

Active Community Toolkit Pilot Evaluation



August, 2014

For information, please contact:

Bernadette McCall
Middlesex-London Health Unit
50 King St.
London, Ontario
N6A 5L7
phone: 519-663-5317, ext. 2314
fax: 519-663-9581
e-mail: Bernie.mccall@mlhu.on.ca

© Copyright 2014
Middlesex-London Health Unit
50 King Street
London, Ontario
N6A 5L7

Cite reference as: Middlesex-London Health Unit (2014).
Active Community Toolkit Pilot Evaluation.
London, Ontario: Author.

Authors:

Bernadette McCall, Public Health Nurse, Healthy Communities & Injury Prevention Team, Environmental Health & Chronic Disease Prevention Services Middlesex-London Health Unit

Melissa McCann, Program Evaluator, Environmental Health & Chronic Disease Prevention Services, Middlesex-London Health Unit

All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	2
Purpose	3
Method	3
Results.....	4
Discussion.....	6
Recommendations.....	7
Conclusion	8
References.....	9
Appendix A – Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plan	10
Appendix B – Evaluation Framework – Pilot Evaluation of the Active Community Toolkit	11
Appendix C – Active Community Toolkit Pilot Evaluation: Tracking Form.....	12
Appendix D – Working Template – Municipal Land Use Application Review Form.....	13

Acknowledgements

Emily Hill, Public Health Nurse, Middlesex-London Health Unit

Joyce Castanza, Public Health Nurse, Middlesex-London Health Unit

Mary Lou Albanese, Program Manager, Middlesex-London Health Unit

Healthy Communities Partnership Middlesex-London

Funded by the Government of Ontario

Executive Summary

Evidence supports the importance of physical activity in the prevention of several chronic diseases and conditions. Changes in neighbourhood, street and building design that encourage regular physical activity as a normal part of peoples' daily lives can be part of the solution to reduce risk factors and incidence of chronic disease and illness. Healthy community design that links the built environment and health is receiving renewed interest by both the public health and planning professionals as well as other stakeholders.

Local governments have the ability to promote health in their communities through healthy community design and creating conditions for citizens to make healthy choices. In recent years there has been a growing trend for public health practitioners to participate in municipal planning processes focused on land use planning.

The Active Community Toolkit (ACT) was developed to assist in providing valid, reliable and standardized input when reviewing Land Use Applications (LUA) in order to support local active community design efforts. Evaluation of the ACT was warranted in order to: 1) determine factors affecting implementation of the toolkit, 2) understand to what extent the toolkit was being implemented as planned, and 3) determine to what extent land use recommendations submitted by public health were influencing planning decisions.

Over a 4 month period, a total of 7 Land Use Applications (LUAs) were reviewed using either the full version ACT assessment tool or an abbreviated version of the tool. Two types of LUAs were reviewed - 4 Subdivision Plans (SUB) and 3 Site Plans (SP). It was not possible to use the ACT to review an Area Plan (AP) since there was no request for input during the time frame in which the evaluation took place. A primary and a secondary reviewer compared their results of using the ACT on 2 out of the 7 LUAs.

The actual ACT assessment tool is comprised of four main categories, each with several subtopics and an extensive criteria list. Reviewers noted that some of the criteria were not applicable to the particular type of LUA under review and in some sections of the tool; criteria were repetitive, again, depending on the type of LUA under review. To expedite the review of 3 LUAs, a Working Template was developed.

Results from the evaluation indicated that overall, the ACT provided a comprehensive, standardized method of systematically reviewing LUAs for active community design features. Since there are three main types of LUA and there can be wide variation in the content provided, recommendations are to retain the current ACT layout and design in order to ensure

relevant criteria are not missed during a LUA review. The main limitations of the ACT include the length of the tool and non-applicability of certain criteria to some types of LUA.

Recommendations for modifying the ACT and the process of applying it to review LUAs included:

- Retain the comprehensive version of the ACT.
- Modify identified criteria to be more specific.
- Modify criteria that are repetitive.
- Use the Working Template that was developed during the pilot evaluation to expedite the review process.
- Develop and maintain a chart for quick reference to relevant documents including planning and health related research and reports.
- Establish criteria as to when internal consultation may be required in order to address other health related concerns and / or assess organizational risk.
- Public health staff should continue to take advantage of learning opportunities to further their knowledge and understanding of active community design.
- Consider additional recommendations made in a recent report on how policies related to healthy community design can be strengthened.

Providing public health recommendations that relate to healthy community design at municipal land use planning tables is a new role for public health. It is essential that public health input be strategically positioned, credible and evidence-based in order for health supporting decisions to be made. The ACT proved to be a useful resource and guide when reviewing LUAs for active community design features. Using it, along with other complimentary resources and tools can provide public health practitioners with a means of addressing chronic disease prevention, as well as other determinants of health, when reviewing municipal LUAs. Determining how best to allocate public health resources and expertise requires ongoing consideration.

Introduction

The link between the built environment and health has been noted since the 19th century (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ontario Professional Planners Institute, 2009). In particular, overwhelming evidence supports the importance of physical activity in the prevention of several chronic diseases and conditions (Warburton, et al, 2007). Changes in neighbourhood, street and building design that encourage regular physical activity as a normal part of peoples' daily lives can be part of the solution to reduce risk factors and incidence of chronic disease and illness (Toronto Public Health, 2014). Healthy community design that links the built environment and health is receiving renewed interest by both the public health and planning professionals as well as other stakeholders.

The World Health Organization recommends the integration of physical activity plans with broader urban design and planning processes as a means of working towards a healthy city (Edwards & Tsouros, 2008). Local governments have the ability to promote health in their communities through healthy community design and creating conditions for citizens to make healthy choices (BC Healthy Communities Society and Healthy Families BC Health, 2014). In recent years there has been a growing trend for public health practitioners to participate in municipal planning processes focused on land use planning (Provincial Health Services Authority, 2008). In Ontario, this type of work is under the authority of the *Ontario Public Health Standards* (OPHS) (Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, 2008) requirements within the Chronic Diseases and Injuries Program Standards. These standards outline public health requirements to support healthy public policies that create and enhance supportive built environments including healthy community design as well as influence policies that address road and off-road safety.

To support OPHS requirements, various guidance documents exist. One of which is the *Healthy Eating, Physical Activity and Healthy Weights Guidance Document* (Ministry of Health Promotion, 2010) which is a tool that identifies key concepts, practical resources and approaches for public health staff to use in health promotion planning pertaining to healthy eating & weights, physical activity and the built environment.

In 2013, the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care released *Ontario's Public Health Sector Strategic Plan* which includes Strategic Goal #3 - Improve health by reducing preventable diseases and injuries and Strategic Goal #4 - Promote healthy environments – both natural and built. Both goals reflect the important roles that physical activity and

healthy environments play in assisting Ontarians achieve their full health potential.

With this background, the Healthy Communities Partnership Middlesex-London (HCP), whose purpose is to influence policy that supports active living across the lifespan, determined that development of a tool to assist in providing valid, reliable and standardized input when reviewing Land Use Applications (LUA) would support local active community design efforts. Using funds from the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, Healthy Communities Partnership Fund, the Middlesex-London Health Unit (MLHU), on behalf of the HCP, contracted a Built Environment and Health Specialist to develop the Active Community Toolkit (ACT). The ACT was developed primarily for public health professionals, however, it may be utilized by other stakeholders including professionals such as planning, design, transportation, transit, engineers, parks and recreation and developers to ensure and/or advocate for the design of healthy active communities. (Appendix A).

Development of the ACT included several steps:

- A review of existing tools designed to review development plans and proposals for active community design features
- The drafting of ACT components using existing tools and research
- Consultation with public health professionals and municipal planning staff to validate concepts, criteria, structure and layout

The ACT is comprised of six sections:

1. Introduction
2. User Guide
3. Active Community Tool to Review Development Plans
4. Glossary of Terms
5. References
6. Appendix

Once developed, it was decided that pilot testing the ACT would provide useful information for both current as well as ongoing use of the toolkit. To this end, a health unit Program Evaluator (PE) and Public Health Nurse (PHN) worked together to develop an

Evaluation Framework (Appendix B) which reflected the following features of the ACT in promoting active community design:

Program Goal: To increase opportunities for active living including active transportation within the built and natural environments.

Program/Policy Objective: To provide input in support of healthy public policies that enhance the built environment in order to create communities that are safe and promote physical activity.

Purpose of the Toolkit: To assist public health professionals to provide valid, reliable and standardized input that supports active community design when reviewing development plans submitted to a municipality.

Target Populations: To provide land use development recommendations using the ACT to: municipal planning departments, committees and decision makers, local developers and/or internal MLHU stakeholders.

Purpose

The purposes of evaluating the ACT were to:

1. Determine the factors affecting implementation of the toolkit.
2. Understand to what extent the toolkit was being implemented as planned.
3. Determine to what extent the recommendations submitted influence planning decisions.

Method

The Evaluation Framework (Appendix B) included two components and a number of key evaluation questions within each component:

Factors Affecting Implementation

- What is the process for determining which Land Use Applications (LUA) are reviewed using the ACT?
- How much time is required for the entire process of reviewing and responding to LUAs?
- What are the factors that help in the creation of LUA recommendations?
- What are the barriers and / or factors that hinder the generation of LUA recommendations?

- What suggestions are there for changing the ACT and / or process?
- Do staff have the required knowledge, skills and comfort to utilize the ACT?
- To what extent is the ACT being implemented as intended?

Effectiveness

- What types of recommendations are being submitted by public health for consideration?
- What impact have public health recommendations had on planning decisions?

A Tracking Form (Appendix C) was developed to gather feedback from the reviewer(s) each time the ACT was utilized for reviewing a LUA.

LUAs were categorized as follows:

- AP (Area Plan) - land use plan for a district or a large neighbourhood
- SUB (Subdivision Plan) – land use plan for splitting up land for development into individual parcels of land
- SP (Site Plan) – land-use arrangement, typically for a single parcel of land

Site Plans were received by the Healthy Communities & Injury Prevention Program Manager who screened them before forwarding relevant LUAs to the responsible Public Health Nurse. Subdivision Plans were received directly by the responsible Public Health Nurse. No Area Plans were received during the evaluation period. The following screening criteria were used:

- Relevancy to active community design
- Ability to commit time
- Political sensitivity
- Relevancy to public health
- Potential impact of the LUA

The full version, Active Community Tool, contained in Section 3 of the ACT (Appendix A), was used to review 4 out of 7 LUAs. A Working Template was developed during the pilot evaluation in order to expedite the process and was used instead of the Active Community Tool to review 3 out of 7 LUAs. Two out

of the seven LUAs were reviewed by a primary reviewer as well as a secondary reviewer; both were Public Health Nurses with knowledge and experience in reviewing LUAs.

The target of reviewing 10 LUAs within the given time frame was not achieved due to a limited number of LUAs received within the pilot evaluation time period that met the screening criteria.

Results

Seven LUAs were reviewed between November 21, 2013 and March 31, 2014. Of the 7 LUAs reviewed, 4 were Subdivision Plans (SUB) requiring an Initial Proposal Report (IPR). IPRs were presented by the developer or designate at a municipal Proposal Review Meeting (PRM) to representatives from various municipal departments and several community organizations. The remaining 3 LUAs that were reviewed were Site Plans (SP), not requiring a PRM.

Factors Affecting Implementation

The Program Manager forwarded 3 (SP) out of approximately 95 LUAs (which included Notice of Assessment and Notice of Public Meeting notifications) to the responsible Public Health Nurse. An additional 4 IPRs were received directly by the responsible Public Health Nurse during this same time period. Criteria used for the screening process provided a useful guide in determining which LUAs were best suited to public health providing recommendations.

Given that only SUB and SP LUAs were reviewed, the ACT provided a comprehensive method for determining active community design features, it being noted that it was not possible to review an Area Plan (AP) within the allotted time frame of the pilot evaluation. The Active Community Tool contained within the ACT is comprised of four main categories, each with several subtopics and an extensive criteria list (Appendix A).

Time spent reviewing and submitting recommendations included some or all of the following steps:

1. Review of the LUA and completion of the Active Community Tool.
2. Review of relevant documents, i.e. provincial and municipal policy documents, planning and health research / reports.
3. Consultation with municipal planning staff.
4. Consultation with public health staff.

5. Determination of specific public health recommendations.
6. Decision on whether or not to submit recommendations based on review of all relevant factors, i.e. potential for health impact, political sensitivity, time involvement, etc.
7. Composition of and submission of recommendations (verbal &/or written).
8. Attendance at Proposal Review Meetings.

A primary and a secondary reviewer assessed two out of the seven LUAs separately (one SP and one SUB) using the ACT and compared their results. The reviewers noted that they applied the ACT criteria in a similar manner and completed Step 1 within a comparable time frame, i.e. SP – 3 - 3.5 hours and SUB – 2 hours.

Minor variations in completing the ACT were noted due to differences in interpretation of some of the criteria. For example:

- Category: Mixed Land Use, A5: ‘Propose recreation spaces’.

The reviewers recommend defining recreation spaces as being either active or passive.

- Category: Housing Density and Diversity, F2: ‘High-rise apartments’.

The reviewers recommend defining high-rise apartments either by height or by the number of floors.

Overall, the reviewers agreed that the ACT was a useful resource that provided a standardized method of reviewing LUAs. The Guidance Comments contained within Section Two: User Guide and the Glossary of Terms contained within Section Four were also helpful. The reviewers also felt confident that they possessed the knowledge, skill and comfort required to apply the ACT in reviewing LUAs.

Having two reviewers independently use the ACT to review the LUAs helped to; 1) establish a basic level of reliability in the tool in order to ensure a consistent application, 2) identify where minor modifications to criteria could be made in order to clarify interpretation and 3) refine the process when reviewing future LUAs.

Only the primary reviewer was responsible for going through all 8 steps in the process. Time spent in completing all steps in the LUA review process ranged between 3.5 and 9 hours depending on the type of

LUA, with more time being spent on LUAs that required a PRM.

It was noted that in the process of using Section Three - Active Community Tool, of the ACT,, that not all the criteria were relevant in the assessment of the three types of LUAs, i.e. SP, SUB and AP. Additionally, it was noted that some criteria were repeated within the same sub-topic, e.g. Public Realms – M: Parks, Open and Recreation Spaces. These features made the tool somewhat cumbersome to use, depending on the type of LUA under review.

For these reasons, the primary reviewer created a Working Template to use instead of completing the Active Community Tool in order to expedite the review process (Appendix D). The Working Template was used to review 3 out of 4 of the LUAs. It comprised the four Active Community Tool categories and respective subtopics but did not include the extensive criteria list. Using the template simplified and expedited the LUA review process.

In addition to the ACT, other sources of information and strategies were used to help inform the LUA recommendations that were made and included the following:

- Key policy documents, i.e. Provincial Policy Statement, Official Plan, Area Plans, Master Plans, Urban Design Guidelines
- Studies & reports that were submitted as part of the Initial Proposal Report (IPR)
- Reports and research from health sources and professional planning associations
- Consultation with municipal planners
- Consultation with public health staff

Barriers and / or factors that hindered the generation of LUA recommendations included:

- LUAs did not always include information related to the criteria contained in the Active Community Tool
- Inability to consult with municipal planning staff for clarification related to aspects of particular LUAs due to time constraints
- The challenge of finding sufficient time to review large volumes of information related to some LUAs

Comments and recommendations submitted by public health in response to LUAs during the pilot

evaluation were organized by using the four main categories of the ACT. Examples of recommendations can be seen in the following excerpts:

1. Mixed land use

- Excerpt: Good mixed land use according to XX Area Plan with residential, park, open space, and proximity to services via the proposed neighbourhood commercial area (noting there is a future Central Activity Node on xx Rd to the North, 1.5-2k away). The proposed neighbourhood commercial & institutional Block areas will serve as gathering places, thus helping to create a sense of a community & place.

