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AGENDA
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
March 28, 2018 – 9 a.m. – Foran/Greene Room, 4th Floor, City Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Call to Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of the Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adoption of the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Committee of the Whole Minutes – March 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presentations/ Delegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NL Historic Trust – Presentation by Jerry Dick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Works &amp; Sustainability – Councillor Ian Froude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Decision Note dated February 19, 2018 re: Mandatory Curbside Yard Waste Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Services &amp; Events – Councillor Jamie Korab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Information Note dated March 22, 2018 re: City of St. John’s, Molson Coors Athlete of the Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Decision Note dated March 21, 2018 re: 2018 Capital Grants to Community Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning &amp; Development – Councillor Maggie Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Built Heritage Experts Panel Report – March 13, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Decision Note dated March 16, 2018 re: Heritage Policy Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation – Councillor Debbie Hanlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Decision Note dated March 15, 2018 re: Metrobus Transit Priority Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
March 14, 2018 – 9:00 am – Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

Present:  Mayor Danny Breen, Chair
          Councillor Dave Lane
          Councillor Hope Jamieson
          Councillor Jamie Korab
          Councillor Deanne Stapleton
          Councillor Wally Collins
          Councillor Maggie Burton
          Councillor Ian Froude
          Councillor Sandy Hickman

Regrets:  Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary
          Councillor Debbie Hanlon

Staff:    Kevin Breen, City Manager
          Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering &
          Regulatory Services
          Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager – Finance & Administration
          Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
          Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager of Public Works
          Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
          Ken O’Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
          Elaine Henley, City Clerk
          Karen Chafe, Supervisor of Office of the City Clerk

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved – Councillor Korab; Seconded – Councillor Burton

That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

Moved – Councillor Korab; Seconded – Councillor Burton

That the Committee of the Whole minutes dated February 28, 2018 be
adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Council considered the above noted.

Concern was expressed about the application process being too onerous for people to reapply every three years, particularly if they have a permanent disability. Some members of Council suggested that people who self-identify as having a permanent disability should have the option to be exempt automatically from the automated garbage collection program. Staff advised that from an audit and evidenced based perspective, the City needs to be diligent in its record keeping of such exemptions. The requirement for reapplication is not meant to be onerous but rather, to keep control over how the program is managed, particularly given the transient nature of people, i.e. changing addresses and changes in personal circumstances over time. It was also felt that there was a risk to compromising the integrity of the system if there is not a certification process.

It was suggested that the reapplication process be reviewed as the program unfolds to ensure that it is less onerous. In advance of the three-year renewal, a reminder notification could be sent to individuals asking them to simply reconfirm their status. Staff was amenable to that idea and assured that the process will continue to be tweaked as it progresses.

Members of Council requested that the City continue to engage the public on this matter and their experiences in relation to the use of the automated garbage collection process and to welcome their testimonials in relation to the program.

Moved – Councillor Froude: Seconded – Councillor Burton

That the matter be deferred to the next Committee of the Whole to enable more engagement with the Community to further articulate their concerns.

MOTION TO DEFER WAS LOST
WITH MAYOR BREEN, COUNCILLORS HICKMAN, LANE, STAPLETON, KORAB AND COLLINS DISSENTING

Moved Councillor Collins; Seconded Councillor Hickman

That Council approve the process by which individuals with mobility limitations can apply for an exemption to use a garbage cart. This process will ensure that the automated garbage collection program will not impede on any one individual's independence.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
COMMUNITY SERVICES & EVENTS – COUNCILLOR JAMIE KORAB

a. Inclusion Advisory Committee Report – January 24, 2018

Recommendation:

Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Burton

That the Inclusion Advisory Committee Report be adopted as presented in relation to the following three recommendations:

1. That Taylor Stocks be appointed as Chair to the Inclusion Advisory Committee.

2. That $50,000 from the 2017 budget be allocated to the current 2018 budget to facilitate the installation of Audible Pedestrian Signals as per the following locations:
   - Topsail Road @ Columbus Drive
   - Prince Phillip Drive @ Westerland Road
   - Kenmount Road @ Brant Drive/H3 Development
   - Kelsey Drive @ Messenger Drive
   - O'Leary Avenue @ Avalon Mall
   - Kenmount Road @ Polina/Avalon Mall
   - Kelsey Drive @ Kiwanis

3. To advertise for an Indigenous/Aboriginal member to serve on the Inclusion Advisory Committee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

b. Municipal Advisory Committee on Youth (MACY) Input

Recommendation

Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Lane

That this report be deferred and referred to a future Committee of the Whole meeting pending the return of Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O'Leary who originally brought forth the idea of having a non-elected youth member on Council. The matter will also be considered in conjunction with research information from other jurisdictions which is in the process of being gathered by staff.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
c. Decision Note dated March 8, 2018 re: Proposed Youth Advisory Committee to Replace the Municipal Advisory Committee on Youth (MACY)

Consideration was given to the above cited Decision Note.

