

MEETING MINUTES

Niagara Region: GO Hub and Transit Stations Study

Meeting 1: West St. Catharines Proactive Advisory Group

Date: Thursday October 12, 2017, 6:30pm – 8:30pm

Location: St. Catharines City Hall (Burgoyne Room, 3rd Floor)

Attendees

Proactive Advisory Group (PAG)

Noel Buckley

Marilyn Guest

Katherine Heykoop

Tami Lyons

Henry Zwolak

Project Team

Marc-Paul Gauthier

Jim Riddell

Judy Pihach

Aaron Butler

Paddy Kennedy

Matt Robinson

Diana Morreale

Alexander Morrison

Arup

City of St. Catharines

City of St. Catharines

City of St. Catharines

Dillon Consulting

GO Implementation Office

GO Implementation Office

Niagara Region

Regrets

Alexandria Tikky

Kelly Kingsman

Sonia Vendittelli

Niagara Region

Proactive Advisory Group

Proactive Advisory Group

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Welcome and Introductions | <p>Lead: Diana Morreale & Paddy Kennedy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff provided a brief overview of the roles and responsibilities that the City and Region have in relation to the Secondary Plan process. City staff explained the purpose of the group and goal of ensuring continued consultation and collaboration between residents and public entities for current and future project initiatives within the Study Area. PAG questioned whether Metrolinx has indicated station design concepts for the station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dillon responded that Metrolinx has not confirmed any design elements for the St. Catharines GO Transit Station. PAG requested that the project team include/invite a Ridley College representative onto the PAG. | <p>Region staff to provide PAG with finalized meeting minutes documented during Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings 1 and 2.</p> <p>PAG to review the Secondary Plan prior to the November 2, 2017 Open House and gain a fulsome understanding of concerns from the around the community. Concerns should be passed along to the project team prior to the Open House.</p> |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Region staff explained that Ridley College had a representative that was a part of a Stakeholder Advisory Committee which was established and consulted with earlier in the project. ○ PAG requested finalized minutes taken during the previous St. Catharines Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings. ○ All parties agreed that a Ridley College representative can be invited to attend these meetings. | <p>Project team to invite a Ridley College representative to join the PAG.</p> |
| 2 | Proactive Advisory Group Charter/Mandate | <p>Lead: Diana Morreale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Region staff provided an overview of the PAG mandate and why it is necessary for the group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG is expected to advocate on behalf of the community. ○ PAG is designed to ensure that residents of the community remain educated and privy to up-to-date study materials and upcoming projects and initiatives ○ PAG does not report to City or Regional Council. It is an advisory group designed to allow for residents to have direct communication with project teams and discuss potential options to mitigate problems/concerns. ● Region staff expressed the desire to have PAG support the St. Catharines Secondary Plan when it is brought forward to City Council adoption and Regional Council for approval. ● Region staff requested PAG to agree upon whether or not a sunset clause of 2 years is appropriate for the mandate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG agreed that 2 years is an appropriate timeframe for the sunset clause. ● PAG requested that the mandate be revised to allow for up to 9 members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project Team expressed concerns with increasing the group size, but ultimately determined that the increase to 9 members maximum is acceptable ○ PAG requested for the Project Team to consider 'alternate' members for instances when it is known that PAG members are expected to be absent. ○ Region staff mentioned that they are working with the Public Health department to locate an additional member using their established networks within the St. Catharines Study Area. ○ Residents to search around the community for potential additional members | <p>Region to update the draft PAG mandate to reflect a 2 year sunset clause.</p> <p>Region to update the draft PAG mandate to allow for 9 members (maximum).</p> <p>Region to continue to explore network options for an additional PAG member with Public Health.</p> <p>Staff to solicit members at Nov 2 Open House</p> |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|--|---|--|
| 3 | Status Update on St. Catharines GO Station Secondary Plan (open discussion) | <p>Lead: Paddy Kennedy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAG questioned how projects identified within the Draft Secondary Plan will be funded? • City staff mentioned that the City does not collect Development Charges; however, the Region does. Additionally, projects will require funding allocation through appropriate Council approvals and processes. These approvals and processes will be dependent on project ownership and jurisdictions involved (for example, intersections of Local and Regional Roads) • Region staff mentioned other possible funding sources could be provincial and private grant/incentive programs. • City staff mentioned that “cash-in-lieu” (parkland dedication) is another funding tool (mandated through the Planning Act). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PAG requested opportunity to provide input on the types of design elements included within park/public space upgrades that are implemented within the study area. ▪ Dillon mentioned that the Plan can identify features and elements that can be improved within the public spaces. The document will provide guidance for public space design elements and considerations. • Region staff clarified the transition of responsibilities within Phase 5 (Station Design) of the GO Hub Study. It was explained that Metrolinx is responsible for station design components and concepts, while the project team is providing input into desirable station elements. • PAG questioned whether the version of the Draft Secondary Plan on display at the Open House will outline identified future projects within the study area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Region staff indicated that there is a table within the Secondary Plan (Table 6.1) which outlines the short-, medium- and long-term Public Work projects ○ Region staff indicated that design elements for some identified projects, such as the Louth Street widening, will be determined through Environmental Assessment (EA) processes. EAs are a public process and this group will be used for input into these projects. • PAG expressed concern with local street widenings identified within the draft Secondary Plan document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Region staff explained that the major widenings identified within the Secondary Plan are for larger streets such as Louth Street, Fourth Avenue, and St. Paul Street West. Local roads have not been identified for | <p>Project team to explore policy options in relation to providing direction on the types of design elements that are included within parks and public spaces.