

10.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Until now, Regional streets have been relatively high speed facilities, catering primarily to car and truck traffic. Both transit and pedestrians have taken on secondary roles, as have cyclists. That is now changing. The perception of the role of Regional streets is being transformed from that of moving vehicles to that of accommodating all modes of transportation within the context of integrating and enhancing communities, creating a sense of place, defining community character and helping to instill community pride. The requirements associated with mobility need to be balanced with other community objectives, on an overall basis, as well as within the context of unique situations.

The purpose of this study was to examine the various needs and objectives critically within the existing available right-of-way and road design standards, and then to assess how more effective use could be made of the available Regional rights-of-way in order to achieve the optimal balance between these competing requirements.

During the next ten years, approximately 31 sections of Regional streets are scheduled to be widened to six lanes, as per the 2006 – 10-Year Road Construction Program. The requirement to widen Regional streets from an existing four lane cross-section to a six lane cross-section should be critically reviewed on a link by link basis, as the needs are identified. Other viable alternative solutions, such as widening a parallel collector street instead, should be considered where applicable. Nonetheless, in the cases where no other viable options exist except to widen Regional streets to six lanes, consideration should be given to allocating the additional lanes to HOV and/or transit lanes in order to help encourage ridesharing and to be supportive of transit initiatives, rather than widening solely for mixed traffic (i.e. continuation of the status quo). It is recognized, however, that implementation of HOV/bike lanes will need to be phased in a logical manner which reflects continuity. For example, at the outset of a widening to a six lane cross-section, it may be necessary to allow mixed traffic in the newly added lanes, because HOV has not yet been implemented up and/or downstream. However, this should only be on the explicit understanding by the public that the intent is to convert these outside lanes for exclusive HOV/bike use at some point in the future.

For most of the four lane Regional streets that are proposed to be widened to six lanes, the available space is limited to a 36 metre right-of-way. Within the limited 36 metre right-of-way, 12 alternative cross-sections were developed which reflect different treatments of how cyclists and other elements are accommodated, and differ with respect to the width of the median. One of the common key features of these alternative cross-sections is reduced lane widths for mixed use vehicular traffic in order to allocate space for other elements which are also viewed as being equally important, such as exclusive bike lanes, wider boulevards, and/or raised medians.

These 12 alternative cross-sections were evaluated based on various criteria in the categories of transportation functionality, mobility and safety; cost; and community needs and values. The alternative with exclusive bike lanes and 6 metre wide raised medians has been identified as being the recommended cross-section. The on-street exclusive bike lanes are better in accommodating cyclists. The extra width between the transit vehicles and the curb with the inclusion of on-street bike lane, can also enhance the safety of pedestrians walking along the sidewalk. The median can also provide a refuge area for pedestrians crossing the street. The wide medians would also allow more space for landscaping and the associated protective measures, thus enhancing the

aesthetics of the corridor. This preferred cross-section is viewed as being able to accommodate all modes of travel in a safe and efficient manner.

In order to test the suitability of the recommended cross-section, it was applied to segments of five case study corridors, representing the five categories reflecting various land use/transportation characteristics which need to be considered. The five categories and case study corridors are: residential (McCowan Road near Denison Road), urban mixed use (Leslie Street near Highway 7), commercial (McCowan Road near Highway 7), employment campus (16th Avenue near Highway 404) and industrial (Weston Road near Steeles Avenue).

The recommended alternative cross-section was found to be applicable to all these categories, with the exception of the residential category where some modifications and refinements were found to be needed. For the residential typology, a 5.2 metre wide median at mid-block locations would need to be implemented rather than the 6 metre wide median, since it is constrained by the adjacent developments (typically reverse frontage). For other categories, landscaping and sidewalks could be extended through appropriate agreements onto private property to complement landscaping which is placed within the public right-of-way. This is more difficult to achieve in a residential setting with reverse frontage development. Where possible, the inclusion of boulevard trees would be desirable.