**Recommendation**

Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Lane

That Council approve the dissolution of the current Municipal Advisory Committee of Youth and establish a new Youth Advisory Committee with the revised Terms of Reference as presented with the following revision:

- that *student governing bodies* be changed to *postsecondary governing bodies*.

Further that Council approve the establishment of a Youth Leadership and Volunteer Committee and the recommendations put forward by the lead staff on ways to further engage youth, children and family.

d. Information Note dated March 1, 2018 re: Low Cost Spay/Neuter Program

Councillor Korab spoke to the content of the above cited Information Note. A further recommendation in this regard will be forthcoming to Council in July.

e. Decision Note dated March 2, 2018 re: Humane Services- Spaying/Neutering of Shelter Animals

The Committee considered the above-noted Decision Note.

**Recommendation**

Moved – Councillor Korab; Seconded – Councillor Burton

That all shelter cats be spayed/neutered prior to adoption with no increase in adoption fee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Councillor Burton questioned the possibility of staff providing Council with an information note considering the feasibility of a mobile trap neuter release program for feral cats like that provided by the City of Halifax. Staff advised that they have looked at the feral cat population and have some data already collected in that regard. There would be a cost factor involved to providing additional services in this regard and it is an item that would have to be referred for budget discussion.
The Committee considered the following recommendations of the Built Heritage Experts Panel at its meeting on February 13, 2018

i. **Decision Note dated February 1, 2018 re: 85 Military Road – Exterior Renovations associated with a Discretionary Heritage Use.**

**Recommendation**  
Moved by Councillor Burton; Seconded by Councillor Hickman

That Council approve the discretionary Heritage Use for 85 Military Road as well as the design of the mixed commercial/residential property, as submitted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ii. **Information Note dated February 7, 2018 re: Heritage Financial Incentives Program**

**Recommendation**  
Moved by Councillor Burton; Seconded by Councillor Lane

Although vinyl siding is a permitted in some Heritage Areas, given that it is not a heritage promoting feature, the Panel recommends that Council strike this clause in the eligibility criteria for the heritage financial incentives program.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

iii. **7 Garrison Hill – John Howard Society – Heritage Designated Building – Window Replacement**

**Recommendation**  
Moved by Councillor Burton; Seconded by Councillor Hickman

That approval be given to replace the south windows at the John Howard Society Building, 7 Garrison Hill with a wooden window that is of the same proportion to that of the existing front bay windows.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
b. Decision Note dated February 22, 2018 re: Application to Rezone Land to the Residential Medium Density (R2) Zone for development of two Single Detached Dwellings, MPA1800001, 364 Blackhead Road

Recommendation
Moved by Councillor Burton; Seconded by Councillor Collins

That Council approve the rezoning application for 364 Blackhead Road from the Industrial General (IG) and Open Space Reserve (OR) Zones to the Residential Medium Density (R2) Zone to allow the development of two Single Detached Dwellings. In this regard, the amendments will be advertised for public review and comment. Following public consultation, the application will be referred to a regular meeting of Council for consideration. Subsequently, Council will have to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment to consider a Regional Plan amendment, followed by regional consultation and a public hearing chaired by an independent commissioner. Staff would co-ordinate with Municipal Affairs to appoint the same person for the Regional Plan hearing and the City’s hearing.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

c. Decision Note dated March 7, 2018 re: Proposed vehicle Impound Parking Lot and Building, DEV1700187, 10 George’s Pond Place

The Committee considered the above-noted Decision Note requesting consideration for the development of a vehicle impound lot and related building for vehicle storage at 10 George’s Pond Place.

Recommendation
Moved by Councillor Burton; Seconded by Councillor Korab

That Council reject the proposed development of the vehicle impound lot and building, as it conflicts with the Kenmount Concept Plan for Lands Above 190 metres.

CARRIED WITH COUNCILLOR COLLINS DISSENTING
d. Decision Note dated March 7, 2018 re: 200 Military Road, The Basilica Cathedral of St. John’s the Baptist – Window Stabilization

Consideration was given to the Decision Note listed above with the following recommendation brought forward.

**Recommendation**

Moved by Councillor Burton; Seconded by Councillor Jamieson

That Council approve the window stabilization to the Basilica Cathedral of St. John the Baptist as submitted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

### DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, March 28, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in Council Chambers.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:33