</p> <p>City staff to review the existing zoning by-law requirements along Ridley Road and provide insight to PAG on where increased density could be placed.</p> <p>Dillon to ensure Cameron Park is protected and identified as a priority within the Secondary Plan policy and schedules.</p> <p>City staff to research the feasibility creating an active transportation connection between Particpark Trail and Ridley Road.</p> <p>City Staff will review the proposed land use designation changes and provide the PAG with potential corresponding zone changes.</p> <p>Project team to re-evaluate height permissions, including transition policies, at station site as well as landscape buffer requirements adjacent to residential area</p> |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>widenings, but rather for improved cycling infrastructure and streetscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAG questioned why the Secondary Plan does not reflect applicable zoning requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff replied that the City's zoning by-law will need to be revised after Secondary Plan is adopted and approved. • PAG questioned the current zoning is for properties along Ridley Road, as well as what the future zoning of the properties could look like. More specifically, these properties include the ones south of Ridley Road represented as "Medium Density" on the proposed Land Use schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff confirmed that these properties are currently zoned as 'R-2' ○ City Staff will review the proposed land use designation changes and provide the PAG with potential corresponding zone changes. This will be for discussion purposes only as the Zoning By-law Amendment process will be separate from the Secondary Plan process. • Region staff mentioned that Secondary Plan includes a policy which directs future development to require a height transition between GO Station Area and existing residential neighbourhood. • Region staff asked PAG if there were any major public input themes omitted from the public information centres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG mentioned a theme missing in relation to protecting Cameron Park (west end of Great Western Street). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PAG expressed desire to protect the park and to have road access along Great Western Street removed. There was concern with the way the park is represented within the schedules, allowing for the possibility for the park to be removed during the reconstruction of the St. Paul Street West Bridge. ○ Dillon stated that the Draft Secondary Plan will protect the park space and enhance the features/elements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Team to ensure the park is protected and is identified as a priority within the Secondary Plan schedules and policy. ○ PAG proposed that a temporary solution to eliminate the Great Western Street vehicle access to the GO Station would be to place a concrete block (similar to the existing at Leeper Street and St. Paul Street West). ○ PAG identified Great Western Street, Ambrose Street, and Permillia Street with the greatest safety concerns. | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|---|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dillon mentioned the new proposed Mixed Use designation to the Ridley College property (north of Ridley Road, east of Louth Street). City staff identified this area for new land use permissions to help frame the corridor as a mixed use node. Ridley College will eventually determine whether they wish to sell the land or redevelop it on their own. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Region staff mentioned that the intersection is a recognized as a minor gateway within the Draft Secondary Plan ○ City staff confirmed that there currently is no height limit for lands at southeast corner of Ridley Road and Louth Street. The rest of the GO Station site currently permits up to 6/7-storeys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PAG expressed concern about potential ‘fishbowl’ effect from the proposed heights within the Draft Secondary Plan ▪ Dillon mentioned that the Secondary Plan includes design guidelines which help to shape new developments (including building height). • PAG requested insight in relation to the vision of the THK lands south of the rail along St. Paul Street West <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff mentioned that the site is recognized as “Mixed Use” within the City’s current Official Plan. The Official Plan also contains provisions that allow for the current employment use to continue and expand (if desired). THK has expressed no desire to relocate. • PAG questioned the total number of surface parking spaces that are proposed for the GO Station site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Arup mentioned that the station site would have about 500-600 surface parking spots (maximum 2041 build-out). ○ City staff noted that there must be a balance between parking and beautification and it is critical for parking to not spillover into existing neighbourhoods. ○ PAG expressed concern about a multi-level parkade for the GO Station site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Region staff mentioned that Metrolinx is transitioning their philosophy in relation to how they plan and design for opening day transit stations. The idea is to focus on active modes of transportation, as opposed to historical focus on automobile users. ▪ City staff mentioned that a parkade on the GO Station site may be more desirable than a surface parking lot, from an aesthetics and impacts perspective. | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|---|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG expressed concern in relation to the GO Station site turning into a large surface parking lot. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arup mentioned that Metrolinx guidelines prioritize is active transportation modes, with least priority for automobile users. There is also increased emphasis on the first-mile and last-mile transportation to and from the station. • Region staff mentioned that it is assumed that Metrolinx will not need the entire site for GO Station design concepts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG expressed desire for buffers in relation to any type of proposed change to the station lands bordering the existing residential neighbourhood. The 'gully' which borders the GO Station site and existing neighbourhood must be re-established. ○ PAG requested the proposed buffer to be shown as a definitive greenspace on all schedules. Planting of long-term vegetation which will mature overtime is preferred/recommended • City staff mentioned that anyone has the ability to apply to amend the Plans to Council. Appropriate notice will have to be provided if this were to occur. The request would have to be evaluated based upon Secondary Plan and Official Plan policies. • PAG requested for lands represented as 6 storey on the GO Station site be extended further towards Louth Street. • PAG questioned if there is opportunity for the City or Region to incentivize a certain mix of land uses and/or affordable housing options? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff indicated developers will experience difficulties with mandatory mixed ground floor uses. These difficulties would stem from the inability of the upper-level units as a sole means to support mixed use businesses. ○ City staff mentioned that certain floor space ratios (FSR) can be used to ensure that a certain amount of permitted mixed uses is accommodated within a development • PAG questioned if there is opportunity to approach non-for-profit organizations in relation to assisting with funding and partnerships for trails and community programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff mentioned that City Council have discussed this option and it could be explored as a possible funding | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|----------------|---|---|
| | | <p>option for the types of improvements identified within the Draft Secondary Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff to research the feasibility creating an active transportation connection between Particpark Trail and Ridley Road. | |
| 4 | Future Studies | <p>Lead: Paddy Kennedy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dillon mentioned that traffic circulation was a key theme heard during the public information centre (June 19, 2017). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff mentioned that the Traffic Calming Study will look at how to mitigate traffic circulation through local neighbourhoods in relation to those attempting to access the station area. ○ Traffic Calming Study does not have any approved City funding. The idea is to complete the St. Paul Street West Bridge reconstruction first because the design of the bridge will influence access into the neighbourhood via Great Western Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PAG expressed concern in relation to increased traffic infiltration into the neighbourhood during the bridge reconstruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team will work with the Region's Public Works staff to identify alternative traffic detour routes that mitigate traffic infiltration into the neighbourhood ▪ PAG indicated that it would be ideal if traffic calming features were implemented prior to the bridge construction occurring to ensure safety within the neighbourhood and mitigate vehicle infiltration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional staff deferred answer to a later date, as project sequencing is not known at this point in time • PAG requested that the City explore implementing free permit parking for residents of the neighbourhood adjacent to the GO Station <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff mentioned that the option could be explored as part of the Traffic Calming Study. • PAG recommended that bike share program, similar to what exists in Hamilton, be represented within GO Station design concepts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City and Region staff agreed that this type of program would be desirable to integrate with the GO Station and will continue to explore this as a potential option with Metrolinx. | <p>Project Team will work with the Region's Public Works staff to identify alternative traffic detour routes during the St. Paul Street West Bridge reconstruction that mitigate traffic infiltration into the neighbourhood.</p> <p>City and Region staff to work with Metrolinx to explore the possibility of integrating a bike share program into GO Station design concepts.</p> |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------------|---|---|
| 5 | Next Steps | <p>Lead: Paddy Kennedy, Diana Morreale & Matt Robinson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dillon will revise Draft Secondary Plan based upon input received from the City, Region, and PAG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Secondary Plan will be available approximately two (2) weeks prior to the public Open House. <p>St. Catharines Public Open House details: Thursday, November 2, 2017 (5:30pm – 7:30pm) Rodman Hall (Studio Gallery) 109 St. Paul Crescent, St. Catharines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region to supply posters and postcards to Tami Lyons for distribution around the neighbourhood Region staff mentioned that Metrolinx will present in front of Councils for each of Niagara's four (4) GO Station Secondary Plan Areas. These presentations are tentatively scheduled for November, and in the weeks following, Metrolinx will host a series of public Open Houses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region to provide PAG with Metrolinx dates once confirmed <p>Next PAG meeting To be scheduled for late-November or December (prior to the St. Catharines statutory Public Meeting)</p> | <p>Region to supply posters and postcards to Tami Lyons for distribution around the neighbourhood</p> <p>Region to provide PAG with Metrolinx St. Catharines Council presentation date and public Open House date (once confirmed).</p> <p>City to schedule next PAG meeting for late-November or December (prior to the St. Catharines statutory Public Meeting)</p> |

