

EDMONTON FEDERATION OF COMMUNITY LEAGUES

Planning and Development Committee Meeting



Flying Canoe Volant , Edmonton. [Source.](#)

February 26 Rescheduled to March 4 @ 6:00 PM

EFCL Offices, 7103-105 Street
Prepared by Stephanie Kovach

Voting Members: Ron Favell (B), Troy Aardema (D), Stephen Poole (E), Kathryn Jones (G), Stephen Raitz (I), Dave Sutherland (J), Vesna Farnden (H), Suzanne MacKinnon (L)

Volunteers: Andrea Wilhelm (F), Elaine Solez (I), Hassaan Zuberi (L)

Vacancies: A, C, G, K

2.0 - Agenda

2.1 - Approval of Agenda

Item 2.1

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 Welcome and Introductions

2.0 Agenda (6:00 pm)

- 2.1 Approval of Agenda (pg. 1)

3.0 Approval of PDC Meeting Minutes (6:00-6:10 pm)

- 3.1 January 29, P&DC Meeting Minutes (pgs. 2-10)
- 3.2 Review of Action Items from the January Meeting (pg. 11)

4.0 Calendar (6:10-6:15 pm)

- 4.1 Important Upcoming Dates (pg.12)

5.0 Discussion Items (6:15-8:00 pm)

- 5.1 Residential Infill Working Group (**UPDATE**) (pg.13) (6:15 pm-6:30pm)
- 5.2 Residential Street Speeds (**UPDATE**) (pg. 14)
- 5.3 Short Term Rentals (**UPDATE**) (pgs. 15-16)
- 5.4 Bus Network Redesign (**UPDATE**) (pgs. 16-20)
- 5.5 Review of PDC ToR (pgs. 20-22) (7:30-8:15pm)

6.0 Reports (pg. 28) (8:15-8:30 pm)

- 6.1 District News (pg. 23)

Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues
Planning and Development Committee January 2020 Meeting
at EFCL Office - 7103 105 Street

Draft Minutes

In Attendance:

Stephanie Kovach (EFCL)
Troy Aardema (D)
Suzanne MacKinnon (L)
Stephen Raitz (I)
Elaine Solez (I)
Vesna Farnden (H)
Dave Sutherland (J)
Hassan Zuberi (L)
Elaine Solez (I)
Andrea Wilhelm (F)

Minutes: Angelika Matson

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Welcome and Introductions

S. Kovach called the meeting to order and the group did introductions.

2.0 Agenda

2.1 Approval of Agenda

S. Mackinnon moved to approve the agenda. Approved by consensus.

3.0 Approval of Planning and Development Committee Meeting Minutes

3.1 November 27, P&DC Meeting Minutes

T. Aardema moved to approve minutes. Approved by consensus.

3.2 Review of Action Items from the November Meeting

S. Kovach determined what the compliance mechanism was for the expedited infill permits and shared with the group.

Regarding the Bus Network Redesign and the communities selected for the on-demand pilot, she was told that is TBD once Council approves funding.

The letter was drafted sharing committee member feedback for open option parking implementation.

S. Mackinnon raised concerns that the bus network redesign will be tricky with LRT delays.

4.0 Calendar

4.1 Important Upcoming Dates

- February 8th David Engwicht speaking event: if committee members want tickets, let S. Kovach know. E. Solez, V. Farnden indicated they would like tickets.
- February 25th Short-term rentals at Urban Planning Committee
- February 26th Residential Street Speeds
- February 26th PDC Meeting
- March 25th PDC Meeting

5.0 Discussion Items

5.1 Expedited Infill Permits

- There is a compliance mechanism that will be used for participants of the infill process: For construction-related activities: there are items where they would lose points (screwing up development application or having any one of the abuses listed). The process will still be relying on neighbours to call and complain.
- There is a long waitlist for this program. S. Mackinnon pointed out that non-developers taking the classes shows that the course is meeting a need (planners, citizens, and builders are taking the courses).
- **Action item: S. Kovach to reach out to Kirsten Goa to find out the non-developers that are taking courses: are they involved with community leagues, etc. Is it putting info in easier to understand terms than the city?**
- **Action item: S. Kovach to look into how many points infractions cost, the range of points matching the severity, etc.**

