May 30, 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 - May 24, 2022

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS
   6.1. Approval In Principle for Redevelopment to Lodging House and Offices – 55 Military Road – DEV2200075

   6.2. Request for Parking Relief - 4 Holdsworth Street – INT2200022

7. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS
   7.1. Dredging at Carnell Drive Rennie’s River Quidi Vidi Lake
        Previously approved by Council via e-poll on May 26, 2022

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   8.1. Committee of the Whole Report - May 18, 2022
        1. Housing Catalyst Fund 2022 Recipients
        2. Regular, Special and CotW Meetings – 2021 Summer Schedule
3. 13 George Street, Second Storey Deck, INT2200008
4. George Street United Church, Heritage Designation of Annex, 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West, HAT2200004
5. 265 LeMarchant Road, Heritage Report TOR, DEV2200040

9. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
   9.1. Development Permits List May 19 to May 25, 2022

10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
    10.1. Building Permits List

11. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS
    11.1. Weekly Payment Vouchers for the Week Ending May 25, 2022

12. TENDERS/RFPS
    12.1. 2022068 – Supply and Delivery, For Lease, 2 New Current Production Articulating Rock Trucks – Robin Hood Bay

13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

14. OTHER BUSINESS
    14.1. Affordable Housing Working Group Membership
    14.2. 150 New Gower Street, Approval, MPA1800003
    14.3. Regional Water Reserve Fund Purchase – Replacement Compressor and Dryer for the Ozone System at Bay Bulls Big Pond Water Treatment Plant

15. ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL

16. ADJOURNMENT
Minutes of Regular Meeting - City Council
Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

May 24, 2022, 3:00 p.m.

Present: Councillor Sandy Hickman
Councillor Maggie Burton
Councillor Ron Ellsworth
Councillor Debbie Hanlon
Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft
Councillor Jamie Korab
Councillor Ian Froude
Councillor Carl Ridgeley

Regrets: Mayor Danny Breen
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O'Leary
Councillor Jill Bruce

Staff: Derek Coffey, Acting City Manager & 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
Karen Chafe, City Clerk
Susan Bonnell, Manager, Communications & Office Services
Christine Carter, 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**
   Acting Mayor, Sandy Hickman, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

2. **PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
   3.1 **Adoption of Agenda**
   SJMC-R-2022-05-24/208
   **Moved By** Councillor Ravencroft
   **Seconded By** Councillor Ellsworth
   That the Agenda be adopted as presented.
   For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley
   **MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

4. **ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES**
   4.1 **Adoption of Minutes - May 16, 2022**
   SJMC-R-2022-05-24/209
   **Moved By** Councillor Froude
   **Seconded By** Councillor Ridgeley
   That the minutes of May 16, 2022, be adopted as presented.
   For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley
   **MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

5. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

6. **DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**
   6.1 **Proposed Accessory Building in the Floodplain Buffer – 42 Beauford Place – INT2200020**
SJMC-R-2022-05-24/210

Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Ridgeley

That Council approve the construction of the Accessory Building in the Floodplain buffer at 42 Beauford Place, with the condition that it must conform to Section 6.2 “Accessory Building” requirements of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

6.2 Notices Published – 46 Churchill Avenue – DEV2200054

Councillor Ravencroft acknowledged the submissions received that are not in support of this new development and added that she was satisfied with the responses to those submissions by Staff that addressed the protection of the trails and the pedestrian spaces. Councillor Ravencroft noted that as this discretionary application is for the consideration of the Townhouse Use only, the developer will be required to submit detailed subdivision design plans, so, there will be other opportunities for additional public feedback on this development.

Councillor Froude referred to the overlay map of the area that was in the public notice and noted that the building lots looked very close to the river. He asked for clarification on whether the flood plain had been considered in the drawing supplied, and for details on the distance of the proposed lots from the edge of the buffer.

The Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services advised that the picture in the ad was schematic and that the new 100-year flood plain and the buffer has to be revised. Mr. Sinyard suggested that Council strike from the motion the number of townhouses in the Decision Note supplied by Staff as this number may change. Mr. Sinyard added that today's decision is for approval of the use only, and once approved, the details and technical plans will be presented, and the final number of lots will be better determined.
Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve the Discretionary Use application for Townhouse Lots at 46 Churchill Avenue.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

7. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS
8. COMMITTEE REPORTS
9. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
   9.1 Development Permits List May 12 to May 18, 2022
10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
    10.1 Building Permits List
11. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS
    11.1 Weekly Payment Vouchers for the Week Ending May 18, 2022

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Councillor Burton

That the weekly payment vouchers for the week ending May 18, 2022, in the amount of $1,710,188.52 be approved as presented.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)
12. **TENDERS/RFPS**

12.1 **2022059 - Janitorial Services for Various City Properties**

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/213  
**Moved By** Councillor Ellsworth  
**Seconded By** Councillor Hanlon

That Council approve for award this open call to the lowest bidders meeting specifications for each Group: Group 1, 2 & 4 to Philrobben Janitorial Limited for $448,308.00 per year (HST not included) and Group 3 to Iggy’s Cleaning Services for $80,000.00 per year (HST not included) as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

12.2 **2022065 - Light Duty Vehicle Maintenance and Repair**

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/214  
**Moved By** Councillor Ellsworth  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ridgeley

That Council approve for award this open call to the two lowest compliant bidders, Drive Line Machine Shop (Lee & Sons Ltd.) – ranked # 1, & Emergency Repair Ltd.- ranked # 2 as per the Public Procurement Act.

Work for this contract is allocated based on ranking starting with the lowest bidder. However due to operational reasons as outlined in the bid documents, the City may bypass the order of ranking and contact the next ranked supplier to complete the repair.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**
12.3 2022073 – Heavy Truck & Equipment Maintenance & Repair Service

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/215
Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

THAT Council approve for award this open call to the three bidders meeting all requirements, Harvey & Company – ranked # 1, Reefer Repair - ranked # 2, City Tire & Auto Centre – ranked #3 as per the Public Procurement Act. Work for this contract is allocated based on ranking starting with the lowest bidder. However due to operational reasons as outlined in the bid documents, the City may bypass the order of ranking and contact the next ranked supplier to complete the repair.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

12.4 2022074 - 2022 Streets Rehabilitation Program Contract 1

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/216
Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council approve for award this open call to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, Pyramid Construction Limited, for $9,690,973.53 (HST Incl.) as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

12.5 2022080 Supply and Delivery of Tires

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/217
Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve for award this open call to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, for Section 1 and 2, Kal Tire (Bid #1) for $312,334.07
(exclusive of HST), as per the Public Procurement Act. There is a price escalation allowance, which is up to a maximum of the appropriate CPI index for years two (2) and three (3). Please note that the SJTC will be participating in this tender (see Commission Approval attached).

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

12.6 **2022082 Tire Retreading Service**

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/218

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth

Seconded By Councillor Korab

That Council approve for award this open call to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, Kal Tire for $313,194.00 (exclusive of HST), as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

12.7 **2022102 - 2022 Streets Rehabilitation Program Contract 2**

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/219

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth

Seconded By Councillor Burton

That Council approve for award this open call to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, Modern Paving Limited, for $4,311,756.53 (HST Incl.) as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)
13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS
14. OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 **Membership – St. John’s Sports and Entertainment Board of Directors**

Councillor Ellsworth presented the recommendation from the Board of Directors of St. John’s Sport & Entertainment Ltd. for the appointment of two new Citizen Representatives.

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/220

**Moved By** Councillor Ellsworth  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ravencroft

That Council confirm the SJSE Board’s recommendations to appoint Jason Silver and Heather Stamp Nunes to the St. John’s Sports and Entertainment Board of Directors.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

14.2 **Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee Hall of Fame Banquet Luncheon**

Councillor Korab advised Council that the sponsorship of the Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee Hall of Fame Banquet luncheon has been an annually supported event by the City of St. John’s, and it is a budgeted item.

SJMC-R-2022-05-24/221

**Moved By** Councillor Ravencroft  
**Seconded By** Councillor Korab

That Council sponsor the Royal St. John’s Regatta Committee Hall of Fame Banquet luncheon at an estimated maximum cost of $5,000.

For (8): Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)
15. **ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL**
16. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm.

____________________________________
MAYOR

____________________________________
CITY CLERK
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Approval In Principle for Redevelopment to Lodging House and Offices – 55 Military Road – DEV2200075

Date Prepared: May 25, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
To request Approval in Principle for a Lodging House and associated Offices at 55 Military Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
An application was submitted requesting Approval in Principle to redevelop and expand the building at 55 Military Road. The building is currently used by the Association for Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador (ARNNL) as office space. It is proposed to be redeveloped by Stella’s Circle into a lodging house (transitional housing) with 15 rooms, common washrooms and kitchen area, seven (7) offices, and common rooms for residents.

The proposed Lodging House Use is a Permitted in the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone, while the Office Use is Discretionary. A building expansion at the rear is proposed, as identified on the attached sketch. The Zone Requirements for the Rear Yard and Height for the proposed expansion are to be set by Council once the detailed plans have been submitted for Final Approval. The building is located in Heritage Area 2, is adjacent to a Designated Heritage Building, and the Heritage By-Law would apply to any exterior work.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

Choose an item.


6. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

8. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

9. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

10. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

11. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council grant Approval in Principle for a Lodging House (transitional house) and associated Offices at 55 Military Road subject to the following conditions:
1. Meet all requirements of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations;
2. Detailed site and servicing plans are to be submitted (expansion and interior work) for final approval;
3. Meet the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone Requirements - height and rear yard will be approved by Council once detailed site plans are submitted;
4. Parking requirements are to be met or a request for parking relief to be approved by Council, at Council’s discretion;
5. A revised Development Agreement is to be prepared and signed prior to final approval as the Office Use is an existing Discretionary Use; and
6. External work is subject to the Heritage By-Law.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Development Committee - Approval In Principle for Women’s Transitional House and Offices – 55 Military Road – DEV2200075.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attachments:   | - 55 Military Road Expansion.pdf  
- 55 MILITARY ROAD.pdf |
| Final Approval Date: | May 26, 2022 |

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

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - May 25, 2022 - 3:47 PM**

**Jason Sinyard - May 26, 2022 - 12:00 PM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Request for Parking Relief - 4 Holdsworth Street – INT2200022

Date Prepared: May 25, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
To approve parking relief for a temporary outdoor Lounge area (parklet) at 4 Holdsworth Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
Jungle Jim’s submitted an application to construct a temporary outdoor Lounge area (parklet) on vacant land adjacent to their existing patio at 4 Holdsworth Street. The property is identified in the Business Improvement Area (Map 6) where properties abutting George Street allow a Lounge as a Permitted Use. The outdoor parklet will be approximately 179.4m² and will require 9 parking spaces. The property owner has secured 2 parking spaces in a parking lot across the street and is seeking parking relief for the remaining 7 parking spaces.

Under Section 8.12, where an applicant wishes to provide a different number of parking spaces than required under Section 8.3 and where the change does not merit a parking report, a staff report may be accepted in lieu. The applicant has indicated that the outdoor Lounge area is temporary in nature, will only be occupied during summer months, and is located where other parking locations/options are available nearby.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:
   
   A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.


6. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

8. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

9. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

10. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

11. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council relieve seven (7) parking spaces for the temporary outdoor Lounge area (parklet) at 4 Holdsworth Street.

**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- Request for Parking Relief at 4 Holdsworth Street- INT2200022.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- 4 HOLDSWORTH STREET.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 26, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - May 25, 2022 - 2:48 PM

Jason Sinyard - May 26, 2022 - 12:02 PM
BID APPROVAL NOTE

Commodity/Bid #: Dredging at Carnell Drive Rennie’s River Quidi Vidi Lake
Date Prepared: Wednesday, May 25, 2022
Report To: Regular Meeting
Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works
Ward: Ward 2

Department: Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Quotes Obtained By: Paul Porter
Budget Code: ENG-2021-051
Source of Funding: Multiyear Capital
Purpose: The purpose of this limited call is to facilitate dredging that is affecting recreational boating at QV Lake and for the June 25th Regatta.

Proposals Submitted By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coady Construction and Excavating Ltd.</td>
<td>$161,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Paving Ltd.</td>
<td>$177,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carew Services Ltd.</td>
<td>$284,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Value: ☒ As above
☐ Value shown is an estimate only for a # year period. The City does not guarantee to buy specific quantities or dollar value.

Contract Duration: The work of this project shall be substantially completed by June 17, 2022

Bid Exception: None

Recommendation: That Council approve for award this limited call to the lowest bidder meeting all specifications, Coady Construction and Excavating Ltd., for $161,850.00 (HST Excluded) as per the Public Procurement Act.

Attachments:
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Dredging at Carnell Drive Rennies River Quidi Vidi Lake.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 25, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Scott Winsor - May 25, 2022 - 10:48 AM

Jason Sinyard - May 25, 2022 - 12:31 PM
Minutes of Committee of the Whole - City Council
Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

May 18, 2022, 9:30 a.m.

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

Staff: Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration
       Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering &
       Regulatory Services
       Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
       Susan Bonnell, Manager - Communications & Office Services
       Karen Chafe, City Clerk
       Christine Carter, Legislative Assistant

Others Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, Supervisor of Planning & Development
          Ann-Marie Cashin, Planner III – Urban Design & Heritage
          Judy Powell, General Manager, Metrobus

1. Housing Catalyst Fund 2022 Recipients

Councillor Ravencroft presented Council with the recommendations for the 2022
Housing Catalyst Fund and gave some background on the fund.

The City of St. John’s and the Community Housing Transformation Centre have
selected five grants totaling $110,000 to be awarded for 2022:

- Anglican Homes - $30,000
- John’s Status of Women Council/Women’s Centre - $30,000
- Gathering Place - $20,000
- Stella’s Circle - $20,000
- Hospitality NL - $10,000
Committee of the Whole Meeting - May 18, 2022

Providing Housing Catalyst grants for affordable housing projects is a goal of the Affordable Housing Strategy 2019-2028, a ten-year plan to address our municipality’s housing needs, developed with the vision of working in-step with partners, stakeholders, and residents to create and maintain safe, suitable, and affordable housing throughout the city.

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Ravencroft
Seconded By Councillor Ridgeley

That Council support the decision to award Housing Catalyst Fund grants to the applicants outlined above, as selected by the fund’s review committee.

For (11): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (11 to 0)

2. Regular, Special and CotW Meetings – 2021 Summer Schedule

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve the proposed summer schedule for Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole (CotW) meetings.

For (11): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (11 to 0)

3. Built Heritage Experts Panel (Councillor Maggie Burton)

1. 13 George Street, Second Storey Deck, INT2200008

Councillor Burton recommended that the Heritage By-Law be amended to allow for consideration of new decks and balconies on facades facing George Street, and that the second storey deck and signage for 13 George Street be approved as proposed.

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth
That Council, subject to Schedule D of the Heritage By-Law being amended to allow for consideration of new decks and balconies on facades facing George Street, approve a second storey deck and signage at 13 George Street, as proposed.

For (11): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (11 to 0)

2. George Street United Church, Heritage Designation of Annex, 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West, HAT2200004

Councillor Burton advised that the City has received an application to remove the Heritage Building designation from the annex portion of the George Street United Church. Should Council agree, the Heritage Building designation will remain on the original part of George Street United Church.

The applicants are preparing to subdivide the two properties as shown on the attached survey. If Heritage Building designation is removed and the sale and subdivision proceeds, the applicants propose in the interim to lease the annex property back to the church until a time when they seek to redevelop it. Once they determine a redevelopment approach, the long-term plan is to demolish the annex, return the back wall of the church to its former state, and redevelop the annex site with a new building.

The applicants and representatives from George Street United Church attended the May 20, 2022 BHEP Meeting as a delegation. The Panel discussed this item at that meeting and then made a recommendation following further discussion at the May 27, 2022 meeting.

It was also questioned if the congregation had been consulted in the process, and the response was that the congregation had given their permission to negotiate the sale of the parcel of land adjacent to the building. Reverend Maich informed the Panel that the original structure of the church would remain unaltered, and any changes would only affect the extension.

Should Council agree with the staff recommendation, any redevelopment of the rear lot would require a Heritage Report and public consultation as the property is adjacent to a Heritage Building.

Councillor Burton added that this sale will greatly assist the financial position of the church.
Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Ridgeley

That Council:
(1) as per Section 11(1)(b) of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law, consider the removal of the Heritage Building designation on the annex portion of George Street United Church located at 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West and advertise the application in accordance with the provisions of the Development Regulation; and
(2) as per Section 8(3) of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law accept the staff report in lieu of a Heritage Report.

For (11): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (11 to 0)

3. 265 LeMarchant Road, Heritage Report TOR, DEV2200040

Councillor Burton presented the Decision Note to approve the draft Heritage Report terms of reference for a proposed extension and renovation at 265 LeMarchant Road (former West Fire Station), a designated Heritage Building.

The City has received an application to convert the former West Fire Station or West End Fire Hall, located at 265 LeMarchant Road, to an Apartment Building. The applicant is proposing to add two floors, to increase the number of storeys from 2 to 4, and horizontal expansion at the rear of the building. The structure will house 16 residential units. The applicant is in the initial design stage and the proposed expansion is subject to change. The application arises from a Request for Proposals issued by the City for the sale and re-development of the site.

Councillor Burton added that it is not being recommended that a public hearing be held on this application.

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve the attached draft Heritage Report terms of reference to consider an expansion to the designated Heritage Building (the former West Fire Station) at 265 LeMarchant Road.
For (11): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (11 to 0)

__________________________________________

Mayor
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Housing Catalyst Fund 2022 Recipients

Date Prepared: May 12, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft, Housing

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Decision on recommendations of the 2022 Housing Catalyst Fund, as selected by application review committee.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The Housing Catalyst Fund is a partnership between the Community Housing Transformation Centre (the Centre) and the City of St. John’s. The Housing Catalyst Fund supports practical and collaborative projects which lead to transformative change in the sector. The role of this fund is to work with community groups and other stakeholders to facilitate and plan housing solutions that will enhance the quality of life for individuals and families and build a healthier community.

The City of St. John’s and the Community Housing Transformation Centre have selected five grants totaling $110,000 to be awarded for 2022:

- Anglican Homes - $30,000
- St. John’s Status of Women Council/Women’s Centre - $30,000
- Gathering Place - $20,000
- Stella’s Circle - $20,000
- Hospitality NL - $10,000

Providing Housing Catalyst grants for affordable housing projects is a goal of the Affordable Housing Strategy 2019-2028, a ten-year plan to address our municipality’s housing needs, developed with the vision of working in-step with partners, stakeholders and residents to create and maintain safe, suitable, and affordable housing throughout the city.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: $50,000 approved by Council for the Housing Catalyst Fund for 2022. The City’s contribution would make up a total of $30,000 in this round of funding. Details can be found in the attached Backgrounder.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Community Housing Transformation Centre providing funding support of $80,000.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   An Effective City: Achieve service excellence though collaboration, innovation and modernization grounded in client needs.

Choose an item.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: The Affordable Housing Strategy aligns with the Strategic Plan’s vision and directions. Affordable Housing actions work in tandem with the Municipal Plan and Development Regulations.

5. Legal or Policy Implications: Working Group and Committee Members whose agencies have applications submitted excuse themselves from any decision-making process to avoid a conflict of interest.

6. Privacy Implications: None anticipated at this time.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Communications and Engagement have been informed of our work to date on the Housing Catalyst Fund.

8. Human Resource Implications: None anticipated at this time.

9. Procurement Implications: None anticipated at this time.

10. Information Technology Implications: None anticipated at this time.

11. Other Implications: None anticipated at this time.

Recommendation:

That Council support the decision to award Housing Catalyst Fund grants to the applicants outlined above, as selected by the fund’s review committee.

Prepared by: Mark Finch, Affordable Housing & Development Facilitator
Approved by: Judy Tobin, Manager of Housing
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>DN Housing Catalyst Fund 2022 Recipients.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- Backgrounder_Housing Catalyst Grant Recipients 2022.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 12, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Judy Tobin** - May 12, 2022 - 11:34 AM

**Tanya Haywood** - May 12, 2022 - 12:10 PM
Housing Catalyst Grant Recipients for 2022

**Anglican Homes**
Awarded $20,000 by the Community Housing Transformation Centre and $10,000 by the City of St. John’s. Funding to support Building Condition Assessments, Age-in-Place Assessments, and Energy Assessments of all Anglican Homes residential properties.

**St. John’s Status of Women Council/Women’s Centre**
Awarded $20,000 by the Community Housing Transformation Centre and $10,000 by the City of St. John’s. Funding to support a Needs and Demand Study that will inform expansion of affordable housing stock for women and non-binary people.

**The Gathering Place**
Awarded $20,000 by the Community Housing Transformation Centre. Funding to contribute toward hiring a project manager for a major supportive housing development project at the former Sisters of Mercy Convent space.

**Stella’s Circle**
Awarded $20,000 by the Community Housing Transformation Centre. Funding to support technical consultations that will inform a National Housing Co-Investment Fund application intended to support a prospective affordable housing development.

**Hospitality NL**
Awarded $10,000 by the City of St. John’s. Funding for the development of a housing toolkit aimed to provide reliable housing information to immigrants and refugees before they arrive in St. John’s.
Title: Regular, Special and CotW Meetings – 2021 Summer Schedule

Date Prepared: May 13, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Mayor Danny Breen, Governance & Strategic Priorities

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
Seeking Council approval to implement the bi-weekly summer schedule for Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole (COTW) meetings.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

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

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

Based on the above, the following is the proposed schedule moving forward, up to and including the summer months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular/Special Meetings</th>
<th>Committee of the Whole Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Tuesday, July 12, 2022</td>
<td>• Wednesday, July 13, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monday July 25, 2022</td>
<td>• Wednesday, July 27, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monday, August 8, 2022</td>
<td>• Wednesday, August 10, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monday, August 22, 2022</td>
<td>• Wednesday, August 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regularly weekly meetings will resume after Labour Day on Tuesday, September 6, 2022.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: N/A

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   
   • Council and Staff
   • General Public
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: N/A

4. Legal or Policy Implications:
   - City of St. John’s Act

5. Privacy Implications: N/A

6. Engagement and Communications Considerations:
   - Meeting schedule is available publicly

7. Human Resource Implications: N/A

8. Procurement Implications: N/A

9. Information Technology Implications: N/A

10. Other Implications: N/A

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the proposed summer schedule for Regular, Special and Committee of the Whole (CotW) meetings.
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Regular, Special and CotW Meetings - Summer Schedule 2021.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 11, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Elaine Henley - May 11, 2021 - 2:07 PM
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 13 George Street, Second Storey Deck, INT2200008

Date Prepared: May 11, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Heritage

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
To approve a second storey deck at 13 George Street, O’Reilly’s Irish Newfoundland Pub.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application from O’Reilly’s for a second storey deck at 13 George Street. The subject property is within the Commercial District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan, Heritage Area 1 and is zoned Commercial Downtown Mixed (CDM).

The applicant has requested to remove the existing awning sign and replace it with a second storey deck. The proposed design is attached for review. Should the deck be approved, the second storey windows would be replaced with doors to the deck, similar to the ground level doors. The railings will be black wrought iron to match the black of the existing windows and signage will be located on the deck railings. There is currently flood lighting on the awning sign, which will also be included in the new signage, as well as pot lights under the deck to wash the building and light the ground floor patio.

The deck will extend to cover the existing ground floor patio, but not to go beyond the fencing and the applicant would enter into an agreement with the City that includes a requirement to maintain a walking area. Any support structures would have to maintain distance for snow clearing. Note, only the second storey deck is proposed at this time. The ground floor patio expansion shown on some renderings if the temporary summer patio and is shown for information only.

Photos of the property from 1984, 2009 and 2021 are provided for reference. Renovations over time have been completed with all appropriate permits and were reviewed by the Heritage Advisory Committee at the time.

From Schedule D – Heritage Design Standards of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law, the following applies for non-residential buildings in Heritage Area 1:
  - Decks and balconies shall not be permitted on a façade facing a public street unless it is an original feature of the building. In this case, original style and design to be maintained.
Decks and balconies on other facades visible from a public street may be permitted where, in the opinion of the Inspector, the design is compatible with the period/architectural style of the streetscape.

Door styles shall be compatible with the period/architectural style of the streetscape.

Under the current design guidelines, a new deck would not be permitted on the subject property as it is in Heritage Area 1.

The application was presented to the Panel for two considerations:
- Should new decks and balconies be permitted on a façade facing George Street?
- Should the proposed design be approved?

Panel members were in support of an amendment to the heritage design standards, noting that having additional outdoor spaces in this area would further animate George Street and adds atmosphere while providing additional capacity for businesses. It was also noted that there are a number of existing decks in that portion of George Street, so it is not introducing a new element to the heritage area. There is already precedent on the adjacent buildings, and they are permitted on the north side of George Street which is in Heritage Area 2. The Panel would like to continue reviewing such applications to ensure that the decks would be compatible with the period and architectural style of the streetscape. Therefore, it is recommended that Council direct the Legal Department to prepare an amendment to the Schedule D of the Heritage By-Law to consider new decks and balconies in Heritage Area 1 on George Street only, at the discretion of Council. This will be brought to Council separately by the Legal Department.

The proposed change to the design standards was also reviewed by the George Street Association Board and generally there were no concerns. The draft wording of the change will be forwarded to the Association for review.

With respect the proposed deck at 13 George Street, subject to the Heritage Design Standards being amended, the Panel recommended to approve the deck and sign as proposed. They agreed the addition of the deck would not alter the overall façade of the building from a heritage perspective and would animate the streetscape.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. **Budget/Financial Implications:** Not applicable.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders:** Neighbouring residents and property owners; George Street Association.

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions:**

   A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.
A Sustainable City: Facilitate and create the conditions that drive the economy by being business and industry friendly; and being a location of choice for residents, businesses and visitors.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: St. John’s Heritage By-Law

5. Legal or Policy Implications: An amendment to the St. John’s Heritage By-Law is required.

6. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Consultation with the George Street Association.

8. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

9. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

10. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

11. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
That Council, subject to Schedule D of the Heritage By-Law being amended to allow for consideration of new decks and balconies on facades facing George Street, approve a second storey deck and signage at 13 George Street, as proposed.

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>13 George Street, Second Storey Patio, INT2200008 (COTW).docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- 13 George Street - Attachments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 12, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Ken O’Brien - May 11, 2022 - 4:45 PM**

**Jason Sinyard - May 12, 2022 - 9:50 AM**
#13
Occupant: O'Keefe's
Date Built: 
Style: 
Architect: 
Renovations: 

#17-21
Occupant: Side Street
Date Built: 1981-82
Style: Modernized Vernacular
Architect: 
Renovations: 

#23
Occupant: Christians
Date Built: 
Style: Vernacular Classical
Architect: 
Renovations: 

George Street

1984
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: George Street United Church, Heritage Designation of Annex, 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West, HAT2200004

Date Prepared: May 11, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Heritage

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
To remove the Heritage Building designation on the annex (rear extension) of George Street United Church, 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application to remove the Heritage Building designation from the annex portion of George Street United Church. Should Council agree, the Heritage Building designation will remain on the original part of George Street United Church.

The applicants are preparing to subdivide the two properties as shown on the attached survey. If Heritage Building designation is removed and the sale and subdivision proceeds, the applicants propose in the interim to lease the annex property back to the church until a time when they seek to redevelop it. Once they determine a redevelopment approach, the long-term plan is to demolish the annex, return the back wall of the church to its former state, and redevelop the annex site with a new building.

George Street United Church was designated by the City as a Heritage Building on July 21, 1989. The heritage statement of significance is attached for reference. The cornerstone for the church was laid on May 27, 1872, and the first service was held on December 4, 1873. In 1959-60, a gymnasium and classrooms were added in a new annex. While the statement does not specifically mention the annex, where the annex was built in 1960 and the designation occurred in 1989, the annex was included in the footprint of the building and the City’s heritage designation. The annex is currently used as office, boardroom and storage space. Only the footprint of the building is designated by the City; the remainder of the property including the yards are not designated.

George Street United Church is also a provincial Registered Heritage Structure (RHS); however, Heritage NL have confirmed that only the original church building is provincially designated. The provincial designation does not include the annex.
Built Heritage Experts Panel’s (BHEP) Recommendation
The applicants and representatives from George Street United Church attended the May 20, 2022 BHEP Meeting as a delegation. The Panel discussed this item at that meeting and then made a recommendation following further discussion at the May 27, 2022 meeting.

It was questioned if the congregation had been consulted in the process, and the response was that the congregation had given their permission to negotiate the sale of the parcel of land adjacent to the building. Reverend Maich informed the Panel that the original structure of the church would remain unaltered, and any changes would only affect the extension. Originally there were entrance doors at the rear façade of the building and the extension was built around these doors with a small courtyard between the two buildings. Two washrooms were added in the 1950s, and these would be reconfigured to open into existing space inside the building but would not affect the original heritage building. The Church would work with the City and Heritage NL to restore the original façade of the building.

The Panel noted that from a federal perspective, the heritage and integrity of any building built 40 years ago and earlier should be maintained and felt that it would shame to de-designate a building on the cusp of the 40-to-50-year designation point. Members of the Panel were not in support of removing the designation, as both the provincial and municipal designation state that the “footprint” is designated. Panel members felt that as the church could proceed with the sale with the designation intact; they would not support removal of the designation at this time. There were also concerns that the removal of the designation would result in an empty lot.

While from a regulatory perspective the Church could subdivide the property with the building intake (with renovations between the two parcels to meet fire, life safety and building code), the applicant’s proposal to purchase the subdivided property will be jeopardized. They noted in the meeting that removal of the designation is a condition of the sale. The Statement of Significance only considers the elements of the church and Heritage NL do not consider the annex to be historically significant, therefore staff disagree with the BHEP’s recommendation and recommend removing the heritage designation from the annex portion of the building. While staff agree with the Panel that this will be a loss of an older building, this is a situation where the City must balance the future of the George Street United Church and the church’s ability to maintain the original building with the loss of the annex.

Should Council agree with the staff recommendation, any redevelopment of the rear lot would require a Heritage Report and public consultation as the property is adjacent to a Heritage Building.

From Section 8 (3) of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law, Council shall require a Heritage Report for an application to amend or revoke the designation of a Heritage Building. A Heritage Report shall evaluate and identify heritage values and resources located on the site, neighbourhood or streetscape, and address the anticipated impacts that the proposed work may have on the heritage value of a building, neighbourhood or streetscape. Where in the opinion of Council it is appropriate to do so, Council may accept a staff report in lieu of the
Heritage Report. In this case, staff feel that we have sufficient information to make a recommendation and it is recommended to accept the staff report in lieu of a Heritage Report.

From Section 11(1)(b) of the Heritage By-Law, unless Council directs otherwise, an application to amend or revoke the designation of a Heritage Building requires public consultation. Generally, this includes a notice to property owners within 150 metres of the subject property, as well as on the City’s website and in *The Telegram*. A public meeting could also be required. Staff recommend that the proposed removal of the Heritage Building designation from the annex be advertised and mailed to properties within 150 metres of the site prior to Council making a decision on the matter.

