Regular Meeting - City Council
Agenda

February 14, 2022
3:00 p.m.
4th Floor City Hall

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   3.1. Adoption of Agenda

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES
   4.1. Adoption of Minutes - February 7th, 2022

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
   5.1. Notice of Motion - Deferral of Planning and Development Applications in Wetland Buffers

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS
   6.2. Notices Published – 430 Topsail Road - DEV2100192
   6.3. Crown Land License for Private Access to a Quarry- Foxtrap Access Road – CRW2200001
   6.4. Notices Published – 607 Torbay Road - DEV2100191

7. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

9. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
9.1. Development Permits List February 3 to 9, 2022

10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
   10.1. Building Permits List for week ending February 9, 2022

11. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS
   11.1. Weekly Payment Vouchers Week Ending February 8, 2022

12. TENDERS/RFPS

13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

14. OTHER BUSINESS
   14.1. 19 King’s Bridge Road, Adoption, MPA2100004
   14.2. Expropriation of 379 and 380 Bay Bulls Road
   14.3. 6 Lambe’s Lane, Adoption, MPA2000005

15. ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL

16. ADJOURNMENT
Minutes of Regular Meeting - City Council
Virtual

February 7, 2022, 3:00 p.m.

Present: Mayor Danny Breen
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O'Leary
Councillor Maggie Burton
Councillor Ron Ellsworth
Councillor Sandy Hickman
Councillor Jill Bruce
Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft
Councillor Jamie Korab
Councillor Ian Froude
Councillor Carl Ridgeley

Regrets: Councillor Debbie Hanlon

Staff: Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services
Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager of Public Works
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
Susan Bonnell, Manager, Communications & Office Services
Ken O'Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
Karen Chafe, City Clerk
Jennifer Squires, Legislative Assistant

Land Acknowledgement
The following statement was read into the record:
“We respectfully acknowledge the Province of Newfoundland & Labrador, of which the City of St. John’s is the capital City, as the ancestral homelands of the Beothuk. Today, these lands are home to a diverse population of indigenous and other peoples. We would also like to acknowledge with respect the diverse
histories and cultures of the Mi’kmaq, Innu, Inuit, and Southern Inuit of this Province.”

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

3.1 **Adoption of Agenda**

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/38

Moved By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)**

4. **ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES**

4.1 **Approval of Minutes - January 31, 2022**

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/39

Moved By Councillor Bruce

Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That the minutes of January 31, 2022, be adopted as presented.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)**

5. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

5.1 **Amendment to the St. John's Electrical By-Law**
Amendment to the St. John's Electrical By-Law to adopt the 2021 Canadian Electrical Code

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/40

Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council amend Section 13 of the St. John's Electrical By-Law as proposed.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

6.1 Crown Land License for Agricultural Use – Pasture Land Road - CRW2200002

Councillor Ridgeley asked for the location of the land in question. Staff responded that the land was in the Thomas Pond Watershed, which has been marked as the City's future water supply. Councillor Ridgely asked for additional information on how much of the 1,028 hectares of land was located inside the Watershed, and Staff replied that the entire area was located in the Thomas Pond Watershed. Members of Council spoke on the importance of the protection of Watershed areas, noting that contamination of such areas would have a regional impact.

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/41

Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Burton

That Council reject the proposed Crown Land License for 1028 hectares of land near Pasture Land Road for an Agricultural Use as it is not appropriate Use within a protected Watershed.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley
6.2 Subdivide of Land in the Watershed - 731 Thorburn Road – SUB2200004

Councillor Korab clarified that the application was for subdivision of the land only, and that no development was being approved for the parcel of land.

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/42

Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council approve the proposed subdivision of land at 731 Thorburn Road to create an additional parcel of land and set the Zone Standards for both properties with a Lot Frontage of 51.6 metres and a Lot Area of 2.35 hectares.

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

Against (1): Councillor Ellsworth

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 1)
11.1 **Weekly Payment Vouchers for the Week Ending February 2, 2022**

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/43

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth

Seconded By Councillor Burton

The weekly payment vouchers for the week ending February 2, 2022, in the amount of $6,223,679.61, be approved as presented.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)**

12. **TENDERS/RFPS**

12.1 **2021182 – Twin Steer Tandem Tandem**

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/44

Moved By Councillor Hickman

Seconded By Councillor Ridgeley

That Council approve for award open call 2021182 – Twin Steer Tandem Tandem to the lowest bidder meeting specification, Harvey & Company Ltd., for $268,450.80 plus HST, as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)**

13. **OTHER BUSINESS**

13.1 **Deferral of Development in Wetlands – Exclusion for Open Water**

Councillor Korab presented the Decision Note and summarized that areas delineated as "open water" in the 2019 Wetlands Delineation Study, defined by the Canadian Wetlands Canadian Classification System were already protected under the City’s floodplain and buffer development restrictions. As such, Wetlands classified as "Wetland, Open Water" in the
Study should be excluded from the deferral previously approved by Council on October 4, 2021. Councillor Froude provided additional clarification, noting that there are two types of protection for open water, Council's deferral, and floodplain protection. While development would be permitted in the floodplain and buffer with Council's discretion, the blanket deferral is preventing the processing of applications that would otherwise be considered. The Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering, and Regulatory Services further explained that there is currently a double layer of protection, and an application has been received for development within the floodplain buffer for a headwall which would discharge water into a river. Council would normally have the discretion to approve the application under development in the floodplain buffer, but as all applications have been deferred until the completion of Phase 2 of the Wetland Study, this application cannot be reviewed. Changing the recommendation will allow Staff to proceed with applications in the floodplain buffer and there would be no decrease in the protection of wetlands.

Deputy Mayor O'Leary asked if this recommendation would impact the Anglican Synod Wetland, and Staff replied that there would be no impact on that site, as it is captured under one of the other Wetland classifications.

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/45

Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council defer all planning and development applications on sites located within the buffer of wetlands classified as bog, fen, swamp, and marsh as delineated under the 2019 Wetlands Delineation Study Phase 1 until the 2021 Wetlands Study Phase 2 is completed and implemented. It is also recommended that staff be given the authority to defer these applications. It is further recommended that Council rescind previous resolution number SJMC-R-2021-10-04/467.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)
13.2 **Roof Sign Approval**

Councillor Burton noted that under the [Sign By-Law](#), all applications for roof signs must come to Council for approval.

SJMC-R-2022-02-07/46  
**Moved By** Councillor Burton  
**Seconded By** Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council approve the request to install the four roof signs as proposed under their discretion as stipulated in the Sign By-Law.

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)**

14. **NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

14.1 **Notice of Motion - Deferral of Planning and Development Applications in Wetland Buffers**

Councillor Jamie Korab gave the following Notice of Motion:

**TAKE NOTICE** that I will at a future Regular Meeting of Council, move a motion to rescind the following motion approved at the October 4, 2021, Regular Meeting of Council:

**Deferral of Planning and Development Applications in a Wetland Buffers**

SJMC-R-2021-10-04/467  
**Moved By** Councillor Burton  
**Seconded By** Councillor Skinner

That Council defer all planning and development applications on sites located within a wetland buffer as delineated under the City's 2019 Wetlands Delineation Study, Phase 1, until the 2021 Wetlands Study Phase 2A is completed and implemented, in accordance with Section 5.1.3(4) “Planning Studies - Deferral of Applications”.

DATED at St. John’s, NL, this 7th day of February, 2022.
15. **ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL**

15.1 **Belvedere Convent (St. Michael's Convent) - 57 Margaret's Place**

Deputy Mayor O'Leary requested an update on the former convent building on Margaret's Place, which has been vacant for quite some time and is a point of concern for neighbouring residents. The Chief Municipal Planner responded that there were no active applications for rezoning or development at the site, and that the building has been designated by the City as a **heritage building**. The Deputy Mayor then inquired if there had been any recent inspections on the property, and Staff will follow up with Inspection Services for response.

15.2 **Churchill Square - Stairs**

Deputy Mayor O'Leary notified Council that she would like to find a solution to the issue of the stairs located on the Southeast corner of Churchill Square. The stairs are part of a grandfathered pedestrian route, and access is currently blocked by a gate installed by a private owner. Although there is a risk of liability, the Deputy Mayor is recommending that the City acquire the stairs and incorporate them into the plan to **Reimagine Churchill Square**, which would ensure safe access for pedestrians in the future. The land is a mix of privately owned and City land, and she would like Staff to arrange a meeting between City Staff, Members of Council, and business owners to find a solution. Councillor Hickman voiced his concerns on the issue and advised that would like to be included in these discussions.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.
NOTICE OF MOTION

TAKE NOTICE that I will at a future Regular Meeting of Council, move a motion to rescind the following motion approved at the October 4, 2021, Regular Meeting of Council:

Deferral of Planning and Development Applications in a Wetland Buffers

SJMC-R-2021-10-04/467
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Skinner

That Council defer all planning and development applications on sites located within a wetland buffer as delineated under the City’s 2019 Wetlands Delineation Study, Phase 1, until the 2021 Wetlands Study Phase 2A is completed and implemented, in accordance with Section 5.1.3(4) "Planning Studies - Deferral of Applications".

For (10): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Stapleton, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, Councillor Collins, and Councillor Skinner

DATED at St. John’s, NL, this 7th day of February, 2022.

__________________________________
Councillor Jamie Korab
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Request for Variance on Lot Frontage – 346 Back Line – SUB2100062

Date Prepared: February 9, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 5

Decision/Direction Required:
To seek approval for a 9.16% Variance on Lot Frontage at 346 Back Line to allow the subdivide for a new Lot.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
An application has been submitted to subdivide and reconfigure land to develop a Single Detached Dwelling at 346 Back Line. The area is zoned Rural Residential Infill (RRI) Zone and the minimum Lot Frontage requirement is 30 metres. The proposed Lot Frontage for the new Lot is 27.25 metres, which will require a 9.16% Variance. Section 7.4 (a) of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations provides that up to a 10% variance pertaining to Lot Requirements can be considered.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Abutting property owners have been notified.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: St. John’s Strategic Plan 2019-2029 - A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Section 10 Rural Residential Infill (RRI) Zone (3)(b) and Section 7.4 Variances.

5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not Applicable.


8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.
9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

10. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the 9.16% Variance to allow the subdivide of a new Lot at 346 Back Line with a Lot Frontage of 27.5 metres.

**Prepared by:**
Andrea Roberts P.Tech – Senior Development Officer
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

**Approved by:**
Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA, Deputy City Manager-
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Development Committee - Request for Frontage Variance – 346 Back Line – SUB2100062.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- Location Map.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proposed and Remaining Parcel.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Feb 9, 2022 - 9:42 AM

Jason Sinyard - Feb 9, 2022 - 10:28 AM
DISCLAIMER: This map is based on current information at the date of production.
Remaining Parcel

Parcel "B"

Remaining land 12.3 acres

proposed building lot 0.5 acres
Title: Notices Published – 430 Topsail Road - DEV2100192

Date Prepared: February 9, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 3

Decision/Direction Required:
A Discretionary Use application has been submitted by DB Billiards Inc. for 430 Topsail Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The Discretionary Use application is for a Lounge that is located on the 2nd storey of the Village Mall and will have a floor area of 678.4m². The Lounge will also offer food (restaurant) service and operate seven days a week from 12 p.m. to 2 a.m. The Lounge will employ up to 10 people, with approximately 2 people per shift. The proposed application site is in the Commercial Regional (CR) Zone.

Two submissions were received. One in support, while the second expressed concerns regarding noise from dances or any other regular social events which might held at the establishment. The applicant advised that the proposed Lounge is a pool hall and there will be no dances or events that include a live band. The City’s Noise By-Law would also apply to this site.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighbouring property owners.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: St. John’s Strategic Plan 2019-2029 – A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Section 10 Commercial Regional (CR) Zone.

5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Public advertisement in accordance with Section 4.8 the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations. The City has sent written notices to property owners within a minimum 150-metre radius of the application sites. Applications have been advertised in The Telegram newspaper at least once and are posted on the City’s website. Written comments received by the Office of the City Clerk are included in the agenda for the regular meeting of Council.


8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

10. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the Discretionary Use application for a Lounge that is located on the 2nd storey of the Village Mall at 430 Topsail Road.

**Prepared by:**
Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, MCIP Supervisor – Planning & Development
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

**Approved by:**
Jason Sinyard, P.Eng, MBA Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Notices Published - 430 Topsail Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- DEV2100192-430 TOPSAIL ROAD.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Feb 9, 2022 - 9:35 AM

Jason Sinyard - Feb 9, 2022 - 10:30 AM
To Whom It May Concern,

My chief concern with the application for "a lounge [offering] food service [...] seven days a week from 12 p.m. to 2 a.m." is the prospect of noise late into the night in the event this establishment holds club-style dances, on weekends say. If there is any intention for dances or any other regular social event to be held in which very loud, bass-heavy music is playing, I would have to object on the grounds that such music can commonly be heard a good distance away late at night, and could thus be disruptive to us and our young children in our home.

Thank you,
Hi There,

I wanted to send a quick note in support of this application. I think that it is reasonable for a shopping mall to have a place like this, and the area has had similar businesses in the past. I frequent the area and think that it'll be a welcome addition.

Thanks,
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Crown Land License for Private Access to a Quarry - Foxtrap Access Road – CRW2200001

Date Prepared: February 9, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 5

Decision/Direction Required:
To seek approval for a Crown Land License for a private access to a Quarry off the Foxtrap Access Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The Provincial Department of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture has referred an application for a Crown Land License off the Foxtrap Access Road for 1.04 hectares of land. The land is proposed to be used for a private access to a Quarry, which was previously approved as a Discretionary Use at the November 9, 2020, Council meeting. The area is currently zoned Rural (R) and Forestry (F). The access would be reviewed along with the Quarry Use when a development application is submitted should the Crown land be awarded.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: St. John’s Strategic Plan 2019-2029 - A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.
4. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John’s Envision Development Regulations Section 10 Rural (R) Zone and Forestry (F) Zone.
5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.
8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.
9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

10. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the Crown Land License for 1.04 hectares for the proposed private access off the Foxtrap Access Road.

**Prepared by:**
Ashley Murray, P. Tech – Senior Development Officer
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

**Approved by:**
Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA, Deputy City Manager-
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
### Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Development Committee- Proposed Crown Land License for private access to a quarry off Foxtrap Access Road-CRW2200001.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- E-159214 Map1_3500.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 10, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Feb 9, 2022 - 10:42 AM**

**Jason Sinyard - Feb 10, 2022 - 2:17 PM**
NOTE TO USERS

The information on this map was compiled from land surveys registered in the Crown Lands Registry.

Since the Registry does not contain information on all land ownership within the Province, the information depicted cannot be considered complete.

The boundary lines shown are intended to be used as an index to land titles issued by the Crown. The accuracy of the plot is not sufficient for measurement purposes and does not guarantee title.