5.2 Residential Street Speeds

- On May 14, 2019 City Council advanced discussions to reduce residential and collector speed limits within our communities by directing City Administration to draft Bylaws that may result in:
 - A city-wide default speed limit of 40 km/hr on both local residential and collector roadways
 - A default limit of 30 km/hr on both local residential and collector roadways in high-density neighbourhoods located in Central Edmonton, which is being referred to as the Core Zone.
- The Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues (EFCL) sought to understand Community League perceptions around liveability of their neighbourhoods and how they interact with city streets. EFCL undertook a literature review and prepared an informational handbook and an extensive online survey. The survey was conducted to understand our members' preferences for managing road safety through speed limits, traffic calming infrastructure and other mechanisms. Of 160 Leagues in EFCL, 117 leagues are represented in the results.
- This was supposed to go forward in January so the P&D committee was unable to make a recommendation to bring to the board, instead S. Kovach and J. Samsonow presented to the board and the board had to come up with a recommendation before the P&D. The Board's recommendation is as follows:
 - The EFCL Board of Directors voted to support the following recommendation to council:
 - 30km/hr on residential roads city-wide
 - 40km/hr on minor collector roads city-wide
 - 50km/hr on major collector roads city-wide
- There is more support for slower street speeds the closer you get to the core. Outside the inner ring road, there's a preference for 40 km/hr.
- The survey broke collector roads into major and minor collector roads (major: higher capacity roads with more traffic). Survey respondents wanted major collector roads maintained at 50 km/hr. Survey respondents preferred 40 km/r for minor collector roads. Survey respondents wanted consistency through a zone or city-wide approach.
- The Committee suggested waiting to see if the CoE's report released in February requires tweaking of EFCL's. The CoE administration was supposed to consult communities within the core zone and may define the core zone differently, so EFCL may want to see what the city says first.
- S. Kovach pointed out that the EFCL Board discussed the merits of safety 30 km/hr versus 40 km/hr and settled on their recommendation based on those merits.
- The Committee pointed out EFCL needed to identify the the reasons behind our position and the survey results and definitely mention what EFCL was able to do when more time is given on a topic. The committee gave resounding feedback on the quality of the

questions, and the quality of the information booklet: they asked that the information booklet be presented as well. The Committee also asked S. Kovach to tell council EFCL got lots of non-league members responding. The Committee asked S. Kovach to present that survey respondents didn't want photo radar and preferred the streetscapes to encourage slower speeds.

- The city may not want to replace the signs because of the costs, which is a concern.
- A. Wilhelm asked if concerned members from District F should come to the committee or the public hearing? The committee agreed that people should present to CoE if possible.
- A. Wilhelm wondered the reason for the difference in participation rates for leagues? Some leagues have differences in engagement approaches. There were also lots of "non-league" people.
- **Action item: S. Kovach to look at the leagues that got lots of responses and find out what they did to engage their members.**
- **Action item: S. Kovach find the results of the CoE's survey on this topic from a few years ago and compare to EFCL's**

5.3 Comprehensive Parking Review

- CoE UPC discussed open parking yesterday. There didn't appear to be much appetite for zoned or phased implementation. The committee moved ahead with the full implementation that will move to a public hearing in quarter three. This will take decades to see the implementation of. Discussion arose of non-profit Ambrose Place (a facility that houses hard-to-house residents) that couldn't get an exemption on their parking minimums, which resulted in a million-dollar parking garage in an affordable housing development that only has three cars in it for staff.
- E. Solez wondered if EFCL can find out if people can rent spots on their residential lots with the new bylaw since this is a big issue in Windsor Park near the University. There might be liability insurance required for parking lots - there was a case in Ontario where the city deemed the residence needed commercial parking.
- **Action item: S. Kovach to find out if people can rent spots on their residential lots with the new bylaw.**