2. Mixed housing

- Excerpt: Intensification within this key corridor will increase support for and viability of improved public transit service and efficiency. Evidence from other cities shows that an efficient public transit system promotes physically active lifestyles (e.g. walking and cycling) with associated health benefits including reduced obesity levels (Urban Land Institute, 2013).

3. Complete Streets

- Excerpt: The modified grid layout of the streets allows for multi-modal movement but connectivity could be improved by extending xx street to yy street. This would facilitate multi-modal access (including pedestrian, cyclist & public transit users) in & out of the area & ultimately allow pedestrians & cyclists to more easily access the city's multi-use pathway system that is planned to run to the east of yy Street.

4. Public Realms

- Excerpt: The subject lands have several natural features both within & around which could be made more available to the neighbourhood by increasing access & viewing options. The 2011 Canadian Community Health Survey on Neighbourhood Environments found that people will be more physically active if they have interesting things to look at (Public Health Agency of Canada: <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/hp-ps/hl-mvs/fast-facts-faits-rapides-eng.php>)

The need for internal consultation to ensure there were no conflicting recommendations was undertaken with one LUA. This discussion resulted in a decision being made to not proceed with submitting recommendations due to political sensitivities and potential organizational risk.

Since all submitted comments and recommendations, either verbal or written, become part of the public record, organizational risk was minimized by consulting with municipal planners / public health staff as necessary and by using well-researched and substantiated evidence from a variety of sources.

Effectiveness

Of the 7 LUAs that were reviewed using the ACT, recommendations were submitted for 6 to either the Planning Services or to the Development Services of the City of London:

- Recommendations for 4 LUAs were provided in both verbal and written formats
- Recommendations for 1 LUA was provided in written format only and
- Recommendations for 1 LUA was provided in verbal format only

It should be noted that final land use decisions can be pending for long periods of time (up to several years) due to the need for various studies that may need to be completed, required modifications to plans based on municipal regulations and subsequent approvals, public consultation, political and /or economic changes, time required for appeals and subsequent decisions to be made. As such, the time required to determine the impact public health recommendations have on a particular LUA decision can vary greatly. Additionally, LUA decisions and outcomes may or may not be influenced by public health recommendations since many factors ultimately feed into the final determination. Thus assessing the extent to which public health recommendations have impacted a particular LUA decision may not be possible.

All 3 of the SPs that MLHU staff had recommended approving either amendment of the Official Plan and / or a change in the existing zoning by-laws to allow development to proceed received municipal council approval. Making these amendments was consistent with supporting healthy community design principals and anticipated positive health outcomes. At the time of writing this report, of the 3 council approved SPs, one SP was under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board.

The final outcomes of the 4 SUBs for which MLHU provided recommendations were still pending at the time of writing this report, it being recognized that steps involved in these types of LUAs are more extensive and require a longer time frame for developers to address the recommendations made at PRMs.

Discussion

It should be noted that in this pilot evaluation that 7 LUAs were reviewed (4 SUB, 3 SP) and that there were no reviews were conducted of an AP. As a result, it was not possible to test the applicability of all ACT criteria to all types of LUAs. For a given category of LUA, i.e. SP, SUB or AP, there can be wide variation as to what is being proposed for development, hence having access to all criteria, such as is contained within the ACT, ensured a comprehensive LUA review.

The initial screening criteria were considered appropriate and allowed for the review of several different types of SUB and SP LUAs. Given the short time frame of the pilot evaluation, there was no opportunity to review an AP, it being recognized that such plans are infrequent, comprehensive and typically developed over long periods of time.

The current ACT layout and design allowed for a comprehensive review of LUAs received during the evaluation period. Use of the ACT demonstrated that it could accommodate a wide variation in how LUA content is presented for review. Criteria of the ACT for all three categories of LUA (SP, SUB, AP) were organized under the 4 main categories; 1) Mixed Land Use, 2) Mixed Housing, 3) Complete Streets and 4) Public Realms, all of which are key concepts to consider when undertaking a LUA review.

The ACT was a useful tool to use when reviewing LUAs in order to provide recommendations that support active community design and included the following features:

- Provided a comprehensive and standardized method of systematically reviewing LUAs using criteria relevant to active community design with consideration given to the built environment and natural settings
- Facilitated the communication of recommendations by using criteria organized according to key planning concepts of: Mixed Land Use, Mixed Housing, Complete Streets and Public Realms

In terms of using the ACT as intended, the main limitations of the ACT include; the length of the tool and non-applicability of certain criteria to some types of LUAs. During the pilot evaluation, the development of a Working Template, using the main categories and sub-topics of the Active Community Tool made working with the tool much easier. Overall the ACT is a useful resource and guide for reviewing LUAs. Using it, along with other complimentary resources and tools that focus on active community design can

provide public health staff with a means of addressing chronic disease prevention, as well as other determinants of health, when reviewing municipal LUAs.

In terms of the effectiveness of using the ACT to influence land use decisions, it is understood that multiple factors play a role in how the LUA process unfolds. For this reason, it was not possible to determine the extent to which recommendations in support of healthy community design principals made by public health staff pertaining to the 3 SPs that were approved by municipal council actually impacted the final decision.

Similarly, determining the impact of public health recommendations pertaining to the 4 SUBs is not possible due to multiple factors that influence the land development process coupled with the longer time frame required for developers to address the recommendations made at PRMs.

As public health staff explore ways and means by which land use decisions can be influenced to support health, consideration needs to be given to the allocation of public health resources required to participate in the LUA review process, the actual impact of recommendations that are made and the ability to measure the impact.

Recommendations

Recommendations for modifying the ACT and the process of applying it to review LUAs include the following:

- Retain the comprehensive version of the ACT to be used as a detailed guide and reference.
- Modify identified criteria to be more specific.
- Modify criteria that are repetitive.
- Use the Working Template that was developed during the pilot evaluation to expedite the review process which includes the four main categories of the ACT and corresponding sub-topics to: 1) capture identifying information pertaining to the LUA; 2) enter relevant information from the actual LUA 3) log relevant contacts made with Planners and / or Public Health staff (Appendix D); and 4) record recommendations.
- Develop and maintain a chart for quick reference that includes the four main ACT categories and corresponding relevant references to: 1) the Provincial Policy Statement policies; 2) the City of London Official Plan and 3) relevant planning and health related research and reports.

- Establish criteria as to when internal consultation with MLHU staff may be required in order to address other health related concerns / issues and / or assess organizational risk.

Moreover, public health staff should continue to take advantage of learning opportunities offered through webinars, workshops, conferences, online courses, etc. These learning opportunities will further their knowledge and understanding of active community design, help them stay abreast of new developments in the field and serve to develop skills in how to navigate and influence municipal / political processes in order to positively impact health.

Additional recommendations relevant to impacting land use development decisions and contained in a 2014 report, *Development Trends in Middlesex-London: An overview Report*, conducted for the MLHU by Dillon Consulting Ltd. on how MLHU could strengthen its impact on policies related to the design of healthy communities included the following:

- 1) Focus resources on Official Plan and Master Plan processes** – where influence over policy at this level will, in turn, impact development practices.
- 2) Identify strategic priority areas** – which will inform municipal staff and developers of where public health interests lie in relation to healthy community design.
- 3) Develop an education strategy** – to inform the general community of the benefits of healthy community design and, in turn, reduce opposition to features such as mixed-use planning, compact communities, complete neighbourhoods, aging-in-place, multi-generational neighbourhoods, active transportation, etc.
- 4) Maintain an involved awareness of development activity** – in order to be cognizant of and involved in development applications and approvals. This will help ensure comments and recommendations are relevant since development does not occur in a predictable fashion due to changes in market trends and policy direction.

MLHU staff should develop a strategy of how to best address healthy community design that allows fulfillment of the OPHS mandate as well as the Strategic Goals contained in Ontario's Public Health Strategic Plan. This strategy should take into account appropriate allocation of public health resources. Steps in developing a strategy could include the following; conduct a scan of pertinent literature, explore how other public health units are fulfilling the provincial mandate and ensure alignment with MLHU priorities. This will assist in determining best practices in promoting and supporting healthy

community design within in the London-Middlesex community.

Conclusion

Providing public health recommendations that relate to healthy active community design at municipal land use planning tables is a new role for public health staff at the MLHU. It is essential that public health input be strategically positioned, credible and evidence-based in order for health supporting decisions to be made. The ACT proved to be a useful resource and guide when reviewing LUAs for active community design features. Using it, along with other complimentary resources and tools can provide public health practitioners with a means of addressing chronic disease prevention, as well as other determinants of health, when reviewing municipal LUAs.

It is important to develop strategies and utilize tools that can assist in positively impacting healthy community design. Determining how best to allocate public health resources and expertise requires ongoing consideration.

References

- Dillon Consulting Limited. (2014). *Development Trends in Middlesex-London: An Overview Report*. Author.
- BC Healthy Communities Society and Healthy Families BC. (January 2014). *How Do Local Governments Improve Health and Community Well-being? A Resource Guide for Local Governments*. Ministry of Health.
- Edwards, P. & Tsouros, AD. (2008). *A healthy city is an active city: a physical activity planning guide*. World Health Organization.
- Middlesex-London Health Unit. (2013). *Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plans*. London, Ontario. Author.
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. (2008). *Ontario Public Health Standards 2008*. Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Ministry of Health Promotion. (2010). *Healthy Eating, Physical Activity and Healthy Weights Guidance Document*. ISBN: 978-1-4435-2912-9, Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. (2013). *Make No Little Plans: Ontario's Public Health Sector Strategic Plan*. Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ontario Professional Planners Institute. (2009). *Planning by Design: a healthy communities handbook*. Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Provincial Health Services Authority. (2008). *Introduction to Land Use Planning for Health Professionals: Workshop Reader*. Author.
- Toronto Public Health, City of Toronto Planning, City of Toronto Transportation Services and Gladki Planning Associates. (May 2014). *Active City: Designing for Health*. City of Toronto.
- Warburton, DE, Katzmarzyk, PT, Rhodes, RE, Shephard, RJ. (2007). Evidence-informed physical activity guidelines for Canadian adults. *Applied physiology, nutrition, and metabolism*, 32 (S2E): S16-S68.

Appendix A – Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plan



HEALTHY COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP
MIDDLESEX-LONDON

Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plans

Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plans



HEALTHY COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP
MIDDLESEX-LONDON

© Copyright information
Middlesex-London Health Unit
50 King Street
London, Ontario
N6A 5L7

Cite reference as: Middlesex-London Health Unit (2013)
Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plans
London, Ontario. Author

Author:
Kim Bergeron, PhD, Bergeron Consulting

Funded by the Government of Ontario

CONTRIBUTORS

This report was prepared by Bergeron Consulting on behalf of Middlesex-London Health Unit and funded through the Province of Ontario under the Healthy Communities Partnership.

Author

Dr. Kim Bergeron, Built Environment and Health Specialist, Bergeron Consulting, Baltimore, ON.

Collaborators:

Middlesex-London Health Unit, Environmental Health & Chronic Disease Prevention Services:

Bernadette McCall, RN, HBA, BScN, MA, Public Health Nurse

Emily Hill, RN, BScN, MA, Public Health Nurse

Melissa McCann, BA, MSW, Program Evaluator

Joyce Castanza, RN, BScN, Public Health Nurse

Marylou Albanese, RN, BScN, MSA, Program Manager

City of London, Planning Services and Development Services

Rob Franklin, Manager of Planning Services, Town of Cobourg

Acknowledgement

We also wish to acknowledge the support of the Healthy Communities Partnership Middlesex-London.

FOR INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:

Bernadette McCall, Public Health Nurse

Environmental Health & Chronic Disease Prevention Services

Middlesex-London Health Unit

50 King St., London, ON N6A 5L7

(519)663-5317 ext 2314

bernie.mccall@mlhu.on.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background.....	5
1.2 Site Development and Design.....	6
1.3 Purpose.....	7
1.4 Methodology to Develop the Tools in the Toolkit.....	8
1.5 How the Toolkit is Organized.....	8
1.6 Preparing to Use the Tool.....	9
1.7 Instructions on How to Use the Tool.....	9
1.8 Considerations When Using the Active Community Toolkit	11

SECTION TWO: USER GUIDE

2.1 Purpose.....	13
2.2 Considerations When Using the Active Community Tool for Reviewing Development Plans	13
2.3 User Guide.....	15

SECTION THREE: ACTIVE COMMUNITY TOOL TO REVIEW DEVELOPMENT PLANS 49**SECTION FOUR: GLOSSARY OF TERMS** 82**SECTION FIVE: REFERENCES** 85**SECTION SIX: APPENDIX A** 86

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Active communities are communities where infrastructure and policies (e.g. municipal, provincial, federal) support active living within the public realm through the *built environment* (e.g. parks, recreation facilities and spaces, sidewalks, and pathways) and *natural settings* (e.g. open spaces, trails, waterfronts). Opportunities exist for people to engage in daily physical activity (e.g. *utilitarian travel, leisure-time physical activity*) and enhance social interaction in a safe, aesthetically and pleasing environment.¹ Active communities are part of the broader concept of healthy, sustainable communities that support physically active lifestyles and consider the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, car share and taxis before the needs of private motor vehicle use.

To achieve the public health societal outcomes of 1) an increased proportion of the population that lives, works, plays and learns in healthy environments and 2) an increased proportion of the public that lives in safe and supportive environments,² an active community needs to include:

1. **Mixed land use:** Density and co-location of different types of uses for physical space (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and cultural). This includes having destinations in close proximity to each other to make active transportation (walking, cycling or public transit) more viable and convenient; and ensuring employment and educational opportunities are located close to housing and commuting options.
2. **Mixed housing:** Density and co-location of dwelling diversity (e.g., single detached homes, semi-detached homes, multi-unit residential).
3. **Complete streets:** Streets designed and operated so that all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities can safely move along and across streets. Complete streets typically include traffic calming measures, streetscape designed for human scale, and aesthetically pleasing environments.³
4. **High quality public realms:** Pleasant and safe environments that will encourage social interaction and connection amongst people, such as parklands, open spaces, paths, trails, parkettes, recreation spaces and facilities, children's play areas, and public plazas.⁴

These design elements support the location of a variety of services and other destinations within walking and cycling distance of residents, thereby increasing non-motorized route options and active transportation.⁵

1.2 SITE DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN

“Design at the site level - from a single lot commercial use to a large mixed-use town centre - is the physical manifestation of a community’s vision, plan, policies, zoning bylaws, parking requirements, street standards, and related standards, regulations and guidelines.”⁵

Municipalities create a number of planning policies and guidelines to guide land development on private and public land. Some policies are legislated by the provincial government (e.g. Official Plan) and some are voluntarily created by a municipality (e.g. Master Plans, strategies, by-laws, guidelines). In order to conduct a comprehensive review and develop recommendations to enhance the design features included in a development plan, it is important to have an understanding of the types of legislation and policies that impact urban design at the local level. The following planning policies and guidelines exist as of June 2013, in the City of London, Ontario.

