

Council Chamber  
City Hall, Saskatoon, Sask.  
Monday, September 23, 1996,  
at 7:00 p.m.

## **MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL**

**PRESENT:** His Worship Mayor Dayday in the Chair;  
Councillors Atchison, Birkmaier, Heidt, Langford, Langlois,  
McCann, Postlethwaite, Roe, Steernberg and Waygood;  
City Commissioner Irwin;  
City Solicitor Dust;  
City Clerk Mann;  
City Councillors' Assistant Kanak

*Councillor McCann introduced Mrs. Gallo's Grade 5 students from Silverwood Heights School and welcomed them to the meeting.*

*Moved by Councillor Postlethwaite, Seconded by Councillor Roe,*

*THAT the minutes of the regular meeting of City Council held on September 9, 1996, be approved.*

*CARRIED.*

### **COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL**

The following communications were submitted and dealt with as stated:

**AA. ITEMS WHICH REQUIRE THE DIRECTION OF CITY COUNCIL**

**1) M.J. Holtlander  
52 Harrison Crescent, dated August 21**

Expressing concern regarding possible closure of the City Hospital. (File No. CK. 150-1)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Atchison, Seconded by Councillor Langford,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*CARRIED.*

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 2**

**2) Michael H. Millar, Administrator  
Saskatoon Food Bank, dated August 15**

Expressing appreciation to Council for proclaiming "Twelve Days of Christmas in July" and providing information regarding the food and fund drive. (File No. CK. 205-5)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor McCann, Seconded by Councillor Atchison,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*CARRIED.*

**3) Caron Pyne  
6-821 Eastlake Avenue, undated**

Submitting concerns regarding removal of trees. (File No. CK. 4139-4)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Roe, Seconded by Councillor Atchison,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*IN AMENDMENT*

*Moved by Councillor Waygood, Seconded by Councillor Roe,*

*AND referred to the Environmental Advisory Council.*

*THE AMENDMENT WAS PUT AND CARRIED.  
THE MOTION AS AMENDED WAS PUT AND CARRIED.*

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 3**

**4) Larry Haiven, College of Commerce  
University of Saskatchewan, dated September 8**

Expressing appreciation for the program offered by the Mendel Art Gallery on Sundays in the summer. (File No. CK. 153-1)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Roe, Seconded by Councillor Langlois,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*CARRIED.*

**5) Lillian Kazakoff  
833 Avenue I North, dated September 9**

Submitting concerns regarding transit service in the Mount Royal area. (File No. CK. 7300-1)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Heidt, Seconded by Councillor Langlois,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*CARRIED.*

**6) Barbara Armstrong, Special Events Chair  
United Way of Saskatoon, dated September 9**

Requesting temporary closure of 21st Street between First and Second Avenues on Thursday, October 3, 1996 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. for a Chuckwagon lunch and Bicycle Rodeo. (File No. CK. 205-1)

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 4**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the request be approved subject to Administrative conditions.

*Moved by Councillor Birkmaier, Seconded by Councillor Waygood,*

*THAT the request be approved subject to Administrative conditions.*

*CARRIED.*

**7) Lorraine Ritchie  
Lorraine's Floral Gallery, undated**

Submitting comments regarding paving of 107th Street. (File No. CK. 6315-1)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Atchison, Seconded by Councillor Postlethwaite,*

*THAT the information be received and referred to the Administration and that Ms. Ritchie be notified when the report will be submitted to Council.*

*CARRIED.*

**8) Martin Bernier, dated September 12**

Providing comments regarding temporary closure of Coppermine Crescent. (File No. CK. 6295-1)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Langlois, Seconded by Councillor Birkmaier,*

*THAT the information be received and joined to the file.*

*CARRIED.*

**9) Honourable Carol Teichrob  
Minister of Municipal Government, dated September 17**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 5**

Submitting comments regarding Revenue Sharing. (File No. CK. 1860-1)

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor Langlois, Seconded by Councillor Roe,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*CARRIED.*

**B. ITEMS WHICH HAVE BEEN REFERRED FOR APPROPRIATE ACTION**

- 1) **Jill A.E. Harriman**  
**633 East Place, dated September 11**

Submitting resignation from the Development Appeals Board. **Referred to the Executive Committee.** (File No. CK. 175-21)

- 2) **Lily Kampman**  
**51 Assiniboine Drive, dated September 17**

Submitting comments regarding the curfew proposal. **Referred to the Administration and Finance Committee.** (File No. CK. 185-1)

- 3) **Brad Laidlaw**  
**234 Poplar Crescent, dated September 16**

Requesting abatement of levies against 234 Poplar Crescent. **Referred to the Administration for a report.** (File No. CK. 1920-1)

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 6**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*Moved by Councillor McCann, Seconded by Councillor Atchison,*

*THAT Item B.3) be referred to the Planning and Operations Committee for a report.*

*CARRIED.*

*Moved by Councillor Heidt, Seconded by Councillor Atchison,*

*THAT the information be received.*

*CARRIED.*

**C. PROCLAMATIONS**

- 1) L.W. (Larry) Brown, Secretary**  
**The Spiritual Assembly of the Bahá'ís of Saskatoon, dated September 10**

Requesting Council to proclaim the week of November 10 to 16, 1996 as Unity in Diversity Week in Saskatoon. (File No. CK. 205-5)

- 2) Lorraine Khachatourians, Chair**  
**Saskatoon Breastfeeding Matters Group, dated September 1**

Requesting Council to proclaim the week of October 1 to 7, 1996 as World Breastfeeding Week in Saskatoon. (File No. CK. 205-5)

- 3) Liz Shoofey Stabler, Executive Director**  
**Saskatoon Society for Autism, Inc., dated September 13**

Requesting Council to proclaim the week of October 21 to 27, 1996 as Autism Week in Saskatoon. (File No. CK. 205-5)

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 7**

- 4) **Terry Fenton, Director**  
**The Mendel, dated September 10**

Requesting Council to proclaim October 1996 as Gallery Month in Saskatoon. (File No. CK. 205-5)

- 5) **W.J. Hewitt,**  
**General Manager/Fire Chief, dated September 9**

Requesting Council to proclaim the week of October 6 to 12, 1996 as Fire Prevention Week in Saskatoon and requesting the temporary closure of 21st Street between Third and Fourth Avenues on October 11, 1996 from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. for a Chili cookout. (File No. CK. 205-5)

- 6) **Darryl Boehm, Chair, Public Relations Committee, Saskatchewan Branch,**  
**Canadian Society of Hospital Pharmacists, dated September 12**

Requesting Council to proclaim the week of November 4 to 10, 1996 as Pharmacy Awareness Week in Saskatoon. (File No. CK. 205-5)

- 7) **Dave Scott**  
**Chief of Police, dated September 17**

Requesting Council to proclaim the week of October 21 to 27, 1996 as Victims Services Week in Saskatoon. (File No. CK. 205-5)

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that City Council approve all proclamations as set out in Section C;
  - 2) that the Fire and Protective Services Department be granted permission for the temporary closure of 21st Street between Third and Fourth Avenues on October 11, 1996 from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., subject to Administrative conditions; and

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 8**

- 3) that the City Clerk be authorized to sign the proclamations on behalf of City Council.

*Moved by Councillor Roe, Seconded by Councillor Steernberg,*

- 1) *that City Council approve all proclamations as set out in Section C;*
- 2) *that the Fire and Protective Services Department be granted permission for the temporary closure of 21st Street between Third and Fourth Avenues on October 11, 1996 from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., subject to Administrative conditions; and*
- 3) *that the City Clerk be authorized to sign the proclamations on behalf of City Council.*

*CARRIED.*

**REPORTS**

Mr. G. Grismer, A/Chair, submitted Report No. 13-1996 of the Municipal Planning Commission;

City Commissioner Irwin submitted Report No. 17-1996 of the City Commissioner;

Councillor Langford, Chair, presented Report No. 17-1996 of the Planning and Operations Committee;

Councillor Steernberg, Chair, presented Report No. 14-1996 of the Administration and Finance Committee;

Councillor Langlois, Chair, presented Report No. 1-1996 of the Board of Trustees - General Superannuation Plan;

Councillor Birkmaier, Chair, presented Report No. 5-1996 of the Audit Committee;

Councillor Birkmaier, Chair, presented Report No. 6-1996 of the Land Bank Committee; and

His Worship the Mayor, Chair, presented Report No. 9-1996 of the Executive Committee.



