AGENDA

Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, June 20, 2018
9 am
Council Chambers
4th Floor, City Hall
AGENDA
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
June 20, 2018 – 9 a.m. – Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Adoption of Minutes
   a. Committee of the Whole Minutes of June 6, 2018

4. PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS
   b. Tiny Homes Presentation – Jess Puddister

4. Public Works & Sustainability – Councillor Ian Froude

   Items for Discussion
   a. Regional Water Committee Report dated May 1, 2018
   b. Decision Note dated May 10, 2018 re: Windsor Lake Water Treatment Plant
      Capital Reserve Fund Expense Procurement of Replacement SCADA Server &
      License Upgrades

5. Housing – Councillor Hope Jamieson

   Items for Discussion
   a. Inclusion Advisory Committee Report dated June 12, 2018

6. Governance & Strategic Priorities – Mayor Danny Breen

      Presentation by Victoria Etchegary

6. Planning and Development – Councillor Maggie Burton

   Items for Discussion
   a. Built Heritage Experts Panel Report dated June 12, 2018
   b. Decision Note dated June 14, 2018 re: Transfer of Mobile Vending Lease Space
7. Transportation – Councillor Debbie Hanlon

Items for Discussion

a. Decision Note dated May 17, 2018 re: Cavendish Square Taxi Lay-by

8. Other Business

9. Adjournment
MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
June 6, 2018 – 9:00 am – Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

Present: Mayor Danny Breen, Chair
Councillor Dave Lane
Councillor Deanne Stapleton
Councillor Debbie Hanlon (left at 9:34 am)
Councillor Ian Froude
Councillor Wally Collins
Councillor Sandy Hickman
Councillor Hope Jamieson
Councillor Maggie Burton

Regrets: Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary
Councillor Jamie Korab

Staff: Kevin Breen, City Manager
Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager – Finance & Administration
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
Susan Bonnell, Manager of Communications & Office Services
Ken O’Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
Elaine Henley, City Clerk
Kathy Driscoll, Legislative Assistant

Two members of the media and four members of the public were also present.

Adoption of Agenda

Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Froude

That the agenda be adopted with the removal of the following:

• Decision Note dated May 10, 2018 re: Council Reconsideration of Impound Lot and Building Appeal Board Recommendations

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Adoption of the Minutes

Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Froude
That the Committee of the Whole minutes dated May 23, 2018 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Governance & Strategic Priorities – Mayor Danny Breen

Decision Note dated May 28, 2018 re: Youth Representation - Council
Mayor Breen spoke to the above listed Decision Note.

Recommendation
Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Hanlon

That Council accept the recommendation from the Advisory Committee on Youth not to invoke Section 5.01 of the City of St. John’s Act permitting Council to have a youth representative appointed to Council

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Finance & Administration – Councillor Dave Lane

Information Note dated May 30, 2018 re: Quarterly Travel Report – First Quarter 2018
The above noted was considered for information purposes.

Decision Note dated May 23, 2018 re: Revisions to Quarterly Travel Report
Councillor Dave Lane spoke to the above noted.

Recommendation
Moved – Councillor Lane; Seconded – Councillor Jamieson

That Council approve the recommendation for enhanced disclosure of travel expenditure. It is staff’s opinion that this will improve the openness, transparency and accountability of Council to its external stakeholders.

CARRIED WITH COUNCILLOR HICKMAN DISSENTING

Decision Note dated May 23, 2018 re: Luncheon – Beatrix Potter School visit (Wandsworth – London, England)
Councillor Lane spoke to the above listed.

Recommendation
Moved – Councillor Lane; Seconded – Councillor Jamieson
That Council grant approval to host a luncheon for the Beatrix Potter school children, teachers and parents.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Community Services – Councillor Jamie Korab

Decision Note dated May 24, 2018 re: Revision of Low Cost Spay/Neuter Program

Councillor Jamieson spoke to the above noted.

Recommendation
Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Burton

That Council approve the implementation of the revised program in September 2018.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- Councillor Burton asked staff to provide her with the numbers of cats and dogs being spayed/neutered each year at Humane Services.

- Councillor Froude requested to know exact costs pertaining to Humane Service’s spaying and neutering of cats and dogs.

Decision Note dated May 24, 2018 re: Special Events Advisory Committee Report

Councillor Jamieson spoke to the above noted.

Recommendation
Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Hanlon

That Council approve the event, Best Kind BBQ, from a regulatory perspective. This location has yet to be tested as a special event site.

This event is subject to adherence to all conditions set out by the Special Events Advisory Committee, not limited to those identified above.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Decision Note dated May 28, 2018 re: Application to Rezone Land to the Residential Kenmount (RK) Zone to allow a Subsidiary Apartment, REZ1800010, 132 Ladysmith Drive

Councillor Burton spoke to the above listed.

**Recommendation**
Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Froude

That Council consider a proposed rezoning at 132 Ladysmith Drive from the Residential Narrow Lot (RNL) to the Residential Kenmount (RK) Zone, and the application be advertised for public review and comment. Following advertisement, the proposed amendment would be referred to a Regular Meeting of Council for consideration of adoption.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Decision Note dated May 29, 2018 re: Application to Rezone Land to Residential Medium Density (R2), REZ1800007 & REZ1800008, 21-29, & 37 Malka Drive

Councillor Burton spoke to the above noted.

**Recommendation**
Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Stapleton

That Council consider a proposed rezoning at 21-29 Malka Drive and 37 Malka Drive from Residential Low Density (R1) to Residential Medium Density (R2), and the application be advertised for public review and comment. Staff further recommend that the application be referred to a Public Meeting chaired by a member of Council for consideration of adoption.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, June 20, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in Council Chambers.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:44 a.m.

