5 The provision of parkland and open space within the subdivision will continue to respect the Official Plan policy objective of clustering new parkland around open space corridors, but the parkland dedication expectations will be augmented by smaller recreational spaces internal to the subdivision. The intent of additional open space is to provide close to home recreation space for youth and community gathering spaces for social interaction. The City will not consider small isolated recreational and community spaces as part of the developer's park dedication obligations under *The Planning Act.*
- 2.6 At the City's option, the developer of the candidate subdivision may be required to develop detailed landscape architectural plans, and contribute financially to the physical improvement of smaller open spaces and community spaces as a condition of development.

#### 3.0 ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS

# The engineering design for the candidate subdivision will be guided by the following standards:

- 3.1 The City will accept a road allowance width of 16.5 metres for local streets in accordance with the draft cross-section illustrated on Figure 1, subject to any any utility placement refinements required by the Utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility providers. The City will accept a road allowance width of 14.5 metres for a one-way local residential street in accordance with the draft cross-section illustrated on Figure 2, subject to any utility placement refinements required by the Utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility Services Department, in consultation with the utility providers.
- 3.2 The City will continue to require the provision of sidewalks on both sides of local streets in keeping with the Official Plan policy regarding the provision of sidewalks. The City will only accept minor refinements to this policy where it is satisfied that all accessibility issues are adequately resolved.

- 3.3 The City <u>will</u> accept the inclusion of rear laneways, with a minimum width of 9 metres, on the basis that the laneway is under private ownership, particularly condominium ownership. The City <u>may</u> accept rear laneway not less than 9.0 metres in width under public ownership only where the developer provides the City with a financial and assumption proposal, acceptable to the City, to satisfy operational concerns, future replacement costs and ongoing maintenance expenses. The financial proposal may include a special area charge for abutting properties, to reflect the enhanced level of municipal service.
- 3.4 Non-standard street lighting fixtures must be approved by the Utility Services Department and Peterborough Utilities Services Inc. and will be subject to a financial payment made by the developer to account for future maintenance and/or replacement.





16.5m ROW - TWO WAY (PARKING ON ONE SIDE) SECTION VIEW SCALE 1:100

# DRAFT





DRAFT