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AGENDA
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
April 11, 2018 – 9 a.m. – Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Call to Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of the Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adoption of the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Committee of the Whole Minutes – March 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presentations/ Delegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Meghan Lafferty, Acting Director of Nature Conservancy of Canada (NCC) – Freshwater Bay – Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Callie Woodward, Leading Edge Group – Continuous Improvement, Council Update – Link to 6a Decision Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finance &amp; Administration – Councillor Dave Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Decision Note dated April 3, 2018 re: Host – Urban Accord Meeting – Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador (MNL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Services &amp; Events – Councillor Jamie Korab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Decision Note dated April 3, 2018 re: The Royal St. Johns’ Regatta Committee – Hall of Fame Induction Luncheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Governance &amp; Strategic Priorities – Mayor Danny Breen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Information Note dated April 2, 2018 re: Update on Continuous Improvement (CI) Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Planning & Development – Councillor Maggie Burton

Consent Agenda

a. Memorandum dated August 19, 2015 re: Digital Advertising Signs (see March 8, 2018 BHEP Memo also)

Items for Discussion

a. Decision Note dated Application to Rezone Land to Commercial Local Zone for an Office Use REZ1800001 – 75 Airport Heights Drive

b. Decision Note dated April 4, 2018 re: Text Amendment to the Residential Low Density (R1) Zone to consider a Dog Boarding Facility, REZ1800004, 37 Aylward’s Lane

c. Decision Note dated April 5, 2018 re: 390 Duckworth Street, Exterior Repairs – The Majestic Theatre

9. Transportation – Councillor Debbie Hanlon

Items for Discussion

a. Decision Note dated March 14, 2018 re: George Street Association Taxi Layby Request

b. Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee Report – March 21, 2018

c. Decision Note dated April 4, 2018 re: 2017 Traffic Pilot Projects

10. Other Business

11. Adjournment
MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
March 28, 2018 – 9:00 a.m. – Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

Present: Mayor Danny Breen, Chair
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary
Councillor Hope Jamieson
Councillor Jamie Korab
Councillor Deanne Stapleton
Councillor Wally Collins
Councillor Maggie Burton
Councillor Ian Froude
Councillor Sandy Hickman

Regrets: Councillor Debbie Hanlon
Councillor Dave Lane

Staff: Kevin Breen, City Manager
Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager of Public Works
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
Ken O’Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
Susan Bonnell, Manager of Communications and Office Services
Carla Squires, Manager of Facilities Division
Garrett Donaher, Manager of Transportation Engineering
Elaine Henley, City Clerk
Kenessa Cutler, Legislative Assistant

Others: Jerry Dick, Heritage Association of NL

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Stapleton
That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

Moved – Councillor Jamieson; Seconded – Councillor Stapleton
That the Committee of the Whole minutes dated March 14, 2018 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PRESENTATIONS / DELEGATIONS

Heritage Association of NL – Presentation by Jerry Dick

Mr. Jerry Dick was present to speak to the above listed. He provided an overview of the Heritage Association of Newfoundland, its mandate, and its role in heritage preservation and adaptive reuse in the province. Mr. Dick detailed the Finding the Profit in Heritage Forum which brought together key stakeholders to discuss adaptive reuse and he outlined the recommendations the forum produced.

Deputy Mayor O’Leary commended the forum and asked how the information gathered will be used. Mr. Dick stated the recommendations are going to be put on the Heritage Association’s website and the association is engaging and educating municipalities in the province as he is doing today.

Jason Sinyard spoke to the difficulty found by staff who encounter potential heritage properties without a living owner. Mr. Dick suggested that by promoting heritage from the beginning and creating a different environment, the public’s opinion will change over time to be more accepting.

Councillor Korab spoke to how a heritage designation can be detrimental to buying and selling property. He asked how the City can ease the concerns of those homeowners who have their homes newly designated as a heritage property. Mr. Dick stated that along with changing residents’ perceptions over time through education, grants and incentive programs are also important. He emphasized the importance of a balanced approach.

Mayor Breen stated an engagement piece is needed; not only with owners and developers, but the public as well.

PUBLIC WORKS & SUSTAINABILITY – COUNCILLOR IAN FROUDE

Decision Note dated February 19, 2018 re: Mandatory Curbside Yard Waste Collection

Council considered the above listed decision note.

Mayor Breen asked if the initiative would result in a third truck (along with recycling and garbage collection). Lynnann Winsor answered yes, but they will use the older trucks in the fleet for curbside waste collection and no additional staff will be required.

Councillors stated the importance of public engagement and asked staff to inform
retailers to ensure they stock enough yard waste bags.

**Moved – Councillor Froude; Seconded – Councillor Jamieson**

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

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

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

**Information Note dated March 22, 2018 re: City of St. John’s, Molson Coors Athlete of the Month**

The above noted information was provided for consideration.

**Decision Note dated March 21, 2018 re: 2018 Capital Grants to Community Groups**

Consideration was given to the above noted. Councillor Korab asked if any of the requests fell outside of the City’s grants policy. Tanya Haywood stated that the St. John’s Public Library Board request did; staff re-evaluated it and concluded the mobile outreach bus portion would be best suited to qualify for the grant. The project cost is $100,000 and as per the grants policy the grant amount would be changed to $50,000. This change would leave $40,000 unassigned.

Discussions ensued as to how to assign the remaining funds.

**Moved – Councillor Korab; Seconded – Councillor Burton**

To approve the 2018 Capital Grants as outlined in the Decision Note cited above with the following modifications:

- To increase the 2018 Capital Grant to Swilers Rugby Club to $100,000;
- To increase the Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee funding to 50% of their requested amount;
- To grant $50,000 to the St. John’s Public Library Board for their mobile outreach bus;
- And to put the remainder into a contingency fund to be used should a deserving project arise.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Built Heritage Experts Panel Report – February 13, 2018
The Committee considered the recommendations of the Built Heritage Experts Panel from its meeting on March 13, 2018:

i. Decision Noted dated March 8, 2018 re: 8 Military Road – St. Thomas’ Parish Hall – LED Wall Signs

Deputy Mayor O’Leary expressed concern regarding the sign’s use, proposed brightness, and its appropriateness in a heritage area.

Mayor Breen stated the City regulates the luminosity of signs under the Heritage Area Sign By-Law and this sign was vetted by the Built Heritage Experts Panel.

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

To defer the above listed to gather move information as to the sign’s use, proposed brightness and its appropriateness in a heritage area.

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

Moved - Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Stapleton

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

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

CARRIED WITH COUNCILLOR FROUDE AND DEPUTY MAYOR O’LEARY DISSENTING

ii. Discussion on Urban Planning

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

To reject the recommendation that Council and staff should seek the Panel’s input on such matters when roads and intersections may be realigned
permanently, and to instead consult with the Panel on such matters as needed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Decision Note dated March 16, 2018 re: Heritage Policy Working Group
The Committee considered the above noted.

Moved – Councillor Burton; Seconded – Councillor Jamieson
That Council approve the formation of the Heritage Policy Working Group with the terms of reference and membership as proposed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

TRANSPORTATION – COUNCILLOR DEBBIE HANLON

Decision Note dated March 15, 2018 re: Metrobus Transit Priority Signals
Council considered the above noted.

Moved – Councillor Collins; Seconded – Councillor Froude
That Council approve the implementation of transit priority features within the City of St. John’s to improve Metrobus service.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
The next meeting will be held Wednesday, April 11, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:36 a.m.

Mayor Danny Breen
Chairperson
CONSERVATION FRESHWATER BAY

CONSERVING AN ICONIC PIECE OF AVALON COASTLINE

Creating an urban nature reserve for all to enjoy.

Newfoundland and Labrador’s Avalon Peninsula is the eastern edge of Canada, where the country meets the magnificent Atlantic Ocean. The landscape of barrens, forests, and wetlands is almost completely surrounded by rugged coastlines indented with numerous bays. Freshwater Bay is one of these, located just south of the province’s capital city.

Freshwater Bay is well known as an area to take a hike, watch for whales, and easily escape from the city. The bay meets the coast at a rocky barachois, next to Freshwater Pond. Now an abandoned fishing settlement, Freshwater Bay was once home to 65 full-time residents. Houses were dismantled in the early 1900s, but the area remains a popular spot for residents of St. John’s to have picnics and outings. Freshwater Bay has long been cherished by locals and tourists alike, but the surrounding natural setting has been taken for granted. While the proximity of the area to St. John’s makes it a valued resource for outdoor enthusiasts, it also means the land is vulnerable to development.

Much of Freshwater Bay is surrounded by provincial crown land, with the exception of a 243-acre (98 hectare) private property that begins at Freshwater Bay and extends south to Blackhead Road. Nature Conservancy of Canada has been offered this land as an incredible gift. The land donors, Crosbie Group Limited, are faithful supporters of both their community and conservation. Rob Crosbie, Chairman of the Crosbie Group, said, “Our family is happy to see this property going to such a high quality conservation group, making sure the land will always be available for the people who use it.”

With your help, we can not only protect this important piece of natural and cultural history on the Avalon, but also conserve the area for continued recreational enjoyment into the future.

Freshwater Bay at a glance

1. Boreal Forest: the majority of the landscape is boreal forest, with species like black spruce, balsam fir, white birch, and tamarack. In addition to providing habitat, the boreal forest stores astounding quantities of our planet’s carbon in its trees, peat, and soils.

2. Wetlands: interspersed throughout the forest are wetlands. Wetlands act as important wildlife habitat and water filtration systems.

3. Nearby seabirds: rock cliffs located along the coastline, just beyond Freshwater Bay, provide valuable seabird habitat because of their rugged and isolated nature, making them relatively free of predators and human disturbance. Many seabird species use this area, including black-legged kittiwakes, black guillemots, herring gulls, and great black-backed gulls.

4. Hiking destination: Freshwater Bay is well known by nature lovers who like to walk. A spectacular trail network, enticing you to explore the area on foot, is devotedly maintained by the East Coast Trail Association and allows you reconnect with nature, just minutes outside the City.

natureconservancy.ca/freshwaterbay
Freshwater Bay is located a few kilometers away from where the sunrise greets North America. It is also one harbor south from one of the oldest English cities on the continent. The 243-acre conservation project is not only an important piece of ecological real estate; its proximity to St. John’s makes it easy to get outside and connect with nature.

The East Coast Trail, an award-winning hiking trail, intersects the property, allowing you to explore the scenery on foot. This is a place full of natural beauty and stories to tell. Along the rocky barachois are remnants of the SS Thetis, which was pulled out to Freshwater Bay as a final resting place after a remarkable career, traveling the world over. A famous arctic explorer ship and sealing vessel, the SS Thetis was once used on a rescue mission in Canada’s high arctic, bringing stranded sailors back to safety.
CONSERVATION FRESHWATER BAY

BE A PART OF THE STORY

The Freshwater Bay project is an opportunity to conserve a spectacular piece of the Avalon Peninsula, just a few footsteps from St. John’s. Freshwater Bay is not only an important piece of cultural history, it is a great example of eastern Avalon coastline, an iconic Newfoundland landscape beloved by locals and tourists alike. With your help this nearby nature retreat will be here for years to come. By conserving Freshwater Bay, it will not only remain protected for everyone to enjoy, but also allow for our continued delight in the incredible closeness to nature we are fortunate to have living in Newfoundland and Labrador.

You can be part of the story by helping NCC safeguard this piece of wilderness forever. The project value for the urban nature reserve is $2.7 million. Although this is a land donation, we need to raise $385,000 for legal fees, a land survey, science work, and our stewardship endowment fund, which will ensure that the natural values of this property are protected, forever. If we do not raise the funds in time, we may lose the opportunity to secure an urban nature reserve for everyone to enjoy.

Yes, I want to support the Freshwater Bay Conservation Project

Title:  □ Mr.  □ Mrs.  □ Ms.  □ Mr. & Mrs.  □ Dr.  □ Other: ___________
Name: ___________________________________________________________
Street Address: ___________________________________________________
City: ___________________________ Province: ______________________ Postal Code: ___________
E-mail: __________________________ Telephone: _______________________

I choose to make my donation by:  □ Cheque (to “Nature Conservancy of Canada”)
□ VISA  □ MC  □ AMEX
Card #: __________________________ Exp.: ___________
Name on Card: __________________________
Signature: __________________________

□ I would like to pledge a total gift of $ __________ over ______ year(s).
Enclosed is my payment of $ __________.
The remaining balance is to be made as installments:  □ annually  □ monthly.

□ I wish to remain anonymous.  □ I wish to be recognized as follows: __________________________

We respect your privacy. If you wish to speak with someone about your donation, please phone us toll-free at 1-877-231-4400 or email atlantic@natureconservancy.ca. NCC keeps supporters informed of activities and opportunities by mailing occasional updates and appeals for support, including NCC’s newsletter. If you would prefer not to receive mailings from us, please check here: □

NCC may direct all or a portion of gifts committed to NCC’s provincial Stewardship Endowment Fund. Revenue generated by the Stewardship Endowment Fund provides for long-term management of properties across Newfoundland and Labrador, including those in the Avalon Peninsula Natural Area, like Freshwater Bay.

Thank You For Your Support
NCC Charitable Registration Number: 11924 6544 RR0001

ATLANTIC REGIONAL OFFICE
Hugh John Flemming Forestry Centre
1350 Regent Street, Suite 260
Fredericton, NB, E3C 2G6
Toll free: 1-877-231-4400

NEWFOUNDLAND AND
LABRADOR OFFICE
136 Crosbie Road, Suite 103
St. John’s NL A1B 3K3
T: 709.753.5540

If a U.S. tax deduction could be more advantageous, NCC works in partnership with a registered U.S. charity, American Friends of the Nature Conservancy of Canada (FNCC), and we would be pleased to explore options with you.
Session Objectives

• Understand CI methodology and benefits for municipalities
• Understand the essential elements to build a culture of CI at City of St. John’s
• Align Council CI expectations for City of St. John’s
How did we get here?

