Regular Meeting - City Council
Agenda

November 28, 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 - November 21, 2022

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS
   6.1. Request to Establish the Building Line – 5 Beaumont Hamel Way – SUB2200037
   6.2. Request to Establish the Building Line – 214,216,244 Petty Harbour Road – SUB2200054
   6.3. Development Committee - Referral from Town of Portugal Cove – St. Phillip’s for New Dwelling – 923A Thorburn Road – INT2200055

7. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS
   7.1. 2022216 - Downtown Sidewalk Snowclearing

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   8.1. Committee of the Whole Report - November 16, 2022
      1. Regional Water Reserve Fund Purchase – Replacement Southlands Pump at the Ruby Line Pump Station
2. 180 Military Road, Designated Heritage Building Renovations, REN2200495

Please note that the motion has been changed to reflect Council's decision to consider the removal of the municipal heritage designation for the rear extension of the building.

3. Canada Drive Active Transportation and Safety Improvements

Please note that the motion has changed to reflect Council's decision to refer the recommendation to SAMAC for consideration.

4. Fee Structure for New One and Two Family Dwelling Construction

9. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

9.1. Development Permits List November 17 to 23, 2022

10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

10.1. Building Permits List

11. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS

11.1. Weekly Payment Vouchers Week Ending November 23, 2022

12. TENDERS/RFPS

12.1. 2022215 - Supply and Delivery of Cummins Parts

12.2. 2022192 – Traffic Control Services – Robin Hood Bay Waste Management Facility

13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

13.1. Notice of Motion - Amendment to Paid Parking Regulations By-Law

Notice of Motion to amend the Paid Parking Regulations to accommodate electric vehicles.

13.2. Notice of Motion - Amendment to Ticketing Amendment By-Law

Amendment to Ticketing Amendment By-Law to accommodate provisions pertaining to electric vehicles.
14. **OTHER BUSINESS**

14.1. SERC – Film Shoot Road Closure 5  
113

14.2. SERC – Holiday Events  
116

15. **ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL**

16. **ADJOURNMENT**
Minutes of Regular Meeting - City Council

Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

November 21, 2022, 3:00 p.m.

Present:
Mayor Danny Breen
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary
Councillor Maggie Burton
Councillor Ron Ellsworth
Councillor Jill Bruce
Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft
Councillor Jamie Korab
Councillor Ian Froude

Regrets:
Councillor Sandy Hickman
Councillor Debbie Hanlon
Councillor Carl Ridgeley

Staff:
Kevin Breen, City Manager
Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services
Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager of Public Works
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
Kelly Dyer, Communications & PR Officer
Jennifer Squires, Legislative Assistant

Others:
Sean Janes, City Internal Auditor

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**
   2.1 National Housing Day (November 22, 2022)

3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
   3.1 Adoption of Agenda

   SJMC-R-2022-11-21/522
   Moved By Councillor Ravencroft
   Seconded By Councillor Bruce

   That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

   For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

   MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

4. **ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES**
   4.1 Adoption of Minutes - November 14, 2022

   SJMC-R-2022-11-21/523
   Moved By Deputy Mayor O’Leary
   Seconded By Councillor Korab

   That the minutes of November 14, 2022, are accepted as presented.

   For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

   MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

5. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

6.1 Request to Set Zone Requirements – 30 Cookstown Road – DEV2200139

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/524

Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve the Commercial Mixed Use (CM) Zone Standards for the proposed building extension at 30 Cookstown Road as follows:

• Building Line – 20cm;
• Rear Yard setback – 2.87 metres; and
• Side Yard setback - 40cm.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

7. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

8.1 Audit & Accountability Standing Committee Report - October 19, 2022

1. Aquatic Safety Audit Report

Councillor Ravencroft informed Council that she took issue with the recommendation for item 2.4 - Naloxone Standard, as well as the senior staff response that the establishment of a city-wide naloxone program was not warranted. She questioned the response as to why it was felt that the program was unwarranted. The Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration advised that the implementation of such a program would take substantial effort from a staff training and liability perspective. While the program was determined to be unwarranted at this time, Council could direct Staff to proceed with work on the creation and implementation of a formalized program. Mayor Breen advised that an amendment could be made to request that Staff start preparations for naloxone
program training. Councillor Ravencroft moved the motion forward, with a friendly amendment from Councillor Ellsworth that Staff first explore the opportunity to create such a program and return to Council with recommendations for implementation. Councillor Burton noted that the scope of work should not be confined to public pools but should extend to all City facilities and that the program should incorporate additional harm reduction training.

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/525
Moved By Councillor Ravencroft
Seconded By Councillor Burton

That Staff bring back recommendations to Council concerning the implementation of a Naloxone training program.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/526
Moved By Councillor Bruce
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve the Aquatic Safety Audit Report and the associated action plans put forth by management.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

9. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

9.1 Development Permits List November 9 - 16, 2022

Council considered the Development Permits List for information.

10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
10.1 **Building Permits List - Week ending - November 16, 2022**

Council considered the Building Permits List for information.

11. **REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS**

11.1 **Weekly Payment Vouchers Ending Week of November 16, 2022**

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/527

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth  
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That the weekly payment vouchers for the week ending November 16, 2022, in the amount of $4,689,546.33 be approved as presented.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

12. **TENDERS/RFPS**

12.1 **2022195 - Grass and Grounds Maintenance for City Owned Properties**

Deputy Mayor O'Leary commented on the range of bid amounts supplied by vendors. Staff explained that it was common to see such a diversity of bids for Public Works tenders and that the range of bids was quite normal.

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/528

Moved By Councillor Ravencroft  
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council recommend for award this open call to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, Greenwood Services Inc., for $39,665.80 a year (HST Incl.) as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude
12.2 **Supply and Delivery of 2 New Waste Collection Trucks**

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/529

*Moved By* Councillor Ellsworth

*Seconded By* Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve for award this open call to Big Truck Rental, for $424,800 plus HST, the lowest bidder meeting all specifications, as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

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

14. **OTHER BUSINESS**

14.1 **Council Meetings – Christmas Schedule**

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/530

*Moved By* Councillor Ellsworth

*Seconded By* Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council approve the suspension of the Regular and Committee of the Whole meetings for the period beginning Tuesday, December 22, 2022,


For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude
14.2 **SERC – Film Shoot Road Closure 4**

SJMC-R-2022-11-21/531

**Moved By** Deputy Mayor O'Leary  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve the requested road closure and noise by-law extension associated with the filming of the television series *SurrealEstate*.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

15. **ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL**

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

_________________________
MAYOR

_________________________
CITY CLERK
Title: Request to Establish the Building Line – 5 Beaumont Hamel Way – SUB2200037

Date Prepared: November 22, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 5

Decision/Direction Required:
Request for Council to establish the Building Line setback for a new Lot at 5 Beaumont Hamel Way.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
An application was submitted to create a new Lot at 5 Beaumont Hamel Way. The proposed Lot will have frontage and access from a new street (yet to be named), which is located off Beaumont Hamel Way. The Building Line setback is proposed to be established at 60.63 metres from the street, resulting in a Lot Frontage of 67.97 metres.

The minimum Building Line Setback in the CR Zone is 6 metres, and the minimum Lot Frontage requirement is 45 metres, which is measured at the Building Line. As per Section 7.2.1(a) of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations, Council shall have the power to establish the Building Line for any Street, or for any Lot where deemed appropriate. In this case, the Building Line is established at 60.63 metres to allow for sufficient Lot Frontage to create a new Lot.

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.

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.

6. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John’s Envision Development Regulations Section 10 “Commercial Regional (CR) Zone” and Section 7.2.1(a) “Building Line -Yards”.