Following public consultation, any feedback will be brought back to Council for consideration. Should Council wish to remove the designation off the annex portion of George Street United Church, they would then direct the Legal Department to prepare a Designation By-Law.

**Subject Property: George Street United Church**
Designated Heritage Building
25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West
Decision/Direction Note
George Street United Church, Heritage Designation of Annex,
25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West, HAT2200004

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

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

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:
   A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.
   A Sustainable City: Facilitate and create the conditions that drive the economy by being business and industry friendly; and being a location of choice for residents, businesses and visitors.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: City of St. John’s Act; St. John’s Heritage By-Law

5. Legal or Policy Implications: A Designation By-Law would be required to revise the designation of George Street United Church.

6. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Public consultation, as per Section 11(1)(b) of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law is recommended.

8. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

9. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

10. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

11. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
That Council:
(1) as per Section 11(1)(b) of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law, consider the removal of the Heritage Building designation on the annex portion of George Street United Church located at 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West and advertise the application in accordance with the provisions of the Development Regulation; and
(2) as per Section 8(3) of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law accept the staff report in lieu of a Heritage Report.
George Street United Church, Heritage Designation of Annex, 25 Buchanan Street/130 George Street West, HAT2200004

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>George Street United Church, Heritage Designation of Annex, 25 Buchanan Street_130 George Street West, HAT2200004 (COTW).docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- George Street United Church - Attachments(COTW).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 12, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No Signature - Task assigned to Ken O'Brien was completed by workflow administrator Karen Chafe

Ken O'Brien - May 12, 2022 - 10:35 AM

No Signature - Task assigned to Jason Sinyard was completed by workflow administrator Karen Chafe

Jason Sinyard - May 12, 2022 - 10:38 AM
Monuments used for tie-in, Zone 1: 80G2259
NAD - 83

All linear measurements are horizontal ground distances. For the computation of coordinates, horizontal ground distances have been reduced to the NFLD 3' M T M projection plane by multiplying them by an average combined scale factor of 0.999904.
Statement of Significance

130 George Street West - George Street United Church

Formal Recognition Type
City of St. John's Heritage Building, Structure, Land or Area

Description of Historic Place
Built in 1873, George Street United Church is the oldest Methodist church in St. John’s. It is a stone church built in the Gothic Revival style of architecture by Elijah Hoole. This designation is confined to the footprint of the building.

Heritage Value
George Street United Church is designated as a Municipal Heritage Building due to its architectural and historical values.

George Street United Church is architecturally valuable as a fine example of a modified Gothic Revival church. Constructed of local stone quarried from the Southside Hills, the entire building is sheathed in concrete. Despite this, many typical Gothic elements remain intact including the pointed arch lancet windows and the large stained glass windows. Furthermore, the interior of this church is architecturally valuable for its well-preserved woodwork. The exposed timber hammerbeam roof of the nave is a typical Gothic element.

George Street United Church is also architecturally valuable for its association with British architect, Elijah Hoole. Hoole was a well-known architect whose other works include Gower Street United Church in St. John’s. George Street United Church was built by local master builder William Campbell and locally known mason Richard Atwill.

George Street United Church is historically valuable as the oldest Methodist Church in St. John’s. Built in 1873, George Street United Church is one of the only churches in the downtown area to survive the Great Fire of 1892. This Church is also historically valuable because on August 5, 1874 it was the site of the Organizational Assembly of the First Methodist Conference. Up until this point, Newfoundland had been a district of the Conference of Eastern British
America. Reverend George Mulligan, as Superintendent Minister of the St. John’s circuit and the principal minister of George Street Church, was elected first President of the new conference at this meeting.

Source: City of St. John’s, meeting held 1989/07/21

**Character Defining Elements**

All those elements that are representative of the ecclesiastical Gothic Revival style of architecture, including:

- stained glass windows;
- hammerbeam roof;
- interior woodwork;
- stone construction;
- concrete sheathing;
- turrets at West end of church;
- kicked eaves; and,
- cruciform layout.

**Location and History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>St. John's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>City of St. John's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Address</td>
<td>130 George Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1873 - 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Elijah Hoole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Richard Atwill William Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Gothic Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan</td>
<td>Cruciform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.georgestunitedchurch.com">http://www.georgestunitedchurch.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Photos:**
George Street United Church Registered Heritage Structure

St. John’s, NL
Registered Heritage Structure

DESCRIPTION

Built in 1873, George Street United Church is the oldest surviving Methodist church in St. John’s, NL. Designed by Elijah Hoole, it is a stone church built in the Gothic Revival style of architecture. This designation is confined to the footprint of the building.
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Formal Recognition Type
Registered Heritage Structure

Heritage Value
George Street United Church was designated a Registered Heritage Structure by the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador in 2000 due to its aesthetic and historic value.

George Street United Church is the oldest surviving Methodist church in St. John’s. A Methodist congregation based at Gower Street United Church was already well established in the mid-nineteenth-century. In February 1862, a committee from the Gower Street congregation was tasked with finding a location for a new church in the working class district on the west end of the harbourfront. A temporary Sunday School and meeting hall were established in rented premises on Pleasant Street, but the committee did not secure a permanent site for the church until 1871.

On May 27, 1872, the cornerstone for the new George Street United Church was laid near the intersection of George Street and Buchanan Street. Construction was led by Devon-born mason Richard Atwell (who died in 1873 from a fall on the construction site) and Bonavista builder William Campbell. The church was officially opened for services on December 4, 1873. On August 5, 1874, the church was the site of the Organizational Assembly of the First Methodist Conference, as Newfoundland became a Conference of the Methodist church in Canada. Up until this point, Newfoundland had been a district of the Conference of Eastern British America. Reverend George Mulligan, Superintendent Minister of the St. John’s circuit and principal minister of George Street Church, was elected first President of the new conference at this meeting.

George Street United Church was designed by well-known British architect, Elijah Hoole – the son of a Methodist missionary. Hoole specialized in building Methodist churches and settlement houses in England. After George Street United Church, Hoole went on to design Gower Street United Church in 1894.

George Street United Church is a good example of Gothic Revival architecture – the most common architectural style for Protestant churches in this period. Constructed of locally quarried slate from the Southside Hills, the entire building was parged with concrete some time in the early twentieth century. This obscured the quoining around the large pointed arch window on the front facade; however, the Gothic style of the pointed arch lancet windows and the large stained glass windows remains intact. The woodwork in the church’s interior is well preserved, as is the exposed timber hammerbeam roof of the nave – another classic Gothic Revival element.

Due to its location, George Street United Church was spared from the Great Fire of 1892 that gutted many downtown churches. The church building has been expanded twice
since that time. In 1908, the church expanded to accommodate a growing congregation. A new gallery and transepts were built on to the original structure, giving the church a cross layout. In 1959-1960, a gymnasium and classrooms were added. In a part of St. John’s which has undergone significant changes since the mid-twentieth century – specifically, the demolition of residential buildings to facilitate the construction of commercial high-rises and the harbour arterial – George Street United is a reminder of the bustling mixed-use neighbourhood that once existed in the area.

Source: Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador property file “St. John’s – George Street United Church – FPT 1480”

**Character Defining Elements**

All those elements that are representative of the ecclesiastical Gothic Revival style of architecture, including:

- number of storeys;
- steep gable roof;
- hammerbeam roof;
- kicked eaves;
- turrets at west end of church;
- louvred windows on turrets;
- stone construction;
- concrete sheathing;
- cruciform layout;
- size, style, trim and placement of wooden windows;
- size, style, trim and placement of stained glass windows;
- size, style, trim and placement of exterior wooden doors;
- interior woodwork, and;
- dimension, location and orientation of building.

**LOCATION AND HISTORY**

**Community**

St. John’s

**Municipality**

City of St. John's

**Civic Address**

130 George Street
Construction (circa)
1872 - 1873

Builder
Elijah Hoole, Richard Atwill, William Campbell

Style
Cruciform
George Street United Church - Photos of the Annex
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 265 LeMarchant Road, Heritage Report TOR, DEV2200040
Date Prepared: May 11, 2022
Report To: Committee of the Whole
Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Heritage
Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
To approve the draft Heritage Report terms of reference for a proposed extension and renovation at 265 LeMarchant Road (former West Fire Station), a designated Heritage Building.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received an application to convert the former West Fire Station or West End Fire Hall, located at 265 LeMarchant Road, to an Apartment Building. The applicant is proposing to add two floors, to increase the number of storeys from 2 to 4, and horizontal expansion at the rear of the building. The structure will house 16 residential units. The applicant is in the initial design stage and the proposed expansion is subject to change. The application arises from a Request for Proposals issued by the City for the sale and re-development of the site.

The subject property is within the Institutional District of the St. John’s Municipal Plan, and zoned Institutional Downtown (INST-DT). The property is within Heritage Area 3 and was designated by Council as a Heritage Building in December 2021. The statement of significance, historic photos and INST-DT Zone table are attached for reference. Please note, the applicant would be permitted to develop within the parameters of the zone requirements, including increasing the height of the building to the maximum height permitted within the zone (23 metres), however the design would still need approval Council for a Heritage Building.

The applicant presented the attached rendering to the Built Heritage Experts Panel during the May 27, 2022 meeting. The Panel observed that that the proposed design did not meet the St. John’s Heritage By-Law heritage design standards for designated heritage buildings. For building extensions, the design standards require the following:

*Additions shall be the same architectural style, or similar and compatible with the building’s architectural characteristics.*

*Modern façade designs may be approved by Council provided the addition is physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the designated building; enhances the visual prominence of the designated building; and does not detract from the character-defining elements of the designated building.*
The Panel commented that the proposed design was not subordinate to and distinguishable from the designated building, and recommended revisions to the proposal to meet the design standards. For example, they suggested to step back the upper storeys from the front façade of the original building to better highlight the original part.

From Section 8 of the Heritage By-Law, Council shall require a Heritage Report for any application where recommended by the Inspector. A Heritage Report will evaluate and identify heritage values and resources located on the site, neighbourhood or streetscape, and address the anticipated impacts that the proposed work may have. A major expansion to a Heritage Building is a case where a Heritage Report is needed. The attached terms of reference will help the applicant, the City and the Panel determine the best way to expand the building while respecting the Heritage Building.

Draft terms of reference for a Heritage Report are attached for Council’s review. The Built Heritage Experts Panel agrees with requiring a Heritage Report and their comments have been incorporated into the draft terms. Public consultation is not required for Heritage Reports, however Council may ask for public consultation for any matter. In this case, staff feel that the Heritage Report and consultation with the Panel will be sufficient. Should Council decide on public consultation, it may be more beneficial to require it before the applicants prepare their Heritage Report.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: City of St. John’s; neighbouring residents and property owners; heritage groups.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

   A Sustainable City: Facilitate and create the conditions that drive the economy by being business and industry friendly; and being a location of choice for residents, businesses and visitors.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: St. John’s Heritage By-Law; Envision St. John’s Development Regulations.

5. Legal or Policy Implications: Not applicable.

6. Privacy Implications: No applicable.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Under the Heritage By-Law, Council may require public consultation for any matter where Council so directs.
8. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

9. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

10. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

11. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the attached draft Heritage Report terms of reference to consider an expansion to the designated Heritage Building (the former West Fire Station) at 265 LeMarchant Road.

**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>265 LeMarchant Road, Heritage Report TOR, DEV2200040 (COTW).docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- 265 LeMarchant Road - Heritage Report TOR and Attachments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 12, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Ken O'Brien - May 12, 2022 - 11:48 AM

No Signature - Task assigned to Jason Sinyard was completed by workflow administrator Karen Chafe

Jason Sinyard - May 12, 2022 - 11:50 AM
A Heritage Report shall at a minimum evaluate and identify heritage values and resources located on the site, neighbourhood or streetscape and address the anticipated impacts that the proposed work may have on the heritage value of a building, neighbourhood or streetscape. 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 Heritage Report shall be provided as part of the report.

A Heritage Report will be prepared at the proponent’s expense and should contain, but is not limited to:

1. **Introduction to Development Site**
   a. A location and current site plan of the property;
   b. A brief description of the property and its location, identifying significant features, buildings, landscapes and vistas;
   c. A brief description of the context of the property, including adjacent properties and cultural resources, their recognition at the municipal, provincial, and/or federal level, and any as yet unidentified or unrecognized potential heritage resources.

2. **Background Research and Analysis**
   a. A comprehensive review of the history of the property’s development as documented and observed through archival, historical, archaeological, written and visual records;
   b. A description of the structure, including mention of original construction, and any additions, alterations, removals, conversions etc.
   c. An evaluation of the heritage significance of the site with emphasis on important architectural/physical features, historical associations within the City, and the situation of the site in local context;
   d. Reference to, or inclusion of, any relevant research materials including (but not limited to) maps, atlases, drawings, photographs, permit records, land title records, tax assessment rolls, etc.
   e. Include a copy of the City’s Statement of Significance for 265 LeMarchant Road.

3. **Assessment of Existing Condition**
   a. A description of the physical condition of the structures on the site, including their exterior and interior;
   b. Current photographs of the property including:
      i. views of the area surrounding the property to show it in context with adjacent properties;
      ii. exterior views of each elevation of the building;
      iii. close-up views of all significant heritage features.
4. **Description of the Proposed Development or Site Alteration**
   a. A description of the proposed development or site alteration;
   b. A conceptual site plan and conceptual drawings of all building elevations;
      i. The description and conceptual drawings should note which heritage feature(s) are considered for retention and which are considered for removal or alteration.
      ii. Site plan to:
         1. include location of the proposed building in relation to neighbouring buildings;
         2. include proximity of the building to property lines and identify setbacks;
         3. identify any stepbacks of higher storeys from lower storeys; and
         4. identify any encroachment over property lines (if applicable);
      iii. Building elevations to include current and proposed elevations and:
         1. identify the height of the building;
         2. identify the finish and colour of exterior building materials;
         3. provide information on the proposed construction of patios/balconies (if applicable);
         4. identify any rooftop structures.
         5. include immediately adjacent buildings and spaces to inform scale/massing/context.
   c. A description of how the proposed development aligns with the Heritage Design Standards of the St. John’s Heritage By-Law.
   d. Provide a rendering of the proposed building from the following locations:
      i. Near 278 LeMarchant Road looking north along LeMarchant Road; and
      ii. Near 258 and 260 LeMarchant Road looking south along LeMarchant Road.

5. **Impact of Development on Heritage Features**
   a. A discussion identifying any impact the proposed development or site alteration may have on the heritage features of the site and character-defining elements of the building;
      i. negative impacts on heritage resources may include, but are not limited to:
         1. the destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage feature;
         2. alteration that is not sympathetic to the heritage feature;
         3. isolation of a heritage feature from its surrounding environment, context, or significant relationship;
         4. direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas;
         5. a change in land use which negates the property’s cultural heritage value;
         6. land disturbances such as a grade change that alters soils and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource.

6. **Recommendation**
   a. Provide clear recommendations for the most appropriate course of action for the subject property and any heritage resources within it. This may include, but not limited to:
      i. a mitigation strategy;
      ii. a conservation scope of work;
      iii. lighting, landscaping and signage;
      iv. interpretation and commemoration.
NOTES:
1. RETAIN EXISTING MH/CB AND GRADE
   NEW PARKING LOT TO THIS GRADE
2. RAISE TOP OF EXISTING CB FROM 57.35
   TO 57.60 AND DRAIN LANDSCAPED
   AREAS TO THIS EXISTING MH/CB
3. INSTALL NEW CB AS SHOWN @ STALLS 1/2
   & DRAIN WITH 150mm PVC TO 3.0M x
   3.0M x 2.4M DEEP ROCK SUMP
EXISTING ELEVATIONS

FRONT ELEVATION

RIGHT ELEVATION

REAR ELEVATION

LEFT ELEVATION
NEW FRONT ELEVATIONS

RAISED HEEL

LOFT

STATION
EXIT STAIRS FROM SUITES 104 & 204. EXACT RISE AND NUMBER OF TREADS TO BE DETERMINED ON SITE BY FINISHED GRADE.
NEW CONSTRUCTION LEVEL 1, 2 & 3

EXISTING

REARDON CONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT LTD

LEMARCHANT FIRE HALL

LEMARCHANT ROAD

DRAWING # A15

DRAWN BY: JFH

APPROVED BY: GMR

DATE: 10/03/22

SCALE: 1/8" : 1

NEW LEFT ELEVATION
**INSTITUTIONAL DOWNTOWN (INST-DT) ZONE**

(1) **PERMITTED USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessory Building</th>
<th>Personal Care Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Day Centre</td>
<td>Place of Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Place of Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>Public Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Home</td>
<td>Public Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Use</td>
<td>Residential Care Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Care Facility</td>
<td>Training School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **DISCRETIONARY USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daycare Centre</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit, which is ancillary to a Permitted or Discretionary Use</td>
<td>Service Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **ZONE STANDARDS EXCEPT PARK, PUBLIC USE, PUBLIC UTILITY, AND PLACE OF WORSHIP**

(a) Building Height (maximum) 23 metres as measured from all property boundaries, such that height is adjusted to follow grades of Streets or property boundaries provided height does not exceed 23 metres from established grade

(b) Building Line 0 metres

(c) Floor Area Ratio (maximum) 3.0

(d) All Other Zone Standards are in the discretion of Council

(4) **ZONE STANDARDS FOR PARK, PUBLIC USE, PUBLIC UTILITY AND PLACE OF WORSHIP SHALL BE IN THE DISCRETION OF COUNCIL.**
## PROPERTY LOCATION

**Civic Address:** 265 LeMarchant Road  
**Applicant Name:** City of St. John's  
**Mailing Address:** Email:

### SECTION A

#### ARCHITECTURE (maximum 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HISTORY (maximum 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENVIRONMENT (maximum 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INTEGRITY (maximum 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE** 86

### SIGNATURE

Reviewed by: Ann-Marie Cashin  
Date (yyyy-mm-dd): 2021-11-10

---

**E - Excellent**  
**VG - Very Good**  
**G - Good**  
**F/P - Fair/Poor**

---

**ST. JOHN'S**  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR, CANADA
Statement of Significance

265 LeMarchant Road (West End Fire Station)

Formal Recognition Type
City of St. John’s Heritage Building, Structure, Land or Area

Description of Historic Place
265 LeMarchant Road is two-storey, concrete structure located in St. John’s, NL. The designation is confined to the footprint of the building.

Heritage Value
265 LeMarchant Road has been designated because of its aesthetic and historic values.

265 LeMarchant Road achieves aesthetic value because it is a good surviving example of an early Modernist Architecture structure in St. John’s. Features of this style include: clean, minimal lines, two storey concrete construction, smooth surface, flat roof, rounded columns, simple window and door design, and slightly recessed windows. The building was also designed with stables at the rear of the building. The original building contained glass block around the main entrance in the transom and side lights, as well as steel signage with individual lettering. Both elements are characteristics of Modernist Architecture but have since been removed. The building also originally had three rounded columns and three bays, however one column was removed in 1973 in order to install two new garage doors. The structure has been renovated over the years, but the character of the building remains generally unchanged.

The West End Fire Station was built at a time when the city was expanding away from the downtown and Modernist Architecture buildings were beginning to emerge in these
new suburban areas. This building achieves historic value because it was the first concrete building in the LeMarchant Road area and the start of a cluster of concrete building developments. The West End Fire Station was built between 1942 and 1944 by the firm of William D. McCarter, Architect, with assistance of his draughtsman, Frederick Colbourne. McCarter and Colbourne went on to design other concrete buildings such as the American Aerated Water Company Building at 278 LeMarchant Road (now a provincial owned building) and Colbourne designed the Cornwall Theatre at 264 LeMarchant Road (now Smith Stockley). These buildings create an enclave of Modern Architecture in St. John’s and development the West End Fire Station played a prominent part in introducing that trend.

Source: Designated at a regular meeting of the St. John’s Municipal Council held on December 13, 2021. The St. John’s Heritage Designation (265 LeMarchant Road, PID #13652) By-Law came into effect on December 17, 2021, upon notice in The Newfoundland and Labrador Gazette.

**Character Defining Elements**
All elements that define the building’s Modern Architecture design including:
- clean, minimal line
- two storey concrete construction
- smooth surface
- flat roof
- rounded columns
- simple window and door design

**Location and History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>St. John’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>City of St. John’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Address</td>
<td>265 LeMarchant Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1942-1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>William D. McCarter, Architect, with assistance of his draughtsman, Frederick Colbourne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan</td>
<td>L-Shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Great Fire and After

On the afternoon of July 8, 1892, a labourer dropped his lit pipe in the hay in the stable of Timothy O'Brien, close to the junction of Freshwater and Pennywell Roads at the top of Long's Hill, St. John's, Newfoundland. The hay caught fire, and soon so did the stable.

By some odd coincidence, the water supply to the area had been turned off that very morning in order to make some new connections of mains. It had been reconnected, but its force on the high ground was slight. A nearby water supply tank had been emptied the previous evening by firemen practising their hose work, and had not been filled.

The fire from the stable quickly grew, and fanned by strong winds coming from the north-west, it hurled sparks far and wide on the roofs of nearby wooden houses. For a month before hardly any rain had fallen. By the end of the day, nearly the entire city was reduced to ashes. Hundreds upon hundreds of houses and businesses burned to the ground. The total loss was estimated at $13,000,000 with over 11,000 people left homeless. This was the St. John's Great Fire, perhaps the darkest single day in the history of the city.

Judge D.W. Prowse was approached to investigate the fire and the response of the local fire brigades. In his report Prowse described the organization of the fire brigades as "starved, mismanaged, rotten". He noted that if City Council was unwilling to improve the fire brigade, the Newfoundland Government would have to take steps to ensure that another Great Fire did not occur.

In November 1892 the Government acted on the advice of Prowse and sent John R. McCowen, the Superintendent of the Penitentiary, to tour fire departments elsewhere in North America and evaluate their equipment and organization. In January 1893 McCowen tabled his report with the Government, stating that the brigade was "disgracefully equipped" and making fourteen recommendations to improve the situation. He recommended either a paid fire department or a combined police and fire department, noting that a combined force would cost $12,000 less.

In March 1893 John Sullivan of the Newfoundland Constabulary was sent to Montreal to buy the necessary equipment for the proposed fire department. Three new fire stations were commissioned to be built in June 1893 and were to be opened in November of that year. The openings were delayed, however, until April 1894. As well, legislation was passed in 1893 appointing a Board of Commissioners who supported the idea of a mixed police and fire department. The Fire Department Act of 1895 placed the proposed new force under the control of the Inspector-General of the
Constabulary, and it remained a part of the Constabulary until May 28th, 1957.

The legislation also divided St. John's into three districts, each of which contained one of three new fire stations. The Central district included the area between King's Road and Adelaide Street. The Eastern District included the area east of King's Road, and the Western District included the area west of Adelaide Street including the South Side. By the end of 1895 there were three new fire stations, housing in total twenty-two paid firemen. The Government worked out an arrangement to share the cost of the fire department with the St. John's Municipal Council.

Central Fire Station

The Board of Commissioners recommended that a new Central Station should be erected to form the headquarters of the department, to be equipped with 1 steam fire engine, 1 chemical engine, 2 Badcock chemical extinguishers, 1 hook and ladder truck, 1 horse hose reel, 1 ambulance wagon, 1 salvage or police patrol wagon, 3000 feet of hose, 8 horses, 10 men and 12 fire alarm boxes (Fox 95).

The site for the Central Station was chosen to be Fort Townshend, off Bonaventure Avenue. The site chosen was the former site of the old Government House, a two storey wooden dwelling house designed by Lt. John Caddy as the summer residence of the Governor of Newfoundland, which had been erected in 1779. Repaired and enlarged in 1812, it was found to be unfit for year round occupation by 1817, but continued as the official home of the Governor until the construction of the current Government House in 1829. By the late 1800's, there was nothing on that particular site, but the 1889 insurance atlas for St. John's does show a two-storey hose house south of where the building was to be constructed.

The fire hall building was constructed from 1893 to 1894, and is visible on the 1893-1907 city insurance atlas. The building was of wooden construction, 3 ½ storeys high with an imposing five storey tower in the south east corner. At the time of its construction the tower would have had a most commanding view of the entire city, and was the perfect location for a fire lookout. It was officially opened July 8, 1895.

Originally constructed to stand alone, there were a number of additions made to the station over
the years. By 1914, a narrow wooden hook and ladder shed was constructed along the west face of
the building, with an exterior alarm bell tower to the immediate south west of the building. The
station had a two storey stable at the rear, one outbuilding also behind the station, and was listed as
having offices on the second floor.

Around 1921 or 1922, and visible on maps from 1925, the hook and ladder shed had been replaced
with a two storey, shed roof addition, with two bays for trucks or wagons in the front facade. The
addition had a dormitory at the front and rear of the second storey, with a large drill room in the
centre. By 1925 as well, there was a two storey stable to the rear of the station proper, and the
original outbuilding had been joined to the main hall by the construction of a one storey linking
building.

The main floor of the station was used for the engines, cars and "all the necessary equipment for
fighting fires" (City 26). The upper storeys were used as barracks for firefighters. A 1920 article
in the *Newfoundland Quarterly* noted that:

> Very excellent quarters have been provided for the single men of the Department
> [sic], who were formerly scattered in different parts of the City. They have a very
> large and airy dormitory and a dining room, kitchen, reading room and recreation
> room provide them with suitable conveniences. Everything is kept in a very clean and
> orderly manner. Other points of interest to the visitor are the drill room and apparatus
> controlling the fire signals throughout the City (City 26).

The upper levels of the Central Fire Hall, along with the East and West stations, also served as
barracks for single constables of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary until 1936. The words of
a former constable barracked in the Central Fire Hall differ greatly from the glowing description of
the *Newfoundland Quarterly* writer:

> There were the fire trucks on the main floor, and some of them seventeen- or
> eighteen-hundred-pound horses were out in the back. In the morning around seven
> o'clock now, they'd start up the fire engines. Of course as soon as they started up the
> engines you know, the fumes from the trucks, the smell of the barn, and everything
> would just be stirred up, and it used to come right up through the three floors, right
> up the pole to the third. We slept there with the stink of that. We didn't have cots, we
> had bunks built up on the side of the wall. The hay was stored in another part of it
> there, and the fleas would get in the hay. There was fleas, and you name it. It was
> never as bad as that out to the seal fishery in my time (Kenny and Wentzel, 26).

In spite of the stink and the fleas, the Central Fire Station continued to use horses and stable them
on site. As late as 1935, the station still housed a 1895 horse-drawn Merryweather model pumper.

Starting in the mid 1930s however, there were a number of changes made to the Fire Department,
largely the work of Patrick O'Neill. Patrick J. O’Neill was born at Witless Bay on March 10, 1883 and entered the police force in 1903. He was promoted to Sergeant in 1907, Head Constable in 1920, Superintendent in 1922, and on August 8, 1934 was appointed to the new office of Chief of Police and Head of the St. John’s Fire Department.

As Head of the Department, O’Neill was instrumental in its reorganization. His aim was to put the department on a footing equal to or better than departments elsewhere. His improvements included instituting a system of promotions and retirements, and an increase in numbers of paid employees to a total of forty men by 1935. O’Neill was also responsible for updating the city’s fire alarm system and ordering two additional fire engines (Fox 124).

Changes in fire fighting technology, organization of the department, and deficiencies in the old wooden station meant that a new station was required. According to a dated photograph in the July 1937 edition of the *Newfoundland Quarterly*, the wood fire hall was standing on May 2nd of that year. Then, on the 25th of May, 1937, then Governor Humphrey Walwyn wrote the following letter to The Right Honourable Malcolm MacDonald, M.P., Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs:

I have the honour to inform you that it is necessary to build a new Central Fire Hall to replace the present building which was erected in 1894 and is a wooden structure consisting of a three-storey main block with a two-story side annex and a single-story rear annex. It was used jointly as a fire station and a residence for the unmarried men of the Newfoundland Constabulary until early in 1936 when the police were transferred to the newly erected barracks. In October last the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works made a detailed examination of the building. He reported that the whole structure was distorted to an alarming degree, beams were deflected and generally the building was in a most unstable condition. He advised that any attempt to strengthen the structure would be a waste of money. The building has been under constant observation and, to prevent an immediate collapse, it has been necessary to augment the trusses which carry the main floor.

2. To continue the use of the present building for any extended period would be to risk disaster and it is therefore a matter of urgency to proceed with the erection of a new fire station with the greatest possible dispatch. Plans have been prepared for a new concrete and steel framed structure 79 feet long x 68 feet wide consisting of a partly excavated basement, ground floor and upper floor.

The excavated portion of the basement (79 feet x 22 feet) contains the furnace room, fuel store, a small ammunition room and a miniature rifle range for police use. The whole of the ground floor is taken up with the fire fighting apparatus and stalls for five horses.
The upper floor provides the following accommodation:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory for Firemen</td>
<td>30' 0&quot; x 27' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day room for Firemen</td>
<td>31' 6&quot; x 13' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor's Workshop</td>
<td>31' 0&quot; x 17' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's Office</td>
<td>10' 6&quot; x 7' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's Bedroom</td>
<td>11' 0&quot; x 11' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers Bedroom</td>
<td>11' 0&quot; x 10' 6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do.</td>
<td>11' 0&quot; x 9' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Drill Room</td>
<td>34' 0&quot; x 27' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavatory (3 W.C's, Urinal, 1 Bath, 1 Shower)</td>
<td>20' 0&quot; x 11' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay Store</td>
<td>27' 0&quot; x 10' 6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Bins</td>
<td>25' 0&quot; x 11' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A hose-drying tower runs from the ground floor to the top of the building. A separate entrance to the drill room has been provided for the police. All external and basement walls are concrete. The rooms on the upper floors are formed by plastered wood stud partitions. The basement and ground floors are of concrete and the upper floor of wood supported by steel girders. The roof is covered with pitch and gravel. Steel window sashes are used throughout the building and the apparatus doors are specifically designed for rapid opening. The building is heated by low pressure steam radiators.

3. It is estimated that the new building will cost $60,000 and, as it is proposed that the work should be begun with the least possible delay, the Commission of Government would be glad to receive by telegraph your authority to proceed. Provision has been included in the draft Estimates for 1937-38 (GN 38).

Demolition of the old structure and the construction of the new hall was underway at least by August of 1937, with a Mr. Thompson acting as foreman. The modern Central Fire Station was officially opened in 1938, the same year as a new Police Drill Hall was also opened at Fort Townshend. The building first appears on the 1942 Ryan map of St. John's.

The current fire hall is one of the older poured concrete buildings standing in St. John's. It is designed in a restrained Classical Revival style, most evident in its use of heavy exterior pilasters and heavy...
cornice moulding. The building has a symmetrical facade, with large garage doors. Plans for the building were largely drawn up by a "C.H.C." of the Department of Public Works, while the steel framing plans for the building were drawn up by the United States Steel Products Co. and the American Bridge Co., of New York. The glass for the building was provided locally by Thomas Glass.

