



## Complete Streets Design Guidelines

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City of Greater Sudbury's proposed Complete Streets Design Guidelines that will guide the construction and reconstruction of all of our streets and roads in the future.

### Context

*"Complete Streets are streets that are safe for all users, regardless of age, ability, income, race, ethnicity, or mode of travel. By using a Complete Streets approach to designing road networks, we can create spaces that allow all users to thrive — not only motorists." – Complete Streets for Canada.*

The City of Greater Sudbury's 2016 Transportation Master Plan recommended implementing a Complete Streets Policy: *"12.4.1 Complete Streets Policy  
Implement a "Complete Streets" policy so that the transportation network is designed, constructed, operated and maintained for all transportation users and all modes of transportation."*

City Council then approved its Complete Streets Policy in June 2018, which includes the policy statement:

*"The City of Greater Sudbury shall plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain the transportation network to provide a comprehensive and integrated network of facilities that are safe and convenient for people of all ages and abilities travelling by foot, bicycle, public transit or vehicle.*

*All planned new roads, including those which are development or growth-driven, shall be built as context-sensitive complete streets to provide facilities for people who walk, bike and take transit.*

*This approach shall also be applied to all infrastructure capital projects, where the entirety of the roadway is planned to be reconstructed or rehabilitated with substantial infrastructure improvements within the existing road allowance, to provide new or improved facilities for people who walk, bike and use public transit.*

*Maintenance programs shall be planned to provide for the safe and convenient operation of sidewalks, cycling infrastructure, the public transit system and roadways for people of all ages and abilities.*

*Implementation of this policy shall reflect the context and character of the surrounding built and natural environments, enhance the appearance of these environments and should make all*

*reasonable efforts to avoid and minimize negative impacts to those features to the maximum extent possible.”*

## **Complete Streets and climate change**

Encouraging more people to bike is important towards reaching the Greater Sudbury’s climate mitigation plan – the Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP) contains a target of 35% of trips by active transportation by 2050 (goal 8 under Low-Carbon Transportation). Having safe, connected, and comfortable cycling infrastructure is critical to encouraging more people to leave their cars at home and use their bikes to travel to work, to schools, to shop, and to their other chosen destinations.

## **Equitable and comprehensive plans, policies and investments**

Comprehensive complete streets guidelines that relate to all 5 aspects of the City’s Complete Streets Policy (plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain) are critical to meeting climate change goals and to addressing socio-economic issues currently being experienced by some members of our community. We are encouraged by the Design Guidelines that are being proposed.

A broader approach is also required that goes beyond just infrastructure – an equitable and comprehensive approach is critical to getting more people on bikes. This includes the participation of all City departments, other agencies like Public Health Sudbury & Districts, and community groups as well, to meet the essential elements of a bicycle friendly community.

## **Bicycle Friendly Communities**

The City’s Corporate Strategic Plan identifies a plan to attain “Silver Bicycle Friendly Community” status. If we are to do that, we need to have a comprehensive community plan to address the Share the Road Coalition’s 4 current E’s of encouraging cycling and a 5<sup>th</sup> that is likely to be included as Share the Road may follow the lead of the League of American Bicyclists:

- ENGINEERING - Physical infrastructure and hardware to support cycling
- EDUCATION - Programs and campaigns that give people on bikes and in cars the knowledge, skills and confidence to share the road safely
- ENCOURAGEMENT - Incentives, promotions and opportunities that inspire and enable people to ride
- EVALUATION & PLANNING - Processes that demonstrate a commitment to measuring results and planning for the future
- 5<sup>TH</sup>: EQUITY & ACCESSIBILITY: Bicycle friendly communities for everyone

The proposed Complete Streets Design Guidelines addresses the “engineering” E, but only for building and reconstructing streets. That is a great first step, but we also need to look at equitable operation and maintenance of road cycling infrastructure, incorporating trails into master planning for both on-road and off-road routes, and how the community can work with

the City to address the other E's of a bicycle friendly community. We look forward to discussions about planning for these in next year's budget.