5.4 Options for Managing Short Term Rentals

- Short term rentals (e.g. AirBnb, VRBO, HomeAway) provide residential rental accommodation for less than 30 consecutive days. They are either:
 - Rental of an entire dwelling.
 - Rental of an individual room or space in a home where the host lives.
- In order to operate a short term rental, the property owner must obtain:

- A short-term residential rental accommodate license (failing to meet a condition under this classification is \$2,000)
- A property inspection with Alberta Health Services
- A building permit if there are changes to the physical floor plan of the property
- Issues with short-term rentals:
 - It can take away rentals from people who live in the city which might affect affordability.
 - There are some listings where property owners don't live in the city. I.e. Garneau had a problem with this last year.
 - There is some disruption for neighbours: noise, waste, etc. The city might not be able to provide timely enforcement.
 - Hotel associations complain that home shares have an unfair advantage because they don't have to pay into the tourism levy.
 - S. Mackinnon pointed out someone might buy a condo downtown and find out that they don't have any neighbours, which might have an impact on community, which has been an issue in Vancouver and Calgary.
 - Air B&B can take advantage of vulnerable people because of affordability and have multiple marginalized people living in one home.
- A. Wilhelm pointed out that in Berlin the landlord has to live there too which helps with lots of issues.
- The committee agreed there were lots of benefits to AirBnB's as well.
- S. Kovach pointed out that there are provincial acts: Residential Tenancies act and the Innkeepers Act.
- At present CoE can only enforce bylaw complaints related to nuisance (noise, garbage, parking), and condo boards might be able to ban short-term rentals as per their bylaws.
- Administration explored potential bylaw changes to manage concerns regarding short term rentals, including:
 - A development permit process for "entire rental" properties. The committee wondered if this meant the use is changed to a rental unit (short term) that you must get a development permit even if you aren't doing upgrades? Mostly just a revenue stream. But if there are complaints and they find out there are no development permits then they can force them to get permits.
 - Increased property tax rates, fees, or levies in lieu for "entire rental" properties; (remit fees could be collected by AirBnB and then paid out to the province, which is done in some other jurisdictions). Looking at this from a community perspective, would increased tax rates on AirBnBs deter AirBnBs? The committee wants to ensure the language is tight around specifying short-term rentals so it doesn't impact rentals. Could the CoE force AirBnB to give addresses of the short-term rentals? Somehow governments should know which addresses are

participating. S. Kovach pointed out that AirBnB haven't been cooperative with CoE on problem properties in the past.

- There is potential for an additional fee to be directed to support affordable housing and tourism. The committee is unsure what regulatory authority the municipality has to implement that kind of levy.
 - **Action item: S. Kovach to look into whether a levy is possible for the CoE to implement.**
- The committee discussed how this will be enforced. The committee wondered what the difference is between a hotel and a condo rented out completely for AirBnBs? The committee was also concerned about the lobbying from a group representing Alberta hotels that is advocating for AirBnBs to be restricted to certain residential zones. Restricting to certain zones is concerning because what will the criteria of those zones be?
- S. Mackinnon pointed out that Denver ties it to the primary residence. They also asked people to swear an affidavit that it was a primary residence and had a massive surrender of business licenses.
- The P&DC agrees having people live on the same property (definition would have to consider condos, so restricting to where you get your mail sent to) is preferred and would solve potential problems.
- **Action item: S. Kovach will send more information and a potential recommendation to the P&DC.**

5.5 Zoning Bylaw Work Plan

- After February 11th it will be good to look at this again.

5.6 Proactive Projects

- S. Kovach: a proactive project is something the P&DC can do to help leagues with big changes that are coming ie. street speeds change. Zoning Bylaw renewal may be an opportunity for a project to educate people.
- S. Raitz discussed changes to the bus network: preparing people for changes in September 2020. T. Aardema received little feedback from communities in the west end when the EFCL pushed out info on it previously. E. Solez said when they took buses off of Groat Road in Windsor Park, she struggled to get information from the CoE and ETS. Everything ETS does is based on where you want to go and when, but that isn't the answer for everyone in a community. S. Kovach pointed out that EFCL might have a bigger role to play when the CoE touches back with communities a year after the implementation. The committee wondered if they'll still do the Bus Network Redesign the way they intended to with the LRT delays.