Mayor Danny Breen
Chairperson
Present
Councillor Sandy Hickman, Chair
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary
Kevin Breen, City Manager
Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager – Public Works
Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager – Finance & Administration
Andrew Niblock, Director – Environmental Services
Terry Knee, Manager- Regional Facilities
Daniel Martin, Supervisor – Water Treatment
Kathy Driscoll, Legislative Assistant

Others
Stirling Willis, Town of Paradise
Garry Spencer, Town of Paradise
Chris Milley, Town of Portugal Cove-St. Phillip’s
Darryl Drover, City of Mt. Pearl
Isabelle Fry, City of Mt. Pearl
Steve Kent, City of Mt. Pearl (arrived at 12:18 pm)

Information Note dated April 23, 2018 re: Request from the Town of Torbay to Connect to Regional Water System

The Deputy City Manager of Public Works spoke to the above noted advising the City of St. John’s had met with representatives from the Town of Torbay on January 10, 2018 to discuss provisions of water services to the Town and further, their request to connect to the Regional Water system.

It was pointed out that two of the key recommendations of the St. John’s Regional Drinking Water Study (CBCL 2016) report are:

- Based on the median population projections, and without considering the implementation of additional water conservation measures, approximately 40-50,000 m3/D of additional treated water is required to service the existing municipalities and the municipalities of Torbay and Holyrood over the 10 - 35-year study planning horizon.
- Due to the anticipated water deficit noted above, it is not possible to add municipalities to the RWS until a new source becomes operational.

The Town was further advised their request would be brought forward to the next Regional Water Committee meeting for discussion.
Deputy Mayor O’Leary read an email she had received from the Mayor of Torbay regarding the Town connecting to the Regional Water Supply. City Staff indicated meetings held with the Town of Torbay clarified the Town would be able to connect to the Regional water supply when an additional source was operational. The question was also raised as to whether Torbay had investigated neighbouring ponds in their area to locate a viable water supply for their town.

The Deputy Mayor requested to review a copy of the 2016 CBCL Drinking Water Study to which she was advised a link to the information would be provided to her.

Conversation further ensued to review other water sources to meet the growing population demand. Both Thomas Pond and Triangular Pond were mentioned as possibilities for additional water supply sources as they were larger ponds more suitable to meet future needs and demands.

The following Motion was made:

**Recommendation:**

**Moved – Councillor Willis; Seconded – Councillor Fry**

To move forward with a secondary water study to identify additional viable water sources and further hold another meeting with the Town of Torbay to clarify the town will not be presently connecting to the Regional water supply.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Councillor Sandy Hickman
Chairperson
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Windsor Lake Water Treatment Plant Capital Reserve Fund Expense
       Procurement of Replacement SCADA Server & License Upgrades

Date Prepared: May 10, 2018

Report To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council

Ward: Not Ward Specific

Decision/Direction Required:

To seek a decision on proceeding with a purchase from the Capital Reserve Fund to replace the existing SCADA server and upgrade associated licenses.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The Windsor Lake Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Capital Reserve Fund is being requested to be used for the purchase of a replacement Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) server and associated license upgrades. The existing server has been in service for seven (7) years and must be replaced to provide reliable and secure operations of the Windsor Lake WTP.

The total estimated cost to replace the existing SCADA server and to upgrade the associated licenses is $186,979.00 + HST.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
   The Windsor Lake WTP has identified sufficient funds within the Capital Reserve Fund to support this equipment replacement project. A detailed breakdown of 2016-2018 contributions less purchases made through this Program is provided as follows:

   **0000-36889 Reserve for Winsor Lake WTP Equipment Replacement**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: 2017 UPS Replacement</td>
<td>$(68,920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$981,080</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
   N/A
3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**
   - **Strategic Plan 2015-2018 Goal: Fiscally Responsible**
     Development of the Capital Reserve Fund provides the Windsor Lake WTP with the ability to replace essential or failed equipment in a timely manner.

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**
   N/A

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

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

7. **Procurement Implications**
   The estimated timeframe for the replacement server and associated license upgrades is approximately 8 to 12 weeks.

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

9. **Other Implications**
   N/A

**Recommendation:**

The SCADA Server is essential for reliable and continuous operation of the Windsor Lake Water Treatment Plant. It is recommended that funding be made available through the Capital Reserve Fund to support the purchase and installation of this equipment.

**Prepared by/Signature:**

Shawn Haye, P. Eng.
Manager, Water Treatment

Signature: ___________________________
Approved by/Date/Signature:

Andrew Niblock, B.Sc.
Director, Environmental Services

Signature: _____________________________

Approved by/Date/Signature:

Lynnann Winsor, P.Eng, M.A.Sc.
Deputy City Manager, Public Works

Signature: _____________________________
Report to Committee of the Whole
Inclusion Advisory Committee
June 12, 2018 – 12:00 p.m. – Gleneyre Room 1, Paul Reynolds Community Centre

Present: Natalie Godden, Manager of Family & Leisure Services, Acting Chair
Councillor Hope Jamieson
Sherry Mercer, Community Services, City of St. John’s
Kimberly Yetman Dawson, Empower
Kim Pratt-Baker, Canadian Hard of Hearing – NL
Donna Power, GoBus/Metrobus
Grant Genova, NLAA, UDN (left at 1:53 pm)
Debbie Ryan, CNIB
Nancy Reid, COD-NL
Margaret Tibbo, (Muggs), Citizen Representative
Paul Walsh, Commissioner – Metrobus (arrived at 12:27 pm)
Tulak Chawan, Association for New Canadians (arrived at 12:27 pm)
Dave Saunders, Citizen Representative
Kathy Driscoll, Legislative Assistant

Others: Leslie White (arrived at 12:57 pm and left at 1:21 pm)
Victoria Etchegary (arrived at 12:57 pm)

REPORT

1. Decision Note – City of St. John’s Inclusion Activities and Approach
Information Note dated January 2, 2018 – City of St. John’s Inclusion Policy

Sherry Mercer spoke to the above noted Decision Note and the following motion was made:

Recommendation

Moved – Kimberly Yetman Dawson; Seconded – Donna Power

That the City continue to implement its current inclusion activities and initiatives and develop an Inclusion Outreach Initiative that highlights these resources and partnerships. However, given the timeframes for the development and implementation of federal and provincial legislation and the unknown impact to the City, it is recommended that the City delay the development of a comprehensive Inclusion Policy until the federal and provincial requirements can be considered/incorporated into the policy development process.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Natalie Godden, Manager of Family & Leisure Services
Acting Chairperson

ST. JOHN’S
Title: Committee of the Whole (COTW) Pilot Project Evaluation Report

Date: June 13, 2018

Report To: Mayor and Council

Councillor and Role: ALL

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Accept and approve the Committee of the Whole Pilot Project Evaluation Report with recommendations as attached.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
Council directed staff to undertake a review of Standing Committees (SC) as per Council Directive#: R2017-05-01/8 in Spring 2017 and to ensure it was completed prior to Election 2017. The SC review endeavoured to provide perspective and recommendations on both governance issues as well as operational matters for the effective and efficient functioning of SCs for the City. That report was tabled and approved at Council on Oct 23, 2017 and one of the recommendations was to pilot the use of Committee of the Whole as a replacement for the Standing Committee structure and to maintain the Audit Standing Committee.

Council accepted this recommendation and the pilot project was put in place in November 2018. The pilot involved the use of Council leads on topic/portfolio areas with the mayor chairing the COTW meetings which were to take place every two weeks at a regularly scheduled time for three hours. Early in the pilot, the meetings were moved to Council Chambers. A consent agenda was also introduced to keep meeting time focused primarily on items requiring discussion and decision. An evaluation plan for the pilot project was tabled at the Nov. 15 Committee of the Whole and outlined the goals and methodology for the evaluation. At the mid-point of the pilot, feedback was sought from staff and Council and a check-in report was tabled at the April 25, 2018 Committee of the Whole meeting which provided an overview of how the pilot project was achieving its goals and noted any challenges or concerns.

Subsequently, a final evaluation was carried out which included one-on-one interviews with Council, feedback from lead staff and City Clerk, and a review of COTW agendas and participation.

The report attached outlines the outcomes of the final evaluation and makes recommendations. As Council concludes its regular bi-weekly COTW meetings on June 20 and moves to a monthly system and moves to bi-weekly Council meetings for the summer, it is important that a decision be made on a permanent governance approach to ensure Council and staff can have the process fully operational for the return of regular meetings in September.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**
   Implementation of streaming and live broadcast for committee and Council meetings. There are some cost savings from COTW achieved by having the meetings outside the lunch period.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders**
   N/A

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**
   Using a pilot project approach is in line with the City’s efforts to be an effective organization and supports continuous improvement. By piloting the COTW approach and evaluating, an appropriate amount of testing and feedback was used before recommendations were made.

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**
   A new rules of procedure bylaw is required to support COTW.

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**
   Council and staff involved in COTW were consulted through the pilot project evaluation. Ongoing communications around the permanent change is required to ensure the public, staff and Council understand the structure, how it functions and any change in process arising.

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

7. **Procurement Implications**
   Implications as it relates to live streaming and appropriate technology purchases.

8. **Information Technology Implications**
   Implications as it relates to live streaming and appropriate technology purchases.

9. **Other Implications**
   N/A

**Recommendation:** Accept and approve the COTW pilot project evaluation report as presented and attached and specifically, the recommendations which are outlined in detail in the report.

**Prepared by:** Victoria Etchegary, Manager, Organizational Performance and Strategy

**Reviewed by:** Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager, Finance and Administration and Elaine Henley, City Clerk

**Approved by:** Kevin Breen, City Manager

**Attachment:** Final Report COTW Pilot Project Evaluation June 2018
Committee of the Whole (COTW)

Pilot Project Evaluation
Final Report June 2018
As per Council directive, a review was undertaken in 2017 to provide perspective and recommendations on both governance issues and operational matters related to the effective and efficient functioning of Standing Committees (SC) for the City of St. John’s.

Internal and external research demonstrated that the Standing Committee structure and Rules of Procedure Bylaw at the City of St. John’s required adjustments to better meet the existing and emerging needs of Council and improve overall governance.

Committee of the Whole* was recommended as a pilot project from Nov. 2017 - June 2018.

A pilot project evaluation plan was tabled at COTW in Nov. 15, 2017.

A “check-in” was conducted at the mid-way point of the pilot to see what was working/not working/needed adjustment and a report presented to Council in April 2018.

*Committee of the whole is a committee comprising all the members of a legislative body, etc. under more informal rules than those used in a regular session. In the City of St. John’s this means the entire Council.
Reasons for moving to COTW pilot

• There was inconsistency of meeting schedule with previous standing committees
• Trying to achieve better balance of content on agendas – information vs decision
• Challenges with council participation with seven standing committees and procedural bylaw requiring only two councillors for quorum
• Lack of clarity internally about which standing committee an item should go to and lack of clarity for the public as a result
• Public access challenges to standing committees, space, location
• Timeliness of meetings and moving items from standing committee to regular meeting for decision
Goals of COTW pilot

- Full Council participation on all matters at the committee level; reducing duplication and items which move back and forth from Council to Committee
- Fewer total number of meetings (exclusive of special meetings)
- Reduced duplication of debate and discussion between committee and Council
- Streamlined and simplified decision making processes resulting in more timely decisions
- Focused public delegation input at Committee-of-the-Whole and receipt of correspondence at Council
- Predictable and simplified meeting schedule
- Delegates only have to attend one meeting of Council to address all members of Council.

Ultimately these changes were expected to result in easier and more transparent access to the public as well
Key questions to be addressed through the evaluation of the pilot

- Are meetings more timely, for Council and staff?
- Are meetings more focused on discussion and debate regarding decisions that need to be made than standing committees were?
- Is there more Council participation overall in COTW vs standing committees?
- Are meetings more administratively streamlined?
- Is information from COTW more accessible to the public?

