AGENDA

Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, May 23, 2017
9 am
Council Chambers
4th Floor, City Hall
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approval of Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adoption of Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole Minutes of May 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Governance and Strategic Direction – Mayor Danny Breen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Decision Note dated May 15, 2018 re: Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole (COTW) Meetings – Summer Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning and Development – Councillor Maggie Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Built Heritage Experts Panel dated May 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Decision Note dated May 16, 2018 re: Clearing and Grubbing Policy – Fee Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Decision Note dated May 16, 2018 re: Temporary Exemption to Noise By-Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transportation – Councillor Debbie Hanlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Decision Note dated May 16, 2018 re: Rennie’s River Easy Traffic Pattern Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present: Mayor Danny Breen, Chair  
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary  
Councillor Sandy Hickman  
Councillor Hope Jamieson  
Councillor Deanne Stapleton  
Councillor Maggie Burton (via audio until 9:52 am)  
Councillor Debbie Hanlon  
Councillor Ian Froude  
Councillor Jamie Korab  
Councillor Wally Collins  
Councillor Dave Lane (arrived 9:17)  

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  
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor  
Brian Head, Manager of Parks and Open Spaces.  
Susan Bonnell, Manager of Communications  
Karen Sherriffs, Manager of Community Development  
Bev Skinner, Manager of Program and Service Delivery  
Jennifer Langmead, Special Projects Coordinator  
Elaine Henley, City Clerk  
Maureen Harvey, Legislative Assistant  

Several members of the media were also present.

ADDITION OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

ADDITION OF THE MINUTES

Recommendation  
Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Hickman

That the Committee of the Whole minutes dated April 25, 2018 be adopted as presented.
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION – COUNCILLOR DAVE LANE

Information Note dated April 25, 2018 re: Council Chambers Technology Upgrade
The Committee was provided with the above note summarizing the next steps for the Council Chambers Technology Upgrade.

1. The Council Chambers Technology Upgrade is proceeding as planned with the assessment of the existing technology and design for future state well underway.
2. The next phase of procuring the required equipment and the related hardware install is anticipated to be complete by the end of August 2018. However, that timeline is contingent on any constraints encountered with install effort in a very challenging construction environment.
3. If the install work proceeds as planned, the final phase of the implementation of the software solution for agenda/meeting management and web streaming should be available for trial usage in late September/ early October 2018.
4. As the install work for Phase 2 commences, another project update will be provided to Council.

Discussion took place on the frustration with the logistics of outside groups using the Foran Greene Room. It was reported a user manual is in the final stages of completion and will assist users of the room. It was also noted that a component of the aging audio system is broken and efforts are being made to find a replacement module until such time as the AV system in the room is replaced.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SUSTAINABILITY – COUNCILLOR IAN FROUDE

Decision Note dated May 2, 2018 re: Goulds Recreation Association Softball Field Proposal

The Committee considered the above.

Recommendation
Moved – Councillor Collins; Seconded - Councillor Lane

That Council approve the conversion of the Eric Williams Soccer Pitch to a softball field.

CARRIED WITH COUNCILLOR JAMIESON DISSENTING

Discussion took place on Century Park on the upgrades that have taken place with concern that replacement of the basketball court asphalt has not taken place as originally promised to residents. The question was whether the City should be putting money into another project with outstanding items on Century Park.
The following points were made:
   a. The proposed field conversion is based on a 50/50 partnership with the Goulds Lions Club.
   b. Century Park has received all upgrades promised, with the exception of asphalt replacement. Staff stated the asphalt at this site is not necessary at this time and the court is in an operable state. i.e. no better or worse than other courts in the City.
   c. Excess funds from the Century Park upgrades were realized mainly because the project was carried out by City staff i.e., the best improvements were made based on available funding.
   d. The delay in bringing forward the field conversion project (from soccer to softball) was to enable staff to review user stats to ensure it was the preferred option.

Councillor Burton excused herself from the meeting at 9:52 am

**COMMUNITY SERVICES AND EVENTS – COUNCILLOR JAMIE KORAB**

**Decision Note dated May 2, 2018 re: Special Events Advisory Committee Report – Proposed St. John’s Rib Fest – July 19th – 22nd – Location at the open space & soccer pitch across from Churchill Square.**

Consideration was given to the above-noted decision note.

Discussion took place with a number of concerns raised:
   a. Residents in the area have already contacted Council with potential concerns of parking and activity associated with the sale of beer on the site.
   b. There is no evidence of what engagement has or will take place in relation to the project.

Discussion concluded with agreement that the matter be deferred pending a meeting that will be initiated by Councillor Froude (Ward Councillor) with staff and the event promoter. All members of Council were invited to attend.

Given the time sensitivity of a decision on this event, the matter will be brought forward to Council at the Regular Meeting May 14, 2018.

**Decision Note dated May 2, 2018 re: Neighbourhood Watch Proposal**

The Committee considered the above noted proposal.

**Recommendation**
Moved – Councillor Stapleton; Seconded - Councillor Hickman
That Council approve to pursue a Neighbourhood Watch partnership with Jiffy Cabs. Upon approval, the Neighbourhood Services team will work with Jiffy Cabs to establish parameters, ensure suitable signage is in place, decals are available for each vehicle, provide education session to Jiffy staff to ensure all messages are accurate and work to expand this concept to other interested taxi providers.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

---

ECONOMIC DEV., TOURISM & CULTURE – DEPUTY MAYOR O’LEARY

Downtown Advisory Committee Report – April 20, 2018

1. Decision Note dated April 12, 2018, re: Downtown Business Exit, Entry and Relocation Survey

The Committee considered the above-cited matter.

Recommendation
Moved – Deputy Mayor O’Leary; Seconded – Councillor Lane

That Council accept the following recommendations:

1. Develop a plan for ongoing connecting and engagement with downtown businesses. This plan will address:
   a. Communication
   b. Building awareness of programs and services
   c. Feedback from businesses
   d. Understanding trends
   e. Welcoming programming

2. A series of targeted meetings with City departments, external stakeholders and other relevant groups to discuss learnings from the downtown survey and previous demographics survey work, and potential options and solutions. For example, it may be worthwhile to convene a conversation that includes parking garage owners as we discuss additional parking possibilities.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Decision Note dated April 9, 2018, re: Fish Festival Concept Plan

Recommendation
Moved – Deputy Mayor O’Leary; Seconded – Councillor Lane
That a Sub-Committee of the Downtown Advisory Committee be struck to develop a fish festival concept and prepare a report to be presented to the Downtown Advisory Committee.

The report will develop a defined set of objectives and a draft program concept, identify possible organizational structure, e.g., not-for-profit, managed by an event company, budget, partnership options (financial and in-kind), identify competitive analysis, outline branding and marketing matters, logistics consideration including regulatory among other factors. A timeline with deliverables should be included in the report. The report of the Sub-Committee would be shared with the Downtown Advisory Committee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, May 23, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:15 am.

Mayor Danny Breen
Chairperson
Title: Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole (COTW) Meetings – Summer Schedule

Date Prepared: May 15, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor & Role: Mayor Danny Breen – Governance and Strategic Direction

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:

Seeking approval from Council to approve the Summer schedule for Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole meetings.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

As per Section 39(1) of the City of St. John’s Act cited below, weekly meetings are not required during the months of July and August.

39. (1) There is to be a meeting of the council for consideration of the general business of the city at least once a week, except during the months of July and August.

Based on the above, the following is the proposed schedule for the weekly Regular and Special meetings of Council:

- Tuesday, July 10, 2018
- Monday, July 23, 2018
- Monday, August 6, 2018
- Monday, August 20, 2018

The weekly Regular and Special meetings will resume on Tuesday, September 4, 2018.

It is further recommended that the Committee of the Whole meet once a month during July and August rather than bi-weekly, as noted below:

- Wednesday, July 25, 2018
- Wednesday, August 22, 2018

The bi-weekly COTW meetings will resume on Wednesday, September 12, 2018.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**
   - N/A

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders**
   - Mayor and Council
   - Staff
   - General Public

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**
   - N/A

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**
   - As per Section 39 (1) of the City of St. John’s Act

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**
   - The general public to be notified accordingly and the public calendar of events to reflect the change(s)

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

7. **Procurement Implications**
   - N/A

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

9. **Other Implications**
   - N/A

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Council approve the proposed summer schedule for Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole meetings for the months of July and August.

