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Introduction: This report is a summary of the findings from a series of community engagement sessions that were held within the Town of Logy Bay – Middle Cove – Outer Cove (LB-MC-OC) between February and June 2018.

The primary objective of these sessions was the development of a sense for community based priorities with respect to current issues and development priorities for the town of LB-MC-OC prior to the development of the next generation of the strategic and municipal plans for the town.

The following community groups were identified as being reflective of the diversity of residents currently residing within the town of LB-MC-OC. These included:

1) Residents over age 50 who had lived in LB-MC-OC for more than 20 years;
2) Residents aged 35-50, who may have lived in LB-MC-OC for a number of years;
3) Large-scale land owners and developers who have developed (or are planning to develop) land for the construction of residential building lots within the Town of LB-MC-OC; and
4) Residents who live in the immediate area of St. Francis of Assisi Church and School and who are directly affected by the flow of traffic in this area at the present time;

Before each of the four sessions noted above began, a representative of the town council welcomed participants and encouraged them to speak freely and openly on all subjects that were to be introduced by the facilitator, Tom Clift.

After the town official left the session, the facilitator provided an overview of the session objectives and discussion topics and encouraged participants to feel free to express their opinions openly in a professional and respectful manner.

An outline of the (approved) facilitator discussion matrix of topics to be discussed is included as Appendix 1 to this document.

The traffic and safety session notes appear last and are not included in the report summary as this discussion was narrower in scope and designed to address one specific topic only.

All other sessions were designed to facilitate more broadly based discussion (of a long-term or strategic nature) the highlights of which will be included in the Summary Findings on page 3.
Summary Findings: There are a number of emerging or consistent themes that have emerged from the three community consultation sessions that were held recently with local area land developers and representatives of a number of important age groups within LB-MC-OC. These include:

1) The desire to maintain the rural nature of the community. This theme is present in discussions of land availability, town planning traffic, road networks, schooling, and the general feeling of community that is present in a community of 2-3,000;

2) The desire for the consistent interpretation and application of municipal by laws and regulations (by council);

3) The desire for enhanced recreational programming, for youth and seniors in particular;

4) The desire for increased supervision and inspection of ongoing development projects to ensure adherence to municipal regulations and the successful completion of the entire project – including promised recreational facility enhancement;

5) The desire for improved quality and timeliness of all forms of communication between the town and its residents;

6) The desire for enhanced personal communication between prospective developers and town staff – in terms of the timeliness of the communication and the respectful nature of the communication;

7) The desire to preserve and enhance the current walking trails within the community;

8) The concern that under the current development agenda, the cost of housing in this community will be prohibitive for the children of many current residents;

9) The concern that the project approval process seems to be a moving target, with changes being requested mid-project – beyond the point when development budgets have been finalized; and

10) The recognition that the Snow’s Lane-Logy bay Road intersection is sub-standard and needs upgrading (almost immediately).
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Session # 1: Comments and Suggestions from the Over 50 Age Group Community Engagement Session

This session began with the facilitator asking the group about their primary motivation for moving to the community of LB-MC-OC, or in the case of lifelong community residents, their primary motivation for continuing to live in the community of LB-MC-OC.

**Summary Themes:** In describing their primary motivation for moving to, or living in, LB-MC-OC, participants in this older age group, and indeed participants in all age group sessions, were virtually unanimous and consistent in their reasons – most of which were defined by a desire to have a simpler, quieter life – one that is generally considered to be associated with a rural community setting, lower population densities, less through-traffic volume, larger lot sizes and a community of people that are gentler, quieter and respectful of their neighbours and fellow community members. Long-time community residents, particularly those whose families have lived in this area for multiple generations, also spoke fondly of the role of the school and the church in fostering this type of community spirit.

Beyond the reasons stated above, local area residents are also clear that they see it as a great advantage to be able to live close to a large metropolitan area with all its amenities, while at the same time being able to enjoy the many benefits associated with rural living.