- Even though the term “complete communities” is used, the CoE does not have a definition of complete communities. The CoE think the City Plan will support this. EFCL may be able to weigh in on what leagues think are complete communities.

5.7 Ward Boundaries

- E. Solez asked if the EFCL sent out info on the ward boundaries, and wondered why the CoE didn’t do mail drops. The committee discussed that the CoE is working within tight timelines. Last time less than 100 people were engaged and this time more than 1000 people were.
- The committee thought overall, the criteria for ward boundaries in the Insight survey seemed reasonable. E. Solez said her district identifies with south of the river, and might be lumped in with downtown issues.
- The committee agrees that communities of interest are important in this discussion. EFCL’s role could be helping communities articulate what their interests are.
- S. Raitz: the issues being raised by the P&DC were echoed in the public engagement.

6.0 Reports

6.1 District News

- District A-C not present
- District D- T. Aardema: the trans mountain line is being built in District D. Andrew Knack has a community connector this weekend that T. Aardema might attend.
- District E not present
- District F: A. Wilhelm the Boyle McCauley newsletter was written about problem properties. Councillor McKeen has written something in the Boyle-McCauley news about it and recognizes it is an issue. Riverdale said “yes in my backyard to affordable housing” at City Council. The motion that was passed was that five skinny lots (CoE declared them surplus) need long-term, non-market, affordable housing. The actual offer still has to come back to Council. Hopefully, with North Glenora it will be a positive model for other neighbourhoods to embrace affordable housing.
- District H nothing to report
- District I - S. Raitz: more development is being proposed in Garneau and Strathcona. They are still waiting to hear what will happen with Garneau neighbourhood renewal. Street speeds and whether it will be in the core zone. Design money for rec centre that would replace Scona pool, the league said they’d be willing to fundraise, charge for parking, crowdsourcing, etc. The CoE asked the administration to look into that. Queen Alex and E. Solez spoke to a follow-up motion for communities, administration, and development to work together to come up with ways to design and operate the city. E.

Solez was concerned about “operating” -can the motion be changed? Their community is dealing with a number of skinny house issues with parking.

- District J - D. Sutherland: Bonnie Doon pool is open again. The Valley Line LRT: 95th Avenue opened again so businesses and residents are happy. Holyrood gardens are amending the development permit and starting work late February 2020.
- S. Mackinnon: nothing to report from her district. Other than the delay in LRT building

Meeting adjourned by consensus at 8:58 PM.

3.0 - Approval of November 27 Meeting Minutes

3.2 - Review of Action Items from November 27

Item 3.2

ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Expedited Infill Pilot Engage with IDEA and/or the City of Edmonton to find out what points are assigned for construction infractions <u>Outcome:</u></p>	<p><i>Incomplete</i> ---</p>
ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Planning Academy Engage with the City to find out if Planning Academy is still being offered <u>Outcome:</u> On indefinite hiatus</p>	<p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p>
ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Residential Street Speeds Prepare a letter outlining the EFCL's support for reduced residential speed limits for City Council <u>Outcome:</u> Council to vote on March 9</p> <p>Connect with leagues who had a lot of responses on the survey and find out what they did to engage their members</p>	<p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p> <p><i>Incomplete</i> X</p>
ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Comprehensive Parking Review Engage with the City of Edmonton find out if it is possible for residents to rent out the space in their driveway or garage <u>Outcome:</u> Yes and they may require a business license to do so. Larger scale parking facilities will not be allowed in residential neighbourhoods.</p>	<p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p>
ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Short Term Rentals Prepare recommendations for Board of Directors that the host must live on site to be eligible to rent their property on a short term basis <u>Outcome:</u> After much discussion and because the Business License will be updated in January 2021, the President put forward a motion to continue to monitor STRs and engage with leagues over the course of the next year.</p>	<p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p>
ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Bus Network Redesign Connect with the city to determine how delays to the Valley Line LRT impact the roll out of the BNR <u>Outcome:</u></p>	<p><i>Incomplete</i> ---</p>

