

PROCESS FOR STREET NAMES/NUMBERING ANOMALIES REVIEW

Document 1

In the establishment and maintenance of clear unique property identification, the Building Services Branch of Planning and Growth Management will review and resolve addressing concerns identified by the public and emergency services based on established criteria inclusive of a public consultation process (detailed in **Document 2**), when street name/numbering changes are required.

Identified concerns that qualify for review include any street or combination of streets that cause confusion for general way-finding and/or create a potential delay in the provision of emergency services. Examples include:

- Streets physically divided
- Duplicate names with different suffixes and duplicate civic numbers
- Similar/exact sounding names
- Names with difficult/multiple pronunciations
- Continuous streets with multiple names
- Streets with non-sequential civic numbers
- Street names not officially recognized

The factors, as prioritized below, are considered when evaluating identified concerns. These were developed in consultation with the public and subsequently endorsed by the Transition Board and approved by City Council as part of the duplicate names project.

1. Number of residents/businesses affected
2. Historical significance
3. Date street was created
4. Street name contributes to an existing theme
5. Street forms a boundary with or extends into a municipality outside the new City
6. Landmark - well known street or safety related (e.g. with a hospital)
7. Cost to replace the signs.

Weighting Criteria

The accepted principle objective when name changes are necessary is to impose minimal impact on the least number of individuals and businesses that would be affected. Where the number of residents and/or businesses are effectively equal, other evaluation factors would be considered and weighed for final comparison. During the duplicate names project, the comments received from the public on the proposed method of evaluation indicated some preferred that the weighting be based solely on historical significance. When tested, it was concluded that a decision based on historical significance only would give unfair advantage in situations where other factors need to be taken into consideration. For example, one street name may have been in existence for many years but the street services only a few residents, while a second street of the same name services numerous residents and businesses where a name change would impose significant disruption. e.g., Queen Street, Richmond vs Queen Street, Ottawa. The evaluation must have the flexibility to fulfill the principle objective and all other factors.

Application:

1. Requests are submitted in writing to the Department by mail or via a web based form (to be developed).
2. Each submission will be reviewed applying the rated criteria set out below in determining the severity of the concern, the impact and recommended course of action.
3. Streets rated 10 will be evaluated and subjected to the street name change process.
4. Streets rated less than 10 will be evaluated with a view to providing additional clarity for way-finding and emergency response.

Classification:

| High Priority for Remedial Action | Value Rating |
|--|--------------|
| • Streets with sections that are not physically connected or clearly visible (Caledon St.) | 10 |
| • Duplicate names with different suffixes and duplicate civic numbers (Ancona Court/Crescent) | 10 |
| • Similar/exact sounding names with the same suffix but spelled differently, with or without duplicate civic numbers (Dayton Cres./Deighton Cres.) | 10 |
| • Duplicate names/duplicate suffixes/duplicate or unique numbering | 10 |
| Remedial Action Would Improve Clarity | |
| • Duplicate name, different suffix but unique civic numbers | 4 |
| • Streets divided into sections where the next section is clearly visible | 4 |
| • Similar/exact sounding names with different suffix and unique numbering | 4 |
| • Street names with difficult/multiple pronunciation | 2 |
| • Streets divided by a physical barrier (Bell St N. and S. [Queensway]) | 2 |
| • Multiple streets with the same name some with cardinal points (Arthur Lane, Arthur Lane N and Arthur Lane S.) | 2 |
| • Duplicate names, one name with the prefix "Old" | 2 |
| • Continuous streets with multiple names (Meadowland Dr., E and W) | 2 |
| • Unofficial/unrecognized names (Ex: Experimental Farm, Carleton University) | 2 |
| • Missing Accents/Incorrect spelling | 2 |
| • Buildings facing one street but addressed to another | 2 |
| • Missing street signs | 2 |
| • Inappropriate suffix | 2 |
| • Non-sequential civic numbering | 2 |

Replacement Names:

- For streets approved for a name change, the Department will initiate the Public Consultation Process described under Recommendation 2. The recommended pre-cleared replacement name will be based on the greatest support from the community.
- The Department will submit a report to the Planning and Environment Committee and City Council recommending the preferred name.
- Legal Services will be tasked to prepare and submit the implementing by-law for Council enactment.
- The effective date for the name change must provide sufficient time for residents/businesses to advise person/business contacts, exhaust stationery and coincide with the next printing of the telephone book (6 months or greater).

Those directly affected plus all emergency and major public/private sector contacts will be notified of the change and the effective date.