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 9**

*Moved by Councillor Postlethwaite, Seconded by Councillor Atchison,*

*THAT Council go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following reports:*

- a) Report No. 13-1996 of the Municipal Planning Commission;*
- b) Report No. 17-1996 of the City Commissioner;*
- c) Report No. 17-1996 of the Planning and Operations Committee;*
- d) Report No. 14-1996 of the Administration and Finance Committee;*
- e) Report No. 1-1996 of the Board of Trustees - General Superannuation Plan Committee;*
- f) Report No. 5-1996 of the Audit Committee;*
- g) Report No. 6-1996 of the Land Bank Committee; and*
- h) Report No. 9-1996 of the Executive Committee.*

*CARRIED.*

*His Worship Mayor Dayday appointed Councillor Postlethwaite as Chair of the Committee of the Whole.*

*Council went into Committee of the Whole with Councillor Postlethwaite in the Chair.*

*Committee arose.*

*Councillor Postlethwaite, Chair of the Committee of the Whole, made the following report:*

*THAT while in Committee of the Whole, the following matters were considered and dealt with as stated:*

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 10**

**"REPORT NO. 13-1996 OF THE MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION"**

Composition of Committee

Mr. Jim Kozmyk, Chair  
Mr. Glen Grismer, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Jill Postlethwaite  
Mr. Ken Rauch  
Ms. Ann March  
Ms. Leslie Belloc-Pinder  
Mr. Gregory Kitz  
Ms. Georgia Bell Woodard  
Ms. Lina Eidem  
Mr. Paul Kawcuniak  
Ms. Sheila Denysiuk  
Mr. Al Ledingham  
Dr. Brian Noonan

- 1. Rezoning  
R.2 District to M.2 District by Agreement  
1407 Albert Avenue  
Lots 1-28, Block 35, Plan G103 & Block 5, Plan G186  
Applicant: Conseil Scolaire Fransaskois de Saskatoon  
2213E Hanselman Court  
(File No. CK. 4351-1)**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1) that the advertising respecting the proposal to rezone Lots 1 - 28, Block 35, Plan G103 and Block 5, Plan G186 (1407 Albert Avenue) from an R.2 District to an M.2 District be approved, subject to the execution of an agreement between Conseil Scolaire Fransaskois de Saskatoon and the City of Saskatoon, which would address the following:
- a) restrict the use of land and buildings on 1407 Albert Avenue to:
    - i) schools operated by public authorities; and
    - ii) school division administration offices.
  - b) restrict the total area of the proposed school division administration offices to 620 square metres;

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 11**

- c) all other relevant clauses of the M.2 Zoning District and the City of Saskatoon Zoning Bylaw No. 6772 will apply;
- 2) that the General Manager, Planning and Building Department be requested to prepare the required notice for advertising the proposed amendment;
- 3) that the City Solicitor be requested to prepare the required Bylaw and Agreement; and
- 4) that the Municipal Planning Commission's report be brought forward for consideration at the time of the public hearing and that City Council consider the Commission's recommendation that the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment, subject to an Agreement, as outlined in Resolution 1) above, be approved.

*ADOPTED.*

Your Commission has considered and supports the attached copy of report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department dated September 4, 1996, regarding an application submitted by Conseil Scolaire Fransaskois de Saskatoon requesting that Lots 1-28, Block 35, Plan G103 and Block 5, Plan G186 (1407 Albert Avenue) be rezoned from an R.2 District to an M.2 District by Agreement.

**REPORT NO. 17-1996 OF THE CITY COMMISSIONER**

**Section A - Administration and Finance**

**A1) Routine Reports Submitted to City Council**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the following information be received.

*ADOPTED.*

Schedule of Accounts Paid \$2,823,617.98	August 30, 1996	September 9, 1996
Schedule of Accounts Paid \$4,882,373.27	September 6, 1996	September 11, 1996
Schedule of Accounts Paid \$2,450,456.45	September 10, 1996	September 16, 1996
Schedule of Accounts Paid	September 10, 1996	September 16, 1996

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 12**

\$7,574,680.67  
(File No. 1530-2)

**A2) Investments  
(File No. 1790-3)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that City Council approve the attached purchases and sales.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Finance Department, September 17, 1996:

"With the approval of the Investment Committee, the attached lists indicate purchases and sales for the City's various funds."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Schedule of Securities Transactions (August 1 - 16, 1996).
2. Schedule of Securities Transactions (August 17 - 31, 1996).
3. Schedule of Securities Transactions (September 1 - 15, 1996).

**A3) Business Tax Adjustments  
(File No. 1985-2)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that City Council approve, for the reasons detailed on the attached lists, the following 1996 Business Tax Write-offs:

- 1) the amount of \$265,439.29 for the period June 1, 1996 to June 30, 1996;
- 2) the amount of \$79,231.78 for the period of July 1, 1996 to July 31, 1996; and,
- 3) the amount of \$19,156.25 for the period of August 1, 1996 to August 31, 1996.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Finance Department, September 9, 1996:

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 13**

"Attached are listings of 1996 Business Tax Adjustments, totalling \$363,827.32, which require Council's approval for write-off.

These listings represent businesses which have discontinued business at the premises indicated; these accounts are not uncollectible, but require adjustment in keeping with Business Tax Bylaw #6714(12) which states:

'Where a business is commenced after the 31st day of January or is discontinued before the 1st day of December, the Council shall, upon written request, adjust the amount levied with respect of that business to correspond with the portion of the year during which the business is, or was, carried on; PROVIDED that such request is made before the expiration of one year following the year in respect of which the amount levied is to be adjusted.'

Business Tax Adjustments are offset by supplementary assessments on new businesses or businesses that relocate, renovate or enlarge premises.

The distribution of this write-off will be as follows:

City	\$153,991.97
School Boards	191,374.08
Business Improvement Districts	<u>18,461.27</u>
	\$363,827.32."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. June, July, and August Business Tax Adjustments.

**A4) City of Saskatoon Municipal Manual - 1996  
(File No. 369-1)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the City Clerk, September 17, 1996:

"I am pleased to present the attached copy of the 1996 City of Saskatoon Municipal Manual for the information of Council. The manual is used as a successful research tool by various libraries, school boards, and others throughout Canada.

Copies of the municipal manual are available in the City Clerk's Office for a cost of \$5.35,

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 14**

including G.S.T."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. 1996 Municipal Manual.

**Section B - Planning and Operations**

**B1) Population Estimate for June 30, 1996  
(File No. PL 425-1)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the following report be received as information.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department, September 5, 1996:

"On August 9, 1996, we received from Saskatchewan Health the June 30, 1996, Saskatchewan Health Insurance Registration (S.H.I.R.) population figure. The figure is 192,940 which is an increase of 3,195 persons from June 30, 1995 (189,745).

Our total estimated population is 201,604 persons as of June 30, 1996. This figure is arrived at by adding the uncounted persons who are not included in the S.H.I.R. file. The S.H.I.R. is a file containing information about persons who are residing in Saskatoon and eligible for health care benefits. Some members of our population receive health care benefits from the Federal Government and are therefore, not counted in the S.H.I.R. file. These uncounted persons include Treaty Indians, R.C.M.P. officers, and Military personnel. Therefore, the total population of Saskatoon is estimated as follows:

S.H.I.R. file	192,940
Treaty Indians	8,520
Military Personnel	59
Regular R.C.M.P.	<u>85</u>
Total Estimate:	201,604

This total estimate is 2,446 persons higher than the estimate of 199,158 provided by this department for December 31, 1995. The figure for Treaty Indians is a Statistics Canada figure supplied to this department by the Saskatoon Tribal Council."

**B2) Easement Requirement**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 15**

**SaskPower, SaskTel, SaskEnergy - Saskatoon Underground  
Briarwood Neighbourhood  
Buffer Strip MB42, Plan 77-S-40192 and  
Municipal Reserve MR1, Plan 77-S-13324  
Project: E63-575-33; Subproject: E633-15-110  
(File No. PL 4090-3)**

---

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that City Council grant an easement to SaskPower, SaskTel, and SaskEnergy as outlined on the attached plan; and,
  - 2) that His Worship the Mayor and the City Clerk be authorized to execute under the Corporate Seal, and in a form that is satisfactory to the City Solicitor, the formal agreement with respect to this easement.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department, September 5, 1996:

"C.A. Moore, on behalf of SaskPower's Land Department, SaskTel, and SaskEnergy, has requested the City's approval for an easement over parts of Buffer Strip MB42, Plan 95-S-40192 and Municipal Reserve MR1, Plan 96-S-13324 as shown outlined on the attached plan. The proposed easement is required to provide underground servicing to the townhouse development located on Parcel B, Plan 95-S-40192. Subdivision Application #20/95 was approved by City Council during its July 17, 1995, meeting (Buffer Strip MB42). Subdivision Application #38/95 was approved by City Council during its February 5, 1996, meeting. As the properties included in the subdivision at the time of approval by City Council were privately owned, Council's approval did not include the granting of easements. Since registration of the Plans of Subdivision has occurred, the City now has title to the Buffer Strip and Municipal Reserve over which SaskPower, SaskTel, and SaskEnergy require an easement.