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

9. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

10. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

11. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

12. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the established Building Line setback at 60.63 metre for 5 Beaumont Hamel Way for a new Lot.

**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 - Request to Re-Establish Building Line – 5 Beaumont Hamel Way – SUB2200037.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- Building Line Location.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aerial Map.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 22, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Nov 22, 2022 - 4:20 PM**

**Jason Sinyard - Nov 22, 2022 - 5:45 PM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Request to Establish the Building Line – 214,216,244 Petty Harbour Road – SUB2200054

Date Prepared: November 23, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 5

Decision/Direction Required:
Request for Council to establish the Building Line Setback and Dwelling location for a new Lot, created from the consolidation of 214, 216 and 244 Petty Harbour Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
An application was submitted to consolidate 3 parcels of land, which include 214, 216 and 244 Petty Harbour Road, to create a new Lot for a Single Detached Dwelling. The Lot is zoned both Rural Residential Infill (RRI) and Rural Residential (RR).

The Dwelling is proposed to be located in the Rural Residential (RR) Zone. The new Lot would not meet the minimum Lot Frontage requirement at the minimum Building Line. Therefore, it is requested that the minimum Building Line be established at a setback of 65.7 metres, resulting in a Lot Frontage that exceeds the minimum Zone requirement of 45 metres. Development Committee has also recommended that house location be set on the Lot, which will establish a Side Yard setback of 18.06 metres from the western property boundary.

As per Section 7.2.1 of the Envision St. John’s Development Regulations, Council shall have the power to (a) establish the Building Line for any Street or Lot, at any point or place Council deems appropriate, and (b) require that any new Building constructed be built on, or at any specific point behind the Building Line.

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.


5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.

6. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John’s Envision Development Regulations Section 7.2.1 (a) and (b) “Building Line – Yards”, Section 10 “Residential Rural (RR) Zone” and Section 10 “Residential Rural Infill (RRI) Zone”.

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

9. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

10. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

11. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

12. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the Building Line setback at 65.7 metres and set the Dwelling location with a Side Yard setback of 18.06 metres from the west property boundary for a new Lot created from the consolidation of 214, 216 and 244 Petty Harbour Road.

**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 - Request to Establish the Building Line – 214,216,244 Petty Harbour Road – SUB2200054.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attachments:   | - 214-244 PETTY HARBOUR ROAD.pdf  
| Final Approval Date | Nov 24, 2022 |

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

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Nov 24, 2022 - 9:21 AM**

**Jason Sinyard - Nov 24, 2022 - 9:25 AM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Development Committee - Referral from Town of Portugal Cove – St. Phillip’s for New Dwelling – 923A Thorburn Road – INT2200055

Date Prepared: November 24, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
As per the recommendation of the City Manager, in accordance Section 104 (4)(d) City of St. John’s Act, Council reject the Single Dwelling at 923A Thorburn Road, Portugal Cove-St. Phillips.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The Town of Portugal Cove – St. Phillip’s has referred an application to the City for a Single Dwelling at 923A Thorburn Road. The property is located within the Broad Cove River Watershed. In 1988 a development permit was issued by the St. John’s Metropolitan Board giving approval to replace the Dwelling. The Dwelling was removed, but a replacement Dwelling was not constructed. The application is now being made to place a new Dwelling on the property.

Development of lands within the Watershed and situate within the legal municipal boundary of the Town of Portugal Cove - St. Phillip’s is subject to Section 104(4) of the City of St. John’s Act, and therefore must be referred to the City for review and approval. The new Dwelling may only be permitted at the City Manager’s recommendation.

Development Committee reviewed this application and from a Watershed protection standpoint there are concerns with allowing new development in the Watershed. Allowing new residential Dwellings to be constructed beyond the timeline for which a Non-Conforming Use ceases to exist, is in contravention of the Urban and Rural Planning Act.

Upon review of the information provided and history of this site, the City Manager recommends that the proposed Single Dwelling not be allowed pursuant to Section 104(4) of the City of St. John’s Act.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Town of Portugal Cove – St. Phillips.

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

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: Not applicable.

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.

6. Legal or Policy Implications: City of St. John’s Act 104(4)(d).

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

9. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

10. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

11. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

12. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:
That Council reject the proposed Single Dwelling at 923A Thorburn Road, Portugal Cove – St. Phillips upon the recommendation of the City Manager pursuant to Section 104 (4)(d) City of St. John’s Act.
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Development Committee - 923A Thorburn Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- 923A Thorburn Road.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Nov 24, 2022 - 10:15 AM

Jason Sinyard - Nov 24, 2022 - 12:25 PM
BID APPROVAL NOTE

Bid # and Name: 2022216 - Downtown Sidewalk Snowclearing
Date Prepared: Thursday, November 24, 2022
Report To: Regular Meeting
Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works
Ward: N/A

Department: Public Works
Division: Roads & Traffic
Quotes Obtained By: Sherri Higgins
Budget Code: 3231-52951
Source of Funding: Operating
Purpose:
To provide snow clearing and ice control services for pedestrians in the downtown area.

Results: ☐ As attached ☒ As noted below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alltask Excavating Inc.</td>
<td>$370,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladneys Bus Ltd</td>
<td>$820,244.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coady Construction &amp; Excavating Limited</td>
<td>$895,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Value: ☐ As above ☒ Value shown is an estimate only for a 1 year period. The City does not guarantee to buy specific quantities or dollar value.

Contract Duration: One (1) year
Bid Exception: None

Recommendation:
That Council recommend for award this open call to the lowest bidder meeting specifications, Alltask Excavating Inc. for $370,000.00 per year (HST not incl.) as per the Public Procurement Act.

Attaches:
Minutes of Committee of the Whole - City Council

Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

November 16, 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

Regrets: Councillor Carl Ridgeley

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

Others: Ron Fougere, Fougere Menchenton Architecture
Bunty Sambhi, Fougere Menchenton Architecture
Randy Carew, Manager, Regulatory Services
Amer Afridi, Manager, Transportation Engineering
Bobby Fedder, Solicitor/Lawyer
1. Regional Water Reserve Fund Purchase – Replacement Southlands Pump at the Ruby Line Pump Station

**Recommendation**

**Moved By** Councillor Ellsworth  
**Seconded By** Deputy Mayor O’Leary

That Council approve access to funding from the Regional Water Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund to support the purchase of this equipment.

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

**MOTION CARRIED (10 to 0)**

1. 180 Military Road, Designated Heritage Building Renovations, REN2200495

Councillor Burton asked that the application be referred back to the Built Heritage Experts Panel to permit members to consider the specialist's report recommending the use of metal siding. While Members of Council did agree with Councillor Burton's suggestion, it was questioned if the BHEP would be in a position to change their recommendation, as metal siding would be in contravention of the Heritage Design Standards. The Chief Municipal Planner advised that the BHEP would continue to recommend against the use of metal siding on designated heritage buildings. The redesignation of the extension would be an alternative way of dealing with the application. The Mayor noted the difficulty in balancing the importance of protecting buildings and maintaining a degree of flexibility when it comes to applications to ensure their preservation and sustainability moving forward. The Chief Municipal Planner advised that when requests for the removal of designations arise, the buildings are usually on the road to demolition. In this case the redesignation would make the building more suitable for long term use.

Councillor Burton then made a motion to remove the municipal heritage designation of the extension of building. Deputy Mayor O'Leary, while supportive of the affordable housing component of the project, stated her
discomfort with the use of metal siding. She requested that going forward similar applications be discussed by both the BHEP and the Environment & Sustainability Experts Panel (ESEP) so that Council is properly informed on best practices when it comes to sustainability. The Mayor recommended that Planning Staff request input from the ESEP as required. Councillor Froude noted his concern that the BHEP had not been provided an opportunity to review and digest the specialist's report on the application and stated that he would not support dedesignation at this time. Councillor Ellsworth remarked that some heritage properties are not constructed of materials that are conducive to energy efficiency and long-term preservation, and the City must make difficult decisions to balance the preservation of heritage properties while supporting affordable housing and the needs to the community.