Subsequent to the check-in process (see report here), other questions were also considered as part of the overall evaluation:

- Are the right people in the room for COTW meetings?
- What aspects of COTW are not working? Where could improvements be made if Council continued with COTW?
- If the previous standing committee structure was not working well (as outlined in the Standing Committee Review report) and if Council were to not continue with COTW, what options would allow for the goals of COTW to be achieved?
Evaluation activities

- Review of COTW agendas for DN vs IN
- Review of # of COTW meetings and time used for meetings in total compared to SCs
- Review of # of Councillors participating in COTW compared to SCs
- Survey of Council at the half way point and at the end of the pilot to determine whether they believe COTW is better for decision making and focused discussion. (One on one interviews with Council at the end of pilot)
- Periodic meetings, two to three, with staff throughout the pilot and at the end to determine if the COTW meetings are more streamlined and focused.
- Opportunity for the media to provide input on whether access to information from COTW is easier than previous SC format.
Administration of COTW vs Standing Committee

- In 2016 there were 47 standing committee meetings; half of the content was focused on information sharing and half on decisions.
- In 2017 there were 26 standing committee meetings (up to September 2017 before COTW took effect); 45% of agenda items required decision, 55% of items were for information purposes.
- For the period of the review there were 15 COTW meetings (Nov 2017 to June 2018); 61% of items were decision/discussion based and 39% were reports or information notes.
- Agenda items move from COTW to Council for vote within a week in most cases.
- Since the check-in process, agendas are tighter and only include the portfolios to be discussed at the meeting.
- Savings of $7500 a year by not having meetings at lunch time.
Question: Are meetings more timely? Are the right people in the room?

- Based on feedback from Council and staff, meetings are more timely overall. Items needing decisions can get on the COTW agenda faster than in the previous structure where standing committee meetings were not always regular.

- Some Councillors feel that there is a loss of discussion from middle management in the current structure; however they also recognize that staff should not be “waiting” to be on the agenda.

- It was noted that senior staff and Council need to review the content of COTW agendas enough in advance to prepare to ensure they can best discuss the item at COTW meeting.
Question: Are meetings more focused on discussion and debate?

- The review of content of COTW agendas would suggest there has been an increase in the amount of agenda items requiring discussion and debate versus information based items.
- View from majority of council and all of staff is that less time is “wasted” because of COTW structure.
- Open and public forum – while better – is still taking some getting used to as it feels more formal.
- Council noted that preparation for COTW is key.
- There is time for focus on discussion and debate within the current three-hour format.
- Some Councillors view COTW as having less opportunity for discussion and debate because items cannot be “brought up” in the meeting and there is some sense of process challenge with getting items on the agenda.
Question: Is there more Council participation overall?

- In 2016 and 2017, the average attendance at Standing Committees was 54%; With COTW, attendance in 2017 was 98% with 10 of 11 councillors having perfect attendance. In 2018 so far, average attendance has been 87%.
- Councillors’ view is that they are expected to be there whether they have items on the agenda or not.
- Previous structure with standing committee made it difficult for working and/or part-time Councillors to attend all SCs
- Generally, Council feels they are more informed and prepared because of public nature of meetings
- COTW allows for full participation of Council
- Having all Council attend COTW is beneficial for sharing information and keeping everyone in the loop
- Some challenges with timing of COTW agenda and the amount of time to review prior to meeting
Question: Are meetings more streamlined?

- Overall Council feels the meetings are more streamlined and this creates more focus on agenda items that need to be addressed.
- Meetings are every two weeks – scheduled and never cancelled – councillors know and plan for the schedule.
- Having agenda items all in one place is helpful for making connections between items and locating items (from public perspective).
- Council generally feel that items get “hashed” out at COTW before they go on to Council vs the back and forth that happened at times in previous structure.
Question: Is information more accessible to the public?

- Majority of Council feel that COTW makes the work of Council more accessible to the public because the media attend and report on what is being discussed.
- Public can access information in one place on City website.
- One committee meeting makes it easier for media to attend and cover Council committee business vs seven standing committees.
  - Media comment: “The new COTW of the whole process is way more accessible and efficient than previous standing committees. The council chambers have always felt like an open and public space for anyone to engage in. Holding the meeting there allows us to feel like we have place do our work. The accessibility is evident in the turnout.”
- Some councillors feel that once an agenda is published there should be communications out to say it’s published and highlight the items on the agenda for that week.
- Some councillors feel that only a small portion of the public is interested in the meeting work of Council and some feel that COTW may make seem like decisions are a done deal before they go to Council meetings.
Question 6: If not old system or COTW, then what?

- Majority of Councillors feel that the COTW is a better governance model overall and makes the work of Council more open and transparent and streamlined.
- Without COTW, the view is that Council would need a way to have standing committees where there was good Council participation which may be challenging for part-time Councillors.
- Need to keep meetings accessible to the public and in a public space – increases transparency – should not move back to boardrooms.
- Live streaming is important regardless of the system and if Council chambers are being equipped for it, then meetings need to stay there.
Question 7: Other comments

- Need to continue to work with room set up and process to make it less formal, while maintaining structure and decorum.
- Need to continue to address what happens when requests get made of staff in COTW and how they get followed up.
- Still need opportunity for information sharing – how does this happen outside of COTW and any follow up on decisions, etc..
- Various views on when agendas are received – could be earlier. Mixed views on whether package from COTW should go to Council the following week or within two weeks.
Recommendations

• Implement Committee of the Whole as the governance structure permanently
• Update the procedural bylaw/rules of procedure document to reflect this change (use best practice from other cities – Guelph is recommended)
• Within the bylaw or rules for procedure document note:
  – The COTW’s mandate, policy/portfolio areas to be covered
  – Delegated authorities if any
  – Frequency and duration of meetings
  – Guidelines around the establishment and dissolution of committees, working groups generally
  – Council and staff’s role in committees, including the role of former Councillors on boards and commissions and the requirement for a cooling off period similar to that applied to advisory committees
  – Process and guidelines for COTW as well as special/in camera meetings and workshops
  – Process for making information requests of staff and process for follow up
  – Process for how items make it to the agenda
  – Process for pulling items from consent agenda and moving it to discussion
Recommendations

Continue with consent* agenda and formalize this approach for items such as:

• Committee meeting minutes
• Committee and staff reports
• Updates or background reports provided for information only
• Correspondence requiring no action
• Staff/public appointment to a committee requiring committee confirmation
• Final approval of proposals or reports that staff have been dealing with for some time and are familiar with the implications
• Routine contracts that fall within policies and guidelines
• Confirmation of documents or items that need no discussion but are required by the bylaws.