Users finding any errors or omissions on this map sheet are asked to contact the Crown Lands Inquiries Line by telephone at 1-833-891-3249 or by email at CrownLandsInfo@gov.nl.ca.

Some titles may not be plotted due to Crown Lands volumes missing from the Crown Lands registry or not plotted due to insufficient survey information.

The User hereby indemnifies and saves harmless the Minister, his officers, employees and agents from and against all claims, demands, liabilities, actions or cause of actions alleging any loss, injury, damages and matter (including claims or demands for any violation of copyright or intellectual property) arising out of any missing or incomplete Crown Land titles, and the Minister, his or her officers, employees and agents shall not be liable for any loss of profits or contracts or any other loss of any kind as a result.

For inquiries please contact the Crown Lands Inquiries Line by telephone at 1-833-891-3249 or by email at CrownLandsInfo@gov.nl.ca. Or visit the nearest Regional Lands Office; http://www.flr.gov.nl.ca/department/contact_lands.html
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Notices Published – 607 Torbay Road - DEV2100191

Date Prepared: February 10, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 1

Decision/Direction Required: A Discretionary Use application has been submitted by Suffonsified Holdings Ltd. for 607 Torbay Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status: The proposed application is for a Clinic at 607 Torbay Road. The Clinic will occupy a floor area of 332m² on the 1st floor, which is used for storage. The entire second floor (650m² floor area) will be used for 6 examination rooms and additional storage. Hours of operation will be Monday to Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. The Clinic will employ 4 employees and on-site parking is provided. The proposed application site is in the Industrial Commercial (IC) Zone.

Two submissions were received. Concerns included the lack of information pertaining to the type of clinic proposed and the increase in traffic. The applicant provided information that the space will be used for a dental clinic. The Traffic Division has reviewed this application and noted that the site had been used by an engineering firm, with many employees. From a traffic perspective they do not see an issue with this application for a clinic and do not foresee any traffic congestion at the traffic signals.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighbouring property owners.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: St. John’s Strategic Plan 2019-2029 – A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Section 10 Industrial Commercial (IC) Zone.

5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Public advertisement in accordance with Section 4.8 of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations. The City has sent written notices to property owners within a minimum 150-metre radius of the application sites. Applications have been advertised in The Telegram newspaper at least once and are posted on the City’s website. Written comments received by the Office of the City Clerk are included in the agenda for the regular meeting of Council.


8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

10. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
That Council approve the Discretionary Use application for a Clinic at 607 Torbay Road.

Prepared by:
Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, MCIP, Supervisor – Planning & Development
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

Approved by:
Jason Sinyard, P.Eng, MBA, Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Notices Published - 607 Torbay Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Feb 9, 2022 - 11:11 AM**

**Jason Sinyard - Feb 9, 2022 - 12:59 PM**
## Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Notices Published - 607 Torbay Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- DEV2100191-607 TORBAY ROAD.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 10, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett** - Feb 10, 2022 - 8:53 AM

**Jason Sinyard** - Feb 10, 2022 - 2:16 PM
Office of City Clerk  
P.O. Box 908  
St. John's, NL  
A1C 5M2  

To: City Clerk  
Re: 607 Torbay Road Proposed Clinic  

In reference to the proposed clinic at 607 Torbay Road, I am requesting information regarding what its going to be used for. What kind of clinic will this be and why do they need so much storage space? Why do they need 6 exam rooms when there are only 4 employees and what will the exam rooms be used for? This does not sound like a regular medical clinic, which worries me. Will there be doctors, or what kind of profession will these employees be?  

As a citizen of St. John's, living in this trailer park, I feel I should have the right to know what is going to be in my neighborhood. I am a senior citizen who lives alone, and I feel very safe in my quiet and peaceful cul-du-sac. I am worried that increased traffic and more people around here will make me feel less safe.  

Thank you,
To Whom it May Concern:

As a resident of the Anne Jeanette Trailer Court, I recently received a letter of notification that the city council will be considering an application for a 'clinic' to be set up at 607 Torbay Road. I found the letter to be confusing and vague. The opportunity to provide 'comments' was given, but only by email or Canada Post. There was no mention of 'questions or concerns', and there was no explanation of what impacts this clinic might have for the residents in this area.

It is difficult to provide "comment'' or feedback of any kind, when we have not been given enough information to determine what, if any, negative impacts the proposed clinic might have in this quiet neighbourhood.

The letter was very detailed about the exact amount of space the clinic would occupy, and how many examination rooms, but was very vague about the type of clinic that might be operating there. I can see no reason why it would matter to us in the least how many square feet this clinic will occupy inside the building, but the TYPE of clinic that might be operating there is very significant. So the main question I have is: 'What type of clinic does Suffonsified Holdings Ltd. hope to set up at 607 Torbay Road?'

One of my concerns is the increased traffic this clinic will bring. There is only one entrance to this trailer court, and if this clinic is operating five days a week, from 8 am to 5:30 pm, will there be a significant increase in traffic, thus causing longer wait times to enter and exit the trailer court.

Depending on what might be happening in this mystery clinic, there may be other concerns, inconveniences or even dangers, but we are unable to bring forth other concerns, because we have not been informed what type of clinic might be operating there. Maybe there is no reason for concern at all, but we cannot make an informed decision on whether or not to provide feedback, if we have not been sufficiently informed.

I called the City Clerk Office with the number given, but only reached a message system, and 'no operator was available' to take my call. I then called the Planning and Development Department and spoke to both the receptionist and Ms. Andrea Roberts. Ms. Roberts informed me that she was unable to disclose the information I requested, and directed me to email this office. I am concerned that the difficulty incurred in trying to reach someone to get information will be a deterrent in the amount of feedback that will be received by your office, for this discretionary use application.

I trust my concerns will be considered, and I look forward to a reply in a timely manner, to give me time to compose further comments if necessary, to submit to your office by the deadline of February 8, 2022.

Thank you for your consideration,
Development Permits List  
For the Period of February 3 to February 9, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Development Officer’s Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demo/Rebuild of Single Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>39-41 Mount Royal Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>22-02-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Code Classification:
  - RES - Residential
  - COM - Commercial
  - AG - Agriculture
  - OT - Other
  - INST - Institutional
  - IND - Industrial

** This list is issued for information purposes only. Applicants have been advised in writing of the Development Officer’s decision and of their right to appeal any decision to the St. John’s Local Board of Appeal.

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett  
Supervisor - Planning and Development


### Building Permits List

**Council's February 14, 2022, Regular Meeting**

Permits Issued: 2022/02/03 to 2022/02/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Penney Cres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Diamond Marsh Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Diamond Marsh Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 York St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Maurice Putt Cres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 Montague St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sugar Pine Cres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Leslie St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 Bay Bulls Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Compton Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Brad Gushue Cres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Queen's Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442 Empire Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Monkstown Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Queen's Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Spitfire Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Willenhall Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Tigress St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Cypress St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mountbatten Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Paddy Dobbin Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Regent St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Diamond Marsh Dr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Week: $1,683,282.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Church Hill                                      Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Kenmount Rd                                    Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277-281 Water St                                    Renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 Torbay Rd                                      Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Hallett Cres                                     Renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-32 Duffy Pl                                      Renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336 Logy Bay Rd                                     New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Harvey Rd                                        Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Danny Dr                                         Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 Main Rd                                         Change of Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Hamlyn Rd                                        Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570 Newfoundland Dr                                 Renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 Topsail Rd                                      Renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673 Topsail Rd                                      Sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  This Week: $431,321.60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Government/Institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Military Rd                                       Deck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  This Week: $2,000.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

  This Week: $0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39-41 Mount Royal Ave                               Demolition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  This Week: $5,000.00

  This Week's Total: $2,121,603.60

  $2,260.00

Repair Permits Issued 2022/02/03 to 2022/02/09:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>% VARIANCE (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$3,022,809.62</td>
<td>$4,901,279.10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$2,500,642.75</td>
<td>$5,106,878.10</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Institutional</td>
<td>$193,449.00</td>
<td>$303,788.00</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>$265,000.00</td>
<td>$122,759.99</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,981,901.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,434,705.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (1 &amp; 2 Family Dwelling)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weekly Payment Vouchers
For The
Week Ending February 9, 2022

Payroll

Public Works $ 697,283.29
Bi-Weekly Casual $ 18,736.82
Accounts Payable $ 3,193,911.17

(A detailed breakdown available here)

Total: $ 3,909,931.28
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 19 King’s Bridge Road, Adoption, MPA2100004
Date Prepared: February 8, 2022
Report To: Regular Meeting of Council
Councillor and Role: Councillor Ian Froude, Planning
Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
Following provincial release of the proposed amendment for commercial uses at 19 King’s Bridge Road, Council may proceed to adopt St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application to rezone property at 19 King’s Bridge Road from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Commercial Neighbourhood (CN) Zone. The existing building was owned by the Anglican Church of Canada and housed church offices and a retail store. The building has been sold and the new owner is seeking a rezoning as the building is no longer associated with an institution. A Municipal Plan amendment is also required. Additional information is provided in the attached amendment.

At its regular meeting on December 20, 2021, Council decided to proceed with the proposed amendments and asked that the NL Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs review and release them. Provincial release has now been issued for the amendments. It is now in order for Council to proceed with the next steps in the process: adopting the amendments and setting the date for a commissioner’s public hearing.

The City has been advised that under covid-19 protocol for public hearings, Council must allow 30 days for written submissions. Should Council decide to adopt the amendments, the tentative date for the virtual public hearing is Wednesday, March 16, 2022, at 7 p.m. via Zoom.

Under Section 4.9 of the Envision Development Regulations, a land use report (LUR) is required for all applications to amend the Municipal Plan or Development Regulations. Given that this property had retail uses in the past, and no changes to the existing building are proposed at this time, staff recommend that, in line with Section 4.9 (3), Council accept this staff report as the land use report. The applicant would be required to meet all City regulations and policies, including the Commercial Development Policy, at the development and/or building permit stage once the commercial use has been determined. There are approximately 30 parking spaces on the parking lot. The applicant may be required to upgrade the site to meet relevant access, parking, landscaping, and any other requirements.
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:
   St. John’s Strategic Plan 2019-2029 - A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and
   preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Map amendments to the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan
   and Development Regulations are required.

5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Should Council adopt the
   amendments, a commissioner’s public hearing is required.


8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

10. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
That Council adopt the attached resolutions for St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number
4, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022, and appoint
Ms. Marie Ryan, a member of the City’s commissioner list, to conduct a virtual public hearing
on the proposed amendments. The proposed date for the hearing is Wednesday, March 16,
2022, at 7 p.m.

Prepared by: Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP, Planner III – Urban Design & Heritage
Approved by: Ken O’Brien, MCIP, Chief Municipal Planner
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>19 King's Bridge Road, Adoption, MPA2100004.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- 19 King's Bridge Road - Adoption Attachments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Ken O'Brien - Feb 8, 2022 - 1:56 PM

Jason Sinyard - Feb 9, 2022 - 10:32 AM
City of St. John’s Municipal Plan, 2021

St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022

Institutional Land Use District to Commercial Land Use District for Office and Similar Uses
19 King’s Bridge Road

February 2022
RESOLUTION TO ADOPT

ST. JOHN’S Municipal Plan, 2021

Amendment Number 4, 2022

Under the authority of section 16 of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*, the City Council of St. John’s adopts the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022.

Adopted by the City Council of St. John’s on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date..

Signed and sealed this ____ day of ________________________.

Mayor: __________________________

Clerk: __________________________

Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*.

MCIP/FCIP: __________________________

MCIP/FCIP Stamp
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE

St. John’s Municipal Plan, 2021

Amendment Number 4, 2022

Under the authority of sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s:

1. Adopted the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022 on the ____ day of Click or tap to enter a date.;

2. Gave notice of the adoption of the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022 by way of an advertisement inserted in the Telegram newspaper on the____ day of Click or tap to enter a date., on the ____ day of Click or tap to enter a date.; and

3. Set the ____ day of Click or tap to enter a date. at 7:00 p.m. virtually via Zoom for the holding of a public hearing to consider objections and submissions.

Now, under section 23 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s approves the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022 on the ____ day of Click or tap to enter a date. as ____________________.

Signed and sealed this ____ day of __________________________.

Mayor: ____________________________

Clerk: ____________________________

Town Seal
Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached City of St. John's Municipal Plan Amendment Number 4, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000.

MCIP/FCIP: ________________________________

MCIP/FCIP Stamp
BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
The City wishes to rezone 19 King’s Bridge Road from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Commercial Neighbourhood (CN) Zone to allow offices and other commercial uses within the existing building. This would require a Municipal Plan Amendment to redesignate the property from the Institutional Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District.

The existing building was owned by the Anglican Church of Canada and housed offices and a retail store. The building has been sold and the new owner is seeking a rezoning as the building is no longer associated with an institution.

The exact use of the building has not been determined yet, however the owner would like to use the building for business offices, law offices, medical/dental or similar. The CN Zone would be appropriate, as it has both Office and Clinic as Permitted Uses. If the property is rezoned to CN, any use in the CN Zone table could be approved, subject to meeting site standards and Council’s approval for Discretionary Uses.

As the exact use has not been determined, a full development and engineering review has not been complete at this stage. Should rezoning proceed, the applicant would be required to meet all City regulations and policies including the Commercial Development Policy. There are approximately 30 parking spaces on the parking lot. The applicant may be required to upgrade the site to meet relevant access, parking, landscaping and any other requirements.

ANALYSIS
The Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan sets a goal to design complete and interconnected, walkable neighbourhoods with efficient infrastructure, facilities and services, including a range of housing options. In order to design complete neighbourhoods, neighbourhoods must include commercial areas and services within walking distance to existing residential areas. Redesignating 19 King’s Bridge Road to the Commercial Land Use District will assist with achieving this goal by allowing commercial uses close to residential neighbourhoods.

The Commercial Land Use District applies to existing and future areas of commercial development within the City. These commercial uses range from small-scale commercial sites serving residential neighbourhoods, to larger regional centres. Policy 8.5.4 states that the City will designate lands for commercial use in appropriate locations along main roadways, at intersections and in the downtown, to ensure an adequate supply of suitable land is available to accommodate a range of commercial activity and support commerce.
19 King’s Bridge Road is along a main roadway, previously contained a retail use and is considered to be an appropriate location for other commercial uses. Therefore, it is recommended to redesignate and rezone this property to accommodate an office, clinic or other commercial use.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION
A virtual public meeting for the proposed amendments was held December 1, 2021 via Zoom. The proposed amendments and public meeting were advertised on three occasions in The Telegram newspaper on November 13, November 20 and November 27, 2021. A notice was also mailed to property owners within 150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website. No submissions were received by the City Clerk’s Office and there were also no attendees at the public meeting. A decision was made to at the public meeting to conclude without presentations due to a lack of public attendance.