The Planning and Building Department has no objection to granting the proposed easement to SaskPower, SaskTel, and SaskEnergy.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Buffer Strip MB42 and Municipal Reserve MR1.

**B3) Communications to Council  
From: Gordon Beresh  
Pharmasave 411**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 16**

**Date:** August 5, 1996  
**Subject:** Establishments of a walkway between LaRonge Road and  
Pinehouse Drive at the Nahanni Drive extension  
(File No. 6150-1)

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that the following report be received as information; and,
  - 2) that a copy of this report be forwarded to Mr. Gordon Beresh.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Public Works Department, September 10, 1996:

"Mr. Gordon Beresh has requested that a walkway be established from LaRonge Road to Pinehouse Drive. Establishing a walkway connecting LaRonge Road and Pinehouse Drive would create a number of related problems because land-use design was determined and executed without provisions for a walkway feature. For the following reasons, it is the opinion of the Public Works Department, that construction of such a walkway at this location, at the present time, is not feasible:

1. The vacant land which is presently used for access by pedestrian traffic between LaRonge Road and Pharmasave is, at the time of this writing, subject to an option to purchase. The developer who is in possession of this option has already initiated design of a project and will likely begin construction this fall. Re-allocation of a portion of the optioned land would be required to construct a walkway in this location. Re-allocation of land may result in a need to expend additional design funds to alter those plans already established so as to facilitate the construction of a walkway at this time.
2. A walkway may not legally terminate on private property. Provisions would have to be made to obtain an easement on, or ownership of, sufficient land which is now privately owned, so the walkway could extend through the property on which Pharmasave is now located to link LaRonge Road with Pinehouse Drive.
3. Because of concerns for pedestrian safety, the Transportation Department will not approve a walkway of this type which terminates at a mid-block location. Configurations of this nature create a serious safety hazard for pedestrian traffic (generally young people on bicycles) exiting the walkway.
4. Further concerns are raised by the excessive length (more than 600 feet) of a walkway in this location. This length would result in restricted visibility in daylight hours and virtually eliminate visibility in darkness. There is a significant grade differential which also makes it difficult if not impossible to see from one end of the subject area through to the other.



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 17**

5. Policing of configurations such as this is difficult and burdensome on existing resources. The environment created is conducive to various forms of criminal activity as well as providing a location for 'hanging-out'. People who would use the walkway at certain times would be subject to the associated risks. For those that would avoid the walkway because of these risks, there would be little functional utility in constructing a walkway."

**B4) Communications to Council**

**From: Harold L. Rogers**

**1301 Avenue J North**

**Date: June 11, 1996**

**Subject: Requesting permission to address Council regarding  
his property at 512 Avenue F South**

**(File No. 4355-1)**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the following report be received as information.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department, September 12, 1996:

"At the June 17, 1996 meeting, Mr. Harold L. Rogers (1301 Avenue J North) addressed Council regarding his property at 512 Avenue F South and asked Council to consider approval for the five suites contained in the building (please refer to attachment). Council referred this matter to the Administration for a report. The property at 512 Avenue F South is located in an RM1 District. Under the provisions of this District, the legal use of this property is as a one-unit dwelling. In this regard, the Planning and Building Department had taken action to have this property comply with the Zoning Bylaw.

In Mr. Rogers' communication to Council, he included a letter from Mr. Silas E. Halyk, Q.C., advising that his parents owned this property and he resided there in the late 1950's. The Planning and Building Department had not previously been aware of this situation. Based on the information contained in the letter, the Planning and Building Department and the City Solicitor's Office have concluded that the property may be considered a legal non-conforming dwelling, containing a maximum of four dwelling units, provided the owner obtains the necessary building and plumbing permits and provides one paved parking space for each dwelling unit.

Mr. Rogers has been advised of this position and has indicated that he is satisfied with it and is prepared to comply with the conditions noted therein."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Excerpt from minutes of City Council, June 17, 1996.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 18**

**B5) Land-Use Applications Received by the Planning and Building Department  
For the Period Between August 28, 1996 - September 13, 1996  
(For Information Only)  
(File No. 4300-2)**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the following report be received as information.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department, September 13, 1996:

"The following applications have been received, are being processed and will be submitted to City Council for its consideration:

**Subdivision**

Application #45/96: 2 Albany Crescent  
Applicant: Garry and Lynn Mayer for Rhonda Furbur  
Legal Description: Lot Pt. 1, Block 612, Plan 68-S-22368  
Current Zoning: R.1  
Neighbourhood: River Heights  
Date Received: August 30, 1996

Application #46/96: Briarwood Close (no civic address assigned)  
Applicant: Webster Surveys Ltd. for Briarwood Developments Ltd.  
Legal Description: Parcels G & H, Plan 96-S-13325  
Current Zoning: R.1A  
Neighbourhood: Briarwood  
Date Received: September 4, 1996

Application #47/96: Briarvale Bay (no civic address assigned)  
Applicant: Webster Surveys Ltd. for Preston Developers Ltd.  
Legal Description: Parcel S, Plan 96-S-13326  
Current Zoning: R.1A  
Neighbourhood: Briarwood  
Date Received: September 4, 1996

Application #48/96: Hedley Street (no civic address assigned)  
Applicant: Webster Surveys Ltd. for City of Saskatoon  
Legal Description: Lots 5, 6, 7, Block 7, Plan 87-S-47751  
Current Zoning: R.2

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 19**

Neighbourhood: Forest Grove  
Date Received: September 4, 1996

Application #49/96: Brookmore Crescent (no civic address assigned)  
Applicant: Webster Surveys Ltd. for City of Saskatoon  
Legal Description: Parcel K, Plan 96-S-13323  
Current Zoning: R.1A  
Neighbourhood: Briarwood  
Date Received: September 5, 1996

Application #50/96: 104A/B - 109th Street West  
Applicant: Mike and Shirley Chometa (by written description)  
Legal Description: Lot 5, Block 3, Plan (HA) I 5611  
Current Zoning: R.2  
Neighbourhood: Sutherland  
Date Received: September 6, 1996

Application #51/96: 258/254 Laycoe Crescent  
Applicant: Webb Surveys Inc. for City of Saskatoon  
Legal Description: Lots 31,31, Block 405, Plan 95-S-26266  
Current Zoning: R.1A  
Neighbourhood: Silverspring  
Date Received: September 9, 1996."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Plan of Proposed Subdivision No. 46/96.
2. Plan of Proposed Subdivision No. 47/96.
3. Plan of Proposed Subdivision No. 48/96.
4. Plan of Proposed Subdivision No. 49/96.
5. Plan of Proposed Subdivision No. 51/96.

**B6) Communications to Council**

**From: Mr. Gee Tsang**

**1643 Alexandra Avenue**

**Date: October 14, 1995**

**Subject: Requesting parking restrictions in the 1600 Block of Alexandra Avenue and expressing concern regarding the safety of children attempting to cross the street in the vicinity of St. Paul School**

**(File No. 6120-3)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** 1) that the following report be received as information; and,

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 20**

- 2) that a copy of this report and Mr. Tsang's letter be forwarded to the principal of St. Paul School.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Transportation Department, September 10, 1996:

“The Transportation Department has investigated the traffic conditions on the 1600 block of Alexandra Avenue regarding pedestrian and vehicular safety. This included a review of accidents, an on-site meeting with Mr. Tsang, a site inspection, and development of potential solutions.

A review of the available accident reports since 1990 for that area showed that in 1990 there was one accident involving a bicycle and two involving parked vehicles. In 1993, there was one accident involving a vehicle backing up and two involving parked vehicles. In 1994, there was one side-swipe accident. These rates are considered quite modest and not suggestive of any corrective action to the roadway or signing.

During a brief on-site meeting with Mr. Tsang on February 1, 1996, a safety concern was raised regarding a school bus that regularly parked on the street near his residence. The owner of the bus line was contacted by telephone and indicated that it is the company's policy that none of their buses are to be parked on the street while not in actual service, and that the driver is required to provide off-street parking for the bus. The owner assured me the driver would be contacted promptly to remove the bus.

A site inspection showed that the 1600 block of Alexandra Avenue is fronted by private residences only. Many home owners have off-street parking that is used regularly, thereby reducing the demand for available off-street parking facilities. Even though the street is comparatively narrow (approximately 9 metres), it is no narrower than many other streets in mature areas of the city which experience even higher demands for on-street parking. The roadway is sufficiently wide to permit access in and out of driveways, even with parking on both sides of the street. Not all of the homes on this street, however, have driveways or back-lane garages. To implement any additional parking restrictions on a local residential street such as this would impose an unreasonable hardship on those residents who need on-street parking near their homes, especially during the winter months.