**Corporate Strategic Plan**

- **Corporate Values**
  - Continuing to do things better
  - Be innovative
- **Strategic Direction**
  - Effective Organization

**Quality of Work Life Study and Task Forces**
- Opportunities for improvements.
- Employees want to be involved.

**Program Review**
- Need to focus on ongoing improvement.

Two initiatives running in parallel 2016-2017
What is CI?

A continuous improvement initiative

Helps improve overall performance

Reduces waste

Makes processes better and more efficient
What is CI?

Is not:
- Eliminating jobs
-forcing people to work harder
-speeding up the work
-only focused on manufacturing operations
-only common sense

Is:
- an enterprise excellence strategy
-focusing on value from the citizen’s perspective
-improving Quality of Work Life
-the continuous pursuit of the better process through waste elimination
-respect for people
High Level View

Inputs
- Employees
- Processes
- Customers
- Information

Outputs
- Highest Quality
- Lowest Cost
- Fastest Delivery

Sources of Loss
- Inflexibility
- Variation
- Waste

CI is about focusing on these sources of loss
Defining value

- The resident/client must be willing to pay for it, i.e. the worth placed upon something.
- The activity must transform the product or service in some way.
- The activity must be done correctly the first time.
The 8 Wastes (DOWNTIME)

- Waiting
- Non-utilized Staff Creativity
- Transporting
- Inventory
- Over Production
- Motion
- Defects
- Excessive Processing

The 8 Wastes
Focus on Flow

A. Traditional Flow = Inefficient flow of value

Free up capacity to create and sustain more efficient, effective, and relevant programs and services.

B. Continuous Improvement Flow = Efficient flow of value
Continually strive for Better

“*To improve is to change; to be perfect is to change often*”

*Winston Churchill*
## Positive Impact of CI

CI is having a positive impact in communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement scores</td>
<td>Turnaround time for critical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and staff safety</td>
<td>Application and registration times for key programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community satisfaction</td>
<td>Rate of errors and reworking solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting time for essential services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership is.....

Top Down

Vision
Strategy
Goals
Objectives

Pain points
Ideas
Methods
Procedures

Bottom Up
A CI Municipality...

- **Process**
  - Capacity
  - Efficiency
  - Flexibility

- **Products & Services**
  - Relevant Services
  - Maximum Quality/reduced waste
  - Minimal Cost

- **Customer Value**
  - Right 1st time
  - Value for dollar
  - Speed of Service

- **Employee Value**
  - Engagement
  - Safety
  - Empowerment

- **Performance**
  - Council Targets
  - Stakeholder Value
  - Healthy Budget
“City of St. John’s CI Journey”

PDCA toward target condition

Current Condition

Next Step

Plan

Do

Act

Check

Target Condition
Critical Success Factors

- Accountability & reporting framework
- Strategic alignment and deployment
- Selection and prioritization of improvements
- Change management and leadership

- Process efficiency metrics
- Tracking benefits
- Rewards and recognition

- Standard methodology
- Templates & technology
- Guidelines and procedures

- Practice and learning
- Idea & solution generation
- Formal training & development
- CI resource management
## CI Roles & Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Daily CI Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>• Participate confidently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborate within and across departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Root cause problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rapid Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unions</strong></td>
<td>• Collaborate within and across departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seek out win-win opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>• Remove roadblocks within and across departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create forums and guide root cause problem solving for rapid improvements (no blame!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measure process efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sponsor, guide and resource CI improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council</strong></td>
<td>• Be informed of current initiatives and achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistent communication to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidance on key areas of focus – Voice of Citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Messages

• It’s not CI if you do not involve the front line
• Continuous Improvement is about continuous learning mentoring and coaching people
• All problems are opportunities in disguise
• Make the process better – not blame the worker
• “Bottom-up” leadership balances “top-down” direction
• Efficiency and effectiveness are achieved by chasing waste, not dollars.
• Capacity is the true commodity
DECISION/DIRECTION

Title: Host - Urban Accord Meeting – Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador (MNL)

Date Prepared: April 3, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor & Lead: Dave Lane – Finance and Administration

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Seeking approval for the City to cover the catering costs associated with hosting the Urban Accord Meetings held in St. John’s from March 14 to 15, 2018.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

- The Urban Accord is a subcommittee of the MNL and is a first-of-its-kind collaborative approach to local economic development. It is founded on the concept of cooperation and the sharing of information to better serve municipalities in Newfoundland and Labrador that will help them to create and grow jobs within their regions. Its mandate is to provide an important professional network of economic development professionals to help assess effectiveness and guidance on how to do so.
- Meetings are held three times yearly with each of the 18 member municipalities rotating the hosting.
- For the first time in four years, the City hosted the meetings held on March 14 and 15 at the Paul Reynolds Community Centre.
- MNL is seeking reimbursement of 50 percent of the costs of catering for those two days.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
   - The total cost for $2,128.33 associated with hosting this event is budgeted under the civic events budget with the Office of the City Clerk.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
   - Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
   - A Culture of Cooperation

4. Legal or Policy Implications
   - N/A

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations
   - N/A

6. Human Resource Implications
   - N/A
7. Procurement Implications
N/A

8. Information Technology Implications
N/A

9. Other Implications
N/A

Recommendations:
It is recommended that Council approve the costs associated with hosting the Urban Accord meetings held at the Paul Reynolds Community Centre on March 14 and 15, 2018.

Prepared and Approved by: Elaine Henley, City Clerk

Attachments: N/A
DECISION/DIRECTION

Title: The Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee – Hall of Fame Induction Luncheon

Date Prepared: April 3, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor & Lead: Jamie Korab – Community Services & Events

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Seeking approval for the City to host the Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee’s annual Hall of Fame Induction Luncheon.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

- The City of St. John’s is a member of the Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee
- The luncheon is scheduled for July 25, 2018 in the Foran/Greene Room for approximately 120 people.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
   - The cost for this event is budgeted under the civic events budget with the Office of the City Clerk.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
   - The Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
   - A Culture of Cooperation

4. Legal or Policy Implications
   N/A

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations
   N/A

6. Human Resource Implications
   N/A

7. Procurement Implications
   N/A

8. Information Technology Implications
   N/A
9. Other Implications

N/A

Recommendations:
It is recommended that Council grant approval to host the annual Hall of Fame Induction Luncheon for the Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee on July 25, 2018.

Prepared and Approved by: Elaine Henley, City Clerk

Attachments:
None
Title: Strategic Plan Annual Report 2017 and 2018 Priorities

Date Prepared: Feb 19, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole (April 11, 2018)

Councillor and Role: Mayor Breen, Governance and Strategic Priorities Lead

Ward: N/A

Issue: To provide an update on results achieved, adjustments and emerging priorities

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

On June 1, 2015 the City of St. John’s rolled out its Corporate Strategic Plan (CSP) for 2015-18. The subsequent implementation plan was released in winter 2016. The plan outlines five values to guide the City’s work, six strategic directions and a series of goals which deliver on these directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Directions</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods build our City</td>
<td>Continue to do things better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A culture of cooperation</td>
<td>Be innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A city for all seasons</td>
<td>Create a positive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscally responsible</td>
<td>Be respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive and progressive</td>
<td>Take ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Performance and Strategy (OPS), a division of Finance and Administration, works with a Corporate Strategic Plan Implementation Team to support the ongoing monitoring and reporting of the plan. Departments are responsible for activities within the plan that advance the directions.

Monitoring

- As of June 2017, 21 initiatives slated for completion for 2016 were outstanding (i.e. were reported in the last mid-year report as either not commenced or commenced with slow progress largely due to 2016 being focused on Program Review). Twelve of these initiatives remained outstanding at December 31, 2017 and are noted in the attached report.
- There were 49 projects/initiatives scheduled to be completed by the end of 2017. Of these, 61% are well underway or completed, 27% have commenced but are moving more slowly than planned, and 12% have not started. Four initiatives have been refocused due to changing priorities and direction and 19 new initiatives have been added as a result of an enhanced focus on organizational performance and the evolution of other projects. Details regarding all projects and priorities can be found in the 2017 report.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications
   Budget and financial implications were considered as the monitoring of the plan was carried out. Projects slated for 2017 were considered in the context of the 2017 budget process and projected 2018 budgets as approved by Council in December, 2016.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders
   External partners identified in a variety of deliverables of the plan.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans
   The Strategic Plan is the overarching City plan and connects with all other City plans.

4. Legal or Policy Implications
   Some initiatives have legal or policy implications and the City Solicitor’s office would be consulted as required.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations
   Ongoing engagement and communication with staff and the larger community is essential to the success of any strategic plan to help foster both awareness and understanding of how the priorities are being advanced. Staff need to know what their role is in advancing the directions. All annual reports and mid-year reports can be found on the city’s website in the publications area. As work begins on a new strategic plan, engagement and communications will become increasingly important to ensure directions align with accountabilities and overall priorities.

6. Human Resource Implications
   Responsibility for the development, monitoring and reporting of the plan rests with the Division of Organizational Performance and Strategy. Implementation is the responsibility of the lead departments.

7. Procurement Implications
   Various components of the plan have procurement implications. These would be addressed through the normal procurement process.

8. Information Technology Implications
   Various components of the plan have information technology implications. These would be addressed through normal approval and planning processes.

9. Other Implications
   It is important that any decisions/announcements of projects outlined in the plan reference how they support/advance the strategic plan.
Conclusion/Next Steps:

Table the Corporate Strategic Plan 2017 Annual Report at an upcoming regular meeting of Council and communicate internally and externally results achieved and priority projects for 2018.

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

Reviewed by: Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager, Finance and Administration

Approved by: Kevin Breen, City Manager

Attachments:
Corporate Strategic Plan 2017 Annual Report
Corporate Strategic Plan
2017 Annual Report
& 2018 Priorities
Corporate Strategic Plan

- Launched in June 2015
- Covers the period 2015-2018
- 6 strategic directions, 36 goals
- Responsibility for overseeing the plan resides with Organizational Performance & Strategy (OPS), Department of Finance and Administration
- Progress reports twice annually – June and December
2017 Annual Progress Report

• Report of initiatives scheduled for completion in 2016 that remained outstanding as of Dec. 31, 2017
• Report on status of all initiatives undertaken in 2017
  - Completed or good progress
  - Commenced, slow progress
  - Not commenced
• Confirmation of priorities for 2018 and identification of any new priorities
Initiatives from 2016 that remain outstanding

- As of June 2017, 21 initiatives slated for completion for 2016 were outstanding (i.e. were reported in the last mid-year report as either not commenced or commenced with slow progress)
- As of December 31, 2017, 12 of these initiatives remained outstanding (listed below with commentary in italics)

Commenced, slow progress

1. Advance Energy Retrofit Project - *Energy Retrofit project to occur in 2018*
2. Develop policy around appropriate use of public spaces within City Hall - *New Policy Analyst position will coordinate this work*
3. Identify boundaries for new planning areas - *Envision St. John’s is still underway, this work would follow*
4. Comprehensive Land Use Development Plan - *Final draft reports completed, will go to Committee of the Whole in 2018*
5. Identify opportunities for partnering/gaps through City-Province program/service inventory - *Some work initiated on inventory, still in progress*
6. Explore implementation of final offer selection for Firefighter Collective Bargaining - *Discussions continue with Provincial Government*
7. Implementation of a Fatigue Management Program – *Research on best practices completed, next steps to be determined*
8. Complete site selection and concept plan study for Mews Community Centre replacement - *working on issue of land ownership*
9. Establish working group with recommendations for engagement around development – *final document with recommendations forthcoming 1st quarter 2018*
10. Electricity Generation at RHB using Biogas - *delayed due to regulatory issues.*

Not commenced

1. Develop an awareness/marketing plan for a distinct downtown – *Downtown St. John’s continues work on a marketing plan*
2. Establish committee, terms of reference for Winter City Strategy – *Winter City Strategy to be revisited in next planning cycle*
Overall Corporate Strategic Plan results for 2017

49 initiatives identified for 2017 across 6 strategic directions

Status of initiatives to December 31, 2017

- Completed or good progress, 30, 61%
- Commenced, slow progress, 13, 27%
- Not commenced, 6, 12%
Detailed status of 2017 initiatives by strategic goal
As the City becomes larger in scale and more diverse it is becoming like many other mid-sized cities, one of smaller communities with their own identities and characteristics. Indeed the "communities," local areas and neighbourhoods, are becoming the core building blocks for city programs, services and policies. We think about our city in this context. City documents and plans speak to the importance of neighbourhoods in how we see ourselves and our interactions.