Mayor Danny Breen  
Chairperson
# Summary of Recommendations for the Preservation and Adaptive Reuse of Heritage Buildings in the City of St. John’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0. Ensure Predictability and Consistency for Developers</td>
<td>1.1 Undertake a Comprehensive Heritage Resources Survey and Develop a Heritage Preservation/Adaptive Reuse Plan for the city’s most significant heritage properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Re-engage the public in reviewing the Municipal Plan and related Heritage Preservation Bylaw to ensure that desired planning outcomes and regulations with respect to heritage are in sync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Develop a “One Stop Shop” within the City of St. John’s for heritage properties and ensure greater transparency of municipal processes dealing with heritage properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Provide financial incentives to support heritage preservation and adaptive reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Support Innovative Models for Adaptive Reuse when a Purely Market Case Can’t be Made</td>
<td>2.1 Hold a public meeting with city and provincial government officials to explore the need for and interest in establishing an entity to develop and manage heritage properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Support a Green Agenda through Heritage Preservation and Building Recycling</td>
<td>3.1 Adopt a policy of fully exploring adaptive reuse options for all structures that they own prior to considering demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Adopt a policy to support the recycling of buildings when demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Maximize Flexibility &amp; Support Creativity to Ensure a Higher Level of Adaptive Reuse</td>
<td>4.1 The City should consistently use its 90-day Demolition Delay Ordinance for designated heritage structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Support an “Adaptive Reuse Innovation Team” program to examine adaptive reuse options for significant heritage structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Develop “Alternate Compliance Methods” and flexible zoning options for heritage-specific building code for St. John’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Strengthen Mechanisms to Ensure that Developers Follow Requirements for Heritage Preservation and Adaptive Reuse and that Developments are Compatible with the City’s Heritage Fabric</td>
<td>5.1 Issue a performance bond for all developments of heritage properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Institute a requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment of heritage properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting the Preservation & Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings in St. John’s

Introduction:
A number of recent high profile demolitions of heritage properties in St. John’s and others at risk highlight the need to reconsider the mechanisms and tools that are available to preserve the city’s valuable heritage structures. Many of the most threatened buildings are those that are most significant: large historic residential structures; historic churches; commercial and public buildings that have either outlived their original purpose or are struggling to keep their doors open. These are some of the most iconic buildings in the city and major contributors to the city’s rich cultural townscape. Due to their prime locations and the fact that they are often situated on large lots means that many of these properties are attractive for redevelopment. If they are to be preserved it is critical that viable options for their adaptive reuse be found.

When high profile heritage properties are targeted for demolition and redevelopment we often find a situation where developers and property owners are pitted against heritage advocates and citizens with the city caught in between. In an effort to address this situation, the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland & Labrador, through a partnership with the City of St. John’s, sponsored a one-day forum in May 2017 called “Finding the Profit in Heritage.” It brought together the various stakeholders with an interest in this issue – developers/property owners with heritage advocates, city officials, planners, designers and others – to create a more constructive dialogue and to explore ways in which more heritage buildings could be adaptively reused.

While development pressures on heritage buildings may not be as great in areas outside of St. John’s, there are, nonetheless, opportunities for the adaptive reuse of heritage structures by private individuals. A number of the recommendations contained in this report can have application to communities across Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some of what we heard included:

- Developers need clarity and predictability in terms of what the rules are around heritage properties
- The adaptive reuse of heritage properties generally involves greater risk than new construction due to such things as: unwelcome surprises in the form of structural or abatement issues; challenges in making old buildings fit modern building and fire codes and accessibility requirements; delays which can drive up costs. These can make financing difficult and with higher risks there is often a desire for higher returns.
- There is a need for pro-active planning and long-term thinking in terms of the future of significant heritage properties rather than dealing with them on an ad hoc, case by case basis which generally leads to crisis management. What are the important heritage
properties in the city that will likely outlive their current use over the next 10-20 years and what are the possibilities for their adaptive reuse?

- Maximum flexibility is required in terms of zoning and application of building and fire codes to support adaptive reuse
- Successful adaptive reuse of heritage buildings requires creativity and a constructive dialogue between the various stakeholders early on in the decision-making process for the redevelopment of a heritage site
- Heritage preservation must be seen within a broader context of other priorities within the city and province: creating a livable urban environment that attracts innovation and investment; the city as an attraction for tourists; the need to decrease carbon emissions and decrease wastes through the conservation of “embodied energy” in existing buildings and avoiding carbon emissions through new building.

Participants at the forum worked through a couple of case studies – one an historic downtown church; the other a heritage home on a large, mature lot – to try to identify viable development options that would preserve the heritage values of the properties and to develop a number of recommendations that would better support heritage preservation.

Recommendations:

1.0. Ensure Predictability and Consistency for Developers

Clear government rules and regulations around heritage properties and their consistent enforcement will provide property owners and developers with greater consistency and predictability. This includes ensuring that all properties that are considered to be of heritage value are either designated or on a public list of properties of interest. Municipal designation after an owner has stated an intent to demolish a building will likely have little success in ensuring its preservation as the owner can use means such as “demolition by neglect” to achieve their objectives.