Implementation of various parking restrictions, such as during the morning and afternoon, has the advantage of providing motorists with increased visibility to see pedestrians. One disadvantage is the tendency towards an increased average vehicular speed. This also creates an environment where pedestrians do not have the protection of a lane of parked cars between themselves and moving vehicles.

There is no restriction in place prohibiting pedestrians from crossing this street mid-block; however, drivers have a reduced expectancy of encountering pedestrians mid-block, even in a

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 21**

residential area, and pedestrians should be more careful when crossing a street from between parked cars. Parents are encouraged to instruct their children against the dangerous and illegal practice of darting in and out from between parked vehicles onto the street.

A representative of the Transit Branch reviewed the existing Transit routing in this area on April 19, 1996, and was not able to find a reasonable alternative to maintaining the existing Transit route on this portion of Alexandra Avenue. The Transit Branch has, however, asked the Public Works Department to provide additional snow removal along this portion of Alexandra Avenue as opposed to grading excess snow to the side of the street, as is the normal practice on this type of street.”

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 22**

**B7) Proposed Parking Restriction  
423 Pendency Road  
(File No. 6120-3)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the existing "No Stopping to Corridor" zone in front of 423 Pendency Road be lengthened by approximately seven metres.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the General Manager, Transportation Department, September 16, 1996:

"The Transportation Department has received a request to install a 'No Parking' zone to the west of the property's east driveway.

Pendency Road is classified as a major collector and is also a Transit route. A pedestrian corridor to serve St. Mark School is located approximately five metres to the east of this driveway. There is a 15 metre 'No Stopping to Corridor' zone west of the pedestrian corridor which, in this case, ends approximately three metres west of the driveway mentioned. Motorists have been experiencing difficulty in seeing around vehicles legally parked west of this 'No Stopping' zone. An extension of the 'No Stopping' zone would appreciably improve the westward line of sight for motorists entering Pendency Road from the apartment's driveway.

The Transportation Department has examined the site and proposes that the existing 'No Stopping to Corridor' zone be extended an additional seven metres to the west or approximately ten metres west of the driveway."

**B8) Proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement  
The City of Saskatoon and David S. Yip/Iven Jen  
Caldwell Crescent/Parr Place Area of Parkridge Neighbourhood  
(File No. 4111-8)**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1) that the proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and David S. Yip/Iven Jen be approved; and,
- 2) that His Worship the Mayor and the City Clerk be authorized to execute such Agreement on behalf of The City of Saskatoon and affix the corporate seal thereto.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the City Solicitor, September 18, 1996:

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 23**

"In keeping with the instruction of the Planning and Operations Committee at its meeting held on September 3, 1996, and the further specific direction of the Manager, Public Works Department, we have prepared and forward herewith for consideration proposed form of Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and David S. Yip/Iven Jen.

The proposed Agreement pertains to the Caldwell Crescent/Parr Place area of the Parkridge neighbourhood, and has been drawn in the form of an extension to an earlier concluded master agreement pertaining to this area. The Agreement sets forth all standard development conditions and requirements."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and David S. Yip/Iven Jen.

**B9) Proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement  
The City of Saskatoon and Preston Developments Inc.  
Budz Green/Bay/Crescent Area of Arbor Creek Neighbourhood  
(File No. 4111-37)**

---

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that the proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and Preston Developments Inc. be approved; and,
  - 2) that His Worship the Mayor and the City Clerk be authorized to execute such Agreement on behalf of The City of Saskatoon and affix the corporate seal thereto.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the City Solicitor, September 18, 1996:

"In keeping with the instruction of the Planning and Operations Committee at its meeting held on September 3, 1996, and the further specific direction of the Manager, Public Works Department, we have prepared and forward herewith for consideration proposed form of Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and Preston Developments Inc.

The proposed Agreement pertains to the Budz Green/Bay/Crescent area of the Arbor Creek neighbourhood, and has been drawn in the form of an extension to an earlier concluded master agreement pertaining to this area. The Agreement sets forth all standard development conditions and requirements."

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 24**

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and Preston Developments Inc.

**B10) Proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement  
The City of Saskatoon and Westland Properties Ltd.  
Chotem Place Area of Arbor Creek Neighbourhood  
(File No. 4111-37)**

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that the proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and Westland Properties Ltd. be approved; and,
  - 2) that His Worship the Mayor and the City Clerk be authorized to execute such Agreement on behalf of The City of Saskatoon and affix the corporate seal thereto.

*ADOPTED.*

Report of the City Solicitor, September 18, 1996:

"In keeping with the instruction of the Planning and Operations Committee at its meeting held on September 3, 1996, and the further specific direction of the Manager, Public Works Department, we have prepared and forward herewith for consideration proposed form of Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and Westland Properties Ltd.

The proposed Agreement pertains to the Chotem Place area of the Arbor Creek neighbourhood, and has been drawn in the form of an extension to an earlier concluded master agreement pertaining to this area. The Agreement sets forth all standard development conditions and requirements."

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Development and Servicing (Extension) Agreement as between The City of Saskatoon and Westland Properties Ltd.

**REPORT NO. 17-1996 OF THE PLANNING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE**

Composition of Committee

Councillor A. Langford, Chair



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 25**

Councillor M. Heidt  
Councillor P. McCann  
Councillor J. Postlethwaite  
Councillor K. Waygood

**1. Residential Parking Permit Program**

**- AND -**

**Saskatoon Prairieland Exhibition  
Problems in Adjacent Neighbourhood**

**- AND -**

**Request for Parking Permits - Avenue R South between 20th and 21st Street  
Files CK. 6120-4 and 6330-1**

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that the concept of the City of Saskatoon adopting a residential parking permit program be approved in principle; and,
  - 2) that a draft residential parking permit program policy be prepared by the Administration and forwarded to the Planning and Operations Committee for review and public consultation, and subsequent approval by City Council.

*ADOPTED.*

Your Committee has considered and concurs with the concept of a residential parking permit program as outlined in the report of the General Manager, Transportation Department, which follows. Your Committee is of the opinion that there must be public consultation and also that a residential parking permit program must be driven and supported by residents of the area in question. Council will note that your Committee has endorsed this as an expenditure neutral program.

Members of Council have received a copy of the document entitled "Implementing A Residential Parking Permit Program in Saskatoon". Copies are available for viewing in the City Clerk's Office.

Report of the General Manager, Transportation Department, dated August 20, 1996:

**"BACKGROUND**

The Planning and Operations Committee, at its meeting held on May 28, 1996, when considering the matter of residential parking problems associated with the Prairieland Exhibition, resolved:

"that the matter be referred to the study underway with respect to residential parking

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 26**

permits in the City."

As the Committee is aware, the Transportation Department has been considering and investigating the use of residential parking permits as a means to alleviate the growing number of complaints and problems associated with on-street parking in residential neighbourhoods adjacent to large traffic/parking generators. Earlier this year, Reid Crowther & Partners Ltd. was commissioned to complete a study regarding implementation of a residential parking permit program in Saskatoon. That study is now complete, and attached for the Committee's consideration is a report entitled, "Implementing a Residential Parking Permit Program in Saskatoon".

**DISCUSSION**

The report outlines why programs such as this are required, implementation criteria, administrative considerations, operational procedures and enforcement policies. Prior to discussing specifics for Saskatoon, a brief description of the philosophy behind residential parking permits may be helpful.

Increasingly in Saskatoon, as car ownership and use grows, the demand on curbside parking space comes under pressure. In many locations, this does not create problems; however, where the demand exceeds the supply, there are conflicts between the groups of people vying for the space, between long- and short-term parkers, and between residents, shoppers, employees and commuters. These areas of conflict are concentrated around high traffic/parking generators. In Saskatoon, the areas in question predominantly surround the University Campus and Royal University Hospital, St. Paul's Hospital, City Hospital, Kelsey Institute, the residential area immediately north of the Central Business District (between 25th Street and Queen Street), the Exhibition area during Exhibition week, the Broadway Area during programmed events, and several of the City's high schools. In each of these cases, it is relevant to ask whether any particular group should be given preference respecting on-street parking and, if so, in what circumstances and to what extent.