Beyond these broadly based themes, older than average area residents appear to be looking for consistency from their town council – across a number of dimensions of service delivery and municipal planning. These include: delivering on promises; consistency in the implementation of the LB-MC-OC Town Plan and the interpretation of the rules that govern municipal planning and development; improved communication between the town administration, the councillors and the community at large; enhanced wellness programming for all ages, including the establishment or upgrading of the walking trails in the community; the establishment of a community garden (for small scale community farming); the establishment of a dog park for its own sake (so that residents might stop using Kelly Park as a Dog Park when it was not designed for such a purpose); and perhaps most importantly, a consistent application of the rules surrounding building lot size and access, along with the establishment of controls on the pace (and nature) of residential and commercial development (if any) within the town of LB-MC-OC.

**Delivering on Promises:** Participants in this session noted that there have been a number of instances recently where developers (or the town council) have failed to deliver on items that were promised (or attached) to previously approved development projects. Most notable among these is the absence of a playground in the Middle Cove (Nageira Crescent) area and the complete absence of any community recreation and play facility in the Logy Bay area. In both instances participants noted that there has been quite a lot of housing development in each of these regions within LB-MC-OC and in these areas in particular there are quite a number of young children – many of whom are looking for outdoor recreation opportunities that are easily accessible within their area of the community.

In other cases participants wondered about day care options and capacity within the community, noting that for the size of the community there appears to be relatively little in the way of organized daycare within the boundaries of the town – both for younger children and older children who need after school care.
With regard to a library, some participants wondered if there was capacity in the Town Hall/Museum area for a community sharing library.

**Consistency in Dealing with the implementation of the Town Plan, Municipal Bylaws and Building Codes:**

With respect to the awarding of building permits and the approval of land for residential building lots, a number of participants wondered about the manner in which half-acre versus one-acre building lots are approved for development. A number of people were of the opinion (thought) that ‘the town’ had moved to the approval of one acre lots only within the town boundaries, while others seemed to think that previously approved half-acre lots could still be built upon.

In short, there appears to be some confusion with respect to the development agenda and rules and in the absence of more detailed information, area residents appear to be speculating as to what the development rules are and whether they are being administered consistently.

Participants also noted situations where there appear to be two occupied buildings on one building lot, or situations where out-buildings appear to have been turned into separate residences for immediate family members. Once again, participants wondered if due process had been followed and if the appropriate permits had been issued prior to renovation and occupancy.

As was also noted in the session with large-scale land owners and developers and the session with middle-aged residents, participants seemed to be of the opinion that the only form of development within the town of LB-MC-OC was to be single family units on one acre lots. Once again there appears to be some confusion, or perhaps a lack of communication with residents, on this matter.

With respect to this issue of consistency in dealing with council and the implementation of town by laws, it was noted by a number of participants that there appears to be little in the way of building inspection within the town and little effort to ensure conformity to regulations.

Examples include: building height; building location on a given site; the indiscriminate removal of trees on newly developed sites; unauthorized camping – especially on long weekends. In general, participants appear to be concerned about the manner in which land might be utilized in the future, the pace of urban development, and the adherence to rules by some (but not all) residents.

Overall, local area residents appear to be satisfied with the current service levels being provided by the town of LB-MC-OC. However, if there is one concern that participants have about current operations it would likely be in the area of communication with town residents. Town communication is generally seen to be slow, last minute and generally not as effective as it could be - given the digital age we live in.

Participants appeared adamant that they wanted to maintain the integrity of their community as it is (was) and were not in favour of any type of change that might materially affect the current profile and mix of people (sense of community) that presently exists within the town.
Participants were particularly concerned with the area they know as ‘the point’ (in Middle Cove) and appeared to have strong views about the preservation of this area as a tourist site – one that should not be developed for camping, or for any other form of commercial establishment.

In this regard participants referred to the idea of responsible growth, supporting the idea that growth should be controlled. Many see this as the best way to ensure that the current rural nature of the community is preserved in a manner that is consistent with our current population density and service profile.

Communication between the Town and Its Residents: Participants cited a number of instances where they were made aware of one or more ‘notice of motions’ only to discover that there was little or no time left to file a comment. In one instance a resident noted a notice of motion that was filed on the 11th of one month and subsequently approved on the 14th of that same month. In such cases residents do not feel that due process is being followed.

With respect to the town newsletter and other forms of communication from the town, many participants were of the opinion that such publications appear to be delivered late or close to being ‘too late’ to be of any real value.