In order to ensure that the greatest number of heritage buildings are redeveloped and preserved, it is necessary to mitigate the risks associated with adaptive reuse. The greater number of unknowns generally associated with adaptive reuse as compared to new construction often make it more challenging as financing can be harder to secure and unforeseen delays can add to costs. There are the usual risks relating to unknown structural conditions and environmental issues which have to be addressed but perhaps one of the biggest risks is the delay created by planning and building code issues and their sometimes inconsistent or inflexible application by government officials. Currently the onus is on the heritage development proponent to prove that alternate solutions to meeting National Building Code requirements can work which can be costly and still meet resistance from building enforcement officials who may be reluctant to stray from the norm.
**Recommendation 1.1: Undertake a Comprehensive Heritage Resources Survey and Develop a Heritage Preservation/Adaptive Reuse Plan for the city’s most significant heritage properties.**

This would allow the city to be proactive, to signal to the development community and to the public those heritage properties for which there is an interest in preservation. This would, ideally, move things away from the reactive, crisis management mode which currently exists and in which, more often than not, things don’t turn out well for heritage buildings. A plan should identify the following:

- Developed a “tiered” system for heritage properties to identify those heritage structures that have the greatest priority in terms of architectural and historical significance and over all contribution to the city’s heritage landscape.
- Significant properties that are likely to outlive their current use within the next 10-20 years (e.g., churches, public buildings, large residential properties) and become available for adaptive reuse.
- Potential highest and best use of heritage properties and the most appropriate means for undertaking their development whether it be through private, public or not-for-profit development. Included in this assessment would be the most appropriate zoning, potential development incentives (e.g., density bonuses, tax breaks, tax breaks for owners of heritage properties in recognition of the added expenses incurred for maintaining them), and alternate building code compliance options that would support the best adaptive reuse of these properties.

Such a plan should engage the public and stakeholders to ensure that the public interest is better met. A list of buildings of interest for preservation should be publically available on the city’s website and efforts made to make the development community aware of it.

**Recommendation 1.2: Re-engage the public in reviewing the Municipal Plan and related Heritage Preservation Bylaw to ensure that desired planning outcomes and regulations with respect to heritage are in sync.** Outdated regulations will not achieve different outcomes. It is also important to link the Heritage Preservation Bylaw to other city plans that include special area plans, the Viewscape Study and others.

**Recommendation 1.3: Develop a “One Stop Shop” within the City of St. John’s for heritage properties** to respond in a comprehensive and timely manner to the needs of property owners who wish to undertake work on their property or to seek a development permit. It would ideally, comprise the following:

- i) a revamped heritage website with ready information on all aspects of heritage designation, regulation and supports. The City of Calgary provides a useful model to consider.
- ii) a mechanism whereby the owner of a heritage property and his/her design consultants can meet with representatives of all of the planning and building enforcement divisions within the city to work through issues relating to a heritage
property upgrade or adaptive reuse. The role of the current Heritage Experts Panel could be expanded to play this role. The city’s review of development plans for heritage properties should be timely and seek to proactively work with a property owner to address code challenges rather merely being the enforcer of regulations. As well, efforts should be made to ensure greater transparency of municipal processes dealing with the development of heritage properties.

Recommendation 1.4: Provide financial incentives for built heritage preservation through enhanced grants and tax measures such as property tax rebates on increased value of renovated buildings.

2.0 Support Innovative Models for Adaptive Reuse when a Purely Market Case Can’t be Made

In some cases, it will be challenging to make a strictly “market” case for adaptively reusing a heritage property. The local economic conditions may not support private sector development or a high enough profit margin cannot be achieved while protecting heritage assets. In such instances non-market (not for profit) mechanisms, social enterprise or public-private entities may play a role. There are numerous examples in the province and elsewhere of such groups. The St. John’s Heritage Foundation, established in 1977, acquired, restored and sold nearly three dozen heritage properties in Downtown St. John’s between 1987-81. The Bonavista Historic Townscape Foundation and the Sir William Ford Coaker Historic Trust have acquired and developed numerous heritage properties and managed or sold them and, in some cases, entered in public-private partnerships. The Shorefast Foundation on Fogo Island owns and manages several heritage properties as part of a social enterprise. Cochrane Street United Church has formed a new not-for-profit organization to manage its building assets. The City could encourage adaptive reuse of heritage buildings for public purposes by actively promoting its provision for tax exemptions on properties developed for such purposes.

Recommendation 2.1: Hold a public meeting with city and provincial government officials to explore the need for and interest in establishing an entity to develop and manage heritage properties. Include a presentation on numerous different models. If there is sufficient interest, undertake a feasibility study on appropriate models and financing.

3.0 Support a Green Agenda through Heritage Preservation and Building Recycling

A strong case can be made that the “greenest” building is that which already exists. It “embodies” all of the energy used to manufacture its materials, transport them to a site and to fabricate them which are lost if a building is demolished and taken to land fill. It is estimated that up to one-third of land fill is comprised of building wastes. If a new building is built in its place, additional CO2 emissions are created. The cities of Vancouver and Portland, Oregon have policies requiring that a significant portion of waste building materials from building renovations or demolitions to be recycled with owners covering the costs. In the case of heritage buildings there are often unique and high quality architectural elements that can be
Recommendation 3.1: Adopt a policy of fully exploring adaptive reuse options for all structures that they own prior to considering demolition and consider incentives to encourage their adaptive reuse by the private and community sector when they are sold. A policy should include a provision that buildings will be put on the market in a timely manner when they are no longer of use to avoid demolition by neglect.