The Chief Municipal Planner informed Council that if it was decided that removal of the designation would be considered, then Legal and Planning Staff would create a Notice of Motion concerning the amendment to the Heritage By-Law followed by a public consultation process. Councillor Burton added that the decision to dedesignate the property would not be made overnight and that there would be several opportunities for public feedback and discussion by Council on the application.

**Recommendation**

**Moved By** Councillor Burton  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve the removal of the municipal heritage designation from the rear extension of the building.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, and Councillor Korab

Against (1): Councillor Froude

Abstain (1): Councillor Ravencroft

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 1)**
3. **Canada Drive Active Transportation and Safety Improvements**

Councillor Burton voiced her concern that the City's Sustainable and Active Mobility Advisory Committee (SAMAC) had not been consulted on the recommendation for active transportation and safety improvements on Canada Drive. She further stated that the Decision Note was thin and lacking in rationale as to who informed the recommendation of a Shared Use Path (SUP) on the South Side of Canada Drive. She made a motion to have the issue referred to the upcoming SAMAC meeting on December 1, 2022, prior to Council making a final decision on the matter. Councillor Froude requested that additional rationale on the recommendation be provided when the Decision Note returns to Council. Councillor Korab asked if the referral to SAMAC would cause delay in construction or funding for the project. Staff advised that as the Decision Note was related to the design of the project, there would be no delay in the process. It was further noted that the proposal may change as design gets underway. Councillor Hickman requested additional detail on the difference between SUPs and Bike Lanes, as well as the applicable cross-sections, be provided when the Note returns to Council. He further asked if there was a snow clearing plan for the project. The South Side is priority 2 and the North Side is priority 4. This was taken into consideration when recommending the South Side for the SUP.

**Recommendation**

**Moved By** Councillor Burton  
**Seconded By** Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That the recommendation be referred to the Sustainable and Active Mobility Advisory Committee for consideration.

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

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)

4. **Fee Structure for New One and Two Family Dwelling Construction**

Councillor Froude asked if the fee structure would apply only to single detached homes and duplexes. The Manager of Regulatory Services responded that the structure would apply to only one- or two-family
dwellings, which account for 10% of all applications. It was then asked if the current structure where the fees change after the first $100,000 of a project would still apply. These fees have been eliminated from one- and two-family dwellings but would still apply to other residential developments, renovations, and commercial projects. Councillor Froude requested that examples comparing the two fee structures be provided when the Decision Note comes to the Regular Meeting.

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council adjust the current calculation scheme for all new one and two family dwelling constructions as proposed with an implementation date of January 1, 2023

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Hanlon, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Froude

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Regional Water Reserve Fund Purchase – Replacement Southlands Pump at the Ruby Line Pump Station

Date Prepared: October 14, 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 Southlands Pump 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 Southlands Pump at the Ruby Line Pump Station. The existing pump failed and must be replaced. The total estimated cost to purchase the equipment is $98,320.00 (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. The current balance of this program is $2,053,141.41 (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
4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: 
   N/A

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: 
   N/A

6. Legal or Policy Implications: 
   N/A

7. Privacy Implications: 
   N/A

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: 
   N/A

9. Human Resource Implications: 
   N/A

10. Procurement Implications: 
    The estimated timeframe for the delivery of this replacement equipment is approximately 34 weeks.

11. Information Technology Implications: 
    N/A

12. 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:**
## Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Regional Water Reserve Fund Purchase - Replacement Southlands Pump at the Ruby Line Pump Station.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Oct 17, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Andrew Niblock - Oct 17, 2022 - 10:09 AM**

**Lynnann Winsor - Oct 17, 2022 - 10:15 AM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: 180 Military Road, Designated Heritage Building Renovations, REN2200495

Date Prepared: November 7, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Heritage

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
To approve proposed renovations and building materials at 180 Military Road, Presentation Convent, a designated Heritage Building.

Note: This property was noted as 172 Military Road in previous Built Heritage Experts Panel (BHEP) agendas. The civic numbering for this area on the City’s MapCentre has since been updated.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The City has received a renovation application from Fougere Menchenton Architecture Inc., on behalf of the Presentation Sisters, to renovate the building at 180 Military Road for the purpose of an Institutional Use (dwelling units).

The subject property is adjacent to the Basilica of St. John the Baptist; within the Institutional District of the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan, zoned Institutional (INST), within Heritage Area 1, and is designated by Council as a Heritage Building. Presentation Convent is also a provincial Landmark Registered Heritage Structure. The provincial designation is limited to the original building, the municipal designation includes the long extension at the rear, but does not include the newer long-term care unit fronting Barnes Road. The provincial statement of significance is attached for reference. The property is within the St. John’s Ecclesiastical District National Historic Site of Canada. The applicant believes the rear extension was built in the 1950s or 1960s. City maps up to 1942 do not show the rear extension, so the applicant’s estimation is assumed to be correct.
Prior to making an application, the consultants attended the July 27, 2022 BHEP meeting to discuss proposed changes to the Presentation Convent. The Sisters are converting the building from a convent into individual dwelling units. Their aim is to make the building as efficient and cost-effective as possible, so they want to better insulate the building. The applicants have proposed to insulate the front of the original building from the inside in order to maintain the original exterior stone, but want to insulate the remainder of the building on the exterior. This includes the rear of the original convent and its long rear extension. Insulating from the outside would require new materials on those facades. The applicant has proposed an exterior insulation and finish system (EIFS) on the side and back of the Motherhouse (the original convent) and vertical metal siding on the rear extension.

When the applicant attended the BHEP meeting, the Panel made the following recommendation:

“Although the Built Heritage Experts Panel supports the concept of the project and applauds the efforts of the development team, they feel that as proposed the metal siding does not meet the intent of the Heritage Bylaw's measure of the new building materials to be compatible and comparable to the existing heritage structure and are recommending rejection.”

The applicant then asked the City to defer bringing this recommendation to Council as they wished to do more analysis of building materials. Since then, the applicant advised that they consulted a building specialist and concluded that they will not be able to insulate from the inside. The specialist advised that insulating from the inside would create issues with airflow and moisture in the walls. Therefore, they maintain that insulating from the outside and covering it with metal siding is the only option and have made a renovation application based on that. The City asked for a copy of the specialist’s report; to date, it has not been given to us.

As this is a designated Heritage Building, exterior renovations must be approved by Council. The building elevations, as well as previous presentations to the BHEP, are attached for review. As well, applicable sections of the Heritage By-Law are attached.

The application was brought back to the BHEP because the applicant has now advised that they believe no other options are viable. The BHEP confirmed their recommendation that the use of metal siding should not be permitted. More appropriate materials are available that do not compromise the exterior of the building. With respect to the other building materials proposed (EIFS proposed for the rear of the original building, and a glass extension for a stairway), we have asked for more information about the building’s trims and detailing, and to show how important elements would be preserved. A more descriptive elevation with labelled details is requested. Staff agree with this recommendation, as metal siding is not consistent with the existing or historic materials of the building and it does not comply with the Heritage Design Standards of the Heritage By-Law.

Should Council wish to approve the metal siding on the rear extension, one way to do so would be to remove the municipal heritage designation from the rear extension (while keeping it on the original convent). The municipal designation would then be consistent with the provincial designation. Heritage Area 1 Heritage Design Standards would still apply; for building
materials, “where replacement is required, modern materials may be permitted where, in the opinion of the Inspector, the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural style. However, veneer man-made products and similar products are not permitted. Accent materials may be permitted at the discretion of the Inspector.”