GOALS

- Promote a safe and secure city
- Improve neighbourhood level services
- Increase access to range/type of housing
- Develop parks and places for people
- Create neighbourhood-focused plans and information
- Deliver satellite & alternative methods for City services/ information
- Maintain & position downtown as a distinct neighbourhood

12 initiatives for 2017
Completed or good progress

- Develop policy around appropriate use of outdoor spaces e.g. City parks
- Deliver on construction of community market
- Develop the Coordinated Access and Rapid Rehousing programs
- Develop a downtown strategy (business, heritage), develop working definitions for the downtown (boundaries) – working boundaries defined, focus currently on wayfinding project
- As part of building an accountability framework, research best practices in other municipalities including the availability of enterprise wide tools for a dashboard solution for reporting
- Prepare plans, initiate construction for Kenmount Terrace Park Community Centre

Commenced, slow progress

- Develop lands inventory for residential and community purposes - Ward 2 in final stages. Reviewing land titles
- Identify framework for creation of Urban Design Guidelines - design guidelines to be examined once Envision St. John’s is complete
- Lead the creation of Affordable Housing Business Plan with community stakeholders - What We Heard document released in January 2018. Strategy to be finalized once feedback from community received and reviewed
- Conduct intersection safety status analysis as part of road safety program - staff required to complete this work being recruited
- Initiate trenchless water main renewal in the Rabbittown area - pipe lining contract proceeded slower than expected during 2017. Will be completed in Rabbittown during 2018

Not commenced

- Strategy toward development of neighbourhood groups – priority for 2018 is on the development of neighbourhood profiles
As a city, St. John's does not operate in isolation. Increasingly cooperative and collaborative interrelationships amongst municipalities and the need to develop mutually beneficial relationships with the private, education, community and not-for-profit sectors, will become crucial to supporting our dynamically sustainable capital city.

**GOALS**
- Improve multi-level government relations
- Develop improved inter-regional municipal relations
- Create effective City-education collaborations
- Create effective City-community collaborations
- Explore regional emergency and continuity management strategy
A Culture of Cooperation

**Completed or good progress**

- Advance Business and Art St. John's initiative, including building stakeholder relationships, data collection, stakeholder event
- Research appropriate model to fit Regional Services for Emergency Management (EM) and Business Continuity Planning including; regional plans, training and prevention model
- Transfer of authority of portions of Highway Traffic Act related to City's Parking Services

**Commenced, slow progress**

- Preliminary design for secondary treatment at Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Facility - Discussions ongoing to develop funding sources
- Promote safe neighbourhoods and transportation through a collective impact approach to community safety: establish a framework, research best practices – under review as part of larger Healthy Community Framework

**Not commenced**

- Develop Watershed Forestry Management Plan - deferred until December 2018 due to staffing constraints
Effective Organization

As an efficient and effective organization we will continue to build, robust systems, structures and frameworks to help respond to and deliver services within a constantly changing environment. Guided by our values, we will support a positive, productive, knowledgeable and engaged workforce that understands the importance of what it means to be citizen-focused.

GOALS
• Cultivate a safe, healthy and respectful environment
• Develop a knowledgeable and engaged workforce
• Advance business continuity and material management plans
• Create a culture of engagement
• Build an accountability framework
• Support corporate-wide information and knowledge sharing
• Support a learning culture
**Effective Organization**

**Completed or good progress**
- Develop and implement a management orientation program and a Managers’ Toolkit that includes financial literacy
- Identify key HR metrics and establish process for tracking and sharing
- Research best practices in other municipalities for employee innovation
- Identify and contract an external EAP provider enhancing services to employees and their families.
- Develop and communicate the End of Employment Policy
- Implement upgrades on HRIS Software for increasing efficiency of Pension admin
- Build the framework for Performance Management and Succession Planning within the organization
- Develop a culture of continuous improvement through workshops/training
- Research best practices in other municipalities for accountability and performance measurement
- Develop learning organization position paper
- Develop online management engagement hub
- Configure and implement an e-recruitment software improving efficiency and increasing transparency for applicants

**Commenced, slow progress**
- Explore project management tools - working group established in 2017, recommendations developed, outcomes and actions to follow in 2018
- Determine Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for City programs/services - development of KPIs will be tied to continuous improvement initiatives and the new strategic plan to be rolled out in 2019
- Identify and prioritize enterprise wide and departmental specific technology solutions arising from program review - Corporate Information Services continues to work with Departments to prioritize requests as they are received. An IT Project Request form has been made available for departments to submit requests and outline their business requirements. This will assist in determining how projects are prioritized.

**Not commenced**
- Review the CSA Psychologically Safe Workplace Standards for adaptability to the City’s Workplace - considering other projects this is deferred to 2018
- Develop pilot process/program for employee innovation, evaluate – tied to other initiatives. As continuous improvement is advanced and the rewards and recognition program is updated, employee innovation will be considered in 2018
There are opportunities to make St. John's a year-round, livable and active city. Like many other Canadian and northern cities, we need to develop innovative approaches to the problems of the seasons while creating opportunities and bolstering the City's ability to attract and retain residents and businesses.

**GOALS**

- Develop a Winter City strategy
- Support year-round active transportation
- Explore options for year-round active, leisure and recreation facilities/programs
- Promote active and healthy living
- Support a weather resilient city
- Incorporate all weather planning in City building and open space development
- Support year-round tourism and industry activity
A City for All Seasons

Completed or good progress

- Work in conjunction with regional partners to develop Destination and Product Development Committee for St. John’s region
- Initiate the Comprehensive Strategy and Master Plan process for the Bicycle Strategy

Commenced, slow progress

Not commenced

- Develop Winter City Strategy - Winter City Strategy to be revisited in next planning cycle
Council recognizes the changing expectations of citizens. There are increasing calls to invest in lifestyle amenities that enhance the livability of St. John's. However, the existing fiscal policy framework by which St. John's and other municipalities operate puts limits on our ability to access tax revenues. Alternative financial considerations and models will be explored.

**GOALS**
- Develop appropriate user fee policies
- Explore complementary public/private partnerships
- Explore cost-sharing programs/foundations/models
- Advance new city-NL government fiscal framework
- Explore sponsorship strategies
- Deliver effective grant programs and services
- Develop multi-year budgeting framework/alignment with strategic directions
### Fiscally Responsible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed or good progress</th>
<th>Commenced, slow progress</th>
<th>Not commenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Deliver on construction of 22 affordable housing units — *good progress, completion in 2018* | • Explore discussions with Province on enhancing equity in water consumption and water fees — *Province does not have fiscal capacity to enter into discussions at this time*  
• Conduct and review a market study for insurance providers to obtain most cost-effective and value added benefit for employees - *currently reviewing RFP submissions for benefit consultant and 3rd party pension administrator. Once secured, a Market Analysis will be conducted* | |
In addressing the challenges facing the City in the coming years, Council and the City will be responsive in developing processes for continuous improvement. Cities with effective public engagement frameworks that create a forum for two-way dialogue with citizens and stakeholders are more responsive in developing effective plans and programs. Being responsive and progressive means the City is supportive of being flexible and solutions-focused with new approaches.

**GOALS**
- Create a culture of engagement
- Become a welcoming and inclusive city
- Build social, environmental and demographic factors into policy-making
- Deliver comprehensive and responsive communications product/services
- Identify and deliver on projects, strategies and programs

**Status of initiatives**
- Completed or Good Progress, 6, 75%
- Commenced, Slow Progress, 1, 12%
- Not commenced, 1, 13%

8 initiatives for 2017
Responsive and Progressive

Completed or good progress

- Explore neighbourhood strategy as means of engagement – *focus is on creating neighbourhood profiles*
- Gap Analysis, develop pilot project methodology and evaluation tools
- Plan for and implement automated garbage
- Establish citizen satisfaction survey
- Explore option of creating a citizen panel
- Undertake an evaluation of the engagement policy, portal and process

Commenced, slow progress

- Identify needs across the community and within the city organization for community talent attraction - *approach across community has had limited advancement. Local Immigration Partnership service mapping to be completed in 2018 will help support this direction*

Not commenced

- Develop procedure to establish a property cadastral layer (GIS) - *resources did not permit progress during 2017. Will implement in 2018 if resources permit*
**Initiatives from the 2017 priority list that have changed in scope or are no longer being pursued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Why initiative has changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhoods Build our City</strong></td>
<td>Priority for 2018 is to develop neighbourhood profiles. Neighbourhood profile draft being developed for presentation to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy toward development of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbourhood groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a downtown strategy</td>
<td>Working boundaries for the downtown have been developed by the Downtown Advisory Committee. The focus of this initiative for 2018 will be on updating the themed signage/wayfinding study which includes consideration of the downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(business, heritage), develop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working definitions for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downtown (boundaries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A City for all Seasons</strong></td>
<td>Winter City Strategy to be revisited in the next planning cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Winter City Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsive and Progressive</strong></td>
<td>Priority for 2018 is to develop neighbourhood profiles. Neighbourhood profile draft being developed for presentation to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore neighbourhood strategy as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means of engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiatives for 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhoods Build our City</th>
<th>A Culture of Cooperation</th>
<th>Effective Organization</th>
<th>A City for All Seasons</th>
<th>Responsive and Progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on construction of community market</td>
<td>Implementation of the Homelessness Partnering Strategy through End Homelessness St. John’s</td>
<td>Identify opportunities to connect with Welcoming Cities Strategy, e.g. diversity training</td>
<td>Develop a pilot process for employee innovation program and evaluate</td>
<td>Implement KPMG report: Pilot and experiment with contracting out snow clearing, ice control, continue and enhance sidewalk snow clearing, fleet review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop neighbourhood profiles</td>
<td>Preliminary design for secondary treatment at Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Facility</td>
<td>Develop and implement process for early identification and intervention of workplace conflict - tools and techniques</td>
<td>Assess current Human Resource Information System, review current information needs and system requirements</td>
<td>Implement automated garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop lands inventory for residential and community purposes</td>
<td>Advance amendments to City Act governing Council/Election/City Clerk’s Office</td>
<td>Review recognition programs for employees and develop more comprehensive approach</td>
<td>Application of IT tools to support internal communication e.g. Manager's toolkit, orientation</td>
<td>Complete Bicycle Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead the creation of Affordable Housing Business Plan with community stakeholders</td>
<td>Identify opportunities for partnering/gaps through City-Province program/service inventory</td>
<td>Facilitate the development of a performance management program</td>
<td>Determine Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) s for City programs/services</td>
<td>Mews Community Centre replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify boundaries for new planning areas</td>
<td>Identify opportunities for partnering/gaps through City-Province program/service inventory</td>
<td>Explore project management tools</td>
<td>Identify and prioritize enterprise wide and departmental specific technology solutions arising from program review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop policy around appropriate use of public spaces within City Hall</td>
<td>Develop Watershed Forestry Management Plan</td>
<td>Market study for insurance providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify framework for creation of Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Develop Watershed Forestry Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Energy Retrofit Project</td>
<td>Explore implementation of final offer selection for Firefighter Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>Review the CSA Psychologically Safe Workplace Standards for adaptability to the City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct intersection safety status analysis</td>
<td>Partnership with NLHC for affordable housing (22 housing units at Convent Sq. currently underway to be completed in 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 19 initiatives added for 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhoods Build our City</th>
<th>A Culture of Cooperation</th>
<th>Effective Organization</th>
<th>Responsive and Progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming pilot projects and evaluate</td>
<td>End Homelessness St. John’s will conduct community consultations to seek recommendations from community partners on the creation of a 10 year plan to address homelessness in St. John's</td>
<td>Develop guidelines, forms, criteria for Employee Leave Program/Flexible Work Schedule Protocol</td>
<td>Deliver on themed signage program as recommended in Roadmap 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop plan for development and delivery core values training and begin delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance content for Managers’ Hub to facilitate knowledge and information sharing across the organization</td>
<td>Advance update/new economic plan and deliver economic summit to inform directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop strategy for management development program to complement competency framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate committee of the whole pilot project and make recommendations</td>
<td>Implement recommendations from the 2017 public engagement evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Streamline the approval, budget processes for employee learning and development program</td>
<td>Plan for and undertake public engagement for 2019-21 budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake learning plan pilot project</td>
<td>Through internal and external consultations, develop new strategic plan for roll out in 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin implementation of 57 recommendations from Paid Parking Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue: Update Council on the City’s continuous improvement strategy and projects currently underway

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
Since March 2017, the City has been advancing its efforts to build a culture of continuous improvement. Outlined in the Strategic plan as a core value “continue to do things better,” and built into the strategic direction to be an “Effective Organization,” the city has developed and implemented a consistent organizational approach to continuous improvement based on best practice.

Working with a consultant to build capacity and outline a strategy, 15 employees received enhanced CI training in late 2017. Additionally, a roadmap for how to embed CI into the culture was developed and is now being implemented. Since October 2017, 107 city managers have received training and employees at St. John’s Sports and Entertainment and Metrobus have also been trained. These sessions have focused on increasing awareness and understanding of the CI approach and teaching staff more about the CI tools the city will be using. Non-management staff are also receiving training and nearly 150 have received training to date. Sessions continue to be offered and participation is excellent.

Nine CI projects are currently underway at the City. Metrobus and St. John’s Sports and Entertainment are also carrying out projects. A CI project follows a specific approach which is based in understanding the root cause(s) for a problem and then working with front line staff to develop and test solutions. CI forces consideration for the voice of the customer and requires the process owner to be a champion in the project.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:
   Cost associated with delivering the original training and developing strategy were primarily covered in the 2017 budget with a small amount allocated for coaching and support for the first six months of 2018. All initiatives related to advance CI are now being undertaken by staff who have been trained to lead projects and deliver the training.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   Unions – Unions have been consulted throughout the development of strategy and union employees have been trained.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
   Strategic Direction - Effective Organization clearly articulates the need to focus on building an accountability framework of which continuous improvement is a key component.

4. Legal or Policy Implications:
   There may be policy implications if CI projects identify change in process or procedure. These would be dealt with by the each, based on the project at the time.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations
   A detailed communications plan has been developed for continuous improvement and communications has focused primarily on staff at this point. As projects are completed and results achieved, the staff will also report to Council and the public on achievements and lessons learned.