To report any errors or omissions please contact Alexander Morrison (Alexander.Morrison@niagararegion.ca)

MEETING MINUTES

Niagara Region: GO Hub and Transit Stations Study

Meeting 2: West St. Catharines Proactive Advisory Group (PAG)

Date: Thursday, November 29, 2017, 6:00pm – 8:00pm

Location: St. Catharines City Hall (Merritt Room, 1st Floor)

PAG & Guest Attendees

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Marilyn Guest | PAG Member |
| Katherine Heykoop | PAG Member |
| Tami Lyons | PAG Member |
| Henry Zwolak | PAG Member |
| Cheryl Selig | T. Johns Consulting |

Project Team

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Aaron Butler | City of St. Catharines |
| Judy Pihach | City of St. Catharines |
| Paddy Kennedy | Dillon Consulting |
| Diana Morreale | GO Implementation Office |
| Alexander Morrison | Niagara Region |

Regrets

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Jim Riddell | City of St. Catharines |
| Matt Robinson | GO Implementation Office |
| Noel Buckley | Proactive Advisory Group |
| Kelly Kingsman | Proactive Advisory Group |
| Amy McLaughlin | Proactive Advisory Group |
| Jodi Summers | Proactive Advisory Group |
| Sonia Vendittelli | Proactive Advisory Group |
| Scott Walker | Ridley College |
| Terri Johns | T. Johns Consulting |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|--------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Terms of Reference | <p><u>Finalizing the PAG Terms of Reference</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members for PAG have been finalized. Two members have been included from the Rykert Community. PAG members are listed within the Terms of Reference. Region staff noted that a 2-year sunset clause has been set for the group. This clause is included within the Terms of Reference. PAG attendees - approved the Terms of Reference. <p><u>Ridley College Participation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheryl Selig (T. Johns Consulting) was introduced by the project team and attended the meeting on representing Ridley College. She explained that her role at this meeting is to observe/understand the purpose of PAG and report back to Ridley College in order to determine capacity with the group. | Final Terms of Reference to be circulated to PAG attached to the "PAG Meeting #2" draft minutes. |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was explained that since the initiation of the project, Ridley College has had a strong history of collaboration with the Region and City on the St. Catharines GO Transit Station Secondary Plan. | |
| 2 | Key changes to the Secondary Plan since the last PAG meeting on October 12, 2017 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team provided an overview of some of the key elements that were revised between the August 2017 draft Secondary Plan and October 2017 draft Secondary Plan. <p><u>Landscape buffer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team noted that Secondary Plan schedules now include/show a landscape buffer between the Transit Station Area lands and the existing residential neighbourhood to the east. PAG questioned the ownership of Station Area parcels. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region staff mentioned that the majority ownership of the parcels belong to Ridley College, while CN Rail owns lands near the existing VIA station (including the station itself). Region staff noted that there is a lease agreement between CN Rail and Niagara resident Mel Bird. Marilyn Guest had mentioned that a resident who abuts the Transit Station Area on Ambrose Drive has a document signed by CN Rail allowing for an easement. According to this resident, it is an easement over the former CN lands, in favour of the Ambrose Drive lots. This resident has requested for clarity as to how the Secondary Plan will impact said easement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team indicated that Ridley College is the owner of the Station Area lands that abut the residential neighbourhood, not CN Rail. Marilyn mentioned that she will ask the resident to share the documentation with the project team. T. John Consulting / Ridley College expressed displeasure with the currently suggested 15m buffer shown within the draft Secondary Plan. T. John Consulting / Ridley College requested a reduction in the specified buffer width to 7.5m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PAG members expressed concern that 7.5m is not a sufficient buffer for abutting residents. T. John Consulting / Ridley College mentioned that there is no indication that an increased buffer width will mitigate the impacts caused by the station. It was noted that Ridley College does not want to have to compensate for the impacts caused by GO Train service on Ridley-owned lands. | <p>Marilyn Guest to provide project team with property owner and CN Rail easement documentation as soon as possible.</p> <p>Project team to strengthen policy within the Secondary Plan regarding landscape buffer.</p> <p>PAG to gauge the interest of Ambrose Street residents to determine whether or not a pedestrian / multi-use pathway would be a desirable element.</p> <p>City staff to confirm the current maximum permitted height within the Zoning By-Law for the Transit Station Area lands.