Recommendation 3.2: Adopt a policy to support the recycling of buildings when they are to be renovated or demolished. While recycling costs can be passed on to building owners as is the case with the City of Vancouver recycling, a less onerous approach for owners would be to allow outside individuals, groups and companies with an interest in salvage to do so prior to demolition. Sufficient time would have to be allotted to allow this to happen. The capacity to manage this and liability issues would have to be explored. Along with this the City should consider promoting the use of recycled building materials to building designers and contractors and the general public. Such a policy may help to spur new business opportunities in building salvage and the building of recycled structures.

4.0 Maximize Flexibility & Support Creativity to Ensure a Higher Level of Adaptive Reuse

Flexibility and creativity are key to ensuring that more of our buildings are adaptively reused. Sometimes building owners and developers don’t fully understand the benefits of adaptively reusing their historic structures or that their renovation can support a premium development. As the forum, “Finding the Profit in Heritage”, demonstrated, bringing together the various stakeholders, including the public, can result in fresh and innovative thinking. For this to occur sufficient time is required to allow stakeholders to come together and consider options.

Recommendation 4.1: Consistent application of its 90-day Demolition Delay Ordinance for designated heritage structures and time for the review of all structures within the Heritage District.

Recommendation 4.2: Support an “Adaptive Reuse Innovation Team” program that brings together a variety of stakeholders: property managers/developers/consultants; architects; planners; city staff and heritage specialists to consider options for the adaptive reuse of a particular heritage property. Property owners could request the services of such a team that would come together for a day to generate ideas and options in a charette type workshop. One way to approach this would be for the City to seek expressions of interest from stakeholder groups to generate a list of potential participants. A call for volunteers could go out to attend a session which would meet on an ad hoc basis on the scheduled day. City staff would support
the sessions by pulling together useful mapping, zoning information, background historical information, relevant studies and other useful data.

**Recommendation 4.3 Develop “Alternate Compliance Methods” and flexible zoning options for heritage-specific building code for St. John’s** along the lines of what has been adopted in other cities. The study undertaken by the City of St. John’s regarding alternate compliance approaches for upper story occupancies in the downtown commercial areas is a good start. The City should create a working group comprising city officials, heritage advocates, design professionals and other stakeholders to undertake research and develop recommendations.

**5.0 Strengthen Mechanisms to Ensure that Developers Follow Requirements for Heritage Preservation and Adaptive Reuse and that Developments are Compatible with the City’s Heritage Fabric**

As the case of Richmond Cottage demonstrated, it is relatively easy for a developer to walk away from an agreement to retain and adaptively reuse heritage buildings as part of a property development. Demolition by neglect is always a strategy that can be used whereby a heritage building is not maintained and deteriorates to the point where the property owner argues that it is too costly to retain. As well, we have seen from developments in the past that they can sometimes be very unsympathetic to the heritage character of an area.

**Recommendation 5.1: Issue a performance bond for all developments of heritage properties** that include a condition of the retention and adaptive reuse of a designated heritage structures and features to be repayable upon the completion of the project. The new development regulations for the City St. John’s make provision for a “financial guarantee.” This should be consistently used for the redevelopment of heritage properties.

**Recommendation 5.2: Institute a requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment** for all developments within and adjacent to Heritage Areas to ensure that new developments are sympathetic to and respectful of the City’s heritage townscape. These are becoming increasingly common in Canadian cities.
Decision/Direction Required:

Approval from Council to proceed with a mandatory curbside yard waste collection program.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

In the spring of 2017, Council approved the mandatory collection of leaves at the curb for the purpose of composting. The leaves were required to be in paper yard waste bags (no plastic bags) and left at the curb on the same day as your garbage collection. This program was offered throughout October and November 2017.

Overall, this initiative was a success with residents diverting over 400 tonnes of leaves that are now being composted at the Robin Hood Bay site. This resulted in a reduction of approximately $25,000 in tipping fees being charged to the City and will ultimately result in a usable end product. This was both a fiscally and environmentally sound decision.

Further to the above initiative, the City had offered a yard waste collection by appointment program. This program was offered throughout May to September 2017. Residents interested in diverting compostable yard wastes could package those wastes in a paper yard waste bag and make an appointment with the City for collection. Accepted yard wastes included:

- Leaves, grass clippings
- Old plants, plant trimmings,
- Small branches less than 1" in diameter.

Last spring was the first time this program was available. It was not heavily promoted yet still resulted in over 800 appointments.

Operational Staff report that there is still a considerable volume of yard wastes collected as garbage at the curb (outside of the leaf program).
In order to make this program more convenient for residents, collection of yard wastes will occur every other week coinciding with recycling collection. Yard waste collections will occur near the start of May through to the end of November. This program will include the leaf collection in the fall. Leaf collection will also occur every other week (this service was offered weekly in 2017).