ST. JOHN’S URBAN REGION REGIONAL PLAN
The proposed amendment is in line with the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan. The subject property is within the Urban Development designation of the Regional Plan. An amendment to the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan is not required.

ST. JOHN’S MUNICIPAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 4, 2022
The St. John’s Municipal Plan is amended by:

Redesignating land at 19 King’s Bridge Road [Parcel ID# 12683] from the Institutional Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District as shown on Future Land Use Map P-1 attached.
CITY OF ST. JOHN'S MUNICIPAL PLAN Amendment No. 4, 2022

[Future Land Use Map P-1]

I hereby certify that this amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Urban and Rural Planning Act.

M.C.I.P. signature and seal

Mayor

City Clerk

Council Adoption Provincial Registration
City of St. John’s Development Regulations, 2021

St. John’s Development Regulations
Amendment Number 6, 2022

Institutional (INST) Land Use Zone to Commercial Neighbourhood (CN) Land Use Zone
for an Office and Similar Uses
19 King’s Bridge Road

February 2022
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT

ST. JOHN’S Development Regulations, 2021

Amendment Number 6, 2022

Under the authority of section 16 of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*, the City Council of St. John’s adopts the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022.

Adopted by the City Council of St. John’s on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date..

Signed and sealed this _____ day of _________________________.

Mayor: ______________________

Clerk: ______________________

Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*.

MCIP/FCIP: ______________________

Town Seal

MCIP/FCIP Stamp
**URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000**

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE**

St. John’s Development Regulations, 2021

Amendment Number 6, 2022

Under the authority of sections 16, 17 and 18 of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*, the City Council of St. John’s:

1. Adopted the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022 on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date.;
2. Gave notice of the adoption of the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022 by way of an advertisement inserted in the Telegram newspaper on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date., and on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date.; and
3. Set the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date. at 7:00 p.m. virtually via Zoom for the holding of a public hearing to consider objections and submissions.

Now, under section 23 of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*, the City Council of St. John’s approves the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022 on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date. as ____________________.

Signed and sealed this _____ day of ____________________.

Mayor: __________________________

Clerk: __________________________
Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached City of St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000.

MCIP/FCIP: ________________________________

MCIP/FCIP Stamp
CITY OF ST. JOHN’S
Development Regulations Amendment Number 6, 2022

PURPOSE
The City wishes to rezone 19 King’s Bridge Road from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Commercial Neighbourhood (CN) Zone to allow offices and other commercial uses within the existing building.

The existing building was owned by the Anglican Church of Canada and housed offices and a retail store. The building has been sold and the new owner is seeking a rezoning as the building is no longer associated with an institution.

This amendment implements St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 4, 2022, which is being processed concurrently.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION
A virtual public meeting for the proposed amendments was held December 1, 2021 via Zoom. The proposed amendments and public meeting were advertised on three occasions in The Telegram newspaper on November 13, November 20 and November 27, 2021. A notice was also mailed to property owners within 150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website. No submissions were received by the City Clerk’s Office and there were no attendees at the public meeting.

ST. JOHN’S URBAN REGION REGIONAL PLAN
The proposed amendment is in line with the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan. The subject property is within the Urban Development designation of the Regional Plan. An amendment to the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan is not required.

ST. JOHN’S DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS AMENDMENT NUMBER 6, 2022
The St. John’s Development Regulations is amended by:

Rezoning land at 19 King’s Bridge Road [Parcel ID# 12683] from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Commercial Neighbourhood (CN) Zone as shown on City of St. John’s Zoning Map attached.
CITY OF ST. JOHN'S DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS Amendment No. 6, 2022

[City of St. John's Zoning Map]

AREA PROPOSED TO BE REZONED FROM INSTITUTIONAL (INST) LAND USE ZONE TO COMMERCIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD (CN) LAND USE ZONE

19 KING'S BRIDGE ROAD
Parcel ID 12683

I hereby certify that this amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Urban and Rural Planning Act.

______________________________
M.C.I.P. signature and seal

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
City Clerk

______________________________
Council Adoption

2021 12 02  Scale: 1:1500
City of St. John's
Department of Planning, Development & Regulatory Services
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Expropriation of 379 and 380 Bay Bulls Road

Date Prepared: February 9, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Carl Ridgeley, Ward 5

Ward: Ward 5

Decision/Direction Required:

Recommendation on the expropriation of

1) 380 Bay Bulls Road for the realignment of Old Bay Bulls Road at Bay Bulls Road
2) 379 Bay Bulls Road for the Goulds servicing Phase 2 – Sanitary Trunk Sewer project.
3) Temporary working easement for 379 Bay Bulls Road

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

1) The Legal Department has been in negotiations with the owners of 380 Bay Bulls Road for the acquisition of their property for the realignment of Old Bay Bulls Road at Bay Bulls Road. The title search identified issues with the title of the property. We have spoken to the owner of 380 Bay Bulls Road to make them aware of the title issues and that they will have to submit a claim to the City to prove their interest in this property.

The purchase price for the property has been established at $2.25 per square foot resulting in compensation in the amount of $32,792.24. The City has already completed the survey which is attached hereto and labeled Schedule “A”.

2) The Legal Department has also been in negotiations with the purported owners of 379 Bay Bulls Road. The registered owners are both deceased, and the property allegedly is to be divided between their two sons, though a title search shows that has yet to be completed.

The purchase price for the property has been established at $1.00 per square foot, as this property is located within the floodplain and development potential is limited, resulting in compensation in the amount of $1,496.18. The purported property owner is in disagreement with this figure and the Legal Department is currently awaiting a counter-offer. The Survey for this property is attached hereto as Schedule “B”.

3) The Legal Department has also been in negotiations with the purported owners of 379 Bay Bulls Road for a working easement to be utilized during the construction and installation of the Phase 2 – Sanitary Trunk Sewer project. This easement will be released once the project is completed. The value of this temporary working easement has been established at $60 per month. The survey for this easement has been completed and is attached as Schedule “C”.

ST. JOHN’S
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:
   a. City to pay fair market value for the expropriated land and the temporary working easement, plus reasonable legal fees

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   a. Property owners of 379 and 380 Bay Bulls Road

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
   a. An Effective City

4. Legal or Policy Implications:
   a. Three Notices of Expropriation will have to be prepared and a Release will have to be prepared for the temporary working easement once the project is finalized.

5. Privacy Implications:
   a. N/A

6. Engagement and Communications Considerations:
   a. N/A

7. Human Resource Implications:
   a. N/A

8. Procurement Implications:
   a. N/A

9. Information Technology Implications:
   a. N/A

10. Other Implications:
    a. N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve the expropriation of:
1) 380 Bay Bulls Road for the realignment of Old Bay Bulls Road at Bay Bulls Road
2) 379 Bay Bulls Road for the Goulds servicing Phase 2 – Sanitary Trunk Sewer project.
3) Temporary working easement for 379 Bay Bulls Road

Prepared by: Andrew Woodland, Legal Counsel
Approved by: Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
### Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Expropriation of 379 and 380 Bay Bulls Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

**Cheryl Mullett - Feb 9, 2022 - 3:53 PM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 6 Lambe’s Lane, Adoption, MPA2000005
Date Prepared: February 10, 2022
Report To: Regular Meeting of Council
Councillor and Role: Councillor Ian Froude, Planning
Ward: Ward 4

Decision/Direction Required:
Following provincial release of the proposed amendment for 6 Lambe’s Lane, Council may adopt St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City received an application from the company WerkLiv to rezone land at 6 Lambe’s Lane from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Apartment 3 (A3) Zone to accommodate three Apartment Buildings with 205 units. A Municipal Plan amendment is required. Background information and analysis on this application can be found in the attached amendment.

In 2020, Council set the terms of reference for a Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR). Once the report was finalized, a public meeting was held on August 10, 2021. Council then proceeded to adopt-in-principle the amendment on September 7, 2021 and forwarded the documents to the NL Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs for review. The amendment was released by the Province on September 22, 2021, however the applicant asked the City to defer consideration of adoption to allow them time to revise their plans.

Recognizing that parking was the most significant concern raised at the public meeting, the applicant has revised the site plan to add 54 parking stalls. They used a ratio of parking similar to their Halifax development and one that is aligned with city center development elsewhere. This includes:

a. Ratio of just over 0.25 parking spaces per unit
b. Additional 5 spots reserved for visitors (ratio increased to 0.3 per unit)
c. Required 6% barrier-free parking spaces
d. Total of 55 guaranteed parking spaces
e. A possible additional 3-5 parking spaces to be determined at the detailed design stage.

The revised LUAR is attached for Council’s review. Staff have advised the applicant that some minor updates to the report and site servicing plan will be required; these would be brought back to Council at the amendment approval stage, should the rezoning proceed.
The amendments are ready for Council to decide whether to proceed with the next steps, by adopting the amendments and setting a commissioner's public hearing. The revised LUAR will be provided on the City’s website for public review before the public hearing.

The Province has advised that, under covid-19 protocols for public hearings, Council must allow 30 days for written submissions. Should Council decide to adopt the amendments, the tentative date for the virtual public hearing is Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 7 p.m. via Zoom, with Commissioner Marie Ryan.

Change in Amendment Reference Numbers
At its regular meeting on September 7, 2021, Council decided to proceed with the proposed amendments and asked that the Province issue a provincial release. At that time, they were called St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 158, 2021 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment 726, 2021. Since then, the new Envision Municipal Plan and Development Regulations have come into effect and the numbering has reset. These are now referenced as Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 and Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022. The amendment document has been updated to include background information and analysis in the body of the amendment, rather than in the Council decision note, as per guidelines from the Province.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Neighbouring residents and property owners; Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: 
   St. John’s Strategic Plan 2019-2029 - A Sustainable City – Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.
4. Legal or Policy Implications: Map amendments to the Envision Municipal Plan and Development Regulations are required.
5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Commissioner’s public hearing is required.
8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.
9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.
10. Other Implications: Not applicable.
Recommendation:
That Council adopt the attached resolutions for St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022, and appoint Ms. Marie Ryan, a member of the City’s commissioner list, to conduct a virtual public hearing on the proposed amendments. The proposed date for the hearing is Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 7 p.m.

Prepared by: Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP, Planner III – Urban Design & Heritage
Approved by: Ken O’Brien, MCIP, Chief Municipal Planner
City of St. John’s Municipal Plan, 2021

St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022

Institutional Land Use District to Residential Land Use District for Apartment Buildings
6 Lambe’s Lane

February 2022
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT

ST. JOHN’S Municipal Plan, 2021

Amendment Number 6, 2022

Under the authority of section 16 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s adopts the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022.

Adopted by the City Council of St. John’s on the 14th day of February, 2022.

Signed and sealed this ____ day of ________________________.

Mayor: ________________________________

Clerk: ________________________________

Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000.

MCIP/FCIP: ________________________________
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE

St. John’s Municipal Plan, 2021

Amendment Number 6, 2022

Under the authority of sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s:

1. Adopted the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 on the ____ day of ___________;
2. Gave notice of the adoption of the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 by way of an advertisement inserted in the Telegram newspaper on the ____ day of ___________; and on the ____ day of ___________; and on the ____ day of ___________; and on the ____ day of ___________; and
3. Set the ____ day of ___________ at 7:00 p.m. virtually via Zoom for the holding of a public hearing to consider objections and submissions; and
4. Accepted written submissions until the ____ day of ___________.

Now, under section 23 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s approves the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 on the ____ day of ___________ as ____________________.

Signed and sealed this ____ day of ____________________.

Mayor: ____________________

Clerk: ____________________

Town Seal
Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached City of St. John's Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*.

MCIP/FCIP: ___________________________
BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
The City has received an application from Werkliv for three 6-storey Apartment Buildings that will contain a total of 205 student residential units. The property is zoned Institutional (INST), in which Apartment Building is not a listed use. The applicant has asked that the property be rezoned to the Apartment 3 (A3) Zone where Apartment Building is a Permitted Use. A Municipal Plan amendment is required to redesignate the land from the Institutional District to the Residential District. The house on the site will be demolished should the application proceed.

Werkliv seeks to develop a residential project that caters to the university student population. They state that there is high demand for quality living arrangements for 2nd and 3rd year students and that affordable furnished rentals close to campus may be hard to find. As well, they believe students want more rental options. Werkliv is proposing a higher density development close to university facilities and public services which they believe will reduce the rental pressure on existing neighbourhoods close to campus. They aim to provide a housing option to students who would normally move farther away from university facilities after their first or second year.

The applicant is also seeking a reduction in the required vehicular parking due to this site’s proximity to Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador. A total of 54 parking stalls are proposed, which are intended to be used for tenant parking, pick up/drop off, accessible parking and car share. The applicant is aiming to shift perspective on car culture and create a development which includes 112 bike parking spaces, including 22 covered spaces and indoor bike storage, proximity to 4 bus stops within a 3-minute walk and they are exploring other collaborations with local markets, grocers and farms to organize potential partnerships for food delivery and other service plans. They believe that if we are not changing behavior through design, placemaking and management, it will be difficult to change our effects on the environment and community at large.

ANAYLSIS
Location
The subject property is 2.27 acres (9,194 square metres) and surrounded by institutional buildings and uses accessory to Memorial University. The property abuts the Aquarena and St. Augustine’s Church to the east, and Memorial’s alumni engagement office and other university facilities to the south and west. The CBC TV and Radio building and a university parking lot are situated north of the property, with
Building Height and Density
The subject property currently contains a single-detached dwelling which would be demolished should the development proceed. The change from a single-detached dwelling to three apartment buildings is an increase in density for this area. From Section 6.4.1(i) of the Municipal Plan, when considering increasing building height Council shall take into account whether the building and the proposed use advances the goals and objectives of the Municipal Plan and contributes positively to the surroundings.

Under Section 4.1 of the Municipal Plan, strategic objectives for housing include:
- Facilitate thoughtfully designed mixed-use development that provides access to various housing options, amenities and employment opportunities in the same neighbourhood.
- Encourage a range of housing options that contribute to community health, sustainable growth and economic security.
- Promote higher density development in and around key transportation corridors to support increased access to housing and transportation options to reduce service and infrastructure costs.

These objectives are achieved by enabling a range of housing to create diverse neighbourhoods that include a mix of housing forms and tenures, including single, semi-detached, townhousing, medium and higher density and mixed-use residential developments. Further, by promoting a broad range of housing choice for all ages, income groups, and family types by supporting the development of housing that is appropriate, accessible and affordable for low-income and moderate-income households. The uses surrounding the site are generally institutional, but the addition of apartment buildings to the larger residential neighbourhood will assist in diversifying the housing stock and providing an affordable option for renters.