*consent agenda means items that do not require any discussion
Other considerations

• Ensure the COTW approach is monitored and modifications and improvements made as needed using a continuous improvement approach
• Action the implementation of live streaming and recording to improve accessibility
• Create more informal portfolio discussions by summarizing key points from a decision note and creating discussion approach
• Have staff speak to notes when needed (at the discretion of the lead staff) and ensure the necessary staff are available
• Schedule a break in the agenda for ten minutes regardless of the size of the agenda – this provides an opportunity to break the formality as well
Questions?
Decision Note dated June 5, 2018 re: 101 Patrick Street

The City has received an application to develop a 10-unit affordable housing complex for seniors at 101 Patrick Street. This lot is shared with Wesley United Church and will not be subdivided.

The subject property is in a Heritage Area 2, the Institutional (INST) Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Institutional (INST). Wesley United Church is a City of St. John’s Designated Heritage Building and the designation is confined to the footprint of the building.

As per Regulation 5.9.4 Heritage Area Standards (Table), new developments must comply with the standards set out in the table or may be approved through a comprehensive package approved by Council.

Further work is to be completed prior to the issuance of Development Approval.

Recommendation
Moved - Bruce Blackwood: Seconded – Robert Sweeney

That approval be given to the design of the 10-unit apartment building at 101 Patrick Street as proposed. It is further recommended that the guard rail be in keeping with the style of the railing surrounding the Wesley United Church and the applicant asked to consider the inclusion of a window on the Patrick/Power Street side to enhance street appeal.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
**Decision Note dated June 5, 2018 re: 41-43 Prescott Street: Dormer Windows**

The City has received an application for renovations to 41-43 Prescott Street. The extensive exterior renovations include new windows, siding, doors and roof.

The subject property is in the Heritage Area 2, the Residential Downtown Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Residential Downtown (RD).

The building is not designated by Council as a Heritage Building.

The proposed renovation includes changing the existing dormer windows from a curved dormer to a gable dormer.

As per Section 5.9.4 Heritage Area Standards (Table) of the Development Regulations, period configuration of the structure and period style of the structure is to be maintained for any façade facing a public street.

**Recommendation**

Moved - Rachel Fitkowski: Seconded – Mark Whelan

That Council reject the proposed change from a curved dormer to gable dormer and further that the applicant be asked to consider the use of wooden trim around the windows and replacement of the proposed front door with one more typical of the Heritage Area.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Decision Note dated June 5, 2018 re: 221 Duckworth Street: Roof Sign**

The City has received an application for a roof sign at 221 Duckworth Street. This building was formerly the John Cabot Building and is now referred to as the South Beach Building.

The subject property is in a Heritage Area 2, the Commercial Downtown (CD) Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Commercial Central Mixed (CCM). The property is not designated by Council as a Heritage Building.

As per Section 15 of the Heritage Area Sign Bylaw, roof signs are considered discretionary signs and may be permitted only upon the recommendation of the Heritage Advisory Committee and at the discretion of Council. The sign material is proposed to be aluminum and the sign will not be illuminated.

**Recommendation**

Moved - Robert Sweeny: Seconded – Bruce Blackwood

That approval be given to the proposed roof sign at 221 Duckworth Street.
Proposed Renovations - 70 Circular Road

The Panel reviewed proposed exterior renovations at the above noted location. The applicant intends to replace the glass roof on an attached greenhouse with shingles, replace windows all to make the structure more weather tight.

This property is a designated heritage building and renovations or repairs require approval by Council.

**Recommendation**

Moved – Garnet Kindervator: Seconded – Robert Sweeny

That approval be given to the proposed renovations at 70 Circular Road.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted.

Glenn Barnes, NLAA, MRAIC
Chairperson
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 101 Patrick Street
Seniors Affordable Housing Complex

Date Prepared: June 5, 2018

Report To: Chair and Members, Built Heritage Experts Panel

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

Ward: 2

Decision/Direction Required: To seek approval for the design of an affordable housing complex for seniors at 101 Patrick Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application to develop a 10-unit affordable housing complex for seniors at 101 Patrick Street. This lot is shared with Wesley United Church and will not be subdivided.

The subject property is in a Heritage Area 2, the Institutional (INST) Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Institutional (INST). Wesley United Church is a City of St. John’s Designated Heritage Building and the designation is confined to the footprint of the building. While this does not directly impact the proposed development, consideration must be taken into the design to ensure it is an appropriate infill alongside a designated building.

As per Regulation 5.9.4 Heritage Area Standards (Table), new developments must comply with the standards set out in the table or may be approved through a comprehensive package approved by Council.

The applicant attended the Built Heritage Experts Panel on March 13, 2018 where initial comments on the design were discussed. They have since submitted revised drawings for the Panel’s review. Please note, the application has not yet been issued Development Approval. The purpose of this review is to provide comments on the design of the building.

As previously submitted, the applicant proposes a two-storey rectangular building with five units on each level. The first-floor units will front toward the church with the second-floor units fronting toward Power Street. The side of the building will face Patrick Street near the intersection with Power Street. Access to the second-floor units will be gained through an exterior stairwell on the western side of the building with a ramp toward Patrick Street on the eastern side.