This option could allow metal siding if the applicant chooses a profile that better replicates the building’s period/architectural style. Revisions to the design would be required, as the vertical metal siding proposed does not replicate the building’s architectural style.

The BHEP do not recommend removing the designation. There was concern that a precedent would be set that would encourage either the use of incompatible materials or a trend of de-designation.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

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

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders:** Property owner; neighbouring property owners and residents; Heritage NL; 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:** Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan and Development Regulations; St. John’s Heritage By-Law.

5. **Accessibility and Inclusion:** Accessibility requirements will be considered during the building permit stage.

6. **Legal or Policy Implications:** Recommendation may include changes to the Heritage Building designation at 180 Military Road.

7. **Privacy Implications:** Not applicable.

8. **Engagement and Communications Considerations:** Should Council decide to change the designation, public engagement would be required.

9. **Human Resource Implications:** Not applicable.

10. **Procurement Implications:** Not applicable.
11. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

12. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council reject the proposed metal siding on the rear extension of 180 Military Road, Presentation Convent, a designated Heritage Building. Further, that the applicant provide additional information about building materials and how elements on the other façade will be preserved, and refer the revised application back to the Built Heritage Experts Panel for a recommendation to Council.

**Prepared by:** Ann-Marie Cashin, MCIP, Planner III – Urban Design & Heritage
**Approved by:** Ken O’Brien, MCIP, Chief Municipal Planner
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Presentation Convent and School
Registered Heritage Structure

St. John's, NL
Landmark Registered Heritage Structure

Explore

📍 Google map

Links

🌐 Website

DESCRIPTION

Presentation Convent and School are 2-storey stone buildings
with basement levels, influenced by the Classical Revival style of architecture. The buildings are located in Cathedral Square, within the complex of the Roman Catholic Basilica-Cathedral of St. John the Baptist, and in the heart of the ecclesiastical district of St. John’s, NL. The designation is confined to the footprint of the buildings.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Formal Recognition Type
Registered Heritage Structure

Heritage Value

Presentation Convent and School was designated a Registered Heritage Structure by the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador in 1999 due to their historic and aesthetic value.

Presentation Convent and School were built for the use of the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a religious order founded in Cork, Ireland in 1775. In 1833, Bishop Fleming, seeking to build the Catholic education system in St. John’s, visited Ireland to recruit suitable teachers. After Fleming’s meeting with the Presentation Sisters in Galway, Ireland, four Sisters volunteered to cross the Atlantic and take on the education of girls in Newfoundland. During their first years, the Presentation Sisters moved several times in order to accommodate the growing number of students. A convent and school were eventually built on Long’s Hill in 1844. Both were destroyed in the Great Fire of 1846, possibly by embers carried in on the belongings of people seeking shelter from the flames.

In 1850, Bishop John Thomas Mullock laid the cornerstone for a new convent. The Presentation Motherhouse was officially opened in 1853 and remains the central convent of the congregation in
Newfoundland and Labrador. In the following decades, the Presentation Sisters (along with the Sisters of Mercy) were instrumental in the operation of girls’ Catholic schools on the Avalon and across the island. The visual prominence of the Presentation Convent and School speaks to the Presentation Sisters’ contributions to Newfoundland education, and to the defining role that Catholicism played in the social, educational and religious lives of many Newfoundlanders during this period. Presentation Convent is constructed of both local and Irish granite. Its styling is typical of a Classical Revival building, with its symmetrical façade and large tetrastyle portico framed by ionic columns. Similar Classical elements including a pediment, quoining and rounded arch windows can be found on the adjoining Presentation School. The convent and school were constructed by locally-renowned architect James Purcell and his partner, builder Patrick Kough. Purcell and Kough worked together on several significant buildings in St. John’s, including the nearby St. Bonaventure’s College and the Colonial Building. The ceiling of the chapel and drawing room were painted in the early 1880s by Polish convict Alexander Pindikowsky, who also painted the decorative work on the ceilings of Government House and the Colonial Building.

As the Presentation Convent continued to gain new members, an additional wing with more living quarters and a larger chapel was added to the convent in 1916; otherwise the building has remained largely unchanged since its construction. The convent and school were historically connected by footpaths and interior passages to the other buildings that make up the ecclesiastical complex of the Basilica Cathedral of St. John the Baptist. Their central location within the ecclesiastical district of St. John’s reflects the growing importance of the Catholic Church in Newfoundland.
The convents are valuable for their contribution to the history and growth of the Catholic Church in Newfoundland and Labrador. They were built during the mid-1800s and represent a significant architectural style.

**Character Defining Elements**

All elements that define the buildings' Classical Revival design, including:

- number of stories;
- mid pitch gable roof with two front peaks;
- returned eaves on gable ends of convent;
- eaves brackets;
- decorative quoining;
- stone construction;
- stone foundation;
- symmetrical facade of ashlar stone;
- portico on main facade;
- size, style, trim and placement of large, rectangular windows, and;
- massing, dimensions, orientation and location.

Elements of interior design including:

- decorative ceiling work by Pindikowsky.

All those elements that relate to the environmental value of the convent, including:

- location within the Ecclesiastical District in central St. John’s;
- location of the convent in relation to the Presentation School;
- connection of the convent, via interior passages and exterior footpaths, to other buildings that form a Roman Catholic complex centred on the Basilica;
- prominent hilltop location, and;
prominent hilltop location, and, visibility from the road.

Notes

In 1862 Bishop Mullock gave the convent the famous statue “The Veiled Virgin” by Giovanni Strazza.

LOCATION AND HISTORY

Community
St. John’s

Municipality
City of St. John’s

Civic Address
180 Military Road

Construction (circa)
1853 - 1853

Builder
James Purcell, Patrick Keough

Style
Irregular
Statement of Significance

Aerial view of St. John's Ecclesiastical District outlined in red

St. John's Ecclesiastical District

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

Description of Historic Place
The St. John’s Ecclesiastical District is a large, linear shaped parcel of land located in the center of St. John’s, in the one of the oldest sections of town. This district includes churches, convents, monasteries, schools, fraternal meeting houses and cemeteries and evokes a visual panorama of imposing masonry buildings of varying architectural styles. Within this organically patterned landscape and generous open spaces are some of the province’s most important 19th century “mother churches”, including representatives from most major denominations prevalent in Newfoundland and Labrador. The buildings vary in size, scale and formality and the district exemplifies its strong educational thrust through the continued uses of many of the buildings for their intended purposes, such as the schools and churches. The district spans an area of more than 61 acres. The natural evolution of the area is evident through its architecture and mature green space and newer buildings included within the district boundaries have been designed to be sympathetic to the styles of the original buildings. The designation is purely commemorative and includes all buildings, lands, landscape features, structures and remains within the boundaries.

Heritage Value
The St. John’s Ecclesiastical District has a strong historic association with religion and education for Newfoundland and Labrador. The collection of ecclesiastical and fraternal buildings, which
comprise the district, represents the pivotal role of the churches in St. John’s society in matters spiritual, educational, charitable, political and recreational for more than 175 years. Although many of these historic functions have been taken over by the provincial government, the area continues to contribute strongly to the community through the various schools and the churches whose facilities serve many cultural and social needs and expressions. It is the spiritual center of St. John’s and of the founding religions and it is used by many groups and faiths for ongoing cultural and social activities.