The yard waste program will assist residents in meeting the new garbage bag limits of the automated garbage collection program as yard waste bags will not count towards the 4 bag limit. Yard waste placed in plastic bags will be left at the curb.

If approved, every other week residents will be allowed to place at the curb:

- One collection cart containing garbage
- Unlimited volume of recycling contained within blue transparent bags
- Unlimited volume of yard wastes contained within paper yard waste bags.

In anticipation of the upcoming automated garbage collection program and as a continuation to the successful leaf program, staff are recommending that Council extend the plastic bag ban on leaves to include all yard wastes. This will allow all yard wastes to be diverted for composting.

Automatic garbage should allow this program to be offered using existing resources.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**
   
   Savings on tipping fees.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders**

   Residents serviced by curbside collection programs, landscaping contractors, and retail suppliers of paper yard waste bags.

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**

   Responsive and Progressive

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**

   Will require to be included in Sanitation Regulations

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**
Comprehensive communications plan would need to be developed to support the launching of the program.

6. Human Resource Implications

N/A

7. Procurement Implications

N/A

8. Information Technology Implications

N/A.

9. Other Implications

N/A.

Recommendation:

Council approve proceeding with the mandatory requirement of yard wastes to be placed in paper yard waste bags for curbside collection (same as leaf program).

Council approve the regular collection of yard wastes every two weeks. Yard waste collection is to coincide with recycling collection. Program is to be offered 7 months a year (May – November).

Prepared by/Signature:

Andrew Niblock, B.Sc.
Director, Environmental Services

Prepared by/Signature:

Janine Piller
Waste Diversion Supervisor

Approved by/Date/Signature:

Lynnann Winsor, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.
Deputy City Manager – Public Works
Title: City of St. John’s, Molson Coors Athlete of the Month

Date Prepared: March 22, 2018

Report To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council

Ward: N/A

Issue: Status of the City of St. John’s Athlete of the Month program

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The City of St. John’s Molson Coors Athlete of the Month is a committee comprised of approximately 12 members from sport, media and community organizations that was formed to work with local sport groups to promote the achievements of athletes in the City of St. John’s.

In 2008, the City of St. John’s partnered with the Athlete of the Month volunteer committee to assist with the administration and promotion of the Athlete of the Month. A website and social media platform were created that would allow sport organizations to input information monthly profiling the achievements of the individuals athletes and teams in the community.

In the last two years, the Athlete of the Month program has been labor intensive for the Recreation Division and it has been difficult to try and maintain the program with integrity. Because most sport organizations are led by volunteers it has proven challenging collecting the accomplishments of the athletes to nominate them for monthly recognition. Also due to work, school and sport travel commitments, attendance by nominated athletes and committee members at the Athlete of the Month luncheons is also low.

After careful review and discussion with the Chair, of the Athlete of the Month Committee and the major sponsor, Molson Coors Canada, it was agreed that the program is not as successful as it once was and that the monthly award program would discontinue in 2018. Local athletes will continue to be recognized weekly and monthly by The Telegram and by Memorial University of Newfoundland.

The annual City of St. John’s Athlete of the Year event for male, female and team continues to be successful and provides well deserved recognition to the many talented male, female and teams who represent our City on a provincial, national and international sport stage. Molson Coors Canada will continue to sponsor our City of St. John’s Athlete of the Year Ceremony.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: N/A

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   - Athlete of the Month Volunteer Committee
   - Molson Coors Canada

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
   - Progressive and Responsive

4. Legal or Policy Implications N/A

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A

6. Human Resource Implications: N/A

7. Procurement Implications: N/A

8. Information Technology Implications: N/A

9. Other Implications: N/A

Conclusion/Next Steps:

Discontinue the Athlete of the Month program effective 2018. Continue with the annual recognition of the City of St. John's Athlete of the Year.

Prepared by/Signature:

Carla Squires, Facilities Manager – Recreation Division, Department of Community Services

Approved by/Date/Signature:

Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager, Community Services

Attachments: N/A
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 2018 Capital Grants to Community Groups

Date Prepared: March 21, 2018

Report To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Approval of Capital Grants

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

A review of the Capital Grants requests in accordance with policy 04-04-01; Requests for Grants and Subsidies, has been carried out by the Grants Review Committee. The committee is comprised of staff from the departments of Community Services; Finance; Public Works, Parks & Open Spaces; and Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services.

Public notice of the Capital Grants deadline was advertised; all who applied completed the required application and provided the appropriate financial documentation. Requests were received from eight organizations totaling just over $660,000.00.