</p> <p>Dillon to strengthen the Transit Station Area urban design guidance in relation to architectural elements and materials used on new development.</p> |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|--|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dillon expressed desire to strengthen policy text in relation to the expectations / purpose of the landscape buffer represented within the schedules. It was noted that the current version of the Plan (October 2017) does not include any language in the policy regarding a buffer. In order to develop effective policy, the function of the landscape buffer will need to be determined. For example: it could permit light trespass; outline design specifications for a wall (if desired or not desired); type of vegetation (coniferous trees). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG expressed comfort with the idea of a multi-use path going through the buffer. ○ T. John Consulting / Ridley College believe that a pedestrian connection within the buffer is important and agree that strengthened policy is needed to identify the function of the buffer. It would be ideal for the function of the buffer to be determined based upon the circumstance of proposed development. ○ City staff noted that residents living on Ambrose may not necessarily want a pedestrian connection behind their homes. These residents should be engaged when the function of the buffer is being established during site plan application(s). • Dillon mentioned that the function of the buffer should be to protect the residential neighbourhood from potential negative impacts caused by the station and any new development within the Station Area, such as noise, light and vibration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dillon mentioned that it would be pre-mature to identify specific design / locational elements within the buffer at this point in time, but policy is necessary to determine desirable elements. ○ City staff stated that once policy within the Secondary Plan is inserted into the City's Official Plan, it can then be used to influence specific development applications and detailed buffer elements. Site plan applications will be the appropriate means to determine specific elements of the buffer. • T. John Consulting / Ridley College expressed interest to see how Metrolinx station design concepts and would influence their property. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Region staff mentioned that station design concepts are not yet known at this point in time; however, Metrolinx has expressed interest towards calling into the next scheduled PAG meeting. • PAG requested insight about the short- and long-term intentions for Ridley College's property. | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|---|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T. John Consulting noted that currently, Ridley’s property is designated for high-density residential development and that a concept plan has been created based upon these permissions. ○ T. John Consulting mentioned it is unknown if / when Ridley College will sell their lands. That is why it is critical to have policy implemented through the Secondary Plan in order to ensure that appropriate direction and guidance is in place for whomever land ownership belongs to. ● PAG requested that the City look to a third party agency to assume responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of any elements deemed appropriate within the landscape buffer. <p>Action plan for “Landscape Buffer” policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Deem that a buffer is the appropriate use for the lands abutting the existing residential neighbourhoods, both in terms of physical space and functional elements. ❖ Establish that the buffer width will be determined based upon the type of development being proposed to the existing residential neighbourhood. For example: no buffer would be necessary if townhouses are proposed to back onto/abutting the existing residential neighbourhood. ❖ PAG to identify the appetite of a pedestrian / multi-use pathway connection behind the Ambrose Street properties. ❖ Project team to share draft text on the policy with PAG once available. PAG to share this policy as they see necessary and coordinate feedback to provide back to the project team. <p><u>Transit Station Area height revisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● T. John Consulting / Ridley College expressed concern with delineating height blocks, as it will hinder the best development of the site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More specifically, the concern is with the prescriptiveness of Schedule 3: Maximum Building Heights. Policy should allow some flexibility as to where heights can be located. The policy should speak to a transition of height from Ridley Road towards the existing residential neighbourhood to the east of the Transit Station Area. ● PAG questioned City staff about the maximum heights currently permitted within the Zoning By-Law. | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|--|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff mentioned that the current Zoning By-law shows 20-storey maximum at the southeast corner of Louth Street at Ridley Road. City staff to confirm the maximum heights that are currently permitted within the Zoning By-Law for the rest of the Transit Station Area. ● PAG requested clarification on Ridley College's stance in relation to how lands to the northeast of Ridley Road and Louth Street are represented within the Secondary Plan schedules. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T. John Consulting / Ridley College stated that the Ridley Road re-alignment as shown within the Secondary Plan was suggested / proposed by Ridley College to make the lands more viable for development potential, as well as to create more space between the rails, and the Ridley Road at Louth Street intersection. ○ T. John Consulting / Ridley College also mentioned that they are opposed to having a surface parking lot at the southeast corner of Louth Street and Ridley Road ○ T. John Consulting / Ridley College stated that they have no objections with how the Transit Station Area is represented within the Secondary Plan (with exception of the maximum building height policy issue, as discussed during this meeting). ● PAG requested that permissions be outlined in relation to the types of building materials used on new development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG expressed desire for new developments to use materials and architectural elements which fit the character of Ridley College and the existing neighbourhood. ○ City staff noted that building materials cannot be forced upon a developer; however, there is opportunity to strengthen guidance in the Plan. <p><u>Louth Street widening</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dillon and Region staff re-confirmed that Louth Street (north of the rail) is being considered for a widening to 4-lanes. The proposed Louth Street cross-section is shown on page 64 of the Secondary Plan. <p><u>Demonstration Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● T. John Consulting / Ridley College expressed concern with the amount of surface parking shown on the demonstration plan (Figure 5.7 and Figure 5.8). | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|--|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project team clarified that the demonstration plan is for illustrative purposes only and will not be carried forward as part of the amendment. <p><u>Transit Station Area access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● T. John Consulting / Ridley College indicated that a street access located mid-block on Ridley Road is the preferred primary access to the Transit Station Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern was expressed in relation to the queuing that would occur on Louth Street (between Ridley Road and the rail) caused by conflict with the at-grade rail crossing. ○ Concern was also expressed in relation to increased traffic cutting through existing neighbourhood due to the potential of being caught at the rail crossing. Increased traffic volumes and speeding close to the school and children were cited as the primary reasons for concern. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Region and City will be responsible for determining appropriate volume/traffic mitigation strategies for the neighbourhood during Capital Work projects. <p><u>Mending neighbourhood / resident relationships</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PAG indicated that residents had expressed discontent with the way that they were treated during the Burgoyne Bridge reconstruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG had identified that some of the other issues included project timeframe uncertainties for local businesses, as well as pedestrian/bicycle access across the Burgoyne Bridge into the Downtown. ○ PAG requested that all detour routes for future Capital Work projects in the area must be walkable. ○ PAG had also mentioned GO Buses travelling down the local streets had been an issue and GO Bus drivers were rude and inconsiderate to local residents. ● Region staff mentioned that they look to take a proactive approach towards ensuring that issues are mitigated between residents and project teams prior to occurring. <p><u>Potential reconfiguration of Ambrose / Permilla / Great Western / Cameron Park</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dillon noted that Policy 4.3.4 (7) has been added on Page 43 of the Secondary Plan based upon discussion from the October 12th, 2017 PAG meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG expressed concern that the new policy would be meaningless once the St. Paul Street West Bridge reconstruction occurred. | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|---|---|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City staff indicated that this concern is unjustified and that Cameron Park will likely experience more space added. • Dillon noted that Great Western Street may or may not be permanently closed resulting from the St. Paul Street West EA. The current policy set provides flexibility and direction for upcoming projects. ○ PAG will be involved with the St. Paul Street West Bridge EA. The group will be a valuable asset during the design and traffic management components of this project. | |