Section 6.1.3 of the Municipal Plan states the City will promote and recognize creativity, innovation and sustainability in architecture, landscape architecture, and site and neighbourhood design. The proposed development is a unique development which uses a creative and sustainable lens. Apartment buildings is little parking is a new concept for St. John’s, but Staff recommend the development as it is in line with the policies in the Municipal Plan.
Parking
The applicant is proposing 54 parking stalls. Under Section 8.3 of the Development Regulations, a minimum of 239 parking stalls are required. The applicant is seeking a parking reduction of 185 stalls.

In the draft presented at the public meeting, the applicant was only proposing 4 parking stalls. Following the public meeting the applicant recognized that the most significant issue expressed from the community were concerns about the lack of parking. The applicant is now proposing a ratio of parking that is aligned with other city center development requirements. This includes:

a. Ratio of just over .25 guaranteed purpose-built parking spots
b. Additional 5 spots dedicated to visitors
c. Required 6% barrier free parking spots
d. Total of 54 parking spots provided
e. Possibly an additional 3-5 parking spots that will be confirmed in the detailed design stage.

The applicants have completed a number of similar developments in Quebec and Halifax and used a similar parking ratio for their Halifax development.

City Development and Engineering staff have reviewed the request for parking relief and support exempting the development from parking requirements. The City’s Parking Enforcement Division is concerned that residents or visitors to the site may park illegally nearby. This becomes an enforcement issue. The applicant believes that having pedestrian friendly housing located close to university will lighten the parking burden of the area by removing the need for more parking spaces.

From Section 7.2 of the Municipal Plan, the City will work with schools, the University, Colleges and private educational institutions to provide alternatives to car travel by improving conditions that encourage students to travel to school on foot, by public transit or by bicycle and create more pedestrian-friendly environment that is interconnected by a network of accessible, safe, comfortable and convenient routes.

If the development proceeds, the applicant will be required to upgrade Lambe’s Lane to include sidewalk on both side of the road, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment. The applicant is also placing a priority on accommodating bicycle storage, which promotes active and alternative forms of transportation.

City staff understand the concerns about parking because this is a new type of development locally. We believe that this can be successful and recommend rezoning the property to accommodate the development.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION
The proposed amendments and associated public meeting were advertised on three occasions in The Telegram newspaper on July 17, July 24, and August 7, 2021. A notice of the amendments and public meeting was also mailed to property owners within
150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website and social media. A virtual public meeting was held on August 10, 2021. Minutes from the meeting and submissions received are included in the Council Decision Note dated August 21, 2021.

**ST. JOHN’S URBAN REGION REGIONAL PLAN**
The proposed amendment is in line with the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan. The subject property is within the Urban Development designation of the Regional Plan. An amendment to the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan is not required.

**CHANGE IN AMENDMENT REFERENCE NUMBERS**
At its regular meeting on September 7, 2021, Council decided to proceed with the proposed amendments and asked that Municipal and Provincial Affairs issue provincial release. At that time the amendments were referenced as St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 158, 2021 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment 726, 2021. Since then, Council has adopted the new Envision Municipal Plan and Development Regulations and the numbering for amendments reset. Further, the amendment year has been updated from 2021 to 2022. These amendments are now referenced as Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 and Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022.

**ST. JOHN’S MUNICIPAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 6, 2022**
The St. John’s Municipal Plan is amended by:

1. **Redesignating land at 6 Lambe’s Lane [Parcel ID# 17287] from the Institutional (INST) Land Use District to the Residential (R) Land Use District as shown on Future Land Use Map P-1 attached.**
CITY OF ST. JOHN'S MUNICIPAL PLAN
Amendment No. 6, 2022

[Future Land Use Map P-1]

AREA PROPOSED TO BE REDESIGNATED FROM INSTITUTIONAL (INST) LAND USE DISTRICT TO RESIDENTIAL (R) LAND USE DISTRICT

6 LAMBE'S LANE
Parcel ID 17287

I hereby certify that this amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Urban and Rural Planning Act.

________________________________________
M.C.I.P. signature and seal

__________________________
Mayor

__________________________
City Clerk

__________________________
Council Adoption

Provincial Registration
Institutional (INST) Land Use Zone to Apartment 3 (A3) Land Use Zone for Apartment Buildings
6 Lambe’s Lane

February 2022
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT

ST. JOHN’S Development Regulations, 2021

Amendment Number 9, 2022

Under the authority of section 16 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s adopts the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022.

Adopted by the City Council of St. John’s on the 14th day of February, 2022.

Signed and sealed this ____ day of _________________________.

Mayor: ____________________________

Clerk: ____________________________

Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000.

MCIP/FCIP: ____________________________
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE

St. John’s Development Regulations, 2021

Amendment Number 9, 2022

Under the authority of sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s:

1. Adopted the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022 on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date.;

2. Gave notice of the adoption of the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022 by way of an advertisement inserted in the Telegram newspaper on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date., and on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date.; and

3. Set the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date. at 7:00 p.m. virtually via Zoom for the holding of a public hearing to consider objections and submissions.

Now, under section 23 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, the City Council of St. John’s approves the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022 on the _____ day of Click or tap to enter a date. as ______________________.

Signed and sealed this _____ day of ______________________.

Mayor: ______________________

Clerk: ______________________

Town Seal
Canadian Institute of Planners Certification

I certify that the attached City of St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000.

MCIP/FCIP: ___________________________
PURPOSE
The City wishes to rezone 6 Lambe’s Lane from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Apartment 3 Zone to allow the development of three Apartment Buildings.

This amendment implements St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 6, 2022, which is being processed concurrently.

Minimum Rear Yard
The City also wished to amendment the minimum rear yard requirement in the Apartment 3 (A3) Zone. Under the previous 1994 Development Regulations, the minimum rear yard in the A3 Zone was 6 metres. The Envision Development Regulations introduced a minimum that would increase the rear yard requirement when higher buildings are proposed. The minimum rear yard for Apartment Buildings states “6 metres, together with 1 additional metre for every 4 metres in excess of 24 metres of Building Height”. While the intent was to provide some additional rear yard space for larger buildings, this requirement does not work as intended when there are multiple buildings on a site with varying building heights, as displayed in the proposed development at 6 Lambe’s Lane. Therefore, it is recommended to amendment the minimum rear yard requirement to 6 metres. This is a standard minimum requirement in most of the City’s zones and is determined to be a sufficient rear yard. Staff also recommend applying this to the A3 Zone Personal Care Home rear yard requirement.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION
The proposed amendments and associated public meeting were advertised on three occasions in The Telegram newspaper on July 17, July 24 and August 7, 2021. A notice of the amendments and public meeting was also mailed to property owners within 150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website. A virtual public meeting was held on August 10, 2021. Minutes from the meeting and submissions received are included in the Council Decision Note dated August 21, 2021, in the September 7, 2021, Council Agenda.

ST. JOHN’S URBAN REGION REGIONAL PLAN
The proposed amendment is in line with the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan. The subject property is within the Urban Development designation of the Regional Plan. An amendment to the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan is not required.

CHANGE IN AMENDMENT REFERENCE NUMBERS
At its regular meeting on September 7, 2021, Council decided to proceed with the proposed amendments and asked that Municipal and Provincial Affairs issue provincial release. At that time the amendments were referenced as St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 81.
Amendment 158, 2021 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment 726, 2021. Since then, Council has adopted the new Envision Municipal Plan and Development Regulations and the numbering for amendments reset. Further, the amendment year has been updated from 2021 to 2022. These amendments are now referenced as Municipal Plan Amendment Number 6, 2022 and Development Regulations Amendment Number 9, 2022.

ST. JOHN’S DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS AMENDMENT NUMBER 9, 2022
The St. John’s Development Regulations is amended by:

1. Repealing Section (3)(g) Rear Yard Zone Standards for Apartment Building in the Apartment 3 (A3) Zone and substituting the following: “(3)(g) Rear Yard (minimum) 6 metres”

2. Repealing Section (4)(g) Rear Yard Zone Standards for Personal Care Home in the Apartment 3 (A3) Zone and substituting the following: “(4)(g) Rear Yard (minimum) 6 metres”

3. Rezoning land at 6 Lambe’s Lane [Parcel ID# 17287] from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Apartment 3 (A3) Zone as shown on City of St. John’s Zoning Map attached.
CITY OF ST. JOHN’S DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS Amendment No. 9, 2022

[City of St. John’s Zoning Map]

AREA PROPOSED TO BE REZONED FROM INSTITUTIONAL (INST) LAND USE ZONE TO APARTMENT 3 (A3) LAND USE ZONE

6 LAMBE’S LANE
Parcel ID 17287

I hereby certify that this amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Urban and Rural Planning Act.

M.C.I.P. signature and seal

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
City Clerk

______________________________
Council Adoption

Provincial Registration 83
Re: Changes made from previous LUAR – January 30, 2022

After the initial public consultations and many conversations, work with St. Johns city planning, members of Council, MUNL, MUNStudent union, First light. We have reflected on all the feedback and have made these significant changes and compromises.

Main Changes

1. Addition of parking. This was the most significant issue expressed from the community. Our team went back to the drawing board and without losing the forward thinking ethos of this project, found a way to integrate a ratio of parking that is aligned with most major city center development requirements and higher than what is normally required for student housing.
   a. Ratio of just over .25 guaranteed purpose-built parking spots
   b. Additional 5 spots dedicated to visitors (ratio increased to .3)
   c. Required 6% barrier free parking spots
   d. Total of 55 parking spots we can guarantee to provide
   e. An additional 3-5 that in the design phase we will attempt to include however are unable to commit to providing those stalls until further detailed design is completed

This plan addresses the concerns in an environmentally and socially responsible way. It preserves the pedestrian friendly aspects of the project without overburdening traffic in the area, and still preserving the same number of mature trees on the lot as originally proposed.

This year we pre-leased 600 beds in Halifax with a similar parking spot ratio with overwhelming success and 4 months ahead of schedule. Response to our product has been significant.

2. METRO BUS: Commitment to providing each unit lease signed with 20 free metro bus tickets per semester to be used in a flexible way, and encourage public transportation for occasional needs. Discussion with metro bus will initiate once rezoning is achieved

3. SNOW & GARBAGE REMOVAL: Clarifications made to snow clearing and garbage removal details. Both of which will continue to progress when a property management plan starts to take form once the property is nearing completion

4. SITE PLAN adjustments: Additional servicing and site plan clarifications

5. NL HERITAGE TRUST: In person visit to document the property and asses any historic value to be preserved. Conclusion: nothing of significant value – could be demolished and potential auction of doors/windows could be organized to reuse material.

Other progress

1. More in depth conversations with surrounding stakeholders, in particular MUNL regarding synergies and issues that can be addressed and resolved constructively. Open dialogue will continue between the two organizations

2. Meetings with MUNSU, to listen to student concerns and stories regarding desperate need for housing, as well as potential collaborations through our “change program” where we donate design time, materials and resources to revamp neglected spaces.
3. Meeting with first light to discuss collaborations, education and potentially providing scholarships through their organizations among other interesting potential collaborative efforts and initiatives including potential to work on our “change program” where we donate design time, materials and resources to revamp neglected spaces.

We are very pleased with the work we have included in this proposal. We feel as though it pushed the upper limits of the development, and hopefully can be part of a new way of building in St Johns.

Sincerely,

Maggie Terrone
Executive Vice President
Werkliv
WerkLiv
Building Quality. Of Life.™
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1.0 Introduction
We develop beautiful yet accessible student and rental housing.

In only 8 years, Werkliv has given over 2000 students and renters intelligently built, attractive modern living spaces that foster quality of life.

We want St.Johns NL, to be next.
1.2 Our Visionary Approach

001 Starting from the Inside Out
We work from the inside out. Our development first begins with the everyday and current living reality of our renters and the communities we plan to build in. We then work with a dream team of like minded designers, architects and engineers to bring these building to life.

002 Going that Extra Mile Using Data
We ask, evaluate, and consider how much space students and renters need now, in years to come, and in ever-changing market realities (such as COVID-19).

003 Collaborate & Listen
We work with elected officials, as they channel the voices of their communities through collaboration. We adapt our projects to compliment their vision of future cities.

004 To Bcorp, or Not to Be
We are a certified BCORP. We understand that we are building for a better tomorrow. We push boundaries, innovate and improve our product everyday.
1.3 Where are students currently living in St John's?

**Residual Demand**
- Total 2020 MUN Enrollment: 19,429
- Purpose built Residence beds: 1,940
- Local NL Students up to 30 min drive: 8,010

**Underserved population**: 9,479

*numbers are approximate estimates

**Student Living**
Due to the fact that there are limited options for 2nd and 3rd year students, they are forced to look for options farther away. This spreads them out across the city, making for less than ideal work/study/life balance.

**Lambe's Lane - The Perfect Location**
- 1-7 minute walk to all MUN buildings
- 1 minute walk to library
- 1 minute walk to the Works, Aquarena

**MUN - Memorial University**
- Campus and facilities
- approx 2000 university beds

**Good Location**
- Very close to campus however:
- these consist mostly of rooms for rent in private homes and are few and far between
1.4 Land Acknowledgement

Werkliv is committed to building a quality of life for all. We respectfully acknowledge the territory on which this development may be built upon as part of the ancestral homelands of the Beothuk, and the island of Newfoundland as the ancestral homelands of the Mi’kmaq and Beothuk. We are also pleased to recognize the Inuit of Nunatsiavut and NunatuKavut and the Innu of Nitassinan, and their ancestors, as the original people of Labrador. We strive to contribute to the reconciliation process through a collaboration with Indigenous artists and craftspeople.
1.5 Summary of Development Proposal

Werkliv is seeking to develop a new residential project that aims to cater to the diverse student population in St. John’s. The demand for high quality living options for 2nd and 3rd year students is high. Affordable furnished rentals close to campus are difficult to find. We believe students are looking for more options. Many are currently living in the basements of older homes or a 20-25 minute walk from campus. Werkliv is proposing appropriate densification close to university facilities and public services. This reduces the rental pressure on existing neighbourhoods close to campus. It also allows quality rental options to be readily available to existing students who typically would move farther away university facilities after their first or second year.

Werkliv’s intention is to redevelop the lands at 6 Lambe’s Lane (PID: 17287). These lands are currently zoned Institutional. The development intention for PID: 17287 is to demolish the existing structures, upgrade existing infrastructure and develop 205 residential dwelling units contained within three 6-storey buildings.

As such, we request that Council consider the rezoning of the subject property to A3 (Apartment High Density) with an amendment to the zone to allow for a greater residential density and reduced parking requirements.
1.6 Design Inspiration

The Atlantic Canadian vernacular, celebrated in Newfoundland & Labrador, has a strong focus on simple forms and strong roof lines. There is a historic building culture of simple, practical, and timeless. We began our design process by studying the various housing forms of the area and other areas of similar context to create a series of “building blocks” which can be arranged many ways to form this new community.