The applicant has updated several aspects on the drawings. The single hung windows, trim around the windows, decorative structural brackets, and horizontal siding remain. They have updated the drawings to extend the traditional style siding to the ground, including wood trim around the windows and
corners, added doors that are in keeping with the streetscape, and extended the roof to create a gable roof. Further revisions since the previous version include removing the grids from the exterior doors, creating a stepper roof pitch (from 6:12 to 8:12), and installing a false mullion bar on the windows under the balcony. The applicants did look at the possibility of adding windows on the Patrick Street side, however, it would impede usable space in the storage area. They may consider adding a small window above the toilet in the second-floor bathroom.

As the deck must be made of non-combustible material, the applicants are proposing a concrete deck. The materials for the guard rail have not been determined at this point. It is recommended that the guard rail reflect the railing surrounding the church. If the guard rail is in keeping with Regulation 5.9.4 of the Development Regulations, it will be approved at the staff level.

This application has previously been deferred by the Panel. The applicant has incorporated many of the Panel’s comments and therefore it is recommended to approve the design as proposed.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. **Budget/Financial Implications:** Not applicable.
2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders:** Not applicable.
3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:**
   *Neighbourhoods Build our City* – Maintain and position downtown as a distinct neighbourhood.
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:**
It is recommended to approve the design of the 10-unit apartment building at 101 Patrick Street as proposed. It is further recommended that the guard rail be in keeping with the style of the railing surrounding the Wesley United Church.
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 Subject Property
Applicant’s Submission

Location of Subject Property
101 Patrick Street
FRONT ELEVATION

1. All wall measurements are to face of stud.
2. Window sizes shown are approximate only. Ensure all bedroom windows meet egress requirements. Gutter and downspout as per NBCC Code.
3. Ridge vents and Gable vents as per code.

All corner and window trim to be rough side out wood trim.

Note: Structural bracket detail to be provided by structural engineer before installation.

RAMP to Patrick Street 1:16 slope

10 Unit Affordable Housing Wesley United Church Of Canada Patrick St John's Nl

Housing to conform to Universal/Visitible Design

R-1 Mar 6 2018 Revisions as per noted from City of St John's
R-2 Locations and spec info for HRV units and ventilation of Kitchen and baths
R-3 As per revisions from City of St John's, Heritage, non combustible deck
R-4 As per revisions from City of St John's May 17 2018

All corner and window trim to be rough side out wood trim.

Note: Structural bracket detail to be provided by structural engineer before installation.

Window sizes shown are approximate only. Ensure all bedroom windows meet egress requirements. Gutter and downspout as per NBCC Code.

Ridge vents and Gable vents as per code.
All corner and window trim to be rough side out wood trim.

NOTE: Rise and run for exit stair to be – Rise 180mm Run 280mm.
1. Contractor to visit site and confirm all aspects of the work before submitting tender.

2. All existing work disturbed by new construction to be made good.

3. Contractor to check all dimensions on site and report any changes in elevations, dimensions, or unforeseen items to the designer before proceeding with the work.

4. Contractor to ensure that all debris from demolition is removed from site, and public safety barriers are erected where required.

5. Contractor to confirm the scope of the work with the owner before pricing the project.

All wall measurements are to face of stud.

Window sizes shown are approximate only. Ensure all bedroom windows meet egress requirements. Gutter and downspout as per NBC Code.

Ramps to be installed with proper handrails, non-skid surfaces, and be a slope of 1 in 16. Ramps to be determined on site after finished grade has been established, and the approval of the Building Accessibility Act and Regulations.

Attic Hatch Locations

NOTE: 1) Bathroom Ventilation to be connected to HRV Unit 2) Kitchen Ventilation over range to be connected to the outside

All doors to be 3'-0" unless noted. All tap handles to be lever type. All switches, plugs, phones, counters, shelves, coat racks, door handles, plumbing fixtures, etc., shall be installed to heights and to the approval of Building Accessibility Act and Regulations.

All switches, plugs, phones, counters, shelves, coat racks, door handles, plumbing fixtures, etc., shall be installed to heights and to the approval of Building Accessibility Act and Regulations.

10 Unit Affordable Housing Wesley United Church Of Canada Patrick St St John's Nl

Housing to conform to Universal/Visible Design

1007 579 8169

212 Merrymeeting Rd St John's Nl

WWW.RJROBERE.DESIGNPLANNING@NL.ROGERS.COM

MAY 17 2018

R-4 As per revisions from City of st John's May 17 2018

R-3 As per revisions from City of st John's Heritage, non-combustible deck

R-2 Locations and spec info for HRV units and ventilation of Kitchen and baths

R-1 Mar 6 2018 Revisions as per noted from City of St John's

date

MAY 17 2018

drawn by

A-4

R-4
Title: 41-43 Prescott Street Dormer Windows

Date Prepared: June 5, 2018

Report To: Chair and Members, Built Heritage Experts Panel

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

Ward: 2

Decision/Direction Required: To seek approval to change to dormer windows at 41-43 Prescott Street, from curved dormers to gable dormers.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application for renovations to 41-43 Prescott Street. The extensive exterior renovations include new windows, siding, doors and roof.

The subject property is in the Heritage Area 2, the Residential Downtown Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Residential Downtown (RD). The building is not designated by Council as a Heritage Building.

The proposed renovation includes changing the existing dormer windows from a curved dormer to a gable dormer. As per Section 5.9.4 Heritage Area Standards (Table) of the Development Regulations, period configuration of the structure and period style of the structure is to be maintained for any façade facing a public street. In this streetscape, a curved dormer is typical of the area. There have been conversions from curved dormers to gable dormers on Prescott Street, and throughout various Heritage Areas. However, this is seen as a loss of character. Therefore, it is recommended to reject the proposed change from curved dormer to gable dormer. If the curved dormer is to be replaced, it is recommended to maintain a curved dormer. It is further recommended to use wooden trim around the windows and to replace the proposed door with one more typical of the Heritage Area.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: Neighbourhoods Build our City – Maintain and position downtown as a distinct neighbourhood.
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:**
It is recommended to reject the proposed change from curved dormer to gable dormer. If the curved dormer is to be replaced, it is recommended to maintain a curved dormer. It is further recommended to use wooden trim around the windows and to replace the proposed door with one more typical of the Heritage Area.