Prepared by: Elaine Henley, City Clerk
Approved by: Kevin Breen, City Manager
a. Decision Note dated May 4, 2018 re: 2018 Heritage Grant Applications

The City approved the Heritage Financial Incentives Program in 2016 for which there are two types of grants available:

1. Heritage Maintenance Grant
2. Heritage Conservation Grant

The City has received fourteen applications – thirteen are recommended for approval and one is presented to Council for consideration. The thirteen applications recommended for approval total $28,160.09 plus waiver of the permit fees. If 22 Wood Street is accepted, the total increases to $32,786.54 plus waiver of the permit fees.

### Heritage Maintenance Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quote (HST inc)</th>
<th>25% of quote to a maximum $1,000</th>
<th>Additional Costs due to Heritage Requirements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Riverview Avenue Designated Heritage Building Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Extensive scraping, replacing rotting siding, priming and painting of house and casing around windows.</td>
<td>$3,392.50 (50% of $6,785 total quote is related to façade facing a public street)</td>
<td>$848.13</td>
<td>~$1,500.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$848.13 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Convent Square Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacement of roof shingles.</td>
<td>$4,830.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$2,000.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Convent Square Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacement of roof shingles.</td>
<td>$4,830.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$2,000.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quote (HST inc)</td>
<td>25% of quote to a maximum $5,000</td>
<td>Additional Costs due to Heritage Requirements</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Patrick Street Heritage Area 2</td>
<td>Exterior painting, caulking and some wood replacement.</td>
<td>$3,852.50</td>
<td>(50% of $7,705.00 total quote related to façade facing a public street)</td>
<td>$963.13</td>
<td>~$1,500.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$963.13 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Sudbury Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacing 2 windows and installing wooden trim around existing windows as part of a larger renovation.</td>
<td>$16,675.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$1,750.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Sudbury Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Scrapping and repainting of clapboard and trim.</td>
<td>$3,737.50</td>
<td>(50% of $7,475.00 total quote is related to façade facing a public street)</td>
<td>$934.38</td>
<td>~$1,500.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$934.38 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Water Street Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Replacement of 3 windows, repainting and repointing brick.</td>
<td>$14,260.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$2,100.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heritage Conservation Grant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quote (HST inc)</th>
<th>25% of quote to a maximum $5,000</th>
<th>Additional Costs due to Heritage Requirements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270-272 Water Street Heritage Area 2</td>
<td>Replace façade on east side of building (#270) including brick, and windows. Window headers and sills to be retained (refinished and reinstalled).</td>
<td>$57,385.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>~$30,000.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$5,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Water Street Heritage Area 2</td>
<td>Remove loose and deteriorated coatings, reparge and waterproofing to preserve the building.</td>
<td>$34,072.20</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>~$10,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$5,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182 Hamilton Avenue Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Installing new clapboard siding, pine trim boards and replacing front steps and landing.</td>
<td>$13,110.00</td>
<td>$3,277.50</td>
<td>~$5,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$3,277.50 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Casey Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacing vinyl siding with clapboard and replacing the front door and transom window above door.</td>
<td>$13,229.53</td>
<td>$3,307.38</td>
<td>~$6,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$3,307.38 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Prince of Wales Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>New door and reinstallation of stained glass transom window.</td>
<td>$3,089.46</td>
<td>$772.37</td>
<td>~$1,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$772.37 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Balsam Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>New clapboard, windows and door.</td>
<td>$16,228.80</td>
<td>$4,057.20</td>
<td>~$6,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$4,057.20 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion took place with respect to extending the deadline for application submission to a later date that would fall more in line with the construction season.

It was also noted that the application for 22 Wood Street was submitted in 2018 for work that had been completed in October 2015. Evidently the owner was unaware of the program and the application cannot be included with the others because it is outside of the time frame as stated in the Program terms.

**Recommendation**
Moved by Bruce Blackwood; Seconded by Mark Whelan

That Council approve the heritage grants in the amount of $28,160.09 plus waiver of the permit fees as cited above.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Recommendation**
Moved by Bruce Blackwood; Seconded by Mark Whelan

That Council reopen the Heritage Financial Incentives Program with a deadline of August 31st in order to exhaust the remaining budgeted funds.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Recommendation**
Moved by Dawn Boutilier; Seconded by Rachel Fitkowski

That Council approve the heritage grant for the owner of 22 Wood Street in the amount of $4,626.25 plus the waiver of permit fees as cited above.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Glenn Barnes, NLAA, MRAIC
Chairperson
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 2018 Heritage Grant Applications
Date Prepared: May 10, 2018
Report To: Committee of the Whole
Councillor & Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Planning and Development Lead
Ward: All

Decision/Direction Required: To seek approval of the grant applications as summarized in the attached tables, subject to compliance with the requirements of the Heritage Financial Incentives Program.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
Council approved the City’s Heritage Financial Incentives Program on July 25, 2016 and offers two types of grants:
1. Heritage Maintenance Grant; and
2. Heritage Conservation Grant.

The City has received fourteen (14) applications for the 2018 Grant program. Thirteen (13) applications are recommended for approval and one (1) application is recommended for refusal.

The Heritage Financial Incentives Program may consider applications for work undertaken prior to grant approval at Council’s discretion if the application is accepted within one (1) year of the date the Building Permit was issued. The applicants for 22 Wood Street have completed extensive exterior renovations, however, the Building Permit was issued October 28, 2015. For Council’s consideration:

- The applicants have completed extensive exterior preservation work to their home and if the Building Permit was issued within the past year, the application would be eligible for a Heritage Conservation Grant.
- 2018 is the third year that the Grant Program has been offered. It is still in its infancy and residents are now starting to become aware of the program.
- If the application is recommended for approval, the total for all grants will still be less than the budgeted $50,000.
- Accepting an application that does not comply with the terms may set a precedent for future years.

Given the Building Permit was issued almost three years ago (October 2015), it is recommended to refuse the application for 22 Wood Street.

At the May 8, 2018 Built Heritage Experts Panel meeting, the Panel made two further recommendations:
1) To open the Heritage Financial Incentives Program for a second round of applications with a deadline of August 31st, 2018 in order to exhaust the remaining 2018 funds. Staff have inquired about this possibility and it is not recommended by the Department of Finance and Administration. No other grant programs are opened past the deadline, and this could potentially cause issues in the community/capital grants area.
2) To allow consideration of work undertaken prior to grant approval if the application is received within two (2) years of the date the Building Permit was issued, rather than just one (1) year. A two year period would coincide with the expiry date of Building Permits. It is recommended that Section 3.2 of the Grant terms be revised from one year to two years.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:
The City budgeted $50,000 in the 2018 Budget. 13 grant applications are recommended for approval for a total of $28,160.09 plus waiver of the permit fees. If 22 Wood Street is accepted, the total increases to $32,786.54 plus waiver of the permit fees.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
The City will partner with the property owners through the Heritage Financial Incentive Program.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
   - Neighbourhoods Build our City – Maintain and position downtown as a distinct neighbourhood.
   - A Culture of Cooperation – Create effective City-community collaborations.
   - Fiscally Responsible – Deliver effective grant programs and services.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Not applicable.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

6. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

7. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

8. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

9. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:

1. To approve the thirteen (13) grant applications as summarized in the attached tables subject to compliance with the requirements of the Heritage Financial Incentives Grant Program and the City’s heritage requirements.

2. To refuse the application for 22 Wood Street as it is outside of the permitted time frame.

3. To reject the Panel’s recommendation to reopen the Heritage Financial Incentives Grant Program for a second round of funding.