Keeping the main form of the building simple, with minimal changes in the plane, will simplify construction and allow for consistency in the unit layouts, allowing the idea of modular building to be more easily explored. Experimenting with window proportions and material tones will transform a long rectilinear building into smaller “houses”.

Using the pedestrian laneways as community green spaces that foster interaction and connection between residents and environment.
2.0 Site Design
2.1 Landscaping, Buffering and Tree Preservation

The submitted landscape plan illustrates the location of existing and proposed landscape elements. The proposed buildings are situated perpendicular to Lambe's Lane, creating space for large pedestrian walkways to access each building. The walkways are a minimum of 6m wide and can accommodate emergency vehicles if required. The walkways will be lined with intricate planting areas and rest areas with benches to create a pleasant pedestrian experience. Different amenity spaces include bicycle parking areas, outdoor lounge spaces, and informal lounge and gathering spaces. Salvaged wood from demolition and select tree removal will be repurposed to build outdoor landscaping elements seating and screens. A screened waste and recycling storage unit has also been shown within the surface parking area adjacent to Building 1. Smaller storage units have been shown outside the ground floor units on the pedestrian laneways.

A site visit was carried out by a local arborist to assess the condition of the existing trees. Their report included the following findings:

- On the Aquarena property boundary, there is a mix of horse chestnut, maple and beech trees. Overreaching limbs from beech and maple require clearance pruning from the Aquarena structure. There are a number of maples growing in and against chain link fence, where removal is recommended before further damage occurs. A codominant or, twinned-stem beech requires removal of one stem in decline. There is evidence of minor grade change and fill piling against tree trunks, and lower branch injury caused by machinery on a few trees close to Lambe's Lane, which is remarkable, but unlikely to affect tree health. Overall the trees in this area are in good health; maintenance pruning, crown raising for accessibility and nuisance removal is recommended.

- Along Lambe's Lane there are beech, oak and a variety of volunteer maple and mountain ash trees. There are many younger trees in this crowded roadside location that may be casualties to site access, servicing and road widening. There are however, two significant trees including a beech and oak tree. General maintenance pruning and crown raising for accessibility is recommended for these two trees.

- On the south boundary line, there are many cherry, maple, and scattered horse chestnut and larch trees. There are a few failed trees in this area, requiring attention, and trees are in general need of maintenance pruning.

The layout of the buildings and landscape elements has been developed with the arborist’s comments in mind. The proposed layout allows for the preservation of the trees along the Aquarena boundary, with the exception of the ones recommended for removal, including the volunteer trees and one beech tree.

The two significant trees along Lambe’s Lane (beech and oak) will be preserved, with some pruning to allow pedestrians and vehicle clearance below it. Appendix B illustrates existing trees that are existing and those to remain, along with some new proposed trees to help offset those that are removed to accommodate the buildings. All tree preservation will occur in accordance City of St. John’s requirements and guidelines.

Shrub and perennial planting has also been shown on site to create pleasant spaces for residents to enjoy, while also creating some separation between the main walkways and the ground-level units. Plants that are selected will suit the site conditions, and will fall within the City of St. John’s Landscape Development Policy.
2.2 Off Street Parking

The proposed development is seeking a reduction in required vehicular parking. A total of 54 parking stalls are proposed, which are intended to be used for tenant parking, pick up/drop off, accessible parking and car share. The reason for this requested parking supply reductions is directly associated with the development’s intended use, in conjunction with its location. The proposed vehicular parking ratio of approximately 0.25 stalls per unit is consistent with parking supply requirements of other jurisdictions in the Atlantic Canada and Nationally, particularly for this building typology and site location (in relation to the site’s urban context).

In a recent article: Review of the effects of Developments with Low Parking Requirements (published on February 2020 by mdpi – Journal on sustainability), over 60 developments were studied across eastern Europe with reduced parking. The main finding of the article was that the most successful projects were the ones designed with a shift in perspective relative to parking. Instead of asking “How much parking is required under this specific zone and how much can it be reduced by?” urban planners asked “How do we transform behavior by addressing mobility?” We outlined the key success elements identified in the study and described how they have been addressed in the development proposal.

1. Proximity to centralized zone

The site is centrally located, within proximity to many facilities and public transportation stops. The development site is close to MUN’s incredible study halls, libraries, tunnels and neighbouring sporting facility “The Works”. Most of the needs for students who will be living in these buildings are within a 1-to-10-minute walk. Currently, an estimated 9,000 students are living outside a reasonable walking distance.

In a Metro Bus study from 2010, 5,000 students were asked about walking to campus. Of those who answered, 63% reported the reason for not walking was distance; 15% reported they always walked (many of them lived on campus or in close proximity to it) and the remainder reported sometimes walking – this would account for students living up to a 30 minute walk away.

In places with harsher climates, proximity is even more important, as braving the cold, wind and snow to walk to campus can be daunting.
3. Access to public transport

There are currently 4 bus stops within a 3 minute walk (on Westerland and Elizabeth Avenue) to the proposed development and many others within a few minute walk (Metro bus map reference on the right). These transit stops, combined, provide access to twelve transit routes (several being high frequency routes) that provide transportation connections across the city. Individuals can also access campus shuttle services to downtown, groceries and other campuses.

4. What mobility services are provided to reduce car dependency?

- 112 bike parking spaces, including 22 covered spaces (refer to Appendix B) and indoor bike storage (refer to Appendix C). Interior unit layout design will include storage spaces that will provide tenants with the option to store their bikes within their units.

- A total of 54 parking stalls are proposed, including the following:
  - Approximately 51 vehicle parking stalls for tenants, located at-grade beneath Building 3 and adjacent to Building 1.
  - 6% of total parking is accessible parking.
  - 3 designated pick up/drop off stalls in front of Building 3.

- Pedestrian pathways are proposed throughout the development providing connections from various building entrances to:
  - on-site amenities (i.e. landscaped open spaces, seating areas, hammocks, bike parking etc.).
  - new sidewalks that will be included within the upgraded Lambe’s Lane right-of-way.
  - a pathway at the north of the site that connects to an existing pathway/stairs adjacent to the Aquarena that connects to the parking area to the north.

- Our goal is to make sure this project is feasible and can be realized. Until more information around the financials of development, site servicing, road upgrade costs are refined, Werkliv is unable to commit to any subsidies in perpetuity. However, we are very committed to increasing mobility and a strong collaboration with Metro Bus to encourage transit use for our future tenants with the following potential initiatives:
  - Marketing campaigns and advertisements focused towards our tenants (we can make these prevalent in the lobbies and through weekly property management newsletters).
  - Metro bus sales booth present at move in week or before new semester.

Based on the proximity of publicly available parking spaces within a seven-minute walk of the development, combined with the rationale provided above, there appears to be no need to create additional parking spaces for this development beyond what is proposed.

If the project were to be accepted, Werkliv will be exploring other collaborations with local markets, grocers and farms to organize potential partnerships for food delivery and other service plans. If we are not changing behavior through design, placemaking and management, it will be difficult to change our effects on the environment and community at large.
2.3. Site Servicing

The proposed apartment building development will be serviced with municipal water supply by connection to the existing 250 mm ductile iron watermain located in Elizabeth Avenue. The watermain in Elizabeth Avenue is part of the Bay Bulls Big Pond Water Supply operated by City of St. John’s Regional Water Supply.

The fire flow requirement for this development is in the order of 2600 USGPM in accordance with the Fire Underwriters Survey “Water Supply for Public Fire Protection”.

Sanitary sewer service will be provided by connection to the existing 200 mm concrete sanitary sewer in Elizabeth Avenue. A new 200 mm PVC sanitary sewer will be installed in Westerland Road and Lambe’s Lane to service the subject property. The peak dry weather sanitary sewer generation rate from the proposed development is 7.59 L/s. Prior to final development approval, an analysis will be provided of the existing and proposed sanitary sewer system to demonstrate the existing municipal sanitary sewer system can accommodate the 7.59 L/s peak dry weather flow.

Storm sewer service will be provided by connection to the existing 300 mm concrete storm sewer in Elizabeth Avenue. A new HDPE storm sewer will be installed in Westerland Road and Lambe’s Lane to service the subject property.

Stormwater detention for the development will be provided in accordance with the City of St. John’s Stormwater Detention Policy. The post development storm sewer flow from the property will be limited to the pre-development 100 year flow or the available capacity in the existing municipal storm sewer system downstream; whichever is smaller. Any required stormwater detention will be provided by an underground chamber system. The proposed Concept Site Servicing Plan is included in Appendix D.

2.4 Emergency Access

As part of the proposed upgrades to Lambe’s Lane, a new fire hydrant is proposed to be installed on the site as shown on Appendices A, B & D. The fire hydrant is within adequate proximity to each of the buildings to provide required level of service.

The development also includes 6m wide walkways between the proposed buildings with mountable curbs connecting these walkways to Lambe’s Lane. These walkways will be cleared and can be used for emergency service vehicle access in the case of an emergency on site.
2.5 Public Road Setback

The minimum setback between the proposed upgraded Lambe’s Lane right-of-way and the buildings is approximately 10.5 metres as shown in Appendix A. This exceeds the minimum building line setback requirements of the proposed A3 zone, which is 6 metres.

2.6 Waste and Recycling Collection

The proposed development plans include small waste and recycling storage units near the building entrances along the pedestrian laneways located between Buildings 1 & 2, and Buildings 2 & 3. These storage units will be screened. Tenants within the buildings will place their garbage and recycling in these various storage units. Additionally tenants will be incentivised to reduce waste and sort recyclables responsibly as part of some of the environmental initiatives implemented once the property is occupied.

Werkliv plans to include private waste collection as part of their property management plan to ensure tidy facilities and prevent accumulation. Every second day, operations staff will transport the waste and recyclables from the various storage units and the larger centralized waste and recycling storage area that is located 10.9 metres from the nearest building and is also screened. The centralized waste and recycling storage area is proposed next to the pick up/drop off stalls adjacent to Building 1, to allow for efficient garbage truck pick-up during private waste collection days. Garbage pick-up will be increased to daily during for two weeks during the move in/move out season. Please refer to Appendix B which shows the specific locations of proposed waste and recycling storage areas.

2.7 Snow Clearing and Storage

We are proposing a snow storage area directly adjacent to the surface parking stalls and adjacent to Lambe’s Lane to allow for sufficient snow clearing and storage.

Werkliv plans to have regular snow clearing as part of their super intendant mandate. The main entrances, exits, and 6-metre-wide walkways between buildings will be cleared of snow. Snow will be removed from the site as required and as dictated by accumulation or build-up. There is ample snow storage space along the northern property line, and between the proposed buildings and Lambe’s Lane.

Please refer to Appendix B which highlights the areas within the site allocated for snow storage.
3.0 Building Design
3.1 Building Use

The new buildings are proposed to be entirely occupied by residential apartment units and common spaces (hallways, stairs, lobbies, common interior amenity rooms, bike storage room). The proposed buildings will replace the two existing structures and small parking area that is currently located at the subject property.

- Proposed Building 1
  Gross Floor Area 5,607 m² (60,360 ft²)

- Proposed Building 2
  Gross Floor Area 5,607 m² (60,360 ft²)

- Proposed Building 3
  Gross Floor Area 6,586 m² (70,892 ft²)

Site Area: 8,461 m² (91,073 ft²)
Total Gross Floor Area: 17,800 m² (191,612 ft²)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 2.1

Gross Floor Area calculations above do not include apartment balcony spaces, roof top terraces or any outdoor spaces. Please refer to Appendix C which includes the proposed floor plans.

3.2 Building Height and Location

The proposed development includes three separate buildings. Buildings 1 and 2 are proposed to be 6 storeys plus additional height for pitched roofs and non-habitable attic spaces. Building 3 is proposed to be 7 storeys to accommodate for vehicular parking beneath. The maximum height of Buildings 1 & 2, including pitched roofs and non-habitable rooftop features is approx. 26.8m (88 ft.). The maximum height of Building 3, including pitched roofs and non-habitable rooftop features is approx. 29.9m (98 ft.). The top storey of each of the building has a reduced footprint and includes outdoor terraces that are commonly accessible to all building tenants. As per Item C of the LUAR Terms of Reference document, please find the requested graphical information as follows:

- Location of proposed buildings in relation to neighbouring buildings (see Appendix A)
- Proximity of buildings to property lines and public streets (see Appendix A)
- Identify any setbacks of higher storeys from lower storeys (see Appendix C)
- Identify Height of the buildings (see Appendix C)
- Information on proposed patios/balconies and rooftop terraces (see Appendix C)
- Identify any rooftop structures (see Appendix C)
3.3 Elevations and Building Materials

The proposed building elevations are shown in Appendix C. The development includes three separate buildings with varying footprints and rooflines. The buildings are rectangular in form to simplify construction, maintain consistency for internal unit layouts, and allow for the consideration of modular building to be explored.

The consistent plane of the building facades allows the changing of material textures/orientation to be noticeable details. Changing the textures creates variety as one walks down the pedestrian laneways. The landscape design combined with the varying materials and textures at a human scale aim to create an inviting, community-oriented space that will help eliminate any perceived feeling of institutional housing.

3.4 Exterior Equipment and Lighting

Exterior lighting associated with the building will be mounted on the buildings at ground level to provide light to the main entrances, secondary entrances, fire exits and pathways. Exterior lighting standards will meet the City of St. John’s regulations and will be designed to ensure the proper lighting levels and standards are met. The lighting will also be designed and situated to have minimal light pollution impact on neighboring properties. Refer to Appendix C for proposed locations.

The location and types of exterior HVAC equipment to be used to service the proposed building will be determined as the building plans are finalized. There will be a small number of roof top mechanical units on the building. The exact size and location will be determined during detailed design. It is expected that by locating the larger units near the centre of the building combined with the small parapet the visual impact will be minimized from abutting streets and properties. As the project moves into detailed design and as HVAC equipment sizes are finalized, the parapet sight lines will be studied to ensure the larger roof top mechanical equipment is screened. The building does not abut any residential properties that could be affected by noise from exterior HVAC equipment. All such equipment will also be designed and installed to have minimal impact on tenants of the building.

3.5 Fire Alarm and Sprinkler Systems

Life-saving fire protection systems, such as fire alarms, fire sprinklers, and fire extinguishers will be integrated throughout each building. Each of these systems is part of an overall, integrated approach to increase the life safety for occupants. For example, properly maintained fire alarm systems provide notification to the occupants and first responders quickly and efficiently. This allows the occupants to leave the building in the early stages of an emergency, and provides first responders the opportunity to arrive on scene and mitigate damage at an earlier stage. Similarly, properly installed and maintained fire sprinkler systems are designed to control the size of a fire until the fire department can arrive and put out the fire.
3.6 Phasing and Construction Timeline

The development is planned to be completed in two phases. Phase 1 will include demolition, upgrades to Lambe’s Lane & servicing, and site excavation.