1. Traffic Calming Policy Manual (under development)
2. London Road Safety Strategy (under development)
3. Official Plan (2006-2010) (currently under review as “Rethink London”)
4. Downtown Master Plan (draft) (2013)
5. Transportation Master Plan 2030 (2013)
6. Design Specification & Requirement Manual (2012)
7. Site Plan Control Area By-law (2012)
8. Cultural Prosperity Plan (2012)
9. Urban Design Guidelines (2011)
10. Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2010)

11. Comprehensive Zoning By-law (2007)
12. Placemaking Guidelines (2007)
13. Drive-Through Guidelines (2006)
14. Bicycle Master Plan (2005)

Site and development plans have the potential to enhance human health and community well-being.⁵ These types of plans can create places and spaces where residents of all ages and abilities will want to engage in safe, accessible, active recreation and transportation and will also facilitate social interactions.⁵ To ensure that site and development plans promote active communities and meet the health and well-being needs of a community, it is important for public health professionals to work with municipal staff and decision-makers (e.g., elected officials).⁶ One way that public health professionals can do this is by reviewing development plans such as area, subdivision and site plans in order to provide feedback on elements of the *built environment* that support active community design.

1.3 PURPOSE

The purpose of this toolkit is to assist public health professionals, provide valid, reliable and standardized input that supports active community design when reviewing development plans submitted to a municipality. Moreover, the Ontario Public Health Standards² require public health staff to work with municipalities to support healthy public policies that enhance the built environment in order to create communities that are safe and promote physical activity.⁷

The toolkit was developed primarily for public health professionals to use; however, other professionals such as planning, design, transportation, transit, engineers, parks and recreation and developers may be interested in utilizing this toolkit to ensure and/or advocate for the design of active communities. Moreover, federal, provincial and municipal government representatives and staff may be interested in the types of elements and criteria included in the toolkit in order to develop overarching policies (e.g. legislation, Official Plan policies) that support the development of active communities across Canada.

The overall goal of the Active Community Toolkit is to increase opportunities for active living including active transportation within the built and natural environments. This will be accomplished by increasing the number and type of active community design elements contained within development plans.

1.4 METHODOLOGY TO DEVELOP THE TOOLS IN THE TOOLKIT

The development of the **Active Community Toolkit for Reviewing Development Plans** involved several steps including:

1. Conducting an online search to identify existing tools designed to review development plans and proposals for active community design features.*
2. Scanning the tools to identify their active community components (see Appendix A).
3. Drafting the components of the toolkit based on existing tools and research pertaining to active community design.
4. Consulting with public health professionals from the Middlesex-London Health Unit and municipal planning staff from the City of London and other areas on the draft toolkit (e.g. focus group, key informant interviews and written consultations).
5. Revising the components of each section in the toolkit based on the consulting process described.
6. Finalizing the toolkit with input from planners and urban designers from the City of London - Planning and Development Department and public health professionals from the Middlesex-London Health Unit.

1.5 HOW THE TOOLKIT IS ORGANIZED

The toolkit is organized into four sections:

Section One: Introduction: Provides an overview of the purpose of the toolkit and how to prepare and use the toolkit.

Section Two: User Guide: Provides guidance to those using the tool included in this toolkit.

Section Three: Active Community Tool to Review Development Plans: To be used to review *Area* and/or *Secondary plans, Subdivision* and/or *Site Plans*.

Section Four: Glossary of Terms: Provides definitions for key terms used in the toolkit. Italicized words in this toolkit are defined in the glossary of terms.

Section Five: References: Identifies the references used to support the development of this toolkit.

Section Six: Appendix A: Scan of checklists designed to review development plans, policies, and proposals for active community features.

* The effectiveness of each tool was not evaluated.

1.6 PREPARING TO USE THE TOOL

Before utilizing the tool, it is advised to have the following resources on hand:

1. The Active Community Toolkit User Guide;
2. The Active Community Tool to Review Development Plans;
3. The Active Community Toolkit Glossary of Terms;
4. The Official Plan for the municipality in which the development is being proposed;
5. Other relevant municipal planning policies, strategies or guidelines (e.g. Site Plan Control By-laws; Design Guidelines; Master Plans);
6. Development application and/or drawings.

1.7 INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THE TOOL

The tool includes questions that describe the plan characteristics (e.g. site address, applicant, name of the plan) and criteria/questions to evaluate if elements of the built environment are present that support active community design (e.g. land use, housing, street design, public realms, etc.). The tool contains criteria pertaining to:

1. **Area Plans:** for review of *area, community* and/or *secondary plans*.
2. **Subdivision Plans:** for review of *subdivision plans*.
3. **Site Plans:** for review of *site plans*.

The following **categories and sub-topics** are included in the tool:

1. **Mixed Land Use**
 - A. Land Use
 - B. Density
 - C. Service Proximity
 - D. Employment Proximity
 - E. Educational Proximity
2. **Mixed Housing**
 - F. Housing Density and Diversity
3. **Complete Streets**
 - G. Street Design
 - H. Pedestrian Oriented
 - I. Cycling Oriented
 - J. Public Transit

- K. Streetscape and Aesthetics
- L. Parking
- 4. Public Realms**
 - M. Parks, Open and Recreation Spaces
 - N. Safety and Surveillance
 - O. Social Interaction and Connection

Each category and sub-topic is organized under the following columns:

Built Environment Elements	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
----------------------------	-----------------	----------	--------------	-----	----	-----	----------

Built Environment Elements: The categories and sub-topics previously listed (A-O) are organized in a chart format.

in User Guide: It is the assigned number corresponding to specific criteria in the user guide. This number can be used to find guidance comments for specific criteria.

Criteria: The questions to be considered when reviewing the development plans. Most questions are framed to start with the phrase, “Does the plan...” There are similarly phrased questions for different built environment elements; therefore, underlined words emphasize what aspect of the built environment is being evaluated.

Type of Plan: This column identifies the type of plan (e.g. Area (AP); Subdivision (SUB); Site (SP)) that is applicable to each criteria.

Yes, No & N/A Columns: Users are to review the submitted plan using the listed criteria questions and record their responses as either ‘yes’; that feature is present; or ‘no’; that feature is not present; or ‘not applicable (N/A)’; that feature is not applicable to that particular plan. At times, the response columns will be shaded; which means that ONLY a written comment is required.

Comments: Space is provided for users to record their comments related to the criteria being evaluated on the plan.

Category Summary & Recommendations: At the end of each category is a section to summarize the results of the assessment in relation to the category and sub-topics evaluated. There is also a section to make recommendations on how to enhance the number and/or quality of the built environment elements to support active community design. For example:

1.0 Mixed Land Use: Summary:
1.0 Mixed Land Use: Recommendations:

Summary & Recommendation Narrative is the last section of the tool. This section is for a narrative that provides an overall summary with recommendations for the type of development being proposed and how it supports or does not support active community design. Consideration is given to the elements of the built environment that were found and those that were not found. The narrative should include specific recommendations for municipal representatives (e.g. planning, parks and recreation, transportation, public works) to consider and the applicant to include in their next submission. The narrative should be in paragraph form using the categories, sub-topics and criteria included in the tool as a guide. It also needs to be determined if it is advantageous to attach the completed tool to the narrative. For example, municipal representatives and decision-makers may be interested in how specific criteria were assessed and/or they may want to incorporate comments made in the comment section in order to provide more detailed feedback to the applicant.

1.8 CONSIDERATIONS WHEN USING THE ACTIVE COMMUNITY TOOLKIT FOR REVIEWING DEVELOPMENT PLANS

- Use of the toolkit is voluntary.
- The toolkit is to be used as a guide to provide input on submitted development plans.
- The toolkit (as of the publication date) is aligned with current Government of Ontario and City of London planning policies and guidelines; however, it is not designed to assure compliance with these policies and guidelines. It is assumed that city officials and staff will ensure this type of compliance.
- The toolkit includes some elements that are not currently located in City of London's planning and development documents, but should be considered for inclusion in future plans or policy updates (e.g. Official Plan; Site Plan Control By-laws).

- It is assumed that each development application should strive to include active community features as fundamental design principles.
- It is intended that the toolkit will enhance the design and development processes and lead towards higher voluntary standards.
- Not all criteria may be applicable to all development plans.
- This is a newly developed toolkit and therefore, there is a limited amount of information on the validity and reliability of the tool

SECTION TWO: USER GUIDE

2.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this user guide is to provide operational definitions for key concepts or terms that are not self-explanatory and to provide guidance for specific criteria included in the tool. The tool is designed to provide a structured process for reviewing development plans and for making recommendations to municipal departments (e.g. planning, parks and recreation, transportation, public works, transit). In addition to the categories and sub-topics described in the introduction section of this toolkit, this user guide identifies:

- The **appropriate criteria** for the type of plan being reviewed (**AP**=Area Plan, **SUB**=Subdivision Plan, **SP**=Site Plan);
- The **source** that the criteria were adapted from. If no source is listed, then the criteria was created based on the overall assessment/adaption of the checklists described in Appendix A; and
- **Guidance comments** (as needed) to help guide the user in evaluating the development plan based on the built environment elements and criteria included in the tool.

2.2 CONSIDERATIONS WHEN USING THE ACTIVE COMMUNITY TOOL

- Users should be familiar with sections one to six of the toolkit.
- Users need to keep in mind that most criteria/questions are framed to start with the phrase "Does the plan..."
- It is also important to note that there are similarly phrased questions for different built environment elements (e.g. public services; retail services); therefore, underlined words emphasize what particular aspect of the built environment is being evaluated.
- Italicized words are defined in Section Four: Glossary of Terms.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

- The tool includes some criteria that are not currently located in any City of London's planning and development documents, but should be considered for inclusion in future plans or policy updates (e.g. Official Plan; Site Plan Control By-laws).
- Typically, there are many versions of a development plan that are submitted before the final approval is received. Therefore, it is important to become involved in the development process as early as possible in order to influence the different stages of the plan.

Users need to keep in mind that municipal staff use current municipal standards, plans and guidelines to make recommendations to applicants. Therefore, providing input into the content of these documents whenever possible will help increase the support for active community design.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

2.3 USER GUIDE

1. MIXED LAND USE

Built Environment Elements	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
A: Land Use	A1	Propose residential development?	AP SUB SP		
	A2	Propose commercial development?	AP SUB SP		
	A3	Propose industrial development?	AP SUB SP		
	A4	Propose parkland?	AP SUB		
	A5	Propose recreation spaces?	AP SUB		
	A6	Propose open spaces?	AP SUB		
	A7	Include > 5% of total proposed land outdoor public space?	AP SUB		Consider all the outdoor public spaces, even if they are dispersed across the development, to determine if they are greater than 5%.
B: Density	B1	Identify the development designation as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low density (upper limit of 30/ha)? 	AP SUB		The Official Plan has policies around what types of locations are good for which types of developments; low, medium, high density. The density of an area is determined during the area plan phase. These designations are based on the City of London's current development designations. Low density: multiple-residence zoned for three-storey

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Built Environment Elements	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					or less walk-up apartments may be developed to 30 units per hectare.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium density (upper limit of 75/ha)? 	AP SUB		Medium density: areas in which buildings would be taller between four and ten storeys that may be developed to 75 units per hectare.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High density (upper limit of 150/ha)? 	AP SUB		High density: zoned for the tallest types of buildings which may be developed to 150 units per hectare.
	B2	Include a residential density between 15 units/acre (37+/ha) and 21 units/acre (54+/ha)?	AP SUB	PEEL	This recommendation is based on the literature review completed as part of the Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health report.
	B3	Identify the population density? (persons/ha). If yes, please list.	AP SUB SP		Population density would not be listed on plan applications. Density may be calculated by the number of people per unit of land area. Therefore, you could calculate an estimate of the population density by multiplying the number of units by the average persons per household. Based on the Census Canada information, in 2011, this was 2.5.
C: Service Proximity	C1	Include \geq 75% of residential units within 800m of \geq 5 neighbourhood <u>public services</u> (e.g. childcare, hospital, public library, plaza, recreation and/or cultural spaces, post office)?	AP SUB	PEEL	List the public services in the comment column.
	C2	Include \geq 75% of residential units within 800m of \geq 5 neighbourhood <u>retail services</u> (e.g. bank, hair salon, cafes, or convenience stores)?	AP SUB	PEEL	Retail services are also included in C3, H4, J7, & O2. List the types of retail services in the comment column. The Walk Score website www.walkscore.com could be a possible resource to identify the types of current retail services in the neighbourhood.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Built Environment Elements	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					To determine the proximity of residential units to new commercial space, establish where new commercial space is being proposed and evaluate its distance from more than 75% of the proposed residential units.
	C3	Include <u>cluster areas of high residential density around nodes of retail and services?</u>	AP SUB	NSW	Retail services are also included in C2, H4, J7, & O2.
	C4	Include <u>cluster areas of high residential density around nodes of transit services?</u>	AP SUB	NSW	Transit services are also included in J1- J9.
D: Employment Proximity	D1	Include local employment opportunities?	AP SUB SP		If you answered yes to A2, local employment opportunities would be a possibility.
E: Educational Proximity	E1	Include a school site?	AP SUB		Consider the criteria listed in the sub-topic educational proximity and engage a school board planner in a dialogue to understand how they determine future school site location and to share the criteria listed in this toolkit for consideration. Area Plans: would typically identify potential school sites and community facility (e.g. church) locations, based on the requirements for the area and input from school boards. Subdivision Plans: School sites would be identified or requested by the Boards of Education, based on Area Plan information and the identified need for the area.
	E2	If yes to E1, is the school site designation: • Elementary?	AP SUB		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Built Environment Elements	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary? 	AP SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post secondary? 	AP SUB		
	E3	If yes to 'elementary', is $\geq 75\%$ of the residential units within a 400m walk of the schoolyard?	AP SUB	NSW	This distance is considered walkable for children < 13 years of age
	E4	If yes to 'secondary' Or 'post-secondary', are these school sites located <u>within</u> 1.6 km's of residential units?	AP SUB	NSW	This distance is considered walkable for youth > 13 years of age
	E5	Include any <u>parkland</u> adjacent to or within 500 m of school sites? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB	NSW	
	E6	Include any <u>recreation spaces</u> adjacent to or within 500 m of school sites? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB	NSW	

1.0 Mixed Land Use: Summary:

Using bullet points, frame the summary to describe the land use elements that are included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

1.0 Mixed Land Use: Recommendations:

Use bullet points to make recommendations related to the elements/criteria that were missing.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