The discussion with respect to communication also focused on issues related to transparency, with participants wondering if it would be possible to explore ways to make much of the work of the town council more transparent. A number of participants stated that there was a reasonable level of transparency presently but they would like the council to explore ways to make things more transparent, if possible. (Note: This was seen as a matter of governance and participants wondered if the current governance model was appropriate).

A number of participants were also of the opinion that when dealing with council they felt that at least some councillors were ‘aggressive’ when dealing with them. When pushed to explain this opinion or put it into some form of context, they expressed the opinion that some councillors were trying to rush them in their presentation or that council didn’t really seem like they were interested in listening to area residents.

Overall participants appeared to be of the opinion that the current council was listening better than in the past.

Big Picture Concerns: One significant point of concern that was echoed by a number of participants in this session was the current price of a single family dwelling building lot in our community. One person suggested that it was a sad thing that many of their children might potentially be unable to purchase a building lot, or a house, in the community they grew up in – at least not at prevailing prices.

This caused the session to pause for a moment as those who may not have thought of this previously considered the implications of what had just been said. A subsequent comment or two provided an interesting backdrop to the discussion.
One participant noted that there appeared to be quite a number of residents in the town who were over the age of 60, causing the participant in question to wonder aloud what these individuals long term living accommodation plan might be.

It was noted that if a seniors complex or small condo complex was made available (within the town) for older residents, it might free up some older less expensive houses for purchase by local area children/young adults. This of course, yielded the inevitable question: Are there any plans for a senior living facility?

A second point that arose in the discussion of big picture concerns centered on the pace or progress of a development project once it has been approved. Once again, area residents seemed to be perturbed over certain development projects that seem to drag on for extended periods of time. Once again participants wondered aloud about the ability of council to inspect, control or influence the development timelines of such projects.

**Recreation Programming and Development:** One of the concerns that a number of residents in this group have is the manner in which The East Coast Trail is developed within the boundaries of LB-MC-OC. Residents appear quite pleased that this trail runs through their town but they would like to see more improvements in that section of the trail that runs through LB-MC-OC. Participants also seemed to be aware that access to the East Coast Trail from the Doran’s Lane area may be in dispute and wondered if the town council was attempting to intercede to help ensure that continued access to the East Coast Trail from Doran’s Lane would always be possible?

Also, in this session (and other sessions) a number of long-time community residents noted that many of the older trails that run within LB-MC-OC appear to be in disrepair, or have been sacrificed in the process of establishing new neighbourhoods, such as the area to the west of Sandalwood Drive and Middle Ledge Drive. Older residents, in this particular area are concerned that as the pace of residential development continues many of these long standing community trails will be lost forever.
Session # 2: Comments and Suggestions from the 35 - 50 Age Group Community Engagement Session

As was the case in our session with older residents, the 35-50 year old community engagement session saw the emergence of familiar themes and concerns and once again participants were consistent in their desire to preserve the rural feel of the LB-MC-OC community.

Participants, almost universally, suggested that they had either moved to this community or decided to stay in this community for the quality of the school, the people and the infrastructure that is available to residents in a relaxed rural setting that is respectful and inclusionary while also being located in close proximity to the largest metropolitan area in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The large lot sizes and the relatively low population density were also noted as specific reasons why participants in this community consultation session decided to move to the Town of LB-MC-OC.

Pace of Development: That being said, one of the primary concerns of this group of relatively young home owners is the speed of land development in this community. Many participants noted their concerns about what appears to be the increased pace of development and the lack of information pertaining to the controls that may (or may not) be in place to ensure that the current profile of the residential dwellings within the town remains intact. That is: primarily single family dwellings on one acre lots, with limited exceptions being made for ½ acre lots that were previously approved as such.

Area residents are also concerned by the changes to the water table in some areas (notably the Pine Line area south to Sandalwood) where there has been a change in the water levels in the Pine Line area since the development(s) in the Sandalwood area.