6. Human Resource Implications
   The Division of Organizational Performance is providing leadership on the governance of CI within the city and managing the training and capacity building. All staff play a role in helping to build a CI culture.

7. Procurement Implications
   CI projects may result in solutions that require procurement. These will be addressed by the each.

8. Information Technology Implications
   As part of the contract with the consultant the city is piloting an online CI management tool which allows for better project management and data collection. The City will determine whether this tool meets its needs before the end of 2018.

9. Other Implications
   The City is early in its continuous improvement journey. Creating a culture of continuous improvement takes time and needs persistent and ongoing support from Council and senior staff. CI is rooted in learning and not all projects will yield desired results. The key is to learn from those projects.

Conclusion/Next Steps:
City staff will continue to advance the CI roadmap and provide an update to Council again in June, 2018

Prepared by/Signature: Victoria Etchegary, Manager, Organizational Performance and Strategy
Approved by/Date/Signature: Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager, Finance and Administration

Attachments:
Continuous Improvement Governance
Overview of Continuous Improvement Projects
## Current City Projects

Nine projects are being undertaken at the City in the first half of 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department - Division</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager - Office Services</td>
<td>Improve printing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager - Office of the City Clerk</td>
<td>Free up capacity on the shared network drive and organize files to improve information management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration - Division of Organizational Performance &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>Streamline and standardize the application and approval process for employee learning and development assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration - Financial Services</td>
<td>Improve the accounts payable process from creation of purchase order to invoice payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager - Human Resources</td>
<td>Streamline and improve the process for the CUPE 569 seasonal changeover from job posting to final fill of position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s Regional Fire Department</td>
<td>Improve process for fire inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works - Robin Hood Bay</td>
<td>Improve the flow of traffic at the Residential Drop-off Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services - Recreation</td>
<td>Improve bookings process for recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services - Citizen Services and Planning, Engineering &amp; Regulatory Services</td>
<td>Decrease turnaround time for permit approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 19, 2015

To: Dave Wadden, M.Eng, P.Eng,
Manager, Development - Engineering

From: Blair Bradbury, P.Eng
Development Engineer - Traffic

Re: Digital Advertising Signs

Canadian jurisdictions and road authorities, including the City of St. John's, have voiced concern that the potential impact of digital advertising signs to road safety is not fully understood and that there is a need to develop national regulations and guidelines to address the matter of digital advertising signs along roadways. In response to these concerns the Transportation Association of Canada’s Road Safety Standing Committee and Traffic Operations and Management Standing Committee completed a two year study to assess digital advertising signage characteristics and road safety impacts. Upon completion of the study the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) has released the “Digital and Projection Advertising Displays: Regulatory and Road Safety Assessment Guidelines”. This document presents a consistent set of guidelines for use when assessing and appropriately managing the roadway risk/safety issues associated with digital signage installations.

The City of St. John's has, under the findings presented in the material, made changes to the approach for which these digital advertising signs are approved. The main point of concern relates to the prohibited installation of a sign within an area of a driver's decision point. Such points include intersections, crosswalks, on/off ramp systems and merge requirements. These decision points have been identified by TAC as crucial areas where a driver's attention must not be distracted from the task of safely navigating the roadway.

In general the City has recognized two types of digital advertising signs, those consisting of third party advertising and those directly related to the property on which the sign is located or onsite advertising. As such the City has implement two new conditions for a sign application’s approval:

- Third party digital advertising will not be permitted within 160 meters of a decision point as identified above.
- Onsite digital advertising will be permitted within 160 meters of a decision point but no closer than 65 meters provided the sign displays simple/plain images with a display duration of 60 seconds minimum before a transition may occur.

Recommendations were also brought forth concerning the lighting levels associated with a sign’s operation. The City of St. John's now requires that all digital signage meet the following:

- Have a maximum illumination level of 1,500 lumens for daytime use and 375 lumens for night time use.
- Have a light sensing device that will automatically adjust the brightness as ambient light conditions change.
- Lighting levels are not to exceed 3.5 lux above the ambient lighting level measured within 10 meters of the sign face. Documentation shall be provided to the City at the time of permit issuance certifying that the digital billboard is incapable of exceeding 3.5 lux above the ambient lighting. The City will reserve the right to lower or increase this level should conditions warrant.
- The sign is to be programmed so that in the event of a malfunction the sign shall either turn the display off or to a full black background.
- A sign shall not be located within 60 meters of a residential house unless the sign remains in a static position between the hours of 11 pm to 7 am.

The fore noted conditions will be applied to all digital signage applications and will be in addition to the City's current Signage By-Law(s). Current conditions which prohibit displayed colours similar to emergency vehicles and traffic control devices, along with requirements that imagine transitions are to be immediate and no animation is permitted will continue to be enforced.

Regards,
Blair Bradbury, P.Eng
Development Engineer – Traffic
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 8 Military Road, St. Thomas’ Parish Hall LED Wall Signs

Date Prepared: March 8, 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 three digital LED wall signs located on St. Thomas’ Parish Hall, 8 Military Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application to install three LED wall signs on St. Thomas’ Parish Hall, located at 8 Military Road. The applicant has applied for three signs, however would be satisfied with one sign facing Military Road. The digital sign will be used for St. Thomas’ Anglican Church messages only.

The subject property is located in Heritage Area 1, the St. John’s Municipal Plan’s Institutional (INST) Districts and is zoned Institutional (INST). St. Thomas’ Parish Hall is not designated by Council as a Heritage Building, however it is adjacent to St. Thomas’ Anglican Church which is a City of St. John’s Designated Building.

The Heritage Area Sign By-Law does not speak to digital signs directly. The sign type most similar to a digital sign is an animated sign which may be permitted upon the recommendation of the Heritage Advisory Committee and at the discretion of Council as per Section 15 of the Heritage Area Sign By-Law. As per Section 18, third party signs are prohibited, therefore the Church would not be permitted to advertise for other organizations or companies. As per the attached letter, they have indicated that the sign will only display church messages.

The location of the three wall signs are attached, however the size will be reduced from 50 ft² to 32 ft² (3 m²). The approximate locations are also marked on the map below.

There have been a number of digital signs of various sizes and sign types approved in Heritage Areas over the past few years. Therefore it is recommended to approve one LED wall sign at 8 Military Road. It is further recommended to update the Heritage Area Sign By-Law to include conditions for digital signs.

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:
   It is recommended to update the Heritage Area Sign By-Law to include conditions for digital signs.

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 one LED wall sign at 8 Military Road. It is further recommended to update the Heritage Area Sign By-Law to include conditions for digital signs.

**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:**
Location of Subject Property and Proposed Signs
Applicant’s Submission
Letter from Revd Canon Gregory Mercer, St. Thomas’ Anglican Church
Location of Subject Property
8 Military Road

Approximate Location of Proposed Signs
Facing the Parking Lot

5' H x 10' W Full color LED Board
Facing King's Bridge Road

5' H x 10' W Full color LED Board
March 6, 2018

City of St. John’s
P.O. Box 908
St. John’s, NL A1C 5M2

Re: Permission to Install LED Board

To whom it may concern;

I write on behalf of the Anglican Parish of St. Thomas’ seeking permission for Bugden Signs Ltd to install an LED sign on St. Thomas’ Parish Hall. We understand that because St. Thomas’ is situated in a Heritage area the largest board we can install is thirty-two square feet. Please be assured that the sign will be used for Church messages only. There will be NO third-party advertising.

Thanking you in advance,

The Revd Canon Gregory Mercer
(Priest and Rector)

cc.
Wayne Squires
Bugden Signs Ltd.
(709) 754-3355
Fax: (709) 754-7295
# 8 Hallett Crescent, St. John’s, NL
A1B 4G7
P.O Box 13921
wsquires@bugdensigns.com

Jesus said, “Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed.” (John 20:20)
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Application to Rezone Land to Commercial Local Zone for an Office Use
       REZ1800001
       75 Airport Heights Drive

Date Prepared: March 28, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

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

Ward: 1

Decision/Direction Required:
To consider a rezoning application for land at 75 Airport Heights Drive from the Residential Low Density (R1) Zone to the Commercial Local (CL) Zone to allow for an Office use. An amendment to the St. John’s Municipal Plan would not be required.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application for an Office use at 75 Airport Heights Drive. The property is currently zoned Residential Low Density which does not allow an Office use. The applicant has requested to rezone the property to Commercial Local in which Office is a permitted use. The properties surrounding 75 Airport Heights Drive are zoned Residential Low Density. A majority of the properties are dwellings apart from a vacant lot adjacent to the property on the western side.

The property is designated Residential Low Density (RLD) under the City of St. John’s Municipal Plan and applies to those areas characterized by a predominance of single detached dwellings. As per Section 2.3.5 of the Municipal Plan, subject to a Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR), the City may permit zones to allow Commercial Neighbourhood uses in any Residential District. Therefore, this property could be rezoned to Commercial Local without an amendment to the Municipal Plan.

There is currently an existing building located at 75 Airport Heights Drive. The building has been a Daycare Centre in the past and the proposed Office use will not alter the exterior of the building. The existing building meets the standards set out in the Commercial Local zone and there is sufficient parking for an Office use. There are no development or engineering concerns with the proposed amendment. As per Section 2.3.5, a rezoning from Residential to Commercial Local within a Residential District is subject to an LUAR. However, given that the exterior of the building will not change, and the intensity of the use will likely not increase with the proposed Office use, it is recommended to accept the Staff Report as the LUAR.

Please be advised that once the property is rezoned, other Commercial Local uses may be permitted. These could include dwelling units on a second or higher storey, a library, adult daycare facility, convenience store, Daycare Centre or service shop as permitted uses, or take-out food service as a discretionary use.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Neighbouring residents and property owners.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: 
   * A City for All Seasons – Support year-round tourism and industry activity.

4. Legal or Policy Implications:
   An amendment to the St. John’s Development Regulations is required to rezone the property on the Zoning Map.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations:
   Advertisement of the proposed amendment. Recommended to be advertised for a Public Meeting chaired by a member of Council.

6. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

7. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

8. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

9. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
It is recommended that Council consider a proposed rezoning at 75 Airport Heights Drive from Residential Low Density (R1) to Commercial Local (CL), 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. Following the public meeting, the application would be referred to a regular meeting of Council for consideration of adoption.

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:
Zoning Map
Survey
Area = 0.1195 Sq. Metres

© Aubrey K. Burt, Nfld. Land Surveyor, 2001
Unauthorized use, alteration or reproduction of this survey plan and/or the accompanying survey description is prohibited by law as outlined in the copyright act. However, use and reproduction thereof by or on behalf of the person to whom this plan is certified is permitted, provided that no alterations are made thereto.

Aubrey K. Burt Surveys
Newfoundland Land Surveyor
7c. O'Leary Avenue
P.O. Box 28271, St. John's, NF, A1B 4J8
Email: aubrey@albsurveyors.nf.net
St. John's: (709) 736-3363
Fax: (709) 736-3364
Buy Roberts: (709) 768-0142

Client: Learys Brook Holdings Limited
Location: Airport Heights Drive, McNiven Estates, St. John's, NF

Scale: 1:400
Surveyed By: W.D. & M.B.
Job No.: 2001-124
Date: September 13, 2001

© Aubrey K. Burt, Nfld. Land Surveyor, 2001
Unauthorized use, alteration or reproduction of this survey plan and/or the accompanying survey description is prohibited by law as outlined in the copyright act. However, use and reproduction thereof by or on behalf of the person to whom this plan is certified is permitted, provided that no alterations are made thereto.

Aubrey K. Burt Surveys
Newfoundland Land Surveyor
7c. O'Leary Avenue
P.O. Box 28271, St. John's, NF, A1B 4J8
Email: aubrey@albsurveyors.nf.net
St. John's: (709) 736-3363
Fax: (709) 736-3364
Buy Roberts: (709) 768-0142

Client: Learys Brook Holdings Limited
Location: Airport Heights Drive, McNiven Estates, St. John's, NF

Scale: 1:400
Surveyed By: W.D. & M.B.
Job No.: 2001-124
Date: September 13, 2001
Title: Text Amendment to the Residential Low Density (R1) Zone to consider a Dog Boarding Facility
REZ1800004
37 Aylward’s Lane

Date Prepared: April 4, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

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

Ward: 4

Decision/Direction Required: To consider a proposed text amendment to the St. John’s Development Regulations to allow for a Dog Boarding Facility located at 37 Aylward’s Lane. An amendment to the St. John’s Municipal Plan would not be required.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application for a Dog Boarding Facility located at 37 Aylward’s Lane. The property currently contains a dwelling with frontage on Aylward’s Lane. It is located in the Residential Low Density (RLD) District of the St. John’s Municipal and is zoned Residential Low Density (R1). The Dog Boarding Facility is proposed to be located in an Accessory Building on the property. While the application is made for 37 Aylward’s Lane, the property owner also owns 45 Aylward’s Lane. The two properties combined total 5453 m² (approximately 1.4 acres).

The applicant proposes to develop a 1000 sq. ft. building for the facility. The applicant would like to develop the building on the currently treed portion of 45 Aylward’s Lane adjacent to the highway to ensure distance from the neighbouring properties. The applicant also proposes to install extensive sound proofing to minimize disturbances. Further, the proposed business hours are approximately 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. to limit noise to daytime hours. The facility will accommodate between 30 and 50 dogs each day and there will be no overnight boarding.