The costs related to the recommended cross-sections are clearly higher because of the additional landscaping in the medians and the exclusive bike lanes. This may require a reassessment of the Region's Roads Capital Program within the Master Plan Update. However, phasing the landscaping features would not help reduce the total costs. The potential issues and drawbacks far outweigh the potential cost benefits of phasing the landscaping features, particularly portraying an incomplete picture of the ultimate vision.

Transitional zones between 4 lanes and 6 lanes typically occur at intersections. At the location where the 6 lane cross-section is being reduced to a 4 lane cross-section, the curb through lane (approach lane) can become an exclusive right turn lane, or alternatively, a new discharge lane can be introduced beyond the intersection and then tapered to allow vehicles to merge with the other two lanes of through traffic. When a 4 lane cross-section is being transitioned into a 6 lane cross-section, an exclusive right turn lane can be changed to a shared through-right lane, which matches the curb lane of the 6 lane cross-section on the far side of the intersection.

It is also clear that the 36 metre right-of-way imposes many spatial constraints that would not be the case if a wider right-of-way was available. In order to accommodate all the basic and desirable functions of the roadway, a 44.2 metre right-of-way is required. However, this can be reduced to 42.6 metres if the lane widths are reduced. Thus, in newly developing areas where land uses have not been set as yet, ideally a wider right-of-way (43 metres) should be protected, in order to avoid these spatial constraints when consideration is being given to widening these Regional streets in the future.

As noted, the implementation of HOV/bike lanes would need to be phased in, with the new outside travel lane being a "convertible" lane (i.e. used for mixed traffic initially, and converted to HOV/bike lanes later). The curb lane would be re-stripped as a HOV/bike lane at the time of implementation of HOV and bike lanes as part of an integrated and

continuous system. Following the widening, but before the implementation of the HOV/bike lanes, signs should be installed to notify the public that the curb lanes will be converted to HOV lanes, or HOV/bike lanes in the future. In the case of future HOV/bike lanes, the 5 metre lane must include a painted delineation between the future bike lane and future HOV lane. Implementation will need to be consistent with and closely coordinated with the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and Regional HOV enforcement strategies, as well as a public education campaign with respect to HOV usage.

In summary, the recommended features reflecting in future Great Regional Streets include:

- Convertible six lane cross-sections with 2+HOV, or HOV/bike lanes along the curb lanes
- Exclusive bike lanes (1.5 metres wide) where the York Region Bicycle Master Plan supports their inclusion
- Continuous sidewalks along both sides of the street
- Continuous illumination along both sides of the street
- Reduced lane widths to 3.3 metres for middle and median lanes, and 3.5 metres for curb lanes
- Design and posted speeds both at 60 km/h
- A landscaped median
 - Desirably 6 metres wide for all categories except residential, assuming that trees, other landscaping and sidewalks could be extended through appropriate agreements onto private property to complement landscaping which is placed within the public right-of-way
 - Desirably 5.2 metres wide for the residential typology, given the spatial constraints imposed by reverse frontage development
- Shared through/right turn lane (i.e. no exclusive right turn lane)
- HOV lanes for 2+ passenger vehicles and transit vehicles with curbside stops (i.e. no bus bays)
- Trees in the boulevard where sufficient space is available to accommodate trees in a sustainable manner.

Ideally, a wider right-of-way, between 43 and 46 metres, should be protected in newly developing areas where land uses have not been set as yet. In such cases, wider boulevards and sidewalks can be provided, which can allow more flexibility in providing different types of planting, landscaping features with some street furniture and street art. It is recognized however, that in specific historic areas through which Regional roads pass and for which an alternative such as a by-pass is not possible, it may not be possible to achieve a 36 metre right-of-way, let alone a widened right-of-way. These areas are detailed in both the local and Regional Official Plans.

With the recommended features as detailed above, the future Regional streets are expected to exhibit substantial improvements as compared to the existing standard cross-sections, in that the recommended cross-sections would be able to accommodate all modes of travel in a safe and efficient manner. Ride-sharing and transit usage would be encouraged with the introduction of HOV lanes. Continuous sidewalks and illumination along both sides of the street are expected to enhance walkability and create a more pedestrian friendly environment. Cycling would also be encouraged with the

introduction of exclusive bike lanes. The landscaping features along the median and boulevards improve the aesthetics of the Regional streets.