Municipal Administration & Communication: In a number of areas of municipal administration, participants noted their concerns with the manner in which information about proposed developments is made available to the residents of the town. It was noted that (on occasion) in the past, local area residents would ‘get wind of’ a proposal that had been approved and have to get lawyers involved to ensure that their concerns were heard and that appropriate action was taken to ensure that certain proposed developments were not allowed to proceed without due caution being exercised by all parties that might potentially be affected by the proposed changes.

Discussion on this topic continued with other examples related to communication issues or challenges between the town, the town council and the broader LB-MC-OC community.

In general, participants in all sessions seem to be of the opinion (based on their own experience) that when it comes to communication between the town and its residents many aspects of communication could be improved upon. Residents suggested that: more items should be posted to the town website; more residents should be encouraged to sign up for electronically delivered information updates; the town newsletter should be distributed earlier; and the town should use these forms of communication for land owners and prospective developers to familiarize themselves with other recently approved development projects, so residents could avoid making the development application mistakes that others have made in the past.
Project Approval Process: In many cases land owners and developers see the project approval process as being a moving target, with rule changes and project approval criterion changing in mid-project; in many cases leading to unforeseen expenses and inevitable delays. (Note: It is important to note that these comments were made in the context of an age group community engagement process – not the session with land owners and developers, which was held at a later date).

Youth Programming: For this group of young to early middle-aged community members (many of whom have teen-aged children) it should come as no surprise that the parents of these children commented that there is very little in the way of community based recreation or support activities for pre-teen and teen-aged children.

A robust discussion ensued on this topic, with many participants suggested that the provision of such space and or activity-based programming would be challenging given the close proximity of LB-MC-OC to the St. John’s Census Metropolitan Area (SJCMA). The group was reminded by the facilitator that the Bay Bulls to Bauline Recreation Association was active in the development of the new Bay Bulls Regional Lifestyle Centre and included in that buildings’ design was a dedicated 2,000+ square foot space for teens, complete with big screen televisions, computers and numerous other pieces of equipment designed for use by teenagers – most of which sits idle for extended periods of time. While the space and equipment was donated by Pennecon Construction, its utilization level is alarmingly low and should serve as an indicator of the challenges that can arise when trying to turn a needs assessment into a program.

On a related point one participant asked the following question:

What are we doing for all of the children who are not interested in sports?

The same participant wondered if it would be possible to arrange for some type of eco-system or environmental science program or perhaps organize one or more geo-cache events during the summer months, for children who do not wish to participate in age group sporting events.

The issues related to walking and hiking trails within the boundaries of LB-MC-OC was raised by this group as well. In this instance participants appeared to be most interested in the revitalization of the traditional walking trails in the community – many of which have become over grown and run down due to lack of care and attention. A number of participants noted that residents of the Lower Road area had taken it upon themselves to revitalize Peter’s Path – a path that connects the Lower Road to Kelly Park. This community based initiative was undertaken so as to ensure that the children of the Lower Road area would have a safer and more direct route to Kelly Park, The Justina Centre and St. Francis of Assisi School. These same parents noted that with the increased speed of car, truck and motor cycle drivers in this area, it was in the interest of their children’s safety to help develop an alternative route to the aforementioned buildings.

Service Delivery: With respect to the development and delivery of municipal services, a number of participants asked questions about road conditions and wondered who owned and was responsible for the roads in the community? The same person suggested that there appeared to be a different service level attached to some roads relative to others. (It was noted that the main artery roads in the town are
in fact the responsibility of the provincial government and as such are subject to a different set of maintenance, cleaning and development standards).

With respect to communication between the town council, town staff and members of the community, participants (generally) were of the opinion that the overall timing of much of the communication between the town and its residents is poor – in the sense of timing and information quality. Response times are perceived as being tighter than necessary, often making timely and considered responses challenging. One participant wondered aloud if it might be possible to post a highlight package of the minutes of town council meetings. It was noted these are available on the town website. (Note: The fact that some residents are unaware of this availability may be a symptom of a larger challenge with respect to communication).

With respect to the current approach to development within LB-MC-OC, a number of participants wondered if it would be possible to have more monitoring of construction projects, more administrative oversight of such projects and a general improvement in the administration by the town regarding the issues noted above.