4. To change Section 3.2 of the Heritage Financial Incentives Grant Program terms to allow consideration of work undertaken prior to grant approval if the application is received within two (2) years of the date the Building Permit was issued.
Prepared by/Signature:
Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP – Planner III, Urban Design and Heritage

Signature: ____________________________________________

Approved by/Date/Signature:
Ken O’Brien, MCIP – Chief Municipal Planner

Signature: ____________________________________________

AMC/kab

Attachments:
Location of Applications
Grant Application Summary Tables
Heritage Financial Incentives Program Terms
8 Riverview Avenue
Designated Heritage Building
Heritage Area 3
24 Convent Square
Heritage Area 3
26 Convent Square
Heritage Area 3
164 Patrick Street
Heritage Area 2
41 Sudbury Street
Heritage Area 3
43 Sudbury Street
Heritage Area 3
310 Water Street
Heritage Area 1
270-272 Water Street
Heritage Area 2
182 Hamilton Avenue
Heritage Area 3
153 Casey Street
Heritage Area 3
68 Prince of Wales Street
Heritage Area 3
17 Balsam Street
Heritage Area 3
22 Wood Street
Heritage Area 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quote (HST inc)</th>
<th>25% of quote to a maximum $1,000</th>
<th>Additional Costs due to Heritage Requirements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 8 Riverview Avenue Designated Heritage Building Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Extensive scraping, replacing rotting siding, priming and painting of house and casing around windows.</td>
<td>$3,392.50 (50% of $6,785 total quote is related to façade facing a public street)</td>
<td>$848.13</td>
<td>~$1,500.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$848.13 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 24 Convent Square Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacement of roof shingles.</td>
<td>$4,830.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$2,000.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 26 Convent Square Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacement of roof shingles.</td>
<td>$4,830.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$2,000.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 164 Patrick Street Heritage Area 2</td>
<td>Exterior painting, caulking and some wood replacement.</td>
<td>$3,852.50 (50% of $7,705.00 total quote related to façade facing a public street)</td>
<td>$963.13</td>
<td>~$1,500.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$963.13 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 41 Sudbury Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Replacing 2 windows and installing wooden trim around existing windows as part of a larger renovation.</td>
<td>$16,675.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$1,750.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) 43 Sudbury Street Heritage Area 3</td>
<td>Scraping and repainting of clapboard and trim.</td>
<td>$3,737.50 (50% of $7,475.00 total quote related to façade facing a public street)</td>
<td>$934.38</td>
<td>~$1,500.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$934.38 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 310 Water Street Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Replacement of 3 windows, repainting and repointing brick.</td>
<td>$14,260.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>~$2,100.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$1,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quote (HST inc)</td>
<td>25% of quote to a maximum $5,000</td>
<td>Additional Costs due to Heritage Requirements</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 270-272 Water Street</td>
<td>Replace façade on east side of building (#270) including brick, and windows. Window headers and sills to be retained (refinished and reinstalled).</td>
<td>$57,385.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$5,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 134 Water Street</td>
<td>Remove loose and deteriorated coatings, re-parge and waterproofing to preserve the building.</td>
<td>$34,072.20</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$5,000.00 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 182 Hamilton Avenue</td>
<td>Installing new clapboard siding, pine trim boards and replacing front steps and landing.</td>
<td>$13,110.00</td>
<td>$3,277.50</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$3,277.50 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 153 Casey Street</td>
<td>Replacing vinyl siding with clapboard and replacing the front door and transom window above door.</td>
<td>$13,229.53</td>
<td>$3,307.38</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$3,307.38 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 68 Prince of Wales Street</td>
<td>New door and reinstallation of stained glass transom window.</td>
<td>$3,089.46</td>
<td>$772.37</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$772.37 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) 17 Balsam Street</td>
<td>New clapboard, windows and door.</td>
<td>$16,228.80</td>
<td>$4,057.20</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$4,057.20 plus permit waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 22 Wood Street</td>
<td>Extensive repair to clapboard and trim, repair to bay windows and repainting.</td>
<td>$18,505.80</td>
<td>$4,626.45</td>
<td>~$10,000.00</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recommended for refusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Area 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Financial Incentives Program

1. Program:

The Heritage Financial Incentives Program is intended to defray some of the development cost difference associated with maintaining and conserving municipally designated Heritage Buildings and those buildings located in the City's designated Heritage Areas, hereinafter referred to as "Heritage Properties". The applicant must substantiate the cost difference and the grant shall not exceed the amount of the cost difference.

2. Financial Incentives:

2.1 Heritage Maintenance Grant: This grant is for the maintenance and repair to façade elements abutting a public street. A grant of up to 25 per cent of the material and labour costs will be available to a maximum of $1,000 per building, per calendar year.

2.2 Heritage Conservation Grant: This grant is for the preservation, restoration and/or replacement of façade elements abutting a public street. A grant of up to 25 per cent of the material and labour costs will be available to a maximum of $5,000 per building, per calendar year.

2.3 Permit Waiver: Once a grant application is approved, Council may waive associated permit fees.

3. General Conditions:

3.1 All work funded by a grant shall comply with all applicable Federal, Provincial and Municipal legislation.

3.2 Any work undertaken prior to grant approval shall be identified and may be considered for funding at Council's discretion provided the City receives the grant application within the time frame as specified in Section 7.1 and within one (1) year of the date the Building Permit was issued.

3.3 For clarity, the use of vinyl siding is permissible in Heritage Areas 2 & 3, however, vinyl siding shall not be eligible for funding.

4. Eligible Work Projects for the Heritage Maintenance Grant:

4.1 Measures undertaken for the maintenance and repair to façade elements abutting a public street, including but not limited to:

- Work to conserve the exterior such as: cornices, parapets, dormers, towers, windows, doors, canopies, and decorative features such as panels, mouldings, trims, carvings and similar architectural details. Subject to demonstrated need, cladding stabilization may also be eligible. This includes the repair and restoration of terracotta and the repointing of stone and brick masonry.
- Work to reconstruct missing exterior elements. This work must be based on drawings, photographs, surviving physical remnants, or other acceptable evidence of the original design.
- Repainting or re-coating of the exterior elements.
- Replacement or repair of roofing shingles, rain gutters, downspouts, flashing, exterior caulking and chimneys to prevent further deterioration due to weather infiltration.

5. Eligible Work Projects for the Heritage Conservation Grant:

5.1 Measures undertaken for the preservation, restoration and/or replacement of façade elements abutting a public street, including but not limited to:
• **Preservation** of existing exterior architectural elements. This may include the preservation of deteriorated windows and doors, cladding, roofing, foundation, cornices, mouldings, architectural trim and other significant features.

• **Restoration** of exterior architectural elements which have been lost but for which the appearance can be clearly determined from physical evidence or documentary sources such as historic drawings or photographs.

• **Replacement** of existing exterior architectural elements that still exist but which are beyond preservation or repair. This includes replacement of deteriorated doors and windows, cladding, roofing, cornices, mouldings, architectural trim, and other significant features.

6. **Not Eligible for Assistance:**

6.1 The following works shall not be eligible:

- New construction;
- Demolition;
- The removal, storage and/or reuse of façade of demolished Heritage Buildings;
- Signage;
- Fences, outbuildings, and landscaping;
- Building relocation;
- Vinyl siding;
- Legal fees and borrowing costs; and
- Owner’s labour.

7. **Application for a Heritage Grant:**

7.1 An application ([http://www.stjohns.ca/forms/heritage-financial-incentives-program-pde-3008](http://www.stjohns.ca/forms/heritage-financial-incentives-program-pde-3008)) for a Heritage Grant shall be made in writing to the City between March 1st and May 1st.

7.2 An application shall be signed by the property owner or a person operating under the owner's written consent. A copy of the written consent shall accompany the application.

7.3 Applications shall include:

- a completed application form;
- current, coloured photographs of the façade abutting a public street, with close-ups of the areas of work, for which the grant is applied. Photographs may be submitted digitally by e-mail or USB drive;
- two cost estimate quotes for the proposed work; and,
- supporting documentation substantiating the amount of increased costs attributed to the designation as a municipal Heritage Building or due to its location in one of the City’s Heritage Areas.

7.4 Late or incomplete applications will not be considered.

8. **Priority of Grant Applications:**

8.1 Priority will be given to:

- designated municipal Heritage Buildings;
- first-time applications;
- the preservation, restoration and weatherproofing historic elements rather than cosmetic improvements; and
- applications supported by a Conservation Plan or a Heritage Report prepared by a design professional (architect, engineer or qualified restoration professional).

9. **Review Process:**

9.1 Applications will be evaluated based on eligibility of work and the work’s positive impact to the public streetscape.

9.2 The Heritage Planner, or his or her designate, shall review and make recommendations to the Built Heritage Experts Panel.

9.3 The Built Heritage Experts Panel shall make recommendations to Council.

9.4 Council may, in its sole discretion approve, approve with conditions, or refuse a grant application.
9.5 Applicants shall be notified in writing of Council’s decision.

