

AGENDA

Committee of the Whole

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

9 am

Council Chambers

4th Floor, City Hall

ST. JOHN'S

ST. JOHN'S

Committee of the Whole Agenda

May 1, 2019

9:00 a.m.

Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

10 New Gower St.

St. John's, NL

A1C 5M2

Pages

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of the Agenda**
 - 2.1 Adoption of Agenda - May 1, 2019
3. **Adoption of the Minutes**
 - 3.1 Committee of the Whole Minutes - April 17, 2019 1
4. **Presentations/Delegations**
 - 4.1 Presentation by Paul Barnes - Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
5. **Community Services & Events - Councillor Jamie Korab**
 - 5.1 Items for Discussion
 1. Inclusion Advisory Committee Report - April 15, 2019 6
6. **Planning & Development - Councillor Maggie Burton**
 - 6.1 Items for Discussion
 1. Built Heritage Experts Report - April 18, 2019 9
 1. Decision note dated April 15, 2019 re: Metal Roofs and Solar Panels 11

2.	Decision Note dated April 17, 2019 re: Streamlining Maintenance Applications for Designated Heritage Buildings	16
2.	Decision Note dated April 23, 2019 re: Mobile Vending Leased Space - Churchill Square	19
7.	Transportation - Councillor Debbie Hanlon	
7.1	Items for Discussion	
1.	Decision Note dated May 1, 2019 re: Parking at Canada Post Community Mailboxes	23
8.	Other Business	
9.	Adjournment	

MINUTES

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

April 17, 2019 – 9:00 a.m. – Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

Present Mayor Danny Breen
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary
Councillor Maggie Burton
Councillor Dave Lane
Councillor Debbie Hanlon
Councillor Deanne Stapleton
Councillor Hope Jamieson
Councillor Ian Froude
Councillor Wally Collins

Regrets: Councillor Hope Jamieson
Councillor Sandy Hickman
Councillor Jamie Korab

Staff Kevin Breen, City Manager
Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager, Planning, Engineering and
Regulatory Services
Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager Public Works
Ken O’Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
Karen Chafe, Acting City Clerk
Maureen Harvey, Legislative Assistant

Other Staff Present Brian Head, Manager of Parks & Open Spaces
Garrett Donaher, Manager of Transportation
Susan Bonnell, Manager of Marketing & Communications

Adoption of the Agenda

Moved – Councillor Collins; Seconded – Councillor Hanlon

That the agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Adoption of the Minutes

Moved – Councillor Froude; Seconded – Deputy Mayor O’Leary

That the Committee of the Whole minutes dated April 3, 2019 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Delegations

Presentation by Mr. Randy Murphy – East Coast Trail Association

Mr. Murphy and Ms. Madeline Florent were present and conducted the above-cited presentation, a copy of which is available from the Office of the City Clerk.

Mr. Murphy noted that a number of Memorandums of Understanding have been executed with multiple municipalities associated with the Trail and the Association is requesting that the City will consider a similar MOU. A draft MOU was provided for consideration.

The matter was referred to the Parks Division of the Department of Public Works for consideration.

Community Services – Councillor Hanlon

Decision Note dated April 17, 2019 re: Key2Access Accessible Pedestrian Signals

Recommendation

Moved – Councillor Hanlon; Seconded Deputy Mayor O’Leary

That the City of St. John’s partake in this proof of concept project, installing Key2Access technology at locations determined in consultation with Key2Access and CNIB totaling the City expenditures of no more than \$25,000.

Should the proof of concept project prove sustainable, additional intersections should be considered. Those intersections with current APS equipment should remain, thus increasing accessible intersections in the City and ensuring fiscal responsibility

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Housing – Councillor Burton

Decision Note dated April 17, 2019 re: Expanding the Exemption of Municipal Fees for Affordable Housing Developments

Recommendation

Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Deputy Mayor O’Leary

That Council expand the exemption of municipal fees to private developers of affordable housing who have confirmed approval under the National Housing Strategy’s National Housing Co-Investment Fund- new construction (NHCF), Federal Lands Initiative (FLI) and Innovation Fund (IF)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Planning & Development – Councillor Maggie Burton

Rezoning from the Institutional (INST) and Open Space (O) Zones to the Commercial Central Mixed Use (CCM) Zone for a 40-unit Residential Development - MPA1900002 - 68 Queen’s Road (Cathedral Parish Hall)

Recommendation

Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Deputy Mayor O’Leary

That the application to rezone 68 Queen’s Road from the Institutional (INST) and Open Space (O) Zones to the Commercial Central Mixed Use (CCM) Zone be considered and the attached draft Terms of Reference for the Land Use Assessment Report be approved.