The building was constructed with a very slight pitch to the roof (1 in 48). Revised plans included a skylight over the tailor's shop and the inclusion of a quartermaster's store, also with a skylight. Originally, this building had multi-pane casement windows in the upper storey, with the lower storey windows being larger 12 pane windows, with the upper central 4 panes forming an operable awning style window. These windows were kept in the building at least until 1963. At some point after this they were replaced with windows of a more modern material and design, although the original window openings were maintained. Plans were also drawn up in 1943 for changes to the original kitchen and dining room layout, and additional plans for a large built in refrigerator were drawn up in 1944. Changes were proposed to the main doors in 1950, which had apparently been the cause of some problems. In 1952, further plans were drawn up for the construction of the drill tower which stands today to the north west of the building.

West End Fire Station

The Central Fire Station was supported by two sister stations, and two smaller sub-stations. The original West End Fire Station, or Fire Station #3, was constructed on New Gower Street, at the intersection of New Gower Street and what was then Bambrick's Street, close to the Horwood Lumber lot off Springdale Street. The exact date of its construction is not known, but a wooden building is shown, labelled as "Western Fire Station 3" on the 1880-1889 insurance atlas, with a 1 ½ storey stable at the rear and an "Alarm Bell" located quite close to the middle of New Gower Street. This structure was probably quite similar to that built by the Central Fire Station. The same fire station building is shown on the 1893-1902 insurance atlas, but the alarm bell was apparently moved off the street by this time.

The West End station was equipped circa 1895 with 1 steam fire engine, 1 horse hose reel, 2 Badcock chemical extinguishers, 2000 feet of hose, 3 horses, 6 men and 8 fire alarm boxes (Fox 95). By 1920 the station also boasted an American-LaFrance motor car, a combination chemical engine and hose car, with a 105 horse power six cylinder motor and ten inch electric searchlight. Concerns were raised at the time whether such a contraption would be able to navigate the winter streets of St. John's (City 26-27).

The West End Fire Station was on New Gower Street at least until July 1931, as it appears on dated maps drawn for the widening of the street. Like the old Central Station however, the wooden station had its fair share of problems. In November of 1938, Superintendent M. Codner wrote that the main stringers supporting the main floor of the building were so rotten, that there was a danger of the fire engine falling though the floor!
There were other reasons for a new station as well. In September of 1941, the Commissioner for Justice and Defense wrote,

I am very much alarmed at the rapidity with which all land in the vicinity of Cornwall Avenue is being built up. In another twelve months there will be practically nothing left. I therefore urge most strongly that a piece of land be acquired immediately for the purpose of the West End Fire Hall, and held until we are in a position to build. The area west and north of LeMarchant Road and Cornwall Avenue has, as you are aware become thickly populated in recent years and the expansion no in that direction has increased and continues to increase with great speed. It is essential for the protection of that area that a fire station should be placed there. In that location it will act as a protection for the lower part of the town to the same extent as the present Fire Hall (GN 13).

As a result, a more modern facility was constructed on LeMarchant Road, c1942. Unlike the Central Fire Station, the new West End Station was designed by an architect outside of the Department of Public Works. The building was designed by the firm of William D. McCarter, Architect, who had his offices in the Royal Bank Building, St. John's. Between 1942 and 1944, the firm drew up a very detailed series of blueprint plans, diagrams and sections, which have been deposited into the collections of the Provincial Archives.

The building at #205 LeMarchant Road first appears on the 1942 Ryan map of St. John's as an L-shaped concrete building. On the 1946 Insurance Atlas, the building is drawn as having 2 storeys and a basement, with stables at the rear. Interestingly, Bennett's Brook is shown on the 1942 plan as flowing to the west of the building, while the 1946 plan shows the brook flowing directly underneath the structure. For a number of years, both the LeMarchant Road Station and the wooden New Gower station were used. Operations shifted entirely to the LeMarchant location in 1945, and the old station was demolished in June of 1946.

East End Fire Station (Fire Station # 2)

The East End Station on Duckworth Street is the newest of the three downtown fire halls. Like the
Central Station, it is the second fire hall on the site. Before the Great Fire of 1892, the spot was occupied by the Water Works pipe yard, and specifically by the pipe yard workshop and stores. The original station was constructed c1893-1895, and first appears on the 1893-1902 insurance atlas.

The original building was a wooden 3 ½ storey structure, with a two storey stable/hayloft in the rear. Its original 1895 equipment included 1 steam fire engine, 1 horse hose reel, 2 Badcock chemical extinguishers, 2000 feet of hose, 3 horses, 6 men and 15 fire alarm boxes (Fox 95). By 1925 it had introduced a motor combination chemical truck, and an ambulance wagon. By 1946 it had added a set of extension ladders. Photographs from the late 1940s show the wooden building still in existence.

Again, as time wore on, the wooden structure became less and less usable. From a series of letters to his superiors spanning several years, it seems that the then Superintendent F. Vivian fought an ongoing battle to keep the building in one piece. By 1942 the building was apparently in danger of collapse, and while repairs stabilized the building, it was the start of the end. By the mid forties there was no hot water for cleaning or other purposes. The windows were in deplorable condition, some falling out, many with no putty, forcing officers to move their beds to avoid rain and snow falling on them. Even the brass fireman's pole was in bad shape, sinking into the soft ground, and despite temporary fixes, unusable in times of emergency.

On July 8th, 1947, Vivian wrote,

> The apparatus floor is of rough timber and holds dust and dirt which makes it impossible for it to be swept or washed clean. The floors in the dormitory and bedrooms are warped and twisted to such an extent that it even makes walking dangerous, this is due to the building sagging over a period of years. The window frames and sashes are practically falling out on the street. The chimney has been smoking for a long time and a short while ago it was swept and it still smokes, which makes life very uncomfortable when men are arranging their meals. The range is a very large one, infact [sic] it is a ship's range which has been in use for a number of years and it in my opinion has outlived its usefulness. The dining-room and kitchen where the men have to prepare and eat their meals is in a desperate condition which is due to the dilapidated condition of the building. The electric wiring is a knob and tube job and is definitely a fire hazard (GN 13).
Vivian closed his letter with the hope that "arrangements will be made within the year to have the East End Station replaced by a new one, as this is urgently needed" (GN 13). Apparently, his letters work, and the building was replaced with a concrete structure similar in design to the West End Station. This building was designed by the Department of Public Works, with plans drawn up by the same "CHC" who drew up the plans for the Central Fire Station. A series of plans, dating from January to July of 1948, are currently on file at the Provincial Archives.

On the 1962 St. John's Insurance Atlas, the wooden fire hall has been replaced by the modern reinforced concrete station, two storeys high with a basement, very similar in design to the West End Station. The building is currently owned by the City of St. John's, and administered by the Department of Building and Property Management.

Sub-Stations

In addition to the three main stations, there were also two smaller sub-stations. The first was on Cookstown Road, at the intersection with Freshwater Road. This was a 1 ½ storey detached concrete building, with a 20,000 gallon capacity water storage tank. On the 1925 insurance atlas it is listed as a sub fire station, housing one steam engine, one hose reel, and 1,000 feet of hose. It first appears on the 1893-1907 insurance atlas listed as a "Fire Engine House". By 1920, there was also a fire hall on the Southside equipped with a hand fire engine, hose reels and ladders (City 27).
Heritage Recommendations
Central Fire Station

• The Central Fire Station is one of the oldest poured concrete buildings standing in the city, and is somewhat unique in an architectural context. Of the three downtown concrete fire stations, this is the finest example. It is in good condition, and is something of a local landmark. Given the construction of the building, it would be very difficult to move.

• If the building is to be demolished, it is the recommendation of the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador that proper steps be undertaken to ensure the building is properly documented. This should include a complete photographic record of the interior and exterior of the building and its demolition. Copies of all documentary material should be deposited in the collections of the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the City of St. John's Archives.
Central Fire Station
Additional Photographs

Front Facade, pilaster and door detail

Firefighters' Monument

Fire Station, rear facade

Training Tower
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LeMarchant Road: An Enclave of Mid-Century Modernist Structures in St. John’s, NL

By Eddy O’Toole and Jerry Dick

Research and writing for this report was completed in 2017. It was edited for publication in 2021.

Introduction

The 1940s brought significant change to St. John’s. An influx of American and Canadian troops, who established bases in and around St. John’s during the war, brought with them North American cultural influences and contributed to a booming economy and population growth. With this came new ways of thinking about buildings. The city’s traditional Georgian and Victorian wood, brick and stone residential and commercial structures gradually gave way to buildings of a “Modernist” design. Often built of concrete and steel, these structures generally had little in the way of decoration with the exception of a number of Art Deco buildings.

Modernist architecture sought to break with the styles and “excessive” decorative treatments of the past and to employ a “modern” industrial aesthetic where form was a direct expression of function. Some of the early modern buildings in the city reflected the Art Deco style, characterized by sleek lines but also fine craftsmanship, and a pastiche of decorative styles that represented luxury, glamour, exuberance, and faith in social and technological progress.

A cluster of buildings near the intersection of Bennett Avenue and LeMarchant Road are a testament to this era in St. John’s which saw the city expand rapidly in the west end. While most have been changed over the years and have lost some of their original features, the simple elegance and refinement of these buildings remain. Most were designed by the St. John’s architectural firm of McCarter and Colbourne which give these buildings a certain cohesion.


For a more detailed look at this era of architecture in Newfoundland and Labrador see Robert Mellin’s 2011 book, *Newfoundland Modern: Architecture in the Smallwood Years 1949-1972* which was a source for much of the information in this report.

An excerpt from a 1946 insurance map depicting the corner of LeMarchant Rd. and Bennett Ave. West Fire Hall (bottom middle) and St. Michael’s (top left) have already been constructed.  
*Source: The Rooms Archives.*

**Structures**

**West Fire Station (265 LeMarchant Rd.)**  
William D. McCarter and Frederick A. Colbourne

*West Fire Station in the early 1960s. Source: The Rooms Archives.*

The earliest of the buildings in this cluster, the West Fire Station, was first conceived in January 1940 to service new development in the west end of St. John’s. Newfoundland’s Chief of Police recognized that the city was moving westward and suggested three possible locations to replace the deteriorated Western Station on New Gower. High demand for land in the area of LeMarchant and Bennett increased the price of the two most desirable parcels. A portion of land at the rear of the government’s Highroads Garage was unenthusiastically selected to be the station’s site as it would have to be built immediately adjacent to an active brook. In addition to deliberating on an effective location, the Chief explored ideas to modernize accommodations from those that existed at the old Western Station. The building program for the new structure called for horse stables which the project architect opposed, “as the presence of horses in the same building is objectionable for many reasons” (Mellin 2011, 30).

Initial plans for the station were provided by Montreal architect A. J. C. Paine. The final construction plans were completed in April 1942 by local architect William D. McCarter and his draughtsman, Frederick A. Colbourne. On its upper floor, the two-storey structure was designed to house fifteen firemen and three officers. Below, a 55-foot, three-bay garage would house the station’s equipment, with 12 feet of additional accommodation for three horses. Horses were deemed more effective at hauling fire-fighting equipment through heavy snow than the fire trucks of the period. A full basement and hose tower were also included.

The station’s facade was simple with subtle design elements including a slightly recessed row of upper windows and large, rounded columns that separated the three garage bays. Glass block, a common modernist material, was used for the transom and sidelights of the main entrance. The building’s sign, located above the garage doors, was fabricated in individual steel letters projecting from the building in a clean, modern font.

The war effort delayed construction. Originally the building had been designed as a steel structure but steel shortages led to a change in design in 1942 to reinforced concrete. Difficulties in accessing steel reinforcing bars further delayed construction until the summer of 1944. During
this time, plans for the horse stables were moved from inside of the equipment garage to the basement level, accessible at the lower west side of the station. The building was finally occupied by the Fire Department the following summer.

A number of problems arose in the years after the West Fire Station’s construction. As the structure settled, multiple cracks opened in its concrete joints which leaked when engines were washed or rain blew in. Additionally, its placement adjacent to the brook left the basement prone to flooding. When the storm drains of Lemarchant were clogged, water would rush down into this level and destroy all the horse feed and leave behind a layer of silt.

In June of 1973 the front facade’s eastern-most column was removed and two new aluminum garage doors were installed onto the station. Since then, the glass blocks around the main entrance have been removed as well but the basic sense of the original design remains.

St. Michael’s Anglican School, later I.J. Samson Jr. High (Bennett Ave.)
Frederick A. Colbourne

As the city spread westward, additional schools were required in the area. Curtis Academy and St. Michael’s Anglican School were the first to service this area of town. The former was built in a style common in the interwar period with somewhat classical detailing. St. Michael’s, which later became I.J. Samson Jr. High, was, at the time of its construction, the largest Church of England school built in the province. It was designed by Colbourne in a much more pared-down fashion than Curtis Academy. Its decoration was reduced to horizontal bands of recessed lines, a feature used by Colbourne on other buildings in the neighbourhood. The symmetrical two-storey structure was articulated with a slightly protruding central entrance and two side wings. Large window openings made of sets of three wood windows permitted lots of light to flood into the classrooms.

The school responded to the public’s desire for more diverse programming than had previously been offered at most schools.

“bearing in mind the purpose in which the school was erected...we have refrained from offering one language and one science only, rather than an offering of two languages and two sciences as at present, . . . if you can prove to the people and the government that you are better citizens and better leaders because you have been educated in a large school, then other large schools will be built.” (George 1953)

By 1953 the already large school was struggling with overcrowding. The building, originally designed to accommodate 480, now held 780 pupils such that classes spilled into the halls and prospective students were being turned away (Daily News 1953). In 1954 a large west wing and auditorium were added, increasing overall capacity for classrooms as well as a dedicated space for sports, drama, and music. This addition employed Colbourne’s horizontal banding and incorporated a large amount of glass block, common among his work of this period. This new wing supported an enrolment of 1028 in 1956.

“There is a School in Newfoundland, In the city it does stand, The School of St. Michael’s is its name, Where Many pupils have won fame. Last year was built an extra wing In which we learn to play and sing, The classrooms are modern in every way, Compared with any School today.

The Auditorium when complete Will to the pupils be a treat,
Then of Physical Training we'll all partake,
And stronger children thus will make.”
(Rendell 1954)

Since being acquired by the St. John’s School Board in 1969, windows were replaced and a large skywalk connected the original and western structures on their second floor. In 2017 the building was demolished. While not a great architectural monument, the school, together with the other structures described in this article, formed a distinctive modernist precinct in the West End of St. John’s, not to mention the memories that it held for many of its former students.

**American Aerated Water Company (278 LeMarchant Rd.)**
Frederick A. Colbourne and William D. McCarter

The factory was built by McCarter’s own construction firm, the Clayton Construction Company, and incorporated a number of features typically found on Colbourne and McCarter’s buildings of the period. According to Mellin:

“[the] building incorporated Art Deco and modernist detailing. At night, the soda-bottling operation was visible through the large front windows and the glow from the illuminated roof lantern turned the building into a local landmark. The central lantern or beacon comprised a cube with circular windows on all sides. Two wide, horizontally ribbed bands, corresponding to the heights of the first and second floor windows, were cast in the concrete, providing a horizontal emphasis. These bands contrast with pronounced verticals in the form of curved concrete fins that frame the front entrance” (Mellin 2011, 31)

These fins echoed the columns separating the garage doors of the fire hall across the road. The building also made ample use of glass block which served to screen the interior workings of the building from public view but which admitted lots of natural light.

The AAWC is visible in the background of this 1956 photo of a Lions-Kiwani’s safety patrol. Source: St. Michael’s Shield, Centre for Newfoundland Studies, MUN.

Another project by Colbourne and McCarter was the American Aerated Water Company (AAWC), a soda-bottling operation situated one block south of St. Michael’s on Lemarchant Rd. The company commissioned the construction of the building after its operations outgrew its first location on Barter’s Hill. A new drive to meet “international pure food standards” influenced the sleek, modern styling of the factory.

“[AAWC] began laying plans for...an ultra-modern plant that would not only be a credit to the industry but which upon its completion has proven to be an architectural triumph.” (Who’s Who 1948)

An AAWC ad published shortly before the move to LeMarchant Rd. Source: Newfoundland Board of Trade, Journal of Commerce, January 1946, 11.
While the company’s production quadrupled it closed its doors a short five years later. The building was purchased by the Smallwood government for $215,000 and it has remained a provincial government office building ever since, housing several different departments over the years. Until 1966 its excavated basement and rear trucking bay were used as storage for the Board of Liquor Corporation. During this time a garage door was added to the front elevation and an elevator at the rear, allowing for easier movement of stock around the premises. By 1954 two sections of glass block windows had been removed from the West end of the building. In the last couple of decades the lantern/beam was also removed.

Cornwall Theatre (264 LeMarchant Rd.)
Luke, Little, and Mace (Montreal)

The most decorative of the modernist structures in this precinct is the building that, since 1961, houses plumbing supplier Smith Stockley. The Cornwall Theatre was built between 1947 and 1948 in an Art Deco style from plans by architects Luke, Little, and Mace of Montreal, the same architects as 1944’s Paramount Theatre on Harvey Rd. It was built by Concrete Products Limited of St. John’s as something of a proof-of-concept for local concrete construction at a cost of $90,000 (Newfoundland Board of Trade 1948, 7). The theatre opened on October 8th, 1948 to a screening of Sun Valley Serenade, a film nominated for Best Cinematography and Best Music at the 1942 Academy Awards.

Movie-going was a popular after-school activity among nearby students. Source: The Curtis Academy Magazine, June 1951, 79.

On the exterior Art Deco features, all of cast-in-place concrete, included a band of curtain-like motifs spanning the facade’s third storey, flanked by two crests of the same design, embossed with the letters “CT.” Rather ornate, nine-pane windows occupied the second floor, their Mullions were arranged as a hash-symbol, with a large square centre on hinges that could be opened. Below this, a large neon sign and semi-circular marquee sheltered the main glass doors and a set of cascading concrete stairs. The 926 theatre auditorium at the rear of the building was constructed of concrete block.

Inside, floors were covered by Kentile or carpet, and wall lights were hidden from view to provide soft illumination throughout the space. In case of power failure, a battery-powered backup system was installed to engage automatically. The outfitting of the Cornwall Theatre was supervised by Alec MacKenzie of United Movies Ltd., who was praised by The Evening Telegram and the Daily News for creating a state-of-the-art experience:


All in all, the New Cornwall Theatre is the last word in modern design and up to the minute lay-out. The fact that it is so completely equipped, despite present day shortages, reflects great credit on the owners and on Mr. Alec MacKenzie of United Movies Ltd., who has supervised the outfitting of this modern showplace.

The Cornwall Theatre was an up-to-date and well-appointed facility when it opened in 1948. Source: Evening Telegram, October 1948.
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The Neighbours

In addition to the four structures described above, several nearby structures were erected by the same architects and builders in the same period.

Automobile Showroom (260 LeMarchant Rd.)

The storefront at 260 Lemarchant Road dates to the late 1940s and was designed in a style similar to Le Corbusier’s early work. Aside from its few window sills and small roof moulding, the cast-in-place structure was simply composed of plate-glass and a smooth, white, facade. A street-side glass wall vertically occupied two thirds of the front facade, and was separated by concrete columns set back an inch from the main form. Looking across the street, this method mimics that of the columns which separate the West Fire Station’s garage bay. This building was designed to serve as an automobile showroom. It was first occupied by Hudson Motor Cars followed by British Motors which remained until 1955. With many windows bricked in and a second floor added, it is substantially changed. It remains today as a show-floor for Smith Stockley.

Cox House (262 LeMarchant Rd.)

Number 262, the residence adjacent to the Cornwall Theatre, was built for Arch E. Cox and his wife. Cox was the chief engineer at McCarter’s Clayton Construction. Cox’s home is unique compared to even the most contemporary residential architecture in St. John’s at the time in its very simple cubist form. While clad in clapboard, there is no ornamentation in the way of window trim or corner boards. Like some of the other buildings described here, the second storey windows are slightly recessed from the front façade, creating a discrete shadow line.
McCarter House (282 LeMarchant Rd.)

A building at the corner of Bennett and Lemarchant, also built by McCarter and, in fact constructed as the architect’s residence, is something of an anomaly in the district. Built in 1948, the structure follows a vaguely Cape Cod style typical of what was found in many American suburbs of the time. It is curious that the architect of so many modern structures in St. John’s chose as his home a more traditional building form. Today the building serves as a pharmacy and doctor’s clinic.

Brookfield Ice Cream Factory (316 LeMarchant Rd.)

1928 but was expanded in 1947 with a “playfully designed,” Art Deco-inspired frontage (Mellin 2011, 137). The addition sported Pittsburgh Plate Glass’s (PPG) “Vitrolite” glass cladding with glass block walls illuminating work areas as at the AAWC building. With this mid-century cladding now removed, the effect is conveyed today through a horizontal corrugated metal cladding in the original black-and-cream colour palette. A current development proposal would see the former factory demolished for the construction of a mid-size residential building.

Grouchy’s (340 LeMarchant Rd.)

The former Avalon Garage and Service Station, also known as Grouchy’s after owner Frank Grouchy, is located a stone’s throw from the Brookfield building. Built of cast-in-place concrete in 1929, Grouchy’s exhibits Art Deco stylistic elements including the central rounded crest, stepped caps atop the repeated pilasters, and recessed rectangular panels along the frieze. The station, located on what was then on a major road artery leading in and out of the city, was meant to evoke the sleek sophistication of the automobile era. The building was eventually acquired by Brookfield (later Scotsburn) for use as a warehouse.

Several doors down from the contiguous enclave described above are two further examples of mid-century construction. Brookfield Ice Cream had been established on LeMarchant Rd. since
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## Development Permits List

**For the Period of May 19 to May 25, 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>IND</td>
<td>Homeworx</td>
<td>Construction of Modular Homes</td>
<td>86 O’Leary Avenue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>22-05-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>165B Doyle’s Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>22-05-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subdivision for 3 additional Townhouses</td>
<td>45 Goodridge Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>22-05-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Newfoundland Power Inc.</td>
<td>Distribution &amp; Street Lighting – Cedar Hill Place</td>
<td>Southlands Area 9 Stage 2B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>22-05-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

** 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 & Development

__________________________________________________________
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## Building Permits List
### Council's May 30, 2022, Regular Meeting

Permits Issued: 2022/05/19 to 2022/05/25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class: Residential</th>
<th>10 Kent Pl</th>
<th>Site Work</th>
<th>Single Detached Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 Great Eastern Ave</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 Springdale St</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Botwood Pl</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Terry Lane</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Terry Lane</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156 Portugal Cove Rd Apt 506</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Condominium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163 Castle Bridge Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Redberry St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Winnipeg St</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Dunkerry Cres</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Melville Pl</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Regiment Rd</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228 Lemarchant Rd</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Semi Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22a Shaw St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Duplex Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22a Shaw St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Duplex Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Bond St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Semi Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Maurice Putt Cres</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 Mundy Pond Rd</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Dooling's Line</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Frampton Ave</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Dartmouth Pl</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 New Cove Rd</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Myrick Pl</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>419 Allandale Rd</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Burns Pl</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Edison Pl</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Edison Pl</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 Tigress St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Old Bay Bulls Rd</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Ballylee Cres  Fence  Fence
7 Emerson St  Site Work  Single Detached Dwelling
7 Guzzwell Dr  Site Work  Retaining Walls
83 Wabush Pl  Change of Occupancy  Accessory Building
9 Mogridge St  Renovations  Single Detached Dwelling
90 Topsail Rd  Extension  Single Detached Dwelling

This Week: $2,042,445.55

Class: Commercial

13 Stavanger Dr  Sign  Restaurant
145 Lemarchant Rd  Renovations  Office
145 Lemarchant Rd  Site Work  Driveway
145 Lemarchant Rd  Fence  Fence
156 Portugal Cove Rd  Renovations  Condominium
162 Duckworth St  Renovations  Retail Store
166 Water St  Change of Occupancy/Renovations  Retail Store
187 Water St  Change of Occupancy  Patio Deck
190 Pennywell Rd  Change of Occupancy/Renovations  Home For the Aged
199 Water St  Change of Occupancy  Patio Deck
332 Water St  Change of Occupancy  Patio Deck
339 Duckworth St  Renovations  Office
346 Water St  Change of Occupancy  Patio Deck
346 Water St  Change of Occupancy  Patio Deck
379 Duckworth St  Change of Occupancy  Patio Deck

This Week: $1,706,608.95

Class: Government/Institutional

This Week: $0.00

Class: Industrial

31 Barrows Rd  Site Work  Harbour Use

This Week: $2,000.00

Class: Demolition

This Week: $0.00

This Week's Total: $3,751,054.50
Repair Permits Issued 2022/05/19 to 2022/05/25: $10,000.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>% VARIANCE (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$17,303,943.15</td>
<td>$28,039,236.61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$83,604,629.54</td>
<td>$26,419,206.47</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Institutional</td>
<td>$799,941.00</td>
<td>$467,288.00</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$4,147,500.00</td>
<td>$31,000.00</td>
<td>-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>$2,311,157.50</td>
<td>$600,792.49</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$108,167,171.19</td>
<td>$55,557,523.57</td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (1 &amp; 2 Family Dwelling)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully Submitted,

Jason Sinyard, P.Eng., MBA
Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Weekly Payment Vouchers
For The
Week Ending May 25, 2022

Payroll

Public Works $ 474,175.40
Bi-Weekly Administration $ 771,414.56
Bi-Weekly Management $ 876,639.85
Bi-Weekly Fire Department $ 857,225.23

Accounts Payable $ 2,282,236.37

(A detailed breakdown available here)

Total: $ 5,261,691.41
BID APPROVAL NOTE

Bid # and Name: 2022068 – Supply and Delivery, For Lease, 2 New Current Production Articulating Rock Trucks – Robin Hood Bay

Date Prepared: Tuesday, May 24, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting

Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works

Ward: N/A

Department: Fleet
Division: Public Works
Quotes Obtained By: Kim Barry
Budget Code: 4331-52626
Source of Funding: Operating

Purpose:
The purpose of this open call is for a fleet replacement of 2 rock trucks for Robin Hood Bay.

Results: ☒ As attached ☐ As noted below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wajax Equipment</td>
<td>$1,610,272.32 (HST included)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Value: ☒ As above

☐ Value shown is an estimate only for a # year period. The City does not guarantee to buy specific quantities or dollar value.

Contract Duration: Scheduled delivery date is July 1, 2023, then the five (5) year lease term begins.

Bid Exception: None

Recommendation:
That Council approve for award to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, Wajax Equipment, for $1,610,272.32 (HST included), as per the Public Procurement Act.

Attachments:
## Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>2022068 - Supply and Delivery, For Lease, 2 New Current Production Articulating Rock Trucks - Robin Hood Bay.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 25, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Rick Squires - May 25, 2022 - 8:02 AM**

**Derek Coffey - May 25, 2022 - 9:19 AM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Affordable Housing Working Group Membership

Date Prepared: May 24, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft, Housing

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
Approval of Membership for the Affordable Housing Working Group (AHWG) based on the recommendation by lead staff and the Office of the City Clerk.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The Affordable Housing Working Group is responsible for providing advice to Council regarding housing system related policies, directives, and strategies as well as implementation of the 10-year Affordable Housing Strategy.

The Community Sector Representative Gail Thornhill of Stella’s Circle has completed her two-year term. A call was placed in April of 2022 seeking one representative from the community sector involved in housing solutions.

The applications have been reviewed and Staff are recommending that Nikki Browne be appointed to the AHWG. Ms. Browne is the Marguerite’s Place Program Coordinator with the St. John’s Status of Women Council. Marguerite’s Place provides housing to meet the needs of single women and non-binary people over the age of 30, without dependents in their care, living on low income, and facing barriers to stable housing. Housing Staff felt that Ms. Brown would bring a new perspective to the table which would support the pillars of the Affordable Housing Strategy.

In addition, Colin Hipditch, the Provincial Government Representative, changed positions and has been replaced by Robert Piccott, Program and Policy Development Specialist with Poverty Reduction - Children, Seniors, and Social Development.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: N/A

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Implementation of the Affordable Housing Strategy will be guided and shaped by multi-stakeholder partnerships and processes. The above representatives support and inform our Affordable Housing Strategy.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

A Connected City: Develop and deliver programs, services and public spaces that build safe, healthy and vibrant communities.

An Effective City: Achieve service excellence through collaboration, innovation and modernization grounded in client needs.

An Effective City: Work with our employees to improve organizational performance through effective processes and policies.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: Affordable Housing Strategy

5. Legal or Policy Implications: N/A

6. Privacy Implications: N/A

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Communications Staff advertised the Call for Membership.

8. Human Resource Implications: N/A

9. Procurement Implications: N/a

10. Information Technology Implications: N/A

11. Other Implications: N/A

**Recommendation:**
That Council recommend appointment of the following members to the Affordable Housing Working Group:

1. Nikki Browne, St. John’s Status of Women Council (Until June 2024)
2. Robert Piccott, Provincial Government Representative (Until June 2024)

**Prepared by:**
**Approved by:**
### Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Working Group Membership - May 30, 2022.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**No Signature found**

- **Tanya Haywood - May 24, 2022 - 2:15 PM**
- **Karen Chafe - May 24, 2022 - 2:20 PM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 150 New Gower Street, Approval, MPA1800003

Date Prepared: May 9, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Ian Froude, Planning

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
Following the 30-day period for the required paper-based commissioner’s public hearing, Council can proceed with the final steps in the amendment process for St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022, and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022, concerning a development at 150 New Gower Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City received an application from Lat49 Architecture Inc. on behalf of Manga Hotels (New Gower) Inc. to rezone land at 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone to accommodate a 13-storey, 136-room hotel with retail space along New Gower Street and a 9-storey, 86-unit residential building at the rear of the lot, closer to Pleasant Street. A Municipal Plan amendment is required to redesignate the property from the Residential District to the Commercial District. Additional information on the application, as well as analysis on the proposed amendment, can be found in the attached amendment package. The commissioner’s analysis on the submissions received can be found in the Commissioner’s Report.

At its February 28, 2022, regular meeting, Council adopted St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022, and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022. In addition to the paper-based hearing, Council set March 30, 2022, for a virtual session for those who wished to speak with the commissioner, the applicant, and/or City staff. In accordance with the Province’s Covid-19 protocol for public hearings, the City allowed at least 30 days for written submissions, which are then considered in the Commissioner’s Report.

A copy of the Commissioner’s Report is attached for Council’s review and consideration. The Commissioner recommended the following:

Acceptance of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022
Redesignate land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District; and
Acceptance of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022

Rezone land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone

Staff agree with the Commissioner’s recommendations and further recommend that Council approve St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022, as adopted.

If the attached amendments are approved by Council, they will be forwarded to the NL Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs for registration. This will conclude the municipal amendment process for this site.