The St. John’s Ecclesiastical District is also historically valuable because of its associations with the religious leaders who were the overseers of daily operations. In a town whose population was once divided along religious lines, individual buildings and clusters thereof are associated with personalities who sat in the seats of religious power and the people who found themselves under their guidance. The denominational clusters of buildings serve to emphasize both the differences and similarities of each religious group at the same time. The buildings remain as imposing, lasting reminders of the institutions responsible for their construction and the contribution of these religious institutions to the community, both positive and negative.

The St. John’s Ecclesiastical District achieves aesthetic value through the formal styles, scales and placements of buildings, landscape features and structures, which show the roles and dominance of religion in the history and development of the capital city. The overall visual impact of the area is achieved through the uses of varying materials, architectural styles, open spaces and statuary whereas today areas like the Ecclesiastical District are no longer being built. Where religion played a crucial and fundamental role in developing the community, these buildings stand as physical testaments to this influence. Also aesthetically valuable is the use of natural, enduring materials which dominate the district landscape. The buildings, constructed in stone and brick, reach skyward with their spires and towers, yet remain solidly firm on their well-built foundations. The varied ornamentations, statuary, grave markers, monuments and fencing, paired with the mature trees and generous use of green space, all combine in a cohesive and organic manner.

The St. John’s Ecclesiastical District achieves environmental value in several ways. The district is a visual landmark for fishermen. Situated on upwards-sloping land the brick and granite buildings rise above the harbour, marking the way for fishermen returning from the fishing grounds as they enter St. John’s harbour. This visual landmark continues to be used to this day, and the views of the district from the harbour, as well as the views of the harbour from the district are considered valuable to the community. Other environmental values include the footpaths, the close proximity of the buildings to each other and the back alleyways reminiscent of 19th century St. John’s; a trend that doesn’t exist in newer parts of the city. The area was intentionally picked by early church leaders to emphasize the dominant position of the churches. The big stone churches held the leaders of society who, in their infinite wisdom, could peer down on the masses of common folk and pass down their laws and rules. The physical location of the church buildings deliberately forced the less-enlightened to look up to the church: a literal reaction to a figurative idea.

Character Defining Elements
All those elements that relate to the variety and the uses of formal architectural styles and
designs often typical of each denomination, including but not limited to:

- Gothic Revival, Classic, Romanesque, Second Empire and Georgian masonry buildings;
  - high quality of craftsmanship;
- the uses of architectural features typically found on specific architectural styles such as
  arched window and door openings on the Gothic Revival Anglican Cathedral and the
  Latin cross layout of the Romanesque Catholic Basilica;
- use of symbols and inscribed identifications such as those found on the BIS (Benevolent
  Irish Society) building in the forms of carved stonework and statuary on the exterior
  façade of the building;
- decorative elements which reflect the grandness of the buildings, including stained glass
  windows, towers, spires, belfries, the Basilica Arch and grand entryways with generous
  open green space;
- dominating nature of spires in an area where they stand out among primarily low
  buildings; and
- various roof shapes, windows and door openings, massing, size and orientation.

All those elements that relate to the predominant use of high quality, durable materials, and to
the variety of these materials, including:

- use of locally quarried granite and bluestone incorporated into masonry buildings;
- use of imported stone incorporated into masonry buildings; and
- use of slate and other durable materials.

All those elements that relate to the physical location of the district, including:

- prominent location on a hill/slope making it visible and symbolic;
- existing major views to and from the district;
- informal organic layout and the ability to read the natural land use patterns and
  circulation routes;
- relationship of major religious institutional buildings to their immediate setting and
  surroundings; and
- interrelationship of buildings and denominational clusters, such as the Roman Catholic
  cluster of its convent, monastery, church and school.

All unique and special elements that define the district’s long and religious/educational history,
including:

- formal landscape elements such as walls, fencing, statuary, grave markers, Basilica Arch
  and monuments;
- the interrelationship between buildings, such as the nearness of the Presentation Convent,
  the Basilica, the Monastery and St. Bon’s School, and the ability to access each by
  footpaths marked out for more than 175 years, and through back doors and alleyways;
- non-formal and traditional treed footpaths and monuments, including unmarked trails
  through cemeteries; and
- openness of landscape;
All those elements that reflect the continuing uses of the district, including:
  - religious, educational and community uses for cultural purposes.

**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>Construction (circa)</td>
<td>1826 - 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stjohns.ca/index.jsp">http://www.stjohns.ca/index.jsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing Conditions:

- EXISTING WINDOW TO BE REMOVED
- PATCH & PROF
- EXISTING OPENINGS AS REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE NEW WORK TO BE RESTORED UPON COMPLETION. REFER TO MECHANICAL ORGANIZATION.

Demolition:

- EXISTING SPRINKLER MAIN TO BE REMOVED AS REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE NEW WORK.

Construction:

- CONTRACTOR SHALL DO ALL WORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT

Materials:

- EXISTING MATERIALS TO BE REMOVED

4. CONTRACTOR SHALL DO ALL WORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE NATIONAL BUILDING STANDARDS AND CODES INCLUDING, BUT

Specifications:

- NEW MATERIALS TO BE USED
- NEW WORK TO BE INSTALLED

7. NEW EXISTING WINDOW TO BE REMOVED
- PATCH & PROF
- EXISTING OPENINGS AS REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE NEW WORK TO BE RESTORED UPON COMPLETION. REFER TO MECHANICAL ORGANIZATION.
### NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING FAÇADES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Façades</strong></td>
<td>Renovations to the building’s façade shall be compatible with the building’s architectural characteristics. <strong>Note:</strong> Typical 19th century storefronts include centrally located recessed doors with display windows on either side.</td>
<td>Building’s façades shall be, in the opinion of the Inspector, compatible with the period/architectural style of the streetscape unless the building’s architectural style is determined by the Inspector to be unique.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recessed Entries</strong></td>
<td>Recessed entries shall be retained. Recessed entries may be added where they are in keeping with the building’s architectural characteristics.</td>
<td>Recessed entries shall be retained. Where possible, recessed entries shall be incorporated into renovations where they are in keeping with the period/architectural style of the streetscape.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building and Cladding/Siding Materials</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLADDING/SIDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and cladding/siding materials shall be consistent with the existing or historic materials of the building.</td>
<td>Original materials of the building to be maintained. Materials used for the front façade shall be carried around the building where side or rear facades are exposed to the public street and/or publicly maintained space, unless otherwise approved by the Inspector. Where replacement is required, modern materials may be permitted, where, in the opinion of the Inspector, the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural style. However, veneer man-made products and similar products are not permitted. Accent materials may be permitted at the discretion of the Inspector.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Trim Style and Materials (including decoration and moulding)</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original trims to be maintained. Trims shall be compatible with the building’s architectural characteristics.</td>
<td>Building trims shall be compatible with the period/architectural style of the streetscape. Existing trims, including style and material, to be maintained for a façade facing a public street and/or publicly maintained space. New developments may require the addition of decorative trims as determined by the Inspector.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1, except modern material may be permitted at the discretion of the Inspector.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 2</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WINDOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windows Style</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The style and configuration of the windows shall be in keeping with the building’s architectural characteristics.</td>
<td>For any façade facing public street and/or publicly maintained space, the style and configuration of the windows shall be compatible with the period/architectural style of the streetscape and in keeping with the building’s architectural style.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window Replacements</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All window replacements shall be restored/returned in keeping with the window style and window configuration of the building's architectural characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where appropriate, in the opinion of Council, additional facades, or parts thereof, may be required to comply with the foregoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where appropriate, in the opinion of Council, additional facades, or parts thereof, may be required to comply with the foregoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note</strong>: Where appropriate, in the opinion of the Inspector, additional facades, or parts thereof, may be required to comply with the foregoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty Windows</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing specialty windows to be maintained.</strong> Specialty windows may be added where, in the opinion of Council, they are compatible with the building’s architectural characteristics.</td>
<td>Existing specialty windows to be maintained, unless otherwise approved by the Inspector. Specialty windows may be added where, in the opinion of the Inspector, they are compatible with the period/architectural style of the streetscape.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Window Trim Style and Material (including decoration and moulding)