2. HOUSING DENSITY AND DIVERSITY

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
F: Housing Density and Diversity	F1	Include a <u>diversity of lot sizes and housing types</u> in residential areas?	AP SUB		If a housing strategy exists, it is recommended to evaluate the strategy in relation to the criteria included in this toolkit to identify where alignment occurs. This information could be used to provide feedback to encourage the strategy to be updated.
	F2	If yes to F1, which of the following housing types are proposed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single 	AP SUB	NSW	If the plan includes several of these housing types, it can be considered a blended neighbourhood. This type of neighbourhood has the potential to reflect diverse economics and demographics, and stages of life, which can also facilitate aging in place. In addition, the inclusion of diverse housing types can also be an indication that the development will include affordable housing opportunities for households with low or moderate incomes.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-detached 	AP SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townhouses 	AP SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-rise Apartments 	AP SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-rise apartments 	AP SUB		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-rise residential building with ground floor commercial units 	AP SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-rise buildings with ground floor commercial units 	AP SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social/Affordable housing 	AP SUB		This would be designated by the municipality as social/affordable housing.
	F3	If yes to F2, please describe how the different housing types are proposed within the development (e.g. different similar housing types clustered together; different housing types integrated across the development).	AP SUB	NSW	List the type of housing being proposed and their relation to each other taking into consideration how the housing types are clustered. For example, evaluate if the multi-unit dwellings are furthest from neighbourhood amenities and clustered together and if so, consider recommending that the developer consider dispersing this type of housing throughout the development or moving it closer to the amenities.
	F4	Does the plan include housing that integrates with the existing neighbourhood? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB SP	NSW	Housing that integrates with the existing neighbourhood can promote social cohesion.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

2.0 Housing Density and Diversity: Summary:

Using bullet points, frame the summary to describe the housing density and diversity elements included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

2.0 Housing Density and Diversity: Recommendations:

Use bullet points to make recommendations to address the elements/criteria that were missing.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

3. COMPLETE STREETS

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
G: Street Design	G1	Propose residential development that avoids large or unnecessary set-backs?	SUB SP		Set-backs are also included in H7.
	G2	Include blocks that are relatively short (< 200-250m block length)?	AP SUB	CDAC	
	G3	Include mid-block pedestrian access links for longer blocks (e.g. >300m due to grades, narrow depths)?	AP SUB	CDAC	
	G4	Avoid the use of cul-de-sacs?	AP SUB	HDC	It is important to note that research studies have found that different populations respond differently to the design of cul-de-sacs. For example, children tend to like them as they are seen as a place to play. Municipal services tend to like them as it makes it easier for service vehicles (e.g. garbage trucks) to provide service. However, they are seen as limiting connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists. Thus, why this question was phrased as "avoid" versus "does not include".
	G5	Include driveway cuts that are kept to a minimum of 4 or fewer per street segment?	AP SUB	HDC	Driveways are also included in H7. Area Plan: Site specific information is usually not identified in area plans which are more general and conceptual in nature. Some area plans include potential <i>neighbourhood streets</i> and lotting patterns to show how an area might develop over the long term. For example, driveway cuts would not be identified on an area plan. However, the

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					policies of the area plan could state that driveways should be designed to a certain standard for the zone in question Subdivision Plan: The location of driveway cuts would not be known at the application stage and would be designed with the servicing drawings.
	G6	Incorporate actions for improved <i>natural habitat connectivity</i> ?	AP SUB SP	HF	Consider how the natural environment is being utilized for connectivity for pedestrians and/or cyclists.
	G7	Include shared/multi-use pathways?	SUB SP		Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15, M18 & G7.
	G8	If yes to G7, are the <u>shared/multi-use pathways</u> designed with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient width (minimally 3.05m)? 	SUB SP		Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15 & M18. A minimal width is based on recommendations made in the Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access: Best Practice Design Guide (2001).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate sightlines? 	SUB SP		Sightlines are also included in H7 & N2.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gentle gradients? 	SUP SP		
	G9	Include shared/multi-use pathways off dead-end streets (e.g. cul-de-sacs)?	SUB	NY	Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7,G8, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15 & M18.
	G10	Incorporate actions for improved <i>ecological function</i> within pathways?	AP SUB	HF	Consider if the street design incorporates design features that improves the ecological

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
			SP		function (the interaction between living, i.e. vegetation, wildlife) and non-living environments. For example, if there is a creek, does the pathway design interfere with the vegetation beside the creek? For more information about this concept, review Healthy parks, healthy people- the health benefits of contact with nature in a park content- a review of relevant literature (2008).
	G11	Encourage integration of the new development with existing development and key destinations?	AP SUB SP	NSW	
	G12	If yes to G11, does the street network (including cycling and walking pathways) build from and add new connections to an existing street network?	AP SUB	NSW	
H: Pedestrian Oriented	H1	Propose <u>arterial streets</u> to include sidewalks on both sides of the road?	AP SUB SP		This is always the case in the City of London as per their current Design Specification & Requirement Manual (2012). However, it is still important to include in this tool as this is an important criteria to support pedestrian oriented design.
	H2	Provide for enhanced pedestrian crossing at <u>mid-block on arterial streets</u> ?	AP SUB		PEEL (Appendix A) recommends that mid-block crossings should be created on blocks that are longer than 250m.
	H3	Propose <u>neighbourhood streets</u> to include sidewalks on both sides of the road?	AP SUB		It is ideal to have sidewalks on both sides of the road; however municipal standards may not require this specification. For example, the

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					City of London's Design Specification & Requirement Manual (2012) only requires sidewalks on one side of cul-de-sacs and streets containing or serving 40 or more units.
	H4	Incorporate any of the following <u>pedestrian environmental quality improvements</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian oriented building entrances? 	SUB SP	NSW	Some of the criteria included in H4 may not be included in the plan application, but may be included in the design drawings that could be requested as part of the final approval process. It is still important to identify in the Complete Streets recommendation section the criteria listed to support pedestrians.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of a buildings' exterior to include active frontage (a pedestrian-friendly urban environment)? 	SUB SP	NSW	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian scale lighting on private buildings and/or on public streets? 	SUB SP	NSW	Lighting is also included in H5, I5, N2, N7, N8 & N9
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public seating in streetscape? 	SUB SP	NSW	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street trees in streetscape? 	SUB SP		Street trees are included in I5 & K6.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universally accessible (designed to accommodate the widest range of potential users) design? 	SUB SP	NSW	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurants, retail uses and historical sites located in/near plan areas, (approximately one destination per block)? 	SUB SP	NSW	Retail services is also included in C2, C3, J7 & O2.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalks to have <u>curb cuts</u> for pedestrians at intersections and other pedestrian street 	SUB SP	NSW	

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ AL= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); CDAC= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; HBS= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; HCC= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; HDC= San Francisco Department of Public Health; HF= National Heart Foundation of Australia; NSW= New South Wales Department of Health; NY= City of New York; PEEL: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		crossings that are appropriately placed for people with disabilities?			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalks free of impediments (e.g., width or grade)? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalks that are at least <u>1.5m</u> wide when there is a <u>buffer</u> along arterial streets? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalks that are at least <u>2.5m</u> wide when there is <u>not a buffer</u> along arterial streets? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street cleaning is addressed in the proposed plan by including trash can locations? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage for pedestrians, specific to the neighbourhood/street, <u>including from public parking lots</u>? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grass strip between sidewalks and on-street parking on <i>neighbourhood streets</i>? 	SUB SP	HDC	
	H5	Incorporate any of the following <u>pedestrian safety measures</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessible pedestrian signals? 	SUB SP	HDC	Some of the criteria included in H5 may not be included in the plan application, but may be included in the design drawings that could be requested as part of the final approval process. It is still important to identify in the Complete Streets recommendation section the criteria listed to support pedestrian safety.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advance limit/yield lines at marked crosswalks? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Bollards</i> (short vertical posts)? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Corner bulb-outs</i>? 	SUB SP	HDC	

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crosswalks that are signalled and marked and include a pedestrian countdown signal? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Channelization islands?</i> 	SUB SP	HDC	These are raised islands that force traffic in a particular direction such as right-turn only.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Chicanes?</i> 	SUB SP	HDC	These are curb bulges or planters on alternative sides, forcing motorists to slow down.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curb extensions, planters or centerline traffic islands that narrow traffic lanes? 	SUB SP	HDC	Write in the comment box which features are included.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian lighting to increase pedestrian visibility? 	SUB SP	HDC	Lighting is also included in H4, I5, N2, N7, N8 & N9.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median <i>pedestrian refuge islands</i> (raised island in the road centre)? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pavement treatments- special pavement textures and markings, colouring to messages (e.g. walk symbol) to designate areas for pedestrians? 	SUB SP	HDC	Pavement treatments are also included in I5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptual design features (e.g., patterns painted into road surfaces that encourage drivers to reduce their speeds)? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions in the number and width of traffic lanes (particularly on arterial streets)? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speed limits below 50 km in residential areas, but not in a school zone? 	SUB SP		Reduced speeds in residential areas lowers the risk of fatality if a pedestrian and/or cyclist are hit by a car.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Truck restrictions, particularly in residential areas and near pedestrian-oriented uses? 	SUB SP	HDC	

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turn restrictions (to keep traffic on main traffic streets) or prohibitions? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Woonerfs?</i> 	SUB SP	HDC	These are 'shared streets' with mixed vehicle and pedestrian traffic, where motorists are required to drive at very slow speeds.
	H6	Orient pathways and sidewalks toward interesting views?	SUB SP	NY	Shared/multi-use pathways were also included in G7, G8, G9, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15 & M18.
	H7	<p>Allow for any of the following methods to <u>minimize contact between cars and pedestrians at driveways</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set-backs? 	AP SUB SP	NY	<p>Driveways are also included in G5. Set-backs are also included in G1. Sightlines are also included in G8 & N2.</p> <p>Area Plan: Site specific information is usually not identified in area plans which are more general and conceptual in nature. Some area plans include potential <i>neighborhood streets</i> and lotting patterns to show how an area might develop over the long term. For example, driveway cuts would not be identified on an area plan. However, the policies of the area plan could state that driveways should be designed to a certain standard for the area in question</p> <p>Subdivision Plan: The location of driveway cuts would not be known at the application stage and would be designed with the servicing drawings.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage? 	AP		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
			SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sightlines for pedestrians and motorists? 	AP SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set back street parking? 	AP SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffer zones? 	AP SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footpaths? 	AP SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street furniture? 	AP SUB SP		Street furniture is also in K11.
I: Cycling Oriented	I1	Make a link between cycling and transit (e.g., bike parking at transit shelters, buses have bike racks or bikes can be taken onto buses)?	SP	NY	Site plans are normally for private property and therefore do not include public bike lanes or share the road signs. The City of London requires on-site bicycle parking spaces, which would have to be identified on site plans.
	I2	Include design features for bicycle access such as interface design/gradients (e.g. incline; level of ground)?	SP	HF	
	I3	Include the development to be within 800m (approximately 4 blocks) of cycling lanes and/or multi-use pathways?	SUB SP	HDC	Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I5, M9, M15, & M18. Consider if there are potential opportunities to

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					connect with cycling lanes and/or multi-use pathways outside the City of London. For example, is there a potential connection to Middlesex County trail routes?
	14	If yes to I3, is the development linked to the city's existing cycling network?	SUB SP		Consider if it is appropriate for linkage to Middlesex County trail routes.
	15	Incorporate any of the following <u>features</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycling lanes are 1.5 m wide? 	SUB SP	HDC	Some of the criteria included in I5 may not be included in the plan application, but may be included in the design drawings that could be requested as part of the final approval process. It is still important to identify in the Complete Streets recommendation section the criteria listed to support pedestrians'.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycling lane signs? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share the Road signs? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dashed intersection cycling lanes? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Double-striped cycling lanes? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Left-turn cycling lanes? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared traffic lanes with sharrows (or painted bike marking on pavement)? 	SUB SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smooth roadway pavement surfaces? 	SUB SP	HDC	Pavement surfaces are also included in H5.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street lighting (adequate for cyclists)? 	SUB	HDC	Lighting is also included in H4, H5, N2, N7, N8

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
			SP		& N9.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street trees (traffic calming, improve cycling environment)? 	SUB SP	HDC	Street trees are also included in H4 & K6
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grills used to protect the earth under the tree with the safety for cyclists and those pushing strollers? 	SUB SP	HDC	Street trees are also include in H4
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signposts providing cyclists with directions, distances, and times to various destinations? 	SUB SP	NY	It is important to note that this is not current practice, but is recommended as a means to encourage cycling for pleasure and transport.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate bikeways and vehicular traffic lanes with physical demarcations? 	SUB SP	NY	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design features related to parking to avoid potential conflicts between cyclists and opening car doors (e.g., by widening parking lanes where appropriate)? 	SUB SP	NY	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative cycling routes, including greenways, which are integrated into the park system? 	SUB SP	NY	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared multi-use pathways in areas with viewing attractions? 	SUB SP	NY	Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I3, M9, M15 & M18.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide facilities for cyclists to park their bicycles along their route or at a final destination? 	SUB SP	NY	
J: Public Transit	J1	Allow for <u>arterial streets</u> to be designed to accommodate a bus route?	AP SUB		Transit services are also included in C1. It is recommended that if a transit plan and/or Transportation Master Plan exists that user reviews these documents to identify where

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					there is alignment between the listed criteria and the recommendations within the municipal documents.
	J2	Allow for <u>collector streets</u> to be designed to accommodate a transit route?	AP SUB		
	J3	Include the provision to link the proposed development to public transit routes/services?	AP SUB SP	NSW	
	J4	Include transit routes that are looped and make use of both arterial and collector streets?	AP SUB		
	J5	Include locating public transit stops within a 500m distance from residential areas?	AP SUB		
	J6	If yes to J5, please list the number of transit stops:	AP SUB SP		
	J7	Locate public transit stops in close proximity of commercial and/or retail building entrances?	AP SUB SP	NY	Retail services are also included in C2, C3, H4, & O2.
	J8	Encourage transit use by furnishing transit stops with pedestrian conveniences such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing additional space for passengers to wait by adding bus bulbs. 	SUB SP	NY	Subdivision: Bus facilities would not be identified on drawings at the application stage. They may be identified on the final service drawings. Bus routes are normally established and operational after a subdivision is substantially built-out.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building transit stop shelters to protect users from sun, wind, and rain. 	SUB SP	AL	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building transit stop shelters with seating or 	SUB	NY	

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		places to lean.	SP		
	J9	Include public transit stops and/or shelters that incorporate places to securely park bicycles?	SUB SP	NY	
K: Streetscape, and Aesthetics	K1	Streetscape: Include streetscapes that are designed to be attractive, interesting and welcoming to pedestrians and cyclists?	SUB SP	NSW	It is recommended that if the municipality has developed placemaking and/or urban design guidelines that they be reviewed to evaluate the alignment between the criteria listed and the features included in the municipal documents.
	K2	Include streetscapes that shelter pedestrians from the weather (e.g., a continuous row of buildings with windows and entrances, awning/overhang)?	SUB SP	NSW	Weather factors also included in M21 & O7.
	K3	Incorporate temporary or permanent public art installations into the streetscape? If yes, please describe.	SP	NY	Public art is also included in K11
	K4	Incorporate 'living green' canopies and other landscape infrastructure (e.g. gardens, flowers in boxes) provisions?	SP	HF	
	K5	Include the provision of supporting infrastructure in desirable locations of the development (e.g., transit stops, public plazas) with shade? If yes, please describe.	SP	HF	
	K6	Include preservation of existing trees?	SP		Street trees are included in H4 and I5.
	K7	Aesthetics: Propose any of the following features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydro transformers? 	SUB SP		These aesthetic features may not be included on a plan; however, the municipality may have standards that need to be followed and/or can request that these features be included on

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					service drawings. It is recommended that municipal documents be reviewed for placemaking and/or urban design guidelines to evaluate if there is alignment between the criteria listed and the guidelines.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone boxes? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cable/satellite television infrastructure? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cell phone tower and/or infrastructure? 	SUB SP		
	K8	If yes to K7, are the features located in areas where they do not detract from the aesthetic qualities of the neighbourhood?	SUB SP		Consider the placement of the features and evaluate if they are located in areas that do not detract from the aesthetic qualities of the neighbourhood.
	K9	If no to K7, describe why their location detracts from the aesthetic qualities of the neighbourhood.	SUB SP		Consider the placement of the features and evaluate if they are located in areas that do detract from the aesthetic qualities of the neighbourhood. For example, in front of residential units or placed beside sidewalks.
	K10	Include design entries (e.g. stone wall, signage) into the development to show enhanced views of the neighbourhood?	SUB SP	NSW	
	K11	Propose any of <u>the architectural forms</u> to animate focal points?	SUB SP		Public art is included in K3 Street furniture is included in H7.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public art 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decorative Fountains 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street furniture 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gazebo 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping 	SUB SP		
L: Parking	L1	Has the developer been asked by the municipality to submit a parking plan?	SUB		
	L2	Include any of the following transportation demand management strategies related to parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car sharing services/parking spots? 	SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferential carpool/vanpool parking? 	SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure bicycle parking? 	SP	HDC	
	L3	Include any parking restrictions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For on-street parking? 	SUB	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For residential permit parking? 	SUB	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least ten feet in advance of crosswalks to improve visibility where there are crosswalks without curb extensions? 	SUB	HD	
	L4	Provide structured residential street parking at a ratio of \leq one space for every two households in the development?	SUB	HDC	
	L5	Incorporate clearly marked pedestrian and cycling	SP	NSW	

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		routes through parking areas?			