**4.0 - EFCL Planning Committee Calendar
January, February, March**

4.1 - Important Upcoming Dates

Item 4.1

March	
9	Residential Street Speeds + Bus Network Redesign
25	PDC Meeting
April	
29	PDC Meeting
May	
27	PDC Meeting

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.1 - Residential Infill Working Group (UPDATE)

Item 5.1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Following the collapse of a foundation in the community of Parkallen, S. Poole, B. Zubot, J. Hardstaff and C. Haraba reconvened a former committee of the EFCL, the Constructions Issues Committee. They have rebranded as the Residential Infill Working Group.

They presented on issues relating to excavation that can arise during the infill redevelopment process at a UPC meeting in April of 2019. This meeting resulted in a number of actionable outcomes for administration and the group.

S. Poole will give an update on work to date.

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.2 - Residential Street Speeds (UPDATE)

Item 5.2

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On February 26, 2020 the EFCL made a presentation to City Council Community and Public Services Committee (CSPC) and outlined our support for a reduction in residential street speeds.

The committee made no recommendation to Council, who will be debating and voting on the following:

- A 40 km/hr default speed limit on residential roads throughout Edmonton, **OR**
- A 30km/hr speed limit on residential roads within the Core Zone, with the residential roads outside of the core zone remaining at 50 km/hr **OR**
- A 30km/hr speed limit on residential roads within the Core Zone and 40km/hr on residential roads outside of the Core Zone

OPPORTUNITIES TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK

- Council will vote on the proposed options on March 9, 2020
- Council will not hear from citizens at this meeting, but there is still time to contact your ward councillor to share your views
- The EFCL is collecting letters from leagues to submit as a cohesive package in advance of the meeting. Please forward any from your districts to stephanie.kovach@efcl.org (both for or against the proposed changes!)

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.3 - Short Term Rentals (UPDATE)

Item 5.3

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On February 25, 2019, City Council's Urban Planning Committee discussed Short Term Rentals (STRs).

Of the motion made in August, City Administration had the following recommendation for Council to consider at this meeting:

- A requirement that short-term rental operators include a valid business license number on advertisements for the property. AirBnb has indicated a willingness to work with the City to implement this requirement. This will help to ensure that the City can track short term rentals (**PASSED - with the hope this will ensure better identification of illegally operating STRs and subsequent enforcement**)

Also of interest:

- The Province of Alberta will impose a 4% tourism levy on all transactions made through homeshare platforms to fund Travel Alberta
- AirBnb is piloting only allowing users who are verified via government issued ID to be able to rent whole rental units in an effort to stymy homes being rented out for house parties

NEW MOTION - Due June 2020

1. That Bylaw 19143 be given the appropriate readings.
2. That Administration explore potential bylaw changes related to short term rentals, including:
 - a. Defining a short-term rental as any rental agreement of 25 days or less;
 - b. Establish a notification process to adjacent property owners for all short term rental properties;
 - c. Examine options to ensure equity in approval processes between "entire rental" properties and shared home rental properties;
 - d. Explore options for "entire rental" properties to address concerns regarding:
 - i. Maximum number of rental days in a year;
 - ii. Maximum number of occupants;
 - iii. Maximum number of rental properties owned by a single person;
 - iv. Restriction of rental property ownership to those with a primary residence in Edmonton
 - e. Development of a complaint and/or bylaw infraction thresholds that would result in license suspension or removal.
 - f. An updated review of regulatory regimes around short-term rentals in other jurisdictions.