**Traffic & The Snow’s Lane Intersection:** Lastly, a number of participants wanted to go on the record as being concerned about the flow of traffic in the Snow’s Lane – Logy Bay Road area. A number of specific concerns were expressed with respect to this area, including:

1) The poor road conditions on Snow’s Lane – from Logy Bay Road to the town boundary and beyond;
2) The width of Logy Bay Road at the intersection with Snow’s Lane;
3) The speed of thru traffic – as a driver (many drivers) proceeds through this intersection;
4) The absence of pedestrian walkways in this area in particular; and
5) The general congestion in this area and along Snow’s Lane, in general.

Virtually all participants agreed that Snow’s Lane was not built to accommodate the current level of vehicular traffic in the area, and as such will require a significant upgrade. (Note: The group was reminded by the facilitator that once Costco moves to the Galway site (in September 2018), there may be a short-lived reprieve in the traffic flow situation on Snow’s Lane).
Session #3: LB-MC-OC Notes from the large-Scale Land Owners Community Engagement Session

As a starting point in the discussion about the land development process in LB-MC-OC and the prospect for future land development in this area, participants were asked to think about and discuss the factors which they felt influenced both the magnitude and pace of development in LB-MC-OC.

Factors Affecting Development: From their perspective, many large-scale land owners tend to see the pace of development as being influenced by the following factors: the amount of land that is available for development; the water table and the ability to demonstrate that there is sufficient water available to support a proposed development – irrespective of size; the ability of the developer to demonstrate that there will be zero net run off associated with the proposed land development project; and the ability to demonstrate that the existing (or proposed) road network can support the proposed development.

In commenting further on the prospects and process of land development in LB-MC-OC participants noted that - from the drilling of test wells - to the requirement to demonstrate net zero water runoff - to the confirmation of the suitability of the existing or proposed road network - the approval process is an unnecessarily long one - marked by many consultations with the Town Engineer, occasional changes in the rules and expectations (mid-project) and an ever increasing level of municipal and provincial expectations.

Development Planning: Of note in these discussions was a user perception that prospective developers have no sense that the Town of LB-MC-OC has established a critical path or approval timeline for development projects – one that would serve to facilitate the timely and efficient progression of proposed development projects. Nor is there a sense that the town is working to a specific development approval agenda.

Numerous developers reported changes in project requirements that were made mid-project, after the initial project had been approved, and without due consideration to the additional cost that may have to be borne by the developer. As one developer noted, to assume that we can automatically pass these costs on to the buyer is not realistic. Developed land has a price limit and once your building lots are priced higher than others, you have a more challenging task to sell your lots.

A number of developers wondered aloud why these projects are not grand-fathered, once approved. That is, once they have been approved, the rules in place at that time should apply until such time as the project has been completed.

They believe that once you have met the project development requirements, as outlined by the project engineer, you should be allowed to proceed – assuming you have met these requirements. Generally speaking developers see most of their current challenges being associated with the upfront components of a proposed project. More specifically, they wondered if there was an implied path associated with the approval process, with published timelines. For examples, once the preliminary plan has been submitted, what is the expected response date? Has a service/reply standard been established?
In particular, developers are wondering about the new storm water detention requirements as these appear to be something that is relatively new and developers know little about these proposed development requirements.

**Road Development Standards & Requirements:** Developers are also concerned about the potential double standard that exists between local access roads and roads that are maintained by the Province of Newfoundland & Labrador. In such cases there are some major challenges with provincially maintained roads, as the sight line standard appears to be applied as if one was developing a four lane highway. On most parts of Marine Drive this standard cannot be achieved – because of the winding nature of the road in this area. At the present time dealing with both the town and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is a very challenging.

When commenting in general terms about the impact of the current regulatory regime on development timelines and costs, most large-scale land owners were of the opinion that in order to stimulate demand they may have to change their offerings, because at the present time the cost to build a new home in the LB-MC-OC area is too high for the vast majority of prospective homeowners – especially first time owners/buyers. The primary issue, as seen by these developers, is that most people can’t afford to live in the LB-MC-OC area today.

**Alternate Considerations:** The developers have suggested an approach which they described as downsized luxury – a slightly smaller home with slightly lower quality amenities and correspondingly lower home values. Given the cost of building materials and labour and the rising cost of developing the required municipal infrastructure, these developers see things at a kind of ‘market impasse’ at the moment. Demand for land has declined and while prices have eased off a little, they have not declined sufficiently to have resulted in a measurable increase in demand (sales).