3.0 Complete Streets: Summary
 Using bullet points, frame the summary to describe the Complete Streets elements included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

3.0 Complete Streets: Recommendations:
 Use bullet points to make recommendations to address the elements/criteria that were missing.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier’s Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael’s Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

4. PUBLIC REALM S

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
M: Parks, Open and Recreation Spaces	M1	Include parks? If yes, go to M4	SUB		<p>It is important to consider the components included in the municipal Parks & Recreation Plan (if one exists). For example, in addition to evaluating the development plan, the categories, sub-topics and criteria may be helpful in evaluating the existing Parks & Recreation Plan to identify areas where the Parks & Recreation Plan aligns with the criteria in this toolkit. This information could also be used to promote changes within the Parks & Recreation Plan.</p> <p>It is important to note that a new development may not require all the criteria listed in this section as it may be already available within the existing development.</p> <p>Site Plans apply primarily to private lands and public parks that have already been established in the area. The site plan would not typically include a park space, but could include private amenity or playground space. However, the neighbourhood in which the development is being proposed could also be evaluated to ensure that there are adequate parks, open and recreation spaces to meet the needs of residents.</p>

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
	M2	Include open spaces? If yes, go to M10	SUB		See comments in M1.
	M3	Include recreation spaces? If yes, go to M16	SUB		See comments in M1.
	M4	Parks Does the plan include <u>park space</u> in one large area rather than dispersing into smaller pieces?	SUB SP	NY	One large area is preferred as it can accommodate multiple forms of recreation. This allows for families to find activities for different ages at one location.
	M5	If yes to M4, is this space within 800m of the majority of residential units?	SUB SP		
	M6	What type of parks are included in the plan:	SUB		
		• Urban squares?	SUB		
		• Village squares/parkettes?	SUB		
		• Neighbourhood parks?	SUB		
		• Community or District parks?	SUB		
		• Town/city wide community parks?	SUB		
	M7	Propose that the parks have a minimum of 50% exposure to public roads (ideally, single loaded roads)?	SUB SP	NY	
	M8	Propose the design of parks to include:	SUB SP		
		• Shading in the summer?	SUB SP		
		• Have protected sunny areas in the winter?	SUB SP		Shade protection was also included in K5
	M9	Incorporate the following features into the <u>parks</u> :	SUB SP		Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15 & M18. A number of these features will be included in the Service Drawing Phase.
		• Multi-use pathways?	SUB SP		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
					See the comments in M1.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Running tracks? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playgrounds? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports courts and/or fields? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water fountains? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rest areas (e.g. benches) that are in the shade? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information board(s)? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entertainment space (band stand; covered picnic area)? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picnic tables? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public washrooms? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple entrances that are highly visible, unobstructed from the street? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffers between active park areas and adjacent residential areas? If yes, please describe. 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy access (e.g. limited barriers to access such as significant changes in ground level)? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A design to complement the cultural and/or heritage preferences of the local population? 	SUB SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A design to accommodate a range of age groups? If 	SUB SP		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		yes, please describe.			
	M10	Open Space(s) Include <u>open space</u> in one large area rather than dispersing into smaller pieces?	SUB		One large area is preferred as it can accommodate multiple forms of recreation. This allows for families to find activities for different ages at one location. See comments in M1.
	M11	If yes to M10, is this open space within 800m of the majority of residential units?	SUB		
	M12	Propose open space with 400m of the majority of residential units?	SUB		
	M13	Propose that the open space is bounded by streets and is not backed onto by residential units?	AP SUB	AL	
	M14	Propose the design of open spaces to include:	SUB		Shade protection are also included in K5, M8, M17 & O7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shading in the summer? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have protected sunny areas in the winter? 	SUB		
	M15	Incorporate the following features into the <u>open spaces</u> :	SUB		Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15 & M18.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-use pathways? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water fountains? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rest areas (e.g., benches) in the shade? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information boards? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picnic tables? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public washrooms? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple entrances that are highly visible, unobstructed from the street? 	SUB		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy access (e.g. limited barriers to access such as 	SUB		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		significant changes in ground level)?			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the inclusion of natural features? If yes, please describe. 	SUB		
	M16	Recreation Spaces Propose recreation spaces within 400m of the majority of residential units?	SUB		
	M17	Propose the design of recreation spaces to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shading in the summer? 	SUB		Shade protection is included in K5, M8, M14 & O7.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have protected sunny areas in the winter? 	SUB		
	M18	Incorporate any of the following features into the <u>recreation spaces</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-use pathways? 	SUB		Shared/multi-use pathways are also included in G7-G9, H6, I3, I5, M9, M15 & M18. A number of these features will be included in the Service Drawing Phase. See comments in M1.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Running tracks? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playgrounds? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports courts and/or fields? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water fountains? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rest areas (e.g. benches) that are in the shade? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picnic tables? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information boards? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entertainment space? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public washrooms? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple entrances that are highly visible, 			

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		unobstructed from the street?			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy access (e.g. limited barriers to access such as significant changes in ground level)? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A design to complement the cultural preferences of the local population? 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A design to accommodate a range of age groups? If yes, please describe. 			
	M19	Propose accommodating multiple forms of recreation to enable environments for different ages? If yes, please describe.	SUB	HF	
	M20	Propose play areas for children (e.g. in parks, recreation spaces, residential developments)?	SUB	NY	Active areas for children are also included in N7 and M21. A number of these features will be included in the Service Drawing Phase. See comments in M1.
	M21	If yes to M20, are the following design features included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtyards, gardens, terraces, and roofs that can serve as outdoor spaces for children's play. 	SUB SP	NY	Active areas for children are also included in N7 and M20.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playgrounds with ground markings indicating dedicated areas for sports and multiple uses. 		NY	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserved or created natural terrain. 		NY	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lights on sidewalks and active play areas to extend opportunities for physical activity into the evening. 		NY	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A variety of climate environments to facilitate activity in different seasons and weather conditions. 		NY	Weather factors are also included in K2 & O7.
	M22	Propose new areas of <u>open and recreation spaces</u> that	AP		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		complement <u>existing recreational opportunities</u> in the area? If yes, please describe.	SUB SP		
	M23	Propose that <u>parks and/or open and recreation spaces to be available within the early stages of the planned use and/or settlement</u> ? If yes, please list which type of space(s) this applies.	AP SUB SP		
	M24	Identify the intended use of parks, open and recreational spaces (e.g., signage, gates, site name)?	SUB	NSW	<p>This may not be included until the service design phase.</p> <p>The purpose of including this type of design is to increase awareness of the types of physical activity opportunities that are available within that setting. For example, signage that includes the name of the park and the type of features included (e.g. Skateboard Park; splash pad).</p> <p>Consider, would it be clear to those who do not live in the community to know what the space is supposed to be used for and who is able to use it (e.g. open to the public).</p> <p>See comments in M1.</p>
N: Safety and Surveillance	N1	Incorporate <i>Crime Prevention through Environmental Design</i> (CDEP) principles (e.g., natural surveillance, access to control, and territoriality) in public realms?	SP	AL	CDEP is based on the concept that changes to the design of a community can reduce crime and violence. For example, design that prevents opportunities for concealment in public spaces.
	N2	Promote natural surveillance and clear sightlines by:	SUB	AL	Sightlines are also included in G8 & H7.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing opportunities for surveillance from adjoining buildings or from nearby streets and shops? 	SP		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including design features that prevent opportunities for concealment in public spaces? 	SUB SP	AL	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving visibility through the type of fence, landscape (e.g., landscape planting lower than 1m or higher than 2m to ensure sightlines) and streetscape? (circle all that apply) 	SUB SP	AL	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including appropriate lighting (e.g. the majority of the space is lit)? 	SUB SP	AL	Lighting is also included in H4, H5, I5, N2, N7, N8 & N9.
	N3	Propose convenient access to public spaces (e.g. parks, open and recreation spaces) for people who are mobility impaired (e.g., elderly, disabled people)?	SUB	HF	
	N4	If yes to N3, please list the design features (e.g., ramps, priority parking spaces, connected routes).	SUB SP		
	N5	Include a facilities' ease of long-term maintenance and access for cleaning, servicing and repairs of all soft (e.g. soil, trees, plants, flowers) and hardscape (e.g. stones, rocks, gates) elements as well as ground infrastructure?	SUB SP	HF	
	N6	Propose that active land uses adjoin or <i>habitable rooms</i> overlook the public domain?	SUB	AL	
	N7	Lighting: Propose that all <u>mixed-use streets</u> must have an average luminance of 10 lux with a minimum of 5 lux?	SUB	PEEL	Lighting is also included in H4, H5, N2, N8 & N9. This may be included in the Service Drawing Phase.
	N8	Propose on <u>all streets pedestrian-level street lamps</u> of 4.6 m	SUB	PEEL	Lighting is also included in H4, H5, I5, N2,

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		in height or less, spaced apart no more than 30 m?			N7 & N9 This may be included in the Service Drawing Phase.
	N9	Include lighting in public realms for night-time safety?	SUB	HF	Lighting is also included in H4, H5, I5, N2 N7& N8. Examples include light up walkways, meeting places, and/or road crossings. This may be included in the service drawing phase.
	N10	If yes to N9, please describe (e.g., light up walkways, meeting places, road crossings, signage, public transport spots, and other well-used night-time areas).	SUB		
O: Social Interaction and Connection	O1	Propose the creation of <u>active mixed use centres or hubs</u> that will provide a focal point for community interaction and identity?	AP SUB SP	NSW	
	O2	Include <u>retail spaces</u> designed and placed to provide opportunities for social interaction and maximize neighbourhood activity?	SUB SP	NSW	Retail spaces are also included in C2, C3, H4, & J7.
	O3	Include communal areas within large housing developments?	SUB SP	NSW	Communal areas are also included in O7.
	O4	Based on the location of different housing types, encourage social mix through housing diversity?	AP SUB SP	NSW	See response to F1 to answer this question.
	O5	Propose the development to be within 1.5 km's of a <u>public facility</u> for community events and functions? If yes, please	AP SUB	NSW	

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Elements of the Built Environment	#	Criteria	Type of Plan	Source	Guidance Comments
		describe.	SP		
	O6	Did planning for the project include a community oversight or advisory process with representative community involvement? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB SP	HDC	
	O7	Propose the provision of an <u>on-site focus for social interaction with transitional zones</u> (public, semi-public, and private spaces) such as:	SP	HDC	Communal areas are also included in O3.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communal open spaces? 	SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting rooms? 	SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community gardens, with seating? 	SP	HDC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children's active facilities? 	SP	HDC	Active areas for children are also included in M20 & M21.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shading and weather protection? 	SP	HDC	Shade protection is included in K5, M8, M14 & M17. Weather factors are also included in K2 & M21.
	O8	Combine architectural structures with community mailboxes to provide for a space that supports community interaction?	SUB SP		

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

4.0 Public Realm: Summary:

Using bullet point, frame the summary to describe the public realm elements included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

4.0 Public Realm: Recommendations:

Using bullet points to make recommendations to address the elements/criteria that were missing.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Summary & Recommendation Narrative:

Review the summary and recommendation sections and write a narrative of the type of development being proposed and how it supports or does not support active community design. Consider the elements of the built environment that were found and those that were not found. Include in your narrative specific recommendations for municipal representatives (e.g. planning, parks and recreation, transportation, public works) to consider and the applicant to include in their next submission. The narrative should be in paragraph form using the categories, sub-topics and criteria included in the tool as a guide. It needs to be determined if it is advantageous to attach the completed tool to the narrative. For example, municipal representatives and decision-makers may be interested in how specific criteria were scored and/or they may want to incorporate the comments made in the comment section to provide more detailed feedback to the applicant.

As municipal representatives meet with an applicant a number of times, the narrative could be used to encourage the submission of additional plans and/or reports by the applicant to ensure active community design. For example, an applicant could be asked by a municipality to submit any number of plans or reports such as Servicing Options Report, Site Engineering Details, Lot Grading Plan, Traffic Calming and/or Traffic Impact Study, Tree, Vegetation & Preservation Report, Park Concept Plan, Market Impact Report, Light Study, On-Street Parking Analysis, Built Heritage Report, Bicycle Network Plan, Bicycle Parking Facilities, Street Furniture Plan, and/or Landscape Plan and Details.

It is also important to consider that some criteria included in the *Active Community Tool to Review Development Plans* are not currently located in any City of London's planning and development documents. However, they should be considered for inclusion in future plans or policies updates (e.g. Official Plan; Site Plan Control By-laws; Parks and Recreation Master Plan). Therefore, the narrative also presents an opportunity to identify additional policies and/or strategies to be included in future municipal documents.

Criteria Sources and Codes: ¹ **AL**= Premier's Council for Active Living (New South Wales); **CDAC**= Bergeron, Franklin & Levesque; **HBS**= The Planning Partnership/Region of Peel Public Health/Toronto Public Health; **HCC**= University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration; **HDC**= San Francisco Department of Public Health; **HF**= National Heart Foundation of Australia; **NSW**= New South Wales Department of Health; **NY**= City of New York; **PEEL**: The Centre for Research on Inter City Health at St. Michael's Hospital/Region of Peel Public Health. For complete reference refer to Appendix A.