<p>| <strong>Window trims shall be compatible with the building’s architectural characteristics. Materials may include wood, stone, brick, the building’s original material, or materials otherwise approved by Council.</strong> | <strong>Note:</strong> The width and style of window trims shall be consistent throughout the building’s façades, unless otherwise approved by Council. | <strong>Period/architectural style of the building to be maintained.</strong> Materials may include wood, stone, brick, the building’s original material, or materials otherwise approved by the Inspector. <strong>Note:</strong> The width and style of window trims shall be consistent throughout any building’s façade visible from a public street and/or publicly maintained space, unless otherwise approved by the Inspector. | <strong>Period/architectural style of the building to be maintained.</strong> Modern materials, including PVC trim, are permitted provided, in the opinion of the Inspector, the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural style. <strong>Note:</strong> The width and style of window trims shall be consistent throughout any building’s façade visible from a public street and/or publicly maintained space, unless otherwise approved by the Inspector. | Same as Heritage Area 2 | Same as Heritage Area 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Window Materials</strong></td>
<td>Modern window materials may be permitted provided, in the opinion of Council, the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural characteristics.</td>
<td>Modern windows materials are permitted provided, in the opinion of the Inspector, the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural style.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dormers</strong></td>
<td>Original dormer shape, size and proportion to be maintained.</td>
<td>Original dormer shape, size and proportion to be maintained, unless otherwise approved by the Inspector.</td>
<td>Dormers shall be placed in a visually balanced arrangement with respect to the width of the roof and the arrangement of the windows and door opening in the façade, unless otherwise approved by the Inspector.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Heritage Building</th>
<th>Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Heritage Area 2</th>
<th>Heritage Area 3</th>
<th>Heritage Area 4 (Battery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roofing Materials</strong></td>
<td>Modern roofing materials are permitted provided the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural characteristics.</td>
<td>Modern roofing materials, including metal roofing materials, are permitted provided the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural style.</td>
<td>Modern roofing materials are permitted. Metal roofing materials must replicate the existing roofing material.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solar Panels and Green Roofs</strong></td>
<td>Solar panels and/or green roofs are not permitted on facades visible from a public street and/or publicly maintained space.</td>
<td>Solar panels and/or green roofs are not permitted on facades visible from a public street.</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
<td>Same as Heritage Area 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FENCES, RAILINGS, RETAINING WALLS, DECKS AND BALCONIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fence, Railing, Retaining Wall, Deck and Balcony Materials</th>
<th>Modern materials are permitted provided the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural characteristics.</th>
<th>Modern materials are permitted provided the appearance replicates the building’s period/architectural style. Glass panels may be permitted on decks and balconies that have upper floor access, at the discretion of the Inspector.</th>
<th>Same as Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Same as Heritage Area 1</th>
<th>Same as Heritage Area 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Unfinished pressure treated wood at front of the building or visible from a public street and/or publicly maintained space is not permitted. Painted or solid-colour stained pressure treated wood is permitted.</td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Unfinished pressure treated wood at front of the building or visible from a public street is not permitted. Painted or solid-colour stained pressure treated wood is permitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Title: Canada Drive Active Transportation and Safety Improvements

Date Prepared: November 8, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Ward 3
Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation & Regulatory Services

Ward: Ward 3

Decision/Direction Required:
Decision is required about which type of active transportation route to design and build on Canada Drive.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
In 2019, the Bike St John’s Master Plan was adopted by council. The vision of the plan is to build “a safe, inclusive, and convenient cycling network that is well-connected, attractive and reflective of the City’s unique topography and climate. As part of an integrated mobility network, this is supported by policies and programs that promote a cycling friendly culture.”

Canada Drive is identified as one of the corridors in the “backbone cycling network.”

An active transportation route along Canada Drive will connect the existing shared-use path on Columbus Drive to the shared-use path under the Team Gushue extension in Mount Pearl. It will ultimately connect with Kelly’s Brook trail via Columbus Drive to create an important east-west route at the core of the cycling backbone network.

The active transportation route options that were presented for public and stakeholder feedback are:

- A bi-directional bike path on the south side of the street, sidewalks on both sides of the street, with parking on one side only; or
- A shared-use path (SUP) on the south side of the street, sidewalk on the other side, with parking allowed on both sides.

The following is a summary of what we heard through public engagement.

- Active transportation is important to the schools. Many students walk or bike to school. Most students live close enough to school that they do not qualify for bussing.
- Most people are generally happy to hear about streetscape changes to improve active transportation. Some people suggest the city is not going far enough to implement safe
and comfortable active transportation infrastructure. Others suggest bike lanes are not needed and are not a good use of taxpayer money.

- There is no definitive agreement on which option is preferred. Those who live on the street mostly prefer a shared use path. Citywide, there is an overall preference for the dedicated bike lanes.
- Sidewalk snow clearing is a major concern regarding the project. Among people living on Canada Drive, the extra width of SUP/sidewalk/bike lanes in front of their homes puts an additional strain on those clearing their driveways. Among people who want to use the new active transportation route, there are questions about its usefulness if it is not adequately maintained in the winter.
- Parking is reported as very important among the people who live on Canada Drive. This is an important factor in their preference for the shared-use-path option.
- There are concerns about sightlines and sidewalk snow clearing priority on the north side of the street and some concerns about connectivity and safety throughout the street.

Staff has evaluated the two facility types in terms of public and stakeholder engagement, sightlines along the corridor as well as winter maintenance. Based on these factors, a shared-use path on the south side of the street is recommended.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:
   - Since sections of Canada Drive are identified for street rehabilitation in 2023 and future years, any changes to the use of the street are best made during the design and construction phase. Piggybacking on rehabilitation work, will help reduce overall cost and avoid extra construction along the corridor.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   - Schools on Canada Drive (St Mathews and Cowan Heights Elementary)
   - Residents of Canada Drive and Cowan Heights

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   A City that Moves: Create a sustainable and accessible, low-carbon public transportation system.

   A City that Moves: Create a sustainable and accessible, low-carbon public transportation system.
4. **Alignment with Adopted Plans:**
   - In the 2019 Bike St John’s Master Plan, Canada Drive is identified as one of the corridors in the “backbone cycling network.”
   - Council has committed to working towards a sustainable mode share target of 16% to be achieved by 2030 and 22% by 2050. To achieve this target the City must continue to invest more in transit, pedestrian, and bike facilities.

5. **Accessibility and Inclusion:**

6. **Legal or Policy Implications:**

7. **Privacy Implications:**

8. **Engagement and Communications Considerations:**

9. **Human Resource Implications:**

10. **Procurement Implications:**

11. **Information Technology Implications:**

12. **Other Implications:**

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the design and construction of a shared-use path on the south side of Canada Drive.

**Prepared by:** Marianne  
**Approved by:** Amer Afridi
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Title: Fee Structure for New One and Two Family Dwelling Construction

Date Prepared: October 6, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation & Regulatory Services

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
To adjust the current permit calculation scheme for all new one and two family dwelling construction to simplify the process and better align with other jurisdictions.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

Permits for new constructions are based on the construction value of the house being built. Inspection Services uses a formula to calculate the construction value which factors in the square meterage of the house. For example, for one- and two-family dwellings, the construction value is currently calculated at $1300 per square meter of the main area, $650 per square meter for an attached garage, and $400 per square meter for a finished basement. This value is then used to determine a permit value by applying a rate of $9 per $1000 of work up to $100,000 and $7.20 per $1000 thereafter.