Prior to submission of an LUAR, it is recommended that the applicant meet with the Built Heritage Experts Panel regarding heritage designation options and the design of the proposed building.

Upon submission of a satisfactory LUAR, it is recommended that the application be referred to a Public Meeting chaired by an independent facilitator. Following the public meeting, the application would be referred to a regular meeting of Council for consideration of adoption.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Councillor Burton suggested that the developer be requested to consider some adaptive reuse for removed materials. Councillor Froude requested that the Terms of Reference of the LUAR include a provision for bike parking.

Built Heritage Experts Report – March 27, 2019

Decision Note dated March 19, 2019 re: Exterior Façade Renovations and Rooftop Alteration – Quality Hotel Harbourview, 2 Hill O’Chips

Recommendation

Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Lane

That approval be given to the exterior façade renovations and rooftop alteration at 2 Hill O’Chips as proposed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Transportation – Councillor Debbie Hanlon

Information Note dated April 17, 2019 re: 2017 Traffic Pilot Projects Veteran’s Square

Council considered the above-noted Information Note which referenced Council’s previous approval to implement the Veteran’s Square reconfiguration pilot project. The intersection of Church Hill and Queen’s Road was identified as an excellent candidate to trial narrowing of the road surface. This intersection has been raised by the public as a hazard for pedestrians in the area and a safety concern for motorists.

Following an evaluation of the pilot project Council, in April 2018, voted to proceed with the permanent installation once funding became available.

Discussion took place with respect to other modifications required and Council was informed that the reconfiguration of Veteran’s Square will be completed during the 2019 construction season.

Decision Note dated April 17, 2019 re: Downtown Decorative Street Lighting LED Conversion

Recommendation

Moved – Councillor Hanlon; Seconded – Councillor Froude

That the City form a Working Group with members representing the Water Street Downtown Stakeholder Committee, Joint Downtown Liaison Committee, Built Heritage Experts Panel and the Arts Advisory Committee. All members of Council are also welcome to attend.

This Working Group would explore the subjective options available if choosing to replace the existing decorative globe lights with LED lights. The Working Group would recommend:

- **Whether to proceed with bulb only replacement (minor illumination improvement only) or replace the fixtures entirely.**
- **If applicable, what the aesthetic design criteria would be when procuring new fixtures.**
- **Possible cost sharing opportunities among downtown interests.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Decision Note dated March 26, 2019 re: Application to Rezone Land to the Rural Residential Infill (RRI) Zone for a Single Detached Dwelling – REZ1900006 – 358 Groves Road.

The above noted Decision Note was discussed at the April 3rd Committee of the Whole Meeting at which time it was deferred. While the original staff recommendation was that Council refuse the application to rezone 358 Groves Road from the Rural (R) Zone to the Rural Residential Infill (RRI) Zone as the property is above the 190-metre contour, Council sought reconsideration by staff.

Staff have once again reviewed the application and the recommendation for refusal remains.

Recommendation

Moved by Councillor Froude; Seconded by Councillor Burton

That Council refuse the application to rezone 358 Groves Road from the Rural (R) Zone to the Rural Residential Infill (RRI) Zone as the property is above the 190-metre contour Council.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Mayor Danny Breen
Chairperson

**Report to Committee of the Whole
Inclusion Advisory Committee**

April 15, 2019 – 12:30 p.m. – Gleneyre Room 2, Paul Reynolds Community Centre

Present: Taylor Stocks, Chair
Natalie Godden, Manager of Family & Leisure Services
Sherry Mercer, Program Coordinator, Inclusive Services
Margaret Tibbo, Citizen Rep
Dave Saunders, Citizen Rep
Debbie Ryan, CNIB
Trevor Freeborn, CODNL
Sarah White, Autism Society
Kim Pratt-Baker, Hard of Hearing Association
Donna Power – Metrobus, Accessible Transit
Megan McGie – Association for the Deaf
Annette Powell – CHANNAL
Joby Flemming - Empower
Maureen Harvey – Legislative Assistant