Staff further recommend:

- Adopting the Land Use Report (LUR) dated October 21, 2021, including the attached revised shadow analysis prepared and submitted to the City in March 2022.
- Approving the Discretionary Use of six dwelling units on the 1st storey (ground floor) of the residential building at the rear of the lot.
  - Within the Commercial Downtown Zone dwellings units on the 2nd or higher storey are a permitted use, but dwelling units on the 1st storey are a discretionary use. Therefore, Council’s approval is required for the ground floor units.
- To set the zone standards as per the site plan in the October 21, 2021, Land Use Report.
  - Only building height, setback, building stepback and floor area ratio standards are established in the Commercial Downtown Zone with all other standards at the discretion of Council. Therefore, Council must set the standards for all other standards such as side yard, rear yard and lot area. In this case it is recommended that Council set the standards shown on the applicant’s site plan (Appendix 3 of the LUR).

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

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

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

A Sustainable City: Facilitate and create the conditions that drive the economy by being business and industry friendly; and being a location of choice for residents, businesses and visitors.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations
5. Legal or Policy Implications: Map amendments to the St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations are required.

6. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

8. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

9. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

10. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

11. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council
1) approve the attached resolutions for St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022, as adopted, regarding land at 150 New Gower Street;
2) adopt the Land Use Report (LUR) dated October 21, 2021;
3) approve the Discretionary Use of six dwelling units on the 1st storey of the residential building (at the rear of the lot); and
4) set the zone standards as per the site plan in the Land Use Report dated October 21, 2021.

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>150 New Gower Street, Approval, MPA1800003.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- 150 New Gower Street - Approval Attachments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commissioner’s Report - Rezoning of 150 NG Street May 12 - M. Ryan.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 150 New Gower Street LUAR - REDUCED.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- REVISED 150 New Gower - Shadow Study (March 2022).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>May 26, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No Signature - Task assigned to Ken O'Brien was completed by delegate Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett

Ken O'Brien - May 24, 2022 - 9:14 AM

Jason Sinyard - May 26, 2022 - 12:04 PM
City of St. John’s Municipal Plan, 2021

St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022

Residential Land Use District to Commercial Land Use District for a Hotel, Retail and Residential Building
150 New Gower Street

May 2022
RESOLUTION TO ADOPT

ST. JOHN’S Municipal Plan, 2021

Amendment Number 3, 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 3, 2022.

Adopted by the City Council of St. John’s on the 28th 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 3, 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 3, 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 3, 2022 on the 28th day of February, 2022;

2. Gave notice of the adoption of the St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022 by way of an advertisement inserted in the Telegram newspaper on the 5th day of March, 2022, on the 12th day of March, 2022, on the 19th day of March, 2022, on the 26th day of March, 2022, and on the 2nd day of April, 2022;

3. Accepted written objections and submissions for the paper public hearing until the 5th day of April, 2022; and

4. Set the 30th day of March, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom for the holding of an additional virtual session.

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 3, 2022 on the 30th day of May, 2022 as was originally adopted.

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 3, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000*.

MCIP/FCIP: ______________________________

Municipal Plan/Amendment
REGISTERED

Number _____________________________
Date _______________________________
Signature ___________________________
BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
The City wishes to rezone 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone to allow a 13-storey hotel with commercial/retail uses on the lower level and a 9-storey residential building containing 86 units. This would require a Municipal Plan Amendment to redesignate the property from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District.

Part of the property is currently zoned Commercial Downtown to accommodate the existing 12-storey hotel. If Council proceeds with this amendment, the entire property will be zoned Commercial Downtown. Parking will be shared between the existing and proposed uses. Detailed information on the development can be found in the attached Land Use Assessment Report.

The proposed new hotel will also have retail or restaurant uses on the first storey. Within the CD Zone, Hotel, Office, Retail Use and Restaurant are all Permitted Uses. With respect to the residential building, Dwelling Unit on the 2nd or higher storey is a Permitted Use and Dwellings Units on the first storey are a Discretionary Use.

The new buildings will use the existing access to the property along New Gower Street. The applicant will provide 182 parking spaces on site; 164 within two levels of underground parking and 18 surface spaces. Development or engineering staff did not have any concerns with the proposed development at this stage. Detailed plans will be required should the amendment proceed.

ANALYSIS
Location
The property is located within Planning Area 1 – Downtown. Adjacent properties to the north and east of the site along Springdale Street and New Gower Street are zoned Commercial Downtown, while properties at the rear of the site are zoned Residential Downtown. Within the RD Zone, Riverhead Towers (a 6-storey apartment building) is located just south of the site,
and a mix of single detached dwellings and townhouses are located west of the site along Pleasant Street. The Commercial Downtown Zone would be considered an appropriate zone at this location.

Policy 8.5.4 of the Municipal Plan recommends to 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. The proposed site is along a main roadway and within close proximity to Pitts Memorial Drive. Further Policy 8.5.3 promotes the growth of new commercial areas for business and retail opportunities, with the downtown as the primary focus. This application would meet this objective.

Building Height and Neighbouring Properties
The change in zoning from RD to CD would allow an increase in building height. The site is currently vacant, so this will be a change for neighbouring properties.

From Policy 6.4.1, the downtown will be treated as two distinct areas: east and west. Adelaide Street is the boundary for delineating height in the downtown. This site is located west of Adelaide Street where greater building height will be considered. The area’s lower elevation reduces the visual impact of taller buildings on the cityscape and surrounding properties, while the close proximity to Pitts Memorial Drive is also key, as this main road brings large volumes of traffic in and out of the downtown daily. The subject property is within the area where the City can accommodate taller buildings.

When considering tall buildings, Policy 6.1.6 sets out the following: ensure that tall buildings are designed and sited to:

- Contribute positively to the skyline of the city;
- Designed with a pedestrian scale at the base and a prominent roofline;
- Be integrated with adjacent areas by stepping down to lower-scale buildings and neighbourhoods;
- Consider the shadow impacts on adjacent residential areas, streets and open spaces; and
- Increase safety and security by incorporating principles for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

The applicants have provided a shadow analysis which shows that there will be morning shadowing at the rear of some properties on Pleasant Street. In the spring and summer, the shadows move off the property by 12 noon, and a little later in the fall and winter. For the hotel, the applicants have proposed curtain wall (glass) along the top of the building to help diminish some of the impacts on the skyline. The buildings have been designed with a pedestrian-scale base and have incorporated recommendations from a wind study to reduce the wind impacts on pedestrians. Building lighting has been proposed to have well lit entrance to create a safe feeling. The lot has also been integrated with the surrounding properties with trails to provide additional pedestrian connections. As the building was designed prior to the new Municipal Plan and
Development Regulations coming into effect, the residential building does not include a stepback.

Policy 6.3.3 also encourages development of mixed-use buildings in the downtown that contribute to the downtown as a “people place”. The mix of hotel, retail, restaurant and dwelling units will create activity on the site during different hours of the day, as well, the pedestrian-scale building base and trail connections will assist in making it a people place.

Heritage Review
The property is located within Heritage Area 3 and subject to the Heritage By-Law. The application was presented to the Built Heritage Experts Panel (BHEP) who recommended that the first storeys of hotel should replicate commercial buildings along Water Street, with respect to recessed entrance and window size and orientation. The proposed design has incorporated this recommendation.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION
A virtual public meeting for the proposed amendments was held January 13, 2022 via Zoom. The proposed amendments and public meeting were advertised on three occasions in The Telegram newspaper on December 18 and December 24, 2021, and January 8, 2022. A notice was also mailed to property owners within 150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website. Minutes from the public meeting and submissions received are included in the January 31, 2022 Council Meeting agenda.

Residents raised concerns over the proposed height of the building, its proximity to neighbouring properties, the possibility of increased traffic and the impacts of living next to a multi-year construction site. All concerns are considered by Council prior to making a decision on the amendment.

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 3, 2022
The St. John’s Municipal Plan is amended by:

Redesignating land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential 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. 3, 2022

[Future Land Use Map P-1]

AREA PROPOSED TO BE REDESIGNATED FROM RESIDENTIAL (R) LAND USE DISTRICT TO COMMERCIAL (C) LAND USE DISTRICT

150 NEW GOWER STREET
Parcel ID 48240

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 4, 2022

Residential Downtown (RD) Land Use Zone to
Commercial Downtown (CD) Land Use Zone
for a Hotel, Retail and Residential Building
150 New Gower Street

February 2022
URBAN AND RURAL PLANNING ACT, 2000

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT

ST. JOHN’S Development Regulations, 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 Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022.

Adopted by the City Council of St. John’s on the 28th 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 4, 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 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 Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022 on the 28th day of February, 2022;
5. Gave notice of the adoption of the St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022 by way of an advertisement inserted in the Telegram newspaper on the 5th day of March, 2022, on the 12th day of March, 2022, on the 19th day of March, 2022, on the 26th day of March, 2022, and on the 2nd day of April, 2022;
6. Accepted written objections and submissions for the paper public hearing until the 5th day of April, 2022; and
7. Set the 30th day of March, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom for the holding of an additional virtual session.

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 4, 2022 on the 30th day of May, 2022 as was originally adopted.

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 4, 2022 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000.

MCIP/FCIP: ____________________________

Development Regulations/Amendment REGISTERED

Number ____________________________
Date ____________________________
Signature ____________________
CITY OF ST. JOHN’S
Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022

PURPOSE
The City wishes to rezone 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone to allow a 13-storey hotel with commercial/retail uses on the lower level and a 9-storey residential building containing 86 units.

This amendment implements St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 3, 2022, which is being processed concurrently.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION
A virtual public meeting for the proposed amendments was held January 13, 2022 via Zoom. The proposed amendments and public meeting were advertised on three occasions in The Telegram newspaper on December 18 and December 24, 2021, and January 8, 2022. A notice was also mailed to property owners within 150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website. Minutes from the public meeting and submissions received are included in the with the Council Decision Note dated January 25, 2022, and presented at the January 31, 2022 Council Meeting.

Residents raised concerns over the proposed height of the building, its proximity to neighbouring properties, the possibility of increased traffic and the impacts of living next to a multi-year construction site. All concerns are considered by Council prior to making a decision on the amendment.

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 4, 2022
The St. John’s Development Regulations is amended by:

  Rezoning land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone as shown on City of St. John’s Zoning Map attached.
CITY OF ST. JOHN'S DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS Amendment No. 4, 2022

[City of St. John's Zoning Map]

AREA PROPOSED TO BE REZONED FROM RESIDENTIAL DOWNTOWN (RD) LAND USE ZONE TO COMMERCIAL DOWNTOWN (CD) LAND USE ZONE

150 NEW GOWER STREET
Parcel ID 48240

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

Mayor

City Clerk

Council Adoption

Provincial Registration
COMMISSIONER'S REPORT ON THE
ENVISION ST. JOHN'S MUNICIPAL PLAN
AMENDMENT No. 3, 2022

and

ENVISION ST. JOHN'S DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS
AMENDMENT No. 4, 2022

Prepared by:

Marie E. Ryan
Commissioner

May 3, 2022
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1.0 Introduction

At the Regular Meeting of the St. John’s Municipal Council (‘Council’) held on February 28, 2022, I was appointed as the Commissioner to conduct a virtual public session and prepare a report with recommendations with respect to proposed amendments to both the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan (Amendment Number 3, 2022) and Envision St. John’s Development Regulations (Amendment Number 4, 2022). The intent of these amendments is as follows:

Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan (Amendment Number 3, 2022)

Redesignate land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District

Envision St. John’s Development Regulations (Amendment Number 4, 2022)

Rezone land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone

This redesignation and rezoning of 150 New Gower Street is in response to an application to allow for a commercial use – to accommodate a 13-storey, 136-room hotel with retail space along New Gower Street, and a 9-storey, 86-unit residential building at the rear of the lot, closer to Pleasant Street.

It is important to state that the St. John’s Municipal Plan must conform to the St. John's Urban Region Regional Plan (SJURRP), which was adopted by the Province in 1976. This Plan applies to all land in the St. John’s Urban Region, which is essentially the Northeast Avalon Peninsula. The SJURRP is the Province’s principal document for determining land use and development in the Urban Region. It distinguishes between urban and rural areas, and provides protection for the Urban Region’s agricultural area, resource areas and designated scenic roads. It is the framework within which municipal plans are prepared by municipalities on the Northeast Avalon.1

My appointment as Commissioner was made by Council under the authority of Section 19 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, with the accompanying duties established in Section 21(2) and 22(1) which note that the Commissioner is to ‘[…] hear objections and representations orally or in writing […]’ and, subsequently, to submit a written report on the public hearing including recommendations arising from the hearing.

However, and of note, within the context of COVID-19, changes were made to the public hearing process. As per a “Circular to Municipalities and Planning Consultants” re Public Hearings, Registrations and Appeals, disseminated by the NL Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment:

‘As a result of the current COVID-19 public health emergency, municipalities must adapt to all public health restrictions while still carrying on necessary activities. To that end, the requirement for public hearings under Section 18 of the Urban and Rural

1 City of St. John’s. St. John’s Municipal Plan (June 2007). Section I -1.4 Relation to Other Levels of Planning. Pg. 1-4.
Planning Act, 2000 ("URPA"), still stands; however, the Province will temporarily waive the requirement to hold a physical public hearing if social distancing protocols cannot be accommodated. Municipalities are required to continue to give notice of public hearings, which must include notice that the Commissioner will only be accepting written submissions, which will be considered and reflected, where appropriate, in the Commissioner’s report to Council.

Councils should provide the public with a minimum of 30 days to provide written submissions. The public should be able to submit comments electronically, as well as in hardcopy by mail. In addition, the requirements in subsections 21(1) & (2) of URPA, which allow for the cancellation of a public hearing and for scheduling the public hearing, respectively, are temporarily waived.’

The City of St. John’s has adhered to the requirements detailed above and, also, has supplemented the 30-day submission process by holding virtual sessions, adding to and complementing the paper-based hearings.

The online virtual session for the proposed amendments related to 150 New Gower Street was scheduled for 7 p.m. on Wednesday, March 30, 2022, via Zoom. This was toward the end of the 30-day submission period, in an effort to add the most value and provide an opportunity for attendees / interested parties to speak with Your Commissioner, the applicant, and City staff, and have the potential for dialogue and discussion.

Prior to this date, and as required by legislation, the session was advertised via the ‘City Minute’ in the March 5, 12, 19, and 26, 2022 editions of The Telegram. Additionally, the amendments were publicized on the City of St. John’s website (https://www.stjohns.ca/public-notice/application-150-new-gower-street-0). Notices also were mailed out, as required, to all property owners within a minimum radius of 150 metres of the subject property; this notice provided a site plan. All of these media advised of the date, time, location, and purpose of the virtual session and noted the end date for submission of comments – April 5, 2022.

The virtual session was convened, as planned, on Wednesday, March 30, 2022, at 7 p.m. There were 12 or 13 interested persons in attendance (at any given time), including City staff, two representatives of the applicant and five or six participants. Assistance at the meeting was provided to Your Commissioner by the following City staff: Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP - Planner III, Urban Design & Heritage, Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services.

Over the 30-day period for written submissions, seven were received (via email) from six individuals. These submissions are referenced in this report under the section “Written Submissions Received” (see Section 3.0), and the full text of the submissions is found in Appendix “A”.

1.1 The Issue

The issue for Your Commissioner and the focus of the virtual session and submissions was whether or not the following two amendments should be approved. In general, the intent of the amendments are:
2.0 Background

2.1 The Application

The process leading to the virtual session and 30-day submission period for the proposed amendments was triggered by a 2018 application from Lat49 Architecture Inc. on behalf of Manga Hotels (New Gower) Inc. The application was to rezone land at 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone and Commercial Central Office (CCO) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone to accommodate a hotel with retail space along New Gower Street and a residential building at the rear of the lot, closer to Pleasant Street. In terms of surrounding zones, to the north and east of the site are Commercial (CD) Zones and to the west and south are Residential Downtown (RD) Zones.

The subject property has frontage on New Gower Street and Springdale Street, plus a small section of Pleasant Street (at the corner of Springdale). It also includes land along New Gower Street that was owned for decades by Newfoundland Power. The subject property borders the rear yards of over a dozen houses (a mix of single detached dwellings and townhouses) on Pleasant Street, as well as Riverhead Towers (a 6-storey apartment building at 30 Hamilton Avenue which is owned by the City).

At the time of the application, Manga Hotels was constructing a 12-storey hotel (Hilton Garden Inn) at the corner of New Gower Street and Springdale Street. This area of the site had been redesignated to the Commercial Downtown Land Use District and rezoned to the Commercial Central Office (CCO) Zone in 2016.

2.2 The Review Processes

The following provides an overview of the relevant correspondence and activity related to the processing of the application for rezoning 150 New Gower Street.

**October 12, 2018 – Correspondence from Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, MCIP – Planner III to the City of St. John’s Committee of the Whole**

*Background*

This correspondence to the Committee of the Whole outlined that an application had been received to rezone property at 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) and Commercial Central Office (CCO) Zones to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone to

---

*Commissioner’s Report*
allow a multi-building development. The development would include a 12-storey hotel, with the option for commercial and retail uses, and a 9-storey condominium/apartment building. This was Phase 2 of development for the site (with a 12-storey hotel being constructed at the time being Phase 1). Two levels of underground parking were to service the entire site – for both Phases 1 and 2.

This correspondence described the subject property as being relatively flat, rising up at its western end. It has an area of approximately 9,250 square metres (0.925 acre), including the hotel which was under construction at that time. The siting of the subject property in relation to New Gower Street and Pleasant Street was also described, as previously referenced in Section 2.1.

The history of the development on the site was outlined. It was noted that the area on which the existing hotel was being constructed at the corner of New Gower and Springdale Streets was redesignated and rezoned in 2016. As plans for the western half of the site had not been determined in 2016, the property was only partially rezoned to accommodate the Phase 1 hotel.

It was explained that to accommodate the multi-building development for Phase 2, the property would need to be redesigned from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District, and rezoned from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the proposed new Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone – as per the then proposed Envision St. John’s Development Regulations. It was suggested that the area on which the initial hotel was being constructed also be rezoned from the Commercial Central Office (CCO) Zone to the proposed Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone, given the site design and parking considerations were in relation to the overall site, encompassing all of the buildings. (Of note, following a Commissioner’s Hearing, this area of the site was subsequently rezoned.)

Planning and Zoning Considerations

The correspondence spoke to planning and zoning considerations both relevant to the then existing St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations, as well as those proposed under Envision St. John’s.

Overall, in relation to the existing and proposed regulatory framework, several key issues were raised:

The St. John’s Municipal Plan encourages compact urban form to reinforce older areas of St. Johns – the Commercial Downtown Land Use District under the Plan allowed areas of ‘additional height’ to a maximum of 12 storeys.

The site is located within Planning Area 1 (Downtown) under the St. John’s Municipal Plan – the overall intent for this area being a model for mixed use; combining single family housing with row housing and apartment uses, with supporting commercial and service uses. The proposed development was cited to align with this intention.

Consultations for Envision revealed a need for and interest in additional building height in appropriate locations within the downtown. Specifically, for Adelaide Street and west, it is considered appropriate for greater height. It was noted that the lower elevation in this area reduces the visual impact of taller buildings on the cityscape.
Under the proposed Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone, a Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR) was mandatory for any building over four storeys (18 metres). While it was recommended that an LUAR be undertaken, it was noted that the proposal at that time was still a preliminary concept. Under the LUAR, considerations would be required for the public realm and the relationship between the buildings, surrounding streets and sidewalks, and neighboring residential buildings. Additionally, specific engineering requirements for servicing would be reviewed and addressed within the LUAR. This correspondence further noted that the developer would be required to submit detailed engineering plans for review and approval and would have to meet all zone requirements of the Development Regulations.

The site falls within the Downtown Parking Area which requires 248 parking spaces for the combined uses across the site’s three buildings (Phases 1 and 2). The parking configuration and interim parking requirements would be addressed with the LUAR; however, it was stated that should there be deficiencies identified, the developer could ask Council for cash-in-lieu payments.

Heritage considerations

When the Phase 1 Hotel was approved, the former Heritage Advisory Committee recommended that a height greater than 10 storeys was not reflective of heritage and, therefore, the site was removed from the heritage area. However, at the time of this correspondence, it was stated that there was a need to ensure new developments are compatible in terms of style, scale, height and architectural details. With this in mind and, in consideration of input from the Built Heritage Experts Panel, the Phase 2 development was to be retained in the heritage area. Once the LUAR was completed, it was to be referred to and reviewed by the Built Heritage Experts Panel.

Key Considerations/Implications

In terms of key considerations and/or implications for the City, the following were identified:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

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

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: A City for All Seasons – Support year-round tourism and industry activity; Neighbourhoods Build Our City – Increase access to range/type of housing.

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Amendments to the St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations would be required.

5. Engagement and Communications Considerations: A public meeting chaired by an independent facilitator and advertisement of a Discretionary Use. As an amendment to the St. John’s Municipal Plan would be required, a Commissioner’s Hearing would also be required at a later date if the application were considered by Council.

6. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.
7. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

8. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

10. Other Implications: Side yard setbacks and landscaping percentages to be set by Council.

Recommendations

It was recommended that the application to rezone 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) and Commercial Central Office (CCO) Zones to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone be considered and the draft Terms of Reference for the LUAR attached to the correspondence be approved. (See Appendix “B” for these Terms of Reference.)

It was further recommended that, upon submission of a satisfactory LUAR, the application be referred to a Public Meeting chaired by an independent facilitator and the Discretionary Use of Dwelling Units on the 1st storey be advertised. It was explained that following the public meeting, the application would be referred to a regular meeting of Council for consideration.

Land Use Assessment Report – submitted by Lat49 Architecture on behalf of Manga Hotels, October 21, 2021

In 2018, Council set a Terms of Reference for an LUAR to be completed for the proposed development for 150 New Gower Street. As defined in the St. John’s Development Regulations (under which the application was considered at the time of submission and up until Envision St. John’s Development Regulations came into effect), an LUAR is “any study prepared by a suitably qualified person who is a full member of the professional society or societies that licence or recognize practitioners in the field and who has had experience directly related to the matter at hand to assess any significant impacts a use or development may have on the urban environment and/or the quality of life of its citizens.”

The LUAR presents an introduction to, and comprehensive overview of, the proposed redevelopment, as summarized below.

A. Building use

The proposed development is anticipated to include two buildings: a 13-storey hotel/commercial building with 2 storeys of retail/commercial at the base and a 9-storey residential condo building. Both buildings would be connected below grade with two levels of underground parking.

Hotel: The 13-storey hotel/commercial building will include 136 hotel rooms: floors 3 through to 13 (11 storeys of hotel rooms) each consist of 12 hotel rooms of varying types and sizes; Level 2 includes four hotel rooms sharing a floor with a meeting/conference area and fitness centre.
The proposed 2 storeys of retail/commercial space would be on the same level as the lobby of the hotel but accessed via shop entrances along New Gower Street or from the parking area on the site.

Condo: The 9-storey residential building will contain residential units on all levels. The ground floor will contain 6 residential units as well as a lobby, fitness room, party room, locker room, garbage room and utility spaces. Each level above the ground storey will contain a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units, to a total of 86. Each unit will have a balcony, and each level will contain a garbage chute leading to the Garbage Room on the ground level.

Underground Parking: The two levels of below grade parking will service the entire site and have a total of 164 parking spaces. Additionally, there will be 18 above ground spaces. A generator room (pending approval from the appropriate authorities) would be located on Level P1.

B. Elevation and building materials

Elevation: The new hotel is approximately 41 m above grade plus an additional 2.2 m to the top of the highest parapet. The proposed residential building is approximately 29 m above ground level, plus an additional 1 m to the top of the parapet.

Cladding: The hotel will be clad in four main materials (off-white panel, a pale grey panel, a wood grain panel and charcoal masonry) that create a pattern across each facade of the building. The base will be weighted by two storeys of charcoal masonry that is predominately on the retail/commercial portion of the building and wraps around the hotel side of the building to create a more pedestrian-scaled base. Additionally, the retail/commercial space area of the building follows New Gower Street and will be designed to mimic similar existing buildings/shops in the downtown core, with shop-like curtain wall glazing and inset entrances to each space. A secondary pedestrian entrance to the hotel, off New Gower Street, will be integrated into this design of the retail/commercial portion of the building.

The residential building will be clad in a charcoal metal panel at the base, which will continue up to the parapet of the three balcony bays on the front and rear elevations, with the exception of the corner balcony at the rear elevation which will be inset and clad in a yellow panel. The base of the residential building will be accented with horizontal bands that help to define the lower two levels of the building. The darker base will be accented above with colorful, clapboard-style siding and/or panels in various colours.

Lighting: On all elevations of the hotel, strip lights are to be located to accent the building design. The hotel signage will be placed at the top of the building. The lower level of the residential building will feature accent lighting that doubles as security lighting along the main walkways and entries of the building.

C. Building height and location

This section situates the proposed development on the site, as described previously, and reiterates that it will be integrated with the existing Hilton Garden Inn. It further speaks to the mass and height of the two new buildings as fitting in with existing tower developments in the immediate area: the new Hilton Hotel, the Delta Hotel and Cabot Place along New Gower
Street, and Fortis Place, located directly across the street on the south side, and 351 Water Street.

The site will feature a roundabout drop-off with 18 parking spaces at grade, ramped access to underground parking, and pathways connecting the building to the parking areas, New Gower Street and an existing path that connects with Riverhead Towers, as well as one to connect to Hamilton Avenue.

Setbacks

The hotel/commercial building is set back from the property line along New Gower Street - 5.63 m at its closest point and, at the side, the building is set back from the property line 2.76 m at its closest point and 11.9 m at its furthest.

The residential building is situated at the rear of the property and is set back from the side property line by 8.48 m at its closest point and by 5.38 m at the rear property line.

Shadowing

The shadow study presented in the LUAR was updated following a submission which raised a concern that the study needed to consider a broader area, i.e., to encompass both sides of Pleasant Street. The results of the updated shadow study were discussed during the virtual session and are summarized herein in Section 4.2.

Mechanical equipment

The hotel building will have a mechanical penthouse, and the residential building will have mechanical roof top units that will be buffered with a roof screen.

D. Building wind generation

Lat49 Architecture Inc. retained Rowan William Davies & Irwin Inc. to assess the pedestrian wind conditions arising from the proposed development, based on a number of delineated factors as laid out in Appendix 8 of the LUAR. The review identified that higher than desired wind speeds are predicted for some areas of the development, and high wind speeds with potential uncomfortable conditions are expected between the two proposed buildings during the winter. Wind mitigation measures were recommended to address these concerns. Of note, it was stated that the proposed development for 150 New Gower Street has a number of positive design features that could mitigate the impacts of wind on the site. It was further identified that additional assessment could be undertaken following the completion of the development to assess effectiveness of the measures.

E. Exterior equipment and lighting

As previously stated, lighting will be mounted or integrated into the facade of the buildings and there will be pathway lighting leading to the entrances of each building. The lighting has been designed to both highlight the architectural features and create a safe environment in and around the buildings. It is not anticipated that the lighting will impact surrounding properties.
F. Landscape and buffering

The layout of the building on the site, including the setbacks from adjoining properties, will allow for ample landscaping and buffering. It was stated that the majority of soft landscaping on the site will be along the open space between the two proposed buildings and relevant property lines. Planting (including planters) will be placed throughout the property but predominately around the pathways, parking areas and entrances of both new buildings. Trees will be distributed on the property as per the City’s Landscape Development policy and Street Tree Planting Standards. Finally, any exterior refuse containers, propane tanks, and/or transformers will be fenced or hidden by planting elements.

G. Snow clearing/Snow storage

It is noted that there is sufficient snow storage space along New Gower Street for City snow clearing and on-site for private snow clearing services to store snow on the landscaped areas.

H. Municipal water and sewer services

Requirements in relation to water, sanitary sewer and storm water runoff are anticipated to be addressed primarily by connection to and/or through existing infrastructure. An existing sanitary and storm sewer that crosses the proposed development will be intercepted and re-routed around the perimeter of the proposed development. It will be connected to the existing sewer.

The anticipated storm water runoff has been calculated based on recent climate change data. As such, it is noted that additional storage volume may be required to accommodate City of St. John’s climate change design criteria for both the existing Hilton Garden Inn site and the proposed development, as the existing tank predates the City’s climate change data.

I. Off-street parking and site access

The off-street parking requirements for the proposed development are discussed in the body of the LUAR as well as in Appendix 10, which presents the results of a review of the parking requirements for the development undertaken by Harbourside Transportation Consultants (HTC). Information is provided on the required number of spaces for both residential and non-residential development in the downtown, as set out in the City’s regulatory framework.

It summary, it is presented that the development requires a minimum of 172 parking spaces to a maximum of 263 parking spaces. Additionally, as per the Provincial Buildings Accessibility Regulations, 6% of the total number of parking spaces provided must be designed and designated as accessible spaces. In total, 182 parking spaces have been provided on-site. As such, it is stated that the development plan includes sufficient parking spaces to meet the parking requirements.

The parking plan is presented in Appendix 11. It shows where 46 parking spaces will be located for the existing hotel during the construction phase of the new development.

J. Traffic
The question of trip generation/traffic is discussed in the LUAR, including in Appendix 12 – which provides trip generation rates as assessed and presented by HTC. It is noted that there will be additional traffic generated both in the AM and PM peak periods with slightly more trips ‘in’ than ‘out’ for both periods.

K. Public transit

As seen in Appendix 9, correspondence from Metrobus identifies that the development will not impact their service or require additional infrastructure.

L. Construction timeframe

The construction timeframe for this project is anticipated to be approximately 30 months, following approvals and permits (a process anticipated to take up to four months). The proposed schedule would begin construction with the hotel portion of the project, followed by the residential component.

Worker parking will be provided as per the site plan in Appendix 11. During Phase 2, after the underground parking has been completed, workers will be able to park in the underground parking area.

Virtual Public Meeting – January 13, 2022

A virtual public meeting for the proposed amendments was held on January 13, 2022, via Zoom, following completion of the LUAR. Your Commissioner was the Facilitator for the session. The proposed amendments and public meeting were advertised three times in The Telegram on December 18 and December 24, 2021, and January 8, 2022. A notice was also mailed to property owners within 150 metres of the application site and posted on the City’s website. Aside from the City staff and representatives of the proponent, there were about eight attendees at the meeting. One of the attendees spoke, noting they had no issues with the development.