Phase 2 will include the construction of Buildings 1, 2 & 3, including the 6-metre-wide pedestrian laneways between the Buildings.

Below are the anticipated timelines for Phase 1 construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and Site Work</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are the anticipated timelines for Phase 2 construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings 1, 2 &amp; 3 Construction</td>
<td>18-24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing, Commissioning &amp; Occupancy</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is anticipated that the overall construction timeframe for this project will be approximately 3 years (including demolition) with an approximate start date beginning in the second quarter of 2022 pending City approval of the development.

During construction, the successful contractor hired to build the building will be required to complete a project plan that identifies laydown areas for materials and equipment as the project progresses.

Some parking for construction workers can be accommodated on-site during construction. Off site parking for construction workers will also be required. During that time, Werkliv will work with the City and the construction company hired to construct the building to identify acceptable off-street parking options. If available, parking permits for construction workers could be obtained from the City to enable parking nearby.
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APPENDIX A: SITE PLAN

LEGEND
- Site Boundary
- Adjacent Property Boundary
- Building Access Point

SITE SUMMARY:
- PID: 17287
- Total Land Area: 8,461 m² / 2.1 Acres
- Existing Zone: (INST) Institutional

NOTES:
- Subject to survey. Property lines and topographic features are approximate only.
- Site subject to by-law review and regulations.

SOURCES:
- Topographic features are from file: 11871topo.DWG
- Plan based on file: Lambe's Lane Landscape Concept 03-18-21.dwg
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Appendix B: Landscape Plan

LEGEND
- Existing Tree to Remain
- Proposed Trees
- Deciduous Planting Area
- Evergreen Planting Area
- Perennial Planting Area
- Lawn
- Concrete
- Pavers
- Asphalt
- Bike Rack (90 Total Parking Spaces)
- Bench
- Picnic Table
- Custom Bench Made From Removed Trees
- Lounge Chair
- Hammock
- Waste and Recycling Storage Units

A 15m Diameter Cul-de-sac
B Accessible Parking and Car Share Parking (Belonging to Development)
C 6m Wide Pedestrian Laneway (Can Accommodate Emergency Vehicles)
D At-Grade Surface Parking Below Building 3
E Snow Storage Locations
F Screened Waste and Recycling Storage
G Covered Parking for 22 Bikes
H Connection to Existing Sidewalk north of the Aquarena
I Pick-up / Drop-off Parking Spaces (Belonging to Development)

Total Landscaped Area (Sod and Planted) = 2640sqm (~31%)
### UNIT TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>Unit area (sf)</th>
<th># Bed/unit</th>
<th># Bath/unit</th>
<th># of Unit Type Building 3</th>
<th># of Unit Type Building 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th># of Bed Building 3</th>
<th># of Bed Building 1 &amp; 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unit A</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit B</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit D</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit E</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit F (bf)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit G</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit H</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit I (bf)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit J</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit K</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit L</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Units | 75 | 65 | - | - |
| Total Beds  | -  | -  | 238 | 209 |

| Total GFA (sf) | 191,612 | Building 3 GFA (sf) | 70,892 | Building 1 & 2 GFA (sf) | 60,360 |
| Lot Area (sf)  | 91,073  | Total Beds          | 656    | Total Storeys            | 5/6/7  |
| Building Area (sf) | 34,632 | Total Units         | 205    |                             |        |
| Lot Coverage   | 38%     |                      |        |                             |        |
| Floor Area Ratio | 2.1     |                      |        |                             |        |
This drawing is not intended to be used for contract pricing or fabrication purposes. All content is subject to change.
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10. ALUMINUM FRAMED WIRED MESH GUARD - JULIETTE BALCONY
11. STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF - MATCHED TO CLADDING

PB

BUILDING A

SCALE: 1" = 20'

ENTRY TO EXIT

WB

NORTH ELEVATION

CLADDING ORIENTATION CHANGE

PARAPET VARIES

WALL MOUNTED LIGHTING FIXTURE

PERFORATED CLADDING

LVL 1

LVL 2

LVL 3

LVL 4

LVL 5

LVL 6

LVL 7

20'-0" MAX. BLDG HEIGHT

29.9m (98'-0") MAX. BLDG HEIGHT

40' 0'

LEVELS

LAMBE'S LANE

NOTE:

THIS DRAWING SHOULD BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH LANDSCAPE DESIGN DRAWINGS.

WERKLIV Student Housing - LUAR Submission
Lambe's Lane, St. John's, NL

ISSUED FOR LUAR
DATE: December 7, 2021

DRAWN BY: JMB
PROJECT NO.: 19-036
Appendix D: Site Servicing Plan
Appendix E: Lambe's Lane Cross Section
Appendix F: Conceptual Renderings

WERKLIV Student Housing - LUAR Submission
Lambe's Lane, St. John's, NL

AERIAL RENDERING

SCALE: 1" = 20'
ALL THAT piece or parcel of land, situate and being on the northwestern side of Lambe’s Lane, in the City of St. John’s, in the Province of Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada, and being bounded and abutted as follows: THAT IS TO SAY, beginning at a point on the northwestern side of Lambe’s Lane, said point having coordinates N 5° 269.916.394 metres and E 324,649.187 metres of the Three Degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projection NAD - 83 for the Province of Newfoundland & Labrador, THENCE by property of Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Newfoundland N 79°08'00" W for a distance of 40.953 metres, THENCE N 49°05'00" W for a distance of 71.480 metres, THENCE by property now or formerly 1977 Canada Summer Games Association N 42°04'00" E for a distance of 64.710 metres, THENCE N 40°55'00" E for a distance of 8.290 metres, THENCE N 48°00'00" E for a distance of 12.500 metres, THENCE S 58°43'00" E for a distance of 46.020 metres, THENCE S 55°37'00" E for a distance of 12.200 metres, THENCE S 53°13'00" E for a distance of 39.620 metres, THENCE along the northwestern side of Lambe’s Lane S 35°39’00” W for a distance of 77.155 metres, more or less, to the point of beginning and containing an area of 9194 square metres, more or less. Which land is more particularly shown on the plan hereto attached. All bearings being referred to the above mentioned projection. All linear measurements are horizontal ground distances.

This description and accompanying plan, Job # 11871 of Brown & Way Surveys, form an integral part of the returns and are not separable.

There is an accompanying Surveyor’s Real Property Report.

Brown & Way Surveys
SURVEYORS REAL PROPERTY REPORT

Prepared By: Brown & Way Surveys
Robert A. Way, N.L.S.

Certified To: Zzap Consulting Inc.

Parcel Location: Civic No. 6 Lambe’s Lane
St. John’s, NL

Reference Survey: Brown & Way Surveys
Current

Structures and other improvements:
The dwelling shown on the attached plan is situated wholly within the boundaries of Civic No. 6 Lambe’s Lane, in the City of St. John’s, NL.

Apparent encroachments and/or comments:
There are two utility poles on the property, four overhead wires crossing the property and two guy wire extending onto the property, each as shown on the attached plan.
There is a propane tank and three lamps on the property, each as shown on the attached plan.
Fences are erected as shown on the attached plan.

Qualifications:

This report and its accompanying Plan No. 11871 form an integral part of the whole and are not separable.

This report has been prepared for the sole use and benefit of the party to whom the same is certified.

This document is not valid unless it bears the original signature and stamp of the Newfoundland Land Surveyor identified hereafter.

Surveyor’s certification:
The location of the structures and improvements are as shown on the accompanying plan.
As a registered Newfoundland Land Surveyor, I hereby certify that this Surveyors Real Property Report was conducted under my supervision and is in accordance with the Land Surveyors Act, 1991, SNL 1991, c.37 and the bylaws made thereunder.

SIGNED AND SEALED AT
ST. JOHN’S, NEWFOUNDLAND
This 12th day of July 2019

Copyright: Robert A. Way, Newfoundland Land Surveyor, 2019. Unauthorized use, alteration or reproduction of this Surveyor’s Real Property Report 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 Report is certified is permitted, provided that no alterations whatsoever are made thereto.
This document was prepared for the person(s) named above. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance or decisions to be made based on it, are the sole responsibility of such third parties. Brown & Way Surveys and or Peter M. Brown/Robert Way accepts no responsibility whatever for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions or actions made based on this document.
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The proponent shall identify significant impacts and, where appropriate, also identify measures to mitigate impacts on land uses adjoining the subject property. All information is to be submitted under one report in a form that can be reproduced for public information and review. The numbering and ordering scheme used in the report shall correspond with that used in this Terms of Reference and a copy of the Terms of Reference shall be included as part of the report (include an electronic PDF version with a maximum file size of 15MB). A list of those persons/agencies who prepared the Land Use Assessment Report shall be provided as part of the report. The following items shall be addressed by the proponent at its expense:

**A. Building Use**
- Identify the size of the proposed building by:
  - Gross Floor Area, and
  - Floor Area Ratio (FAR).
- Identify all proposed uses/occupancies within the building by their respective floor area.

**B. Elevation & Building Materials**
- Provide elevations of the proposed building.
- Identify the finish and colour of exterior building materials.

**C. Building Height & Location**
- Identify graphically the exact location with a dimensioned civil site plan:
  - Location of the proposed building in relation to neighbouring buildings;
  - Proposed upgrades to Lambe’s Lane;
  - Proximity of the building to property lines and identify setbacks;
  - Identify width of the access between the buildings;
  - Identify any stepbacks of higher storeys from lower storeys (if applicable);
  - Identify any encroachment over property lines (if applicable);
  - Identify the height of the buildings;
  - Information on the proposed construction of patios/balconies (if applicable);
  - Potential shadowing/loss of sunlight on adjacent public and private properties, including sidewalks;
  - Identify any rooftop structures; and
- Provide a Legal Survey of the property.

**D. Exterior Equipment and Lighting**
- Identify the location and type of exterior lighting to be utilized. Identify possible impacts on adjoining properties and measures to be instituted to minimize these impacts.
- Identify the location and type of any exterior HVAC equipment to be used to service the proposed building and identify possible impacts on adjoining properties and measures to be instituted to minimize these impacts.
E. Landscaping & Buffering
- Identify with a landscaping plan, details of site landscaping (hard and soft).
  - Consideration should be given to tree preservation and incorporating existing trees into future site development. Indicate through a tree plan/inventory which trees will be preserved.
- Identify the location and proposed methods of screening of any electrical transformers and refuse containers to be used at the site.
- Identify any additional street-level elements, such as weather protection measures at entrances, street furniture, etc.

F. Snow Clearing/Snow Storage
- Provide information on any snow clearing/snow removal operations. Onsite snow storage areas must be indicated.

G. Off-street Parking and Site Access
- Identify the number and location of bicycle parking to be provided.
- Identify the number and location of accessible parking to be provided.
- Identify if there will be onsite carshare, taxi, pick-up/drop-off, or other vehicle space.
- Identify how vehicle circulation will be managed during move-in move-out periods.
- Indicate if there will be transit pass arrangements.
- Identify the location of all access and egress points, including pedestrian access.
- Provide a minimum 6.0m buffer between the property boundary and any onsite curb/structure.
- Provide pedestrian connection to the north side of the Aquarena.
- Indicate if access can be provided to the Aquarena parking lot such that emergency access can be improved.
- Indicate how garbage will be handled onsite. The location of any exterior bins must be indicated and access to the bins must be provided.

H. Municipal Services
- Provide a preliminary site servicing plan.
- Identify if the building will be sprinklered or not, and location of the nearest hydrant and siamese connections.
- Identify points of connection to existing sanitary sewer, storm sewer and water system.
- Provide the proposed sanitary and storm sewer generation rates.
- The proposed development will be required to comply with the City’s stormwater detention policy. Provide stormwater rate generated by the proposed development for the maximum 10-year climate change rainfall and information on how onsite stormwater detention will be managed.

I. Public Transit
- Consult with St. John’s Metrobus (St. John’s Transportation Commission) regarding public transit infrastructure requirements.
J. Construction Timeframe

- Indicate any phasing of the project and approximate timelines for beginning and completion of each phase or overall project.
- Indicate on a site plan any designated areas for equipment and materials during the construction period.
Virtual Public Meeting using Zoom  
Public Meeting – 6 Lambe’s Lane  
Tuesday, August 10, 2021  

Present:  
**Facilitator**  
Cliff Johnston  

**City of St. John’s**  
Ken O’Brien, Chief Municipal Planner  
Ann Marie Cashin, Planner III, Urban Design & Heritage  
Jennifer Squires, Legislative Assistant  
Councillor Ian Froude  

**Proponents**  
Maggie Terrone, VP Atlantic Canada, Werkliv  

There were approximately 25 people in attendance.  

**CALL TO ORDER AND BACKGROUND PRESENTATIONS**  

Cliff Johnston, Chairperson and Facilitator, called the meeting to order at 7 pm. The Chair provided an overview of the proposed rezoning application for 6 Lambe’s Lane. Werkliv have submitted an application to develop three Apartment Buildings with a total of 205 units. The City is considering rezoning 6 Lambe’s Lane from the Institutional (INST) Zone to the Apartment High Density (A3) Zone to accommodate the development. A Municipal Plan amendment would be required. The Chair then informed attendees of the format of the meeting, City Staff would first outline the main points of the application, the proponent would then give a presentation, followed by questions from attendees, and comments or submissions. Each attendee would be given an opportunity to speak once, and then second speaker questions would be permitted. Attendees were asked to use the raise hand feature to indicate that they would like to speak. Ann Marie Cashin, Planner III, Urban Design & Heritage for the City provided a quick tutorial on Zoom, highlighting the raise hand and chat features.  

**PURPOSE OF MEETING**  

Ann Marie Cashin, Planner III, Urban Design & Heritage for the City, spoke on the policy changes that would be required to accommodate the proposed development. Rezoning the Institutional Zone to the Apartment High Density zone, as well as a Municipal Plan amendment would be necessary to permit development. After the minutes from the meeting are complete, and submissions are complied for consideration, the rezoning application would be brought to council for approval or rejection. If approved, the application would then be sent to Municipal Affairs with the Provincial Government for
review. Once released, it would be brought back again to Council for adoption. At this point there would be a Commissioner’s Public Hearing, which would provide an additional opportunity for public consultation. The results of the Public Hearing would be presented to Council for consideration before making a final decision on the proposal.