Others: Garrett Donaher, Manager of Transportation

REPORT

1. Information Note dated March 25, 2019 re: Committee Engagement of Public Projects

The Committee reviewed the above-noted information note. Arising from discussion was the Committee's desire to be consulted on City projects that impact the inclusive community. Particular mention was made with respect to Rawlins Cross Pilot Project for which feedback is currently being sought.

Recommendation

Moved – Debbie Ryan; Seconded – Joby Flemming

Given the potential impact of the Rawlins Cross Pilot Project, particularly as it relates to pedestrian traffic flow and safety, the Committee requests consultation prior to final implementation.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Taylor Stocks,
Chairperson

INFORMATION NOTE

Title: Committee Engagement for Public Projects

Date Prepared: March 25, 2019

Report To: Inclusion Advisory Committee
Committee of the Whole

Councilor and Role: Councillor Hope Jamieson, Council Representative
for Inclusion Advisory Committee

Ward: Not ward specific

Issue: Ensuring appropriate means of engagement with the Inclusion Advisory Committee as it relates to public projects.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

As noted in the previous Decision Note – Inclusion Outreach Collaborative, the City of St. John's outlined the resources and collaboratives that the City has in place to support Inclusion and Diversity, which includes Inclusion Advisory Committee engagement on large and pilot projects. Engagement may take place in various forms including, but not limited to, invitation to public engagement sessions, special meetings of the Inclusion Advisory Committee and individual consultations with Committee members who have expertise in that subject matter. Appendix A provides further descriptions on key forms of engagement.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
N/A
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
 - a. Inclusion Advisory Committee
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
 - a. A Culture of Cooperation
 - i. Create effective City-community collaborations
 - b. Responsive and Progressive

ST. JOHN'S

- i. Create a culture of engagement
 - ii. Become a welcoming and inclusive city
 - c. Effective Organization
 - i. Develop a knowledgeable and engaged workforce
 - ii. Support corporate-wide information and knowledge sharing
- 4. Legal or Policy Implications
N/A
- 5. Engagement and Communications Considerations
 - a. Various forms of engagement with the Inclusion Advisory Committee. The form of engagement selected will take into consideration such factors as project timeline, impact on community and subject experts.
- 6. Human Resource Implications
N/A
- 7. Procurement Implications
N/A
- 8. Information Technology Implications
N/A
- 9. Other Implications
N/A

Conclusion/Next Steps:

To implement the various means of engagement between the City of St. John's and the Inclusion Advisory Committee as it relates to public projects.

Prepared by/Signature:

Sherry Mercer, Inclusive Services Coordinator

Approved by/Date/Signature:

Natalie Godden, Manager – Family & Leisure Services

Attachments: Appendix A



REPORT
BUILT HERITAGE EXPERTS PANEL MEETING
April 18, 2019– 12:00 p.m. – Conference Room A

Present: Glenn Barnes, NLAA, MRAIC, Chair
Ken O'Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
Ann-Marie Cashin, Planner III, Urban Design and Heritage
Rob Schamper, Technical Advisor
Rachael Fitkowski – Landscape Architect
Robert Sweeny – Historian
Garnet Kindervater, Contractor
Mark Whelan, HW Architecture
Dawn Boutlier, Planner
Maureen Harvey, Legislative Assistant

Regrets: Bruce Blackwood, Contractor

Decision Note dated April 15, 2019 re: Metal Roofs and Solar Panels

The Panel was requested to discuss options for energy efficient retrofits on buildings in the St. John's Heritage Areas, specifically the use of metal roofs and solar panels.