**Seniors Housing (Options & Implications):** One solution these land developers suggested would be to proceed with the development of some type of housing for seniors in LB-MC-OC. Their rationale is based on the fact those who are most likely to be interested in living in such accommodations are most likely to have lived in LB-MC-OC for some time and they would most likely be vacating houses that were 40 to 50 years old and of lower than average value. These homes would then be considered as available, affordable inventory for the young people of our town who would potentially be able to afford such a home, thereby fulfill their dream (and perhaps the dreams of their parents) of allowing them to own a home in LB-MC-OC.

Developers also suggested that establishing small pods of seniors housing (for example, four connected units with shared services) might also serve to place less pressure on development requirements over the long term. It was noted that these units would likely be smaller in size (1,000 sq. ft.) and generally be designed as two-person dwellings. If properly designed, they suggested, these units could avail of shared services such as: a common driveway, a common water supply and common septic services.

These land owners and builders noted that at the present time the LB-MC-OC area has one of the lowest building rates in eastern NL. They see the reason for this as being a function of the number of controls
that have been placed on development in the short-term and the short-sighted view that council appears to have with respect to development in the LB-MC-OC.

Current Developments (Unintended Consequences): Developers suggested that having all the new houses in this area developed as executive housing is short-sighted. They noted that a slower rate of development will mean fewer people moving in, lower enrollments in the community school and the inevitable talk of amalgamation with St. John’s. It was suggested that the best way to plan for the future is to ensure there is a steady and predictable development pace – one that ensures (among other things) at least 25 children entering St. Francis of Assisi School each fall. (Note: 7 classes (K to Grade 6) of 25 children would result in a school with 175 children – an enrollment level that is generally considered to be smaller than average and once again spawning talk of amalgamation.

Future Considerations: Ideally developers would like to see both a five year and 10 year development plan that contemplates:

1) More than one size and type of single family dwelling;

2) Building lots that can accommodate senior living on a small-scale; and

3) Mixed use small scale developments such that might include executive town homes or small-scale commercial development in the area of Snow’s Lane.

At least one developer asked if the town was contemplating any small scale business or commercial activity. It was noted that at the present time there is relatively little development or infrastructure within the town boundaries. Examples (they suggested) might include a coffee shop, a day care facility and a small-scale professional building for healthcare professionals.

With respect to the long term development agenda for the town, it was noted that there is capacity for approximately 300 building lots at one acre per lot. Given our current population of 2,200 and 2.4 persons per household (on average), then there are approximately 900-1,000 residential units in our town presently. Assuming these reference statistics are accurate, we can expect a 30-35 percent increase in the population of the town and a similar increase in the number of residential dwellings - from a current level of 900-1,000 to 1,300 maximum, with a total population of approximately 3,000. This includes 2,200 (present population) + (300 households X 2.4 persons per household) = 720.

What is more challenging to predict is the pace at which this development might occur.

Conversely, we might reasonably ask the following question:

What are the municipal infrastructure needs of a town of 3,000 and how do these differ from a town of 2,200?

As one developer noted:

If these questions aren’t addressed in the strategic or municipal planning process, then there is no chance that provision for such development will be made in the final plan.
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It was also noted that at the present time there are approximately 75 building lots for sale in LB-MC-OC. As such, these developed lots account for 25% of the available growth capacity under the present development agenda (75 ÷ 300 = 25%). Presumably a significant portion of this inventory must clear before any additional large-scale development might be reasonably be considered by a well-informed developer.

It was also noted that LB-MC-OC has one of the highest open space land provisions on the north east Avalon. At 10% this appears to be double the standard used by other communities in the region. The group wondered what the rationale for such might have been. (Note: This question was asked in a positive enquiring tone and was not intended as a criticism, per se. The participant was merely unaware of the rationale for this decision).

It was also suggested that council might change existing building lots to residential medium density, as this might allow for a few more ½ acre lots to be developed within the community.