Three submissions were received in relation the public hearing, all of which were opposed to the proposed development at 150 New Gower Street. Reasons for this position included:

- The development is too much for the site and out of scale with the historically residential low-rise neighbourhood; one additional building would seem reasonable and should be the residential portion; the addition of two buildings creates a ‘wall’ of towers along New Gower Street; the construction timeline will be arduous for the surrounding neighbours who experienced construction for the existing hotel.
- The building will create additional shadowing for properties already impacted by the existing hotel, and potentially create wind issues, resulting in hazards for adjacent structures.
- Market value of residences has been impacted by the existing hotel.
January 25, 2022 – Correspondence from Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP- Planner III, Urban Design and Heritage, Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services, to the Regular Meeting of the City of St. John’s Mayor and Council

This correspondence once again referenced the application from Lat49 on behalf of Manga Hotels to rezone property at 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone. More specific information was provided about the proposed multi-use building, both within the body of the correspondence and in information on the amendments, which was attached to the correspondence. Specifically, it was stated that the proposed development was to accommodate a 13-storey, 136 room hotel with retail or restaurant uses along New Gower Street and a 9-storey, 86-unit residential building at the rear of the lot, closer to Pleasant Street.

Further, it was stated that this proposal would require a Municipal Plan amendment from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District.

Alignment with the St. John’s Urban Region Regional Plan

The proposed Municipal Plan amendment was said to be in line with the SJURRP and so an amendment to the SJURRP would not be needed. The subject property is within the Urban Development designation of the Regional Plan.

Planning and Zoning Considerations

Within the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone, hotel, office, retail use and restaurant are all permitted uses. With respect to the residential building, dwelling units on the 2nd or higher storey are a permitted use, and dwellings units on the 1st storey are a discretionary use.

The new buildings will use the existing access to the property along New Gower Street. The applicant will provide 182 parking spaces on site; 164 within two levels of underground parking and 18 surface spaces.

It was reiterated that the proposed development meets key objectives and policies of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan including:

- Designating lands for commercial use in appropriate locations, with the downtown being considered the primary focus for growth of new commercial areas.
- Allowing greater building height in areas west of Adelaide Street.
- Contributing to the downtown as a ‘people place’ by encouraging development of mixed-use buildings.

Heritage Review

The application was presented to the Built Heritage Experts Panel. The proposed design has incorporated the panel’s recommendation that the 1st storey of the hotel should replicate commercial buildings along Water Street, with respect to a recessed entrance and window size and orientation.

The public meeting
This correspondence notes, as previously referenced, that no concerns were raised at the public meeting, although some were raised in the submissions. The efforts the applicant has made to address issues of shadowing and wind were discussed. It was cited that the subject property is at a lower elevation than Pleasant Street, and this grade difference helps reduce the impact of the 9-storey building; the residential building is approximately 6 to 7 storeys above Pleasant Street.

Further, the applicants have attempted to mitigate shadowing impacts by setting the building between about 5.4 and 6.3 metres from the Pleasant Street lot boundaries.

The issue of concern regarding the height of the buildings and ‘wall’ effect was recognized but, again, it was stated that this part of downtown has been recommended for additional building height in the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan. Additionally, it was highlighted that the building along New Gower Street steps back above the 2nd storey to reduce the effect of a ‘wall’ along the street.

The issue of stepbacks in relation to a building which abuts a residential zone also was discussed in this correspondence. It was felt that, while Section 7.1.4 of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations cites this requirement, given the application was submitted and reviewed under the former regulatory framework, Council could consider the application within this context.

**Key Considerations/Implications**

In terms of key considerations and/or implications for the City, there were minor changes from those identified earlier:

**Provincial Review**

In terms of next steps, it was stated that should Council adopt the amendments in-principle, a copy would be forwarded to the NL Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs for review, as required by the Urban and Rural Planning Act. A public hearing would be required following provincial review and release. Adoption of the LUAR, approval of the discretionary use, and setting the lot standards would occur at the approval stage.

**Recommendation**

The recommendation was that Council adopt-in-principle the resolutions for the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment 3, 2022 and St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment 4, 2022, regarding land at 150 New Gower Street.

**February 9, 2022 – Correspondence from Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP - Planner III, Urban Design and Heritage, Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services, to Elaine Mitchell, Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs**

This correspondence presented the amendments related to 150 New Gower Street and overviewed the process for the application to the date of the correspondence. It requested a Provincial review and release for the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022 and Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022. It was stated that, upon issuance of the Provincial release, the amendments would be referred to
Council for consideration of formal adoption and a Commissioner would be appointed to conduct a public hearing on the amendments.

**February 14, 2022 – Correspondence from Elaine Mitchell, MCIP, Planner III, Local Governance and Land Use Planning Division, Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, to Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP, City of St. John’s**

This correspondence detailed that, in keeping with the requirements of Section 15 of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000, staff with the Local Governance and Land Use Planning Division reviewed the documentation provided by the City to determine any Provincial or agency interests. Based on this review, the documents were released from Provincial review on behalf of the Department. This correspondence further stated that Council could now consider the documents for adoption and schedule a public hearing and noted the change in approach to holding public hearings, as previously overviewed, to focus on a 30-day period for written submissions.

**February 21, 2022, Correspondence from Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP- Planner III, Urban Design and Heritage, Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services, to the Regular Meeting of the City of St. John’s Mayor and Council**

This correspondence once again outlined the background to the application for rezoning of 150 New Gower Street, the amendments required to both the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations to accommodate the application, relevant implications, and other information previously discussed herein.

Further, this correspondence informed the Mayor and Council that Provincial release had been issued for the relevant amendments.

As such, it was recommended that Council could proceed with the next steps in the process to adopt the resolutions for the amendments, appoint Your Commissioner, and proceed with the virtual public session.

It also was stated that following the hearing, the amendments would be brought back to Council with the Commissioner’s Report for consideration. Adoption of the LUAR and approval of the Discretionary Use of a Dwelling Unit on the 1st storey (ground floor) would also be considered at that time.

**3.0 Written Submissions Received During The 30-Day Comment Period**

As highlighted earlier, six written submissions (email) were received from seven individuals during the 30-day period allotted for comments on the proposed rezoning of 150 New Gower Street. Most of the submissions noted opposition to the proposed rezoning overall, or aspects of the proposed development. A petition with 60 names accompanied one of the submissions.
opposed to the rezoning. The following provides a summary of the main points raised in the submissions, the full text of which is found in Appendix “A”.

- One submission was in full support of the general nature of the project, noting that such projects encourage investment. However, it was felt that the current hotel design was not visually appealing, it should be wider and taller, and there should be a greater use of a glass façade to maximize the views of the downtown. In terms of the residential building, it was felt the façade should be made of light-colored materials.

- The developer could consider designating a percentage of the residential building units for affordable housing, with rents set at or below market rent. This would support the intent of the City’s Housing Strategy and reflect the existing social mix of housing in the area. There are potential funding sources to support such a direction. To avail of funds under the National Housing Strategy, the units would need to be individually-owned, which would have been the case if the residential building were to be condos, but there is no clarity on whether a decision has been made in this regard. Securing community benefits should be revisited by the City and a more effective approach developed.

- Earlier correspondence (~2013) referenced one residential building for the remainder of the site at 150 New Gower Street (following the first hotel). The current proposed development with its scale and scope is much more than would have been contemplated in Envision for this area.

- The heights of both the residential building and hotel should be reduced. The continued development in the area has created a ‘wall’ between area residents and culturally-significant landmarks and the scenery of downtown. The high structures in the area do not benefit the neighbourhood. There should be a minimal height allowance above neighbouring structures. The area proposed for development is the last section of natural skyline and view of the harbour for many residents in the area.

- The 60-name petition submitted was for the ‘height allowance of the new hotel at the corner of New Gower and Springdale to be lowered to a maximum of 6 to 7 storeys instead of 14 storeys’.

- Neighbours will be shadowed by more buildings with this development. There should be an updated shadow study to include the impact on additional streets. Will the stepback be required on the upper floors of the residential building?

- Other questions related to:
  - the timing of construction;
  - whether there would be additional noise from the units on the roofs of the buildings which would impact further up Pleasant Street;
  - whether the residential condos would be for long-term purchase or nightly rental, which would be more akin to having a third hotel on the site.
It was noted that, if the timeline presented in the LUAR is inaccurate, it should be updated based on the schedule for development on the site, including what buildings might be erected first.

- The parking allocation does not seem sufficient for the full site (including the three buildings), and traffic exiting the site will have negative implications for many of the surrounding streets.

- Receiving such late notice of the scale of this proposed development (pre-Christmas 2021), when the development has been under consideration by the City since 2018, was disappointing.

- Notices should not only be sent to property owners but those occupying the residences in the area. The City’s website was difficult to maneuver to access information on the hearing.

4.0 The Virtual Session

Your Commissioner explained the intent of the virtual public session to those in attendance and spoke to the process to be undertaken during the course of same, i.e. presentation of the application by City staff, presentation on behalf of the applicant, and comments/questions from any in attendance who desired to express their support or objections/concerns regarding the amendments under consideration.

4.1 Overview of the Application


In her presentation, Ms. Cashin overviewed that an application had been received to rezone a portion of the subject property at 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone. She further identified that the existing hotel is already in the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone, and that a Municipal Plan amendment would be required to redesignate a part of the property.

In terms of the actual development, Ms. Cashin overviewed what has been presented herein, that it would include a 13-storey hotel with retail and commercial on the two bottom stories (with a required stepback as of the third storey) and a 9-storey condo/apartment building. She did state that the zoning will allow an increase in building height. As the site is currently vacant, the development will be a change for the neighbouring properties. Ms. Cashin referenced the updated shadow study, which was provided to Council (and Your Commissioner).
She noted that the applicants had attended a Built Heritage Experts Panel meeting and revised their drawings/design to be reminiscent of commercial areas of Water Street, as previously described.

Finally, Ms. Cashin overviewed the next steps following the paper public hearing. She reminded those in attendance that there was a 30-day period for submission of comments (which would end as of Tuesday, April 5). The Commissioner would prepare a report to Council with recommendations; however, the authority lies with Council to accept or reject the recommendations and approve or reject the amendments. If the amendments were approved, they would be forwarded to Province for registration.

4.2 Presentation on behalf of the applicant

Richard Symonds with LAT49 presented on behalf of the applicant.

He noted that LAT49 Architecture had been working with Manga Hotels for a couple of years and that the initial design was done by Mataj Architecture out of Ontario. LAT49 updated the design based on, for example, feedback from the Built Heritage Experts Panel, as well as the results of the wind and traffic studies.

He referenced a number of elements of the proposal, most of which were discussed previously, and highlighted that the parking will be primarily underground, which will allow for more greenspace. Further, he spoke to some of the engineering components including that the development will make use of a storm water retention chamber built as part of the previous development.

Mr. Symonds showed renderings of the development from various vantage points in the area. He also said that throughout the LUAR, the 9-storey building is referred to as a condo building, but the intention is for rental units.

In terms of the height of the 9-storey building, he noted that the view from Pleasant Street will now include this building. However, because of the way the site drops off, this helps to mitigate what will be seen – up to about 6 or 7 stories to the grade of Pleasant Street. In an effort to further mitigate the impacts of the building, the development will keep open space between the 9-storey building and Riverhead Towers and will facilitate a pedestrian connection to Springdale Street.

He overviewed the results of the updated shadow study, identifying that there will be shadowing along the residential properties at Pleasant Street in the morning hours of the Spring, Summer, Fall and Winter months, to varying degrees:

• In the Spring, there is shadowing across some houses on both sides of the lower end of Pleasant Street in the morning; this is cleared by mid-day.

• During the Summer, the neighbouring residential properties will not be as affected by the shadows, with only a small portion of the backyards of one or two houses on the south side of Pleasant Street being affected by this in the early morning hours. There will be no shadowing across to the other side of the street; and no impact by mid-day.
• In the Fall, there is some shadowing impact in the mornings coming across some of the houses and out into Pleasant street; by mid-day there is no impact.

• Most impact would be felt in the winter when the sun is low in the sky. There will be quite a long shadow going across Pleasant Street, with a fair degree of shadowing also around mid-day. Riverhead Towers also was noted to be casting a shadow into the backyards.

The other primary area affected by the shadowing is the parking lot on the site itself, as well as the section of New Gower Street along the south. There is no impact from shadows toward the north at Riverhead Towers.

Mr. Symonds further explained that the shadow study software does not recognize other structures/natural topography further from the site, which are impacting the area. He noted it is hard to model in the downtown, as the Southside Hills already cast shadows on the area under consideration. It is difficult, therefore, to properly ascribe what is causing the shadowing.

4.3 Overview of the Submissions

Your Commissioner explained that there had been a number of submissions received from city residents in relation to the proposed amendments related to the application for 150 New Gower Street. She provided a summary of the comments, as presented in Section 3.0.

4.4 Presentations by those in Attendance

The following comments were provided by attendees at the virtual session in relation to the proposed amendments for 150 New Gower Street.

Speaker #1: This speaker said they appreciate all of the consideration the developer has provided in, for example, trying to site the buildings and address the shadowing to lessen the impact on surrounding properties. They also are aware of the work and history of this particular developer here and across Canada. This speaker noted they had already provided their concerns in writing.

They described the site under consideration as the cusp between the downtown and a lower-scale residential area. They understand that this area allows the development, but felt that having two hotels comprising 25 storeys and a 9-storey residential building is a bit excessive and quite a step up. They noted they were not suggesting that the development be abandoned and started over but that modification in terms of reduced height would help.

They also felt that another helpful step would be if the developer could give back to the community and designate a portion of the units as affordable – at or below market rental. This would not require physical changes, but some of the units would be more affordable and designated as such. This speaker said they had already reached out to Council and staff to put this idea forward. If this direction were to be pursued, it was noted that the City could be a convenor of this discussion with appropriate community groups bringing it to reality, while development still proceeds.
This speaker referenced that Magna has a fabulous family foundation, doing great work around mental health and wellness. They felt that a focus on affordable housing might be a way to replicate some of this community work in St. John’s. Such an approach of working with the community would make everything more palatable, and it would be a win-win for the developer for their vision going forward.

This speaker did lament that they first heard about the development and the two proposed buildings close to the Christmas season and when the COVID-19 Omicron variant had emerged. They said the neighbourhood was surprised by this development, especially given its nature and scale, and the work that must have been ongoing since 2018.

Response from City staff: An LUAR can take a long time to complete and, sometimes, a development has come as a surprise to neighbouring residents. Going forward, within the Envision Framework, and as of November 2021, there is a requirement for an initial public consultation on an LUAR before it is submitted to the City. However, the current application did not fall within the context of this new requirement.

Speaker #1 provided a second set of comments following Speaker #3’s questions about the time frame for construction. They asked that the development proceed in as compressed a time frame as possible and wondered which of the buildings would be built first, noting the timing would impact any discussions regarding affordable housing.

Response from R Symonds: The current thinking is the residential tower would be built first. However, it was further clarified that ideally both towers would be built concurrently, but a firm decision had not yet been made.

Speaker #2: This speaker, who was once a resident of the neighbourhood and frequents the area, asked for clarification on a number of aspects of the development.

They asked if the underground parking was for one or both of the buildings, and would it be under only one building.

Response from R Symonds: The current parking will be removed for the most part, and the underground parking will service the entire site. The parking will be primarily under the residential building and partially under the new hotel; there will be elevator access from both buildings.

This speaker then asked whether, in relation to mechanical infrastructure, there had been an assessment of noise factors of rooftop units or structures on the ground close to the residential area.

Response from R Symonds: There have not been any studies done related to sound, but there won’t be any units on the ground. The units will be up in the roof area; on the hotel they will be in an enclosed penthouse. With the exception of evaporative equipment, the equipment will be primarily indoors and, similarly, with the residential
building there will be no large HVAC equipment outside or down near any existing housing. There would be an emergency generator and propane tanks lower to ground. Aside from the generator briefly running once a month for maintenance, it would only be activated in the event of an emergency.

This speakers’ last comment was in support of Speaker #1’s suggestion of community building, with some units in the residential building being offered as affordable housing. They strongly support this kind of initiative. This speaker said that if the City or developer were to consider such an initiative, they would be glad to offer their help and support to both groups.

Speaker #3: This speaker said they were relatively new to the community. They wondered about the process of building a large hotel and residence, timelines for construction and the noise impact on the community. They said that creating a multi-level underground parking likely includes a large amount of digging and disruption and asked if this would create much noise. They wondered what impacts could be expected during the development and what the hours of operation would be.

Response from R Symonds: The City has regulations about work hours for construction - nothing earlier than 7am and the cutoff is 11pm. During good weather, activity likely is from 7am to 6:30pm; winter should be clued up by just after dark, 4:30 or 5pm, and starting a bit later in the morning, as well.

The parking is underground. Geologically, there is a trough underground in the rock. It will be excavated, but this trough is a benefit, as there won’t be as much rock busting and removal, as if it were a solid cliff. This is part of the reason it was considered acceptable to do underground parking in this way, as they won’t have to go through solid rock.

In terms of time frame, general excavation is not a long process – a month or so. For the rock excavation, there would be small-scale blasting or busting for a few months. Once construction starts, perhaps after about three months, they could start to pour concrete for parts of the underground structure.

R. Symonds referenced that, in the LUAR, it was said there should be 30 months in total for the project, and he thought this is somewhat realistic. However, it depends on financing and funding as to whether the owner decides to erect one building first and then the second, or, once the garage is built, they continue on with both buildings at the same time.

R. Symonds thought the idea was for the residential building first with the underground garage and site servicing, and perhaps the hotel after that. Overall, it would easily be about three years for construction for all aspects.
Speaker #4: This speaker asked about safety of the buildings in the area that are half-built into the cliff, such as those on Pleasant Street, in the context of the blasting and activity to provide underground parking. What precautions will be taken? Will it be monitored, and what happens if someone’s foundation starts cracking? Is this a realistic concern?

*Response from R. Symonds:* Blasting is a specialized trade. In general, there are blasting operations happening near other buildings, especially in larger cities. There are geotechnical engineers who consider the type and shape of rock and what kind of charge is needed. In this day and age, accidental over-blasting is very rare.

*When the City built the sewage treatment plant, there were massive amounts of blasting and rock excavation. Quarries located close to the city are routinely blasting. R. Symonds noted that he could not be specific in relation to what could happen to any one dwelling in the area of New Gower Street, and how sound the foundation might be and whether a tremor would damage it. However, they noted any construction would be by licensed professions following all regulations and requirements.*

### 5.0 Considerations

In reaching a conclusion on the merits of the proposed amendments, Your Commissioner considered the following information.

#### 5.1 Consistency with the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan

##### 5.1.1 A Strong Economy

*Chapter 2 ‘Framework for Growth’*

As stated in Section 2.2. ‘Growth and Development Strategy’ of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan:

> The strategy for growth set out in this Plan is one that attempts to balance growth with a strong diverse economy […] Balance will be achieved through:

> …an emphasis on encouraging intensification, and a greater mix of uses, through investment in infrastructure that supports higher density development along major transportation corridors and centres where there are opportunities for redevelopment;

> […]

Further, the vision for the City of St. John’s, as per Section 2.3 ‘City Vision’ includes that:

> St. John’s will have a future of continued economic prosperity […] St. John’s attracts and welcomes investment, residents and visitors from the region, the province and around the world.
One of the key themes articulated in Section 2.4, is ‘A Strong Diversified Economy’ which identifies that the goals, objectives and policies of the Municipal Plan are consistent with and support the goals of the City’s Economic Roadmap.

Further, in relation to the downtown, it is stated:

The downtown will remain an important employment and retail centre. […] Through urban design, the City will determine the appropriate size, scale and location of new development that can be accommodated within the historic downtown, in order to increase opportunities for new development, and re-use existing structures to accommodate a mix of retail, service, office and residential uses.

Chapter 5 ‘A Strong Economy’

Chapter 5 speaks to efforts to strengthen the City’s role as the centre for commerce and employment in the region. Strategies cited in this section include to:

[…foster and retain a diversified economy that consists of a mix of local, regional, national and even international businesses, as well as a diversity of business types and sizes. Ensuring sufficient lands are identified to accommodate the various sectors, while encouraging mixed-use neighbourhoods […]

5.1.2 Housing

As described in Section 4.1, strategic objectives set out 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.

[…]

Identify appropriate areas for future growth and development that take advantage of existing infrastructure and services, which would in turn create financial efficiencies and limit urban sprawl.

Limit impacts to established neighbourhoods, heritage districts and employment areas.

[…]

5.1.3 Heritage

Chapter 4 also includes a section on heritage (Section 4.7):

[…]

Balancing the desire to retain our built heritage with opportunities for new development in heritage areas has been, and will continue to be, a challenge. […] Heritage resources will now be protected under the new St. John’s Heritage By-Law, which derives its
authority from the City of St. John’s Act. This new legislative structure will allow greater authority for the protection of heritage resources.

As an element of the framework for the new St. John’s Heritage By-Law, it is intended that ‘new developments within the City’s Heritage Areas are compatible and in keeping with the streetscape in accordance with the City’s Heritage By-Laws.’

City’s Heritage By-Law

As per Schedule D ‘Heritage Area Design Standards’ and in relation to non-residential buildings in Heritage Area 3, recessed entries are preferred. This is the direction which the Built Heritage Experts Panel recommended for the first storey of the proposed hotel – it should replicate commercial buildings along Water Street.

5.1.4 Planning Area 1 ‘Downtown’

The objective for Planning Area 1 (Section 10.1) is:

To ensure a comprehensive and balanced development of the downtown that provides a dynamic focus for a wide variety of activities within a harmonious physical setting through pursuit of [a number of] land use objectives.

The land use functions set out for Planning Area 1 include those which encourage and enhance retail services, accommodate a range of populations of varying income levels in a range of housing types, and enable a major site for high-density tourist accommodations.

5.1.5 Intensification and urban design

The Plan has a specific focus on urban design and intensification, in particular in reference to the downtown as per the following:

Chapter 2 ‘Framework for Growth’

‘Urban Design’ is one of the key themes discussed under Section 2.4:

[…] The ability to achieve intensification and redevelopment that encompasses a mix of land uses within the built-up areas of the city requires high quality urban design. […]

Urban design guidelines will be prepared for commercial areas in the downtown, addressing such things as site specific parameters for height, bulk and form of buildings, as well as exterior design elements.

Chapter 6 ‘Urban Design’

 […]
While principles of good urban design can be applied throughout the city, it will be of particular importance in areas that are identified for future intensification. Urban design is also needed in the downtown, where there is a desire to preserve heritage assets, while encouraging and accommodating new development.

Section 6.1 ‘General’

[...]

Built Form

Ensure that ground and lower levels of buildings contribute positively to the public realm and streetscape, and are designed at a pedestrian scale.

Require that new development and redevelopment of existing sites be integrated into the surrounding neighbourhood.

Ensure that tall buildings [...] consider the shadow impacts on adjacent residential areas, streets and open spaces [...].

Section 6.3 ‘Development in the Downtown’

[...]

Encourage development of mixed-use buildings in the downtown that contribute to the downtown as a ‘people place’.

Further to the issue of considering impacts on adjacent properties, and as per Section 4.4 ‘Good Neighbours: Reducing Land-Use Conflict’:

Conflict often arises where a land use or building is proposed next to a residential or open space use, or where a building is proposed that is considered out of scale or character with the form of adjacent buildings. Many different uses and building forms can co-exist, provided proper consideration is given to site and building design, and measures to reduce or eliminate potential land-use conflicts.

1. Ensure that the review of development proposals considers how new development may affect abutting properties and uses.

2. Establish a set of requirements that address compatibility between land uses, buildings and sites, such as shadow impacts on adjacent properties, parks and open space, separation distances, odours, lighting, transportation and noise.

5.1.5.1 Building Height

As referenced in Section 6.4 ‘Building Height’:

Some of the most contentious issues in the city involve the height of buildings, particularly in the downtown. The city’s built form consists largely of low-rise
buildings, while taller buildings such as office towers, hotels and a range of institutional buildings are dispersed throughout the city.

Further, the strategies for addressing heights of buildings in various areas and neighborhoods are delineated, including for two distinct areas of the downtown. As described in Section 6.4(d), Adelaide Street will be the boundary for delineating height in the east and west end areas:

The objective for the east end of Downtown (east of Adelaide Street) is to retain the existing urban form and human scale along the commercial corridors of Duckworth and Water Street, while allowing some additional height. […]

In the west end of Downtown (west of Adelaide Street), greater building height will be considered. The area’s lower elevation reduces the visual impact of taller buildings on the cityscape and surrounding properties, while the close proximity to Pitts Memorial Drive is also key, as this main road brings large volumes of traffic in and out of the downtown daily. Height shall be subject to heritage requirements, the appropriate building orientation, stepbacks, public space and parking standards.

5.1.6 Land Use Districts and Redesignation

5.1.6.1 Commercial Land Use District

Section 8.5 of the Envision St. John's Municipal Plan overviews the Commercial Land Use District:

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 […] Smaller concentrations of commercial uses can also be found along the city’s main roadways. […] The role of the City is to ensure an adequate level of commercial services are provided throughout St. John’s, by facilitating appropriate development in new areas, and maintaining the viability of older areas. Retail uses in commercial areas directly serve residential needs, while office uses bring employees from residential districts daily. It is, therefore, necessary and desirable to place commercial facilities close to residential neighbourhoods, while minimizing the impact on established neighbourhoods and municipal services.

A number of objectives in relation to commercial land uses, which are relevant to the amendments under consideration, include:

Within the Commercial Land Use District, Council shall establish commercial land use zones that accommodate a wide range of permitted and discretionary uses including retail, restaurants, entertainment and assembly, hotel, office, service shop, clinics, residential, day care centres, schools, place of worship, parking, and light industrial uses, along with other uses which are listed in the corresponding Zones under the Development Regulations.
Promote the growth of new commercial areas for business and retail opportunities, with the downtown as the primary focus.

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.

Downtown

The Commercial Downtown Zones shall be established within the Development Regulations and considered within Planning Area 1 (Downtown), while the Commercial Downtown Zone shall only be considered in the west end (west of Adelaide Street).

Proposals for Commercial Development

Encourage and facilitate redevelopment or expansion of commercial sites in a manner that addresses compatibility with adjoining residential uses and shall be subject to a Land Use Report, where a commercial use is proposed in or adjoining a Residential Land Use District.

Commercial Development within the Heritage Area

All commercial development within the defined Heritage Areas shall be subject to the City’s Heritage By-law.

Mixed-use Development

Within the City, there are a number of areas where a mix of commercial, residential and other compatible uses currently co-exist, in various built form. […] The concept of mixed-use development helps to build a sense of place within the community. It embraces such concepts as reduced auto dependence, public transit, reduced urban sprawl and better use of infrastructure through higher density development, while allowing for greater flexibility and adaptability of uses when developing projects.

5.1.6.2 Designation of the Subject Property

The subject property at 150 New Gower Street is located within the Residential Land Use District. This District, as set out in Section 8.4 of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan:
…applies to established and developing residential neighbourhoods of the city. […] Within the Residential Land Use District, Council shall establish low, medium and high density residential land use zones that consider a variety of residential forms.

To accommodate the proposed development on this site, a zoning change is required from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone. Rezoning the subject property to Commercial Downtown would require a redesignation from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District.

5.1.7 Considerations for Implementation

Section 9 of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan sets out considerations for planned growth in the city. This includes Section 9.5 “Considerations for Rezonings” which states that:

[…] In considering requests for rezoning, Council shall consider all appropriate policies set out in this Plan and have regard for the following:

[...]

Compatibility of the development in terms of height, scale, lot coverage and bulk with adjacent properties;

Whether the proposed use will alter the intended mix of land uses in the District or neighbourhood. […]

The Land Use Report

Section 9.7 also describes the Land Use Report (LUR) (formerly the Land Use Assessment Report – LUAR) as ‘a valuable tool in the review of proposals for a development or use that cannot be adequately evaluated by City staff.’ This section further notes that ‘Council shall prepare and approve Term of Reference setting out the matters that require assessment in an LUR.’

5.2 Envision St. John’s Development Regulations

5.2.1 Proposed Amendments

As per the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations, the land at 150 New Gower Street under consideration for rezoning is in the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone. As the name implies, this zone allows for a continuum of permitted smaller-scale residential uses (e.g., single detached dwelling, bed and breakfast) and discretionary uses which include some small-scale and/or neighbourhood type usages – e.g., service shop, daycare centre, convenience store.

To accommodate the development of a hotel and a multi-level residential building, it is proposed the site be rezoned to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone. This zone allows for an expanded list of permitted larger-scale commercial activities, including a hotel and dwelling units on the 2nd storey or higher of a building (which would facilitate the residential building expected to be of 9 storeys).
The Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone does not specifically reference an ‘apartment’ or ‘condo’ and allows dwelling units on the 1st storey of a building as a discretionary use. This ensures that if a proposed development has frontage on one of the established commercial streets in the downtown (e.g., Water Street), then the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone would enable commercial uses on the first storey – to ensure compatibility with the existing streetscape.

Council has the discretion to approve the residential dwellings on the 1st storey of the proposed ‘apartment/condo’ building at the 150 New Gower Street site; it will not have frontage on the street.

### 5.2.2 Zoning Considerations

#### 5.2.2.1 Parking and traffic

The issue of increased traffic and concerns with sufficiency of the parking were raised in relation to the proposed rezoning for 150 New Gower Street.

**Traffic**

As per the traffic studies undertaken for the LUAR, peak hour trip generation estimates were provided for weekday mornings and afternoons, based on the number of units for the entire site – i.e., the existing hotel, as well as the proposed hotel and apartment/condo. It was reported that the maximum projected trips in and out at peak times in the morning would be 172 and in the evenings – 227.

**Parking requirements**

In relation to parking in the Downtown, and as set out in the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Section 8 ‘Parking Requirements’, there are differing requirements depending on whether parking is required for residential or non-residential developments. Of note, the parking requirements included in the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations are new, as the previous parking standards were revamped. As such, the requirement for parking for 150 New Gower Street is different in 2022, as compared to when the application was first considered in 2018.

**Non-residential parking requirements**

As set out in Section 8.6 ‘Downtown Parking Area’:

8.6.1 Non-Residential Parking in the Downtown Parking Area

For non-Residential Development in the Downtown Parking Area, the minimum and maximum number of required parking spaces shall be 50 percent of those shown in Section 8.3.

Parking standards set out in Section 8.3 which would apply to the proposed hotel for 150 New Gower Street, including the potential commercial/retail uses, and which could be reduced by 50%, are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of building</th>
<th>Range of parking spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1 parking space for every 4 guest rooms or suites together with 1 parking space for every 5 m² of banquet/conference/meeting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Gross Floor Area is 200 m² or less, no parking space is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Floor Area is above 200 m² but not greater than 500 m²: 1 parking space for every 20 m² of Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Floor Area greater than 500 m²: 1 parking space for every 10 m² of Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>If the Gross Floor Area is 200 m² or less, no parking space is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 parking space for every 30 m² of Net Floor Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As detailed in Section ‘I’ of their LUAR, the applicant proposes to base their non-residential parking requirements for the, as of yet, undefined commercial/retail space on the most restrictive scenario:

[…]

…the commercial/retail space that is part of the new hotel, would be subject to 50 per cent of the parking requirements in the Envision Development Regulations. Since the nature of the businesses that will be occupying these spaces are unknown at this time in the development process, whether retail or restaurant, the parking requirements have been based on the most restrictive. For commercial space greater than 200 m² and less than 500 m², one parking space to be provided for every 20 m² (min) and 5 m² (max) of gross floor area has been used (Restaurant classification).