In summary, Great Regional Streets are now viewed as integral elements of urban structure, and give form and shape to urban areas. They will help determine the character of an area, influence walkability and scale, and would help to support and integrate land uses along their lengths. They are not only expected to address the transportation network needs including efficiency, viability and capacity, but also the community focused goals related to pedestrian friendliness and transit focused design. This would in turn enhance a sense of place, define the community character and instil community pride.

J:\01 PROJECTS\2003jobs\16-03102 SevenLane.gks\Report\FINAL REPORT (NOVEMBER 2008)\Toward Great Regional Streets (chapter10).doc

11.0 NEXT STEPS

Between the submission of the draft final report in January, 2006 and the final report in December, 2008, the Council for the Region of York adopted the recommendations as outlined herein, including the narrowing of lane widths and the introduction of landscaped medians.

However, in order to practically implement these recommendations, various changes in policy and/or procedure will be required, or further studied. Specifically, the following are required:

- Assessment of the Region's Roads Capital Program in view of:
 - The additional costs related to landscaped medians and exclusive bike lanes, such that projects may need to involve shorter segments of roadway, or further phasing.
 - The need for logical phasing of HOV/Transit lanes.
 - The need for phasing of bike lanes to create a logical network in accordance with the York Regional Bicycle Master Plan.
- Amendment to the access control policy as a result of the introduction of planted medians. This policy will need to balance the desired cross-section which includes medians, with access requirements for adjacent land uses, where access will be impacted by the introduction of the medians. Alternative means of achieving access will need to be addressed.
- Amendment to the Official Plan with respect to designated rights-of-way for Regional Streets. Currently the typical maximum Regional Street right-of-way is 36 metres. The study has identified the need for between 43 and 46 metre rights-of-way in order to address the various competing requirements. This has been suggested for protection in newly developing areas where land uses have not been set as yet. It is recognized, however, that special provisions need to be made in localized areas, for example where arterials pass through historic hamlets and/or where widenings would adversely impact these established communities.
- Development of a comprehensive Regional HOV strategy, recognizing that generally roadways should only be widened for purposes of creating high occupancy vehicle lanes, not to create additional road capacity for mixed traffic. This would result in the most effective use of the additional road capacity which is being created. The strategy needs to consider a number of factors including, but not restricted to:
 - Criteria for eligibility (e.g. 2 or 3 occupants per vehicle) and how this coordinates with the eligibility criteria of other jurisdictions. For example MTO requires a minimum of 2 persons per vehicle, whereas the City of Toronto requires 3 persons per vehicle as a minimum
 - Length of designated HOV lane for these to be effective in attracting users
 - Connectivity with HOV lanes under other jurisdictions (e.g. Provincial, City of Toronto).

- Development of a Regional HOV enforcement strategy, in view of the intent to create a network of HOV lanes in the Region of York.
- Review of pedestrians crossing requirements of arterial streets under the jurisdiction of the Region of York. Considerations include but are not limited to:
 - Methods of enhancing pedestrian safety
 - The need for pedestrian activated signals
 - Whether pedestrians will be allowed to cross at unprotected locations at their own risk (e.g. at breaks in landscaped medians, where the median provides a refuge area allowing them to cross half of the roadway at a time).
- Discussions with local municipalities regarding sidewalk design and implementation. Currently sidewalks adjacent to Regional Streets are under the jurisdiction of the local municipalities through which the Regional Streets pass. The intent as outlined herein is for all Regional streets to have sidewalks along both sides of the street, except in underdeveloped (rural) areas.
- Amendment to Regional design standards which would effectively mean that the design and posted speeds are the same in the urbanized parts of the Region, taking into consideration operations, safety and related factors. This is important from the perspective of implementing the recommended changes (e.g. length of tapers, lane widths, etc.).
- Development of street tree planting design guidelines and specifications. These specifications will include performance standards, critical soil volumes, quality and compaction of soil and other design factors which sustain street tree health.
- Development of design guidelines for the landscaped medians, taking into consideration the general land use categories that have been identified, sustainability, costs and related factors.
- Building on the design guidelines, the preparation of a catalogue of streetscape treatments that can be referenced when selecting elements for specific applications.