POSITION OF THE BOARD

- Connect with Business Licensing to be considered as a stakeholder in these conversations
- Continue monitoring the implementation and enforcement of new regulations as the short term rental industry in Edmonton progresses through 2020 and make recommendations as necessary in January of 2021 when the Business Licensing Bylaw is renewed

The EFCL and PDC will continue to monitor the issue through 2020 and consider a recommendation in 2021 when the Business License Bylaw is renewed.

NEXT STEPS

- S. Kovach to prepare engagement materials and distribute them to district representatives

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.4 - Bus Network Redesign - First KM/Last KM (UPDATE)

Item 5.4

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

More frequent service on high demand routes will come at the cost of some neighbourhoods losing conventional fixed route *community-level* service in the new network. This has been called the “First/Last KM Challenge,” which refers to the challenge of providing a shared transportation solution for the first and last leg of a person’s journey, particularly in areas that are more difficult and costly to service due to low population density, low ridership, and/or road network/geographic barriers.

On February 25, City Council’s Urban Planning Committee discussed the solutions for the First KM/Last KM challenge with the new transit network.

Administration identified 70 areas through the City where the walking distance to transit was beyond 600 metres. This was further narrowed down to 30 communities that could support an on demand service model, outlined in Table 1 below:

1. Aspen Gardens	11. Cloverdale	21. Montrose
2. Avonmore	12. Donsdale	22. Oleskiw
3. Balwin	13. Falconer Heights	23. Patricia Heights
4. Blackmud Creek	14. Grandview Heights	24. Potter Greens
5. Blackburne	15. Henderson Estates	25. Quesnell Heights
6. Brander Gardens	16. Kenilworth	26. Rio Terrace
7. Breckenridge Greens	17. Killarney	27. Skyrattler
8. Brookside	18. King Edward Park	28. Twin Brooks
9. Calder	19. Lansdowne	29. Wedgewood Heights
10. Cameron Heights	20. Lauderdale	30. Westridge

Table 1: Communities that were identified as being able to support an on-demand transit service delivery model.

At the previous meeting, Administration was directed to explore options 2, 4 and 7, to service the communities outlined in Table 1 (above), which are outlined in Table 2 (below):

Service Level Options

					On-Demand Options ¹			Fixed-Route
	Existing Areas		New Areas		Passenger Van	Ride Hail	Taxi	Current Level
	Peak	Off-peak	Peak	Off-peak	Annual Cost	Annual Cost	Annual Cost	Annual Cost
Tier 1 - Maintaining Service								
Option 1	Yes	No	No	No	\$3,148,000	\$4,005,000	\$5,851,000	\$3,154,000
Option 2	Yes	Partial ²	No	No	\$5,194,000	\$5,177,000	\$7,849,000	\$5,516,000
Tier 2 - Expanding to all areas warranting service								
Option 3	Yes	No	Yes	No	\$4,853,000	\$6,012,000	\$8,451,000	\$5,507,000
Option 4	Yes	Partial	Yes	No	\$6,693,000	\$7,110,000	\$10,347,000	\$7,584,000
Option 5	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	\$7,263,000	\$7,420,000	\$10,842,000	\$8,259,000
Option 6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	\$9,133,000	\$8,333,000	\$12,469,000	\$10,827,000
Option 7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$10,267,000	\$9,027,000	\$13,534,000	\$12,517,000

Table 2: Costing of each service delivery model

1 Costing reflects service delivery only (service hours) and does not include initial implementation and contract management costs.

2 Partial refers to maintaining off peak service in areas that currently receive off-peak, but not introducing off-peak in areas that do not.