There is a public perception that residents should have the right to park outside their own homes. In most residential areas, that expectation is adequately provided for, but it cannot be met everywhere. There are sound, social reasons for matching the expectation, as far as it can be matched, and residential parking may be selected as the priority demand on the available curbside space. Residents, if they have little or no chance of parking their car near their homes, are penalized with respect to the full enjoyment of their dwelling. When they can park close to their home, they have ready accessibility to their vehicle, there is less risk of damage to it and greater peace of mind. Non-resident parkers have wider options of where they park or, in some cases, whether or not they use private vehicles for their trip.

A decision to give preference to residents must, however, be taken with regard to overall parking strategy, to parking demand and provision in the area, and to the consequential effects of creating such a preference. The Transportation Department supports the development of a policy that will provide a means to address residential parking problems.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 27**

The attached study documents these criteria and the necessary steps to be taken. If City Council supports a residential parking permit program as a strategy, the program outlined in the study is the type of program the Transportation Department would recommend.

**JUSTIFICATION**

When setting out the terms of reference for this study, the consultant was instructed to prepare the report based upon the understanding that a residential parking permit program was to be established in Saskatoon. The Transportation Department is of the opinion that conditions now exist within certain residential areas in the City, that may warrant the creation and implementation of residential parking permit zones. There is really no other effective and long-term solution to the problems associated with transient parking occurring in residential neighbourhoods close to large traffic/parking generators.

Rather than providing a long dissertation regarding the pros and cons of such a program (which has already been conducted by staff and is available for the Committee's reference if necessary), a report outlining the policies and procedures required for an RRP program would provide more information from which City Council could formulate a decision as to whether or not to proceed. As the report indicates, such programs have been used successfully in many, if not all, major Canadian cities and are seen as the most effective long-term solution to the parking problems being experienced in some Saskatoon neighbourhoods.

The following is a brief listing of the major recommendations contained in the report. It provides the Committee with an outline of the major steps and changes that would be required to implement a program. Supplementary detail on these items is contained within the report.

1. Before any such program can be initiated, enabling legislation must be passed. This would take the form of a revision to the existing Traffic Bylaw No. 7200.
2. Criteria for determining the warrant or need of creating a residential parking permit (RPP) zone would be established in the form of policy. The policy would be comprised of the following major points:
  - Ø the requested area to be zoned as RPP must be designated as single-detached or semi-detached housing area (i.e. permits would not be issued to apartment buildings)
  - Ø the non-resident parking that is occurring must be a result of a high traffic/parking generator as identified in the foregoing
  - Ø for an RPP to be considered for special events and exhibition type facilities, the non-resident parking must occur for more than 12 days per year
  - Ø the proposed RPP zone must consist of a minimum of 10 square city blocks
  - Ø the minimum level of support from residents of the proposed RPP must be no less than 70 percent.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 28**

3. The implementation process would consist of a number of steps, a large component of which would be undertaken by the applicant(s). These would be:
  - Ø upon receipt of a request for an RPP zone, staff would send out, to the applicant(s), criteria for establishing an RPP and a blank petition for requesting civic administration to determine the need for an RPP zone based on the 70 percent support level from the local residents as mentioned above
  - Ø assuming the criteria and petition requirements are met, the Transportation Department would conduct a parking study to determine the extent of the transient parking in the area (transient parkers should be 70 percent or greater, when measured at two times during the day)
  - Ø if requirements are successfully met, all RPP's which are established shall employ a two-hour parking restriction, applied consistently over the zone
  - Ø notices are sent to the area residents in the RPP of the impending installation of the two-hour parking restriction, a brief description of what the RPP entails, the office location and service hours to secure permits, the cost (if there is one) of the permit and documentation required to secure the permit.
  
4. The following administrative policies and procedures would be required:
  - Ø permit applicants must provide evidence of vehicle ownership or use, and two pieces of documentation regarding proof of residency within the RPP zone
  - Ø any person, except apartment dwellers, living within the RPP can apply for a permit
  - Ø one permit issued per registered vehicle
  - Ø limited term, visitor parking permits to be issued upon special request from resident(s) within RPP
  - Ø adopt procedures to ensure permits are returned when residents either move or dispose of their vehicle
  - Ø permits to be valid for one year, with expiry dates of various zones staggered throughout the year, but always at month-end
  - Ø residents to be notified of the permit expiry by mail, plus an indication on the permit
  - Ø develop a permit database to track permit issuance and validity
  
5. Since rigorous enforcement is one of the main keys to success of an RPP, it should be done on a continuous basis. There may be staffing implications associated with this.

There are two other recent events that may heighten the need for a policy on RPP's to be developed. The new City Hospital surface parking lot is now open. A commitment was made some time ago that once the parking facilities at the Hospital were complete, a review

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 29**

of parking in the general area surrounding the Hospital would be undertaken. It is difficult to speculate at this time whether the new parking area will have a positive or negative effect, since some parking has been allocated to staff, but at a monthly charge. Whether a migration of current on-street parking occurs to the surface lot remains to be seen. Complaints regarding employee and non-resident parking in this area continue to be a perennial problem for the Transportation Department.

Secondly, the University of Saskatchewan will be implementing new parking regulations this fall. These may have a rather significant impact on the residential area south of the University, where there is currently a two-hour parking restriction imposed between the hours of 0900 - 1600. The U of S will begin charging for evening parking, Monday through Thursday, this fall. Metered locations will require coinage being inserted in the evenings, and permits will be required to park in any lots. This will likely relocate a significant amount of evening parking from the campus to the residential area to the south.

**OPTIONS**

The Transportation Department identified two options to consider with respect to the problem of transient parking in residential areas. These are:

1. Do nothing and maintain the status quo. Currently, the Transportation Department installs parking restrictions within residential areas to increase vehicle turnover. The distinction between this and a true RRP is that the restrictions apply equally to everyone. That is, both residents of the area and transient parkers must abide by the restrictions or be liable for a parking ticket. Some of these have proven successful, but the Department receives numerous complaints from residents enquiring as to why they cannot park, uninhibited, in front of their own home. Basically, this amounts to a "bandage" type solution of acknowledging that the problem exists, but concluding that it is a way of life in the particular neighbourhood.
2. Be proactive and resolve the parking concerns through the implementation of an RRP as suggested above. Although this will involve additional costs, the policy guidelines established allow the administration to address community concerns relatively easily.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

With Option 1 above, there are no policy implications. The "do-nothing" approach would likely result in an ever increasing number of complaints and a dissatisfied public. Policy has been established for the current Department practice. When a complaint or petition is received, the Transportation Department assesses the concern in order to determine a level of validity. This sometimes involves collecting parking data in the neighbourhood. If the concern is validated, the Department surveys the residents of the block faces experiencing a problem as to whether or not they would wish to see a parking restriction implemented, bearing in mind that it would apply to themselves as well as transient parkers. If there is

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 30**

majority support (the policy states 90 percent, although restrictions have been implemented at slightly lower approval rates) from the residents of the block faces in question, the Department would recommend to City Council the implementation of a restricted hourly parking zone on the block faces. The residents are then notified of Council's decision and as to when the signs are to be installed. As mentioned above, this has proved relatively successful in some limited instances, but residents are still angry that they have to agree to restrictive parking measures, which put a hardship on their lives, in order to get relief from the on-street parking congestion.

If City Council decides to adopt an RPP program, there are several items which the report does not fully address which will either require the direction of Council or will impact on the operating budget.

First, a comprehensive policy outlining RPP criteria would need to be developed. This would not be too daunting a task, as the Transportation Department would not be "reinventing the wheel". Of larger consequence are the issues of charging for permits and the operating cost of such a program.

A basic decision would have to be made as to whether or not residents are charged for the permits. This would be a controversial issue, but the Transportation Department believes a modest charge to offset administrative costs could be levied. Typical charges in other Canadian cities range from \$10 to \$25 annually.