REFERENCES

1. Understanding Barriers: York Region's First Annual Accessibility Plan (Consultation Draft). York Region Accessibility Advisory Committee, May, 2003.
2. Woodbine Corridor Urban Design Study. Brook McIlroy Inc., April, 2001.
3. Highway 7 Streetscape Study. Town of Markham, 1999.
4. Vision 2026 – Towards a Sustainable Region, Regional Municipality of York, Spring, 2006.
5. Greening Strategy Achievements, Regional Municipality of York.
6. York Region Centres and Corridor Study, The Planning Partnership, Royal LePage Advisors, csb inc. and Poulos + Chung, November, 2002.
7. Focus Ontario. Environics, 2003.
8. Highway 7 Corridor Transitway Environmental Assessment, Terms of Reference. iTrans Consulting Limited and Delcan Corporation, March, 2003.
9. Yonge Street Transitway Environmental Assessment, Terms of Reference. McCormick Rankin Corporation, December, 2002.
10. Yonge Street Transitway, Need and Justification. McCormick Rankin Corporation, July, 2002.
11. Regional Streets: Standards for Rights-of-Way and Boulevards. Regional Municipality of York, May, 1998.
12. York Region Transportation Master Plan, Overview Report. The Regional Municipality of York, 2002.
13. 2006 - 10 year Roads Construction Progress. Regional Municipality of York.
14. YRT Technical Guidelines for Transit Facilities, Stops and Accessories. York Region Transit, January, 2005.
15. York Region Speed Zones Map. Regional Municipality of York, March, 2003.
16. Regional Streetscape Policy. The Regional Municipality of York, December, 2001.
17. Older Driver Highway Design Handbook. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, December, 1998.
18. Workshop on Freight Supportive Land Use Guidelines. Ontario Ministry of Transportation, March, 2003.
19. Regional Municipality of York Demographic Characteristics (2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey).
20. A Vision for Highway 7 (Report No. 6 of the Planning and Economic Development Committee). Regional Municipality of York, June, 2002.
21. Yonge Street Vision – Richmond Hill Graphic Image (Report No. 6 of the Planning and Economic Development Committee). Regional Municipality of York, June, 2003.
22. Regional Official Plan, Office Consolidation. Regional Municipality of York, November, 2005.
23. Transportation Master Plan (Including 2031 Road and Transit Networks: Staging and Costs Technical Report and Current Throughput Capacity Projections for 7 Lane Regional Roads). The Regional Municipality of York, June, 2002.
24. Road Works Development Charge Credit – A Guideline for Applicants. The Regional Municipality of York, April, 2002.
25. Regional Road Streetscaping, Policy Development – Status Report. The Regional Municipality of York.
26. Regional Road Streetscaping Policy Update. The Regional Municipality of York.
27. YRT Non-Rider Survey. York Region Transit, June, 2003.
28. YRT Mobility Plus Service Customer Satisfaction Survey. York Region Transit, February 2003.