When calculating the cost of new construction permits, only the floors above grade (e.g., main floor, second floor) are included in the calculation of construction cost. As such, any floors below grade, regardless of whether they are finished or not, are not factored into the permit cost for new constructions.

If an applicant proceeds to complete an unfinished basement after an occupancy certificate has been issued by the City, then a separate building permit must be obtained based on the calculated construction cost of finishing the basement. Given this, applicants who finish a basement after initial occupancy approval has been granted may deem the associated permit cost as unreasonable resulting in reduced customer satisfaction.

The above permit costing methodology was compared to the methodology used by selected Cities in other Atlantic provinces. It was determined that unlike St. John’s, Moncton, NB, Halifax, NS, and Saint John, NB all incorporate the square footage of finished levels below grade into the cost of new home construction permits. Hence, there is an opportunity to change the fee structure for new construction permits that better align with other municipalities fee structures.
The current permit cost scheme was also identified during an internal audit of the Permit Counter in 2021 as having potential to be problematic and was suggested to be changed to simplify the process and be more in line with other jurisdictions.

The proposed values will see a cost per square meter for new one and two family dwellings being:

- $8.00 per square meter for all construction above grade
- $5.00 per square meter for all development below grade and attached garages
- $3.00 per square meter for unfinished below grade areas

The above values were determined so as not to impose increases in permit revenue, although, some dwelling construction types may see a marginal increase in permit fees.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Considering the below grade development of new dwelling construction, a marginal increase in revenue may be observed.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Notification will be provided to the Home Builders Association of the change, however, most construction scenarios will not see a notable increase in fees. A January 1, 2023 implementation date will apply.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   An Effective City: Ensure accountability and good governance through transparent and open decision making.

   A Sustainable City: Be financially responsible and accountable.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: N/A

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: N/A

6. Legal or Policy Implications: N/A

7. Privacy Implications: N/A

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A
9. Human Resource Implications:

10. Procurement Implications: N/A

11. Information Technology Implications: New calculation formulas for determining permit values will have to be implemented in the back end of the Information Management System.

12. Other Implications: N/A

13. 

Recommendation:
That Council adjust the current calculation scheme for all new one and two family dwelling constructions as proposed with an implementation date of January 1, 2023

Prepared by:
Randy Carew, CET – Manager – Regulatory Services

Signature: ________________________________

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

Signature: ________________________________
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# Development Permits List

For November 17 to November 23, 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>COM</td>
<td>Country Ribbon Inc.</td>
<td>Lot Consolidation</td>
<td>18 East White Hills Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>18-11-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Brace Investment Limited</td>
<td>Lot Consolidation</td>
<td>111 Cowan Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>23-11-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

_________________________________________
# Permits List

## Council's November 28, 2022 Regular Meeting

Permits Issued: 2022/11/17 to 2022/11/23

### BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED

#### Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Carondale Dr</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Electra Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Diamond Marsh Dr</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Caravelle Pl</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Pennywell Rd</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Monchy St</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Soper Cres</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 Southside Rd</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Semi Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338 Blackmarsh Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Milbanke St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sugar Pine Cres</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Pepperwood Dr</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Halley Dr</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ginger St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Avondale Pl</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Waterford Bridge Rd</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 New Gower St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 Higgins Line</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 East White Hills Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 King's Rd</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Topsail Rd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Topsail Rd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Kenmount Rd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Service Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547 Kenmount Rd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Car Sales Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Brennan St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82 Elizabeth Ave</td>
<td>Change of</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Week: $927,730.00
Occupancy/Renovations

Government/Institutional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Week: $3,242,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industrial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Week: $0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66 Leslie St</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Week: $8,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Week's Total: $4,178,230.00

REPAIR PERMITS ISSUED: $79,993.00

NO REJECTIONS

YEAR TO DATE COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>% Variance (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$57,611,611.02</td>
<td>$72,687,442.33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$117,957,792.82</td>
<td>$99,077,936.06</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Institutional</td>
<td>$33,219,907.00</td>
<td>$1,980,468.00</td>
<td>-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$4,164,500.00</td>
<td>$351,000.00</td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>$4,213,580.57</td>
<td>$1,657,408.92</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$217,167,391.41</td>
<td>$175,754,255.31</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (1 &amp; 2 Family Dwelling)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>219</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 November 23, 2022

Payroll

Public Works $ 426,972.22
Bi-Weekly Administration $1,111,443.81
Bi-Weekly Management $ 912,944.03
Bi-Weekly Fire Department $ 857,245.66

Accounts Payable $3,074,083.73

Total: $ 6,382,689.45

(A detailed breakdown here)
BID APPROVAL NOTE

Bid # and Name: 2022215 - Supply and Delivery of Cummins Parts
Date Prepared: Wednesday, November 23, 2022
Report To: Regular Meeting
Councillor and Role: Councillor Ron Ellsworth, Finance & Administration
Ward: N/A

Department: Finance & Administration
Division: Supply Chain
Quotes Obtained By: Sherri Higgins
Budget Code: 0000-15101
Source of Funding: Operating

Purpose:
The purpose of this open call is for the Supply & Delivery of Cummins Parts for the Fleet division to be used on an as required basis.

Results: ☐ As attached ☒ As noted below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvey &amp; Company Ltd.</td>
<td>$86,630.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Value: ☐ As above
☒ Value shown is an estimate only for a 1 year period. The City does not guarantee to buy specific quantities or dollar value.

Contract Duration: One (1) year with two (2) possible one (1) year extensions.

Bid Exception: None

Recommendation:
That Council recommend for award this open call to the lowest and sole bidder meeting specifications, Harvey & Company Ltd. for $86,630.46 per year (HST not incl.) as per the Public Procurement Act.

Attachments:
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>2022215 - Supply and Delivery of Cummins Parts.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 23, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Rick Squires - Nov 23, 2022 - 3:42 PM**

**Derek Coffey - Nov 23, 2022 - 3:44 PM**
DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL REQUEST/RFP

Commodity/Bid #: 2022192 – Traffic Control Services – Robin Hood Bay Waste Management Facility

Date Prepared: Monday, November 21, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting

Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works

Ward: N/A

Department: Public Works

Quotes Obtained By: Sherry Kieley

Budget Code: 4331-52100 & 4334-52100

Source of Funding: Operating

Purpose:
To control traffic at the Robin Hood Bay residential drop-off and commercial tip face.

Proposals Submitted By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety First Contracting Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKS Solutions Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa’s Property Services Pro Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelloway Construction Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Value: ☐ Value shown is an estimate only for a 2 year period. The City does not guarantee to buy specific quantities or dollar value.

Contract Duration: Two (2) years with option to renew for one (1) year

Recommendation:
THAT Council award to Safety First Contracting Ltd in the amount of $876,836 based on evaluation of the proposals by the City’s evaluation team as per the Public Procurement Act

Attachments:
**Report Approval Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>2022192 - Traffic Control Services - Robin Hood Bay Waste Management Facility.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report approved and signed as outlined below:

**Andrew Niblock - Nov 24, 2022 - 2:43 PM**

**Lynnann Winsor - Nov 24, 2022 - 2:44 PM**
NOTICE OF MOTION

TAKE NOTICE that I will at the next regular meeting of the St. John’s Municipal Council move to amend the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations to add a provision related to payment for use of electric vehicle charging stations on Saturdays, Sundays, or any other defined as a holiday within the meaning of the Shops Closing Act, RSNL 1990, C. S-15.