This type of use is usually considered a Kennel and may be permitted as a Discretionary Use in the Agriculture (AG), Rural (R), and Rural Residential (RR) zones. From the Development Regulations, a Kennel is defined as:

KENNEL means an establishment used for the boarding of small animals normally considered as household pets and other animals. This shall include the boarding of animals during the day and for extended periods of time.

However, when applications do not include overnight boarding and are limited to daytime hours, the use may be considered a Service Shop. A Service Shop is defined as:

SERVICE SHOP means a Building or a part of a Building where personal services are provided. Without limiting the generality of this definition, a Service Shop could include retail sale of personal merchandise, a barber shop, hairdressing establishment and a tailoring shop.
Neither a Kennel or Service Shop is a permitted or Discretionary Use in the R1 zone and therefore a text amendment to the zone is required to allow the use. Please note, as per Regulation 7.8(d), the Dog Boarding Facility may not be considered as a Home Occupation because Home Occupations can only be located in an Accessory Building in the Rural, Rural Residential, Rural Residential Infill, Agricultural and Forestry zones.

Amending the zone to add such a use would mean that similar uses may be developed in the R1 Zone throughout the City. Consideration has been given to limit the use to properties of an acre or more, however in an R1 Zone, large properties will likely abut several residential properties. This could create a potential nuisance in neighbourhoods. Given the proposed number of dogs the use may accommodate, it is not an appropriate use for a Residential Low Density neighbourhood and should be limited to more Rural areas as already allowed in the Development Regulations as a Discretionary Use. They can also be accommodated in some Commercial zones.

Therefore, it is not recommended to amend the Development Regulations to allow for a Kennel or Service Shop use in the Residential Low Density Zone.

Consideration has also been given to re-zone the property to a zone where this type of use may be considered. This is considered ‘spot zoning’ and is typically not recommended within a residential neighbourhood. Given the location of this property at the end of a gravel road amongst a predominantly residential neighbourhood, it is not recommended to spot zone the property to another zone to accommodate the use.

**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* – Create neighbour-focused plans and information.

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 not consider amending the Residential Low Density (R1) zone of the St. John’s Development Regulations to consider a Dog Boarding Facility at 37 Aylward’s Lane.

**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:**
Zoning Map
Survey
Title: Clifford Glimson Wight
37 Aylwards Lane
St. John's, Nfld.

Scale: 1:500
Survey By: BM CM JM

Date: Oct. 27, 1997
Job No.: 2002

James A. Martin, N.L.S.

Title: Clifford Glimson Wight
37 Aylwards Lane
St. John's, Nfld.

Scale: 1:500
Survey By: BM CM JM

Date: Oct. 27, 1997
Job No.: 2002
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 390 Duckworth Street, Exterior Repairs
The Majestic Theatre

Date Prepared: April 5, 2018

Report To: Committee of the Whole

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

Ward: 2

Decision/Direction Required: To seek approval for exterior repairs to the Majestic Theatre, located at 390 Duckworth Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application for repairs to the Majestic Theatre, located at 390 Duckworth Street. In 2017 the property was subject to a fire on the exterior of the building. The proposed renovations will repair the damage from the fire and will include replacing exterior vinyl siding to match the existing, removing the existing stairwell and replacing it with one that matches the existing, and replacing a section of the roof to meet the original condition with matching trim and cladding. The areas to be repaired are highlighted on the attached photos.

The subject property is located in Heritage Area 2, the Commercial Downtown (CD) Official District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan and is zoned Commercial Central Mixed (CCM). The building is designated by Council as a Heritage Building.

As per Section 5.9.3 of the St. John’s Development Regulations, the exterior of any Heritage Building shall not be repaired or altered without the express written permission of Council.

The proposed renovations match the current cladding, roof and existing stairwell, therefore it is recommended to approve the renovations as submitted.

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 exterior renovations to the Majestic Theatre, located at 390 Duckworth Street, as submitted.

**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
Photos submitted by Applicant
Location of Subject Property
390 Duckworth Street
Decision/Direction Required:

Direction is required to approve a new after-hours taxi layby area on New Gower Street and make corresponding adjustments to the existing George Street taxi layby.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

On Feb 6, 2018 the George Street Association (GSA) reached out to Council on the topic of taxi layby areas. The GSA noted recommendations from 2015 in the Mayors Advisory Committee on Crime Prevention Report (MACCP). The MACCP report identified that the large number of patrons congregating on George Street at bar closing time poses a safety concern. The MACCP makes three recommendations, one of which was redesigning taxi layby areas in the vicinity of George Street. The MACCP report recommended:

- that the existing taxi queue be removed from George Street West
- that a new taxi queue be approved on New Gower Street for patrons heading east
- that a new taxi queue be approved on Water Street east of Adelaide Street for patrons heading west
- that the new taxi queue areas operate from 10pm to 4am so as to limit impact on existing parking and businesses

These recommendations were intended to disperse George Street patrons at closing time reducing congregation of potentially disorderly patrons at the existing taxi layby area. This public safety goal is reiterated by the request from the GSA. The GSA also notes a concern for people running into traffic trying to catch a taxi. The GSA indicates that the RNC are supportive of this change.

Another aspect of the concerns raised are the impacts that the Water Street construction will have on taxi laybys in the coming months.

This request is discussed below and is accompanied by the attached Area Key Map to provide a clear index of the areas being discussed. Reference to the Area Key Map will appear as a number in line with the text below similar to this: #. 
Existing Taxi Layby Areas

Currently there are two taxi layby areas serving George Street:

- An after hours taxi layby on George Street West which replaces 13 on street parking stalls from 6PM to 6AM.
- A full time taxi layby on Adelaide Street between Water Street and George Street operated by City Wide Taxi. During busy evening periods taxis queue across Water Street onto Bishop’s Cove as they wait to enter the layby.

Existing Vehicle Circulation

There are currently a number of vehicle restrictions in the George Street area. Taken together these restrictions minimize the possibility of conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians while still allowing for taxi service to be provided in a convenient location.

George Street between Adelaide Street and Water Street is currently closed to vehicle traffic each day at 12PM (noon) and reopens at 8 AM the following morning. Establishments along this section do have short term permits available to them to allow loading/unloading.

Adelaide Street is a one way street from Water Street to New Gower Street. George Street West is a one way street from Queen Street through Adelaide Street to Water Street.

The combined restrictions on Adelaide Street and George Street mean that for most of the day all vehicle traffic entering George Street West or Adelaide Street must exit at Adelaide Street and New Gower (beside the City Hall Annex).

Adelaide Street is currently closed to entry on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights from 10PM to 6AM the following morning. Two illuminated signs which read “No Entry (Except By Permit) 10PM to 6AM” are posted at the Water Street entrance to Adelaide Street and are illuminated at the relevant times. In addition barricades are often used to help enforce this regulation. Emergency vehicles and City Wide Taxis are permitted to enter Adelaide despite this restriction.

In July, 2016 after considering recommendations from the MACCP report City Council added a restriction to George Street West such that no entry is permitted on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights from 10PM to 6AM the following morning. With this restriction the only vehicles circulating on George Street and Adelaide Street after 10PM on these evenings are taxis and emergency vehicles.

Recommended trial Taxi Layby on New Gower Street

The area along the south side of New Gower Street stretching from the City Hall Annex westward currently provides a mobile vendor parking stall and many metered parking
stalls. This area has previously been identified as a candidate location for a taxi layby should changes to the existing situation be called for.

In response to the recent discussion about the MACCP and taxi layby options it has been suggested that a new layby be trialed in this area. In order to avoid conflict with the mobile vendor parking stall it is recommended this layby area would cover the seven parking stalls closest to the City Hall Annex.

As a balance between the needs of George Street patrons later in the evening and early evening restaurant patrons it is recommended that rather than beginning at 6PM this layby be reserved beginning at 8PM daily.

In order to implement this change “No Parking Except By Permit 8PM to 6AM” signs would be installed along this block of parking meters. To ensure that people visiting downtown are informed of the new restriction a total of four of these signs would be placed. In addition Parking Services staff would bag these meters daily just after 6PM similar to the practice with the existing taxi layby on George Street. This is done as a courtesy to reinforce the restriction in place.

In order to install the four required signs two existing sign poles would need to be extended. The required work is common and would be completed by Public Works staff. The signs cost just over $30 each.

Potential extended trial area

The mobile vendor parking stall on this block of New Gower Street is currently leased until November 2018. If council wished, the area covered by this trial taxi layby could be extended to cover the full block from Queen Street to Adelaide Street. This would provide 12 stalls worth of parking for the taxi layby. Relative to the recommend trial area above one additional sign would be required to complete this extended area and one of the existing sign poles would no longer need to be modified.

Impact on public of trial Taxi Layby

As the recommended taxi layby would only be in effect after hours (8PM to 6AM) there would be no impact to parking meter operations with this trial. The parking spaces displaced for the recommended taxi layby mean that seven fewer free on street parking stalls would be available to the general public in the evenings.

If the extended trial area were implemented then there would be eleven free parking stalls no longer available for public use in the evening. In addition the City would need to break the existing lease for the mobile vendor parking stall. This stall also benefits from a private investment of approximately $10,000 to provide an electrical service drop which makes the
impact to the leaser more significant. The extended trial area would mean a small loss of the lease revenue and the small intangible loss in downtown vibrancy that a food truck provides.

Impact of the Water Street Infrastructure Replacement

Starting April 2018 construction on this project will begin. The first stage of construction will occur from Waldegrave Street to Adelaide Street. Due to this construction Adelaide Street between Water Street and George Street will be closed to all vehicles.

As a result of this change the existing City Wide layby needs to be relocated. After meeting with the owner of City Wide Taxi it was determined that the best location for a temporary replacement layby would be on the south side of George Street West immediately adjacent Adelaide Street. This area currently provides three metered parking stalls one of which is an accessible stall.

Three alternative locations for the accessible parking stall were considered:

- on the north side of George Street West immediately adjacent Adelaide Street
- on the south side of George Street West between the existing mobile vendor parking stall and the temporary taxi layby
- on the south side of George Street West immediately adjacent 354 Water Street

The location adjacent 354 Water Street was selected as the best option for this temporary accessible parking stall based on availability of curb cuts and the desire to not impact the existing after hours taxi layby.

These temporary arrangements will require the removal of existing meters and the placement of new signs to inform the public of the new parking configuration.

Due to the current vehicle restrictions in the area the result of this temporary accommodation will not have any appreciable impact on taxis exiting the area. Taxis entering the area would, in some circumstances, experience a small detour to enter the back of the layby queue.

Construction activity on this stage of the Water Street Infrastructure Replacement will constrict vehicle traffic through the intersection of Water Street and Adelaide Street. Parking throughout the construction area will also be lost intermittently as construction vehicles, staging, or excavation require this space. Given these constraints the prospect of a taxi layby on Water Street in this area was set aside for the time being.

Accompanying Changes to Existing George Street Layby

In order to provide early evening patrons of the area with more public parking, and to avoid confusion with adjacent areas following different rules, it is recommended that as part of this
trial the existing layby on the north side of George Street be adjusted to an 8PM to 6AM restriction rather than the existing 6PM to 6AM.

This change would involve the adjustment of the five signs along George Street that communicate the layby restriction.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**

   Up to a few hundred dollars would be spent on the signs required for the recommend trial taxi layby and changes to the existing George Street layby.

   As part of this change new parking meter bags would be order to communicate the correct timing for the layby restriction. This new order also provides the opportunity to correct an issue with the legal interpretation of our existing meter bags. The 13 existing spaces and 7 new spaces would require a total of 20 new meter bags at a cost of $100 each; a total of $2,000. This cost would be borne by existing Parking Services budgets.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders**

   n/a

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

   This recommend trial taxi layby may contribute to this strategic direction:

   Neighbourhoods Build our City: Promote a safe and secure city

4. **Legal or Policy Implications**

   n/a

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**

   This recommend trial taxi layby would need to be communicated to the public through all the typical channels.

6. **Human Resource Implications**

   n/a
7. **Procurement Implications**
   n/a

8. **Information Technology Implications**
   n/a

9. **Other Implications**
   n/a

**Recommendations:**
On a trial basis, approve a new after hours taxi layby area on the south side of New Gower Street stretching from the City Hall Annex westward to the existing mobile vendor parking stall. Implement this trial layby area from 8PM to 6AM daily and adjust the existing George Street layby to match these times.

**Prepared by:**
Garrett Donaher, Manager - Transportation Engineering

**Approved by:**
Brendan O’Connell, Director of Engineering

**Attachments:**
Area Key Map
1. Recommended trial after hours taxi stand
2. Existing (unused) food truck location
3. Existing after hours taxi stand
4. George Street after hours barricade location
5. Temporary accessible parking stall
6. Existing food truck location
7. Option for accessible parking stall
8. Existing accessible parking stall
9. Temporary City Wide taxi layby (5 stalls)
10. Option for accessible parking stall
11. Existing City Wide taxi layby
12. Adelaide Street after hours entry restriction
13. After hours taxi queue extension
Present  Anna Bauditz, Transportation System Engineer, Chair
Garrett Donaher, Manager - Transportation Engineering
Mike Adam (for Brian Head)
Travis Maher, Community Services Coordinator
Stephen Hill
Erin Dawe
Adam Press
David Hood (via audio call)
Adam Press
Regrets:  Rob Moloney
Carol Grouchy
Tobias Laengle
Councillor Dave Lane

REPORT

1. Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

The terms of reference were tabled with agreement that they be brought forward for Council’s formal adoption.