As older buildings are renovated, many residents and property owners are looking for ways to make their buildings more energy efficient. The City wishes to encourage adaptive re-use of buildings in the Heritage Areas, and therefore the City is seeking ways to strike a balance between preserving the heritage and character defining elements of a buildings and allowing renovations to make the building more energy efficient. In particular, the use of metal roofs and solar panels are brought to the Panel for discussion and recommendation. This discussion is limited to buildings in the Heritage Area and does not include designated Heritage Buildings because any renovation to a designated Heritage Building would be assessed on its own merit and require Council's approval

Recommendation

Moved by Mark Whalen; Seconded by Dawn Boutlier

That the following apply to the use of modern materials in heritage areas:

- **Shingles for residential dwellings will be permitted subject to the material replicating heritage style**
- **Solar Panels will be ermitted as long as they are not visible from the street.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Decision Note dated April 17, 2019 re: Streamlining Maintenance Applications for Designated Heritage Buildings

As stated in the above-noted Decision Note, the Panel was requested to determine an appropriate process to streamline general maintenance applications for designated heritage buildings.

Recommendation

Moved by Robert Sweeny; Seconded by Dawn Boutilier

That minor maintenance applications for designated heritage buildings be evaluated by staff and sent directly to a Council meeting for Council's approval.

Further, that any applications that would alter the building or character defining elements of the building will follow the existing process of being referred to the BHEP for a recommendation to Council.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Glenn Barnes, NLAA, MRAIC
Chairperson**

DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Metal Roofs and Solar Panels in the St. John's Heritage Areas
Date Prepared: April 15, 2019
Report To: Chair and Members, Built Heritage Experts Panel
Councillor & Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Planning and Development Lead
Ward: All

Decision/Direction Required:

To discuss options for energy efficient retrofits on buildings in the St. John's Heritage Areas, specifically the use of metal roofs and solar panels.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

As older buildings are renovated, many residents and property owners are looking for ways to make their buildings more energy efficient. The City wishes to encourage adaptive re-use of buildings in the Heritage Areas, and therefore the City is seeking ways to strike a balance between preserving the heritage and character defining elements of a buildings and allowing renovations to make the building more energy efficient. In particular, the use of metal roofs and solar panels are brought to the Panel for discussion and recommendation. This discussion is limited to buildings in the Heritage Area and does not include designated Heritage Buildings because any renovation to a designated Heritage Building would be assessed on its own merit and require Council's approval.

Metal Roofs

The City is beginning to receive requests for metal roofs. As per Section 5.9.4 Heritage Area Standards (Table) of the St. John's Development Regulations, modern roofing materials may be used in all three Heritage Areas. In Heritage Area 1, modern materials may be used provided such materials, in the opinion of the Inspector, replicate the period style and materials of the structure.

Metal roofs have about a 50-year lifespan and are a good option for areas with high winds. While metal roofs are about three times the cost of asphalt shingled roofs, some residents prefer metal due to the long lifespan. Similar to other roofing materials, metal roofs come in a variety of shapes, styles and colours. One of the more popular styles is the gauged/standing seam roof style, but other options include slate style, shake style and Mediterranean tile, among others (see below). The gauge style typically does not replicate the period style of the St. John's Heritage Areas. In some cases, the other styles may be more appropriate but generally cost 50% more than the gauged style.

The City allows a variety of roofing materials in the Heritage Area, as long as it replicates the roofing styles along the streetscape; metal shingled styles could be permitted but the gauged



metal roof style would not be recommended. While allowing shingled metal roof styles may be a balance between heritage preservation and energy efficiency, there will be an additional cost for residents if the City limits the style choice.



Gauged Style



Slate Style



Steel Shingle Style



Cedar Shake Style

Solar Panels

Solar technologies are important for both environmental and financial reasons. As technologies advance, so do the options for solar panels. Research on solar panel policies in heritage conservation areas in other municipalities shows that there are a variety of policies ranging from very restrictive to no restrictions at all. Below is a summary of such policies and the benefits and drawbacks of each:

- Solar panels not permitted – This type of policy ensures that heritage conservation areas are maintained in their purest form with other original materials permitted. While the historic features are maintained, it is argued that denying applications outright may make historic homes unsustainable in the future energy economy.
- Solar panels are only permitted on sides not facing a public road – This type of policy ensures that the view of the building from the street is preserved while allowing the potential for installation on another side of a sloped roof. This may work for some residents; however, the disadvantage is that depending on the orientation of the street

and the building, there may be cases where one neighbour may be permitted solar panels while the other is not.