Type of Plan: **Area** OR **Subdivision** OR **Site** (circle one)

Name of Plan: _____ 49

SECTION THREE: ACTIVE COMMUNITY TOOL TO REVIEW DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Review Conducted by: _____
Date of Review: _____
Type of Plan under Review (circle one): Area Subdivision Site

Site Address/Location: _____

Plan Submitted by: _____

Name of Plan: _____

Name of Applicant: _____

Date of Submission: _____

Has a concept plan (e.g. the applicants' initial ideas) been submitted? (Circle one) Yes No Unknown

Number of lots proposed: _____

Number of blocks: _____

Density: _____

1. MIXED LAND USE

Built Environment Elements	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
A: Land Use	A1	Propose residential development?	AP SUB SP				
	A2	Propose commercial development?	AP SUB SP				
	A3	Propose industrial development?	AP SUB SP				
	A4	Propose parkland?	AP SUB				
	A5	Propose recreation spaces?	AP SUB				
	A6	Propose open spaces?	AP SUB				
	A7	Include > 5% of total proposed land outdoor public space?	AP SUB				
B: Density	B1	Identify the development designation as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low density (upper limit of 30/ha)? 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density (upper limit of 75/ha)? 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density (upper limit of 150/ha)? 	AP SUB				
	B2	Include a residential density between 15 units/acre (37+/ha) and 21	AP SUB				

Built Environment Elements	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		units/acre (54+/ha)?					
	B3	Identify the population density? (persons/ha). If yes, please list.	AP SUB SP				
C: Service Proximity	C1	Include $\geq 75\%$ of residential units within 800m of ≥ 5 neighbourhood <u>public services</u> (e.g. childcare, hospital, public library, plaza, recreation and/or cultural spaces, post office)?	AP SUB				
	C2	Include $\geq 75\%$ of residential units within 800m of ≥ 5 neighbourhood <u>retail services</u> (e.g. bank, hair salon, cafes, or convenience stores)?	AP SUB				
	C3	Include <u>cluster areas of high residential density around nodes of retail and services?</u>	AP SUB				
	C4	Include <u>cluster areas of high residential density around nodes of transit services?</u>	AP SUB				
D: Employment Proximity	D1	Include local employment opportunities?	AP SUB SP				
E: Educational Proximity	E1	Include a school site?	AP SUB				
	E2	If yes to E1, is the school site designation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary? 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary? 	AP SUB				

Built Environment Elements	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post secondary? 	AP SUB				
	E3	If yes to 'elementary', is \geq 75% of the residential units within a 400m walk of the schoolyard?	AP SUB				
	E4	If yes to 'secondary' Or 'post-secondary', are these school sites located <u>within</u> 1.6 km's of residential units?	AP SUB				
	E5	Include any <u>parkland</u> adjacent to or within 500 m of school sites? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB				
	E6	Include any <u>recreation spaces</u> adjacent to or within 500 m of school sites? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB				

Type of Plan: **Area** OR **Subdivision** OR **Site** (circle one)

Name of Plan: _____ 53

1.0 Mixed Land Use: Summary:

Using bullet points, frame the summary to describe the land use elements that are included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

1.0 Mixed Land Use: Recommendations:

Use bullet points to make recommendations related to the elements/criteria that were missing.

2. HOUSING DENSITY AND DIVERSITY

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
F: Housing Density and Diversity	F1	Include a <u>diversity of lot sizes and housing types</u> in residential areas?	AP SUB				
	F2	If yes to F1, which of the following housing types are proposed?	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-detached 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townhouses 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-rise Apartments 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-rise apartments 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-rise residential building with ground floor commercial units 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-rise buildings with ground floor commercial units 	AP SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social/Affordable housing 	AP SUB				
	F3	If yes to F2, please describe how the different housing types are proposed within the development (e.g. different similar housing types clustered together; different housing types integrated across the development).	AP SUB				

Type of Plan: **Area** OR **Subdivision** OR **Site** (circle one)

Name of Plan: _____ 55

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
	F4	Does the plan include housing that integrates with the existing neighbourhood? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB SP				

2.0 Housing Density and Diversity: Summary:
 Using bullet points, frame the summary to describe the housing density and diversity elements included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

2.0 Housing Density and Diversity: Recommendations:
 Use bullet points to make recommendations to address the elements/criteria that were missing.

3. COMPLETE STREETS

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
G: Street Design	G1	Propose residential development that avoids large or unnecessary set-backs?	SUB SP				
	G2	Include blocks that are relatively short (< 200-250m block length)?	AP SUB				
	G3	Include mid-block pedestrian access links for longer blocks (e.g. >300m due to grades, narrow depths)?	AP SUB				
	G4	Avoid the use of cul-de-sacs?	AP SUB				
	G5	Include driveway cuts that are kept to a minimum of 4 or fewer per street segment?	AP SUB				
	G6	Incorporate actions for improved <i>natural habitat connectivity</i> ?	AP SUB SP				
	G7	Include shared/multi-use pathways?	SUB SP				
	G8	If yes to G7, are the <u>shared/multi-use pathways</u> designed with:	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient width (minimally 3.05m)? • Adequate sightlines? • Gentle gradients? 	SUB SP SUP SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
	G9	Include shared/multi-use pathways off dead-end streets (e.g. cul-de-sacs)?	SUB				
	G10	Incorporate actions for improved <i>ecological function</i> within pathways?	AP SUB SP				
	G11	Encourage integration of the new development with existing development and key destinations?	AP SUB SP				
	G12	If yes to G11, does the street network (including cycling and walking pathways) build from and add new connections to an existing street network?	AP SUB				
H: Pedestrian Oriented	H1	Propose <u>arterial streets</u> to include sidewalks on both sides of the road?	AP SUB SP				
	H2	Provide for enhanced pedestrian crossing at <u>mid-block on arterial streets</u> ?	AP SUB				
	H3	Propose <u>neighbourhood streets</u> to include sidewalks on both sides of the road?	AP SUB				
	H4	Incorporate any of the following <u>pedestrian environmental quality improvements</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian oriented building entrances? 	SUB SP				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of a 	SUB			

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		buildings' exterior to include active frontage (a pedestrian-friendly urban environment)?	SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian scale lighting on private buildings and/or on public streets? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public seating in streetscape? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street trees in streetscape? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universally accessible (designed to accommodate the widest range of potential users) design? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurants, retail uses and historical sites located in/near plan areas, (approximately one destination per block)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalks to have <u>curb cuts</u> for pedestrians at intersections and other pedestrian street crossings that are appropriately placed for people with disabilities? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalks free of 	SUB				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		impediments (e.g., width or grade)?	SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalks that are at least <u>1.5m</u> wide when there is a <u>buffer</u> along arterial streets? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalks that are at least <u>2.5m</u> wide when there is <u>not a buffer</u> along arterial streets? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street cleaning is addressed in the proposed plan by including trash can locations? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage for pedestrians, specific to the neighbourhood/street, <u>including from public parking lots</u>? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grass strip between sidewalks and on-street parking on <i>neighbourhood streets</i>? 	SUB SP				
	H5	Incorporate any of the following <u>pedestrian safety measures</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessible pedestrian signals? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advance limit/yield lines at marked crosswalks? 	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bollards</i> (short vertical posts)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Corner bulb-outs</i>? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosswalks that are signalled and marked and include a pedestrian countdown signal? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Channelization islands</i>? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chicanes</i>? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb extensions, planters or centerline traffic islands that narrow traffic lanes? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian lighting to increase pedestrian visibility? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Median pedestrian refuge islands</i> (raised island in the road centre)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavement treatments-special pavement textures and markings, colouring to messages (e.g. walk symbol) to designate areas for pedestrians? 	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptual design features (e.g., patterns painted into road surfaces that encourage drivers to reduce their speeds)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions in the number and width of traffic lanes (particularly on arterial streets)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speed limits below 50 km in residential areas, but not in a school zone? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Truck restrictions, particularly in residential areas and near pedestrian-oriented uses? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turn restrictions (to keep traffic on main traffic streets) or prohibitions? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Woonerfs?</i> 	SUB SP				
	H6	Orient pathways and sidewalks toward interesting views?	SUB SP				
	H7	Allow for any of the following methods to <u>minimize contact between cars and pedestrians at driveways</u> :	AP SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		• Set-backs?					
		• Signage?	AP SUB SP				
		• Sightlines for pedestrians and motorists?	AP SUB SP				
		• Set back street parking?	AP SUB SP				
		• Buffer zones?	AP SUB SP				
		• Footpaths?	AP SUB SP				
		• Street furniture?	AP SUB SP				
I: Cycling Oriented	I1	Make a link between cycling and transit (e.g., bike parking at transit shelters, buses have bike racks or bikes can be taken onto buses)?	SP				
	I2	Include design features for bicycle access such as interface design/gradients (e.g. incline; level of ground)?	SP				
	I3	Include the development to be within 800m (approximately 4 blocks) of cycling lanes and/or	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		multi-use pathways?					
	14	If yes to I3, is the development linked to the city's existing cycling network?	SUB SP				
	15	Incorporate any of the following <u>features</u> :	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling lanes are 1.5 m wide? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling lane signs? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share the Road signs? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dashed intersection cycling lanes? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double-striped cycling lanes? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Left-turn cycling lanes? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared traffic lanes with sharrow (or painted bike marking on pavement)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smooth roadway pavement surfaces? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street lighting (adequate for cyclists)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street trees (traffic calming, improve 	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		cycling environment)?					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grills used to protect the earth under the tree with the safety for cyclists and those pushing strollers? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signposts providing cyclists with directions, distances, and times to various destinations? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate bikeways and vehicular traffic lanes with physical demarcations? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design features related to parking to avoid potential conflicts between cyclists and opening car doors (e.g., by widening parking lanes where appropriate)? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative cycling routes, including greenways, which are integrated into the park system? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared multi-use pathways in areas with viewing attractions? 	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide facilities for cyclists to park their bicycles along their route or at a final destination? 	SUB SP				
J: Public Transit	J1	Allow for <u>arterial streets</u> to be designed to accommodate a bus route?	AP SUB				
	J2	Allow for <u>collector streets</u> to be designed to accommodate a transit route?	AP SUB				
	J3	Include the provision to link the proposed development to public transit routes/services?	AP SUB SP				
	J4	Include transit routes that are looped and make use of both arterial and collector streets?	AP SUB				
	J5	Include locating public transit stops within a 500m distance from residential areas?	AP SUB				
	J6	If yes to J5, please list the number of transit stops:	AP SUB SP				
	J7	Locate public transit stops in close proximity of commercial and/or retail building entrances?	AP SUB SP				
	J8	Encourage transit use by furnishing transit stops with pedestrian conveniences such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing additional 	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		space for passengers to wait by adding bus bulbs.					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building transit stop shelters to protect users from sun, wind, and rain. 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building transit stop shelters with seating or places to lean. 	SUB SP				
	J9	Include public transit stops and/or shelters that incorporate places to securely park bicycles?	SUB SP				
K: Streetscape, and Aesthetics	K1	<u>Streetscape:</u> Include streetscapes that are designed to be attractive, interesting and welcoming to pedestrians and cyclists?	SUB SP				
	K2	Include streetscapes that shelter pedestrians from the weather (e.g., a continuous row of buildings with windows and entrances, awning/overhang)?	SUB SP				
	K3	Incorporate temporary or permanent public art installations into the streetscape? If yes, please describe.	SP				
	K4	Incorporate 'living green' canopies and other landscape infrastructure (e.g. gardens, flowers in boxes) provisions?	SP				
	K5	Include the provision of supporting	SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		infrastructure in desirable locations of the development (e.g., transit stops, public plazas) with shade? If yes, please describe.					
	K6	Include preservation of existing trees?	SP				
	K7	Aesthetics: Propose any of the following features:	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydro transformers? Telephone boxes? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cable/satellite television infrastructure? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cell phone tower and/or infrastructure? 	SUB SP				
	K8	If yes to K7, are the features located in areas where they do not detract from the aesthetic qualities of the neighbourhood?	SUB SP				
	K9	If no to K7, describe why their location detracts from the aesthetic qualities of the neighbourhood.	SUB SP				
	K10	Include design entries (e.g. stone wall, signage) into the	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		development to show enhanced views of the neighbourhood?					
	K11	Propose any of the <u>architectural forms</u> to animate focal points? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public art 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decorative Fountains 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street furniture 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gazebo 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping 	SUB SP				
L: Parking	L1	Has the developer been asked by the municipality to submit a parking plan?	SUB				
	L2	Include any of the following transportation demand management strategies related to parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car sharing services/parking spots? 	SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferential carpool/vanpool parking? 	SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure bicycle parking? 	SP				
	L3	Include any parking restrictions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For on-street parking? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For residential permit parking? 	SUB				

Type of Plan: **Area** OR **Subdivision** OR **Site** (circle one)

Name of Plan: _____ 69

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least ten feet in advance of crosswalks to improve visibility where there are crosswalks without curb extensions? 	SUB				
	L4	Provide structured residential street parking at a ratio of \leq one space for every two households in the development?	SUB				
	L5	Incorporate clearly marked pedestrian and cycling routes through parking areas?	SP				

3.0 Complete Streets: Summary

Using bullet points, frame the summary to describe the Complete Streets elements included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

3.0 Complete Streets: Recommendations:

Use bullet points to make recommendations to address the elements/criteria that were missing.

4. PUBLIC REALM S

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
M: Parks, Open and Recreation Spaces	M1	Include parks? If yes, go to M4	SUB				
	M2	Include open spaces? If yes, go to M10	SUB				
	M3	Include recreation spaces? If yes, go to M16	SUB				
	M4	Parks Does the plan include <u>park space</u> in one large area rather than dispersing into smaller pieces?	SUB SP				
	M5	If yes to M4, is this space within 800m of the majority of residential units?	SUB SP				
	M6	What type of parks are included in the plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban squares? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village squares/parkettes? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood parks? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community or District parks? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town/city wide community parks? 	SUB				
	M7	Propose that the parks have a minimum of 50% exposure to public roads (ideally, single loaded roads)?	SUB SP				
	M8	Propose the design of parks to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shading in the summer? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have protected sunny areas in the winter? 	SUB SP				
	M9	Incorporate the following features into	SUB				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		the parks:	SP				
		• Multi-use pathways?					
		• Running tracks?	SUB SP				
		• Playgrounds?	SUB SP				
		• Sports courts and/or fields?	SUB SP				
		• Drinking water fountains?	SUB SP				
		• Rest areas (e.g. benches) that are in the shade?	SUB SP				
		• Information board(s)?	SUB SP				
		• Entertainment space (band stand; covered picnic area)?	SUB SP				
		• Picnic tables?	SUB SP				
		• Public washrooms?	SUB SP				
		• Multiple entrances that are highly visible, unobstructed from the street?	SUB SP				
		• Buffers between active park areas and adjacent residential areas? If yes, please describe.	SUB SP				
		• Easy access (e.g. limited barriers to access such as significant changes in ground	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		level)?					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A design to complement the cultural and/or heritage preferences of the local population? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A design to accommodate a range of age groups? If yes, please describe. 	SUB SP				
	M10	Open Space(s) Include <u>open space</u> in one large area rather than dispersing into smaller pieces?	SUB				
	M11	If yes to M10, is this open space within 800m of the majority of residential units?	SUB				
	M12	Propose open space with 400m of the majority of residential units?	SUB				
	M13	Propose that the open space is bounded by streets and is not backed onto by residential units?	AP SUB				
	M14	Propose the design of open spaces to include:	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shading in the summer? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have protected sunny areas in the winter? 	SUB				
	M15	Incorporate the following features into the <u>open spaces</u> :	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-use pathways? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water fountains? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rest areas (e.g., benches) in 	SUB				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		the shade?					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information boards? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picnic tables? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public washrooms? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple entrances that are highly visible, unobstructed from the street? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy access (e.g. limited barriers to access such as significant changes in ground level)? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the inclusion of natural features? If yes, please describe. 	SUB				
	M16	Recreation Spaces Propose recreation spaces within 400m of the majority of residential units?	SUB				
	M17	Propose the design of recreation spaces to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shading in the summer? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have protected sunny areas in the winter? 	SUB				
	M18	Incorporate any of the following features into the <u>recreation spaces</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-use pathways? 	SUB				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Running tracks? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playgrounds? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports courts and/or fields? 					