Recommendation
Moved – Adam Press; Seconded – Stephen Hill

That Council give final approval to the Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee Terms of Reference as attached.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted

Anna Bauditz
Chair
1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory committee name:</th>
<th>Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to (Insert name of standing committee):</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of formation</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting frequency:</td>
<td>Minimum of 4 times per year, typically once every two months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff lead:</td>
<td>Manager of Transportation Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff liaison:</td>
<td>Transportation System Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Division, Department of Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Spaces Division, Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council member champion:</td>
<td>Councillor Dave Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PURPOSE

The Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee provides information and advice to the Committee of the Whole on matters that affect the City, as referred to it by committees of council, or as initiated by the Committee or the community, concerning cycling issues and the development of a safe, comfortable, and convenient City wide cycling network.

Specifically, the Committee will:
- Provide guidance on the completion and implementation of the Bike St. John’s Master Plan to ensure recommendations are driven by citizens, committee, and council with technical support provided by a chosen consultant.
- Provide a forum for citizens and the City to exchange information and ideas regarding cycling.
- Provide advice and perspective to the City on its policies and practices and be involved in the public engagement process when cycling, active transportation, and/or complete streets are involved to ensure consideration for cycling is included where appropriate.
- Provide guidance on the completion of approved bicycle projects and to identify and propose possible future bicycle projects.
- Identify potential opportunities to coordinate improvements to the City’s cycling network with planned roadway rehabilitation and construction projects.
Advisory committee recommendations to Committee of the Whole will occur in the manner defined by these terms of reference to best support City Policy. The advisory committee has no decision making authority and is advisory only. The purpose of the Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee in relation to specific City policies, plans and strategies is as follows:

Advisory Committee Relationship to Strategic Plan:

- Neighbourhoods Build our City – Promote a safe and secure city, improve neighbourhood-level services, increase access to range/type of housing, develop parks and places for people
- A Culture of Cooperation – Create effective City-community collaborations
- A City for All Seasons – Support year-round active transportation, explore options for year-round active, leisure and recreation facilities and programs, promote active and healthy living, incorporate all weather planning in City building and open space development, support year-round tourism and industry activity
- Responsive and Progressive – Create a culture of engagement, identify and deliver on projects, strategies, and programs

Applicable Legislation/City Bylaws:

- Highway Traffic Act: [http://www.assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/statutes/h03.htm](http://www.assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/statutes/h03.htm)
- City of St. John’s Act: [http://www.assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/statutes/c17.htm](http://www.assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/statutes/c17.htm)

Other City Plans, Guides or Strategies:

- Cycling Master Plan, 2009
- Recreation and Parks Master Plan, 2008
- Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan, 2017 (adopted in principle)
- Open Space Master Plan, 2014
- St John’s Development Regulations
- Subdivision Design Guide

Other Distinct Deliverables and Considerations:

- The Committee will guide the completion and implementation of the Bike St. John’s Master Plan to ensure the plan reflects and balances the priorities and recommendations of citizens, Committee, and Council.
- The Committee, working through the staff lead, will work cooperatively with City staff and departments, will identify distinct opportunities to promote and better accommodate purposeful and recreational cycling within the city including, but not limited to, the development of a safe, comfortable, and convenient cycling network.
### 3. MEMBERSHIP AND COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Advisory Committee will be composed of a maximum of 13 total member from the following stakeholder groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1.1 Public Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public members are volunteers and will receive no compensation for participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Public Members</strong> (4 members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee will include four (4) residents serving as general public members that reflect a range of ages and backgrounds with a goal of one representative from each of the following groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A person who is interested in cycling but does not currently do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A person who is a beginner/occasional cyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A person who is an avid recreational cyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A person who is an avid cyclist for purposeful transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations/Groups</strong> (2 members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee will include two (2) persons serving as stakeholder organizational representatives of local cycling groups or organizations. Each organization/group may also appoint an alternate representative to attend committee meetings in the event that the primary member is unable to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation from Individuals between the Ages of 19 - 35</strong> (1 member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one public member, aged 19-35 will be appointed to each advisory committee. These individuals must be between the ages of 19-35 at the time their application is submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorial University:</strong> One of the general public, organization, or individual between the ages of 19 - 35 will be filled by a person who studies or works at Memorial University if possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcommittees:</strong> When deemed necessary, the Committee may strike a working committee or subcommittee to deal with specific issues or deliverables. Subcommittees must have at least one advisory committee member who will act as the subcommittee chair and report back to the Committee. Composition of Subcommittees may also include other members of the public and organizational representatives. Subcommittees shall meet as an independent group, reporting to the advisory committee on specified meeting dates, or as deemed necessary by the committee Chair or Lead Staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Distribution List:</strong> A mailing list will be maintained of interested individuals and organizations. This list will be circulated on committee agendas to have opportunities to provide feedback to the committee. This list will also serve as a point of contact for ideas, comments, and general feedback on cycling issues. In particular, the following stakeholders will be invited to join the stakeholder distribution list:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary
• Grand Concourse Authority
• MUN Bike Share
• First City Cycling Club
• Avalon Bike Association
• Adventure St. John’s
• Bike Newfoundland
• Cycling Canada
• Safety Services NL
• Critical Mass
• Avalon Cycling (Facebook group)
• Ordinary Spokes

### 3.1.2 Staff and Council Members (Ex-Officio Members)

**Staff Lead** (1 member)
A Staff Lead will be appointed to the advisory committee by the appropriate City executive or senior management. Other staff support/attendance may be requested by the Lead Staff where required.

**Staff Liaisons** (3 members)
Staff Liaisons will be appointed by respective City divisions to represent their departments on the Committee. Staff Liaisons may also appoint an alternate representative from their respective division to attend committee meetings in the event that the primary representative is unable to attend.

**Committee Chair**: This advisory committee will be chaired by the Staff Lead or a designated staff liaison. The staff member chairing this committee will have the responsibility of ensuring the committee carries out its work as per the terms of reference.

**City Clerk** (1 member)
The City Clerk will have a representative on this advisory committee.

**Council** (1 member)
This advisory committee will have one council representative acting as advisory committee spokesperson/champion. Other council may attend and contribute but will not take part in determining committee recommendations.

### 3.2 Length of Term

**Public Members**
Unless otherwise indicated, the advisory committee term of appointment is two years. Recognizing the value of experience and the need for continuity, incumbents who are willing to seek reappointment may signify their intent to serve an additional year, for a total of three years. In some cases members may be encouraged to provide guidance, expertise and attend in a bridging capacity following the end of their term.
Organizations/Groups
The role of an organization will depend on its relationship with the Committee and ongoing ability to represent interests of a stakeholder group relevant to the purpose of the advisory committee. Where appropriate organizations will be encouraged to alternate appointed representatives following the completion of a three year term.

Staff Lead and Liaisons
A review of the Staff Lead and Liaisons will occur every three years as part of the advisory committee review. No term limit will apply to the length of staff committee appointments.

Cooling-off Period (Former City Staff and Council)
There will be a cooling off period of two years for Council and Staff once they are no longer associated with the City. Setting term lengths with a cooling off period will promote gradual turnover, ensuring a constant balance between new members and former staff or council.

Additional Considerations:
- Public members may not serve on more than one advisory committee at a given time.
- Midterm Appointments: When an appointment is made which does not coincide with the beginning of a term (i.e. to fill vacancy) the partial term (i.e. less than two years) shall not count towards the maximum length of service or number of terms on the Committee for the appointee.
- Unless otherwise expressed in this Terms of Reference, the limit on length of advisory committee membership for any public member is three consecutive years.

Exceptions to the above terms are as follows: when an insufficient number of applications have been received; if a particular area of expertise is indispensable and there are no other suitable replacements; if the advisory committee would suffer from a lack of continuity (i.e. more than half of all members are replaced at once); if determined to be necessary by the staff lead to fulfill the Advisory Committee’s Purpose as defined in its Terms of Reference.

4. ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND REPORTING

4.1 Roles and Responsibilities

As a municipal advisory body, Advisory Committee roles include:
- Advising and making recommendations to standing committee(s) of council, in a manner that will support City policy matters relevant to the committee’s defined Purpose.
- Providing resident and organizational based expertise.
- Working within given resources.

Shared Member Responsibilities

Conduct
Members shall strive to serve the public interest by upholding Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws and policies. Advisory committee members are to be transparent in their duties to promote public confidence. Members are to respect the rights and opinions of other committee members.
Preparation
Meeting agenda and accompanying materials will be circulated electronically one week prior to all meetings; members are expected to review all distributed materials prior to meetings. Alternate material distribution methods to be made available upon request.

Agendas
- Agendas to require focus with clear parameters for content and alignment with terms of reference/purpose.
- Agendas will be finalized one week before advisory committee meetings.
- Items and accompanying material that are received after the agenda has been prepared and distributed (but prior to the meeting) will be moved to the following meeting’s agenda at the discretion of the Staff Lead.
- All public members are to submit potential agenda items and related material to the Committee Chair and Lead Staff person for consideration two weeks prior to meeting.

Attendance and Participation
Active participation in advisory committee meetings is expected of all public members. “Active participation” may refer to both meeting attendance and/or engagement. An effort should be made to attend meetings in person or remotely. Members who do not actively participate in more than 3 consecutive meetings without justified absence may be retired from the committee at the discretion of the Staff Lead.

Committee members who wish to request a leave of absence for an extended period of time (3+ months) may submit such a request to the City Clerk. Previously submitted applications (stored Application Forms) may be used to fill temporary vacancies created by approved leaves of absence.

Voting
Council members and individuals from City Staff are ex-officio and therefore non-voting. Consensus should be sought by committee on recommendations; however, tie votes will be broken by the committee chair. Divisive recommendations should be carefully considered before being forwarded to Standing Committee and/or Council.

4.2 Member Roles and Responsibilities

4.2.1 City Staff

Chair
- The presiding officer of an advisory committee will be referred to as "Chair". The role of the Chair will be filled by the Staff Lead or a delegated Staff Liaison.
- Uphold advisory committee processes and functions in accordance with all terms presented, maintaining productivity and focus. This includes ensuring committee members’ conduct themselves in a professional manner.
- If appropriate, with support from the City Clerk and Staff Lead, the Chair will help build and coordinate a work plan for the advisory committee.
- Prepare and submit agenda items and accompanying materials to the City Clerk (i.e. act as a conduit for all communications between public members and the City Clerk).
- Where appropriate, support the Lead Staff and/or City Clerk in fulfilling committee requirements related to reporting processes (annual presentations, written reports, FAQ’s etc.).
- Assist in the development of content for Notice of Vacancy documents.
• Review advisory committee terms of reference with City Clerk and Staff Lead at the end of each term and be prepared to propose amendments as needed.

**Staff Lead**
• To act as a liaison between the committee and the City; linking across departments on issues relevant to committee work.
• Ensure the committee is informed about City policy, procedure and available resources in reference to specific agenda items, and provide procedural and/or technical advice to assist committee where appropriate.
• Request additional staff support/attendance as needed.
• To develop agendas in cooperation with the Chair and City Clerk’s Office for distribution.
• Incorporate input from the advisory committee into ongoing City work where appropriate (e.g. projects, staff updates, publications)

**Staff Liaisons**
• Represent interests of department.
• Communicate Committee Activity to department.
• Bring department activities of interest to Committee agenda.

**City Clerk**
• To be responsible for administrative functions related to advisory committee operation, establishment, review, and term amendments. This includes leading or supporting day-to-day committee activities such as the co-ordination of meeting schedules and the external/internal distribution/posting of advisory committee agendas and reporting forms (i.e. meeting notes/minutes).
• Facilitate and support the recruitment and appointment process through assisting in the development of “Notice of Vacancy” contents while ensuring all relevant forms and supporting documentation are completed and received.
• In adherence with the terms of reference, the Office of City Clerk and Division of Organizational Performance and Strategy will assist with committee selection which will be led by Transportation Engineering Staff.
• The Office of the City Clerk will ensure new members receive orientation.

**4.2.2 Public Members**

**General Public**
Public members are expected to advise City decision making; applying personal skills, knowledge and experience in carrying out functions commensurate with the defined purpose of the committee. Roles to include: active participation in committee meetings; electing a Chair; representing select committee interests in the community and engaging with residents and experts when appropriate.

**Organizations/Groups**
In addition to the responsibilities held by all public members, organizational members will also be conduits to/from their respective organizations. As such they will be expected to provide insight on behalf of organizational stakeholders, and update their members on the work of the committee.
### 4.2.3 Council

Council members have a focused role. One council representative will sit on each advisory committee as the Advisory Committee Champion. In accordance with the role of advisory committees (i.e. to advise council through Committee of the Whole), and to promote and enhance the committee’s advisory function, council representatives will be encouraged to attend meetings as observers, and to act as a liaison between the committee and council.

In cases where an item of committee business (as detailed in a given meeting agenda) would benefit from having more than one council representative attend, it will be the responsibility of the Chair and/or Staff Lead to inform council.

### 4.3 Reporting

The Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee shall report through the Committee of the Whole to City Council; however, depending on the issue, reports may be directed to another standing committee or directly to Council where appropriate.

**Standardized Reporting Process:**

- The advisory committee Staff Lead, Committee Chair and City Clerk will work to complete an Advisory Committee Reporting Form following each committee meeting.
- The Chair, or a designate, will submit *Advisory Committee Reporting Form* contents, along with any other Committee updates, to Committee of the Whole as required. Following reporting to Committee of the Whole, Advisory Committee Reporting Forms will be posted to the City of St. John’s website.