The applicant intends to provide a mix of minimum and maximum restrictions for parking related to the existing and new hotels: 1 parking space for every 4 guest sleeping rooms in addition to 1 parking space for every 5 m² (min) and 4 m² (max) of banquet/seminar/conference/meeting space.

Residential parking requirements:

As set out in Section 8.6 ‘Downtown Parking Area’:

8.6.2 Residential Parking in the Downtown
(1) Residential Development on Water Street or Duckworth Street having 5 Dwelling Units or less: no parking spaces are required. Residential Development on Water Street or Duckworth Street having 6 or more Dwelling Units shall comply with the parking space requirements in Section 8.3.

(2) All other Residential Development in the Downtown Parking Area, other than on Water Street or Duckworth Street, shall comply with the parking space requirements in Section 8.3.

Parking standards set out in Section 8.3 which would apply to the proposed apartment/condo building for 150 New Gower Street, and for which no reductions are allowed, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of building</th>
<th>Range of parking spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment building</td>
<td>Dwelling Size/Minimum parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studio - 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bedroom Dwelling - 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Bedroom Dwelling - 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Bedroom Dwelling or greater - 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking:</td>
<td>0 visitor parking spaces for the first 7 Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 visitor parking space per 7 Dwellings thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the following table, which is provided in the LUAR, the applicant is proposing to slightly exceed the required number of parking spaces (+10) over and above the minimum required for the total site and three buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Units, Rooms or Gross Floor Area (GFA)</th>
<th>Minimum Parking</th>
<th>Maximum Parking</th>
<th>50% reduction – as applicable (Min/Max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>86 units</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>93-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>290 rooms</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>37-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel meeting space</td>
<td>346 m² GFA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>34-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>318 m² GFA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172- 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2.2 Building height and stepbacks
**Height**

As per the discussion in Section 5.1.5.1 herein, within the context of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan, developments on streets west of Adelaide Street in the Downtown can be considered for greater building height. As such the Zone Standard for the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone at 150 New Gower Street is:

(3) Zone Standards Except Park, Public Use, Public Utility and Parking Lot

(a) Building Height (maximum) - 54 metres, provided height over 18 metres requires a Land Use Report

Recognizing the impact taller buildings may have on surrounding properties, streetscapes and pedestrian experiences, the Envision Development Regulations include requirements for ‘stepbacks’ defined in the Regulations as ‘the portion of a building that is horizontally recessed from the façade that faces the street.’

For the Commercial Development (CD) Zone, and in relation to the Hotel which has frontage on New Gower Street, the following Zone Standard therefore applies:

[...]  

(c) Building Façade Stepback on Street with a 0 metre Building Line  
0 metre stepback for first 18 metres in Building Height, 4 metre stepback for greater than 18 metres in Building Height. Where Building Façade abuts more than one Street, stepback shall be applied to a minimum of 2 Streets, such Streets being determined by the Chief Municipal Planner.

The hotel fronting on New Gower Street will be stepped back as detailed above.

The Envision St. John’s Development Regulations also detail ‘General Site Requirements’ in Section 7, one of which pertains to stepbacks when buildings abut a residential zone:

7.1 Lot Requirements

[...]  

7.1.4 Building Stepback  

All Buildings on a Lot which is in or abuts a Residential Zone and being 12 metres or greater in Building Height shall not project above a 45 degree angle as measured from the Rear Yard Lot Line and/or Side Yard Lot Line at a height of 12 metres.

As referenced in the January 25, 2022, correspondence discussed herein in Section 2.2, the application under consideration was reviewed in-depth under the previous regulatory framework including the former St. John’s Development Regulations. As such, Council could consider approving the application under this former framework, without requiring the stepback for the apartment/condo.
6.0 Conclusion

In reaching a conclusion on the merits of the proposed amendments, Your Commissioner considered the following:

6.1 Consistency with the St. John’s Municipal Plan

Overall vision and approach

The vision for the City of St. John’s, as provided in the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan includes that St. John’s has a focus on economic prosperity, including to attract investment, residents and visitors from the region, the province and around the world.

In addition, specific Municipal Plan polices (as presented herein) speak to encouraging intensification and mixed-use buildings in the downtown, as well as promoting the growth of new commercial areas for business and retail opportunities. Further, the Plan speaks to accommodating a range of populations of varying income levels in a range of housing types and enabling sites for high-density tourist accommodations in the downtown.

Commercial Land Uses

The City has a role in ensuring appropriate and adequate commercial land use by facilitating appropriate development in new areas and minimizing the impact of commercial development on residential neighbourhoods and municipal services. As noted in Section 5.1.6.1 herein, the Commercial Land Use District applies to existing and future areas of commercial development within the City. The intent, as previously stated, includes a primary focus on the downtown.

The City also has a role in enabling mixed-use development to support walkability to local services, reduced urban sprawl and better use of infrastructure through higher density development.

The subject property is along a main roadway and is an appropriate location for a commercial use, particularly since there is an existing hotel on the site, and there are many other commercial uses in the area. Moreover, this area of Water Street has been earmarked for greater building height, especially since it is noted that the area’s lower elevation reduces the visual impact of taller buildings on the cityscape and surrounding properties.

The objective for Planning Area 1, as detailed previously, is to ‘ensure a comprehensive and balanced development of the downtown that provides a dynamic focus for a wide variety of activities within a harmonious physical setting […]’

The land use functions set out for Planning Area 1 include those which encourage and enhance retail services, accommodate a range of populations of varying income levels in a range of housing types, and enable a major site for high-density tourist accommodations.

Redesignation
The proposed development for 150 New Gower Street is consistent with the vision, intent and direction of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan – facilitating increased density, effective urban form, balanced development and mixed uses in the downtown.

Redesignation of the site at 150 New Gower Street from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District is appropriate. It provides for an expanded range of commercial uses and allows for continued mix of land uses in the area.

6.1.1 Mitigation of Impacts in Relation to the Amendments

The Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan identifies a role for the City in ensuring that impacts associated with particular zones are compatible with policies adopted under the Plan. As stated earlier, and referenced in Sections 8.5 and 4.4 of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan, while it is desirable to place commercial facilities close to residential neighbourhoods, attention has to be paid to minimizing the impact on established neighbourhoods and municipal services.

The challenge for the developer and the City, in relation to the proposal for 150 New Gower Street, is to ensure that all due care and attention are paid to mitigating the impacts of the development on the abutting residential area. The primary issues of concern raised by those who attended the virtual public meeting and/or virtual paper-based session, as well as in the submissions received for one or both of the aforementioned processes, were fairly consistent and, in summary, related to:

Parking and traffic

There is a projected increase for vehicles entering and existing the site as a result if the proposed rezoning. However, given traffic would be coming and going from three buildings including two hotels (where patrons would be more likely be moving to/from their hotels over the full day and evening, as opposed to a specific point in the AM or PM), it would seem that the increase would be manageable for the surrounding areas. However, it will be important for traffic to be monitored in this area, should the development proceed, to address any emerging issues with traffic flow.

In relation to the parking requirements, and as discussed herein, the applicant is proposing to provide slightly more parking spaces than are required by the parking standards. As well, given the bulk of the parking will be underground, it does allow for more attention to greenspace and related amenities on the site.

Height and shadowing

The related issues of height and shadowing, particularly from the apartment/condo building are not ones which can be alleviated as desired by those in the surrounding residential areas, given this area of the downtown (falling into the ‘west of Adelaide Street’ region) allows for greater building height.

The applicants have endeavored to mitigate impacts by siting the property abut 5 to 6 metres away from the Pleasant Street lot boundaries, and availing of the natural topography of the
subject property such that the apartment/condo building stands about 6 or 7 storeys above Pleasant Street as opposed to 9 storeys.

The one issue which Council may wish to consider in relation to the concerns expressed by those impacted by the development, would be whether or not to consider the application under the current regulatory regime and require a stepback for the residential building.

Construction schedule

If Council approves the amendments for the proposal for 150 New Gower Street, and as the development proceeds through additional internal review processes, it would be helpful to the abutting residents if there was more clarity on the construction schedule and potential related impacts.

Affordable housing

While ‘affordable housing’ is not a rezoning issue, it was raised in submissions and during the virtual session, and Your Commissioner feels it should be included. It was felt that there could be an opportunity to truly provide housing for a range of income levels, should Council consider engaging with the developer on providing a few affordable housing units within the residential building. This would support the direction in the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan around diversifying the type of available housing, increase the affordable housing stock, and align with the City’s efforts as per its affordable housing strategy.

7.0 Recommendations

Based on the foregoing considerations, Your Commissioner recommends the following:

Acceptance of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan Amendment Number 3, 2022

Redesignate land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Land Use District to the Commercial Land Use District

Acceptance of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Amendment Number 4, 2022

Rezone land at 150 New Gower Street [Parcel ID#48240] from the Residential Downtown (RD) Zone to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 11TH DAY OF MAY 2022

Marie. E Ryan,
Commissioner
Attention: Office of the City Clerk

In regards to the application to rezone land to allow a 13 story hotel and a 9 story residential building at 150 New Gower Street please see my following concerns after reviewing the ‘Land Use Assessment Report’.

PARKING:
The proposal is to provide 182 parking spaces total – 93 of which will be for the 86 unit condo. That leaves 89 parking spaces for the 290 hotel rooms, commercial spaces, and hotel meeting/conference spaces.
Additionally, the plan calls for the removal of all parking from the Hilton Garden Inn, an adjacent property.
How would this parking deficiency impact the surrounding residential neighbourhoods and commercial properties?

TRAFFIC:
The primary exit from the Condo and Hotel will be primarily on New Gower Street at Pitts Memorial, a main route entering and exiting the City.
If exiting the proposed development to go downtown, they will have to turn right at Hamilton Avenue and proceed up Patrick Street having significant traffic implications in these residential areas.
Further negative traffic implications will arise if they are allowed to use the exit through the Hilton Garden Inn to Springdale Street. That will make the light at the bottom of Springdale problematic particularly at rush hour.
This area will already experience increased traffic congestion with the addition to the Jag Hotel currently under construction.

SHADOW STUDY
What area does this study cover? It appears the image has been cut off at Pleasant Street. What are the shadow impacts beyond the area in the images? My home on [redacted] is in this area, what will be the impact to particularly in the winter. I would like to see an updated shadow study showing the impact on Gilbert Street.

In closing on a personal note, I recently moved to the area in question having purchased my home at [redacted] in [redacted]. I was impressed by the lovely bright morning light shining through the east facing windows and the expansive views of Southside Hills. On several evenings I’ve enjoyed watching the moon rise over the hills from my sofa. Many in this neighbourhood enjoy the same and wish not to be overlooked by tall building. The Hilton Garden Inn is already an imposing structure impeding views.

Additionally, concerning the community as a whole, considering the City’s downtown vacancy rate issue how can this development be justified? Given the boarded up shop fronts downtown, surely additional commercial space is not desired.
I trust the concerns outlined will be taken into serious consideration.

Regards
Hello,

There is already a hotel on the location you have indicated on the map.

Can you please provide some clarification on what’s happening in this rezoning application?

Is this a new building or change of use of the existing?

Is there another hotel planned?

I own [redacted]

Thanks and regards,
Good afternoon,

The application is to rezone the remainder of the lot to the Commercial Downtown (CD) Zone to allow a second hotel, as well as a residential building (for a total of three buildings on the lot). The existing hotel will remain. I have clipped a section of the site plan below, however additional information on the application including renderings of the buildings can be found here: https://www.stjohns.ca/public-notice/application-150-new-gower-street-0.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,
Ann-Marie
Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP - Planner III - Urban Design & Heritage  
City of St. John's - Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services  
Phone: 709-570-2041 Fax: 709-576-2340  
Email: acashin@stjohns.ca  
John J. Murphy Building (City Hall Annex), 4th floor  
Mail: PO Box 908, St. John's, NL, Canada A1C 5M2

From: Karen Chafe <kchafe@stjohns.ca> On Behalf Of CityClerk  
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 1:21 PM  
To: CityClerk <cityclerk@stjohns.ca>  
Cc: Andrea Roberts <aroberts@stjohns.ca>; Ann-Marie Cashin <acashin@stjohns.ca>; Ashley Murray <amurray@stjohns.ca>; Tracy-Lynn Goosney <tgoosney@stjohns.ca>; Jason Sinyard <jsinyard@stjohns.ca>; Ken O'Brien < kobrien@stjohns.ca>; Lindsay Lyghlte Brushett <LLyghtleBrushett@stjohns.ca>; Planning <planning@stjohns.ca>; Jennifer Squires <jsquires@stjohns.ca>; Christine R. Carter <crcarter@stjohns.ca>  
Subject: RE: (EXT) Development 150 New Gower St

Good Afternoon:
Hi there,

please accept this letter and petition for the public hearing happening tomorrow March 30 for the proposed hotel and apartment development to occur at the 150 New Gower St, corner of Springdale property. Appreciate a clarification that this has been received and will be included in the considerations. My understanding is that normally petitions need to be done by signature, this one was done in a virtual open editable document for safety of my neighbors due to the ongoing pandemic and as such should be accepted. I will be forwarding a copy of these documents also to Happy City St. John's.

Thanks,
Petition for Height Allowance of New Hotel at Corner of New Gower and Springdale to be Lowered to Maximum 6-7 instead of 14 Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resident of Which Street</th>
<th>Contact (ph or email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Ramsay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samm Lamkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Harnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Puddicombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Puddicombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsey Hamen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Lanphear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Callahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Pearce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Langmead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne M Madden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Pearce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie Duff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Movelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Foran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Parsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey Critch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Carrigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Smed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Puddicombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa Maheu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Primmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte May Hobden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Pardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emile Arsenault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy simms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry neary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Janes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Pardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Pardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Withers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose McDougall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmella Gray-Cosgrove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mandville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Inkpen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Ambs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Whitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Blackwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the Municipal Representatives present for the public hearing regarding the rezoning of the property at the intersection of Springdale, Pleasant, and New Gower Street at 150 New Gower St.

Finding out about this most recent application for rezoning of the area adjacent to the recently erected Hilton Hotel on the same property came to mine and many of my neighbor’s dismay and surprise that this has been greenlighted – as such I sought it necessary to have my concerns shared here at the public hearing. I have still yet to receive any formal indication from the City regarding this hearing, despite being a resident living immediately adjacent to said property. It has come to my attention that only property owners receive these notices. I’ve been renting here for many years and continue to plan too, the landlord for my property lives out of the country, and I know that many other properties in this area are also rentals. As such, I request council initially look into how they conduct their public engagement sessions, notices, and who is deemed able to engage, why not just send a blanket notice to area residents to allow the people who are actively living here the opportunity to also take part in this process which will affect their neighborhood. Furthermore, attempting to get information regarding this hearing on the City’s website proved to be extremely difficult. I am someone who has been a public servant previously with the City of St. Johns and currently with the Federal Government and even though I am used to navigating tedious bureaucratic systems, this came as no easy task. As such, this is disconcerting, and should be for all residents, as ease and access to these public hearings need to be paramount as they drastically can effect change for the neighborhoods and the people you represent. I will be submitting a petition along with this letter which was distributed electronically as a open editable document for safety concerns with the pandemic. It has come to my attention that the City may require physical signatures but I ask that given the extenuating circumstances and the large community spread of the Coronavirus at this time for this be accepted. It is my understanding this engagement itself will be taking place virtually which I presume is due to the pandemic, seems fair that the same allowances without a face-to-face exchange be made for your residents.

This morning before heading into work I enjoyed the view out my window, the sun peaking up over the southside hills and shining in through my back window. This area to the south is the last section of natural skyline and sight of the edge of the harbour for me and many other area residents of Pleasant St., Springdale St., Gilbert St., Charlton St., Patrick St., and Hamilton Ave.
Over previous years the continued development and rezoning of the area has essentially created a wall between area residents and other culturally significant landmarks and scenery of the downtown. From my vantage point, the fortis building (which to my knowledge is currently mostly vacant) blocks off most of the view of the harbour and the Hilton to it's left standing 13 stories high towers over neighboring residences and impedes the previous enjoyed landscape of the narrows with its breathtaking sunsets. The benefit of living in the downtown, with its historical buildings and rich culture is in part losing its appeal to the overdevelopment for temporary visitors in transit to enjoy our surroundings, while our neighborhoods left quite literally in these buildings shadows.
The erection of the Hilton several years ago has not improved the immediate neighborhood in any significant way though at the public hearing held like this one a much different picture was painted where a market of sorts would be erected. Instead, it is a hotel with amenities mainly only allowed utilization by their customers. Since 2020 with Snowmageddon and the following pandemic, this hotel, that houses luxury suites for short term stays, has been mostly vacant. Not to mention it is one of five already large story hotel buildings in the downtown vicinity, not including another one currently being built at the bottom of Springdale St, along with many boutique hotels, countless bed and breakfast’s, and air bnb’s. Who then do these extremely high structures benefit? It would seem that it is solely the proprietors and property owners, only having to occupy a small area of land and maximizing building up for their capital gain to the detriment of the neighborhood (a neighborhood filled with people who you work for and represent). When I shared news to some homeowners in my area, they were appalled. The contradiction of council making homeowners of heritage area homes jump through hoops to meet the requirements for any type of renovation, meanwhile rezoning and allowing new developers to build soaring glass buildings in their vicinity (in mine and others case literally in their backyard) that are not in line with any of the historical structures and architecture St. John’s is so well known for (not to mention blocking off the ability to see these beautiful colorful houses from the legendary view we all know so well when coming into St. John’s harbour or from the opposite side of the harbour toward Fort Amherst). As such, I urge city council to reconsider the story allowance for zoning of the hotel property
in question. If a building were to stand between 4-6 stories high, it would not impede the current view to neighboring residents. The petition that was circulated even put that up 1 storey which would go above the neighboring apartment unit by a storey and for the lower lying areas will still block off view of the Southside Hills but will at least allow the morning and early afternoon sun to shine on those properties. Furthermore, the building should be built with consideration of the nearby downtown structures and how it can best be made to suit it. Within that realm one can look to the Marriott on Duckworth Street which exhibits a minimal height allowance over its neighboring structures and the outside is in line with the area’s architecture.

That was covering the hotel part of the proposal, now onto the apartment building. Over the last decade the City of St. John’s has seen a large increase in expensive luxury units including a large number of new condominiums and apartment buildings especially in the downtown area. Many of these units are left unoccupied as the cost is too extravagant for many. Although details are yet to be shared, it is reasonable to believe that the proposed apartment complex will be high-priced and not attainable to most residents and the ones who most require housing at this time. As such, I appeal members of council to ensure this, and other apartment proposals, have requirements that align with the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy, especially with the current ongoing rental crisis that is bound to become more grave as the City’s housing market booms. Other municipalities in the country have proven with success, conditions for new builds to allocate a percentage of units that are more affordable. The downtown core needs to be protected from the insistent gentrification that such one-sided developments bring – a big part of CSJ’s affordable housing strategy is the diversification of property and that facet is vital to the continued vibrancy of our downtown. Furthermore, from the 2018 report on affordable housing the city stated there would be a push for affordable dwellings of this nature from new developments, however this has not been the case with the large amount of new apartment buildings in the downtown solely being luxury units with high vacancy rates, meanwhile many individuals in the rental market are grappling to find reasonable accommodations within the city limits.

Given these points, I urge council to keep in mind concerns that the city of Halifax is experiencing. With their downtown brimming with high end condos/apartment units and the skyrocketing of housing affordability, there has in recent years been an exodus to neighboring municipalities, especially for young families and people from varied socioeconomic backgrounds, at a huge loss to the community in many aspects (both financially, culturally, and otherwise). If St. John’s wants to continue to thrive it needs to continue to place utmost importance on the diversification of all of its neighborhoods, the affordability of properties for their average resident, require developers to appropriately consider the residents of the neighborhoods they are building within, and that they reflect the needs and values of the citizens for whom you work.

I hope that this letter submissions received from others, along with the petition, are properly taken into consideration for the future of this neighborhood.

Sincerely,
From: Jennifer Squires
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 2:12 PM
To: Ann-Marie Cashin
Cc: Christine R. Carter; Jennifer Squires; Ken O'Brien
Subject: Re: (EXT) Tonight's City commissioner's hearing regarding 150 New Gower Street

Thanks Ann-Marie, this is really helpful in outlining the meeting format. You've answered my questions nicely, so I'll see you at the meeting tonight.

Beyond the concerns I raised in my earlier letter to Council regarding the scale, nature and impacts of the proposed development, I will be proposing at tonight's meeting that the developer consider dedicating a percentage of the residential building's units for affordable housing (30%, for example).

I recognize this possibility depends on the developer’s willingness to explore it further, but since the residence won't be constructed until the proposed hotel is completed, there's certainly sufficient time to develop a financial and operational plan to enable this (it wouldn't entail any physical changes to the building). Rents in the dedicated units would need to be pegged at or below the average market rent for similar units in the area.

I mentioned it to Ken O'Brien on Monday and then explored the idea with City Housing manager Judy Tobin, as well as Councillor Ravencroft and Deputy Mayor O'Leary, and the idea appears to have merit in their view (depending on the developer’s willingness, of course).

My personal sense, having helped develop numerous affordable housing communities in the city, is that the proposed inclusion of affordable units within the new development will help meet identified future housing needs in the City Housing Strategy, as well as better reflecting and including the social mix that is already a part of the neighbourhood Manga seeks to expand in.

I also believe there would be a broad-based community and funder willingness to viably support an affordable component within the housing. The $40B National Housing Strategy includes a multi-million dollar federal agreement with NL to deliver a range of affordable housing solutions here, including those within private developments. In fact, the Strategy's goals can't be met without private developers. So there are lots of financial and other tools in the kit to help them deliver affordability with a solid business case.

Furthermore, the inclusion of a percentage of affordable units could have positive synergies with neighbouring Riverhead Tower, owned by the City. In exploring the inclusion of new affordable housing, discussions could also consider whether unmet needs for community space or services could be met modestly in the hotel's retail podium, or even in the residential building directly.

I noted with interest from Manga's website that they have established the Toor Foundation to give back to communities (Toronto's Centre for Addictions and Mental Health is a prime beneficiary). So perhaps if asked, the developer already has a heart for the kind of thing I'm suggesting.

I really wish that neighbouring property owners and tenants had been notified in 2018 when the current two-building development proposal was reported to Council, leading to the subsequent LUAR. It would have given us time to consider, engage with and adjust to the potential changes coming. I must say it came as a shock when I first received the City flyer just 3 months ago (Dec 17) outlining the proposal. The 2013 City notice about rezoning the portion of the property now containing the Hilton hotel only indicated that one residential building was a possibility for the remainder of the property if rezoned. That is the understanding we and our neighbours have been living with since that time - and
it sounded reasonable to me. We’d received no indication otherwise, until Dec 17/21. So to see within the Jan 13/22 public meeting package that a 2018 staff memo to Council outlined essentially the current development proposal, I was so disheartened to think we’d never been informed directly at that time. Especially given the scale and scope of the combined development on the entire property totalling 34 storeys, including 25 floors of hotel accommodation. Even with Envision’s aim to bulk up development in our area (and protect other areas from similar development), this is taking that vision and putting it on steroids, resulting in a hotel super-block, and what I believe to be the largest development on a single property in the entire downtown and surrounding neighbourhoods. (I say hotel super-block, in part, because I anticipate that Manga may intend to partner with Premiere Suites to offer nightly and short term furnished accommodation for visitors in the proposed condo, as it currently offers at its Star of the Sea residences on Henry Street).

Lastly, looking beyond this project to future development planning, I truly believe that the question of securing community benefits needs to be revisited by the City, and ultimately, terms and conditions for incorporating this approach carefully and appropriately into planned developments needs to be adopted as a way of doing business. Otherwise, we will just keep missing opportunities to have these conversations at the outset, and will end up chasing the bus after it’s already departed.

Thanks for considering my input, and I look forward to tonight’s meeting. I’m happy to chat with you directly anytime, if you wish.

All the best,

On Wed, Mar 30, 2022, 1:10 PM Ann-Marie Cashin <acashin@stjohns.ca> wrote:

Hi 🌼

We don’t have a formal agenda for the meeting but generally the Commissioner opens the meeting, the City presents on the proposed changes, the applicant presents on the development and then the Commissioner opens it up for questions/concerns from the attendees. Some Commissioner’s may allow for questions in between the City's and applicant's presentation. This meeting is slightly different in that under Covid protocol the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs requires a paper hearing. Tonight’s meeting is just a virtual session to compliant the paper public hearing (written submissions). Everything heard tonight though will be noted by the Commissioner and considered when making their recommendation.

Cameras will depend on how many participants we have. If there are a lot of attendees sometimes there are connectively issues when everyone has their videos on so we do from time to time ask people to turn off their video until they ask a question. Otherwise, people can leave their videos on if they choose to do so. Mics will be turned off until you wish to speak to reduce feedback.

I hope this helps. If you have any further questions, please let me know.
Thank you,

Ann-Marie

From: Christine R. Carter <crcarter@stjohns.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 11:48 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Ann-Marie Cashin <acashin@stjohns.ca>; Jennifer Squires <jsquires@stjohns.ca>
Subject: RE: (EXT) Tonight's City commissioner's hearing regarding 150 New Gower Street

Good day [Redacted]

I'm copying Ann-Marie Cashin for her response to your questions, as she has all the information for tonight’s virtual meeting.

Thank you,

Christine Carter

Christine Carter, Legislative Assistant
Office of the City Clerk
City of St. John's
P.O. Box 908
St. John's, NL A1C 5M2
Telephone (709) 576-3158

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.
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Christine R. Carter <rcarter@stjohns.ca>
Subject: (EXT) Tonight's City commissioner's hearing regarding 150 New Gower Street

Good morning Christine,

Do you happen to have an agenda for tonight's meeting which you could share? (I don't recall seeing one sent to registered participants).

Also, do we need to have our cameras on and mics muted for the session (except when speaking), so the chair can see us and more easily engage with participants?

Thanks kindly,
Hi

I had sat in on most of the meeting on 150 New Gower last night and a good majority of my questions answered, but even though we know the rough timeline and plan to build both buildings at the same time, I realized we didn’t ask...if this proposal is accepted, when are we looking at having a shovel go in the ground? Anticipated work start date?

I also remembered at the first meeting there was talk of a step back on the upper floors of the apartment/condo structure because of its proximity to the property lines of the houses on pleasant. Is that not required now? From my experience I’m not sure that shadow map is accurate however with it being so close the upper floors will it be shadowing the the N/E side of the road.

All the noise level from roof aircxchange etc. I hadn’t thought of it last night but will the noise impact properties further up the hill? We don’t really know the decibel level or the duration of the cycle.

Thank you,
Good afternoon,

From the Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR), the applicant has not indicated when they would like to begin but I believe they would like to start as soon as they have approvals. The LUAR does state that construction is anticipated to be approximately 30 months in length following approvals and permits (a process anticipated to take up to 4 months). If their timelines are correct, it’s possible they may receive development approval later this year if the amendment proceeds.

With respect to the step back, it was discussed at the public meeting however as the application was submitted in 2018 and much of the work has been completed prior to the requirement for the step back, it was deemed that Council could accept the development without the step back. Some information on this can be found in the decision note to Council here: https://pub-stjohns.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=18447

With respect to roof top structures, the applicant noted that any roof top structures would be screened to help minimize any noise impacts.

If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Thank you,
Ann-Marie

Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP - Planner III - Urban Design & Heritage
City of St. John's - Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Phone: 709-570-2041 Fax: 709-576-2340
Email: acashin@stjohns.ca
John J. Murphy Building (City Hall Annex), 4th floor
Mail: PO Box 908, St. John's, NL, Canada A1C 5M2
Karen Chafe

From: 
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 7:59 PM 
To: CityClerk 
Subject: (EXT) 150 New Gower Street rezoning and development application 
Attachments: StaroftheSea_en.pdf

Dear City Clerk,

Regarding the application above - and further to my January 18, 2022 letter to Council; my March 30, 2022 email correspondence with City planner Ann-Marie Cashin; and my participation in the March 30, 2022 City commissioner's hearing - I'm submitting the following clarifying questions and comments here, prior to the April 5, 2022 deadline for comments. I trust you will forward this to the commissioner for consideration in preparing her report to Council.

After last night's helpful commissioner's hearing, I came away with a few questions about what I heard at the meeting, and I have some additional related information to share with you below.

**Reduced Building Heights:**

Related to neighbouring residents' requests that the proposed 9- and 13-storey building heights be reduced, I've enclosed a photo to give you a resident's perspective on the potential heights. The following photo was taken from our 2nd floor rear window looking out onto 150 New Gower Street. Riverhead Towers appears on the right (6 storeys), the Fortis building appears in the distance on the left (on Springdale near Water Street), and the Southside Hills span the horizon (in the space where the proposed buildings would be). One can envision the much taller 9-storey residence to the left of Riverhead Towers, with the even taller 13-storey hotel just beyond it (at more than twice the height of Riverhead Towers). It has been stated by the proponent that the land elevation at 150 New Gower Street will reduce the impact of building heights, and while it is true that the site elevation is lower than that of Pleasant Street, it is not significantly lower than the neighbouring land on which Riverhead Towers sits - and one can see from the enclosed photo that the roof of Riverhead Towers at 6-storeys rises above the viewer's eye-level, blocking out the view of the hills behind it. I submit this photo for your information in consideration of our request regarding building height reductions.
Clarification of the Construction Timeline and Phasing:

As you know, residents are also seeking a shortening of the overall construction timeline if it is feasible, for the reasons I outlined in my January 18, 2022 letter. Greater clarity on the construction phasing and timeline would be very helpful. The proponent's October 21, 2021 LUAR noted in 'Section L' that, following the permits and approvals (approximately 4 months), "the proposed schedule would begin construction with the hotel portion of the project, and then followed by the residential component."

At the March 30, 2022 commissioner's hearing, I believe I noted two alternate scenarios mentioned by the proponent: that the residence be built first, followed by the hotel; or that both buildings be constructed simultaneously once the underground parking is first completed. The latter option would seemingly result in a significant reduction in the construction timeline, so would be more desirable. As a result of the meeting discussion, I'm looking for clarification regarding which of the three options is the one that will be used by the proponent. If it's not the version presented to Council in the LUAR, then I request that a re-calculated, updated construction timeline be provided and shared before Council makes its final decision on the application.

Condominium or Rental Residence:

All of the documentation from the proponent and the City related to the 150 New Gower Street application since plans were first outlined in 2018 indicate that the proposed residential building will be a condominium (by definition, housing individually-owned units). At the March 30, 2022 commissioner's hearing, however, the proponent stated that the building is now being contemplated as a rental residence instead. It would be beneficial to know which form of tenure the building will ultimately be developed for. Any consideration by Manga Hotels to include a percentage of affordable units within the building would necessitate that the building be a rental residence, since funding through Canada’s National Housing Strategy are primarily targeted for rental and co-operative housing providers. I therefore believe it would be helpful to know Manga’s decision with regard to condo or rental tenure for the residence before Council finalizes its decision on the rezoning.