Budget 2018 allocated $500,000 towards capital grants to community groups; the same amount approved last year. The following are the recommendations of the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Permit Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane Centre</td>
<td>Renovation of Annex including construction of affordable supportive housing and affordable seniors housing. Renovation of Community event space. Bring exterior back to its historical place in downtown St. John’s.</td>
<td>5,249,598</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>37,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal St. John's Regatta Committee</td>
<td>Purchase of 2 safety boats to replace aged fleet.</td>
<td>79,463</td>
<td>79,463</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCA St. John's</td>
<td>Security improvements to facility. Not recommended for funding as request is for operational improvements to facility - no capital component.</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Permit Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's Legends</td>
<td>Addition of automated timing infrastructure to Aquarena 65m pool. Infrastructure will increase the likelihood of Legends Swim Club attracting teams from outside NL for hosted events and further opportunities for NL/CSJ to host Canada Games.</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's Public Library Board</td>
<td>Anticipated cost of fit up/renovation of new library space. Funding for a mobile outreach unit.</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>107,500</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's Retired Citizens Assoc.</td>
<td>Renovation to facility including replacing entrance doors to ensure the facility meets wheelchair accessibility code.</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swilers Rugby Club</td>
<td>Redevelopment of Swilers Rugby Field. Provision of a first class playing surface which will allow the club to effectively run community based programs and host National and International events on a safe high quality surface.</td>
<td>995,913</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>7,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley United Church</td>
<td>Construction of Seniors Affordable Housing Project.</td>
<td>1,377,250</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>10,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>661,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,109</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**
   $500,000.00 Capital Grant funding to be budgeted annually.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders**
   N/A
3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**
   Aligns with Fiscally Responsible Strategic Direction

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**
   As outlined

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**
   N/A

6. **Human Resource Implications**
   N/A

7. **Procurement Implications**
   N/A

8. **Information Technology Implications**
   N/A

9. **Other Implications**
   N/A

**Recommendation:**

1) Approval of $500,000.00 as outlined in the above chart.

**Prepared by/Signature:**
Beverley Skinner – Manager of Events and Services

**Signature**

**Approved by/Date/Signature:**
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager, Community Services

Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager, Finance
NEW BUSINESS


The applicant is seeking approval for three digital LED signs to be located on St. Thomas’ Parish Hall, 8 Military Road.

Discussion took place with respect to the increasing number of LED signs being installed throughout the City and the Panel recognized the need to have the Heritage Area Sign By-law updated for regulation purposes.

Recommendation
Moved – Mark Whalen; Seconded – Michael Philpott

It is recommended to approve one LED wall sign at 8 Military Road at location preferred by the applicant. It is also recommended that the sign not include rolling messages or animation or the permission of third party advertising.

Further that staff undertake a review of the Heritage Area Sign By-law such that it includes conditions specific to available LED sign technology.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

b. Discussion on Urban Design

The Panel proceeded to discuss the matter of urban design, particularly as it relates to
Council’s recent approval of the reconfiguration of Rawlin’s Cross as a pilot project for a roundabout. Recognizing that Rawlin’s Cross is in a heritage area, the Panel feels that changes should have been referred to the Panel for review, as urban design is part of the Panel’s mandate.

The question was raised as to whether any permanent changes would affect the heritage character of the area.

Staff recognized the location as having strong heritage value, however, given the proposal is a transportation, engineering initiative, it is not expected to compromise the heritage character. As proposed, the intersections will change very little, except for traffic signs, some directional changes, the removal of the traffic lights, and some extensions to the traffic medians will provide more space mid street for pedestrians.

Discussion ensued and concluded with the following recommendation:

**Recommendation**
Moved by Lydia Lewycky; Seconded by Matthew Mills

Recognizing that urban design is an aspect of built heritage, Council and staff should seek the Panel’s input on such matters when roads and intersections may be realigned permanently.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

---

Glenn Barnes, NLAA, MRAIC
Chairperson
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Heritage Policy Working Group

Date Prepared: March 16, 2018

Report To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Heritage Lead

Ward: All

Decision/Direction Required: To approve the formation of a Heritage Working Group whose task is to review the City’s Built Heritage Policies and recommend improvements.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City proclaimed its heritage area in 1977, one of the first in Canada. Since then, the heritage area has expanded in size several times. At the same time, Council has designated a series of buildings as heritage buildings; the list is now greater than 130. Over the years, the City has commissioned several studies on aspects of Built Heritage and has included Built Heritage Policies in the St. John’s Municipal Plan. The City’s Heritage Advisory Committee, first formed in 1977, changed to the Built Heritage Experts Panel in 2016 as part of a reorganization of advisory committees.

There have been some heritage successes in recent years, including the creation of the Heritage Financial Incentives Program. There have also been setbacks, including demolitions of a designated Heritage Building (Richmond Cottage on McLea Place), and of a building that merited designation (Quinnipiac on Winter Ave). Waterford Manor, a designated building, suffered an extensive fire and looks likely to be demolished. The City has been sued over not allowing the demolition of Bryn Mawr, a designated building on Portugal Cove Road.

Council wants to avoid further demolitions of designated buildings and encourage the designation of more. If there are gaps in the City’s Heritage Policy, these need to be fixed.