**Notes:**

- The use of additional reporting methods is the responsibility of the Lead Staff and/or City Clerk, who will seek assistance from the Marketing and Communications regarding communications. Additional reporting will depend on the nature of a given advisory issue.
- Council to be kept informed of committee activities through formal reporting and through the appointed Council Champion.
- Organizational representatives will be encouraged to report to (i.e. maintain open communication) with their respective organizations regarding committee work.

### 5. COMMITTEE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

#### 5.1 Recruitment, Vacancies, and Applications

Recruitment practices will be consistent for all advisory committees. When new members are required a “Notice of Vacancy” will be prepared by the City Clerk and distributed through City communication channels by the Marketing and Communications. Additional communications opportunities may be identified by relevant departments/committee members. This document will include general information regarding committee purpose, the terms of reference and a link to the Advisory Committee Application Form.

A vacancy on an advisory committee occurs when a member resigns, vacates a position or when their resignation is requested by the advisory committee Chair. Vacancies may occur at: the date of resignation; the date the member ceases to be qualified; the date the committee Chair declares the position vacant due to lack of attendance or incapacitation.

All applicants must complete an Advisory Committee Application Form which may be downloaded from the City website, or obtained by visiting/calling Access 311. Applications will be made available in large print format.
Eligibility
Appointments to City of St. John’s advisory committee’s will be made providing adherence with the following eligibility requirements:

- Preference will be given to residents of St. John’s. Exceptions may be made by the selecting body.
- Organizational representatives must be based in or serve/do business within the City of St. John’s.
- Organizational representatives are not required to be residents of St. John’s.

Commitment to Equity and Inclusiveness
The City of St. John’s is strongly committed to equity and inclusiveness. In selecting advisory committee members, the City will aim to design processes that are transparent, accessible, free of discrimination, and seek to remove barriers for disadvantaged groups including: young people (ages 18-30), senior citizens, women, Aboriginal people, members of sexual minorities, persons with disabilities, and members of visible minorities.

Selection Criteria
In addition to eligibility requirements, an applicant’s specific skills and experience will be important factors in committee selection. While all who meet the Eligibility Requirements outlined above are encouraged to apply, applicants with demonstrated participation in groups or initiatives with goals relevant to an advisory committee’s purpose will be preferred. Some other considerations pertaining to general selection criteria include: past professional and volunteer experience, ability to perform required tasks, and complementary skills, or competencies possessed. Those who are selected to serve on City advisory committees will be notified by email and/or telephone. A committee handbook and other relevant information will also be provided to successful applicants.

6. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The City of St. John’s recognizes that engagement between the City and its citizens is an essential component of an effective municipal government. The City views public engagement as a process – one that facilitates dialogue with the right people, using the right tools, at the right time on subject areas of mutual interest.

In accordance with the City of St. John’s Engage! Policy, the role of the Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee in the spectrum of engagement will fall within the realm of “consultation”. This means that the advisory committee will provide a forum for the public to provide specific feedback on relevant City matters; helping to inform decision making. As such City of St. John’s advisory committees will be based on the principles of commitment, accountability, clear and timely information, and inclusiveness.

Advisory committees are only one of the ways to engage with the City. Where applicable the City will consider the use of other tools to gather perspectives and input. These tools may include the City’s Engage! St. John’s
online engagement platform, social media, the Bike St. John’s website, and the committee circulation list.

7. OTHER GOVERNANCE

7.1 Review of Terms

Taking into account recommendations from the Committee Chair and Council Champion, the City Clerk and Lead Staff will review Advisory Committee Terms of Reference documents every two years. The purpose of this review will be to ensure that the operations and function of each committee are still aligned with its defined purpose (i.e. the advisory committee remains relevant to City Plans). A review template will be used to maintain consistency. Through this review process amendments to advisory committees will be proposed and adjustments made to Terms of Reference as required.

7.2 Meetings and Schedules

The Advisory Committee is to formally meet no less than four times and no more than ten times on an annual basis. Meetings will typically take place before corresponding standing committee meetings. The exact frequency of advisory committee meetings will be determined by the Chair, Staff Lead, and City Clerk.

Unless otherwise specified (generally one week prior to a meeting) advisory committee meetings shall be held at City Hall and shall be closed to the public.

Alternative Meeting Formats:
To facilitate participation and scheduling, remote meeting formats such as video conference and/or teleconference will be employed as determined to be effective and feasible by the Committee Chair.

Online Polls:
From time to time issues may arise that require rapid feedback and recommendation from the Advisory Committee. In these cases, the Committee Chair will facilitate an online poll with assistance from the City Clerk as needed.

7.3 Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

Conflicts of Interest
A conflict of interest refers to situations in which personal, occupational or financial considerations may affect or appear to affect the objectivity or fairness of decisions related to the committee activities. A conflict of interest may be real, potential, or perceived in nature. Conflict of Interest may occur when a Committee member participates in discussion or decision-making about a matter which may financially benefit that Member or a member of his/her family, or someone with whom the Committee member has a close personal relationship, directly or indirectly, regardless of the size of the benefit.

In cases where the Committee agenda or Committee discussions present a conflict of interest for a member, that member is required to declare such conflict; to abstain from discussion; and remove himself/herself from the meeting room until the agenda item has been dealt with by the Committee.

Confidentiality:
All Committee members are required to refrain from the use or transmission of any confidential or privileged information while serving with the Bike St. John’s Advisory Committee.

**Staff Lead Name: Garrett Donaher**

Signature: ________________________  Date : _______________________

**Chair Name: Anna Bauditz**

Signature: ________________________  Date : _______________________

**City Clerk Name:**

Signature: ________________________  Date : _______________________

Last updated: 2017/12/07
Decision/Direction Required:
Decision is required on whether the City of St. John’s should permanently implement the changes tested in the 2017 traffic pilot projects.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
In April of 2017, City Council Directive SJMC2017-04-01/166R approved the implementation of the following three transportation pilot projects:

1. Duckworth Street-Plymouth Road Loop
2. Great Eastern Drive-Petite Forte Drive Mini-Roundabout
3. Veteran’s Square Reconfiguration

The projects were developed in response to specific local traffic concerns and were intended to test effectiveness of new treatments, improve overall traffic flow, enhance pedestrian safety, and reduce the number of potential conflict points between vehicles and/or pedestrians in project areas.

Prior to making any changes, background data (such as speed, traffic counts, and overall levels of service) was collected at each project location. The City issued Public Service Announcements regarding the projects and notices of the upcoming changes were delivered to residents and businesses who were in the immediate area and directly impacted by the pilot projects. The approved pilot traffic measures were then constructed on a trial basis in August and September and were monitored by the City’s Transportation Engineering group until mid-November at which time the temporary infrastructure was removed and previous traffic conditions were reinstated. From November 9 to November 22 a public survey covering all projects was available to gather direct feedback from those affected. A total of 1913 people responded.

All three pilot projects demonstrated great technical success. Public feedback was more mixed with the Duckworth Street-Plymouth Road Loop and the Veteran’s Square Reconfiguration receiving positive feedback on balance and the Great Eastern Drive-Petite Forte Drive Mini-Roundabout receiving negative feedback.
Key Considerations/Implications

1. **Budget/Financial Implications**  
The recommended projects will need to be designed for permanent installation and costs estimated based on these designs. It is planned to include them for consideration in a future Capital Budget.

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

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans**  
Neighbourhoods Build Our City: Improve neighbourhood-level services  
Promote a safe and secure city  
Responsive and Progressive: Identify and deliver on projects, strategies and programs

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

5. **Engagement and Communications Considerations**  
None at this time.

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

7. **Procurement Implications**  
None at this time.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

1. Council proceed with permanent implementation of the Duckworth Street-Plymouth Road Loop, as soon as funding can be assigned.

2. Do not install the Great Eastern Drive-Petite Forte Drive Mini-Roundabout on a permanent basis. Great Eastern Avenue will continue to be eligible for traffic calming through the process defined in the Traffic Calming Policy.

3. Council proceed with permanent implementation of the Veteran’s Square Reconfiguration, as soon as funding can be assigned.
Prepared by:
Garrett Donaher, Manager, Transportation Engineering

Approved by:
Brendan O’Connell, Director of Engineering

GD/

Attachments:
2017 Traffic Pilot Projects - Final Report
2017 Traffic Pilot Projects – Final Report

Introduction
In April, 2017 the City Council Directive SJMC2017-04-01/166R approved the implementation of three traffic pilot projects for completion in 2017. The projects were developed to address specific local traffic concerns brought forth by City staff and residents with the goal of improving overall traffic flow, enhancing pedestrian safety, and reducing the number of potential conflict points between vehicles and/or pedestrians in project areas.

This report is divided into sections for each of the pilot projects completed. It outlines the intentions and implementation process of each project and documents the evaluation of each installation based on technical observations and feedback received from residents and stakeholders. Based on the completed assessments, recommendations for council to consider are made for each project as to whether the temporary traffic accommodation and control measures should be made permanent, and considerations when developing a permanent installation.

Lessons Learned
This is the first time that the City of St. John’s has attempted traffic pilot projects such as these. Over the course of the pilot period several lessons were learned that will contribute to more successful pilot projects in the future.

1. Timeliness of placement and removal of signs
2. Timeliness of placement and removal of pavement markings
3. Quality of pavement markings in terms of covering/removing old markings
4. Communication and advance warning of changes
5. Flexible bollards used often caused a visual distraction when clumped together

Note on survey response
In the summary of survey responses below a single total value is used to capture public opinion. This value represents the sum of neutral and positive responses. This total can be seen as representing the ratio of respondents that would be okay with the change. The term “acceptance” is used in the table headings to capture this simply.

Duckworth Street-Plymouth Road Loop

Background
The intersections of Quidi Vidi Road with Duckworth Street and Plymouth Road have been identified many times by the public as confusing and hazardous locations. In order to reduce potential conflict points at these intersections, traffic flow was simplified along Duckworth
Street, Quidi Vidi Road, and Plymouth Road by converting to one-way loop circulation. *Figure 1* illustrates the changes implemented as part of the pilot project.

We hoped that by making the changes we would realize several benefits:

- The area will be less confusing and safer to drive through
- Traffic will flow more smoothly
- Pedestrian safety will improve as vehicles travel along more clearer, predictable, paths

*Figure 1: Reconfigured Duckworth-Plymouth Loop Circulation*

There was some inconvenience to local residents, employees and visitors as some travel routes became a bit less direct.

This temporary measure was in place from September 5 to November 16. At that time existing conditions were reinstated.

**Before and After Data Collection**

Vehicle and pedestrian counts were conducted in August and again in October to capture before and after traffic patterns. The three locations counted were:

- Duckworth @ Quidi Vidi
- Duckworth @ Plymouth
- Plymouth @ Quidi Vidi

Patterns during the morning peak (roughly 8AM to 9AM) and during the afternoon peak (roughly 4PM to 5PM) were assessed to determine the impact that this pilot project had.
There was some variation in the overall volumes that did not appear to be related to the pilot project but rather just a reflection of the inherent variability in traffic volumes from day to day and month to month, particularly the change from summer with higher Signal Hill traffic to autumn with less.

Overall the number of conflicts was dramatically reduced; this is a direct analogy to intersection safety. For example at the intersection of Duckworth, Temperance, Battery, Signal Hill, and Qidi Vidi there is a 96% reduction in angle conflicts and a 3% reduction in merge conflicts (total reduction of 58% of conflicts). This is after accounting for the seasonal change in volumes.

Two patterns that could be associated to the change in traffic flow were observed:

- In the morning peak there were fewer vehicles entering the study area on Duckworth (at Cavendish Square) and more entering on Temperance. Similarly there were more exiting on Duckworth and fewer exiting on Temperance. This pattern indicates that drivers destined to Plymouth coming from downtown were choosing to travel via Water to Temperance and circulate around less of the loop then they would need to if entering at Duckworth. Before the change these drivers were able to proceed directly to Plymouth from Duckworth. This pattern also indicates that when westbound drivers were forced to circulate via Plymouth they chose to exit the loop at Duckworth and continue on toward downtown rather than head downtown on Plymouth as they were doing before.

- In the afternoon peak there were more vehicles entering Plymouth via Empire and Qidi Vidi and more exiting on Duckworth. There is also fairly strong usage of the turnaround at the Duckworth/Plymouth junction. This pattern mirrors what we saw in the morning peak. Rather than circulate around the full loop drivers are exiting at Duckworth to proceed downtown where before they travelled straight down Qidi Vidi Road onto Temperance. The increase in turns at the Duckworth/Plymouth junction indicates that drivers are not using a broader rerouting to get to destinations east of the area. It also points to the usefulness of an improved Cook’s Hill connection.

Overall the changes in traffic patterns indicate that drivers have shifted their routing between Cochrane Street, Hill O’Chips, and Temperance Street to enter or exit the loop at a more advantageous location. All three of these streets are relatively unencumbered and shifts between them at the scale seen are inconsequential.

An increase in vehicles exiting Duckworth at Cavindish Square, however, will impact the level of service at the confluence of Duckworth, Ordinance, and Canvendish. This area is also historically tangly.
Ultimately the improvement in conflicts far outweighs the small redistribution of traffic that occurred and this project is considered very successful from a technical perspective.