As for operating costs, an RRP program would definitely be a service-level increase. There would need to be an increase in both staffing and installation/maintenance allocations. There may be a need for increased enforcement personnel, but experience in other cities has shown that revenue collected from violations typically covers all enforcement costs. The following indicate typical anticipated costs for establishing an RRP program:

- Ø Administrative Costs - It is estimated that one-half to three-quarters of a staff year would be required to implement an RPP program throughout the City. Experience in other cities shows that one staff year is required per 20,000 permits issued. It is estimated that Saskatoon could eventually require somewhere near half to three-quarters this number to satisfy the problem areas that have been identified above. This would not necessarily mean a new individual solely handling the entire program. The main administrative and management duties would be the responsibility of the proposed Parking Coordinator (referred to in the Transportation Department's report regarding the creation of a Parking Branch). The Parking Coordinator would field enquiries, set criteria, recommend policy and generally oversee the administration of the program. Besides this, staff would be required to conduct parking surveys, validate and issue permits and maintain databases. It is estimated that the staffing cost would be approximately \$30,000 annually.
- Ø Printing/Postage/Advertising - Again, based on somewhere in the order of 15,000 permits being issued, these costs are estimated at \$10,000.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 31**

- Ø Signage Costs - The cost to install and maintain the permanent street signage that must accompany such a program is estimated at \$1,000 per square city block. Based on a minimum requirement of 10 square city blocks per RPP, the minimum signage cost for establishing an RPP would be approximately \$10,000. Although a detailed estimate has not been completed, the initial capital cost to install signage throughout the anticipated RPP zones could easily exceed \$100,000. It should be noted that this cost would likely be spread over a number of years as requests and approvals for RPP zones are implemented incrementally.
- Ø Annual Sign Maintenance Costs - As the number of RRP zones grows, annual maintenance costs of signage would increase. Initially the annual maintenance could be absorbed within the Signing and Road Markings Operating Budget; however, based on an average 10-year life expectancy of the signage, the operating cost of the program would have to be increased to account for maintenance at some point after program implementation. Depending on field conditions, this would likely begin to occur after year five but before year ten of the program. Eventually, annual maintenance costs could reach \$10,000.
- Ø Enforcement has not been quantified in dollar terms as the assumption that violation revenues would offset any additional enforcement costs has been used.

Since the Department is unsure as to how many zones may be established, an estimate of yearly operating costs is subject to considerable variation. The staff and printing/postage costs would be a constant and could amount to approximately \$40,000. Signage costs would be the large variable with total costs likely being incurred over a number of years. Assuming a ten-year life expectancy of the signage, an average yearly cost may lie between \$10,000 and \$20,000.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

There is currently no funding provided for any type of residential parking permit program. The estimated \$50,000 to \$60,000 of annual operating costs would represent a service-level increase which would have to be reflected in the Transportation Department's annual operating budget. There is the potential to offset this cost by charging a fee for the permits. Depending on the number of permits issued, there may be an opportunity to create a relatively substantial subsidization of this cost, while maintaining a relatively low permit fee.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Implementing a Residential Parking Permit Program in Saskatoon - Report by Reid Crowther."

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 32**

Composition of Committee

Councillor R. Steernberg, Chair  
Councillor A. Atchison  
Councillor D.L. Birkmaier  
Councillor H. Langlois  
Councillor P. Roe

**1. Communications to Council**

**From: Eric Olauson, Recreation Director  
Eastside Youth Centre Inc.**

**Date: September 4, 1996**

**Subject: Requesting a grant for the Eastside Youth Centre Inc.  
(File No. CK. 1870-1)**

---

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that no additional funding be provided to the Eastside Youth Centre Inc. beyond the \$10,000 Saskatchewan Lottery allocation already made, in that there are no sources of funding for this request; and
  - 2) that the issue of year-round youth centres be referred to the Administration for a feasibility report, including alternatives such as partnering.

Attached is a copy of the above-noted communication, which City Council considered at its meeting held on September 9, 1996 and referred to the Administration and Finance Committee for a report to Council at the next meeting.

Your Committee met with Mr. Pat Bitz, President, Eastside Youth Centre Inc. at its meeting held on September 16, 1996 and determined that the drop-in centre is valuable to the communities that it serves, and commends the Board of Directors for every effort in making this a successful venture.

The summer youth centre that was operated by the Leisure Services Department in this area was discontinued to avoid a duplication of services, and the funding was used in another program. Unfortunately, there is no excess funding available from the Leisure Services Department's Youth Centre Program or any other grant program to satisfy this request. The funding from Saskatchewan Lotteries was adjudicated by the Leisure Services Department, and the Eastside Youth Centre received \$10,000 this year.

*Moved by Councillor Steernberg,*



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 33**

- 1) *that no additional funding be provided to the Eastside Youth Centre Inc. beyond the \$10,000 Saskatchewan Lottery allocation already made, in that there are no sources of funding for this request; and*
- 2) *that the issue of year-round youth centres be referred to the Administration for a feasibility report, including alternatives such as partnering.*

IN AMENDMENT

*Moved by Councillor Langford,*

- 3) *AND THAT the matter be referred to the Administration to determine whether it is feasible to accommodate the centre in another facility to reduce operating costs.*

*THE AMENDMENT WAS PUT AND CARRIED.  
THE MOTION AS AMENDED WAS PUT AND CARRIED.*

**2. Banking Services  
(File No. CK.1660-5)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the Banking Services Agreement with the Bank of Nova Scotia be extended for an additional two (2) years.

*ADOPTED.*

Your Committee has reviewed the following report of the General Manager, Finance Department, dated September 10, 1996 and supports the extension of the Banking Services Agreement:

**"BACKGROUND**

The City of Saskatoon's current Banking Services Agreement with the Bank of Nova Scotia was approved by City Council on October 12, 1993. The Banking Services Agreement covers a three- year period commencing January 1, 1994, with an option to extend the term of the agreement for an additional two years. The City of Saskatoon reserves the right to exercise its option to extend or terminate the current contract.

**JUSTIFICATION**

Discussions have been held with the Bank of Nova Scotia to determine the pricing schedule for the City's banking requirements for an additional two years, commencing January 1, 1997. The Bank of Nova Scotia has stated that there will be no change in service fees for the two year extension.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 34**

Contracted services provided to the City by the Bank of Nova Scotia have been excellent. The Bank of Nova Scotia has provided options to improve work flows and keeps the City abreast of developments in the banking industry. Some initiatives the Bank of Nova Scotia has helped implement include (1) Direct Debit services [TIPPs and utilities], (2) Direct Deposit [Payroll], (3) Interac technology, and (4) processing of utility bill payments, made at various financial institutions, utilizing Bank of Nova Scotia personnel.

**OPTIONS**

An alternative to the recommended action would involve the retendering of the Banking Services Agreement. This process would include the compilation, preparation, and distribution of a Request For Proposal and extensive analysis of submissions received.

A retendering of the Banking Services Agreement would not be the preferred course of action. The Bank of Nova Scotia had offered the most favourable fee schedule for banking services in 1993, eclipsing other pricing submissions by a substantial margin. The Bank of Nova Scotia agreed to fix the cost of banking services to the City for a period of five years. Furthermore, the time and cost of civic staff to re-tender the banking services contract would likely negate any service and/or price enhancements offered by prospective submissions.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

With service fees fixed for the additional two years, commencing January 1, 1997, there will be no financial impact to the City. However, the introduction of new technologies together with volume-driven pricing may impact banking charges."

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 35**

**REPORT NO. 1-1996 OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES -  
GENERAL SUPERANNUATION PLAN**

Composition of Committee

Councillor H. Langlois, Chair  
Councillor M. Heidt  
Mr. P. Richards  
Mr. F. Smith  
Mr. M. Baraniecki  
Mr. T. Graham  
Mr. W. Furrer  
Mr. L. Thiessen

**1. Appointment of Independent Trustee  
General Superannuation Plan  
(File No. CK. 1796-1)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that Mr. William Wallace be appointed as the independent Trustee on the Board of Trustees of the General Superannuation Plan for a period of three years.

*ADOPTED.*

As Council will recall, the General Superannuation Plan was approved as a trusteeed Plan under Clause 1, Report No. 8-1996 of the Executive Committee, at the meeting held on August 12, 1996. The Trust Agreement indicates, under Clause 6(1), as follows:

- (1) The trustees shall be comprised of nine persons appointed as follows:
  - (a) four persons shall be appointed by the City;
  - (b) four persons shall be appointed by the following employee organizations according to an agreement entered into by those organizations:
    - (i) Saskatoon Civic Employees' Union, Local 59 CUPE;
    - (ii) Saskatoon Civic Employees' Union, Local 47 CUPE;
    - (iii) Saskatoon Civic Employees' Union, Local 859 CUPE;
    - (iv) International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 319;
    - (v) Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 615;
    - (vi) Saskatoon Civic Employees' Union, Local 2669 CUPE;
    - (vii) City of Saskatoon Exempt Staff Association Inc.; and
  - (c) one person who shall not be an employee of the City, shall be appointed by the City for a three (3) year renewable term upon the recommendation of the

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 36**

Trustees appointed under (a) and (b). There shall be no limit upon the number of terms which may be served by a Trustee appointed under this clause.

The Board of Trustees has met to consider the appointment of an independent trustee, as outlined in (c) above, and has agreed to the appointment of Mr. William Wallace, who was previously a member of the Pension Administration Board and Fund Administration Committee.