The City is finalizing its Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations. Heritage Policies will remain in the new Municipal Plan, but Heritage Regulations will migrate from the current Development Regulations to a new Heritage By-Law. Some questions to be addressed in a review of Heritage Policy:

Do our heritage policies need tightening? Do they encourage or discourage owners to keep their buildings intact? Is there a need for other incentives (financial or non-financial)? Should the City have stricter regulations for designated Heritage Buildings, and for any building in a heritage area?
How do our policies reinforce heritage requirements? Do we preserve the heritage value of buildings when we allow non-heritage changes in a heritage area? How does the City compare with best practices that are promoted by the Heritage Foundation of NL and Parks Canada?

How can we prevent demolition by neglect? Do we need higher minimum maintenance standards for designated buildings and for any building in a heritage area? How can we work with the owners of properties where a significant building occupies a large tract of land?

How can we promote and reinforce the heritage area as the cultural and business heart of the city?

Is there a need to recognize our rural heritage, particularly in Gould’s? Our fishing heritage? Our agricultural heritage?

How can we promote heritage, not only as a showcase for fine and rich old buildings, but also as a place for everyday life - not just for museums and archives but also for schools, affordable housing, niche and everyday businesses, and more?

The following membership is proposed for the Heritage Policy Working Group:

Chair – Councillor Maggie Burton, Council’s Heritage Lead.
Public member of the City’s Built Heritage Experts Panel.
Public member with an economic or business perspective.
Public member with development experience.
Public member with design and renovation experience.
Relevant City staff.

The following members are proposed:

Chair – Councillor Maggie Burton.
Bruce Blackwood, public member of the Built Heritage Experts Panel.
Jessica Dellow, board member of the NL Historic Trust.
Emily Wolf, Architectural Historian.
John Collins, Economist.
Ann-Marie Cashin, Planner III-Urban Design and Heritage.
Ken O’Brien, Chief Municipal Planner.
Rob Schamper, Technical Advisor.
Linda Bishop, Senior Legal Counsel.

The Working Group’s terms of reference are as follows:

- The Working Group will meet monthly for a limited period of time until its work is complete. Its progress will be reviewed at the end of 2018 to see if it should continue into the following year.
- The Group shall be chaired by the member of Council.
- The Group shall report to Council through the Committee of the Whole.
- The work of the Group is private until brought forward to the Committee of the Whole.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: As included in the membership of the Working Group.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: Under the City’s Strategic Plan, this initiative aligns with: A Culture of Co-operation - Create effective City-community collaborations. Neighbourhoods Build Our City - Create neighbour-focused plans and information. Responsive and Progressive - Identify and deliver on projects, strategies and programs.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: The results of the Heritage Policy Working Group will help inform the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations, the proposed Heritage By-Law, and other City by-laws.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations: To be determined.

6. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

7. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

8. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

9. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
It is recommended that Council approve the formation of the Heritage Policy Working Group with the terms of reference and membership as proposed.

Prepared by/Signature:
Ken O’Brien, MCIP – Chief Municipal Planner
Signature: ________________________________

Approved by/Date/Signature:
Jason Sinyard, P.Eng., MBA – Deputy City Manager – Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Signature: ________________________________
Title: Metrobus Transit Priority Signals

Date Prepared: 2018.03.15

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Debbie Hanlon - Transportation

Ward: Currently identified in 2, 3, 4 but may apply in 1 and 5 in future

Decision/Direction Required: Approval to implement transit priority modifications at key locations.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

Transit priority refers to a variety of approaches that can be used to give transit vehicles preference through an intersection. These practices are well established in the traffic and transit industries. By applying transit priority measures buses can complete their routes more quickly and with more reliability.

Metrobus has approval to purchase transit priority equipment and has funding in place to do so. Several locations have been identified by Metrobus as causing delay to their routes which negatively impacts service levels for transit users and when compounded increases the cost of transit service. Examples include:

- Freshwater Road at Stamps Lane / Oxen Pond
- O’Leary Avenue at Thorburn Road
- Lemarchant Road / Harvey Road / Long’s Hill / Freshwater Road / Parade Street
- Topsail Road at Hamlyn Road and Topsail Road at Columbus Drive
- Prince Philip Drive at Clinch Crescent / Westerland Road

Transportation Engineering staff will work with Metrobus to identify the specific changes required to implement transit priority in these or other areas as Metrobus funding allows.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
   Metrobus has approved funding in place.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
   Metrobus
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
   Neighbourhoods Build Our City – Improve neighbourhood-level services
   Responsive and Progressive – Identify and deliver on projects, strategies and programs
4. Legal or Policy Implications
   n/a
5. Engagement and Communications Considerations
   A communications campaign will be necessary upon implementation of transit priority.

6. Human Resource Implications
   n/a

7. Procurement Implications
   n/a

8. Information Technology Implications
   n/a

9. Other Implications
   n/a

Recommendation: Approve the implementation of transit priority features within the City of St. John’s to improve Metrobus service.

Prepared by/Signature: Garrett Donaher, Manager- Transportation Engineering

Approved by/Date/Signature: Brendan O’Connell, Director of Engineering

Attachments: n/a