**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 Subject Property
Applicant’s Submission
Location of Subject Property
41-43 Prescott Street
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 221 Duckworth Street  
        Roof Sign

Date Prepared: June 6, 2018

Report To: Chair and Members, Built Heritage Experts Panel

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

Ward: 2

Decision/Direction Required: To seek approval for a roof sign at 221 Duckworth Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application for a roof sign at 221 Duckworth Street. This building was formerly the John Cabot Building and is now referred to as the South Beach Building.

The subject property is in a Heritage Area 2, the Commercial Downtown (CD) Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Commercial Central Mixed (CCM). The property is not designated by Council as a Heritage Building.

As per Section 15 of the Heritage Area Sign Bylaw, roof signs are considered discretionary signs and may be permitted only upon the recommendation of the Heritage Advisory Committee and at the discretion of Council. The sign material is proposed to be aluminum and the sign will not be illuminated.

The building was constructed in 1947 by William J. Ryan and was extensively renovated in 2009 to restore and enhance the building’s Art Deco design. The application states that the roof sign is the restoration of an architectural feature. The City has not been able to find evidence that a roof sign existed at this location, however the style of the sign is typical of Art Deco architecture, in particular the Miami Beach Architectural District (pictured below). Typically, the sign would be placed above the doorway however given the geometric feature above the door, the applicant has proposed to locate the sign on the roof.

Roof signs are not typical of downtown St. John’s, however, given the Art Deco style of 221 Duckworth Street, it is recommended to approve the roof sign as proposed.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
   *Neighbourhoods Build our City* – Maintain and position downtown as a distinct neighbourhood.

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:**
It is recommended to approve the roof sign at 221 Duckworth Street as proposed.

**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 Subject Property
Photo of Original Building
Examples of Art Deco Buildings and Signs
Applicant’s Submission
Location of Subject Property
221 Duckworth Street

Photo of Original Building
1981/82
Examples of Art Deco Buildings and Signs
Architectural Feature Restoration - Prop

Letter Specs:
Manufacture one set of non-illuminated 1/8" thick custom painted "South Beach" letters. Letters will be fabricated using 1/8" thick aluminum backs and .060 aluminum for the returns (s will be welded.

Support Trough & base:
All aluminum is 1/8" including channel. Manufacture one 2"x3" x 96" support trough using 1/8" thick channel. Manufacture one 10"x4 x 96" 1/8" thick all.

All letters will be welded to support trough on the first and second surfaces. Support lip to base plate.

No paint on either component.
Title: Transfer of Mobile Vending Lease Space
Date Prepared: June 14, 2018
Report To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of Council
Ward: 2

Decision/Direction Required:
For consideration of council to transfer the Mobile Vending Lease Space on Harbour Drive assigned to JosephMaxwell Holdings Inc. to Wayken Enterprises for the operation of BeaverTails.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
Council in 2014 approved a Mobile Vending space on Harbour Drive adjacent to the Pier 8 entrance/exit under recommendation of the Department of Building and Property Management. BeaverTails franchise operated out of this location for two years and since late 2016 vacated the space however maintained the rights to the lease space.
The franchisee has decided to sell the mobile vending unit and has acquired a conditional sale subject to the leased space it currently holds on Harbour Drive being transferred to the potential purchaser.

There have been no other inquiries for this space and no one waiting for a leased space to become available.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. **Budget/Financial Implications:** Although there are no costs to the City the initial proponent installed an electrical service for the space at a cost of approximately $10,000.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders:** Not Applicable

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

4. **Legal or Policy Implications:** The lease agreement currently held by JosephMaxwell Holdings Inc. is not transferrable to another party without approval of council.

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:** Since the beginning of the operation of Beavertails there have been concerns expressed by the St. John’s Port Authority regarding illegally parked vehicles in the area of the space which affects the operation of the port. In a recent letter submitted by the Port Authority (attached) it is suggested that the port has suffered significant negative impacts to port operations as a direct result of the mobile leased space. The letter also recommends that the City remove this space from its current location to an area that will not affect port operation.

The matter of illegally parked vehicles on City Property can be mitigated through enforcement efforts as there is a presence of a Parking Enforcement Officer in the area during weeks days. Parking on Port property is not a matter for the City.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that Council approve the lease transfer from JosephMaxwell Holding Inc. to Wayken Enterprises for the operation of BeaverTails Food Truck.
Prepared by/Signature:
Randy Carew, CET, Manager Regulatory Services

Signature: ____________________________________

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

Signature: ____________________________________

Attachments: Letter from St. John’s Port Authority
March 21, 2018

Mr. Randy Carew, CET  
Manager, Regulatory Services  
Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services  
City of St. John’s  
P.O. Box 908, St. John's A1C 5M2

Dear Mr. Carew,

Re: Removal of Mobile Vending Parking Space – Harbour Drive

The St. John’s Port Authority (SJPA) is committed to providing a safe, secure and accessible environment for port operations and tenant activity at Piers 6 to 8 on the Marginal Wharf. As such, the SJPA is requesting that the City of St. John’s remove the mobile vending parking space located adjacent to port’s primary entrance / exit to Piers 8 to 11 from Harbour Drive. Having this as an active commercial operation leads to constant illegal parking, unsafe sight lines for those entering / leaving the wharf and general operational disruption for our working port.