**REPORT NO. 5-1996 OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Composition of Committee

Councillor D.L. Birkmaier, Chair  
Councillor D. Atchison  
Councillor H. Langlois  
Councillor P. McCann  
Councillor R. Steernberg  
His Worship the Mayor

- 1. Annual Audit of Financial Statements  
to December 31, 1995  
Deloitte & Touche  
(File No. CK. 1610-1)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*ADOPTED.*

Attached is a copy of a letter dated April 15, 1996 from the external auditors, Deloitte & Touche, in follow-up to their audit of the City's Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 1995. Your Committee reviewed this letter along with the following response from the Acting General Manager, Finance Department dated July 18, 1996, with representatives of Deloitte & Touche, and is satisfied that the appropriate steps have been taken to correct the errors identified:

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 37**

**BACKGROUND**

"It is the common practice of our external auditors, Deloitte & Touche, to provide the Administration and the Audit Committee with any observations they may have made regarding their annual review of the City of Saskatoon financial statements. Their observations, from their April 15, 1996 Management Letter, have been highlighted in this report along with our response to their recommendations.

**GST INPUT TAX CREDITS**

'During our review of capital projects, we noted instances where the GST input tax credit had either not been calculated or had been calculated incorrectly on the invoice. These instances resulted in missed input tax credits. Upon further investigation it was noted that the system in place to detect these errors was not fully functional.'

As part of our effort to ensure full recovery of any GST input tax credits, we have designed an exception report which is used to highlight expenditures where no tax credit, or an incorrect credit, was taken. While this procedure has been effective, the computer program had been changed during a conversion process, the result of which was the preparation of a report which did not take into account all possible input tax credit opportunities. This has subsequently been corrected and the reports have been re-run against the applicable files for the last three years, and all necessary documentation examined, to ensure that maximum GST credits have been applied.

**PENSION PLANS: FOREIGN CONTENT**

'The trustee of the various pension plan investments calculates the percentage of foreign content for each plan. During our review of these calculations, it was noted that US \$ cash was not being included. While the inclusion of the US \$ cash in each calculation did not result in a violation of the foreign content rules, in order to be accurate in this calculation, US \$ cash should be included.

We recommend the trustee be advised of the need to include US \$ cash in the foreign content calculation, in order that these calculations can be relied on to monitor the adherence to the foreign content rules.'

We will be providing each of the Pension Boards with a copy of the observation made by the auditors."

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 38**

**2. Comprehensive Audit  
Solid Waste Management  
(File No. CK. 1600-1)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the information be received.

*ADOPTED.*

Your Committee has met with representatives of the Environmental Services Department to review the following report of the Auditor General dated June 25, 1996 on the above matter, and supports the target implementation dates included in Implementation Plan of the Comprehensive Audit of the Solid Waste Management Program:

**"BACKGROUND**

At its meeting on January 2, 1996, Council dealt with the Comprehensive Audit: Solid Waste Management Report of the Audit Committee and resolved, in part:

- 3) that the Administration be instructed to add targeted implementation dates to the Implementation Plan and table a copy of the Implementation Plan with the Audit Committee on, or before the end of March 1996; and
- 4) that a public consultation program be included in the report referred to in 3) above.'

This report has been delayed because target dates in the Implementation Plan hinged on initiating a number of the Audit Report recommendations. One of the most significant recommendations of the Audit Report was the preparation of the Solid Waste Management Master Plan (SWMMP). Because of the enormity of this recommendation, a separate project outline was required. This outline was submitted to Council in February. In addition, a number of the Audit Report recommendations required funding through the operating budget. After Council debate the operating budget funding was lost and thus the need for changes to the Implementation Plan.

**DISCUSSION**

**Implementation Plan**

The implementation Plan dealing with the operating components and the financial systems of Solid Waste Management are included in the attachments. Also included is the project outline of the SWMMP which incorporates many of the recommendations of the Audit Report (e.g. stake holder input).

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 39**

**Public Consultation Program**

Public consultation, or better public involvement in public decision making, is an ongoing, specialized, and situation specific process.

- Ongoing, in that dialogue with the community must be maintained to educate, inform, and obtain input from stake holders.
- Specialized, in that as a member of Council correctly pointed out, the process should be left to communications consultants, not engineers.
- Situation specific, in that some decisions require public input, some require public acceptance, and some require public involvement in the decision making process.

In each case, a very different approach is required. In each case the resources required for success can be significantly different.

Public consultation generally involves the organized public (agencies, associations, special interest groups) and the unorganized general public. Stake holder input from the organized public is a major component in the SWMMP project. Stake holder involvement from the organized public can generally be accomplished with relative ease and with minimal resources. The following program is included in the outline of the SWMMP project and is currently proceeding:

- Stake holders have been provided with copies of the outline of the SWMMP for review and input (e.g. Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management, Saskatchewan Environmental Society, Saskatchewan Waste Materials Exchange, Saskatchewan Eco Network, Saskatchewan Waste Reduction Council, Saskatoon Environmental Advisory Council, Meewasin Valley Authority, Cosmopolitan Industries, Sarcan, Laidlaw Waste Systems, Perry Waste Disposal, Committee Members of the Regional Waste Management Project). As various investigations outlined in the SWMMP are completed, the findings will be circulated for review and input.
- A Waste Minimization Coordinator has been appointed and is currently cataloguing and defining the scope of all recycling programs available to the community. Working relationships with recycling firms and waste reduction associations have been established. Contacts will be established with community associations, school groups, and public service clubs.
- The conversion of the downtown collection system has included soliciting input from downtown merchants prior to finalizing the program.
- The Regional Waste Management Project (RWMP) Committee was established in 1992 to ensure that a wide range of public input was reflected in the planning process of that project. Consultation with the Committee will continue.
- The results of the SWMMP studies will give substance to available waste

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 40**

management options. An accurate projection of the landfill's useful life will help to provide direction for decommissioning and post closure operations. Sound projections of future waste generation will result in conceptual designs of alternate management options. These options will be reviewed by the stake holders.

- Waste minimization options will be investigated and draft strategies will be prepared for review and input. Final strategies reflecting stake holder input will be presented to Council for approval.
- Studies outlined in the SWMMP will identify solid waste management strategies that will impact the design of a regional waste management centre. The RWMP Committee will have an opportunity to review and recommend on the findings.

Involvement of the general public (unorganized) is a more complex, time consuming, and costly process. Initially the public must become aware or become informed on all the issues. Following a well run information and education program, sound input can be obtained from the public via an appropriately designed process. Presently management can formulate alternate waste management strategies, however, a process for involving the general public in decision making is required.

**JUSTIFICATION**

Involving the organized public will not capture the position of all of the general public. If there is a commitment to a comprehensive public involvement process, resources must be made available. In order to involve the general public, an effective program normally includes three phases.

Phase I - An information and issue awareness campaign that would involve radio and newspaper ads, brochures, Internet, phone-in service, bill inserts, open houses, and presentations throughout the community. All information would be related to the SWMMP.

Phase II - A formal public consultative process relative to the studies included in the SWMMP project. A combination of telephone and written surveys, steering committees (e.g. Regina Round Table on Solid Waste Management), public meetings, presentations/reports circulated via libraries, Committees of Council, etc., would be used to dialogue on the issues.

Phase III - The final step is that of obtaining public direction for decision making. Regulatory constraints can limit the amount of decision making that can be shared; however, Council can decide the level of decision making it wishes to share with either organized groups and/or the unorganized public. At that point an appropriate public involvement process can be designed and implemented. Public involvement processes that include shared decision making generally require skilled and experienced facilitators.

The described three-phased program is normally designed by consulting firms possessing



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 41**

strengths in both communications and the technical field. There are currently a number of firms that specialize in waste management strategic planning, waste minimization and diversion project research, design and implementation, communications, and training. One of these firms, working in cooperation with the City's Communications Branch and the Solid Waste Management Branch, will ensure that a truly meaningful and ongoing public involvement process is established.

**OPTIONS**

There are really no options. Either there is commitment to a public involvement process or not. However, there are many options in the mechanics of public involvement. Through in-house design and implementation costs could be reduced. However, the savings would not likely be significant ( $\pm 10\%$ ). If the process is to be meaningful, there needs to be a thorough effort.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no policy implications.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The consultative approach currently underway with the organized public, will generate minimal costs in 1996 and can be tailored to meet 1997 budget limitations. A three phased general public involvement process will require more resources. Based on preliminary estimates of media component costs alone, the program would cost in the order of \$60,000. The Landfill Replacement Reserve, which has a current balance of \$316,000, and an annual provision of \$685,000, could serve as the source of funding.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. IV Implementation Plan
2. Project Outline for Solid Waste Management Master Plan"

Note: The Implementation Plan for the financial controls has not been included as an attachment due to the sensitive nature of this document.