10. Applicant’s Responsibilities on Approval of a Grant

10.1 Upon approval of a grant application, the applicant shall:

• submit all costs and work plans to the City;
• obtain a building permit, if one is required, from the City;
• notify the City when there are any deviations to the costs and/or work plans;
• provide any other information as may be requested by Council; and,
• complete the project as set out in the grant application.

11. Funding:

11.1 Funding for the Heritage Financial Incentive Program may be established by Council on an annual basis during budget deliberations.

11.2 Each property shall be limited to one (1) grant per calendar year, and two (2) grants in any four (4) consecutive calendar years.

12. Conditions for Grant Payment

12.1 Applicants are required to complete all work and submit proof of payment of all paid invoices pertaining to the work within 24 months from the date of Council’s approval of the grant.

12.2 Applicants shall submit coloured photographs of the completed work for which the grant is applied. Photographs may be submitted digitally by e-mail or USB drive.

12.3 All work and documentation must be deemed satisfactory upon inspection by the City prior to the disbursement of the grant. If upon final inspection it has been determined that the work has not been completed as per approved plans; and/or, has not been completed in compliance with all applicable legislation, the grant will be cancelled.

12.4 The grant may be cancelled should the work associated with it remain incomplete 24 months after approval of the grant.

12.5 In addition, once a grant is approved, the City may waive any associate permit fees on the application.
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Clearing and Grubbing Policy - Fee Exemption

Date Prepared: May 16, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor & Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Planning and Development Lead

Ward: All

Decision/Direction Required:
To exempt farming operations in the Agricultural (AG) Zone from paying the required $50,000 per hectare security for land approved for clearing and grubbing.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City’s Clearing and Grubbing Policy, see attached, requires that developers provide a $50,000 per hectare security for land approved for clearing and grubbing. The security is returned to the developer once development commences on the approved site. The purpose of the security is to ensure developers do not clear and grub land on speculation without plans to develop. If a reasonable amount of time to develop the site is surpassed, then the City can request the developer to landscape the cleared and grubbed area or use the security to hire a private contractor to do the same.

Some farmers have expressed concerns that their farming activities are not large capital generating operations and that the impacts of providing these securities would be detrimental to the development of new areas for farming.

Key Considerations/Implications:


2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   To support and enhance the farming industry.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: Not Applicable.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Not Applicable.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not Applicable.

7. Procurement Implications: Not Applicable.

8. Information Technology Implications: Not Applicable.


**Recommendation:**
To exempt farming operations in Agricultural (AG) Zones from being required to pay the $50,000 per hectare clearing and grubbing security.

**Prepared by/Signature:**
Dave Wadden, M.Eng., P.Eng. -Manager of Development

Signature: ________________________________

**Approved by/Date/Signature:**
Jason Sinyard, P. Eng, MBA - Deputy City Manager - Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services

Signature: ________________________________

DW/dlm

**Attachments:**
Clearing and Grubbing Policy
City of St. John’s
Development Permit – Stripping and Grading of a Development Lot

A development permit for stripping and grading is NOT required if:

- The area concerned is less than 1,000 square metres;
- The stripping or excavation is part of a development for which a development permit has been issued;
- The applicant has already signed a development agreement with The City for the area concerned.

Otherwise, the following information is required to be submitted by the Applicant for review by the City of St. John’s. Incomplete applications will not be processed.

REQUIRED INFORMATION:

A Clearing and Grubbing Report must be submitted with the following information:

- Project name
- Applicant Name, Address and Contact Info
- Property location (legal address)
- Land Owners Name, Address and Contact Info (if other than the Applicant)
- Land Owners consent form (See attached document)
- Estimated start date for clearing and grubbing activities
- Estimated start date for construction of development project
- Legal land description (surveys)
- Development application file number
- Overall site size to be stripped and graded under this application (ha)
- Description of existing site (include current and past site use, type of vegetation present, percent of site currently vegetated/forested, slopes, current underground or above ground infrastructure, any mounds or depressions or stockpiles, type of soil, possible areas of contamination, current drainage pathways, final discharge points). Include site plans, photos etc.
- Description of adjacent areas within 150 m of the site (in particular, provide information on properties that may be impacted by dust, runoff, flooding, rodents, etc., as a result of the proposed vegetation removal). Include site descriptions, photos, etc.
- Description (including final grades, site features, etc.) of site following clearing and grading activities
- Methods for controlling dust from the site
- Methods for controlling rodents and other pests from the site
If Approval-in-Principle has not been granted for the proposed development as per the City’s Development Policy, plans will be required, outlining the following items:

- **Access Points**: A concept plan will be required, and reviewed for the potential impact of traffic generated by the proposed development. The proposed vehicular access points to the site must be indicated. A traffic study may be required, if requested by the Development Engineer.

- **Water Supply**: The proposed connection point to the City’s existing infrastructure must be indicated. The proposed method of supplying water to the development will be evaluated to determine if adequate pressures and flows exist in the City’s system.

- **Sanitary Sewer Generation**: The proposed connection point to the City’s existing infrastructure must be indicated. The City’s sanitary sewer network will be evaluated to determine if the present system has capacity available to accommodate the flows that would be generated by the proposed development.

- **Storm Sewer Generation**: The proposed connection point to the City’s existing infrastructure must be indicated. The City’s storm sewer network will be evaluated to determine if the present system has capacity to accommodate the flows that would be generated by the proposed development.

The following plans are to be prepared by a Professional Engineer registered to practice in Newfoundland and Labrador, and submitted to the City for review:

- General site plan, indicating property lines, existing survey control markers, easements, right-of-ways, existing utilities and services, existing trees and major vegetation, unusual parcel conditions, and the means by which all storm water in and from the subject lands will be controlled and disposed of. Downstream culverts should be shown to handle the existing surface runoff and any anticipated increase in runoff.

- Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan for all stages of site preparation. The plans should utilize design features such as construction entrances, filter berms, sediment basins, sediment traps, swales and check dams, to adequately deal with sediment. These plans will be updated and submitted for review as required. In addition to providing the details of the proposed erosion and sedimentation control practices, the ESC plan will include the names and contact information of the people responsible for implementing the plan, the inspection and maintenance schedule as well as emergency response plans. Consideration must be given to the impact of seasonal changes on the efficacy of various control techniques.

As a condition of this Permit:

- The City of St. John's reserves the right to ask for all ESDC inspection reports and accompanying photos at any given time to ensure compliance with the ESDC Plan.

- Requires a security in the amount of **$50,000 per hectare** of land that will be cleared. The security will be released when site development commences. After clearing the site, should the developer fail to adequately develop the site after a reasonable amount of time, as determined by City Staff, the security will be used to reinstate the site.
Title: Temporary Exemption to Noise by-law

Date Prepared: May 16, 2018

Report To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council

Ward: 4

Decision/Direction Required:
For consideration of council to approve a temporary exemption to the Noise By-Law to allow work to take place between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. for a four-week period starting May 29, 2018 to June 22, 2018.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
On occasion, requests come in from developers and contractors to work outside the hours of the current Noise By Law (7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.). This depends on the project involved, location and the complexity of construction.

A request has been submitted from the contractor RCS Construction who is constructing an extension to the Avalon Mall at 48 Kenmount Road to work from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to enable them to erect the steel frame of the extension in a safe and timely manner.

Due to the Avalon Mall remaining open during regular business hours and the amount of general public and school children in the immediate area, the contractor has deemed it would be in the interest of public safety to perform this part of the construction after the Mall closes each day.

To facilitate this work, a large mobile crane will be installed onsite for the overhead erection of the steel frame. Night time lighting will be set up onsite directed towards the construction area only. The contractor will try and limit any unnecessary construction noise. Any process where excessive noises are created will be done during regular daytime hours.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not Applicable
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not Applicable
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: Not Applicable
4. Legal or Policy Implications: Exemption to the City of St. John’s Noise By-Law Section 5(1) Provincial Occupational Health and Safety measures to be enforced by the Province
5. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Public notification and announcements would have to be made by the contractor to advise the public of the situation taking place and the disruption taking place.

6. Human Resource Implications: Not Applicable

7. Procurement Implications: Not Applicable

8. Information Technology Implications: Not Applicable

9. Other Implications: Area residents will be affected by this work going on at night time, construction noise and site lighting will have an effect on the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that Council permit the exemption to the Noise By-Law subject to the hours and time frame applied for, public notification and announcements to take place prior to work starting.