Figure 1: Harbour Drive Mobile Vendor Space
A) BACKGROUND

The Port of St. John’s has experienced tremendous growth over the past decade or so. From our burgeoning energy sector, increasing cargo activity, strong fishery and a dynamic tourism industry, port activity has never been stronger. Of course, with this exciting growth, we must adapt and evolve to ensure that we are maintaining superior standards in our working port. The SJPA has been doing just that as we continue to ensure safety and vessel accessibility for port users are our top priorities.

In 2014, the SJPA conducted an Operational Review of Piers 6, 7 and 8 – an area that had been of concern to port users and the SJPA for some time, as increased levels of activity resulted from: more vessel traffic; the addition of new restaurants; the tour boat operations during the summer; and, unfortunately, illegal parking by non-port users.

Port users told us that changes were needed to ensure safer conditions and to deal effectively with operational realities. As such, the SJPA engaged a third party to conduct a thorough review of this area in consultation with port users with a view to making improvements. Pier 8, shown in Figure 2, is the busiest of the three areas studied in terms of vehicle traffic and vessel servicing, given it is a staging area for work on vessels berthed in the area and the main artery for access to Pier 9 to 11.
B) PREVIOUS MOBILE VENDING OPERATIONS HARBOUR DRIVE (PIER 8)

While improvements to the area were underway to provide a safe, secure and accessible environment for port operations and tenant activity, the City of St. John’s granted a Mobile Vending Unit permit to an operator on Harbour Drive adjacent to the Pier 8 entrance / exit. While this permit pertains to City-owned properties, it was regrettable that it was granted without any prior consultation with the SJPA.

This ultimately resulted in a significant negative impact to port operations in the area, more specifically, it contributed to an increase in illegally parked vehicles on port and City property, above and beyond that which the SJPA was already trying to address while attempting to improve and / or mitigate operational risk(s) in the area.

While the SJPA endeavoured to work with the Mobile Vendor it became extremely difficult at times and we had to expend great efforts in terms of resources and time to address illegal parking, facilitate movement of heavy equipment and to maintain a safe line of sight for vehicles exiting Pier 8. At the extreme, the SJPA had to hire additional security personnel to monitor and control the illegal parking. During a single week alone in mid-July 2014, 96-vehicles belonging to the Mobile Vendor’s customers were recorded to have parked illegally on port property and subsequently were directed to vacate the premises.

Ultimately, the Mobile Vendor chose to relocate its operations from Harbour Drive to Bannerman Park and no other vendor has operated from this area. Since that time we have been able to minimize illegal parking, however, the removal of the mobile vending unit space would certainly assist in avoiding future problems.

C) WAY FORWARD

It remains our objective to provide a safe, secure and accessible environment for port operations and tenant activity in the Piers 6 to 11 area on the Marginal Wharf, as such, we request that the City of St. John’s remove the existing mobile vendor space and no longer permit it, or other similar activities near crosswalks, access / egress zones and / or gates along Harbour Drive.

Sincerely,

Bob McCarthy, B. Comm., PMP
Vice-President, Development

Attachments
Image A: Illegally parked vehicles on City Roadway at Pier 8 entrance / exit behind Mobile Vendor.
Image B: Illegally parked Mobile Vendor vehicle on City Roadway adjacent to Mobile Vending Unit
Image C: Illegally parked customer / vehicle at Pier 8 entrance / exit.
Title: Cavendish Square Taxi Lay-by
Date Prepared: May 17, 2018
Report To: Committee of the Whole
Councillor/Theme: Debbie Hanlon - Transportation
Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
Decision is required to formalize a taxi lay-by area along the east side of Cavendish Square, north of Duckworth Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
Cavendish Square between Duckworth Street and Military Road is an area of high demand for taxi patrons. Metered parking spaces along the west side of Cavendish Square across from the Sheraton Hotel are used by taxis waiting to be hailed. In this area it is often the case that taxis are parked across more than one of the angled stalls and the meters are not paid while occupied by the taxi. These metered spaces are not intended to accommodate this lay-by behaviour.

To provide an appropriate area for taxi lay-by activity, a formal taxi lay-by area is proposed along the east side of Cavendish Square between Duckworth Street and the entrance to the Sheraton Hotel. The area would be identified with signage and paint markings. Space for up to four taxis could be provided and would be available to all taxi companies with no exclusive rights for use.

Providing this taxi area would require the relocation of Metrobus stop #1985 which is currently located along this segment of Cavendish Square. Metrobus has confirmed that relocating this stop north of the Sheraton Hotel entrance would be appropriate. Routes servicing this stop travel north along King’s Bridge Road and do not merge back onto Cavendish Square.

Figure 1 illustrates the proposed taxi lay-by area and relocated Metrobus stop on Cavendish Square.

Designating an area such as this for a taxi lay-by is not standard practice for the City. Effectively this change allocates a public resource (street right of way) to private commercial enterprises (taxi companies). It is being recommended in this case to address inappropriate taxi behaviour. Following installation, if the inappropriate behaviour continues the City may wish to revisit the installation of this taxi lay-by and/or other measures to incentivize proper behaviour or punish inappropriate behaviour.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**
   No major infrastructure improvements are required to complete this project. Minor costs will be incurred to produce and install signs as well as complete the pavement markings.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders**
   Metrobus has been consulted on the required relocation of bus stop #1985.

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**
   The proposed initiative 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
Improve neighbourhood-level services

A City for All Seasons: Support year-round tourism and industry activity

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**

   n/a

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**

   Communication with taxi companies regarding the operation and enforcement of this lay-by area will be an important part of this change.

6. **Human Resource Implications**

   n/a

7. **Procurement Implications**

   n/a

8. **Information Technology Implications**

   n/a

9. **Other Implications**

   n/a

**Recommendations:**

That council approve a formal taxi lay-by area along the east side of Cavendish Square between Duckworth Street and the entrance to the Sheraton Hotel.

**Prepared by:**

Anna Bauditz, Transportation System Engineer

Signature: ________________________________

**Approved by:**

Garrett Donaher, Manager - Transportation Engineering

Signature: ________________________________