| 3 | Project Team verbal summary of the Nov. 2, 2017 Open House | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was observed that many public attendees “<i>didn’t see anything new</i>” in the Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project team attributed this comment to the expectations that Metrolinx would have station design concepts available for this meeting, which they were not. • There was a sense of public engagement fatigue. • City staff mentioned that they had heard a good idea from a local resident in relation to public art in Cameron Park. The idea would be to pay homage to the City’s old NST line and recognize the station being the second oldest in Ontario (second to Union). • Members of the public observed and project team acknowledged that the venue was too small for the Open House. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAG suggested that similar to the June event, Ridley College is the ideal venue for future Open Houses / events. | |
| 4 | What we heard at the Metrolinx Nov. 22, 2017 Open House | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tami Lyons noted that generally she was discontent with the information that Metrolinx had provided. • City staff noted that there were a lot of questions relating to service delivery and integration, but not many answers. • Tami Lyons had mentioned that she had recently heard that there had been a study completed which identified travel behaviours of residents in Niagara. This study indicated that people are travelling more frequently from Niagara to Hamilton, as opposed to Niagara to Toronto. Tami mentioned that this message needs to be relayed to Metrolinx for the development of their Service Delivery Plan. • It was observed that residents were curious about when track improvements for St. Catharines have been / will be scheduled. | |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|----------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Henry Zwolak mentioned a rumour about Metrolinx requiring 2 additional tracks at the St. Catharines GO Station site. This would require re-locating the existing station and platform slightly to the south. ● Region and City staff observed that several comments were mentioned about station location, <i>“why is the station where it is?”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Metrolinx re-iterated that the station location has been confirmed through the 2011 ESR. | |
| 5 | Other Business | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Region to coordinate with Metrolinx to have a representative call-in to the next PAG meeting. ● Project team to determine if THK lands (south of the track) are available to accommodate GO station parking (as shown within the 2011 ESR). ● Timeframe around the St. Paul Street West Environmental Assessment (EA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ St. Paul Crescent: what will happen to the segment between Ridley Road and Pelham Road? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Region staff noted that the St. Paul Street West EA was slated to begin in early 2018; however, the Region is in the middle of Public Works staffing changes meaning that a delay in project initiation could occur. The EA will likely determine what happens to the portion of St. Paul Crescent between Pelham Road and St. Paul Street West. | <p>Metrolinx to call-in to the next PAG meeting.</p> <p>Project team to discuss ESR lands with THK representatives.</p> |
| 6 | Next Steps | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Statutory Public Meeting is anticipated to occur in winter 2018. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The statutory Public Meeting provides opportunity for public delegations directly to City Council. ○ The statutory Public Meeting will be hosted at City Hall (Council Chamber). ○ City staff and Dillon will have a presentation with any delegations following thereafter. ○ Council will be able to ask questions to both the presentation and any delegations. ● City staff are working on the draft Official Plan Amendment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Official Plan Amendment will be publically released prior to the statutory Public Meeting. ○ PAG will have a chance to review the draft Official Plan Amendment prior to the statutory Public Meeting. ● The City has a two-step adoption process. The statutory Public Meeting occurs first, followed by council adoption at a later date. | <p>Project team to schedule next PAG meeting (expected mid-to-late January).</p> <p>Project team to provide PAG with draft Official Plan Amendment once available, accompanied with a tracked-changes version.</p> |

| # | Item | Discussion Topics | Action Required |
|---|------|--|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAG requested a tracked-changes version of the draft Official Plan Amendment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project team will provide the draft Official Plan Amendment once available. ○ Dillon noted that the draft Official Plan Amendment will primarily be text and will not visually look like the current draft Secondary Plan document. • Project team to schedule next PAG meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Purpose of this meeting will be to review the draft Official Plan Amendment and discuss changes. ○ Next PAG meeting is expected to be scheduled for mid-to-late January (prior to the statutory Public Meeting). | |

To report any errors or omissions please contact Alexander Morrison (Alexander.Morrison@niagararegion.ca)