- Solar panels are permitted as long as they do not detract from the look of the building – This type of policy is fairly flexible and does not limit the location of the solar panel but is subjective. It is not a clear-cut policy that informs the property owner if they would be approved or not. This type of policy would benefit from an information pamphlet indicating what placement would be appropriate in a Heritage Area.
- Solar panels are permitted – This type of policy removes any subjectivity, but also removes the control of placement of solar panels. There is a risk that the solar panels may alter the look of the heritage conservation area.

The St. John's Heritage Area is at an advantage with respect to solar panels because a large portion of buildings in the Heritage Areas have flat roofs and solar panels may not detract from the look of the building. It would not be recommended to install a solar panel on the sloping side of a mansard roof.

The topic is brought to the Panel for a discussion on appropriate solar panel policies for the St. John's Heritage Areas, and options for gabled and sloped roof styles.



Solar panels that blend with the existing roof. Note, more expensive solar panels generally include pure black panels that do not have a metal frame or rims and only extends five inches from the roof's surface



Solar panels that detract from the look of the building.
Source: citylab.com

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.
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:

The topics of metal roofs and solar panels in the St. John's Heritage Areas are brought to the Built Heritage Experts Panel for discussion. More research may be required prior to making a recommendation to Council.

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/dlm

Attachments: Not applicable.

DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Streamlining Maintenance Applications for Designated Heritage Buildings

Date Prepared: April 17, 2019

Report To: Chair and Members, Built Heritage Experts Panel

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

Ward: All

Decision/Direction Required:

To determine an appropriate process to streamline maintenance applications for designated heritage buildings.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

Section 355 of the City of St. John’s Act sets out regulations for heritage preservation. As per Section 355 (2) of the Act, “A building, structure, land or area designated by the council shall not be demolished or built upon nor shall the exteriors of the building or structure be altered, except with the approval of council”. Therefore, any exterior work to a designated heritage building, whether it is minor maintenance repairs or a major renovation, requires Council approval.

To date, the process for evaluating any repairs to a designated heritage building has been an initial staff review, followed by a referral (i.e. Decision Note) to the Built Heritage Experts Panel (BHEP). The Panel’s recommendation then goes to a Committee of the Whole Meeting and then to a Council Meeting for a decision. Depending on when the application is submitted in relation to the next BHEP meeting, this process can take anywhere from four to seven weeks. In cases where a building requires emergency repairs, or the repairs are purely maintenance, this is a lengthy process. While we do try to expediate applications for minor repairs through e-vote, and requests for the application to go directly to a Council meeting, these are exceptions and not the rule.

To accelerate the current process, it is recommended that minor maintenance applications for designated heritage buildings should be evaluated by staff and sent directly to a Council meeting for Council’s approval. This would include applications for such things as repairs to shingles or roof flashings, re-pointing or re-painting of the building, or replacement of windows or doors in the same style and proportion of the existing. Generally, this is simply a replacement or repair of an existing feature. It is recommended that any applications that would alter the building or character defining elements of the building would follow the existing process of being referred to the BHEP for a recommendation to Council.



Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.
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 that minor maintenance applications for designated heritage buildings should be evaluated by staff and sent directly to a Council meeting for Council's approval.

Further, it is recommended that any applications that would alter the building or character defining elements of the building should follow the existing process of being referred to the BHEP for a recommendation to Council.

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/dlm

DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Mobile Vending Leased Space – Churchill Square
Date: April 23, 2019
Report To: His Worship Mayor Breen and Members of Council
Ward: 4

Decision/Direction Required:

To permit the lease of a parking stall in Churchill Square for the purposes of operating a motorized mobile vending unit.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The Division of Regulatory Services has been approached by the Association of New Canadians to discuss the possibility of setting up a food truck in the City at a dedicated location with the flexibility of moving to attend special events. This initiative will provide training and educational opportunities for new Canadians as they embark on being contributing members of the community.