29. YRT Conventional Transit Customer Satisfaction Survey. York Region Transit, January, 2003.
30. York Region Vision Plan – Visual Preference Survey. A. Nelessen Associates, 1998.
31. Delivering the GTA Vision – Centres, Corridors and Transit. The Regional Municipality of York, June, 2002.
32. Town of Markham Official Plan, (Revised 1987) As Amended. Office Consolidation, July, 2005.
33. Town of Richmond Hill Official Plan Consolidation. Town of Richmond Hill, December 1998.
34. City of Vaughan Official Plan Amendment 600 (Amending OPA 400). Office Consolidation. City of Vaughan, January 2003.
35. Centre Area Planning District (Markham Centre). Town of Markham, July, 1997.
36. Official Plan Amendment No. 155, Bayview Glen Secondary Plan, Town of Richmond Hill.
37. Amendment Number 500 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area – Secondary Plan for the Vaughan Corporate Centre. City of Vaughan.
38. North Yonge Street – Richmond Hill Urban Design Study. Town of Richmond Hill, 2001
39. Access Guideline for Regional Roads. The Regional Municipality of York, May, 2004.
40. Impacts of Access Management Techniques. NCHRP Report 420. National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1999.
41. Capacity and Operational Effects of Midblock Left-Turn Lanes. NCHRP Report 395. National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1997.
42. Parsonson, P.S., M.G. Waters, and J.S., Fincher. Georgia Study Confirms the Continuing Safety Advantage of Raised Medians Over Two-Way Left-Turn Lanes. In Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference on Access Management, Portland, Oregon, August 2000.
43. Eisele, W.L., W.E. Frawley, A.T. Griffin, and J.D. Miles. Estimating the Impacts of Access Management Techniques: Methodology and Preliminary Findings. Research Report Number 4221-1. Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, October 2002.
44. Parsonson, P.S., M.G. Waters, and J.S. Fincher. Two-Way Left-Turn With a Raised Median: Atlanta's Memorial Drive. In Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Access Management, Fort Lauderdale, FL, 1998.
45. Zegeer, C.V., C.T. Esse, J.R. Stewart, H.H. Huang, and P. Lagerwey. Safety Effects of Marked vs. Unmarked Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Locations: Results from 30 Cities. In CD Conference Proceedings of the 2nd Urban Street Symposium, Sponsored by the Transportation Research Board, Anaheim, California, July 2003.
46. Eisele, W.L. and W.E. Frawley. A Methodology for Determining Economic Impacts of Raised Medians: Final Project Results. Research Report Number 3904-4. Texas Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas, October 2000.
47. A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C., 2001.
48. Bevan, T.A., R. Mason, and J.A. McKenzie. Context Sensitive Design Challenges for Major Suburban Arterial Street Projects. In CD Conference Proceedings of the 2nd Urban Street Symposium, Sponsored by the Transportation Research Board, Anaheim, California, July 2003.
49. Access Management – Balancing Access and Mobility (Answers to Your Questions). Florida Department of Transportation (<http://www11.myflorida.com/planning/systems/sm/accom/pdf/ampromo3.pdf>).

50. Pedestrian Facilities Guidebook: Incorporating Pedestrians Into Washington's Transportation System. Sponsored by Washington State DOT, Puget Sound Regional Council, Association of Washington Cities, and County Road Administration Board and prepared by OTAK, September 1997.
51. Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities: A Recommended Practice of the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Prepared by the Traffic Engineering Council Committee TENC-5A-5, Chaired by Charles V. Zegeer, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, D.C., March 1998.
52. Alternative Treatments for At-Grade Pedestrian Crossings: An Informational Report, Prepared by the Nazir Lalani & the ITE Pedestrian and Bicycle Task Force, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2001.
53. An Analysis of Factors Contributing to "Walking Along Roadway" Crashes: Research Study and Guidelines for Sidewalks and Walkways, Report No. FHWA-RD-01-101, USDOT, Federal Highway Administration, February, 2002.
54. Guidelines for the Location and Design for Bus Stops. TCRP Report 19. Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1996.
55. Transit-Friendly Streets: Design and Traffic Management Strategies to Support Livable Communities. TCRP Report 33. Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1998.
56. Bus Rapid Transit Volume 1: Case Studies in Bus Rapid Transit. TCRP Report 90. Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 2003.
57. Levinson, Herbert S. Bus Rapid Transit on City Streets How Does It Work. In CD Conference Proceedings of the 2nd Urban Street Symposium, Sponsored by the Transportation Research Board, Anaheim, California, July, 2003.
58. Stockton, Wm. R., Daniels, G., Skowronek, D.A., and Fenno, D.W. The ABC's of HOV – The Texas Experience. Texas Transportation Institute, September, 1999.
59. Turnball, K. F. HOV Facilities: Challenges and Opportunities. In Conference Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on HOV Systems, Seattle, Washington, October, 2002.
60. HOV Systems Manual. NCHRP Report 414. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1998.
61. Planning and Design Guidelines, Vaughan Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan (Preliminary Draft). City of Vaughan (Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited), 2003.
62. Regional Niagara Bikeways Master Plan. Region of Niagara (Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited), 2003.
63. Translink's Bicycle Usage and Attitude Survey, 2000, (http://www.best.bc.ca/_etc/pdfs/Transportation%20Facts/cycling_fs.pdf).
64. Translink Trip Diary, 1999, (http://www.best.bc.ca/_etc/pdfs/Transportation%20Facts/cycling_fs.pdf).
65. Transportation Association of Canada, 1999. Geometric Design Guidelines for Canadian Roads.
66. National Survey on Active Transportation, 1998. Go For Green Ottawa.
67. City of Mississauga, 2003. Cycling Facts. (www.city.mississauga.on.ca/cycling)
68. New York City Bicycle Master Plan. New York City, 1997.
69. City of Toronto Official Plan. City of Toronto, 2002.
70. City of Toronto Cycling Master Plan – Final Report on Quantitative Research Results. Decima Research Inc., 1999.
71. Collection of Cycling Concepts. Road Directorate, Denmark, 2000.