Including Affordable Rental Housing Within the Residential Building:
I sincerely hope that Manga Hotels is favourably considering the proposal I have made to dedicate 30% of proposed residential units for affordable rental housing (with rents pegged at or below average market rents in the area). While I recognize that related details would need to be worked out after Council's rezoning decision, I respectfully request that Manga Hotels indicate to Council now (prior to a rezoning decision) whether it will favourably pursue the possibility of including affordable housing within the residential building. This would be a show of good faith and goodwill, signaling a serious intent to move in this direction. Subsequently, City Housing could ideally convene partnership discussions to this end, bringing together housing funders and local affordable housing providers to assist Manga Hotels with funding and an operational plan to realize this goal.

A Further Clarification Regarding the Proposed Residential Building:

Regardless of whether the proposed residence is a condo or a rental building, when promoting a prospective large-scale, multi-unit residential building such as the one Manga Hotels is seeking Council's approval for, it is implied and understood that the housing units will offer a sense of security and permanence for residents, and a sense of community stability within the building. After all, that is the definition of a 'home'. While it's acknowledged that temporary visitor accommodation has become part of Canada's residential landscape, I would like to know whether Manga Hotels' proposed condo (or rental) building is being developed to offer furnished visitor suites on a nightly-rate basis, similar to a hotel. I ask because, if the overall 150 New Gower Street application is approved, there will already be two hotels on the property - a 12-storey one and a 13-storey one - with 154 and 136 rooms, respectively, offering a total of 290 rooms. Additional hotel-style accommodation in the proposed residential building would fundamentally change the reality of what has been proposed to Council. I believe it is important for Council to know the answer to this question from the proponent before a final decision is made regarding the rezoning and development application.

I pose the question above because it appears that Manga Hotels' Star of the Sea Residences on Henry Street already offers hotel-style, furnished accommodation on a nightly basis through a partnership with Premiere Suites, Canada's largest provider of furnished temporary residences. I've enclosed Premiere Suites' promotional sheet about the Star of the Sea, along with typical rate information below. I would like Manga Hotels to assure Council that this is not its intention for the proposed residential high-rise at 150 New Gower Street.
The Hotel Operator:

Prior to the Hilton Garden Inn's construction on the subject property, I believe it was already publicly known who the operator would be. Has this been determined for the proposed 13-storey hotel - and if so, could Manga Hotels please share this information now? I'm unsure why this hasn't been shared in any of the application documents as yet.

Perimeter Construction Hoarding, and Post-construction Fencing:

The answer to the following questions may lie within the LUAR, but I could not find them, so will pose them here.

During construction, will there be restricted access by the public to the entire portion of the subject property slated for construction, through the use of protective hoarding? I seem to recall during the Hilton’s development phase that construction materials, trailers and equipment occupied a large portion of the undeveloped property adjacent to the emerging building - an open area that was easily accessible to the public around the clock, without protective construction hoarding fully securing the area. This appeared to be a potential safety risk. I'm hoping that the entire perimeter of what will surely be a massive development site spanning several years will be fully surrounded and securely enclosed with construction hoarding.

Will there be any new permanent fencing along the perimeter of the subject property adjacent to the rear of the Pleasant Street properties?
In closing, thanks once again for the opportunity to participate in the review of Manga Hotels' rezoning and development application for 150 New Gower Street. While I may have had many questions and comments regarding the development, they are shared with the intent of strengthening, modifying and integrating what has been proposed into a more favourable plan for all.

Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss anything I've raised here or in my previous communications regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
Star of the Sea

10 Henry Street, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador

Star of the Sea: Executive living awaits you in the heart of historic St. John's at Star of the Sea Residences. Spacious one bedroom and two bedroom, fully furnished suites have been designed to make downtown living effortless, elegant, and urban. Star of the Sea Residences are uniquely situated to ensure you have the best views of both the St. John's harbour and this colourful city. These executive short-term rental suites feature luxurious queen beds, fully equipped kitchens, in-suite laundry and private balcony.

House Rules

- Check in anytime after 3 PM
- Check Out by 10 AM
- 1 night minimum stay
- All Premiere Suites are 100% smoke free

Amenities

- Wifi Internet
- Workspace
- Free Local Calling
- Bi-weekly Housekeeping
- Gym
- Party Room
- Parking On Site

Suites & Reservations

- One Bedroom
- One Bedroom plus Den
- Two Bedroom

Email: reserve.atlantic@premiereSuites.com
Call Us: 1-888-575-7808
Good day Mr./Ms. City Clerk,

I wish to comment on the proposed development for 150 New Gower Street, by Manga Developments and respectfully ask for them to be considered by the commissioner assigned to this application.

In principle, I am in full support of the general nature of this project. Our city needs to be supportive of more projects of this type and scope, if we are to encourage more investment in our city and strengthen our treasury. Also, we need to be able to compete against other cities in the Atlantic region, for the same development dollars. However, there are some concerns I have with the existing designs of both buildings:

1. Hotel: I believe that the current design is both not visually appealing enough and a little too wide for this location, to optimally minimize the structure's lateral view obstructive footprint. Given this zone's height allowance flexibility under the new city plan, the developer should consider making the building narrower and taller, up to 18 stories (60 m) including the uppermost utility floors, in order to allow a greater view of the surrounding lower levels of the downtown. Also a greater use of a glass facade should be encouraged, to permit hotel patrons to enjoy the views of our beautiful city's downtown. An example is the Gazebo Tower in Sydney, Australia. Neighbours who object to this project on the basis of being overshadowed, need to understand that development of this kind need to be given priority over sentimental objections, in order to make the downtown more commercially attractive and sustainable to both developers and patrons.

2. Residential building: I think the facade of this building should be made of lighter-coloured materials and the use of brick should be discouraged, if possible. We need to stop building dirty, drab-looking structures in our city, especially in the downtown, to project and encourage architectural vibrancy and confidence.

In closing, I thank you for your consideration and look forward to the next set of discussions on this worthwhile project.

Sincerely,
Appendix “B” – LUAR Terms of Reference
TERMS OF REFERENCE
LAND USE ASSESSMENT REPORT (LUAR)
APPLICATION TO REZONE PROPERTY AT 150 NEW GOWER STREET

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(s) by:
     - Gross Floor Area
     - Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
   • Identify all proposed uses/occupancies within the building(s) by their respective floor area:

B. Elevation & Building Materials
   • Identify the height of the building(s).
   • Provide elevations of the proposed building(s).
   • Identify the finish and colour of exterior building materials.

C. Building Height & Location
   • Identify graphically the exact location with a site plan:
     Location of the proposed building(s) in relation to neighbouring buildings; Proximity of the building(s) to property lines and identify setbacks; Information on the proposed construction of patios/balconies (if applicable); Identify any additional street-level elements, such as weather protection measures at entrances, etc.
     Potential shadowing/loss of sunlight on adjacent public and private properties, including sidewalks; and
     Identify any rooftop structures.

D. Building Wind Generation
   • Identify how building placement and height will alter the wind conditions onsite, entrances to the building, adjacent streets and sidewalks. Identify measures to minimize impacts at the pedestrian level.

E. 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(s) and identify possible impacts on adjoining residential properties and measures to be instituted to minimize these impacts.

F. Landscaping & Buffering
• Identify with a landscaping plan, details of site landscaping (hard and soft).
• Identify the location and proposed methods of screening of any electrical transformers on the site.
• Identify the location for refuse storage to be used at the site and buffering.
• Identify pedestrian connections (both onsite and to New Gower Street and/or Springdale Street) and how they are designed: landscaping, lighting, bicycle parking for retail space, street furniture, etc.

G. Snowclearing/Snow Storage
• Identify proposed method of snow clearing and/or location of snow storage area(s) on the site.

H. Municipal Services
• Identify points of connection to the City's water and sewer system and the re-routed services across the site in order to accommodate the development.
• The proposed development will be required to comply with the City's stormwater detention policy. Provide information on how onsite stormwater detention will be managed.

I. Off-street Parking and Access
• Identify the number of parking spaces required for the overall proposal.
• Identify parking area(s), the number of off street (underground) spaces to be provided subject to the current Service NL requirements. Identify vehicular ingress and egress, traffic circulation and any loading areas.
• Identify where parking will be located for the existing hotel during construction Phase 2.

J. Traffic
• Provide the anticipated traffic generation rates associated with the proposed development.

K. Public Transit
• Consult with St. John's Metrobus (St. John's Transportation Commission) regarding public transit infrastructure requirements.
L. 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 where workers' parking is to be accommodated during the construction period and designated areas for equipment and materials during the construction period.
LAND USE ASSESSMENT REPORT

APPLICATION TO REZONE
150 NEW GOWER STREET

October 21, 2021
Manga Hotels Corporate Office
3279 Caroga Drive
Mississauga, Ontario
L4V

Kingslake Projects Inc.
109 Railside Road, Suite 101
Toronto, ON
M3A 1B2
contact: Vahe Kouyoumijian

t: 416-391-2428
e: vahe@kingslakeprojects.com

CONSULTANTS:

Local

683 Water Street, 2nd Floor
St. John's, NL
A1E 1B5
t: 709-753-7132
f: 709-753-6469
e: info@lat49.ca

Architectural

9 Forsythe Street
Oakville, ON
L6K 3J8
t: 416-897-2867
f: 709-753-6469
e: m.algohary@matajarchitects.com

Wind

901 King Street West, Suite 400
Toronto, ON
M5V 3H5
t: 519-823-1311
e: brandon.law@rwdi.com

Parking + Traffic

Suite 301, Terrace on the Square
8 Rowan Street, P.O. Box 23169
St. John's, NL
A1B 4J9
t: 709-579-6435
f: 709-579-7515
e: mstuckless@harboursideengineering.ca

Parking & Traffic

9 Forsythe Street
Oakville, ON
L6K 3J8
t: 416-391-2428
f: 709-753-6469
e: vahe@kingslakeprojects.com

Engineering

40 Aberdeen Ave
Suite 202
St. John's, NL
A1A 5T3
t: 709-754-2114
f: 709-738-0707
e: keith.hannon@pinnacleengineering.ca
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Introduction

Manga Hotels is proposing a new development for the current empty lot located at 150 New Gower Street. This new multi-building development will sit next to an existing 12 storey hotel (the Hilton Garden Inn) at the corner of New Gower Street and Springdale Street.

The existing Hilton Garden Inn was re-designated Commercial Downtown and rezoned Commercial Central Office (CCO) in 2016. However, with the new development at 150 New Gower Street and with the proposed Envision Development Regulations for the City of St. John’s, it has now been suggested by the City that the entire site, including the existing hotel, be re-designated to Commercial Downtown and rezoned to the new Commercial Downtown (CD) zone.

This LUAR is submitted by LAT49 Architecture Inc. on behalf of Manga Hotels for the development of 150 New Gower Street into a 13 storey hotel with the option for commercial/retail use at the lower level and a 9 storey condominium/apartment building.
A | BUILDING USE

There are two new buildings proposed for this site: a 13 storey hotel/commercial building with 2 storeys of retail/commercial at the base and a 9 storey residential condo building. Both buildings are connected below grade with two levels of underground parking.

The area of the property, including the existing hotel at the corner of New Gower Street and Springdale Street, is approximately as follows:

**Total Area of Property:** 9,260 m² (99,674 ft²)

Please reference the below table for Floor Area and Gross Floor Area (GFA) of each building. Also, note that the GFA was calculated by removing the area of the underground parking and amenity spaces (pool, lobby, fitness centre), however, meeting rooms and storage areas have been included in this calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Hilton Garden Inn</th>
<th>New 13 Storey Hotel</th>
<th>New 9 Storey Condo</th>
<th>Underground Parking</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area</td>
<td>9,279 m²</td>
<td>10,206 m²</td>
<td>7,555 m²</td>
<td>7,684 m²</td>
<td>34,724 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>9,882 ft²</td>
<td>109,856 ft²</td>
<td>81,321 ft²</td>
<td>82,710 ft²</td>
<td>373,766 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage %</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Rooms/Units</td>
<td>154 rooms</td>
<td>136 rooms</td>
<td>86 units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>290 rooms 86 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Space Area</td>
<td>211 m²</td>
<td>135 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>346 m² 3,724 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retail Space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>318 m²</td>
<td>3,423 ft²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>318 m² 3,423 ft²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underground Parking**

The two levels of below grade parking will service the entire site and has a total of 164 parking spaces. Each below grade parking level has a total area of 3,842 m² per level (7,684 m² in total) of which 3,420 m² on Level P1 and 3,452 m² on Level P2 is the parking area itself. The remainder of the area is lobby and access space along with mechanical/electrical/utility space. A generator room (pending approval from the appropriate authorities) is located on Level P1.

**Hotel**

The 13 storey hotel has a typical floor plan for floors 3 through to 13 (11 storeys of hotel rooms) consisting of 12 hotel rooms that vary between King Studios, Double Queen Studios and Double Queen Suites. In addition, on Level 2 there will be four hotel rooms that share the floor with a meeting/conference area and fitness centre. The total number of hotel rooms for this hotel is 136. The lobby level includes a large front entry and check-in area, a business center, a lounge with kitchen service prep, a pool and washrooms.
The proposed 2 storeys of retail/commercial space would be on the same level as the lobby of the hotel but accessed via shop entrances along New Gower or from the parking area on the site. As previously noted, all meeting rooms, boardroom spaces as well as a fitness centre will be located on the second level of the Hotel.

Reference the below table for a breakdown of area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Hotel Rooms</th>
<th>Amenity Area (m²)</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Meeting Space</th>
<th>Retail/Commercial</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>- 148 m²</td>
<td>138 m²</td>
<td>5 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>318 m²</td>
<td>477 m²</td>
<td>1,086 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>214 m²</td>
<td>22 m²</td>
<td>143 m²</td>
<td>29 m²</td>
<td>135 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>206 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 9</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 10</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 11</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 12</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 13</td>
<td>630 m²</td>
<td>26 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>7,144 m²</td>
<td>456 m²</td>
<td>281 m²</td>
<td>342 m²</td>
<td>135 m²</td>
<td>318 m²</td>
<td>1,530 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condo

The 9 storey residential building will contain residential units on all levels. The ground floor will contain 6 residential units as well as a lobby, fitness room, party room, locker room, garbage room and utility spaces. Each level above the ground storey will contain 7 One Bedroom Units, 2 Two Bedroom Units, and 1 Three Bedroom Unit for a total of 86 units. Each unit will have a balcony and each level will contain a garbage chute leading to the Garbage Room on the ground level.

Reference the below table for a breakdown of area. For typical floor plans, see Appendix 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Amenity Area (m²)</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>377 m²</td>
<td>51 m²</td>
<td>61 m²</td>
<td>83 m²</td>
<td>287 m²</td>
<td>859 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 9</td>
<td>743 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94 m²</td>
<td>837 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>6,321 m²</td>
<td>51 m²</td>
<td>61 m²</td>
<td>83 m²</td>
<td>1,039 m²</td>
<td>7,555 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B | ELEVATION & BUILDING MATERIALS

Hotel

The new hotel is approximately 41 m above grade plus an additional 2.2 m to the top of the highest parapet with floor to floor heights currently set at 2.88 m for floors 3 through to 13 with higher floor to floor heights set for the bottom two levels. The building is clad in four main materials that create a pattern across each facade of the building. These materials include an off-white panel, a pale grey panel, a wood grain panel and charcoal masonry.

The base is weighted by two storeys of charcoal masonry that is predominately on the retail/commercial portion of the building to create a more pedestrian scaled base. The retail/commercial space was designed to mimic similar existing buildings in the downtown core with shop-like curtain wall glazing and inset entrances to each space. This retail/commercial area of the building follows New Gower Street in an effort to create shops along the street similar to the existing condition on Water Street. A secondary pedestrian entrance to the hotel off New Gower Street is integrated into this design of the retail/commercial portion of the building.

The north elevation features the primary entry off of the roundabout on the site and is highlighted by a suspended canopy with the wood grain panels centered on the facade to help to frame out the main entry. Above, on all elevations, strip lights are located to accent the building design. The hotel signage is placed at the top of the building.

Residential

The proposed residential building is approximately 29 m above ground level plus an additional 1 m to the top of the parapet with floor to floor heights currently set at 3.05 m.

This building is clad in a charcoal metal panel at the base which continues up to the parapet of the three balcony bays on the front and rear elevations with the exception of the corner balcony at the rear elevation which is inset and clad in a yellow panel. The base is accented with horizontal bands that help to define the lower two levels of the building. The darker base is accented above with colourful clapboard style siding and/or panels in various colours. There is a mixture of punched windows and curtain wall glazing throughout the building. The balconies feature glass rails and are connected to the living area of the units via floor to ceiling glazing.

The lower level of the building features accent lighting that doubles as security lighting along the main walkways and entries of the building.

Refer to Appendix 6 for elevations and Appendix 13 for building renderings.

C | BUILDING HEIGHT & LOCATION

The proposed development is located at the northwest corner of Springdale Street and New Gower Street and is an extension of the existing hotel development (Hilton Garden Inn). Overall, the mass and height of the two new buildings fit in with the current buildings located along the north side of New Gower Street including the new Hilton hotel, the Delta hotel and Cabot Place. In addition, Fortis Place, located directly across the street on the south side, and 351 Water Street are other examples of a recent tower developments in this area.
The site is designed to be integrated with the current hotel (Hilton Garden Inn) and features a roundabout drop-off with 18 parking spaces at grade. There is a ramped access to underground parking and the site is landscaped with pathways connecting the building to the parking areas, to New Gower Street and linking into an existing path that connects with Riverhead Towers as well as one to connect to Hamilton Avenue. The hotel/commercial building is set back from the property line along New Gower Street by 5.63 m at its closest and the building shape follows the turn in the property line in the direction of Hamilton Avenue. At the side of the property, the building is set back from the property line 2.76 m at its closest and 11.9 m at its furthest. The Residential building is set at the rear of the property and is set back from the side property line by 8.48 m at its closest point and by 5.38 m at the rear property line. Refer to the Site Plan in Appendix 3.

The hotel building will have a mechanical penthouse and the residential building will have mechanical roof top units that will be buffered with a roof screen. Each unit in the residential tower will have a balcony that is enclosed by a glass rail supported by steel railings and posts. The balcony will be an extension of the floor slab and tied into the structure of the building. Initially, a roof deck patio was designed to be located on the roof of the residential tower, however, this has been removed for the time being after looking at recommendations from the RWDI in the attached wind study.

As the shadow study in Appendix 7 shows, there is an impact on existing buildings created by the shadows during the year. There will be shadowing along the residential properties at Pleasant Street in the morning hours of the Spring, Fall and Winter months. During the Summer, the neighbouring residential properties will not be as affected by the shadows with only a small portion of the backyards of one or two houses on Pleasant Street being affected by this in the morning hours. The other primary area affected by the shadowing is the parking lot on the site itself as well as the section of New Gower Street along the south. In the evening hours from March through until September, New Gower Street will be shaded by these two new buildings. There is no impact from shadows toward the north at Riverhead Towers. The most significant shade created by these two new buildings will be within the parking and circulation areas of the site as well as some impact during the morning hours throughout the year toward the residential properties along Pleasant Street. Refer to Appendix 7 for the images of the shadow studies taken at the Winter Solstice, Spring Equinox, Summer Solstice and Fall Equinox.

**D | BUILDING WIND GENERATION**

In terms of the effect of wind on the site, the proposed development has a number of positive design features such as the podium of the commercial building and canopies above main entrances and vestibules. Appropriate wind conditions are expected along all sidewalks, the main entrances to the two buildings, and the entrances along the east façade of the commercial building. Higher than desired wind speeds are predicted at the secondary entrances along the west façade of the commercial building during the winter, and at the grade level outdoor amenity areas and upper level outdoor amenity areas of both buildings during the summer. High wind speeds with potential uncomfortable conditions are expected at the walkway between the two proposed buildings during the winter. A report of the wind conditions on site and a recommendation of several localized wind mitigation measures has been completed by the wind consultant, RWDI, and can be found in Appendix 8.

Some of the recommendations include introducing a pergola and planting at the intersection between the two new buildings where downwashing of the wind down the facade of the building could create uncomfortable conditions for pedestrians. In an effort to mitigate this issue, coniferous trees will be planted in that area and, if proven to not reduce the effect of the wind conditions on site, a pergola will be added at a later date. Although the suggestion to relocate the walkways in that area was considered,
the decision was made to keep those pathways in that area under the current design. The walkways at that intersection lead to the service entry and a secondary exit off of the Hotel and also connect the existing pathway from Riverhead Towers. With the mitigation measures in place to reduce the wind conditions in that specific location and the lower rate of use of those pathways on site, we believe that conditions at those pathways will be improved for comfort for pedestrian use.

Additionally, some tall planters will be placed along the west entrances to the commercial units to help mitigate higher wind speeds in that area. At the rear of the Residential building, the outdoor patio area will have a large pergola and increased planting to create a calmer wind zone and likewise, the play area will be surrounded by planting as well.

As noted in the previous section, due to the measures required to create a comfortable pedestrian environment, the roof deck on the residential building has been removed under this current design. Refer to the Landscape Plan in Appendix 4 for locations of planting.

E | EXTERIOR EQUIPMENT & LIGHTING

Both of the buildings proposed for the property will have lighting mounted or integrated into the facade of the building and will have pathway lighting leading to the entrances of each building. The lighting that will be mounted to the exterior of the building can light not only architectural features but walkways leading to and from the entrances/ exits to ensure the high degree of safety. The hotel will have facade lighting on the exterior in the form of accent lighting at the edges of the building as well as lit signage at the parapet. The line of edge lighting will not be excessively bright as it is only meant to highlight architectural features on the building. This lighting is not anticipated to impact any surrounding properties. Pole lighting for parking, lighting the access road and pathways will be placed throughout the site as necessary as well to increase visibility and safety.

The lighting for the site will be carefully selected to appropriately light the given area but also be robust enough to last in our local weather conditions. In addition, the lighting of the site is also meant to create a safe environment at the exterior of the building. Refer to the Site Plan in Appendix 3, the Landscape Plan in Appendix 5 and the elevation drawings in Appendix 6 for suggested lighting locations.

F | LANDSCAPING & BUFFERING

The two new buildings that are part of this proposed development are generously spaced on the site allowing a larger percentage of landscaping and buffering from nearby properties. The hotel/commercial building is set back from New Gower Street by approximately 5.6 m which creates space for soft landscaping elements such as the planting of trees and shrubbery along the street and along the pathways leading to the building. Likewise, the residential component is set back from the side property line by approximately 8 m at its closest point. This creates a wide buffer between the existing apartment building off of Hamilton Avenue (Riverhead Towers) and the proposed residential building. Along the north portion of the site, the residential building is setback 5.3 m at the closest point from the neighbouring properties on Pleasant Street.

There are several outdoor spaces in this development including a small patio space off of the hotel/commercial building and two patio spaces with a play area off of the condo building. Both feature hard and soft landscaping elements along with benches and seating areas. The patio space off of the hotel is for general use only - not for restaurant or lounge use.
The majority of soft landscaping on the site will be along the open space between the two proposed buildings and the property lines, primarily at the south and west portions of the site. Planting will be placed throughout but predominately around the pathways, parking areas and entrances of both new buildings. These will include planters featuring shrubbery and flowering plants. Trees will be planted along street frontages (New Gower Street). If sufficient room does not exist to plant trees along the site frontage, or if planting within easements is not possible, trees will be distributed throughout the property per the City's Landscape Development Policy and Street Tree Planting Standards. The pathways and patios will feature stonework and concrete pavers highlighted by planters and accent lighting. Furthermore, street furniture such as benches and waste/recycling bins will be placed along pathways and at entrances. Bicycle parking will be provided near the entrances to both buildings.

The strip of land between the new hotel building and New Gower Street is an easement and is not part of the property for this development. However, the design includes pathways connecting the retail portion of the development to the sidewalk along New Gower Street within the easement and to include soft landscaping as well. It is not known at this time whether this area will require re-grading or the extent of any buried utilities. The developer will work with the City to create a plan for the easement that suits all parties and, should re-grading be necessary for the berm, it is the intention of the developer to complete any necessary grading to link the pathways to the sidewalk along New Gower Street.

Refuse containers are located in the garbage room on the main level of the Residential building. There will be a chute on each level that will lead down to the garbage room. The garbage room will be air conditioned to deal with any odors that may result from the storage of garbage in the room and will have a hose bib with a floor drain for cleaning purposes. The garbage will be removed via the side exit at the north end of the building. Likewise, any refuse or garbage from the Hotel portion of the development will be appropriately dealt with on the main level of the Hotel with interior collection and storage in a garbage room. This room will have similar features as the one in the Residential building.

Any exterior refuse containers, propane tanks, or transformers will be fenced or hidden by planting elements. The current location for the propane tank is just beyond the parking area at the north property line at the rear of the Pleasant Street properties. The generator and electrical transformers are located in the underground parking area.

Refer to Appendix 5 for the Landscape Plan and Appendix 6 for a plan of the underground parking.

G | SNOWCLEARING / SNOW STORAGE

There is room for snow storage from City snowclearing along New Gower Street as the Hotel/Commercial building is set back just about 6 m from the sidewalk. The pathways that lead into the hotel and commercial entrances off of New Gower Street will be cleared as necessary by a hired snowclearing service. For snowclearing on site, the developer would hire a snowclearing service to clear the snow to the various landscaped areas across the site. There is a good amount of snow storage space to the left of the main access of the site and in the center of the roundabout.

See Appendix 5 for the Site Plan showing proposed snow storage locations.
H | MUNICIPAL SERVICES

**Water Service**

The subject property is serviced by the City of St. John’s Water Supply System. An existing 250 mm watermain is located in New Gower Street along the frontage of the property and a 150 mm watermain is located in Hamilton Avenue. Both these watermains are available for connection to provide water service to the proposed buildings. At this time the current proposed connection is to the 250 mm watermain in New Gower Street.

The approximate static pressure of the water distribution system in this area is 115 to 120 psi which will be reduced by approximately 15 psi in the future by the City of St. John’s. The fire flow requirement for the proposed new building is in the order of 1300 USGPM in accordance with the Fire Underwriters’ Survey of “Water Supply for Public Fire Protection”. A recent flow test conducted in the area indicates an available flow of 1820 USGPM with a 95 psi residual pressure.

**Sanitary Sewer Services**

The expected peak dry weather flow generated from the proposed development is 15.4 L/s. There is an existing 600 mm diameter combined sewer within the developments property boundary constructed for the Hilton Garden Inn which is available for connection. This combined sewer connects to the existing 400 mm diameter sanitary sewer in New Gower Street. It is anticipated the receiving sewer has sufficient spare capacity to accommodate the expected sanitary sewage flow from the proposed development.

**Re-Routing Existing Combined Sewer**

There is an existing 400 mm diameter combined sanitary and storm sewer that crosses the proposed development. This combined sewer will be intercepted at the northwest corner of the subject property and re-routed around the perimeter of the proposed development. The new combined sewer will be connected to the existing combined sewer near the southwest corner of Hilton Garden Inn building.

**Storm Water Management**

The anticipated peak storm water runoff from the proposed development is 445 L/s based on a 1:100 year event (2 hour storm duration). This value includes the latest climate change data. Storm water runoff will be collected via standard roof drain systems, site catchbasins / storm sewers and conveyed to an existing concrete underground storm water detention system. Additional storage volume may be required to accommodate City of St. John’s climate change design criteria for both the existing Hilton Garden Inn site and the proposed development as the existing tank predates the City's climate change data. The detention system will be constructed as a concrete tank or a series of oversized pipes. The captured storm water will continue to be released to the City’s municipal storm water system in New Gower Street via an outlet control device designed to release the storm water at the pre-development rate.
The design of water, sanitary, storm and stormwater detention services for this development will satisfy all technical engineering requirements as established by the City of St. John’s. In addition, when this development is submitted to the City under detailed design, expected peak dry weather sanitary flow and storm sewer pre-development flow rate will be updated to suit the City’s engineering requirements. Likewise, a pre- and post-development XPSWMM model will be completed at this stage as well.

This review of Municipal Services to the site was provided by Pinnacle Engineering. For a site servicing plan, see Appendix 4.

## 1 | OFF-STREET PARKING AND ACCESS

The proposed development will include the existing 154-room hotel (Hilton Garden Inn), a new 136 room hotel with 318 m² of commercial retail space and a new 86-unit condominium building. The existing hotel (Hilton Garden Inn) has 211 m² of meeting/conference space and the new hotel will have 135 m² of this type of space.

### City of St. John’s Parking Requirements

150 New Gower Street is located within a boundary area of the Downtown defined in the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Zoning Map, and is included on the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations Downtown Parking Standards Map (Map 2). Accordingly, any development that occurs on this site is subject to the Downtown Parking Standards. The Downtown Parking Standards are divided into two separate requirements: Non-Residential Development and Residential Development.

For Non-Residential Development in the Downtown Area, including commercial, retail, office, institutional, and all other forms of non-residential developments — including hotels — the minimum and maximum number of parking spaces is permitted to be 50 per cent of the requirements stated in the Envision Development Regulations Parking Standards. Parking for Residential Developments in the Downtown Area must comply with the Envision Development Parking Standards, with no reduction for location.

In this particular situation, the commercial/retail space that is part of the new hotel, would be subject to 50 per cent of the parking requirements in the Envision Development Regulations. Since the nature of the businesses that will be occupying these spaces are unknown at this time in the development process, whether retail or restaurant, the parking requirements have been based on the most restrictive. For commercial space greater than 200 m² and less than 500 m², one parking space is to be provided for every 20 m² (min) and 5 m² (max) of gross floor area has been used (Restaurant classification).

The new and existing hotels require one parking space for every four guest sleeping rooms in addition to one parking space for every 5 m² (min) and 4 m² (max) of banquet/seminar/conference/meeting space.

For Residential Developments, the Downtown Parking Standard for condominium buildings is based on the Apartment classification from Table 8.3 of the Envision Development Regulations. This requirement provides parking minimums per type of dwelling unit, whether studio, one-, two-, or three-bedroom or greater, and accommodation for visitor parking.

The parking requirement calculations for 150 New Gower Street are shown in Table 1. In total, this development will require a minimum of 172 parking spaces, of which 6% must be accessible. In
total, 182 parking spaces have been provided on-site; 164 spaces provided over two levels in the underground garage and 18 surface spaces; 13 barrier free parking spaces have been provided (11 required), divided between the surface and underground parking. The development plan exceeds the minimum parking requirements as set out in the Envision Development Regulations by 10 spaces.