**Public Survey and Resident/Stakeholder Feedback**

The following table summarizes the public survey conducted. These results are based on the 1,034 responses that indicated they had experienced this pilot project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did this one way traffic loop impact you?</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was intended to make traffic flow less confusing through the intersections where Duckworth, Quidi Vidi, Signal Hill, Battery, Temperance, and Plymouth come together. Do you feel that these intersections are less complicated with these changes in place?</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was intended to improve safety for drivers and pedestrians. Do you feel that this intersection is safer with these changes in place?</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how do you feel about [this] project compared to the way things worked before?</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the distribution of responses along the five point scale that was used to score this project overall. The positive skew evident reflects the acceptance scores above.
In the survey the City also asked: “Do you have any other thoughts on this traffic loop?” This open ended response solicited the following common themes:

- Area is confusing 22.1%
- Issues with set up / take down of project 2.4%
- Cook’s Hill was an issue, especially bottoming out at Duckworth 3.0%
- Drivers had poor behaviour 9.0%
- Active transportation raised 3.3% (The counts conducted showed that this area is a very busy pedestrian area, opinion was mixed on whether this project helped or hindered walking in the area.)
- The stop and yield configuration at Duckworth and Temperance is not working 3.7%
- Other minor issues raised: Coach bus accommodation and issues with Temperance (yield control, crosswalk, suggestion of one way down hill)

On the day of implementation there were several issues that were addressed on the fly:

- some general confusion
- wrong-way entry onto Duckworth from Signal Hill Rd – temporary crash barrels were placed to block entry until centre intersection island could be installed
- violations of southbound stop sign on Quidi Vidi Rd – stop sign was lowered and additional signage was placed
- violations of westbound stop sign on Duckworth, this is a historical problem that continued throughout the pilot period

Continued observations/resident feedback:

- positive response even from residents who had initial concerns
- residents have identified a permanent solution would have additional opportunities to improve the solution provided
- compliance with on-way circulation has improved

**Considerations for Permanent Installation**

- relocate Cooks Hill to the west to align with Factory Lane to provide a direct route for traffic exiting Factory Lane to loop around to head north on Empire Ave or Quidi Vidi Rd
- channelize southbound right turns off Empire Ave to provide greater separation distance from stopping southbound traffic along Quidi Vidi Rd
- grading concerns along Cooks Hill, existing vertical profile/entrance onto Duckworth has vehicles bottoming out
- accommodation for tour buses is needed
- consult Built Heritage and other City committees on design
• consider making Temperance one way down hill
• consult Built Heritage and other City committees on design

**Conclusion**
This project was both technically successful and generally well received. It is recommended to implement this change permanently.

**Great Eastern Drive-Petite Forte Drive Mini-Roundabout**

**Background**
The intersection of Great Eastern Avenue and Petite Forte Drive was identified as an excellent candidate to trial a modern mini-roundabout design using temporary re-usable materials. Great Eastern Drive has also been an area of traffic concern for many residents over the years and a mini-roundabout is expected reduce speed and improve safety in the vicinity of Petite Fort Drive.

We hoped that by making the changes we would realize several benefits:

- Traffic would be slowed in the vicinity of the intersection
- Traffic exiting Petite Forte Drive would not need to wait as long to access Great Eastern Drive
- Overall safety at the intersection would be improved by eliminating angle conflict points and lowering speeds

This temporary measure was in place from August 14 to November 17.

**Before and After Data Collection**
The key performance indicator for this pilot project was the effect on speed in the vicinity of the roundabout. Two “before” measurements were taken and one “after” measurement. These are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>85th %ile speed</th>
<th>Mean speed</th>
<th>Vehicles &gt;50km/hr</th>
<th>24hr volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>60 km/hr</td>
<td>52 km/hr</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>5,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>54 km/hr</td>
<td>43 km/hr</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>6,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>49 km/hr</td>
<td>41 km/hr</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>5,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The September 2016 count was used in a traffic calming evaluation at the time. This evaluation placed the section of Great Eastern Avenue between Petite Forte Drive and Gil
Eannes Drive on the traffic calming list. It was not ranked high on this list and it would, as a result, be some time before the normal course of the traffic calming program would address Great Eastern Avenue.

The August 2017 count was conducted immediately before implementation of the pilot project. As is shown by the dramatic difference in volumes for this count, this count does not appear to have captured typical conditions. At the time of this count there was construction activity on Kenmount Road and anecdotal evidence supports Great Eastern as having been used as a bypass route to avoid this construction. This influx of vehicles and unfamiliar drivers explains the results for this count. As such, less weight is given to this count in the technical evaluation.

The October 2017 count is relatively close in overall volume to the September 2016 count. This indicates a return to typical travel conditions on Great Eastern Avenue.

The 85th percentile speed shown in the table above is our standard measurement for speed as it is considered a good balance in the distribution of speeds that people travel. From the data above this measurement dropped 11km/hr from the original 2016 measurement and 5km/hr from the 2017 before case. This indicates that the fastest drivers are being slowed which shifts the distribution of speeds further to the slower end of the spectrum. This slowing of the fastest drivers is mirrored in the percentage of people travelling above 50km/hr. The drop from 68.8% of vehicles travelling over 50km/hr to only 15.3% of vehicles travelling over 50km/hr is an extremely good improvement in the speed profile adjacent the roundabout.

Overall, the technical evaluation concludes that this project was very successful with respect to its goal of lowering speeds in the vicinity of this intersection. The change in speeds is a very strong traffic calming result. Mini roundabouts such as this are clearly a very effective tool to combat excessive speeds at a neighbourhood scale.

Public Survey and Resident/Stakeholder Feedback

The following table summarizes the public survey conducted. These results are based on the 976 responses that indicated they had experienced this pilot project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did this roundabout impact you?</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed reduction was a goal of this project. Data collected showed that this roundabout reduced the operating speed nearby on Great Eastern Avenue by between 5km/hr and 11km/hr. Do you feel that this result is &quot;worth it&quot; for this roundabout?</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how do you feel about [this] project compared to the way things worked before?</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graph below shows the distribution of responses along the five point scale that was used to score this project overall. The negative skew evident reflects the acceptance scores above.

In the survey the City also asked: “Do you have any other thoughts on this mini-roundabout?” This open ended response solicited the following common themes:

- Concerns about how this would be cleared of snow 6.0%
- Opinions that the design was flawed 35.3%
  This very common opinion seems to be rooted in a fundamental misunderstanding about the purpose of this roundabout as well as the idea that roundabouts can be used to serve more than one purpose.
A modern roundabout as seen in other areas around the City is intended to maintain smooth and slow traffic through an intersection. This improves safety and reduces the overall delay that drivers experience travelling through the intersection.
The mini roundabout installed as part of this pilot project is intentionally designed to act as a barrier to free flowing traffic. This produces the desired traffic calming effect of the roundabout.
Many people conflated these two different purposes feeling that because the pilot roundabout was a barrier to travel it was incorrectly designed. Better communication in the future may help alleviate this misunderstanding.
- Desire to provide a 3-way stop at this intersection 15.4%
  A 3-way stop is an inappropriate traffic control mechanism to use at this intersection.
The large flows along Great Eastern in comparison to Petite Forte would acclimatize
drivers to a condition where there is rarely an opposing vehicle at the stop sign. This in turn leads to non compliance which is a very large safety concern for both drivers and pedestrians.

- Desire to provide speed bumps along Great Eastern 21.6%
  Speed bumps are not an appropriate tool for Great Eastern, speed cushions are the appropriate tool that fill this desire. In general we try to avoid speed cushions on roads that serve as bus and emergency routes and as main accesses into communities. Carrick Drive is an exception to this. In the future when Great Eastern is addressed under the traffic calming policy speed cushions will be an option on the table.
  Related to the request for speed bumps was the statement that this pilot project was not technically successful because it didn’t affect speeds further down Great Eastern Avenue. This pilot was never intended to affect speeds further away along Great Eastern. All traffic calming devices, including roundabouts and speed humps have a localized effect. This is why roundabout corridors are more successful than isolated roundabouts and why speed humps are installed in a long series of humps rather than at an individual point.

Many concerns were raised about the impact to residents immediately adjacent the roundabout:

- There is a loss of on street parking
  On street parking is plentiful in this area. No one is the City has a claim to the on street parking immediately adjacent their property. While it requires a change for adjacent residents, the loss of a few spaces immediately adjacent the intersection is, from a technical perspective, insignificant to the benefits realized.

- Access to driveways is restricted
  The temporary curbs used as part of this pilot project have a higher, and steeper, profile than our standard low back curbs. While the temporary curbs were navigable, they were less comfortable than what would have been in place in a permanent implementation. The permanent curb design is effectively the same as the existing curb present at the bottom of driveways.
  While some movements in/out of driveways are less comfortable with the addition of the curbs required for a roundabout such as this there is no actual restriction that occurs.
  City regulations have encouraged subdivision design with driveways leading directly off ‘T’ intersections for many years. This configuration is less than ideal and is being phased out. However, it will continue to present challenges to the implementation of traffic calming measures throughout the City.

- Universal design of pedestrian crossing
  The pedestrian crossings included in the temporary roundabout design were effectively the same as the existing pedestrian crossings. No reduction in accessibility
occurred during the pilot project. A permanent installation would afford the opportunity to improve these crossings.

- Waste collection and delivery services are interrupted
  Waste collection vehicles can easily ride over the curbs present in this type of roundabout which results in no impact. Delivery services can easily park one or two houses down in order to make deliveries, this is a common occurrence in more dense areas of the City.

- Bus service and community mailbox impacts
  Metrobus was consulted during this pilot and had no issue with the pilot roundabout. Concerns were raised that the adjacent community mailboxes (immediately east of the intersection) would be more difficult to access. This concern did not materialize in observations of the area. In fact, by requiring drivers travelling along Great Eastern to align their vehicles closer to the centre line of the street the areas where people would stop to pick up mail were more removed from the travel path on Great Eastern. The Newfoundland and Labrador English School District was consulted on the impacts to their school bus route in the area. No concern was raised by NLESID.

**Considerations for a permanent installation:**

- Investigate potential to recover one removed on-street parking space along the north side of Great Eastern Drive at the eastern approach.
- Increase eastbound travel deflection along Great Eastern Drive (along top of ‘T’).
- Evaluate impact on snow and emergency services.

**Conclusion**

This project was highly successful from a technical perspective and directly addressed the concerns raised about speed in the neighbourhood. Typically with traffic control changes that are not critical the City seeks a majority support from the local residents before moving forward with a change. There is clearly not the required level of support for this particular modification. As such it is not recommended to implement this change permanently. Great Eastern Avenue will be brought forward for other traffic calming treatments in its due course as part of the overall traffic calming policy ranking.
**Veteran’s Square Reconfiguration**

**Background**

The intersection of Church Hill and Queen’s Road was identified as an excellent candidate to trial narrowing of the road surface. This intersection had been raised by the public as a hazard for pedestrians in the area and a safety concern for motorists.

We hoped that this change would lead to the following benefits:

- Increasing pedestrian safety by reducing the distance that people walked on the street as they travelled along Queen’s Road
- Increase driver safety by creating a more traditional ‘T’ intersection
- Reduce traffic on Bond Street by eliminating the direct route through Veteran’s Square
- Improve parking in the area by increasing formal parking stalls and eliminating areas where informal parking occurs on the street

This temporary measure was in place from August 14 to November 16.

**Before and After Data Collection**

This project was evaluated through observation of driver and pedestrian behaviour in the area. Observations showed that:

- Drivers approached the turn from Church Hill to Queen’s Road more slowly, with better visibility to pedestrians
- Issues with pavement markings led to some confusion about positioning on approach to the turn
- The length of the crosswalk along Queen’s Road was dramatically reduced
- Parking activity on Veteran’s Square did not respect the crosswalk/sidewalk area that had been separated from Queen’s Road leading to a less comfortable pedestrian experience
- The informal parking area was successfully eliminated, reducing the driver confusion that accompanied this condition
- The new formal parking area was not as well used as it could have been due to lack of clarity in temporary devices
- Shortcutting through Bond Street was reduced

These observations lead to two general conclusions:

- This project was successful at meeting its technical goals
- There were several implementation details that lowered the success of this project and could be corrected in a permanent installation
Public Survey and Resident/Stakeholder Feedback

The following table summarizes the public survey conducted. These results are based on the 704 responses that indicated they had experienced this pilot project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did this reconfiguration impact you?</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was intended to improve pedestrian safety in the area by reducing the crosswalk length. Do you feel the crosswalk changes improved pedestrian safety?</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was intended to make the angle between Church Hill and Queen's Road more comfortable. Did you notice any improvement in this regard when travelling through the intersection?</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how do you feel about [this] project compared to the way things worked before?</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below shows the distribution of responses along the five point scale that was used to score this project overall. The positive skew evident reflects the acceptance scores above.

In the survey the City also asked: “The area inside Veteran's Square was set aside for parking during this pilot project. If this project became permanent how would you prefer this area be used?” The graph below shows the mix of responses received. Based on these responses it is recommended that any permanent installation incorporate both green space and public parking opportunities.
In the survey the City also asked: “Do you have any other thoughts on this reconfiguration?” This open ended response solicited the following common themes:

- The change is confusing 3.8%
- The radius of the turn on to Queen’s Road is too tight 4.2%
  A tight radius is a fundamental feature of this change to achieve the desired outcomes.
- Other minor issues raised: Issues surrounding Garrison Hill, desire for a roundabout like treatment surrounding Gower Street United, lack of visibility to the east, steep grade of Church Hill

**Considerations for a permanent installation:**

- incorporate accessible parking spaces
- more clear delineation of parking spaces
- close Veteran’s Square entirely to provide green space
- consult Built Heritage and other City committees on design

**Conclusion**

This project was both technically successful and generally well received. It is recommended to implement this change permanently.