**Prepared by/Signature:**
Rob Schamper, CET, Technical Advisor Regulatory Services

Signature: __________________________

**Approved by/Date/Signature:**
Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA, Deputy City Manager, Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services

Signature: __________________________

**Attachments:** Appendix “A” Site Drawing
Steel erection will begin at GL 3-Q and continue working each bay directly to FL3.6 moving north. Each bay must be 100% erected including balancers, joists, decking, girts and miscellaneous members prior to starting the next. As the steel is erected each new bay will block access for the crane to the previous bay. Steel erection is scheduled to last for approximately 1 month and during this time it is not possible to move the crane after initial set-up to the job configuration being used.
Title: Rennie’s River East Traffic Pattern Review  
Date Prepared: May 16, 2018  
Report To: Committee of the Whole  
Councillor/Theme: Debbie Hanlon - Transportation  
Ward: 4 and 2

Decision/Direction Required:
Decision is required to adopt the recommendations of the Rennie’s River East Traffic Pattern Review.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
At the direction of Council, a review of current traffic circulation and patterns in the area of Rennie’s River between Portugal Cove Road and King’s Bridge Road was completed to determine if changes can be made to improve network connectivity. The Rennie’s River East Traffic Pattern Review identifies existing area traffic restrictions including current restrictions creating circulation barriers and explores potential options for improvement.

Peak hour traffic and pedestrian data was collected at study intersections to better understand how people currently travel through the area. Traffic restrictions were mapped and barriers to connectivity in the area were identified. Based on a technical analysis of data collected and a review of collision history at study intersections, the following potential changes were developed and presented for public consultation:

A) Remove the entry restriction onto Winter Avenue to restore the westbound through connection.  
B) Allow off-peak left turns onto King’s Bridge Road at the Dominion access.  
C) Construct a sidewalk or trail along the south side of Circular Road between Bannerman Road and King’s Bridge Road, adjacent to the Government House property.  
D) Construct curb extensions or upgrade the Empire Avenue/Circular Road intersection to a mini-roundabout to allow turning movements, calm traffic, and improve connectivity.  
E) Upgrade the Circular Road/Rennie’s Mill Road intersection to a mini-roundabout and reverse one-way flow along Circular road to improve safety and create a westbound route through the area.

The engagement webpage for the project went live on April 18, 2018 where those interested were invited to complete an online survey to share their opinions of the changes being considered. Two in person drop-in engagement sessions were hosted at the Bannerman Pool House on May 2, 2018 and on May 3, 2018 where participants were invited to as questions, discuss, and provide feedback on
the possible area changes. There were over 480 valid survey responses and about 40 people, primarily from the immediate neighbourhood, attended the in-person engagement sessions.

The survey results and feedback received were reviewed to determine which potential changes were generally supported. Based on public support and further technical considerations, the following recommendations are advanced for Council consideration:

- Remove the entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road and consult with residents of Winter Avenue regarding the installation of permanent speed humps along the roadway.
- Permit eastbound left turn movements at the Dominion Access onto King’s Bridge Road outside of morning and evening weekday peak hours.
- Construct a sidewalk connection along the south side of Circular Road between Bannerman Road and King’s Bridge Road.
- Construct the proposed curb extension and traffic calming concept along Carpasian Road at the Empire Avenue and the Circular Road intersections and permit left and through movements on Empire Avenue at Carpasian Road outside of morning and evening weekday peak hours.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

**Budget/Financial Implications**

The following recommended changes require additional budget allocation:

- If resident support for the permanent installation of speed cushions along Winter Avenue is received, the cost to construct these traffic calming features will be approximately $12,000. This can be funded from the existing Traffic Calming Budget.
- The approximate cost to construct the proposed segment of sidewalk along Circular Road is on the order of $60,000.
- The proposed curb extension and traffic calming treatments along Carpasian Road at the Empire Avenue and Circular Road intersections are estimated to cost on the order of $100,000 to $200,000.

**Partners or Other Stakeholders**

n/a

**Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**

The attached paid parking management strategy directly acts on the City values of “Continue to Do Things Better” and “Be Innovative” and will contribute to these strategic directions and goals:

- Neighbourhoods Build our City: Promote a safe and secure city
- Create neighbour-focused plans and information
Effective Organization: Create a culture of engagement
Identify and deliver on projects, strategies, and programs

Legal or Policy Implications
n/a

Engagement and Communications Considerations
Further engagement and communications with are residents and citizens regarding the proposed changes will be completed.

Human Resource Implications
n/a

Procurement Implications
n/a

Information Technology Implications
n/a

Other Implications
n/a

Recommendations:
That council approve the recommendations of the attached Rennie’s River East Traffic Pattern Review and that budget identified as required to complete the proposed changes be allocated when available.

Prepared by:
Anna Bauditz, Transportation System Engineer
Signature: ________________________________

Approved by:
Garrett Donaher, Manager - Transportation Engineering
Signature: ________________________________

Attachments:
Rennie’s River East Traffic Pattern Review
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Introduction

Follow a request from residents a traffic calming assessment was conducted on Winter Avenue in April, 2016. In 2017 a survey was circulated to Winter Avenue residents to determine if there was sufficient support for a permanent traffic calming installation. In this survey the City received the suggestion of implementing a No Entry restriction at Winter Avenue and King’s Bridge Road. A follow up poll was conducted among those who had responded to the original survey and sufficient support for this idea was established.

Through traffic on Winter Avenue was a key concern for residents. Staff identified that this restriction would likely be more effective at reducing through traffic on Winter Avenue than other forms of traffic calming. Staff also identified that this restriction would impact the travel patterns for those that currently use the through route, however quantifying this impact was not feasible at the time. Council considered the possible impacts and, on staff’s recommendation, agreed to implement the No Entry restriction. Council did have concern about the unquantified impact and directed staff to conduct a follow up assessment of the restriction to determine the effectiveness and impacts of the change.

Upon implementation in summer of 2017 public feedback regarding the No Entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road led Council to identify the need to study frustration with restricted turning movements in a broader area of Rennie’s River between Portugal Cove Road and King’s Bridge Road. Council directed that a review of the existing traffic operations, circulation, and restrictions in the area be completed to determine if changes can be made to improve network connectivity.

Study Area

This review focuses on the primary roadway network within the area surrounding the east portion of Rennie’s River. Figure 1 illustrates the general study area and provides a list of the study area intersections.
Peak hour pedestrian and vehicle count data was collected at study intersections and additional area intersections to better understand how people currently travel through the area. Counts were competed at each intersection on a typical weekday between February 7, 2018 and March 15, 2018.

It is recognized that due to the time of year pedestrian activity would not be as high as other times of year. This was considered and accounted for in the assessment conducted.

Figure 2 summarizes peak hour vehicle count data and illustrates existing intersection traffic control and turning restrictions in place.
Figure 2: Peak Hour Vehicle Traffic Volumes and Existing Restrictions
Roadway Network Connectivity

Northbound/Southbound

Peak hour vehicle volumes recorded support the understanding that King’s Bridge Road functions as the primary north/south corridor through the area while Portugal Cove Road and Carpasian Road also serve as major north/south links. Although congestion along these routes (in particular along King’s Bridge Road between The Boulevard and Circular Road) limits traffic flow during time of peak demand, no existing restrictions act as barriers to north/south connectivity.

Signal timing at the intersections of King’s Bridge Road & The Boulevard and King’s Bridge Road & Empire Avenue (Circular Road) will be reviewed and adjusted to optimize peak hour traffic flow along the King’s Bridge corridor.

Eastbound/Westbound

To better understand existing eastbound and westbound circulation through the study area, available route options between major area entry and exit points were mapped. Figure 3 and Figure 4 illustrate existing eastbound and westbound travel patterns through the area respectively and identify existing restrictions that create circulation barriers.

As shown in Figure 3, eastbound travel through the study area is relatively unrestricted. Although the right turn only restrictions on Empire Avenue at Carpasian Road and at Rennie’s Mill Road and the southbound left turn restriction on Rennie’s Mill Road at Empire Avenue divert eastbound traffic to Circular Road, eastbound connectivity is still maintained.