Table 1: Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Minimum Parking</th>
<th>Maximum Parking</th>
<th>50% Downtown Parking Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums (ITE LUC 221)</td>
<td>Refer to Appendix 10: Parking Study for requirements</td>
<td>86 units</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>93 - 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (ITE LUC 310)</td>
<td></td>
<td>290 rooms</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>37 - 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Meeting Space</td>
<td>346 m² GFA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>34 - 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>318 m² GFA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8 - 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Parking Spaces Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>172 - 263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Parking Spaces Provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Net Floor Area (NFA) = 80% of Gross Floor Area (GFA)
Overall Lot Area 9,260 m²

A detailed Parking Study can be found in Appendix 10.

Beyond the parking provided for this development it is also located along major transit routes and can be easily reached via Metrobus, or simply by walking. There is also a drop-off area provided for each proposed building as well as a loading area directly across from the proposed Residential building. The underground parking lot does not contain any loading areas.

During construction, a total of 46 parking spaces for the existing hotel at the corner of Springdale Street and New Gower Street will be provided based on the parking plans provided in Appendix 11. These parking calculations were completed by Harbourside Engineering.

J | TRAFFIC

Trip generation estimates for the proposed development were prepared using trip generation rates published in the 10th edition of the Trip Generation Manual by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). A summary of the trip generation rates and inbound/outbound splits for the relevant land use codes is included in Table 1.

Table 1: Assumed Trip Generation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Source¹</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour Rate</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums (ITE LUC 221)</td>
<td>ITE LUC 221 - Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (ITE LUC 310)</td>
<td>ITE LUC 310 - Hotel</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>ITE LUC 820 - Shopping Center</td>
<td>1,000 ft² GFA</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Trip generation rates are in vehicles per hour per unit.
The weekday morning (AM) and afternoon (PM) peak hour trip generation estimates for the development are included in Table 2. It is estimated that the proposed development will generate 172 two-way vehicle trips (91 trips in/81 trips out) during the AM peak hour and 227 two-way vehicle trips (119 trips in/108 trips out) during the PM peak hour.

This information and traffic study was completed by Harbourside Engineering and a copy of this study can be found in Appendix 12.

K | PUBLIC TRANSIT

LAT49 Architecture contacted Keith Woodfine, Transit Planner at Metrobus, to inquire about any public transit infrastructure requirements for this development and after reviewing the location Metrobus does not feel there are any further transit infrastructure required. Please refer to Appendix 9 for email correspondence.

L | CONSTRUCTION TIMEFRAME

The construction timeframe for this project is anticipated to be approximately 30 months in length following approvals and permits (a process anticipated to take up to 4 months). The proposed schedule would begin construction with the hotel portion of the project and then followed by the residential component.

Worker parking will be provided as per the site plan in Appendix 11. During Phase II, after the underground parking has been completed, workers will be able to park in the underground parking area.
APPENDIX 1 | TERMS OF REFERENCE
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(s) by:
  - Gross Floor Area
  - Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
- Identify all proposed uses/occupancies within the building(s) by their respective floor area.

B. Elevation & Building Materials
- Identify the height of the building(s).
- Provide elevations of the proposed building(s).
- Identify the finish and colour of exterior building materials.

C. Building Height & Location
- Identify graphically the exact location with a site plan:
  - Location of the proposed building(s) in relation to neighbouring buildings;
  - Proximity of the building(s) to property lines and identify setbacks;
  - Information on the proposed construction of patios/balconies (if applicable);
  - Identify any additional street-level elements, such as weather protection measures at entrances, etc.
  - Potential shadowing/loss of sunlight on adjacent public and private properties, including sidewalks; and
  - Identify any rooftop structures.

D. Building Wind Generation
- Identify how building placement and height will alter the wind conditions onsite, entrances to the building, adjacent streets and sidewalks. Identify measures to minimize impacts at the pedestrian level.

E. 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(s) and identify possible impacts on adjoining residential properties and measures to be instituted to minimize these impacts.
F. Landscaping & Buffering
   • Identify with a landscaping plan, details of site landscaping (hard and soft).
   • Identify the location and proposed methods of screening of any electrical transformers on the site.
   • Identify the location for refuse storage to be used at the site and buffering.
   • Identity pedestrian connections (both onsite and to New Gower Street and/or Springdale Street) and how they are designed: landscaping, lighting, bicycle parking for retail space, street furniture, etc.

G. Snowclearing/Snow Storage
   • Identify proposed method of snow clearing and/or location of snow storage area(s) on the site.

H. Municipal Services
   • Identify points of connection to the City’s water and sewer system and the re-routed services across the site in order to accommodate the development.
   • The proposed development will be required to comply with the City’s stormwater detention policy. Provide information on how onsite stormwater detention will be managed.

I. Off-street Parking and Access
   • Identify the number of parking spaces required for the overall proposal.
   • Identify parking area(s), the number of off street (underground) spaces to be provided subject to the current Service NL requirements. Identify vehicular ingress and egress, traffic circulation and any loading areas.
   • Identify where parking will be located for the existing hotel during construction Phase 2.

J. Traffic
   • Provide the anticipated traffic generation rates associated with the proposed development.

K. Public Transit
   • Consult with St. John’s Metrobus (St. John’s Transportation Commission) regarding public transit infrastructure requirements.

L. 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 where workers’ parking is to be accommodated during the construction period and designated areas for equipment and materials during the construction period.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Rowan Williams Davies & Irwin Inc. (RWDI) was retained by LAT49 Architecture Inc. to assess the pedestrian wind conditions for the proposed 150 New Gower St. in St. John’s, NL (Image 1). This assessment is based on the following:

- A review of regional long-term meteorological data from St. John’s International Airport;
- Design drawings received from LAT49 Architecture Inc. on May 22, 2019;
- Wind studies undertaken by RWDI for similar projects in the St. John’s Area;
- Our engineering judgement and knowledge of wind flows around buildings\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^3\); and,
- Use of software developed by RWDI (Winestimator\(^2\)) for estimating the potential wind conditions around generalized building forms.

This qualitative approach provides a screening-level estimation of potential wind conditions. Conceptual wind control measures to improve wind comfort are recommended, where necessary. In order to quantify these conditions or refine any conceptual mitigation measures, physical scale-model tests in a boundary-layer wind tunnel would typically be required.


2. BUILDING AND SITE INFORMATION

The proposed development is located along New Gower St., south of Springdale St. (Images 1). The site is currently unoccupied, and is immediately surrounded a high-rise building to the north, a mid-rise building to the southwest and low-rise residential buildings in all other directions (Image 1). Away from the immediate surroundings, the buildings are generally dense and low-rise to the southeast through west to northeast with the harbor and grass lands, followed by St. John’s Bay to the northeast through southeast. A number of high-rise buildings are located to the northeast and north of the site.

The proposed development will consists of a 13-storey hotel/commercial building (including a 2-storey podium) and a 9-storey residential building (see Images 2 and 3). The public pedestrian areas of interest include building entrances, outdoor amenity areas at the grade level and above-grade level, walkways and public sidewalks.
3. METEOROLOGICAL DATA

The meteorological data recorded at St. John’s International Airport, for the period from 1984 to 2014, were used as a reference for wind conditions in the area. The distributions of wind frequency and directionality for the summer (May through October) and winter (November through April) seasons are shown in Image 4.

When all wind data is considered, winds from the west-southwest and west directions are frequent during the summer. During the winter, prevailing winds are from west-southwest through west-northwest directions, with secondary winds from south.

Strong winds of a mean speed greater than 30 km/h measured at the airport (at an anemometer height of 10m) occur more often in winter than in the summer and are primarily from west-southwest through west-northwest directions. Winds from these directions could potentially be the source of uncomfortable or even severe wind conditions, depending upon the site exposure or development design. The analysis methods have accounted for these and all winds directions.

Image 4: Directional distribution of winds approaching St. John’s International Airport (1984-2014)
The RWDI pedestrian wind criteria are used in the current study. These criteria have been developed by RWDI through research and consulting practice since 1974. They have also been widely accepted by municipal authorities as well as by the building design and city planning community. The criteria are as follows:

**Pedestrian Safety**

Pedestrian safety is associated with excessive gust wind speeds that can adversely affect a pedestrian’s balance and footing. If strong winds that can affect a person’s balance (90 km/h) occur more than 0.1% of the time or 9 hours per year, the wind conditions are considered severe.

**Pedestrian Comfort**

Wind comfort can be categorized by typical pedestrian activities:

- **Sitting (≤ 10 km/h):** Calm or light breezes desired for outdoor seating areas where one can read a paper without having it blown away.
- **Standing (≤ 14 km/h):** Gentle breezes suitable for main building entrances and bus stops.
- **Strolling (≤ 17 km/h):** Moderate winds that would be appropriate for window shopping and strolling along a downtown street, plaza or park.
- **Walking (≤ 20 km/h):** Relatively high speeds that can be tolerated if one’s objective is to walk, run or cycle without lingering.
- **Uncomfortable:** None of the comfort categories are met.

Wind conditions are considered suitable for sitting, standing, strolling or walking if the associate wind speeds are expected for at least four out of five days (80% of the time). Wind control measures are typically required at locations where winds are rated as uncomfortable or they exceed the wind safety criterion.

Note that these wind speeds are assessed at the pedestrian height (i.e., 1.5 m above grade or the concerned floor level), typically lower than those recorded in the airports (10 m height and open terrain).

These criteria for wind forces represent average wind tolerance. They are sometimes subjective and regional differences in wind climate and thermal conditions as well as variations in age, health, clothing, etc. can also affect people’s perception of the wind climate.

For the current development, wind speeds comfortable for walking or strolling are appropriate for sidewalks and walkways; lower wind speeds comfortable for sitting or standing are required for building entrances and outdoor amenity areas, where pedestrians may linger.
5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

Background

Predicting wind speeds and occurrence frequencies is complicated. It involves building geometry, orientation, position and height of surrounding buildings, upstream terrain and the local wind climate. Over the years, RWDI has conducted thousands of wind-tunnel model studies regarding pedestrian wind conditions around buildings, yielding a broad knowledge base. This knowledge has been incorporated into RWDI’s proprietary software that allows, in many situations, for a qualitative, screening-level numerical estimation of pedestrian wind conditions without wind tunnel testing.

The proposed development is taller than its immediate surroundings and is exposed to the prevailing southwesterly through northwesterly winds. Tall buildings tend to intercept the stronger winds at higher elevations and redirect them to the ground level. Such a Downwashing Flow (see Image 5a) is the main cause for increased wind activity around tall buildings at the grade level. When oblique winds are deflected down by a building, a localized increase in wind activity or Corner Acceleration can be expected around the exposed building corners at pedestrian level (see Image 5b). When two buildings are situated side by side, wind flow tends to accelerate through the space between the buildings due to channeling effect caused by the narrow gap (see Image 5c). If these building/wind combinations occur for prevailing winds, there is a greater potential for increased wind activity.

Building setbacks, podiums and stepped facades will reduce the direct impact of downwashing wind flows at grade; however, it will result in accelerated winds on the podium itself (Image 5d).

Detailed discussions on the potential wind comfort conditions at key pedestrian areas are provided in the next sections.
5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

Sidewalks and Walkways

The proposed commercial building has a 2-storey podium on the south side which is a positive design feature in deflecting winds accelerating down the tower, away from the ground. Also sidewalks of New Gower St. will be blocked by the proposed development from the strong westerly winds. Springdale St. and Pleasant St. are far enough from the site not to be impacted by the proposed development. Wind conditions along all surrounding sidewalks are not expected to be negatively impacted by the addition of the proposed development to the site and conditions are expected to remain similar to what is currently experienced.

Appropriate wind conditions are expected at most of the walkways around the proposed buildings; however, as a result of downwashing of the westerly winds off the west façade of the commercial tower and around its northwest corner, as well as channeling of southerly, southwesterly and northwesterly through northeasterly winds between the residential and commercial towers, high wind speeds with potentially uncomfortable conditions are expected at this area during the winter (marked by A in Image 6). More comfortable conditions at A can be achieved by installing a canopy along the west façade of the tower, wrapping around the northwest corner or installing a trellis to cover the gap between the two towers. Alternatively, localized wind control measures such as coniferous landscaping
or porous windscreens, can help to reduce windscreens at this area. We recommend to relocate the walkways and keep pedestrians away from this area. Examples of these mitigation measures are shown in Image 7. Wind tunnel testing can be conducted at later design stage to quantify these conditions and evaluate the effectiveness of the recommended mitigation measures.

Image 7: Examples of wind mitigation measures at area A
5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

Entrances

The main entrances to the residential building and commercial building are along their north facades marked by B1 and B2, respectively, in Image 6. Retail and secondary entrances to the commercial building are marked by B3 though B7 in Image 6.

Both B1 and B2 have a canopy above them which is a positive design feature in protecting them from winds accelerating down the facades. In addition, both entrances have vestibules which provides an area for pedestrians to take shelter at on windy days. These two entrances are positioned on the north side of the buildings and will be protected by the buildings themselves from the prevailing southwesterly through northwesterly winds. Appropriate wind conditions are expected at both B1 and B2 throughout the year.

Entrances B5 through B7 will be protected by the commercial building from the westerly winds and therefore appropriate wind conditions are expected at those entrances. Westerly winds could accelerate down the west façade of the commercial building and result in high wind speeds at the ground along the west façade. As a result, higher than desired wind speeds are expected at entrances B3 and B4, in particular during the winter.

If more comfortable conditions at B3 and B4 are desired, we recommend recessing them into the façade to provide a zone protected from the prevailing winds. Alternatively, a canopy can be installed above B3 and a windscreen or tall planters on the north side of B4. Examples of these mitigation measures are shown in Image 8.
5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

Grade Level Outdoor Amenity Areas

A play and seating area is planned on the south side of the residential building (C1 in Image 6) while an outdoor patio is planned on the west side of the commercial building (C2 in Image 6).

The existing mid-rise building to the southwest of the site is expected to protect these areas from the southwesterly winds directly approaching the site. However, these amenity areas are exposed to the westerly winds as well as both westerly and southwesterly winds accelerating down the south façade of the residential building and west façade of the commercial building, resulting in wind speeds that are slightly higher than desired during the summer. The proposed landscaping around these areas are positive design features; however, we recommend to increase their density, including underplanting, to ensure adequate wind protection is provided. Alternatively, porous windscreens installed around the areas where calm wind conditions are desired, can help to reduce the wind speeds. Additionally, canopies or trellises installed along the south façade of the residential building and west façade of the commercial building will help to deflect winds accelerating down the facades away from the ground.

Examples of these mitigation measures are shown in Image 9.
5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

Above Grade Outdoor Amenity Areas

A terrace is located at the roof level of the residential building (C3 in Image 10) while the podium of the commercial building could potentially be used as an outdoor amenity area (C4 in Image 6).

C3 will be exposed to the prevailing westerly and southwesterly winds since the residential building will be taller than its immediate surroundings in those directions. C4 will be exposed to the westerly and southwesterly both directly as well as after they are downwashed off the west and south facades of the tower. Wind speeds at both areas could be higher than desired for passive activities during the summer, when they will be mainly used.

If more comfortable conditions at these amenity areas are desired, we recommend to ensure the height of the guardrails along their west and south perimeters are min 2 m tall. Additionally, hard or soft landscaping elements such as planters, windscreens and trellises, throughout these area will help to provide further wind protection. Examples of these mitigation measures are shown in Image 11. Wind tunnel testing can be conducted at later design stage to quantify these conditions and evaluate the effectiveness of the recommended mitigation measures.
5. PEDESTRIAN WIND CONDITIONS

Image 11: Examples of mitigation measures at the above-grade outdoor amenity areas
6. SUMMARY

Wind conditions on and around the proposed 150 New Gower St. are discussed in this report, based on the local wind climate, surrounding buildings and our past experience with wind tunnel testing of similar buildings.

The proposed development has a number of positive design features such as the podium of the commercial building, canopies above main entrances and vestibules. Appropriate wind conditions are expected along all sidewalks, the main entrances to the two buildings and the entrances along the east facade of the commercial building.

Higher than desired wind speeds are predicted at the secondary entrances along the west facade of the commercial building during the winter, and at the grade level outdoor amenity areas and upper level outdoor amenity areas of both buildings during the summer. High wind speeds with potential uncomfortable conditions are expected at the walkway between the two proposed buildings during the winter. Wind mitigation measures have been recommended in the report which can help to improve the conditions at theses areas. Wind tunnel testing can be conducted at later design stage to quantify these conditions and evaluate the effectiveness of the recommended mitigation measures.
From: Jessica Stanford [mailto:j.stanford@lat49.ca]  
Sent: November-29-18 5:21 PM  
To: keith.woodfine@metrobus.com  
Subject: Metrobus Requirements

Hi Keith,

We are working on a new development along New Gower Street that is currently going through the process with the Planning Department at the City of St. John’s. As part of this process we are working on a LUAR (Land Use Assessment Report) which asks for any impact that the development may have on current transit.

I’ve attached both the LUAR and a context map of the site. Public Transit is part of Section K. If you could have a look and decide if there is any impact on transit by this development, that would be great. We would need a statement from Metrobus regarding the public transit infrastructure requirements (if any) in that area.

Thanks for your time.

Jessica

JESSICA STANFORD | ARCHITECT | NLAA MRAIC

LAT49 Architecture Inc.  
T. 709.753.7132 | F. 709.753.6469 | E. j.stanford@lat49.ca  
683 Water Street, 2nd floor, St. John’s, NL, A1E 1B5

lat49.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email. Thank you!
October 19, 2021

LAT49 Architecture Inc.
683 Water Street, 2nd Floor
St. John’s, NL A1E 1B5
T. 709.753.7132 | F. 709.753.6469
E. m.white@lat49.ca

Attention: Mark White, NLAA, MRAIC

Regarding: 150 New Gower Street – Parking Requirements Review

Harbourside Transportation Consultants (HTC) has completed a review of the parking requirements for a proposed development at 150 New Gower Street. The development, located at the northwest corner of Springdale Street and New Gower Street, is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Development Land Use Concept Plan – 150 New Gower Street
The proposed development includes an existing 154-room hotel, a new 136-room hotel with 318 m² of commercial retail space and an 86-unit condominium building.

City of St. John’s Parking Requirements

The Parking Requirements for the City of St. John’s are defined in Section 8 of the Development Regulations. Section 8.3 provides the general parking standards including number of parking spaces that must be provided (minimum) and which shall not be exceeded (maximum) by type or nature of building.

The site, 150 New Gower Street, is located within the boundary of the Downtown Parking Area as outlined on Map 2 in the Development Regulations. The Downtown Parking Area is subject to the following parking requirements:

Non-Residential Parking in the Downtown Parking Area

For non-Residential Development in the Downtown Parking Area, the minimum and maximum number of required parking spaces shall be 50 percent of those shown in Section 8.3.

Residential Parking in the Downtown Parking Area

1. Residential Development on Water Street or Duckworth Street having 5 Dwelling Units or less: no parking spaces are required. Residential Development on Water Street or Duckworth Street having 6 or more Dwelling Units shall comply with the parking space requirements in Section 8.3.

2. All other Residential Development in the Downtown Parking Area, other than on Water Street or Duckworth Street, shall comply with the parking space requirements in Section 8.3.

The parking requirement calculations for 150 New Gower Street are summarized in Table 1. In total, this development requires a minimum of 172 parking spaces and is limited to a maximum of 263 parking spaces. In accordance with Provincial Buildings Accessibility Regulations, 6% of the total number of parking spaces provided must be designed and designated as accessible spaces.

In total, 182 parking spaces have been provided on-site; 164 spaces provided over two levels in the underground garage and 18 surface spaces. The development plan includes sufficient parking spaces to meet the parking requirements.
Table 1: Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Parking Standards</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Parking Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (ITE 221)</td>
<td>0.8 per Studio</td>
<td>1.2 per Studio</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 per 1 Bedroom</td>
<td>1.2 per 1-Bedroom</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 per 2 Bedroom</td>
<td>1.5 per 2 Bedroom</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 per 3+ Bedroom</td>
<td>2.0 per 3+ Bedroom</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 visitor parking spaces for the first 7 Dwellings; 1 visitor parking space per 7 Dwellings thereafter</td>
<td>Maximums are summed for building and inclusive of visitor parking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (ITE 310)</td>
<td>1 parking space for every 4 guest rooms or suites</td>
<td>1 parking space for every 2 guest rooms or suites</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 parking space for every 5 m² of banquet/conference/meeting space</td>
<td>1 parking space for every 4 m² of banquet/conference/meeting space</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (ITE 820)</td>
<td>1 parking space for every 20 m² of Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>1 parking space for every 5 m² of Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Net Floor Area (NFA) = 80% of Gross Floor Area (GFA)

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please don’t hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Best Regards,

Mark Stuckless, P. Eng.
Senior Engineer
T: (709) 579-6435
E: mstuckless@harboursideengineering.ca
REQUIRED: 46

Based on 154 hotel rooms and 211 m² of meeting space in the existing Hilton Garden Inn.

PROVIDED:

- Standard Parking Spaces: 43
- Accessible Parking Spaces: 3
- TOTAL: 46
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LAT49 Architecture Inc.
683 Water Street, 2nd Floor
St. John’s, NL A1E 1B5

T. 709.753.7132 | F. 709.753.6469
E. j.stanford@lat49.ca

Attention: Jessica Stanford, MRAIC NLAA

Re: 150 New Gower Street – Development Trip Generation Rates

Ms. Stanford,

This is to advise that Harbourside Transportation Consultants (HTC) has prepared the trip generation rates for the proposed commercial/retail development at 150 New Gower Street; in accordance with section J of the terms of reference for the Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR) for this development. The proposed development is shown in Figure 1 and is located at 150 New Gower Street in downtown St. John’s, NL. The proposed development will include a 154-room hotel (currently under construction), a 136-room hotel with 318 m² of commercial retail space and an 86-unit condominium building.

Figure 1: Development Land Use Concept Plan – 150 New Gower Street
Trip generation estimates for the proposed development were prepared using trip generation rates published in the 10\textsuperscript{th} edition of the *Trip Generation Manual* by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). A summary of the trip generation rates and inbound/outbound splits for the relevant land use codes is included in Table 1.

Table 1: Assumed Trip Generation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Source(^1)</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trip Generation Rates(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>ITE LUC 221 - Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>ITE LUC 310 - Hotel</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>ITE LUC 820 - Shopping Center</td>
<td>1,000 ft(^2) GFA</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Trip generation rates are in 'vehicles per hour per unit.'

The weekday morning (AM) and afternoon (PM) peak hour trip generation estimates for the development are included in Error! Reference source not found. It is estimated that the proposed development will generate 172 two-way vehicle trips (91 trips in/81 trips out) during the AM peak hour and 227 two-way vehicle trips (119 trips in/108 trips out) during the PM peak hour.

Table 2: Trip Generation Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use(^1)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trips Generated(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums (ITE LUC 221)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (ITE LUC 310)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (ITE LUC 310)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (ITE LUC 820)</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>ft(^2) GFA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Trip Generation Estimate (vph)</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Trips generated are in 'vehicles per hour.'

If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Regards,

[Signature]

Harbourside Transportation Consultants
Robin King, P. Eng.
Senior Transportation Engineer, Principal
P: 709.330.6462
E: rking@harboursideengineering.ca
APPENDIX 13 | EXTERIOR PERSPECTIVES
VIEW FROM CORNER OF SPRINGDALE STREET AND NEW GOWER STREET
Recessed store front entrances with adjacent storefront glazing.

Small upper punched windows
CIVIC No. 150 NEW GOWER STREET
ST. JOHN’S
NEWFOUNDLAND & LABRADOR

ALL THAT piece or parcel of land, situate and being on the western side of New Gower Street, 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 western side of New Gower Street, said point having coordinates N 5 268 716.050 metres and E 326 279.192 metres of the Three Degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projection NAD - 83 for the Province of Newfoundland & Labrador, THENCE along the western side of New Gower Street for a distance of 53.976 metres along the arc of a curve having a radius of 134.894 metres and a chord distance of 53.617 metres on a bearing of S 14°00'26" W, THENCE by property of The City of St. John’s S 69°14'43" W for a distance of 7.887 metres, THENCE S 06°48'48" E for a distance of 11.537 metres, THENCE S 06°56'46" E for a distance of 12.098 metres, THENCE S 11°55'10" E for a distance of 11.689 metres, THENCE S 13°33'55" E for a distance of 5.666 metres, THENCE S 15°09'19" E for a distance of 11.723 metres, THENCE S 01°52'28" E for a distance of 12.262 metres, THENCE N 83°00'00" W for a distance of 0.914 metres, THENCE S 07°29'56" W for a distance of 5.791 metres, THENCE S 29°37'21" W for a distance of 25.192 metres, THENCE by property of Tamarac Resources Inc. N 35°18'15" W for a distance of 8.614 metres, THENCE N 53°29'40" W for a distance of 3.267 metres, THENCE N 63°02'41" W for a distance of 11.607 metres, THENCE N 19°50'40" E for a distance of 5.700 metres, THENCE N 11°59'50" E for a distance of 2.012 metres, THENCE N 07°09'05" W for a distance of 1.271 metres, THENCE N 61°52'45" W for a distance of 2.761 metres, THENCE N 54°56'13" W for a distance of 2.822 metres, THENCE by property of The City of St. John’s N 52°40'15" W for a distance of 26.237 metres, THENCE N 31°56'41" E for a distance of 0.298 metres, THENCE N 75°08'31" W for a distance of 8.056 metres, THENCE N 78°43'00" W for a distance of 12.142 metres, THENCE S 33°08'00" W for a distance of 9.414 metres, THENCE N 52°50'24" W for a distance of 26.609 metres, THENCE N 72°09'00" W for a distance of 15.316 metres, THENCE by property of Bruce Pearce and Shawn Silver N 63°57'00" W for a distance of 7.366 metres, THENCE by property of Jack Brown & Way Surveys
Lanphear N 55°46'00" E for a distance of 5.543 metres, THENCE by property of Sonia Rose N 50°15'00" E for a distance of 5.254 metres, THENCE by property of Arthur Jenkins and Ruth Jenkins N 54°30'00" E for a distance of 6.710 metres, THENCE by property of Tauras A. Biskis N 52°54'00" E for a distance of 9.508 metres, THENCE by property of David Murphy and Elizabeth Murphy N 66°13'00" E for a distance of 2.577 metres, THENCE N 41°52'00" E for a distance of 4.797 metres, THENCE by property of Robert Holden and Cynthia Holden N 41°21'23" E for a distance of 13.934 metres, THENCE by property of Robert Holden and Cynthia Holden and by property of Horwood Lumber 1974 Ltd. N 39°48'36" E for a distance of 14.857 metres, THENCE by property of Black Bear Investments Limited and by a Right-of-Way N 42°20'39" E for a distance of 10.713 metres, THENCE by property of Penny O’Dea S 37°54'00" E for a distance of 9.980 metres, THENCE N 47°35'02" E for a distance of 13.569 metres, THENCE by property of Karen Power, by property of Roxanne Murphy, by property of Davin C. French and Melissa K. Brake, by property of Gerald Smith and Patricia Smith, by property of Duncan J. Finlayson and Renee A. Finlayson and by property of Bryant Harris and Christina Brake N 44°33'18" E for a distance of 32.795 metres, THENCE by property of Bryant Harris and Christina Brake N 52°06'48" W for a distance of 4.968 metres, THENCE N 35°27'10" W for a distance of 14.991 metres, THENCE along the southern side of Pleasant Street N 54°25'24" E for a distance of 11.529 metres, THENCE along the southern side of Springdale Street S 85°05'30" E for a distance of 38.521 metres, THENCE along the western side of New Gower Street S 23°32'27" E for a distance of 9.565 metres, more or less, to the point of beginning and containing an area of 9620 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 # 11474 of Brown & Way Surveys, form an integral part of the returns and are not separable.

There is a storm sewer easement (3.0 metres wide) crossing subject property as shown on the attached plan.

There is a Newfoundland Power Inc. Easement, registered in Registration No. 832821 extending partly along the eastern boundary as shown on the attached plan.

Brown & Way Surveys
SURVEYORS REAL PROPERTY REPORT

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

Certified To: Magna Construction

Parcel Location: Civic No. 150 New Gower Street
St. John’s, NL

Reference Survey: Brown & Way Surveys
Current

Structures and other improvements:
The concrete foundation shown on the attached plan is situated wholly within the boundaries of Civic No. 150 New Gower Street, in the City of St. John’s, NL.

Apparent encroachments and/or comments:
Fences are erected as shown on the attached plan.
There is a storm sewer easement (3.0 metres wide) crossing the subject property as shown on the attached plan.
There is a Newfoundland Power Inc. Easement, registered in Registration No. 833821 as shown.
A portion of the asphalt, Tamarac Construction, is placed inside the southern boundary as shown.
There are overhead wires crossing the southern portion of the property as shown on the attached plan.

Qualifications:
This report and its accompanying Plan No. 11474 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 Newfoundland Land Surveyors Act, RSN, and the bylaws made thereunder.

SIGNED AND SEALED AT ST. JOHN’S, NEWFOUNDLAND
This 24th day of January 2018

Copyright: Robert A. Way, Newfoundland Land Surveyor, 2018. 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.
NOTE: These drawings are not to scale.
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DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Regional Water Reserve Fund Purchase – Replacement Compressor and Dryer for the Ozone System at Bay Bulls Big Pond Water Treatment Plant

Date Prepared: May 24, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
To seek a decision on proceeding with the purchase of a replacement ozone system compressor and dryer funded through the Regional Water Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The Regional Water Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund is being requested to be used for the purchase of a replacement compressor and dryer for the ozone system at the Bay Bulls Big Pond Water Treatment Plant. One of the existing compressors and dryers have failed and require replacement. This equipment is critical to the operation of the ozone water treatment system at the Bay Bulls Big Pond water treatment plant.

The total estimated cost to purchase the equipment is $203,861.00 (HST Extra).

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:
The Regional Water System has identified sufficient funds within the Regional Water Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund to support this equipment replacement. A detailed breakdown of contributions less purchases made through this program is provided as follows:

**0000-36883 Reserve for Regional Water Equipment Replacement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: SCADA Servers</td>
<td>($183,341.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Southlands Pump</td>
<td>($88,278.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance (Dec 31, 2021)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,354,565.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(i)
Note:
(i) 2022 Contribution of $400,000.00 has yet to be added to the reserve fund and is not reflected in the balance to date provided.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
The Southlands pumps at the Ruby Line Pump Station supply potable water to a portion of the City St. John’s, the City of Mount Pearl, the Town of CBS, the Town of Paradise and the Town of Portugal Cove-St. Phillips.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:
N/A
N/A

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans:
N/A

5. Legal or Policy Implications:
N/A

6. Privacy Implications:
N/A

7. Engagement and Communications Considerations:
N/A

8. Human Resource Implications:
N/A

9. Procurement Implications:
The estimated timeframe for the delivery of this replacement equipment is approximately 9-11 weeks.

10. Information Technology Implications:
N/A

11. Other Implications:
N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve access to funding from the Regional Water Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund to support the purchase of this equipment.

Prepared by: Daniel Martin, Manager – Regional Facilities
Approved by:
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