### **Moving people, not cars**

Active Transportation is transportation, and we are happy to see that the City is looking at holistic policies and implementations that seek to move people, and not move just cars.

People who must or choose to travel by bike should be treated as a minimum, as equitably as those who can or choose to travel by car/truck. We should be providing safe infrastructure for all modes of travel, and have multi-modal service levels for all modes of travel. The most vulnerable road users should be prioritized first (pedestrians, then cyclists and other micro-mobility users, then people in motorized vehicles).

The City has been moving forward with many enhancements to our road infrastructure to accommodate cycling and walking. Clear timelines are needed to move towards a core network of safe routes on our most high-speed and high volume roads, all connecting to safe infrastructure in our neighbourhoods. While the proposed Complete Streets Design Guidelines will guide future new and retrofitted roads, it will not advance the retrofits and maintenance that are critical to make biking convenient and comfortable on continuous routes that connect all destinations.

Other programs and actions are integral to encouraging more people to bike. The City's Transportation Master Plan Section 6 (Active Transportation: Cycling and Walking), lists many opportunities, programs, and recommendations as a complement to infrastructure; some have been implemented, many are still outstanding. Bicycle parking for example is critical infrastructure that is currently lacking and is stopping some people from using their bikes when going to their destinations. Some programs have helped with this (Bicycle for Businesses program for example), but they are limited in time and many needed programs don't exist at all. We need a review of what is required, a community consultation on what is missing or needed, and timelines identified so the investments that the City makes in infrastructure are maximized.

### **Complete Streets Policy – 5 areas:**

The Complete Streets policy that was adopted by Council in 2018 speaks to “plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain. We need to move more quickly on ensuring that all of the 5 areas are addressed in the next budget. <https://www.greatersudbury.ca/live/transportation-parking-and-roads/complete-streets/complete-streets-policy/>

## Plan:

We need to build on what is in the Transportation Master Plan Section 9 (Cycling and Pedestrian Master Plan). Vague timelines of Short Term (generally 0 – 5 years); Medium Term (generally 6 – 10 years); and Long Term (generally 11 – 15 years and beyond) need to be confirmed in a 10-year outlook within the budget planning process, just like other road projects are. Specific timelines for each project need to be identified and funded. Retrofitting existing roads/streets needs to be accelerated.

Planning should include not only new roads and projects, but also how to retrofit critical roads that were previously constructed without safe and convenient cycling. We are encouraged with the Paris/Notre Dame project, but we should be planning and funding Lasalle now that Maley has been built. Major roads that are currently in the queue for construction must include Complete Streets cycling infrastructure, especially if they are arterial roads or connectors.

We cannot wait 20+ years to build our spine network along our major roads. The guiding principles guiding all planning and design should include: safety (appropriate infrastructure, routes and signage); comfort and accessibility (appeal to cyclists of all ages and abilities); continuity (continuous routes that bridge gaps); connectivity (connect key destinations and communities); and equitability (cycling for all members of our community).

## Design and construct

These areas of the policy will be addressed with the proposed Design Guidelines, which is very welcome. We hope that the guidelines will include more than just the design typologies. We understand that intersection designs will be included. We'd like to see roundabouts addressed, how multi-use paved paths can be incorporated, and transitions from dedicated cycling infrastructure to roads that are shared with motorized traffic.

## Operate and maintain

These areas have been areas of concern for many years, and appropriate maintenance policies and levels of service are needed to keep our streets safe for people on bikes. We had understood that the City would prepare a year-round maintenance policy for cycling infrastructure, but that has yet to be proposed to Council. We need to revise the winter maintenance policy if we want people to bike during the winter.