It was suggested that some residents appear fearful of development and the reason for this may be that they are unaware of the available inventory (300 lots) and the potential impact of moving from 2,200 residents to 3,000 residents. From the developers perspective this scale of development does not appear to be capable of affecting the rural nature and feel of this community.

With respect to the current development application process, it was suggested that the current process be standardized, if it isn’t already. Participants suggested that water analysis work should be completed before any requisite traffic studies and that the Town Municipal Plan and strategic planning process be subject to a series of community consultations, as these documents are being drafted and provisions considered. They suggested that here needs to be a reasonable development agenda (as outlined above) and residents need not fear development - they should embrace development. It was noted that failing to embrace development will inevitably lead to a loss in services, discussion of amalgamation and the loss of both local government and governance.

With respect to dealing with developers, a number of developers noted very slow response times, or the absence of a response to their request(s). They noted: All we need to know is that our request has been noted and will be attended to; not getting any type of response (for more than seven business days) is considered to be too long.
Session # 4: Traffic and Safety Community Engagement Session

There are issues related to **overflow parking** in certain areas of the community. These include, but are not limited to, the following areas:

1) St. Francis of Assisi Church parking lot;

2) St. Francis of Assisi School parking lot;

3) The Logy Bay-Middle Cove-Outer Cove Town Hall parking lot(s); and

4) Middle Cove and Outer Cove beaches – particularly during the peak summer season and the period when the capelin are running/spawning.

The areas located closest to the SFA church and school appear to be those areas where individuals and residents have the biggest issues. Individuals whose homes are located in close proximity to the church and school are most often affected when local area roadways, driveways and fields are clogged with vehicles that are forced to overflow the church/school parking lot due to a lack of parking capacity at the school/church. These overflow parking issues are often associated with ‘special events’ that are held at the SFA School and Church.

It was noted that there has been significant discussion in recent years about the possibility of expanding the church/school parking lot so as to increase overall parking and throughput (drop off) capacity.

While it was generally agreed that the SFA Parish Council had been in favour (supportive) of an expansion to the parking lot for the church/school, it was also suggested that the Council may not presently be in a position (financially) to support such an initiative at the present time. (Note: We have not pursued this statement formally with the SFA Parish Council to confirm its authenticity).

It was also the opinion of those in the group that the primary impediment to the improvement of parking capacity appears to be with the SFA School design and infrastructure, in that the layout of sewage pipes and drainage fields (that are also located to the south east of the school) make expansion of the parking lot (to the southeast) a significant challenge.

While residents have noted that the (limited) use of pylons appears to have eased the traffic flow situation in the immediate area of the SFA School entrance (somewhat), there continues to be a need for a more permanent solution (long term) solution. To this end, it was suggested that permanent sidewalks be installed in the area between the priest’s house and the church/school parking lot entrance, on the northwest side of the Pouter Cove Road. It was specifically noted that only an impediment as solid and large as a sidewalk would be sufficient to deter some people from parking in this area.

As is often the case when there is traffic congestion in a particular area, there is also an issue related to the speed of vehicles that are trying to proceed through a congested area.

With respect to school traffic congestion there are generally seen to be two major issues:
The first is the congestion that occurs virtually every morning in the 15-20 minutes before school starts, when parents are faced with the task of dropping their children to school in a safe and timely manner, while local area residents (who do not have children at SFA) are faced with trying to proceed through this area while on their journey to work each day;

The second and related issue is the general speed of vehicular traffic as motorists from within and outside our community drive through the SFA School zone. While the issues of speed and congestion in the school zone is most notable in the morning rush hour, it can also be noticed when school closes (at 2:00 p.m.) and again between 4:00 and 5:30 as local area residents and those living further north of LB-MC-OC find their way home from their place of work in St. John’s. It was the opinion of many participants in this session that those drivers who do not appear to live in LB-MC-OC area and are ‘just driving through’ seem to pay little or no attention to the posted speed limit signage in LB-MC-OC; most notably in the area of SFA School.

That being said, it was also noted that the solar powered ‘current speed’ indicator signage may not be located in the optimum place. This was considered to be particularly true in the case of the north facing current speed indicator signage which at the present time is located at a point just past the school parking lot on the Outer Cove Road, near Nugent’s Road.