Several areas were explored, which included locations in the downtown and Churchill Square. Churchill Square was the desired location for the vending unit as it provided a more robust location (see Appendix A). Although the vending unit will be positioned in the area of the Open-Air Market, it will be located far enough away that it will not have a negative impact on those users.

In addition, the area has an existing permanent Mobile Vendor that has been located in Churchill Square for several years. The area has also seen an increase in food sale occupancies over the past two years. The presence of another food vendor, as proposed, will not interfere with the operations of the aforementioned businesses as the clientele will be more diverse than existing operators.

Further, the proposed location will not interfere with the paid parking that currently exists as it will be located in a non-metered area. Considerations will have to be made when the area undergoes changes as proposed under the Paid Parking Management Strategy.



Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: The current rate for a leased space in Churchill Square is \$1,500 plus HST per year. There will also need to be a post and sign installed so that the space is clearly defined as a mobile vendor space.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: Not applicable
4. Legal or Policy Implications: Not applicable
5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable
7. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable
8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable
9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable
10. Other Implications: Not applicable

Recommendation:

It is recommended that council grant the request of the Association of New Canadians and allow an additional mobile vendor to operate out of Churchill Square as proposed.

Prepared by/Signature:

Randy Carew, CET, Manager, Regulatory Services

Signature: _____

Approved by/Signature:

Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA, Deputy City Manager, Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services

Signature: _____

Attachments



Appendix A



ST. JOHN'S

DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Parking at Canada Post Community Mailboxes

Meeting Date: May 1, 2019

Report To: Committee of The Whole

Ward: All

Decision/Direction Required: Implementation of Parking Restrictions at select Canada post Locations.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

Requests from the public and individual councilors to have a parking restriction installed at Canada Post community mail boxes have arisen since the implementation of this program. The addition of parking restrictions was not considered at the time due to the large number of these sites, the cost of the associated sign supports and parking signage at each location, difficulty of effective long-term enforcement, and demand for public parking.

The basis of the community mail boxes was to have them placed in strategic locations that residents would be able to walk to the location to collect their mail. These community mail boxes were never intended as a drive-to destination. The nature of postal mail means that there is no urgency in visiting a community mail box. A visit to the mailbox can be done at any time of the day or week and is only necessary on an occasional basis. If, due to special circumstances, a person feels that driving to their local mailbox is necessary, the option is available to do so in the evening or on the weekend when demand for parking in the area is naturally lower and nearby curb space is available.

Larkhall Street, Terra Nova Road and Clancey Drive have had the most requests for parking restrictions. This is in relation to existing traffic generators in the area. These areas include the Health Science Centre, Canada Revenue Agency / Farmers Market and Quidi Vidi Lake during rowing season.

During the winter months snow accumulation on sidewalks is a contributing factor to the demands for parking restrictions at community mail boxes. Rather than a unique concern, this is another consideration in the much larger discussion of sidewalk snow clearing throughout the City.

ST. JOHN'S

Transportation Engineering has not received any complaints from Canada Post regarding access to mailbox locations. The City does not maintain an inventory of community mail boxes

Should council elect to install restrictions at community mail boxes the most practical application would be a “Maximum 15 Minute” restriction at these locations. At a typical location this would require the addition of two sign supports with a sign on each. A typical sign post installed by the contractor is between \$185-\$199 per post per location and the average cost of 1 sign is \$25. Thus, a reasonable estimate for each community mail box where a restriction is implemented would cost roughly \$500 tax included. Staff time for planning, installation, and enforcement would also be required. Long term maintenance costs for these signs would only become a concern if a large number of restrictions were implemented.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
\$500 per mailbox location plus additional staff time.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
n/a
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
n/a
4. Legal or Policy Implications
Potential for additional prosecution load.
5. Privacy Implications
n/a
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations
Typically, a parking regulation change of this scale would not trigger a public announcement. However, given the nature of this particular concern, a public announcement should be made.
7. Human Resource Implications
n/a

8. Procurement Implications

n/a

9. Information Technology Implications

n/a

10. Other Implications

n/a

Recommendation: Maintain status quo with respect to parking near community mail boxes.

Prepared by:

Steve Fagan, Supervisor Traffic Analysis

Approved by:

Garrett Donaher, Manager Transportation Engineering

Attachments:

none