Year-round maintenance of cycling infrastructure is required to keep people safe. This year, some streets like Howie still had some missing bike lane painted lines as of July 1; people park in bike lanes with no consequences; some of the current programs for maintaining/resurfacing pavement only addresses car travel lanes; sand sweeping only happens once a year which causes some safety issues for people on bikes and the priority for sweeping is tied to a hierarchy of streets that prioritizes car/truck travel. Existing and missing policies and guidelines

should be identified, plans made to implement gaps in the next budget year, and yearly reviews made to ensure they are current and being properly funded/implemented.

### **General comments on the [design guidelines](#):**

Context is important as not all streets are exactly the same; nor are communities. Speeds should be lowered on some streets to complement the infrastructure changes and funding identified to change our culture of speeding in our communities. We welcome the pilot project to reduce speeds on neighbourhood streets.

Different infrastructure should be implemented based on the context of the street/road, the destinations on that street/road (schools, businesses, shopping), and the zoning contexts. However, generally, any street with 50+ km/hour speeds should have separated infrastructure.

Many streets with 50+ km/hour speeds will also need separated infrastructure based on its context (Lasalle). We would like to see a listing of the streets and suggested infrastructure as a second step of this project. We should be looking at a more holistic view with Net Zero data and components.

### **Comments on the proposed designs**

We need to make all possible efforts to accommodate cycling infrastructure on our streets/roads, even if that means inconveniencing motorists. Widening roads will not encourage people to get out of their cars and use other modes of transportation. We should be narrowing more lanes and doing more road diets. We encourage narrower car/truck lanes as a standard with the exception for curb lanes which should be designated for bus/truck traffic.

In many circumstances, because of our topography, people on bikes don't have access to side roads as alternate travel corridors. We understand that constrained/retrofits may have slightly lower recommendations, but implementing the desirable options should always be the preferred option, especially for higher speed, higher volume roads. Changing how we approach levels of service along with the hierarchy of importance (vulnerable road users and then cars/trucks) will change how we plan and measure road efficiency – constrained/retrofits options should always be a last resort.

Not everyone will be familiar with the changes to Book 18 done in 2021. Moving forward, it is important to provide the definitions of the cycling infrastructure that are used in your recommended typologies when presenting your information to the public. Providing the definitions for the different infrastructure as it defined in section 4.1 Types of Cycling Facilities will make it easier for people to understand what is presented:

- Physically separated bikeways, which include elements such as curbs, planters or bollards to provide physical separation between people riding bikes and motor vehicle traffic (includes cycle tracks which are at the level of the sidewalks).

- Bicycle lanes, which include designated space for cyclists but no physical separation
- Shared cycling facilities, which provide no distinct operating space for cyclists but provide other supporting amenities such as traffic calming and wayfinding (eg signage).

For example, in the urban arterials typology, cycle tracks are preferred (we agree), and for constrained/retrofit, options include physically separated (we agree) or shared (we don't agree). We have to find ways to accommodate dedicated space for cyclists on these urban roads, otherwise we will continue to see people cycling on sidewalks.

## **Urban:**

### Urban arterials (50/60 km/hr):

*Provide efficient connections between the City and other major centres outside the City and/or separate communities/activity centres within the City. Traffic Movement is a primary consideration. Enhanced transit facilities may be provided on these streets. Max of 5 lanes of motorized traffic, with medians required for 3+ lanes, turning lanes required for 5+ lanes, and restricted on-street parking.*

*Recommended: cycle tracks with physically separated or shared if constrained/retrofit. Example: Lorne Street.*

ALL arterials need separated cycle tracks or on-road physically separated infrastructure because of their high speed/high volume. Shared roadways should not be implemented. As noted before, in many circumstances, because of our topography, people on bikes don't have access to side roads as alternate travel corridors. Many of our arterials usually also have businesses and other destinations that people need to get to, many of them mid-block.