**Background and Current Status**

The City Planner informed attendees that the land in question was surrounded by the Institutional Zone, as well as the Pippy Park Zone, with some residential and commercial properties in the area. A Land Use Assessment Report has been prepared to provide additional information on the property. The City Planner noted that the applicant is proposing to have very few parking spaces to accommodate residents and visitors. There will be 4 parking spaces provided for accessible parking, drop offs and pickups, and the apartments would be marketed towards residents and students who do not own a vehicle. Council would have to provide parking relief for 254 parking spaces to permit the development to be built. The City Planner also stated that a variance would be required to allow for a 5.9 m setback, as a 6 m side yard is typically required. City Staff have reviewed the application and there were no concerns at this time, but this may change as things move towards development approval. The road and sidewalk will require upgrading and there has been a request made for a connection from the site and the Aquarena pedestrian connection.

**PRESENTATION BY THE DEVELOPER**

Maggie Terrone, Werkliv’s Vice President for Atlantic Canada, was present to provide background information on the company, the proposed development on Lambe’s Lane, as well as similar projects in Montreal, Halifax, and PEI. All of Werkliv’s completed developments have zero, or reduced parking, putting a focus on pedestrian mobility, biking, and public transport. The proposed development would contain 205 fully furnished apartments, with 22 fully accessible units. It would have 102 spaces for bicycle parking, and Werkliv would like to collaborate with Metrobus on public transportation for the building. The development would also include improvements to sidewalks, focus on tree preservation, and include space for community gardens and social spaces to improve the mental health and wellness of students living in the apartments. Werkliv asked students what their main concerns were when renting apartments and the response was price, location, and convenience. Werkliv aim to keep rent and the cost of living as low as possible for residents, the buildings would be located within walking distance to campus and would be fully furnished. The proximity to the university would increase student safety, and help students save money. Of the 19,270 students enrolled at Memoriam University, 6,000 are either international or come from out of province, indicating that there would be a market for the apartments. Ms. Terrone then addressed parking for the
development, stating that the existing parking requirements were put in place to address residential parking needs, but in reality, students do not have the same needs. The proof of this is the success of existing Werkliv projects and developments across Europe with no parking, or reduced parking. Ms. Terrone discussed the environmental benefits of the project and believes a shift in perspective is required. They also noted that the development may improve parking in the area by reducing demand.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments for Staff or the proponent.

**COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker #</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Speaker asked if the new sidewalk would impede access to the church parking lot. Staff responded that parking lot access would not be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Attendee questioned if there would be enough space for two-way traffic on Lambe’s Lane. Lambe’s Lane has been reviewed by Transportation Engineering Staff and they are satisfied with what has been proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Speaker inquired if students will be asked if they have a car when they apply for housing. Ms. Terrone replied that they would not make it a prerequisite, but it will made clear that parking is not available, and the apartments would be promoted as being “no-car.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Participant asked if not owning a vehicle was a condition of the lease, and if the general public would be able to rent an apartment or would it be students only. The proponent repeated that it would not be a prerequisite, but residents would be encouraged to not have a car. The rentals would be made available to the public but in the past all applicants to existing developments have been students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Registrant stated that proponent has underestimated the demand for parking required for pickups, drop offs and delivery. The proponent explained that although at the moment the road would not be able to handle the increase in traffic, Lambe’s Lane would be upgraded to 2 lanes plus sidewalks, with the additional area for drop offs only. The two lanes would be wide enough for garbage trucks to enter the area. The speaker then inquired as to the total number of residents that would be living in the buildings, and Ms. Terrone replied that there would be approximately 650 residents accommodated by the development. The speaker then asked how these residents would get...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groceries, if they would be delivered or if they would be expected to walk to grocery stores, and the proponent replied that they would investigate resources in the area, working with farmer’s markets and grocery stores to determine the best methods for residents to get their groceries.

6. Participant works for MUN and wished to discuss the items outlined in a letter sent to Werkliv for response. They previously lived in an area where a similar proposal was developed with no parking, and they feel that the proponent is naïve to believe that a no parking residence will work. There are residences on the MUN campus and residents still have cars, which they use for running errands, shopping, and going on trips. Students are not interested in public transit and the busses are empty. They feel as though the parking variance is too great and will be problematic and troublesome for the whole area, with students parking illegally and on adjacent streets, which will increase requirements for parking enforcement as a result. They also spoke on Memorial’s business model which may be impacted by the increased competition for rental units, potentially resulting in a loss of revenue, and having a negative impact on the Memorial brand and reputation. Memorial have a support system and security in place for the benefit of those living in the residences and worry that those inhabiting the Werkliv apartments, and their families may believe they have the same amenities available.

7. A representative from Memorial University addressed the submission sent to Werkliv outlining their concerns. The university have three major concerns, the first being parking. They feel that the plan to change behaviour by not having parking available and discouraging the use of cars is unrealistic. They are also concerned with the impact the development may have on the university’s business model, and that the development will have a negative impact on the university’s brand and reputation.

8. Attendee lives in the area and noted that currently parking is congested at best and feels that the proposed no-parking model will not work. They are surprised that Staff and Council currently have no concerns with the development as proposed. The Chief Municipal Planner clarified that the parking variance was central to the application and had been discussed in great detail. Council will look at the feedback received and then decide if they would like to approve the amendment and let the project go forward. The proponent feels as though there is enough of a market to support the development.
9. Speaker is concerned with the traffic that would be generated by the development and the lack of parking.

10. The registrant owns a rental property in the area and has concerns about the housing supply. They noted that the population is not growing and is worried that the development will result in existing rental properties being empty.

11. Speaker lives in the area and stated that there is a major problem with parking. They also felt that the increase in tuition would result in a drop in university enrollment and that the market may not be there once the units become available.

12. Participant noted that there was a shortage of parking for St. Augustin’s Church. The lot is not patrolled and there is an issue with people parking there illegally. They are concerned the development will further exacerbate the issue.

Herein ended the discussion portion of the meeting.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ms. Terrone thanked attendees for their comments and submissions and spoke to the importance of continuing to discuss the development with Memorial University. They will take the feedback received into consideration and continue to work with the City as the application process continues.

The Chair explained the next steps for the application and reminded participants who wished to have their comments considered by Council to do so by making written submissions which would be appended to this report.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Cliff Johnston
Chairperson/Facilitator
August 6, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept the revised submission from Memorial University based on documents made available in recent weeks in advance of public consultations. The information below is being submitted on behalf of Memorial University in response to the *6 Lambe’s Lane development by Werkliv, for three Apartment Buildings with a total of 205 units.*

Memorial has identified several areas of concern regarding potential impacts of the proposal on the university which are not currently addressed in documents available from the City of St. Johns. Namely:

a) **Traffic in the area:** Westerland Road is a busy roadway with an existing high volume of pedestrian traffic. In the past several years, upgrades to the roadway for pedestrian safety have been undertaken. However, further roadway upgrades to Westerland Road may be required to accommodate increased traffic and increased pedestrian safety.

b) **Access to Alumni House:** The document outlines roadway changes that may cause confusion or reduced/constricted flow of traffic to the Alumni House (also located on Lambe’s Lane). This includes the road turning into a circle in front of the development, then continuing on to the Alumni House.

Memorial would like confirmation if access to the Alumni House building will be altered or impacted during the construction process or indefinitely post-construction.

c) **Parking:** The June 2020 City Decision/Direction Note indicates “This application is unique in that the applicant is requesting parking relief for all parking requirements.” In addition, it is indicated “…significant amount of publicly available parking spaces within a seven-minute walk of the proposed development. Some offer monthly rental rates to the public. MUN also has on-campus parking spots that are not pictured that serve faculty staff and students on a first come first serve basis.”

These points raise concerns for Memorial, as it is believed that the demand for parking is drastically underestimated. Memorial’s student housing provides some parking for students, yet the demand from this group consistently exceeds supply. Memorial is concerned that parking demand from residents, visitors, service persons, etc., of the new development will face the same issue. This will result in individuals illegally parking in the nearby Memorial facilities. These facilities are already under considerable strain, and illegal
parking would impact nearby employees, paying customers of the Aquarena, students, and others frequenting the university. This will also increase demand for parking enforcement by Memorial and/or investment in alternate measures such as parking gates to ensure parking is available for students/staff/faculty, clients/customers, donors, alumni, volunteers, and similar.

Memorial has been actively working with the City of St. John’s and other levels of Government to develop approaches designed to reduce the volume of traffic and parking congestion in the area of the university for several years. Some options that have been reviewed include park and ride arrangements, increased participation in public transit by way of a universal student pass program, improved bus terminal facilities on campus, etc. A project considering high density residential applications is anticipated to further compound existing parking and traffic concerns.

In consideration that the required new zoning is for residential purposes, it is anticipated that illegal parking will extend to overnight. This will impact parking lot servicing, snow clearing, etc., that is done outside normal business hours.

d) **Emergency access:** Memorial has concerns with additional access and flow relating to the query in the proposal to “Indicate if access can be provided to the Aquarena parking lot such that emergency access can be improved.” The Werkliv project also contains minimal information on emergency access, and Memorial requests more information on this item.

e) **Snow clearing:** Consideration is required on the planned snow clearing operations of the property to ensure no snow dumping or access issues on Memorial’s property or impacts to the Aquarena. Additionally, if access is expected to the property from the Aquarena, this will impact snow clearing operations for the university and illegal parking will impact the university’s ability to keep its lots cleared. More information is required.

f) **Lambe’s Lane road condition:** Lambe’s Lane roadway is narrow and currently in a state of disrepair with no sidewalks. Upgrades and expansion of the area would be required to accommodate the increased two-way vehicular traffic flow, pedestrians, and bike traffic.

The university has received complaints regarding the condition of the road along with safety concerns for pedestrians and vehicles alike due to the narrow roadway and limited sightlines. This roadway serves as a regular pedestrian route for students, staff and faculty of Memorial, and students of Prince of Wales Collegiate. The current documents do not demonstrate how, or if, a high density residential project will mitigate the risks to the high pedestrian traffic resulting from the increase in vehicular traffic frequenting the site (taxis, deliveries, support services such as trades for building repairs/snow clearing/grounds maintenance/garbage collection, residents, visitors, etc.).

Given the tight proximity of neighboring facilities (St. Augustine’s Church, Aquarena, Alumni House), options to improve sightlines/traffic flow are very limited.

g) **Expropriation:** Memorial requires confirmation if any of its land is required and will be expropriated to complete the required facilities upgrades.

h) **Bus stop:** Additional public transportation upgrades may be needed to accommodate the increased use for Metrobus services in the area (i.e., shelter).
i) **Proposed development ingress/egress:** Additional consideration needs to be given to the ingress/egress of the building and the impact on Memorial’s nearby facilities.

j) **Impact on business model:** Aside from the numerous operational and logistical considerations outlined herein, Memorial also has concerns about the impact on Memorial-owned residences. In particular, the potential impact to Memorial’s own housing facilities, including lost revenue and competition by a for-profit private business. As you are aware, Memorial’s residences were built and operated with tax payer support and as a not-for-profit, we strive to offer reasonably priced, high-quality accommodations to students at cost recovery for annual operations. A development of 205 units (and currently unknown total inhabitants) may impact Memorial’s ability to maintain its current business model.

k) **Impact on brand and reputation:** Beyond simply providing a place to live, Memorial provides a high level of proactive safety, emergency and wellness services, and support from trained residence and student life teams, and Campus Enforcement and Patrol staff available 24 hours a day, 7 days a day week. Students, their families, and the public may not distinguish between Memorial-run residences and this development, and may have an expectation that similar services are provided to all students regardless of who the landlord may be. The fact remains that Werkliv’s tenants will largely be Memorial students not governed by the same rules or provided with the same student supports as on-campus residents. This may negatively impact Memorial’s brand and reputation, which should not be underestimated.

l) **Potential noise concerns for neighboring Alumni House.** High density residential is bound to bring noise. Everyday living for residents will result in noise that may potentially interrupt business operations within the neighboring Alumni House.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these potential issues.

Sincerely,

Kent Decker
August 10, 2021

Dear Mr. Kent Decker,

This letter is in response to the written concerns around the 6 Lambe’s lane development proposal (dated August 6, 2021), of which we acknowledge receipt.

Thank you for bringing concerns to our attention. We take every one of these very seriously. Over the past year and a half, we have been working with the city in preparation of this Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR). Many of the concerns outlined below have been explored in depth in that document, which is available for public viewing through the city of St. John’s website, however I have responded specifically to some of your concerns below. I hope we can continue this discussion in person this fall.

Our intention is to make this project a benefit to students, but also to the surrounding area. Please take a minute to review these responses and feel free to send any additional concerns our way. We are open and eager to have collaborative and constructive conversations.

a) Traffic in the area: We believe that adding sidewalks to the current dirt road will help navigate pedestrian traffic the right direction. The reduction of car parking should keep the vehicular traffic the same or similar and 2 lanes will help with circulation of existing cars. There will be a loading zone off the road for deliveries and 4 parking spots on the left for accessible vehicles and other pick ups.

b) Access to Alumni House: There will be major improvements to the existing road. It will be paved and able to accommodate two-way traffic. The connection to the Alumni House will not be affected. The Alumni House will benefit from the road upgrades in several ways including having pedestrian-designated sidewalks instead of what is currently a 1-way gravel road used to enter the Alumni House parking lot. As for during the construction period, we will be developing a construction management plan to address any circulation issues and ensure access to the Alumni House is clear. Note that this step will come if/when the project is accepted. We are happy to discuss this in greater detail, if necessary.

c) Parking:

We acknowledge your valid concerns and realize that MUNL has had to mitigate parking issues over the past few years. We have reviewed this situation in great detail and believe that an underlying issue with parking is a result of a lack of housing options in close proximity to campus. This has increased the need
for students to own and use their car to commute to university and resulted in a higher demand for parking spots.

We believe the Aquarena likely faces similar issues, as a result of out of area students driving in to attend class and not having a designated parking spot or permit to park.

While this project will not increase enrollment numbers, it will eliminate the need for many students to drive long distances to attend class.

Adding parking will only address the surface issue and not the real problem, which we believe can be resolved by increasing adequate housing close to campus.

d) Emergency access: The proposed development has considered all emergency vehicles and circulation in great depth over the last year and a half. The LUAR submission was delayed to specifically address these items in the design, in consultation with the Engineering and Traffic Departments at the city. We will be happy to give you more information once we are past this preliminary stage.