Westbound travel through the Rennie’s River East area is significantly impacted by existing restrictions. As shown in Figure 4, major area westbound exit points along Carpasian Road, Empire Avenue, Circular Road and Rennie’s Mill Road cannot be reached within the study area. Travel outside the study area is required to get to these destinations. Right turn only restrictions at Lake Avenue and the Dominion access on King’s Bridge Road coupled with the no-entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road requires westbound traffic to travel along New Cove Road or re-route along Carnell Drive and The Boulevard or along Lake View Avenue and Forest Road. Existing turning restrictions in place at Empire Avenue & Rennie’s Mill Road and one-way eastbound travel along Circular Road between Carpasian Road and Rennie’s Mill Road requires westbound traffic to divert north along Rennie’s Mill Road or south along Bannerman Road.

Pedestrian Activity

Figure 5 illustrates area transit stops and the peak hour pedestrian crossing volumes recorded at study intersections. Because of study timing, counts were completed during winter months. Pedestrian volumes captured therefore represent seasonal off-peak levels. It is noted that a higher concentration of pedestrians is found along area transit routes and in the areas of major employment and commercial development. During summer months, an overall increase in area pedestrian activity is expected with a significant increase in recreational pedestrian activity.
Figure 3: Eastbound Study Area Circulation

Legend:
- Major Area Entry Points
- Major Area Exit Points
- Available Route Options
- Barriers to Eastbound Connectivity
Figure 4: Westbound Study Area Circulation
Figure 5: Peak Hour Pedestrian Crossing Volumes
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- AM Peak Hour (PM Peak Hour) Two-Way Pedestrian Crossing Volume
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February/March 2018
Peak Hour Pedestrian Volumes

St. John's
Circulation Barriers and Constraints

A review of each of the restrictions causing circulation barriers in the Rennie’s River East area was completed. The rational behind maintaining these restrictions was explored and possible changes to the restrictions were identified.

Right Turn Only restriction onto King’s Bridge Road from Lake Avenue

The intersection of Lake Avenue & King’s Bridge Road is located just north of the signalized intersection of Empire Avenue (Circular Road) & King’s Bridge Road. The close proximity of these intersections creates conflict points and safety concerns for left-turning vehicles at Lake Avenue. This constraint coupled with the level of traffic activity at the Empire Avenue/King’s Bridge Road intersection supports keeping the current restriction in place. Therefore, no changes to the existing right turn only restriction are recommended.

Turning movement restrictions at Empire Avenue & Rennie’s Mill Road

The existing turning movement restrictions at the Empire Avenue/Rennie’s Mill Road intersection were implemented over 15 years ago in response to safety concerns and the collision history of the intersection. The grade along Rennie’s Mill Road and the skewed angles at which Empire Avenue and Rennie’s Mill Road intersect create very poor sightlines for vehicles at the intersection. These constraints, the limited right of way available in the area to accommodate changes, and the level of traffic activity along Rennie’s Mill Road support keeping the current restrictions in place. Therefore, no changes to the existing turning movement restrictions at the Empire Avenue/Rennie’s Mill Road intersection are recommended.

No Entry onto Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road

Traffic calming along Winter Avenue was requested by residents to address traffic volume and speed concerns. The street qualified for traffic calming in 2016 and the no-entry restriction onto Winter Avenue from King’s Bridge Road was chosen through the process outlined in the City’s Traffic Calming Policy.

While 85th percentile speeds along Winter Avenue were measured above the posted speed limit of 30 km/hr, the volume of traffic contributed significantly to the traffic calming warrant score. Although placing a no-entry restriction comes with connectivity implications, it is a more effective tool in reducing traffic volumes. The overall extent of the restriction impacts could only be determined through implementation. Given these considerations and resident support for the measure at the time, it was decided that the no-entry restriction onto Winter Avenue from King’s Bridge Road would be implemented and the impacts on traffic volumes and speeds would be evaluated. The restriction put in place on August 7, 2017. Figure 6 summarizes the daily traffic volumes and speeds measured along Winter Avenue before and after the no-entry restriction was implemented. Counts were completed along the midpoint of the street between King’s Bridge Road and Portugal Cove Road.
Figure 6: Winter Avenue – Measured 24-hour Traffic Volumes and 85th Percentile Speeds

As shown in Figure 5, implementation of the no-entry restriction resulted in re-routing approximately 870 westbound trips to other area streets in a 24-hour period. It is noted that a portion of these re-routed trips represents local traffic. The magnitude of re-routed local traffic is estimated to be on the order of 350 to 400 daily trips (approximately 40% to 45% of the re-routed traffic) based on the number of homes in the immediate area and the volume of westbound traffic present along Winter Avenue intersection after the restriction was implemented.

Given these assumptions this restriction prevented roughly 500 drivers from travelling through the area. Based on the distribution of vehicles throughout the day roughly 75% of these, or 375, would be on Winter avenue during the core 8AM to 6PM daytime window. This is an average of 37.5 vehicles in each hour of the core daytime. Further distributing these to the single busiest hour it is estimated to have 60% more traffic than the average: 60 vehicles per hour. Therefor the final estimate for impact to non-local drivers is about 1 vehicle per 60 seconds at the peak, or around 1 vehicle per 90 seconds on average.

It is noted that implementation of the no-entry restriction had no significant effect on travel speeds along the roadway based on speed data recorded before and after the restriction was placed.

The no-entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road creates an additional barrier to constrained westbound travel through the Rennie’s River Area. Given the portion of reassigned westbound traffic local to the area that is impacted by the restriction and that other measures to address speeds along Winter Avenue may be available:

(A) The option to remove the entry restriction onto Winter Avenue to restore the westbound through connection was considered as a possible change.
**Left turn restriction onto King’s Bridge Road from the Dominion Access**

The westbound left turn movement onto King’s Bridge Road from the Dominion access intersection is currently banned. Sightlines at this intersection are adequate and queuing space along the access approach is provided, however, traffic volumes along King’s Bridge Road during the weekday peak hours represent a constraint. Capacity assessment results indicate that while westbound left turning traffic would experience long delays and a low level of service during the morning and evening weekday peak hours, sufficient capacity exists to permit the movement during off-peak hours.

(B) The option to allow off-peak left turns onto King’s Bridge Road at the Dominion access was considered as a possible change.

**South Side of Circular Road**

While most major study area roadways include sidewalks to accommodate pedestrians, the south side of Circular Road east of Bannerman Road adjacent to the Government House property represents a break in this network. An informal trail has developed from use along this link which suggests demand may support formalizing and improving this connection. Pedestrians travelling along the south side of the street also interact with fewer residential driveways and do not have to navigate the crossing where Empire Avenue and Circular Road meet. A trail rather than a sidewalk could accommodate cycling should a future cycling route be established along this link.

(C) The option to construct a sidewalk or trail along the south side of Circular Road in this area was considered as a possible change.

**Turning movement restrictions at Empire Avenue & Carpasian Road**

The existing turning movement restrictions at the Empire Avenue/Carpasian Road were implemented over 15 years ago in conjunction with the restrictions implemented at the Empire Avenue/ Rennie’s Mill Road intersection. These right-turn only restrictions along Empire Avenue were placed to address safety concerns and high collision rates. Factors contributing to these safety concerns at the intersection include poor sightlines for approaching vehicles along Empire Avenue, the width and exposed eastbound/westbound crossing of Carpasian Road (>15m), and vehicle volumes and speeds along Carpasian Road. At the time, a number of alternative measures including convex mirrors, a four-way stop, traffic signals, and a beacon warning system were considered but the turning movement restrictions were deemed to be the most suitable choice.

While the turning movement restrictions have resulted in an overall reduction in collisions at the intersection, they have created a barrier to eastbound and westbound connectivity. Consideration was therefore given to possible alternative measures that would permit better eastbound/westbound connectivity while still maintaining safe intersection operations.

(D) The option to allow construct curb extensions or upgrade the intersection to a mini-roundabout to allow turning movements, calm traffic, and improve connectivity was considered as a possible change.
Turning movement restrictions at Circular Road & Rennie’s Mill Road

In the years following implementation of the turning movement restrictions at the Empire Avenue/Rennie’s Mill Road and the Empire Avenue/Carpasian Road intersections, Circular Road between Carpasian (Monkstown) Road and Rennie’s Mill Road was converted from two-way to one-way eastbound circulation. Eastbound and westbound traffic along Empire Avenue had re-routed to this segment of Circular Road after the turning movement restrictions were placed. The circulation change was made to address this increase in traffic as well as an increase in collisions at the Circular Road/Monkstown Road intersection. While this change was effective in reducing traffic volumes along a portion of Circular Road, westbound connectivity in the area was further constrained.