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

__________________________
COUNCILLOR
BY-LAW NO. 1616

ST. JOHN’S PAID PARKING (AMENDMENT NO. 1-2022) REGULATIONS

PASSED BY COUNCIL ON _____, 2022

Pursuant to the powers vested in it under the City of St. John’s Act, RSNL 1990, c C-17, as amended, and all other powers enabling it, the City of St. John’s enacts the following By-Law relating to the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations.

BY-LAW

1. This By-Law may be cited as the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations (Amendment No. 1 – 2022).

2. Subsection 2(d) of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is repealed and the following is substituted:

   “2(d) “motor vehicle” shall have the same meaning as in the Highway Traffic Act, RSNL 1990, c. H-3, as amended and shall include electric vehicles.”

3. Section 2 of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is amended by adding the following definitions and renumbering the subsections accordingly:

   (1) “electric vehicle” means a vehicle that is propelled by one or more electric motors, using electrical energy stored in rechargeable batteries, or another energy storage device, and is capable of being plugged into an electric vehicle charging station, including, but not limited to, plug-in battery electric cars, fuel cell battery electric vehicles, and plug-in hybrid vehicles.

   (2) “electric vehicle charging station” means the vehicle charging equipment, inclusive of the electric vehicle charging station pillar, electronic/physical parts, head, and any other relevant equipment used for the purposes of charging electric vehicles.

   (3) “electric vehicle parking area” means a street, portion of a street, parking lot, or parking facility that is for parking electric vehicles, and which is controlled and regulated by parking meter(s), pay by phone app, pay station(s), and/or electric vehicle charging stations;

   (4) “electric vehicle parking space” means a single space that is for parking an electric vehicle, and which is controlled and regulated by parking meter, pay by phone app, pay station(s), and/or electric vehicle charging station(s).
4. Section 7 of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is repealed.

5. Section 13 of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is repealed and the following is substituted:

   13. Notwithstanding the foregoing, payment for parking shall not be required on Saturday or Sunday or on any other day defined as a holiday within the meaning of the Shops' Closing Act, RSNL 1990, c. S-15, as amended; payment for parking does not include any payment required for the use of an electric vehicle charging station.

   IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Seal of the City of St. John’s has been hereunto affixed and this By-Law has been signed by the Mayor and City Clerk this ________ day of__________________, 2022.

___________________________________
MAYOR

____________________________________
CITY CLERK
NOTICE OF MOTION

TAKE NOTICE that I will at the next regular meeting of the St. John’s Municipal Council move to amend the St. John’s Ticketing Amendment By-Law to add a provision related to the parking of vehicles that are not physically connected to electric vehicle charging stations in parking spaces designated for the charging of electric vehicles.

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

________________________________________
COUNCILLOR
Pursuant to the powers vested in it under the powers conferred by Sections 188 and 189 of the Highway Traffic Act, RSNL 1990, Chapter H-3, as amended, a delegation of power by the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation dated April 27, 1990, an approval of the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation dated April 12, 1996, and the City of St. John’s Act, RSNL 1990, c C-17, as amended, and all other powers enabling it, the City of St. John’s enacts the following By-Law relating to the St. John’s Ticketing Amendment Bylaw.

**BY-LAW**

1. This By-Law may be cited as the St. John’s Ticketing Amendment Bylaw (Amendment No. 1 – 2022).

2. The following is added as Section 14 of the St. John’s Ticketing Amendment Bylaw:

   “14. (1) A person shall not park a vehicle so that the vehicle is parked in a space designated for the charging of electric vehicles, unless that vehicle is physically connected to the electric charging station.

   (2) Any person who violates or contravenes this section is guilty of an offence and is liable to a minimum fine of sixty dollars ($60.00).

   (3) An offence under this section may be prosecuted by means of a traffic ticket under the provisions of the Provincial Offences Act.”

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF** the Seal of the City of St. John’s has been hereunto affixed and this By-Law has been signed by the Mayor and City Clerk this ________ day of ________________, 2022.

___________________________________
MAYOR

___________________________________
CITY CLERK
Title: SERC – Film Shoot Road Closure 5

Date Prepared: November 24, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Debbie Hanlon, Special Events Regulatory Committee

Ward: N/A

**Decision/Direction Required:** Seeking Council approval of a road closure associated with the filming of the television series Hudson and Rex.

**Discussion – Background and Current Status:** Hudson and Rex production are requesting the following road closure. A traffic control company has been secured for the road closure. Surrounding businesses have been made aware of the request. Local traffic and emergency vehicles will be granted access.

December 4 - 7, 7:00am – 8:00pm, Princes Street

[Map of Princes Street area showing the street and surrounding businesses.]
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: N/A
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: N/A
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions: N/A
4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: N/A
5. Accessibility and Inclusion: N/A
6. Legal or Policy Implications: N/A
7. Privacy Implications: N/A
8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A
9. Human Resource Implications: N/A
10. Procurement Implications: N/A
11. Information Technology Implications: N/A
12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve the requested road closure associated with the filming of the television series Hudson and Rex.

Prepared by: Christa Norman, Special Projects Coordinator
Approved by: Erin Skinner, Supervisor – Tourism and Events
**Report Approval Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>SERC - Film Shoot Road Closure 5.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Erin Skinner - Nov 24, 2022 - 10:33 AM**

**Tanya Haywood - Nov 24, 2022 - 11:55 AM**
Title: SERC – Holiday Events

Date Prepared: November 24, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Debbie Hanlon, Special Events Regulatory Committee

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:

Seeking Council approval of road closures associated with the Festival of Music and Lights on December 3 (inclement weather date of December 10), the Downtown Holiday Fair on December 11 (inclement weather date of December 18), and the Shea Heights Christmas Parade on December 3.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The Festival of Music and Lights is planned for December 3 (inclement weather date of December 10), from 5pm – 6pm in Bowring Park. This event requires a road closure on Waterford Bridge Road, from Cowan Avenue to Bay Bulls Road from approximately 4:30pm – 6pm. City of St. John’s Parking Enforcement and a traffic control company will be present to implement the road closure.
The Downtown Holiday Fair is planned for December 10 - 11 (inclement weather date of December 17 - 18), from 2pm – 5pm in the downtown. The Sunday portion of this event requires the closure of George Street, from Adelaide Street to Water Street from 10am – 6pm. Commissionaires will be on site to implement the road closure.

The Shea Heights Christmas Parade is planned for December 3 from 11:00pm – 1:30pm. The parade will begin at the Community Centre, 130 Linegar Avenue, turn on Dillon Crescent, and return to the Community Centre. Volunteers are on site to implement this road closure.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: N/A

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Downtown St. John’s, George Street Association, Lion’s Club, Government of Canada.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:
   
   A Connected City: Develop and deliver programs, services and public spaces that build safe, healthy and vibrant communities.

   A Connected City: Increase and improve opportunities for residents to connect with each other and the City.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: N/A

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Both the Festival of Music and Lights and the Downtown Holiday Fair will have additional accessible parking for the event, and accessible viewing areas staffed by the City’s inclusion team.

6. Legal or Policy Implications: N/A

7. Privacy Implications: N/A

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A

9. Human Resource Implications: N/A

10. Procurement Implications: N/A

11. Information Technology Implications: N/A

12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve the road closures associated with the Festival of Music and Lights on December 3 (inclement weather date of December 10), the Downtown Holiday Fair on December 11 (inclement weather date of December 18), and the Shea Heights Christmas Parade on December 3.

Prepared by: Christa Norman, Special Projects Coordinator
Approved by: Erin Skinner, Supervisor of Tourism and Events
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>SERC - Holiday Events.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Erin Skinner - Nov 24, 2022 - 10:26 AM**

**Tanya Haywood - Nov 24, 2022 - 11:54 AM**