<p>Option 2 (Tier 1 - Maintaining existing service)</p> <p><u>Existing areas</u> Peak hours: YES Off-peak hours: PARTIAL</p> <p><u>New areas</u> Peak hours: NO Off-peak hours: NO</p> <p>Passenger van = \$5,194,000 Fixed route = \$5,516,000</p>	<p>Option 4 (Tier 2 - Expanding to all areas warranting service)</p> <p><u>Existing areas:</u> Peak hours: YES Off-peak hours: PARTIAL</p> <p><u>New areas:</u> Peak hours: YES Off-peak hours: NO</p> <p>Passenger van = \$6,693,000 Fixed route = \$7,584,000</p>	<p>Option 7 (Tier 2 - Expanding to all areas warranting service)</p> <p><u>Existing areas:</u> Peak hours: YES Off-peak hours: YES</p> <p><u>New areas:</u> Peak hours: YES Off-peak hours: YES</p> <p>Passenger van = \$10,267,000 Fixed route = \$12,517,000</p>
--	--	---

Table 3: Costing of service delivery options 2, 4 and 7 (as service delivery is expanded, the difference in cost between fixed-route and on-demand service grows)

Council has advanced OPTION 7

Administration also identified residences for people with limited mobility which are currently served by Community Bus Routes and are not directly served by a bus route in the new network.

On-Demand Service for Limited Mobility Residences

Locations

The following is a list of residences for people with limited mobility which are currently served by Community Bus Routes and are not served directly by a bus route in the new network.

Route 305

- Canora Gardens Apartments
- McQueen Gardens Apartments
- Ortona Villa
- St.Joachim Manor
- Summit Village Housing
- Tegler Terrace

Route 307

- Gateway Manor
- Grace Garden Court
- Ottewell Place
- Ottewell Terrace

Route 309

- Ansgar Villa
- Kiwanis Place Senior Citizen Lodging Apartments
- Rosedale Estates
- Rosedale in the Park
- Rosedale Villa
- Tegler Manor

Route 319

- Celo Vesnivka
- Father Hannas Apartments

Route 340

- Mill Woods Shepherd's Care - *Not proposed for on-demand service*

Preliminary Costing: On-Demand Service for Limited Mobility Residences

	Options	
	1 - Weekday Midday Only	2 - Weekday Midday and Weekends
<i>Routes 305 & 319</i>	\$109,000	\$176,000
<i>Routes 307 & 309</i>	\$219,000	\$349,000
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING (Prelim)	\$328,000	\$525,000
Service Hours		
<i>Routes 305 & 319</i>	1,632	2,631
<i>Routes 307 & 309</i>	3,263	5,207
Total Service Hours	4,895	7,838
Total Annual Kms (estimated)	122,375	195,950
Total Vehicles	4	5

Council has advanced OPTION 2

IMPORTANT NOTES:

- The on demand delivery option to underserved neighbourhoods and residences is a two year pilot
- The “van” will resemble the community buses we currently have, with accessibility features, individual seats, and a centre aisle
- At the two year mark, Council will examine the advancement of these services to a public service model
- As per the new Transit Service Policy, the network will be reviewed annually to make changes and adjustments as necessary to ensure it is meeting customers needs

OPPORTUNITIES TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK

- Council will vote on the above on March 9, 2020
- Council will not hear from citizens at this meeting, but there is still time to contact your ward councillor to share your views

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.5 - Review of PDC ToR + Principles

Item 5.5

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Before we amend the Terms of Reference and Planning Committee Principles we need to identify the interests of the committee. We will also *begin* reviewing the meeting format.

1. *Nominal Group Process (Card storming)*

Question: What issues are most important to you as community members?

Reflect individually and brainstorm as many thoughts as come to you in response to the question and record each thought on a single note (5-10 minutes)

In groups of 3, discuss the similarities and differences in your responses (10 minutes)

After 15-20 minutes, we will post the cards in a visible place on the wall. Clarifying questions can be asked as we go.

The group will point out cards that are similar or related and they will be grouped into columns. The group will then come up and review the groupings and ensure cards are in their appropriate columns.

Groups of 3 will be assigned a column and be tasked with identifying a word or short phrase that describes the content of the column.

2. *Identifying Success Criteria*

Individually, answer the following three questions on individual notes (10 minutes):

1. What needs to happen at this meeting?
2. What does success look like?
3. How will we know we've been successful?

In groups of three, identify 2 or 3 critical outcomes (15 minutes).

After, we will share them with the larger group.

6.0 - Reports

6.1 DISTRICT NEWS