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drinking water fountains? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rest areas (e.g. benches) that are in the shade? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Picnic tables? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information boards? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entertainment space? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public washrooms? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple entrances that are highly visible, unobstructed from the street? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy access (e.g. limited barriers to access such as significant changes in ground level)? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A design to complement the cultural preferences of the local population? 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A design to accommodate a range of age groups? If yes, please describe. 					
	M19	Propose accommodating multiple forms of recreation to enable environments for different ages? If yes, please describe.	SUB				
	M20	Propose play areas for children (e.g. in parks, recreation spaces, residential developments)?	SUB				
	M21	If yes to M20, are the following design features included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtyards, gardens, 	SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		terraces, and roofs that can serve as outdoor spaces for children's play.					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playgrounds with ground markings indicating dedicated areas for sports and multiple uses. 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserved or created natural terrain. 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lights on sidewalks and active play areas to extend opportunities for physical activity into the evening. 					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of climate environments to facilitate activity in different seasons and weather conditions. 					
	M22	Propose new areas of <u>open and recreation spaces</u> that complement <u>existing recreational opportunities</u> in the area? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB SP				
	M23	Propose that <u>parks and/or open and recreation spaces</u> to be available <u>within the early stages of the planned use and/or settlement</u> ? If yes, please list which type of space(s) this applies.	AP SUB SP				
	M24	Identify the intended use of parks, open and recreational spaces (e.g., signage, gates, site name)?	SUB				
N: Safety and	N1	Incorporate <i>Crime Prevention through</i>	SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Surveillance		<i>Environmental Design</i> (CDEP) principles (e.g., natural surveillance, access to control, and territoriality) in public realms?					
	N2	Promote natural surveillance and clear sightlines by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing opportunities for surveillance from adjoining buildings or from nearby streets and shops? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including design features that prevent opportunities for concealment in public spaces? 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving visibility through the type of fence, landscape (e.g., landscape planting lower than 1m or higher than 2m to ensure sightlines) and streetscape? (circle all that apply) 	SUB SP				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including appropriate lighting (e.g. the majority of the space is lit)? 	SUB SP				
	N3	Propose convenient access to public spaces (e.g. parks, open and recreation spaces) for people who are mobility impaired (e.g., elderly, disabled people)?	SUB				
	N4	If yes to N3, please list the design	SUB				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
		features (e.g., ramps, priority parking spaces, connected routes).	SP				
	N5	Include a facilities' ease of long-term maintenance and access for cleaning, servicing and repairs of all soft (e.g. soil, trees, plants, flowers) and hardscape (e.g. stones, rocks, gates) elements as well as ground infrastructure?	SUB SP				
	N6	Propose that active land uses adjoin or <i>habitable rooms</i> overlook the public domain?	SUB				
	N7	Lighting: Propose that all <u>mixed-use streets</u> must have an average luminance of 10 lux with a minimum of 5 lux?	SUB				
	N8	Propose on <u>all streets pedestrian-level street lamps</u> of 4.6 m in height or less, spaced apart no more than 30 m?	SUB				
	N9	Include lighting in public realms for night-time safety?	SUB				
	N10	If yes to N9, please describe (e.g., light up walkways, meeting places, road crossings, signage, public transport spots, and other well-used night-time areas).	SUB				
O: Social Interaction and Connection	O1	Propose the creation of <u>active mixed use centres or hubs</u> that will provide a focal point for community interaction and identity?	AP SUB SP				

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
	02	Include <u>retail spaces</u> designed and placed to provide opportunities for social interaction and maximize neighbourhood activity?	SUB SP				
	03	Include communal areas within large housing developments?	SUB SP				
	04	Based on the location of different housing types, encourage social mix through housing diversity?	AP SUB SP				
	05	Propose the development to be within 1.5 km's of a <u>public facility</u> for community events and functions? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB SP				
	06	Did planning for the project include a community oversight or advisory process with representative community involvement? If yes, please describe.	AP SUB SP				
	07	Propose the provision of an <u>on-site focus for social interaction with transitional zones</u> (public, semi-public, and private spaces) such as:	SP				
		• Communal open spaces?					
		• Meeting rooms?	SP				
		• Community gardens, with seating?	SP				
		• Children's active facilities?	SP				
		• Shading and weather protection?	SP				

Type of Plan: **Area** OR **Subdivision** OR **Site** (circle one)

Name of Plan: _____ 80

Elements of the Built Environment	# in User Guide	Criteria	Type of Plan	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
	08	Combine architectural structures with community mailboxes to provide for a space that supports community interaction?	SUB SP				

4.0 Public Realm: Summary:
 Using bullet point, frame the summary to describe the public realm elements included in the plan. Clearly identify which criteria were present and which were missing.

4.0 Public Realm: Recommendations:
 Using bullet points to make recommendations to address the elements/criteria that were missing.

Summary & Recommendation Narrative:

Review the summary and recommendation sections and write a narrative of the type of development being proposed and how it supports or does not support active community design. Consider the elements of the built environment that were found and those that were not found. Include in your narrative specific recommendations for municipal representatives (e.g. planning, parks and recreation, transportation, public works) to consider and the applicant to include in their next submission. The narrative should be in paragraph form using the categories, sub-topics and criteria included in the tool as a guide. It needs to be determined if it is advantageous to attach the completed tool to the narrative. For example, municipal representatives and decision-makers may be interested in how specific criteria were scored and/or they may want to incorporate the comments made in the comment section to provide more detailed feedback to the applicant.

As municipal representatives meet with an applicant a number of times, the narrative could be used to encourage the submission of additional plans and/or reports by the applicant to ensure active community design. For example, an applicant could be asked by a municipality to submit any number of plans or reports such as Servicing Options Report, Site Engineering Details, Lot Grading Plan, Traffic Calming and/or Traffic Impact Study, Tree, Vegetation & Preservation Report, Park Concept Plan, Market Impact Report, Light Study, On-Street Parking Analysis, Built Heritage Report, Bicycle Network Plan, Bicycle Parking Facilities, Street Furniture Plan, and/or Landscape Plan and Details.

It is also important to consider that some criteria included in the *Active Community Tool to Review Development Plans* are not currently located in any City of London's planning and development documents. However, they should be considered for inclusion in future plans or policies updates (e.g. Official Plan; Site Plan Control By-laws; Parks and Recreation Master Plan). Therefore, the narrative also presents an opportunity to identify additional policies and/or strategies to be included in future municipal documents.

SECTION FOUR: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

1. **Active transportation:** Any form of human powered transportation, including but not limited to walking, cycling, skateboarding, rollerblading, etc.
2. **Active frontage:** the creation of pedestrian-friendly environments in front of buildings.
3. **Active mixed use hubs or centres:** located in central areas that are designed to be the hub of a variety of uses by pedestrians, cyclists and those using public transit.
4. **Aesthetically pleasing environments:** environments that create pleasure for those who use them such as pedestrians, cyclists, those who use public transit and/or motorists. Public art, water, greenery, are examples of ways to improve the aesthetic appeal of environments.
5. **Area Plan:** a land use plan for a district or a large neighbourhood within a municipality.
6. **Arterial roads:** major traffic and transit routes, intended to carry large volumes of vehicular traffic and designed to provide continuous routes across urban areas.⁸
7. **Bollards:** short vertical poles that are used to define pedestrian areas. Sometimes, they include pedestrian lighting features.
8. **Built environment:** Human-made surroundings (e.g. buildings, parks, schools, road systems, and other infrastructure that we encounter in our daily lives) that provide the setting for human activity, including land use patterns, the transportation system, and urban design.
9. **Channelization islands:** raised islands that forces traffic in a particular direction such as right-turn only.
10. **Chicanes:** infrastructure such as curb bulges or planters placed in such a way as to force motorists to slow down.
11. **Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CDEP) Principles:** an approach to deterring criminal behaviour by creating a built environment through environmental design that influences offender decisions before a criminal act occurs.

12. **Collector roads:** traffic and transit routes designed to carry lower volumes of traffic than arterial roads, and providing continuous access across neighbourhoods.
13. **Corner bulb-outs:** design feature that extends pedestrian space from the roadway; used to shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians.
14. **Ecological function:** means the natural processes, products or services that living and non-living environments provide or perform within or between species, ecosystems and landscapes. These may include biological, physical and socio-economic interactions.⁹
15. **Greenways:** Pathways with flora/vegetation/landscaping.
16. **Habitable rooms:** are rooms that are used throughout the day such as living rooms, kitchens.
17. **Leisure-time physical activity:** engaging in physical activities that are for leisure or recreation purposes, for example, walking with a friend.
18. **Living green' canopies:** include tree coverage and other natural landscaping.
19. **Mix of housing:** includes different dwelling types (e.g. single, semi-detached, townhouse,) and thus, reflect different types of density and affordability
20. **Natural environments:** are environments comprised of natural features such as open green spaces, lakes, and ravines.
21. **Natural habitat connectivity:** naturally occurring environments which provide connectivity for pedestrians and/or cyclists. Examples include waterfronts, forests and green space.
22. **Neighbourhood streets:** roads designed to carry low traffic volumes, at low speeds, typically for residential uses.
23. **Nodes of transit services:** where more than one form of transportation is available such as public transit, car share, pedestrian and cycling features and other motorized services such as taxis.
24. **Pedestrian refuges:** raised medians with accessible curb-cuts that provide refuge for pedestrians.

25. **Set-backs:** placement of the building in relation to the road.
26. **Sharrows:** street markings for shared-lane between vehicles and cyclists.
27. **Site Plan:** proposed land-use arrangement, normally for a single parcel of land.
28. **Subdivision Plan:** a plan for splitting up land for development into individual parcels of land.
29. **Utilitarian travel:** engaging in transportation that serves a practical purpose. Utilitarian travel does not have to be physically active, but it's one reason for the use of active travel (e.g. walking to get from one place to another such as from home to school).
30. **Woonerfs:** "shared streets" with mixed vehicle and pedestrian traffic, where motorists are required to drive at very slow speeds.

SECTION FIVE: REFERENCES

1. Planning Active Communities across Ontario. 2013. Terms of Reference. www.planningactivecommunities.com
2. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-term Care. 2008. Ontario Public Health Standards.
3. Ministry of Infrastructure. 2012. Creating Complete Communities. www.placestogrow.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=267&Itemid=84
4. Hastings & Prince Edward Counties Health Unit. 2012. Building Complete and Sustainable Communities: Healthy Policies for Official Plans. www.pecounty.on.ca/pdf/HealthyPoliciesforOfficialPlans_Final_web_1.pdf
5. Canadian Institute of Planners. 2012. Healthy Communities Practice Guide. The quote is from page 42.
6. Bergeron, K. & Levesque, L. 2012. Government Policies for Active Community Design in Ontario: Challenges to Achieving Collaboration between Five Ministries. Canadian Journal of Urban Research, 21 (1): 29-54.
7. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-term Care. 2010. Healthy Eating, Physical Activity and Healthy Weights: Guidance Document.
8. Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2011. Transit-Supportive Land Use Planning Guidelines.
9. Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2005. Provincial Policy Statement.

SECTION SIX: APPENDIX A

Table 1 provides an overview of checklists designed to review development plans, policies and proposals for active community features. The checklists are presented in alphabetical order by the code used in Section Two: User Guide.

Table 1: Scan of Checklists Designed to Review Development Plans, Policies and Proposals for Active Community Features

Code in User Guide	Title	Year	Author/Organization	Components
AL	Development and Active Living: Designing Projects for Active Living: A Development Assessment Resource & Navigational Tool	2010	Premier's Council for Active Living New South Wales	This checklist is organized by 5 principles and 15 matters for consideration. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Walkability & Connectivity 2. Active Travel Alternatives 3. Legibility (wayfinding) 4. Quality Public Domain 5. Social interaction & inclusion
CDAC	Draft Checklist for Planners to Design Active Communities	2007	Bergeron, Franklin, & Levesque; Haliburton Kawaratha Pine Ridge District Health Unit Public Health	This checklist is organized under 8 categories. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Population Density 2. Street Connectivity 3. Street Design 4. Streetscape 5. Transportation/Transit System 6. Mixed Land Use 7. Parklands and Trails 8. Safe Community Features
HBS	Healthy Background Study: Development of a Health Background Study Framework	2011	The Planning Partnership; Region of Peel Public Health and Toronto Public Health	There are 6 core elements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density 2. Service Proximity can be regulated through transit-supportive density 3. Land use mix 4. Street Connectivity 5. Road Network and Sidewalk Characteristics

Code in User Guide	Title	Year	Author/Organization	Components
				6. Parking
HCC	Healthy Communities: The Comprehensive Plan Assessment Tool	2010	University of Delaware Institute for Public Administration	There are 5 components and 24 sub-categories. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pedestrian/Bicycle Accessibility 2. Mixed Use/Compact Development 3. Complete Street Principles 4. Access to Healthy Food 5. Open Space and Recreation
HDC	Sustainable Communities Index-Healthy Cities, Health People Healthy Development Checklist	2012	San Francisco Department of Public Health	This checklist is organized under 7 criteria with 21 sub-categories <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment Criteria 2. Transportation Criteria 3. Community Criteria 4. Public Realm Criteria 5. Education Criteria 6. Housing Criteria 7. Healthy Economy Criteria
HF	Active Living Impact Checklist: A tool for development in the Australian Capital Territory	2012	National Heart Foundation of Australia	Healthy spaces and places organized under 10 key design principles <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active transport 2. Aesthetics 3. Connectivity 4. Environments for all people 5. Mixed density 6. Mixed land use 7. Parks and Open Spaces 8. Safety and surveillance 9. Social inclusion 10. Supporting Infrastructure
NSW	NSW Healthy Urban Development Checklist: A guide for health services when commenting	2009	New South Wales Department of Health	This checklist includes 8 categories and 32 sub-categories <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Physical Activity 2. Transport and Connectivity 3. Housing 4. Employment

Appendix B – Evaluation Framework – Pilot Evaluation of the Active Community Toolkit

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK – Pilot Evaluation of the Active Community Toolkit

Program Goal: To increase opportunities for active living including active transportation within the built and natural environments.

Program/Policy Objective: To provide input to support healthy public policies that enhance the built environment in order to create communities that are safe and promote physical activity

Purpose of the Toolkit: To assist public health professionals to provide valid, reliable and standardized input that supports active community design when reviewing development plans submitted to a municipality (ACT, 2013, p. 7)

- Purpose of Evaluation:**
1. To determine the factors affecting implementation of the toolkit.
 2. To understand to what extent the toolkit is being implemented as planned.
 3. To determine to what extent the recommendations submitted are influencing planning decisions.