### Main street - downtown (30-50 km/hr):

*Streets that connect a mixture of residential, commercial and institutional uses. These streets are multi-modal with an emphasis on public realm and streetscaping elements. These streets balance mobility and place making. 1 motorized lane in one direction with no median required and on-street parking on one or both sides.*

*Recommended: cycle tracks with physically separated or shared if constrained/retrofit. Example: Cedar Street.*

We generally agree, however if shared must be implemented because of constraints, then we need to look at other road changes to force different behaviours for motorists to safely share the space. Context is important here, for example Elgin Street with its "entertainment district" is very different from Elm Street. The definition here is 1 motorized lane in one direction. So how does Elm Street fit into the different classifications – it does not fit into the next category, as it is not rural.

Our Greater Sudbury Downtown and town centres should go through a planning exercise to look at how to implement dedicated cycling spaces, main streets that could be closed to car/truck traffic, and which streets should be prioritized. Durham and Elgin streets are a prime example of streets needing retrofits (they are the hubs of our downtown entertainment district). The Elgin Greenway has been delayed for many, many years (phase 1 in the 2018 budget was never done). We should be looking at an alternative if the Greenway will not happen within the next few years.

We are encouraged with plans for Larch and Cedar, which will see the elimination of a car travel lane to put in cycling infrastructure. Also with the possibility of a renewed Downtown Master Plan.

It will require some creativity to retrofit downtown streets like Elm Street, as it is a main street, but also an arterial connector. Will Elm Street be classified as a main street? Many of our other community main streets are both a main street as well as an arterial connector. We look forward to seeing how our streets/roads are classified so we can provide more comments about some specific recommendations for those streets/roads.

#### Main street – old historic downtown (30-50 km/hr):

*Streets that connect a mixture of residential, commercial and institutional uses in rural areas. These streets have a strong sense of place. They are multi-modal and have a pedestrian priority. These streets emphasize a place making function. Max 2 lanes with no median required and on-street parking on one or both sides.*

*Recommended: physically separated with buffered bike lanes or shared if constrained/retrofit.  
Example: a street in Chelmsford*

General comments on these main streets: People who bike should have dedicated spaces to avoid them travelling on sidewalks (which is what happens now).

Many of our rural community main streets are both a main street as well as an arterial connector. It is important that we be equitable for people on bikes, and there should be no difference in how we evaluate and build infrastructure in all of our downtown areas, whether they are the main downtown core, or the downtown cores in Chelmsford, Capreol, Copper Cliff, or elsewhere.

#### Urban residential collector (40-50 km/hr):

*Streets that connect residential neighbourhoods to higher order streets. These streets have a multi-modal focus and often connect residents to community activity centres. Speed and volumes are limited. Max 2 lanes with no median required and varied on-street parking.*

*Recommended: buffered bike lanes with bike lanes constrained/retrofit. Example: Auger Avenue*

We agree with this recommendation.

Industrial commercial connector (neighbourhood collector) (40-50 km/hr):

*Streets that connect commercial retail land uses to higher order streets. These streets are multi-modal with a emphasis on public realm and streetscaping elements. These streets may include both street-oriented and non-street oriented commercial. Max 2-3 lanes with no median required and on-street parking not required.*

*Recommended: physically separated with buffered bike lanes constrained/retrofit. Example: Marcus Drive*

We agree with this recommendation. Big box store developments are very hard to navigate safely on a bike.

Urban Local Residential (30-50 km/hr):

*Slow streets with low volumes that provide a sense of place for residents. These streets act as a place for neighbours to connect. Max 2 lanes with no median required and one side, both sides or no on-street parking.*

*Recommended: Neighbourhood Bikeway with mixed traffic constrained/retrofit. Example: Brenda Drive*

We agree with this recommendation with the caveat that people will not fully understand what a Neighbourhood Bikeway really looks like. Brenda Drive as pictured does not accurately reflect Book 18's "Low-volume, low-speed streets that prioritize bicycle travel using treatments such as traffic calming, traffic reduction, signage, pavement markings and intersection crossing treatments. These treatments encourage through movements for people riding bikes while discouraging or prohibiting similar through trips by motorized traffic." These are the streets where you more often see children and families.