Currently, Lambe’s Lane is a one-way dirt road and the Alumni House uses this to access its parking spots. We believe this is an unsafe practice for pedestrians and drivers. Our proposal upgrades Lambe’s Lane to a 2-way road with pedestrian sidewalks on both sides. The building is fully sprinklered and a new fire hydrant will be installed in the area, ensuring top safety features. Additionally, the turning circle was included so emergency vehicles have clear and direct access. Any additional changes can be reviewed when civil drawings begin. Planning and Fire Code Engineers with the City of St. John’s have thoroughly reviewed this project and have recommended changes that are reflected in the current design. At this juncture, we are looking for public approval for the development and we will continue to make efficiencies and improvements as this project moves forward.

e) Snow clearing: We have discussed this in great detail with the city and the need to plan accordingly is well understood. Lambe’s lane and the turning circle will become public property and the snow clearing will be municipality’s responsibility. However, our property management plan will include an additional back-up snow clearing plan for the property. We are open to discussing these details further and taking additional suggestions.

f) Lambe’s Lane road condition: These issues will be greatly improved by the upgrades included in our proposal.

g) Expropriation: We are currently in discussion with facilities. The land in question has services that are currently tied into MUNL’s system. We have a proposal to add additional capacity alongside the sewer services (without tying into MUNL’s capacity). For this we may require access to the serving area for a short time to upgrade the services in general. These discussions can be had in more depth with our engineers and your facilities.

h) Bus stop: we had not considered this, seeing as most of the students in our potential building will be at walking distance to campus. However, we are open to discussing having a bus shelter.

i) Proposed development ingress/egress: Egress guidance must be followed according to Building Code and will be part of the planning and permitting stage. A larger discussion with MUNL can be had to share details.
j) Impact on business model: We understand and validate these concerns.

It is not in our business model to house first year students. In fact, we have not had any first-year students lease our units in the last 5 years. We plan to redirect any inquiries from first-year students to the MUNL residences office (unless MUNL would require assistance in housing individuals in which we would be happy to help).

Our model is to develop near universities where the supply of university residences does not meet the number of students enrolled. For example, we have projects in proximity to the Dalhousie University campus. Dalhousie is a university with similar enrollment about 20,000 enrolled over their campuses, and with about 2311 University residence beds. The number of apartments available close to campus, even including those that have been built in the last couple of years do not keep up with the need for student accommodation. Hence our development project on Seymour Street – also built very close to campus and will serve close to 500 students looking for safe, affordable, and convenient apartments.

l) Potential noise concerns for neighboring Alumni House. We take noise issues very seriously and although we cannot manage all noise, we do manage our buildings in a way that encourages love and respect for the community. Live-in super-intendants and additional management will be integrated into the day-to-day property management.

Note that generally, our buildings are quiet during the day, while students are studying (or sleeping).

We look to continue to improve the living experience for all. Our most important goal is to ensure students have the right environment to excel in academics and enjoy their university experience. Thank you kindly for providing a written list of your concerns, we are open to discussing all and any issue further in person at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Maggie Terrone  
Vice President, Atlantic Canada  
902-442-8408 x 201 | maggie@werkliv.com  
www.werkliv.com

Building Quality.  
Of Life.™
August 13, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: WERKLIV DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL - 6 LAMBE'S LANE

Further to the August 10, 2021, public meeting held regarding the development of 6 Lambe's Lane and the revised submission the university made to Council via letter dated August 6, 2021, please be advised that the university did receive Werkliv's response dated August 10, 2021, which Werkliv indicated they would be providing to the City.

The university would like to go on record as stating that, although it appreciated Werkliv's response, it feels the response did not directly answer many of the concerns raised by the university and the university does not adopt or accept Werkliv's response as a fulsome or acceptable response to the university's concerns.

The university reiterates that all of the concerns raised in the August 6, 2021, letter are valid and unanswered concerns.

It was very apparent from the August 10, 2021, public meeting that not only the university has concerns but St. Augustine's Anglican Church and many local residents share these concerns. Various voices at the meeting reiterated the concern with the City allowing the requested parking variance. Parking is already a major concern in that area among residents and on behalf of the church and there was nothing stated by Werkliv neither in its response to the university nor in its answers to questions raised at the meeting that would serve to alleviate those concerns.

Werkliv's response was that there are simply not enough housing options close to campus. As discussed at the meeting, this is not the case. There are university owned and operated apartments and residences on campus and many rental options for students all in very close proximity and within walking distance to campus. To think that an apartment complex with 205 units housing 650 (or potentially more) students would eliminate vehicle use because of its proximity to campus is simply not feasible. It does not take into account other uses students have for their vehicles such as visiting family and friends, carrying out errands, shopping, going on outings, etc., in other parts of the City as well as outside of the City. It does not account for the considerable parking requirements for visitors to the building. Werkliv's response to these issues was to compare St. John's to European cities where people bicycle and walk everywhere. That is not happening in St. John's. Allowing the requested parking variance will lead to a larger congestion and parking problem than already exists in that area.
Werkliv has repeatedly indicated that they have consulted with the university on issues of concern yet, to date, there has been only one communication of which we are aware and that served as an introductory discussion rather than a meaningful discussion of their proposed project and its impact on the university.

The university would like to take this opportunity to reiterate all of its concerns and to advise that it does not adopt Werkliv’s response as any real answer to the concerns of the university.

Sincerely,

Kent Decker
Parking is a problem in MUN area. How can approval be given for relief of 254 parking spaces.? Additionally Lambe’s Lane is a lane at best. Difficult to drive to and from church in winter.
I cannot support this proposal.
Hi, I am writing to voice my support for what appears to be a beautiful, thoughtfully designed project that could do much to improve how the city of St. John’s thinks about apartment housing.

I support their request to have full parking relief at this site.

And as long as the built heritage experts panel has no objections, and a plan is made to salvage the existing building (which is woefully, shamefully slipped under the rug in this otherwise excellent plan) for materials, this project would have my enthusiastic support.

Kind regards
Jennifer Squires

From: Karen Chafe on behalf of City Clerk
Sent: Monday, August 9, 2021 10:02 AM
To: Jennifer Squires; Andrea Roberts; Ashley Murray; Ann-Marie Cashin; Dave Wadden; Jason Sinyard; Ken O'Brien; Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett; Planning
Subject: FW: (EXT) Lambe's Lane Development Public Meeting

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 9, 2021 10:00 AM
To: Ian Froude <ifroude@stjohns.ca>
Cc: City Clerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>; Mayor <mayor@stjohns.ca>
Subject: Re: (EXT) Lambe’s Lane Development Public Meeting

Thank you for responding. I am amazed that the City will even entertain such a deviation from its regulations, especially so close to the end of its term. The residents of our area have major concerns for current and future implications.

This is not a Memorial University sponsored, nor supervised project. It is a private, for profit proposal which will not follow City by-laws and regulations. To exempt a company from providing mandatory 254 (two hundred fifty four) parking spaces is not a minor adjustment. It is unrealistic and lacks any semblance of good judgement. The timing of the request is also questionable, and could be issue of contention in the upcoming election.

As our Ward representative, I ask that you ensure that any construction in this area follow current guidelines.

[Redacted]

On Jul 26, 2021, at 10:19 AM, Ian Froude <ifroude@stjohns.ca> wrote:

Thank you for the feedback,

I notice you have copied the City Clerk, so they will ensure the link is active and rules are being followed.

Ian Froude
Councillor - Ward 4 | Conseiller municipal – District 4
City of St. John’s, NL | Ville de Saint-Jean, TN
(709) 576 - 8217

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 24, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Ian Froude <ifroude@stjohns.ca>; City Clerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>
Cc: Mayor <mayor@stjohns.ca>; Sheila O'Leary <soleary@stjohns.ca>; Deanne Stapleton <dstapleton@stjohns.ca>; Debbie Hanlon <dhanlon@stjohns.ca>; Jamie Korab <jkorab@stjohns.ca>; Maggie Burton <mburton@stjohns.ca>; Wally Collins <wcollins@stjohns.ca>; Sandy Hickman <shickman@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Lambe’s Lane Development Public Meeting

Your link posted in today’s paper referencing the Lambe’s Lane Development does not appear to be active.
Unfortunately the timing of this request and the invalid link will prevent people from registering a reaction for a development whereby exemptions from several City regulations are being requested.

Again, I wish to issue a strong objection to construction of any apartment complex in our area that does not meet current city code standards, especially with respect to parking.

I have lived on University Avenue for the past 34 years. There is currently no parking available for people to visit my home before five pm, and that is without University in session. I also have problems accessing my mailbox on [redacted] when University and schools are in session. All streets in this area experience the same problems.

* To exacerbate the current situation is totally unacceptable.

* To use the excuse that the apartments will be designated for students with no access to transportation flies in the face of logic when one sees empty residences and experiences students seeking to rent parking spaces in private driveways to provide access to parking.

I respectfully ask that the information published be corrected and my concerns taken into consideration.

<image001.jpg>

Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the individual(s) addressed in the message. If you are not the intended recipient, any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Any correspondence with employees, agents, or elected officials of the City of St. John’s may be subject to disclosure under the provisions of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, S.N.L. 2015, c.A-1.2.
Hi Ms. Squires,

Some questions for tonight’s Zoom meeting re Lambe’s Lane:

1. Will any of the units be rented to the public? What is prohibiting this from happening.

2. Is not owning a vehicle while leasing an apartment a condition of leasing?

3. Does the developer realize that the parking spaces in the area are now heavily used by clients of those facilities ie, the Aquarena, St. Augustine’s Church etc

4. How does the developer propose to change the culture of students to alternate forms of transportation.

Thank you,

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 9, 2021, at 9:41 AM, Jennifer Squires <no-reply@zoom.us> wrote:
Further to last night’s zoom meeting, my husband and I were registered to attend. Unfortunately we both had prior commitments and were a little late checking in. I did take some notes, but must have missed some points and dialogue on how this proposal got as far as it did despite violating basic City codes.

1). Would it be possible to obtain a copy of the minutes of that session?

2). Was any investigation undertaken on the company making the proposal, ie background, experience, membership of its board of directors, or any Newfoundland connections? It seems unusual that such a basic requirement as **205...TWO HUNDRED FIVE** parking spaces could be bypassed as well as bypassing codes for space variances.....the latter being far more important considering the confined road space both to the property and on the property itself.

3). I was concerned over the comment that the complex could not be mandated for university students only, but basically no one else would want to live there?? Will the City be assuming liability over what such a complex could create?

4). Finally, has there ever been a proposal of a similar nature reviewed by Council, and if so, what was the result?

Anything you could provide would be greatly appreciated.

Sent by me

On Jul 26, 2021, at 10:02 AM, Jennifer Squires <jsquires@stjohns.ca> wrote:

Good Morning

There was an error in the link when it was originally posted, it may have carried over to the version in the paper. Staff are in the process of sending out a revision for future publications. The online link is correct and if you would like to register you can do so at the following:

Register in advance for this meeting:  
[https://stjohns-ca.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZ0qf-gqDwvGtEZAgX4wNhEUb8cAJhyGUS0](https://stjohns-ca.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZ0qf-gqDwvGtEZAgX4wNhEUb8cAJhyGUS0)

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting. If you require any additional assistance please let me know.

Thank you,

Jennifer Squires
To Whom it May Concern:

My husband and I have lived at Lambe’s Lane for over 30 years. According to your memo, this puts us within the proximity of the application site for the construction of three apartment buildings and a 254 vehicle parking space at 6 Lambe’s Lane specified for public consultation.

We are totally opposed to this project. This area, along with the adjacent fields beside the Aquarena and Prince of Wales Collegiate, comprise the only space in this immediate part of the city that offers a home and feeding area to birds and other wildlife, as well as to trees, grasses, and wildflowers. It is a quiet, tree-lined area - a green space - used by dog walkers, students, schoolchildren, and nature-lovers, as well as parishioners at the Anglican church beside it. The construction and subsequent buildings and parking lot proposed would totally destroy all of this, and add one more to the stripped and destroyed green spaces of our City - at a time when the City seems simultaneously to be trying to augment green spaces.

Please do not allow this re-zoning and project to go ahead.

Sincerely,

Karen Chafe
As MHA for our area, I thought you should be aware of the following. I have been advised by the City Planning Office that it will be a topic for Monday night’s City Council meeting. I have also been advised that this is the first time such a request has ever been entertained.

I ask that you consider whether a proposed development, on inadequate space, for three buildings consisting of 205 apartments for 600 people, with an exemption request for ANY PARKING SAVE FOR THREE HANDICAPPED SPACES .... in an area where there is no off street parking, and despite objections from MUN, St. Augustine’s Church and the residents of the University Avenue and Elizabeth Avenue areas .... is appropriate. These complaints were voiced via a Zoom call, during August, with the referral to Government coming on the Labour Day weekend.

My apologies for the late notification, as I was only made aware of this today following my phone call requesting a status update.

Begin forwarded message:

I spoke with you a while back regarding the proposed Lambe’s Lane development. You referred me to someone in Municipal and Rural Affairs, and I left a message but no one called me back. For the record, could you please relay my comments below to the appropriate parties? Thanks.

There is a proposal to develop 6 Lambe’s Lane (next to the Aqua Arena and St. Augustine’s Church) into a private, for profit three building complex housing 205 apartments for 600 people. This is not associated with MUN. The contractor is not Newfoundland based.

The City is requesting two exemptions:

Jennifer Squires
- The first allows for an exemption from providing any parking spaces except for three handicapped spaces, which are required by law.
- The second requests a space variance exemption, as the area in question is not large enough to house the buildings themselves. The rationale is that the building will be designed for students who will not have cars.

I just wanted to reiterate the concerns of the people of the University Avenue area with respect this request, which I understand will be going to St. John’s City Council on Monday night and, if approved, then be forwarded to your Department for Government approval.

I attended a Zoom meeting sponsored by the City for reaction. Concerns relative safety, oversight, security, emergency access, deliveries, traffic flow behind Aqua Arena, confusion with MUN housing and damage to Memorial’s branding, and especially parking were expressed by Memorial University, St. Augustine’s Church, and residents of the Elizabeth Avenue area and the University Avenue area, as well as others.

We learned from the meeting that the developers cannot mandate that residents only attend post secondary, nor that they cannot have a vehicle. The comment made that “Nobody else would want to live there” was extremely worrisome for our neighbours.

In addition to the other issues raised, we have lived for forty years in our home and know only too well the area’s struggles respect to student parking during regular times. If there is such a need for housing, a more appropriate solution would be to redevelop the Hoyles Escasoni Complex which has the space, the parking and is more suited to accommodate MUN, the Marine Institute and CONA students. The solution is not to ignore City codes and construction guidelines which were established for valid reasons. To ignore or amend these regulations will create precedents which will be impossible to walk back from.

The timing of the request has also raised flags:
- so close to the end of the current Council’s term;
- rushed through in August month (when many houses in our area are in transition), the adjacent two schools are closed, and Memorial is in closed session;
- being brought to Council on Labour Day weekend during the back to school/university/work timeframe;
- during Covid restrictions through Zoom, which severely restricts participation (especially since the first link to register was not working).

The concept that consideration would be given to THREE apartment complexes without the appropriate space requirements, and WITHOUT ANY PARKING, in an area where on street parking is banned, seemed impossible. However, common sense and good judgement appear to be in short supply and we are now at this point in the process.

I wanted you to be aware of the concerns of the area residents, the Church and the University prior to your making this decision.

Thank you for your consideration