Target Populations: City of London (COL) Planning Department; COL Committees, Developers, internal MLHU stakeholders

COMPONENT	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	Why Question is Important	PERFORMANCE MEASURES/ INDICATORS OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	Data Source	Data Collection Tool	Data Collector	Time-frame for Data Collection
Factors affecting Implementation	What is the process for determining which Land Use Applications (LUA) are reviewed using the Toolkit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is the Toolkit being utilized / implemented? • What proportion of LUA available for review by the health unit are we reviewing using the ACT? 	Understanding the rationale behind which LUA are reviewed will be important in order to have confidence that we are spending our time and efforts wisely.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria used during screening of LUA (determining whether or not we submit a response) • Type of Land Use Development (Official plan amendments, zoning changes, community planning proposals, etc.) • # of LUAs reviewed • LUA identifier information 	Program Staff	Tracking Form	Program Staff	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)
	How much time does it require? (completing process, calling planners, consultations with internal staff, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much time has been spent following up with others to obtain a better understanding of the LUA? 	To determine amount of time required for the entire process of reviewing and responding to LUAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the amount of staff time spent utilizing the Toolkit, following up with staff, partners, submitting recommendations, etc. 	Program Staff	Tracking Form	Program Staff	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)

COMPONENT	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	Why Question is Important	PERFORMANCE MEASURES/ INDICATORS OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	Data Source	Data Collection Tool	Data Collector	Time-frame for Data Collection
	<p>What information / strategies helped inform LUA recommendations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other types of information has been gathered to help inform the recommendations noted on the Toolkit? 	<p>To help understand what information / strategies were used in generating the LUA recommendations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information / strategies that helped create the recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> COL Official Plan Provincial Policy Statement Consultation with Planner(s) Consultation with Public Health Staff Attendance at City Meetings Documents (e.g. Master Plans) Other 	Program Staff	<p>Tracking Form</p> <p>Debriefing Session</p>	<p>Program Staff</p> <p>Program Evaluator</p>	<p>Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)</p>
	<p>What are the barriers / factors that hinder the generation of LUA recommendations?</p>	<p>To help understand what barriers/challenges and factors hindering the generation of recommendations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers / factors that hinder the creation of recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in the Official Plan Not in the Provincial Policy Statement Lack of information in the LUA Other 	Program Staff	<p>Tracking Form</p> <p>Debriefing Session</p>	<p>Program Staff</p> <p>Program Evaluator</p>	<p>Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)</p>
	<p>What suggestions are there for changing the Toolkit and/or process?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there ways to streamline the process? What refinements are recommended? What recommendations are there for an ongoing data entry tool? If an electronic tool is needed, what are the features of an electronic data entry tool that are required? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which criteria relate to the COL Official Plan? Which criteria relate to the Provincial Policy? 	<p>To determine suggestions for improving the Toolkit and process of implementation.</p> <p>To determine a format for ongoing data collection (paper vs. electronic tool).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of the suggestions for improvement (e.g. streamlining process, refinements) Identification of features and versatility needed in an electronic data compilation system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report generation (indicators) 	Program Staff	<p>Tracking Form</p> <p>Debriefing Session</p>	<p>Program Staff</p> <p>Program Evaluator</p>	<p>Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)</p>

COMPONENT	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	Why Question is Important	PERFORMANCE MEASURES/ INDICATORS OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	Data Source	Data Collection Tool	Data Collector	Time-frame for Data Collection
	Do MLHU staff have the required knowledge/skills/comfort to utilize the tool and process? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the concepts contained within the ACT clear and applicable? Are there other sources of information and training that would increase your knowledge/skills/comfort to utilize the tool and process? 	To identify any further educational needs or professional development needs to support the review of LUA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of terms/concepts on the Toolkit that require further clarity and explanation Identification of additional knowledge & skills needed to support the use of the Toolkit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> training/workshop other 	Program Staff	Tracking Form Debriefing Session	Program Staff Program Evaluator	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)
Fidelity (implemented as intended)	To what extent is the Toolkit being implemented as intended? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are we filling out the criteria that is relevant to the specific land use application? Are some criteria emerging as ones that are consistently being commented on? Others that are rarely being responded to? 	It is important to understand to what extent the Toolkit is able to provide useful information for recommendations to LUAs. To determine if the tool works in its current format to assess Areal Plans (AP), Subdivision Plans (SUB) & Site Plans (SP).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of scenarios where the criteria is not relevant to an AP, SUB, & SP categories as initially specified 	Program Staff	Tracking Form	Program Staff	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)

COMPONENT	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	Why Question is Important	PERFORMANCE MEASURES/ INDICATORS OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	Data Source	Data Collection Tool	Data Collector	Time-frame for Data Collection
	<p>What types of recommendations are being submitted for consideration?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the rationale used to support the recommendations? • What process is used in order to ensure that there is no conflict in recommendations coming from MLHU? 	<p>To understand what types of recommendations are being proposed and the rationale behind those recommendations.</p> <p>To understand what other recommendations MLHU is putting forward to ensure that the messages do not conflict with one another.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #, type and description of Land Use Application recommendations submitted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Written ○ Verbal ○ Delegation to city hall ○ Description of key recommendations by the four categories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of the rationale used to support the recommendations (i.e. Official Plan, Provincial Policy Statement, other reports, community or political preference/situations, etc.) • # of submissions that have requested written follow-up on land use decision • Need for internal consultation? (e.g. related to land hazards, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Internal consultation not needed? ○ Internal consultation required? 	Submissions to Planning Department	Tracking Form	Program Staff	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)
	<p>Is there potential organizational risk in disseminating the recommendations?</p> <p>Is there a plan for minimizing the organizational risk?</p>	To document situations where there is the potential for organizational risk in disseminating the recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the potential for organizational risk in disseminating the recommendations • Description of the plan for minimizing the organizational risk 	Program Staff	Tracking Form	Program Staff	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)

COMPONENT	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	Why Question is Important	PERFORMANCE MEASURES/ INDICATORS OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	Data Source	Data Collection Tool	Data Collector	Time-frame for Data Collection
Effectiveness	<p>What impact has MLHU recommendations had on planning decisions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can there be a link made between the recommendations provided by MLHU and the planning decisions? • What other factors are influencing or impacting the decisions being made by COL planning department or other key stakeholders? (e.g. economic benefits outweighing health risks?) • What, where and how should ongoing efforts be focused? 	<p>To determine the outcome of the Land Use Application decisions in which MLHU has provided input.</p> <p>This will help us understand how to strategically address our recommendations. This will help us to determine how to frame our messages to influence decision making. This will help determine where ongoing advocacy efforts should be focused.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking of Land Use Application decisions. Identification of various level of influence / impact may include in order to track the type of active community design elements within development plans). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MLHU input inserted into recommendation sections of COL reports ○ City Council / committee approves recommendations for the developer to make <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appeal from the developer regarding the recommendations ▪ OMB (Ontario Municipal Board) outcome (favourable? Not favourable?) ○ Applicant/Developer implements recommendations 	<p>COL Committee Minutes</p> <p>COL Council Minutes</p> <p>Data sources to monitor OMB decisions, application/ developer implementation</p>	Tracking Form	Program Staff	Documented ongoing throughout pilot and at end of pilot phase (min. of 10 LUA or March 2014)

Appendix C – Active Community Toolkit Pilot Evaluation: Tracking Form

Active Community Toolkit Pilot Evaluation: Tracking Form

Name of Plan:	
Date of Entry into MLHU	Click here to enter a date.
Date Passed to HCIP Staff	Click here to enter a date.
Deadline for Submission	Click here to enter a date.
Type of Plan:	<input type="radio"/> Area Plan <input type="radio"/> Subdivision Plan <input type="radio"/> Site Plan
Type of Land Use Development:	<input type="radio"/> Official Plan Amendment <input type="radio"/> Zoning Changes <input type="radio"/> By-Law Changes <input type="radio"/> Community Planning Proposals
Date of Screening:	Click here to enter a date.
Screening Process:	<input type="radio"/> Ability to commit time <input type="radio"/> Relevancy to Active Community Design <input type="radio"/> Other, please specify: _____
Screening Conducted by:	
Recommended for Review	<input type="radio"/> Yes, requiring a Review <input type="radio"/> No, not requiring a Review
Review Conducted By:	
Date of Review:	Click here to enter a date.

Implementation Factors	
How much time has the entire Review process taken?	Identify the estimated hours for completion of the review process:
	<input type="radio"/> Reviewing the LUA and completing the ACT
	<input type="radio"/> Consultations with COL Planner(s)
	<input type="radio"/> Attendance at COL Meetings(s)
	<input type="radio"/> Reviewing Policy documents
	<input type="radio"/> Consultations with Public Health Staff
	<input type="radio"/> Submitting recommendations
	<input type="radio"/> Other, please specify: _____
Estimated Total Number of Hours	
What type of information has been gathered & strategies used to help inform the recommendations?	<input type="radio"/> Contacts with Planner(s), Name: _____ <input type="radio"/> Attendance at COL Meeting(s), Meeting and Date: _____ <input type="radio"/> COL Official Plan <input type="radio"/> Provincial Policy Statement <input type="radio"/> Other relevant municipal planning policies, strategies or guidelines: _____ <input type="radio"/> Other research evidence: _____ <input type="radio"/> Consultations with Public Health Staff <input type="radio"/> Other, please specify: _____
What barriers/challenges were experienced in utilizing the Toolkit to generate the LUA recommendations?	
What barriers/factors were experienced in generating the LUA recommendations?	<input type="radio"/> BE Element(s) not reflected in Official Plan, specify: _____ <input type="radio"/> BE Element(s) not reflected in Provincial Policy Statement, specify: _____ <input type="radio"/> BE Element(s) not reflected in the LUA, specify: _____ <input type="radio"/> Other, please specify: _____

<p>Were there any questions/criteria that were not applicable to the specific type of LUA being reviewed?</p> <p>This will help inform what questions/criteria are relevant to which type of LUA.</p>	
<p>What suggestions are there for changing the Toolkit and/or process? Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamlining the process? • Refinements to the ACT 	
<p>Are there any concepts contained within the ACT that are not clear and/or applicable?</p>	
<p>Are there other sources of information and training that would increase your knowledge/skills/comfort to utilize the tool and undertake the process?</p>	
<p>Fidelity - Implemented as Planned</p>	
<p>Are there instances where the criteria is not relevant to an AP, SUB or SP categories as initially specified on the ACT? Please describe and provide any suggestion for modification.</p>	

<p>Is there a need to consult with other MLHU teams regarding submissions in order to ensure that the messages do not conflict with one another?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Internal consultation required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sent email to MLHU team, Contact: _____ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was there an identified need to discuss the proposed recommendations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No ▪ Did it result in conflicting proposed recommendations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, specify: _____ - • No
<p>What types of recommendations are being submitted/ presented?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Written submission, Contact: _____ ○ Verbal submission by phone, Contact: _____ ○ Meeting with Planners, Contact: _____ ○ Delegation to London Council, or Other COL Committee, Committee: _____ ○ Other, please specify: _____
<p>What is the rationale used to support the recommendations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Official Plan ○ Provincial Policy Statement ○ Other relevant municipal planning policies, strategies or guidelines: _____ ○ Other research evidence: _____
<p>Has written follow-up from the COL been requested regarding the LUA submission?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes ○ No
<p>Is there potential organization risk in disseminating the recommendations? Please describe.</p> <p>How will the recommendations be viewed by the public?</p> <p>Are there other organizations submitted recommendations?</p> <p>What other contextual issues are being raised?</p>	

<p>Is there a plan for minimizing the organizational risk? Please describe.</p>	
<p>Effectiveness</p>	<p>Ongoing Follow-up Post-Submission</p>
<p>Identification of various levels of influence/ impact:</p>	
<p>MLHU recommendations inserted into COL reports</p>	<p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date: Click here to enter a date. • Report/Document Name: _____ • Related to Topic Area: _____ <input type="radio"/> No </p>
<p>City of Council / Committee approves recommendations</p>	<p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date: Click here to enter a date. • Committee Name: _____ <input type="radio"/> No </p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal from the applicant/ developer regarding recommendations 	<p> <input type="radio"/> Yes, Date: Click here to enter a date. <input type="radio"/> No </p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ontario Municipal Board outcome 	<p> <input type="radio"/> Favourable, Date: Click here to enter a date. <input type="radio"/> Not Favourable, Date: Click here to enter a date. </p>
<p>Applicant / Developer Implements Recommendations</p>	<p> <input type="radio"/> Yes, Date: Click here to enter a date. <input type="radio"/> No </p>
<p>What other factors may be influencing or impacting the decisions being made by COL planning department or other key stakeholders?</p> <p>Provide a description and</p>	

<p>evidence to describe factors that may be influencing or impacting uptake of MLHU recommendations (e.g. economic benefits outweighing health risk, etc.)</p>	
<p>What impact has MLHU recommendations had on planning decisions?</p> <p>Provide a written description</p>	
<p>Additional Notes:</p>	

Appendix D – Working Template – Municipal Land Use Application Review Form

Middlesex-London Health Unit

Working Template: Municipal Land Use Application Review Form

Municipality: London

Type of Plan:

- Initial Proposal Report:
 - Subdivision Plan
 - Other
- Area Plan
- Subdivision Plan
- Site Plan
- Other (*describe*):

Plan Identifier (*title, address, municipal number*):

Plan Applicant (*Developer / Consultant*):

Date of Notice of Application or Notice of IPR meeting (*yy/mm/dd*):

Municipal Contact Person (*name, title, Dept, email, phone #*):

Municipal Planner Contact Person (*name, title, Dept, email, phone #*):

MLHU Staff Reviewer (*name, title, Dept, email, phone #*):

Online / Hyperlinks to relevant documents:

Date(s) of Review by MLHU staff (*yy/mm/dd*):

MLHU Staff Signature:

Active Community Toolkit (ACT) for Reviewing Development Plans

General Overview:

	Active Community Toolkit – Categories & Subtopics	Category Notes	Discussion Points: Planner /Public Health Staff	Category / Subtopic Summary
1	Mixed land use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land Use ○ Density ○ Service Proximity ○ Employment Proximity ○ Educational Proximity 			
2	Housing Density & Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Density & Diversity 			
3	Complete Streets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Street Design ○ Pedestrian Oriented ○ Cycling Oriented ○ Public Transit ○ Streetscape & Aesthetics ○ Parking 			
4	Public Realm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parks, Open & Recreation Spaces ○ Safety & Surveillance ○ Social Interaction & Connection 			
	Overall Summary & Recommendations			
	Outcome			



MIDDLESEX-LONDON HEALTH UNIT

Chronic Disease Prevention and Tobacco Control & Healthy Communities and Injury Prevention Teams Logsheet

Recording Date/Time/Signature (yy/mm/dd)	Contact Date /Time (yy/mm/dd)	Needs Assessment	Plan/Intervention	Outcomes/Evaluation

Contact Codes	
FC	Face to face contact. Document significant interactions. Recording is based on judgment of staff. Example, dropped off pamphlets to site
PC	Phone contact with client. Example called contact to arrange drop-off of resources
EMM	Email message.
VMM	Voicemail message.

Notice of Collection: The Personal Information on this Chronic Disease & Injury Prevention Team Logsheet is collected under the authority of the *Health Protection and Promotion Act* and applicable privacy legislation. This information will be used for delivery of public health programs and services and may be used for evaluation or statistical/research purposes. Any questions about the collection of this information should be directed to the MLHU Privacy Officer, Middlesex-London Health Unit, 50 King Street, London, ON N6A 5L7, (519) 663-5317 x2251 Fax: (519) 663-9413 or e-mail: privacy@mlhu.on.ca

Notice of Collection Provided: YES N/A
 MLHU Staff Initials: _____