(E) The option to upgrade the Circular Road/Rennie’s Mill Road intersection to a mini-roundabout and reverse one-way flow along Circular road to improve safety and create a westbound route through the area was considered as a possible change.
Figure 7: Rennie’s River East Public Engagement Tool

Legend:
- Support for existing restrictions
- Planned work
- Possible changes
- Trail/pathway

Constraints:
- Line of sight
- Peak hour traffic volume
- No opportunity for change

Constraints:
- PM peak hour traffic volume

Potential adjustments to peak hour signal timing to improve flow along King’s Bride Road

Intersection infrastructure improvements being made as part of the Quidi Vidi Winners Circle Project

Possible Changes to Area Restrictions:

A. Winter Avenue & King’s Bridge Road
Remove entry restriction onto Winter Avenue to restore westbound through connection

B. Dominion Access & King’s Bridge Road
Allow off-peak left turns (No Left 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) to improve westbound connectivity

C. South side of Circular Road
Construct a sidewalk or trail

D. Empire Avenue & Carpsias Road
Construct curb extensions or upgrade the intersection to a mini-roundabout to allow turning movements, calm traffic, improve safety, and create an eastbound route through the area

E. Circular Road & Rennie’s Mill Road
Upgrade the intersection to a mini-roundabout and reverse one-way flow along Circular Road to improve safety and create a westbound route through the area
Public Consultation and Consideration of Potential Area Changes

Public consultation formed an important component of the travel pattern review. The possible area changes described above were shared with citizens to gather feedback and determine which changes were supported by the public. The engagement webpage for the project went live on April 18, 2018 where those interested were invited to complete an online survey to share their opinions of the changes being considered. A copy of questions asked through the survey is appended to the report for reference in Appendix A.

Two in person drop-in engagement sessions were hosted at the Bannerman Pool House on Wednesday, May 2, 2018 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM and on Thursday, May 3, 2018 from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM. Participants were invited to ask questions, discuss, and provide feedback on the possible area changes.

Figure 7 was used as part of the survey and drop-in session materials to summarize and present the potential area changes to the public.

The online survey was closed one week following the drop-in sessions on Thursday, May 10, 2018 after being open 22 days for participation. It is noted that a large number of duplicate surveys were completed. These spurious responses were removed from the overall survey results before analysis was completed. In total, 482 valid responses to the survey were received.

Overall, 55% of survey participant identified as residents of the area while 45% identified as individuals who travel through the area. Participants were asked how often they travel through the area and by what primary mode. The charts below present the travel habits of survey respondents.

As shown, the majority of survey participants travel by vehicle through the Rennie’s River East area on a daily basis.

The results of the survey and the feedback received was considered alongside the technical merits and constraints of the potential area changes. Recommendations were developed based on a review of this information.
**(A) Winter Avenue & King’s Bridge Road**

The majority of survey participants indicated their support for removing the entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road. Furthermore, 66% of survey respondents who identified as residents of the area supported this proposed change.

While restoring westbound connectivity along Winter Avenue is generally supported, residents along the street are very concerned about traffic volumes returning and vehicles continuing to speed along the street.

Construction of permanent traffic calming speed cushions would reduce vehicles speeds along the street (which were not improved by the entry restriction). While removing the entry restriction at King’s Bridge Road restores a westbound route along Winter Avenue, speed cushions and appropriate signage indicating entry to a traffic calmed neighbourhood would also help to discourage non-local traffic. As per the City’s traffic calming process, residents of Winter Avenue and Judge Place would be consulted further to determine if installation of speed cushions is supported. A notice including the proposed layout of speed cushions along Winter Avenue, as shown in Appendix B, would be circulated to residents to gather feedback. With a majority of residents’ support, the speed cushions could be installed later this construction season for a cost of approximately $12,000 and could be funded from the existing Traffic Calming Budget.

It is recommended that the entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road be removed and that residents of Winter Avenue be consulted as to whether the installation of permanent speed cushions along the roadway is supported.
(B) Dominion Access & King’s Bridge Road

The results of the survey show that a small majority of participants support allowing off-peak left turns onto King’s Bridge Road from the Dominion access.

As previously noted, analysis indicates that capacity is available to allow this movement outside of the evening peak hour. While results indicate the left turn movement could be accommodated in the morning peak hour, maintaining the right-turn only restriction during this time would be a more conservative approach. Sightlines at the intersection are adequate and the upstream and downstream signals along King’s Bridge Road create additional breaks in through traffic at the intersection.

Permitting this movement would also help accommodate a portion of westbound traffic previously using Winter Avenue.

It is recommended that the existing right-turn only restriction for eastbound movements at the Dominion Access/King’s Bridge Road intersection be in effect during morning and evening weekday peak hours (from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM, Monday through Friday) and that the left turn exit to King’s Bridge Road be permitted outside these times.

If unforeseen problems arise the full time right-turn only restriction could be reintroduced.
(C) South Side of Circular Road between Bannerman Road & King’s Bridge Road

Most of the survey participants support the construction of a sidewalk or trail along the south side of Circular Road, adjacent to the Government House property. A larger number of respondents indicated that they were neutral or undecided about this change.

As a large number of participants indicated that walking was not one of their travel modes through the area, results were grouped into responses of “walkers” (participants who listed walking as either their primary or secondary mode of travel) and “non-walkers”.

This breakdown shows that while a larger number of participants who walk through the area support this possible change, a plurality of “non-walkers” also support the construction of a trail or sidewalk in this location.

As previously noted, formalizing this link would also help pedestrians travelling along Circular Road avoid crossing the street at Empire Avenue.

A high-level cost estimate for this 300 m link of sidewalk is on the order of $60,000 including some anticipated utility relocation work.

It is recommended that a sidewalk connection along the south side of Circular Road between Bannerman Road and King’s Bridge Road be constructed as soon as budget is allocated.
(D) Empire Avenue & Carpasian Road

The possibility to remove the existing turning movement restrictions at the Empire Avenue/Carpasian Road intersection received the greatest level of public support with almost 80% of survey participants in favour of the potential change.

A mini-roundabout at this intersection would maintain and calm traffic flow along Carpasian Road while providing right-of-way and additional capacity for side street movements along Empire Avenue. While this treatment may improve intersection operations and safety, grades along Carpasian Road pose a significant technical challenge. Public engagement feedback indicated that while participants were supportive of an intersection treatment that would remove the existing turn restrictions they were hesitant and had concerns about a mini-roundabout. This concern was particularly strong among those who are familiar with the difficulty some drivers have on this hill during slippery conditions.

Curb extensions at this intersection would calm traffic along Carpasian Road while providing improved sightlines for vehicles approaching the intersection along Empire Avenue. While this treatment does not increase the intersection capacity for side street movements, it reduces the exposed crossing distance for both vehicles and pedestrians. While capacity constraints support maintaining the existing right-turn only restriction during weekday peak hours, off-peak left and through movements from Empire Avenue could be permitted at this intersection if curb extensions were developed.

Participants at the drop-in engagement sessions indicated that the existing marked crosswalk on Carpasian Road is underutilized given less than optimal placement. Curb extensions at the Empire Avenue/Carpasian Road intersection would provide an opportunity to locate a marked crosswalk on Carpasian Road across the north approach of the intersection.

Public feedback also raised the concern of vehicles speeding along Carpasian Road. The wide cross-section of Carpasian Road in combination with roadway grades in this location are likely contributing to this issue. By incorporating curb extensions at the Circular Road/Monkstown (Carpasian) Road intersection to the south and developing a traffic calming centre island on Carpasian Road to the north, this issue should be significantly improved.

Figure 8 illustrates a curb extension and traffic calming concept for Carpasian Road in the subject area. It is anticipated that design and construction of this project may cost between $100,000 and $200,000.
It is recommended that the proposed curb extension and traffic calming concept along Carpasian Road at the Empire Avenue and the Circular Road intersections be constructed as soon as funds are allocated. Once complete, left and through movements on Empire Avenue at Carpasian Road will be permitted outside of the morning and evening weekday peak hours.
(E) Circular Road & Rennie’s Mill Road

Survey feedback regarding the potential to create a westbound route along Circular Road was generally positive. It is noted that when survey participants were separated into daily and weekly travel habits, daily users of the area were 62% in favour of the possible change while weekly users were 78% in favour. This indicates that a greater portion of those supporting the proposed change would use the route less often.