In addition, it was suggested that this sign (in its current location) also serves to divert driver attention from those cars and children that are in the immediate area of the school parking lot entrance on the Outer Cove Road. It was noted that if this sign was moved further north to the area immediately preceding the school parking lot entrance it would serve to let drivers know of their excess driving speed prior to entering the school parking lot entrance and in sufficient time to allow them to make the required speed adjustments. It was the opinion of the group that the south facing current speed sign is located in a reasonable or optimum location at the present time.

Generally, participants at this session were of the opinion that the congestion around SFA School appears to be more of a problem than vehicle speed. As one final initiative in this area, it was also suggested that a third speed bump be installed in the area between the church entrance and the school/church parking lot entrance. It was suggested that this would serve as one final incentive (deterrent) for drivers to slow down just prior to entering the area where children would be disembarking and less likely to be paying attention to oncoming traffic.

It was the opinion of the majority of those present at the traffic and road safety session that, for the most part, the addition of speed bumps and humps in various residential areas within the boundaries of LB-MC-OC has seen a general reduction in road speeds; especially in residential neighbourhoods.

However, traffic speeds on our major trunk roads, including Logy Bay Road, Outer Cove Road, Middle Cove Road, Marine Drive and Snow’s Lane are higher than most area residents appear comfortable with.

Participants frequently noted the dangerous speeds at which certain drivers traverse the roads in LB-MC-OC. It was also noted that in the past calls to the RNC for increased patrols in this area of the SFA School...
have met with short-term declines in speeding in the area, for the most part the effect is generally considered to be short-lived.

In summary, participants appeared to appreciate the efforts which the LB-MC-OC Council have made in recent years to address traffic and road safety issue in ‘our town’ but at the same time they are of the opinion that a few more initiatives could be undertaken: notably, moving the current north facing current speed that is currently located just south of the SFA School on the north-west side of Outer Cove Road; putting additional pylons and or installing sidewalks between SFA School and the Priest’s house/office, and policing traffic flow in the morning between 8:00 and 8:30, in particular.
Focus Group Selection and Content Matrix by Discussion Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Community Health &amp; Recreation by Age group</th>
<th>Land Availability and Related Issues: Usage Regulations &amp; Taxation</th>
<th>Urban Planning &amp; Development: General Pace of Urban Development</th>
<th>Municipal Capacity &amp; Service Levels by Activity Type</th>
<th>Town Plan: Highlights &amp; Perspective on Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>JBA Expansion By Activity Type (Gaps)</td>
<td>Issues &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Issues &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Issues &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>JBA Expansion LBMCO Community Health Needs Community Recreation Needs (Changes from Municipal Plan Consultation</td>
<td>Land Use, Lot Sizes and Designation Protocols</td>
<td>Review Highlights of Municipal Plan to build perspective: Dig deeper</td>
<td>Experience dealing with Town Staff: Service levels; Response time; Quality of response; Usefulness of Response.</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59 &amp; 60 Plus</td>
<td>Specific Senior’s Issues: Community Health &amp; Living; Housing; Taxation</td>
<td>How to deal with large tracts of family land :use; Divisibility &amp; Tax</td>
<td>Pace of Development; Development Principles</td>
<td>Issues &amp; Concerns</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideally we would like to attract a mix of individuals from each of the three major areas of our town and in each case also be able to select at least one community (opinion) leader from each sub-constituency.

We should also strive to have a fairly equal balanced between males and females.

In Group #1: 18-34. We should try to have an equal number of 18 – 24 and 25 34 as these two groups likely see things very differently – the latter group will have their sights set on family and housing, while the younger group are really just users who live in the community in their parent’s home.
In Group # 2: 35-49. We should strive to have a mix of young marrieds with no or young kids and households with school aged kids; especially those who have kids at SFA as this group probably have their own unique set of issues.

In Group # 3: 50-59 & 60+: We need to make sure that this group has at least 3-4 participants from each age group to make sure each sub-set has a chance to voice their concerns. It would be nice if a few of this group were relatively new to our Town so that we can get a more balanced perspective. The NL way is to be overly critical with no real sense of perspective – because many have never lived anywhere else – a broader perspective wouldn’t hurt.
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