72. Bikeway Traffic Control Guidelines for Canada. Transportation Association of Canada, 1998.
73. Geometric Design Standards for Ontario Highways. Ministry of Transportation of Ontario, 1994.
74. Recent Geometric Design Research for Improved Safety and Operations. NCHRP Synthesis Report 299. National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 2001. (www.trafficalming.org).
75. Hauer, E. Lane Width and Safety, Draft, March, 2000.
76. Regional Road Corridor Design Guidelines. Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton, July 2000.
77. Streetscape Manual. City of Toronto, 1995.
78. Landscape Guidelines for Regional Roads. Regional Municipality of Peel, December 1996.
79. Ness, Jacob R. Development of Guidelines for the Aesthetic Surface Treatment of Safety-Shaped Median Barriers. August 2004. (<https://txspace.tamu.edu/bitstream/1969/1297/1/etd-tamu-2004B-CVEN-Ness-2.pdf>).
80. Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division - Technology Development – Aesthetic Barrier Systems (http://www.efl.fhwa.dot.gov/techdev/abs_index.htm).
81. California Highway Barrier Aesthetics Report (Edition 1a), June, 2002. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/images/barrier-aesth1final.pdf>)
82. Flexibility in Highway Design. U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration. (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/flex/ch04.htm)
83. Garrick, Norman W. New Concepts for Context Based Design of Streets and Highways. In TRB 2005 Annual Meeting CD-ROM. January 2005.
84. Synthesis of Safety Research Related to Speed and Speed Limits. Publication No. FHWA-RD-98-154. (www.tfhr.gov/safety/speed/speed.htm)
85. Garber, Nicholas J. and Ehrhart Angela A. The Effect of Speed, Flow and Geometric Characteristics on Crash Rates for Different Types of Virginia Highways. Virginia Transportation Research Council, January, 2000.
86. A Guide to Best Practices for Achieving Context Sensitive Solutions. NCHRP Report 480. National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 2002.
87. York Region Transit Drawings and Specifications. York Region Transit, November, 2005.
88. York Region Transit Five-Year Service Plan, 2006 – 2010. Final Report, Entra Consultants, May, 2006.
89. Town of Aurora Official Plan, June 27, 1991, January 2007 Office Consolidation.
90. Town of East Gwillimbury Official Plan. (Official Plan Amendment No. 95), July, 1997.
91. The Official Plan of the Township of King Planning Area As Amended by Amendment Nos. 2, 17, 26, Consolidated Copy as of 2000.
92. Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan, Office Consolidation, August, 2004.
93. Town of Newmarket Official Plan, October 10, 2006.
94. Town of Georgina Official Plan (OPA 88), November, 2002.
95. York Regional Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan Study, Draft Copy, May, 2007 version 1.
- 96.