Concern was also expressed regarding how a mini-roundabout at the Circular Road/Rennie’s Mill Road intersection would operate, especially in winter. Some residents of Circular Road were also concerned about a potential increase in vehicle volumes along the roadway.

A number of technical constraints including grades, sightlines, and traffic volumes pose a challenge to implementing a mini-roundabout treatment at this location. In addition, by creating the described westbound route, an increased number of vehicles may wish to travel along Empire Avenue through the King’s Bridge Road intersection. The King’s Bridge Road intersection represents a pinch point for capacity in the existing road network and an increase in westbound traffic would oppose the existing high volume of eastbound left turns at the intersection.

Reversing eastbound flow along this segment of Circular Road would also eliminate the existing route that allows eastbound vehicles on Circular Road to make a left turn onto Rennie’s Mill Road to head north on Portugal Cove Road.

Given the technical considerations and constraints, no changes to the Circular Road/Rennie’s Mill Road intersection restrictions or travel direction along Circular Road are recommended at this time.

Bicycle Considerations

The City of St. John’s is currently in the process of retaining a consultant to complete an updated Bike St. John’s Master Plan. This new master plan will consider existing and future bike routes and facilities in the City and will make specific recommendations for priority projects.

While no recommendations specific to cycling are made as part of this traffic pattern review, consideration will be given when implementing any proposed changes to ensure cycling in the area is not negatively impacted. Any planned infrastructure changes will be reviewed to determine if cycling routes and accommodation should be coordinated and incorporated as part of the project work.
Additional Area Considerations

As part of the possible Quidi Vidi Winners Circle project, improvements could be made to the intersection of Lake Avenue & Clancey Drive. These changes would clarify right of way, improve pedestrian connectivity, and reduce conflicts at this location.

Figure 9: Proposed Concept for Clancey Drive & Lake View Avenue Realignment

Kings Bridge Road between Empire Avenue and Military Road is schedule for rehabilitation next year. As part of this project, the existing southbound Metrobus stop across from Forest Avenue will be reviewed to determine if a bus lay-by can be developed. This stop is a transfer point and oftentimes busses block southbound traffic on King’s Bridge Road. A formal bus loading lane would allow southbound traffic to navigate around queued busses and improve traffic flow along King’s Bridge Road.

King’s Bridge Road & Empire Avenue Intersection Configuration

The intersection of King’s Bridge Road and Empire Avenue is a pinch point in the area road network capacity. The need to accommodate northbound and southbound traffic volumes competes with providing service for a high volume of eastbound left turn movements at the signalized intersection.

A technical review of signal timing plans in place at the Empire Avenue/King’s Bridge Road and New Cove Road (The Boulevard)/King’s Bridge Road was completed. While small adjustments may be made to optimize signal operations, the presence of the enhanced crosswalk on King’s Bridge Road between the intersections creates an interruption in coordination along King’s Bridge Road.
Some movements at the intersection, including the eastbound left turn, are approaching capacity during the AM and PM peak hours and may experience longer delays and queues. While operations are constrained during times of peak demand, none of the movements at the intersection are over capacity. It is also noted that traffic volumes at the intersection have remained relatively stable over the past 15 years. Therefore, large scale capacity upgrades are not currently warranted.

Possible changes to the existing intersection configuration that would not require adjustment of the existing roadway cross-section or right-of-way were explored. The opportunity to convert the existing left turn lane and shared through/right lane on the southbound approach of the intersection to a shared left/through lane and a shared through/right lane was considered. This would require banning the northbound left turn movement and removing the dedicated arrow for the southbound left turn movement at the intersection. In addition, the two southbound through lanes would be required to merge downstream to a single lane.

Although capacity assessments indicate this revised intersection configuration would increase capacity for southbound through traffic and provide improved levels of service for some movements, results assume that southbound traffic will use both lanes roughly equally. This assumption is likely unreliable given existing travel habits and the required downstream lane merge. In addition, the permissive southbound left turn movement under the revised scenario would change established patterns for this left turn at the intersection. Therefore, no changes to the existing configuration of the Empire Avenue/King’s Bridge Road are recommended at this time.

**Summary of Recommendations**

Based on the traffic pattern review completed for the Rennie’s River East Area, the following recommendations are made:

- Remove the entry restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road and consult with residents of Winter Avenue regarding the installation of permanent speed cushions along the roadway.

- Permit eastbound left turn movements at the Dominion Access onto King’s Bridge Road outside of morning and evening weekday peak hours.

- Construct a sidewalk connection along the south side of Circular Road between Bannerman Road and King’s Bridge Road.

- Construct the proposed curb extension and traffic calming concept along Carpasian Road at the Empire Avenue and the Circular Road intersections and permit left and through movements on Empire Avenue at Carpasian Road outside of morning and evening weekday peak hours.
APPENDIX A – Rennie’s River East Traffic Pattern Review Survey Questions

Let us know how you get around this area and what you think about the five possible changes we have identified for this area. Visit the project engage page for more information or to leave comments or suggestions.

How often do you travel through the area shown above?
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly or less often

How do you usually travel through the area?
- Vehicle (as a driver or passenger)
- Transit
- Walk
- Bike
How else do you travel through the area?
☐ Vehicle (as a driver or passenger)
☐ Transit
☐ Walk
☐ Bike
☐ Not applicable, I only use my primary mode of transportation through the area

Do you live in the area?
☐ Yes
☐ No

(A) Would you like the "No Entry" restriction onto Winter Avenue removed?
This would restore the westbound through connection.
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Undecided or neutral

(B) Would you like to be permitted to make a left turn exit from Dominion onto King’s Bridge Road?
An afternoon restriction (No left 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) would remain.
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Undecided or neutral

(C) Would a sidewalk or trail constructed along the south side of Circular Road next to the Government House property make it easier for you to get around?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Undecided or neutral
(D) Would you like to lift the "Right Turn Only" restriction when coming off Empire Avenue onto Carpasian Road?

This would require the construction of curb extensions or a mini-roundabout.

This change would also calm traffic and improve safety.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Undecided or neutral

(E) Would you like to be able to follow a westbound route along Circular and Empire?

This would require upgrading the intersection with a mini-roundabout and reversing one-way flow along Circular Road.

This change would also calm traffic and improve safety.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Undecided or neutral
Dear Resident:

Please be advised that as per the approved recommendations of the Rennie’s River East Travel Pattern Review, the “no-entry” restriction on Winter Avenue at King’s Bridge Road will be removed.

To address resident concerns regarding speeding and help deter short-cutting, permanent traffic calming speed cushions are being considered for Winter Avenue. Four sets of permanent speed cushions would be installed between Glenridge Crescent and Judge Place at intervals of approximately 120 metres along with sign posts where necessary and Speed Cushions signs. The figure below illustrates the locations of the proposed speed cushions:

These cushions are designed to allow emergency vehicles to pass through unimpeded by providing space between the cushions for the width of emergency vehicle tires. This spacing will allow motorcycles to pass through without any calming effect.
While the installation of speed cushions will address vehicle speeds along Winter Avenue, some vehicles may accelerate between each set. Noise created by this acceleration in combination with noise generated by vehicles passing over the cushions is important to consider. In most applications of speed cushions, noise related complaints are received after they are installed.

In accordance with the City of St. John’s Traffic Calming Policy, a survey of residents is required before proceeding with this traffic calming plan. **Please note that a minimum 60% of all affected residents on your street must be in favour in order to proceed.**

Thank you for your cooperation and participation. We will advise you of the outcome of this enquiry. If the project proceeds, you will be provided with further details on any future public meetings regarding this project.

For more information on Traffic Calming and the Rennie's River East Traffic Pattern Review go to the City of St. John's website or call Access St. John's at 311.
Traffic Calming Request Support Form

Please fax, mail, or e-mail your response to the Traffic Division no later than DATE

Please ensure only one response per household.

Name (required): _____________________________________
Address (required): _____________________________________
Phone: _____________________________________
Email Address: _____________________________________

Do you support the proposed installation of permanent speed cushions on Winter Avenue?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If No, please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Return to:
Transportation Engineering –
Department of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services
P.O. Box 908
St. John’s NL A1C 5M2

trafficcalming@stjohns.ca
Fax: (709) 576-8305