**Rural:**

Rural Arterial (Thoroughfare) (60-80 km/hr):

*Streets that connect residential neighbourhoods to higher order streets. These streets have a multi-modal focus and often connect residents to community activity centres. Speed and volumes vary. Max 4 lanes with median required with 4 lanes and on-street parking restricted.*



*Recommended: Multi-Use Path with Buffered Paved Shoulder constrained/retrofit. Example: Municipal Road 84 (Capreol Road)*

With posted speeds that can be as high as 80 km/hr (which means operational speeds are often higher than that), separated, dedicated infrastructure is preferred. We often hear the preferred option – a multi-use path - from new cyclists, seniors, and families. Cyclists who are confident, including those who use these roads for active transportation to work or elsewhere, prefer paved shoulders for speed; if the paved shoulders are very wide (as per the MTO standard for provincial cycling routes), those may be acceptable to other types of users.

We would like to see additional information about which roads would fit into this category. There is difference between arterial roads that are 2 lanes (Capreol Road) and 4 lanes (Maley, MR 80, MR 35). Some projects would benefit from a multi-use path as well as wide paved shoulders.

We are happy that the City has a policy that adds paved shoulders to all reconstructed rural arterials. Moving towards a multi-use path as a standard would greatly benefit people who want to travel between our communities but are nervous about using the paved shoulder.

Rural Collector (Connector) (50-60 km/hr):

*Streets that connect residential neighbourhoods to higher order streets. These streets have a multi-modal focus and often connect residents to community activity centres. Speed and volumes vary. Max 2-3 lanes with no median required and on-street parking one side.*

*Recommended: Multi-Use Path with Buffered Paved Shoulder constrained/retrofit. Example: Valleyview Road (MR 80 to Martin Road)*

We are happy to see a multi-use path as the recommended treatment, as long as paved shoulders are also an option on these types of roads. See comments above.

Rural Local Residential (30-50 km/hr):

*Slow streets with low volumes that provide a sense of place for residents. These streets act as a place for neighbourhoods to connect. Max 2 lanes with median not required and on-street parking on one side.*

*Recommended: Paved shoulder with mixed traffic constrained/retrofit. Example: Percy Avenue (Val Caron)*

While being rural, these streets still have a high order of placemaking like the urban residential local streets. We hear from many of our members that the rural neighbourhoods and connectors outside of the downtown core need to be equitably retrofitted in the same way as the downtown core roads/streets. The preferred treatment for urban residential streets is

Neighbourhood Bikeway. This treatment should be an option for rural residential streets as well, especially when there is high traffic/speeding on these streets.

We agree with this recommendation, with the caveat that mixed traffic would not include large commercial trucks and that streets with high volumes of cars/parking should be evaluated for options that would provide better safety for cyclists. These are the streets where you more often see children and families.

Rural local residential (Urban Area) (30-50 km/hr):

*Slow streets with low volumes that provide a sense of place for residents. These streets act as a place for neighbourhoods to connect. Max 2 lanes with median not required and on-street parking on one side, both sides, or none.*

*Recommended: Multi-use path with mixed traffic constrained/retrofit. Example: Tedman Avenue*

We agree with this recommendation, with the same comments as for rural local residential. A note that some of these streets flow into sections that are urban in topology. Consistency and connectivity are important in these areas.

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment.

*Rachelle Niemela*

Rachelle Niemela  
Chair, Bike Sudbury

<b>Climate Change</b>  Enable commuter cycling	<b>Safety</b>  Improve safety - appropriate infrastructure, routes, signage	<b>Connectivity</b>  Connect key destinations and communities
<b>Continuity</b>  Continuous routes that bridge gaps	<b>Comfort and Accessibility</b>  Appeal to cyclists of all ages and abilities	<b>Equitability</b>  Cycling for all members of our community