**REPORT NO. 6-1996 OF THE LAND BANK COMMITTEE**

Composition of Committee

Councillor D. L. Birkmaier, Chair  
Councillor H. Langlois  
Councillor K. Waygood  
Councillor H. Heidt  
Councillor J. Postlethwaite

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 42**

His Worship the Mayor

- 1. Request to Purchase City-Owned Property  
Lot 31, Block 144, Plan No. 79-S-18673  
810 - 59th Street East, North Industrial Area  
Saskatoon Metal Manufacturing Ltd.  
File No. CK. 4215-1**

*THE ITEM WAS WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE CHAIR.*

- 2. Request to Sell City-Owned Residential Lots  
Lots 37 to 39, Block 452, Plan 86-S-41004  
Lots 40 to 57, Block 452, Plan 87-S-10852  
Lots A to C, Block 452, Plan 84-S-26865  
Lots 1 to 10, Block 454, Plan 87-S-10852  
Lewis Crescent, Westview Neighbourhood  
File No. CK. 4131-9**

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that the Land Manager be authorized to offer for sale through the lot draw process Lots 37 to 39, Block 452, Plan 86-S-41004, Lots 40 to 57, Block 452, Plan 87-S-10852, Lots A to C, Block 452, Plan 84-S-26865 and Lots 1 to 10, Block 454, Plan 87-S-10852 at the prices established in this report; and,
  - 2) that any of the above-noted lots which are not sold through the lot draw process be offered for sale over-the-counter, on a first-come, first served basis.

*ADOPTED.*

Your Committee reviewed the following report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department dated August 29, 1996 with the Land Branch Manager and supports the sale of the noted properties as outlined above. Upon consideration of this report, your Committee requested a response from the Administration with respect to whether there are any residential lots that are difficult to sell and might be used for "affordable" housing under the Social Housing Program:

**"BACKGROUND**

The Westview neighbourhood was initially subdivided in 1961. In 1986, the City subdivided and offered for sale 94 single-family lots within the neighbourhood in the area

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 43**

south of Richardson Road on Junor Avenue, Hall Crescent and Catherwood Avenue. In 1992 the prices on the remaining unsold lots were reduced and by the end of 1995 all reduced price lots offered for sale had been sold. Early in 1996, a further 16 lots (serviced in 1986) were offered for sale. To date, three of the lots have been sold.

**REPORT**

Your staff intend to offer for sale 34 lots located on Lewis Crescent (Attachment #1). These lots were partially serviced in 1986 and have never been offered for sale. The surface improvements were constructed in 1996 to take advantage of the services already in the ground and to continue our policy of having an adequate inventory of serviced residential lots. In keeping with our current sales' practice, the lots will be offered for sale to both individuals and builders through a lot draw process. Any lots that are not sold through this process will be offered for sale over-the-counter, on a first-come, first-served basis.

Prices for new lots are calculated using the approved prepaid service rates, a land rate and the approved land administration fee percentage. By applying a selling price of \$1,975.00 per front metre to the lots located on Lewis Crescent, the price for a lot with 15.25 metres of frontage is as follows:

Selling Price 15.25 metres @ \$1975.00 per front metre =	\$30,118.75
Services =	\$25,451.36
Land =	2,860.27
Administration Fee =	<u>1,807.12</u>
Total =	\$30,118.75

These prices are substantially higher than the prices that have been charged in the area since 1992 when lot prices were reduced to stimulate sales. However, the full cost of providing services and administration will be collected for each of the lots and a deposit will be made to the Property Realized Reserve.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Plan showing lots to be offered for sale on Lewis Crescent."
3. **Request to Sell City-Owned Property**  
**Lots 46 to 61, Block 357**  
**Lots 36 to 61, Block 358**  
**Lots 1 to 9, Block 413**  
**Plan to be Registered**  
**Fairbrother Crescent, Avenue and Bay**  
**Silverspring Neighbourhood**  
**File No. CK. 4131-7**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 44**

- RECOMMENDATION:**
- 1) that the Land Manager be authorized to sell the 51 lots in the Silverspring Neighbourhood through a lot-draw process, at the prices which are outlined in this report;
  - 2) that any of the above-noted lots which are not sold through the lot-draw process be placed for sale, over the counter, on a first-come, first-served basis, and at the prices which are outlined in this report;
  - 3) that the Land Manager be authorized to administer development-controls for the 51 new lots located in the Fairbrother Subdivision within the Silverspring Neighbourhood, as a condition of sale, in accordance with the criteria outlined in this report.

*ADOPTED.*

Your Committee has reviewed the following report of the General Manager, Planning and Building Department dated August 29, 1996 on the above matter, with the Land Branch Manager, and has determined that the University of Saskatchewan approves the proposed lot prices, as outlined in the report:

**"BACKGROUND**

Under agreement with the University of Saskatchewan, the City has been developing and selling residential lots within the Silverspring neighbourhood since 1987. As of December 31, 1995, 416 lots have been sold in the neighbourhood. To the end of August 1996, we have sold another 139 lots and a further 111 building permits have been issued in Silverspring. This compares to 88 sales and 84 building permits for all of 1995. Our current unsold inventory stands at 15 lots.

**REPORT**

Your staff intend to offer for sale 51 new lots located in the Fairbrother area within the Silverspring neighbourhood (see Attachment #1). These lots constitute the first phase of this new development which began in the summer of 1996. All 51 lots will be offered for sale to both individuals and builders through a lot-draw process. Any lots that are not sold through this process will be made available for purchase over-the-counter on a first-come, first-served basis.

**Pricing**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL**

**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996**

**PAGE 45**

Prices for residential lots are established using the approved prepaid service rates, a land rate and the approved land administration fee. Using this criteria the combined front metre charge is calculated between \$2350.00 and \$2700.00 per front metre, depending upon the location of the lot on the crescent or cul-de-sac. Lot sizes range from 15 metres to 18 metres of frontage. Therefore, prices will range between \$35,000.00 and \$48,000.00 depending upon the frontage of the lot and whether it is located on the crescent or cul-de-sac. These prices are approximately 8% higher than the prices established for Phase I of the Laycoe area last year. Using the example of a lot with 15.0 metres of frontage and applying a front metre charge of \$2350.00, the breakdown of the sales price is follows:

Crescent Lot                      15.0 metres @ \$2350.00 per front metre =      \$35,250.00

Services =	\$23,850.00
Land =	9,285.00
Administration Fee =	<u>2,115.00</u>
Total =	\$35,250.00

Cul-de-sac Lot 15.5 metres @ \$2700.00 per front metre =      \$41,850.00

Services =	\$24,645.00
Land =	14,694.00
Administration Fee =	<u>2,511.00</u>
Total =	\$41,850.00

**Development Controls**

Consistent with the manner in which Phase I and Phase II of Laycoe Crescent were offered for sale, development-controls will be administered as a condition of sale for the 51 new lots. These controls would apply to both individuals and builders as follows:

- All dwellings must be constructed with an attached garage.
- The minimum size for a bungalow, bi-level, or split-level dwelling will be 1,000 square feet. The minimum size for a two-storey dwelling will be 1,500 square feet.

These controls reflect the current industry standard. They provide a degree of confidence to new home buyers and existing residents that there will be a consistency to the new homes that will be constructed. The controls will apply to both individuals and builders constructing in the subdivision.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Plan showing 51 lots in Fairbrother area."

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 46**

Composition of Committee

His Worship the Mayor, Chair  
Councillor D. Atchison  
Councillor D. L. Birkmaier  
Councillor M. Heidt  
Councillor A. Langford  
Councillor H. Langlois  
Councillor P. McCann  
Councillor J. Postlethwaite  
Councillor P. Roe  
Councillor R. Steernberg  
Councillor K. Waygood

**1. Appointment to Development Appeals Board  
(File No. CK. 175-21)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** that Ms. Katherine Rawlyk be appointed to the Saskatoon Development Appeals Board, to the end of 1997, to replace Ms. Jill Harriman.

*ADOPTED.*

There is a vacancy on the Development Appeals Board, due to the resignation of Ms. Jill Harriman."

*Moved by Councillor Postlethwaite, Seconded by Councillor McCann,*

*THAT the report of the Committee of the Whole be adopted.*

*CARRIED.*

**MOTIONS**

Report of the City Clerk:

"Councillor Postlethwaite gave the following Notice of Motion at the meeting of City Council held on September 9, 1996:

'TAKE NOTICE that at the next regular meeting of City Council, I will move the following motion:

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 47**

"THAT the City Hall Cafeteria be deemed smoke-free as soon as possible to set an example instead of providing sanctuary for smokers whose own places of employment prefer to be smoke-free.""

*Moved by Councillor Postlethwaite, Seconded by Councillor Birkmaier,*

*THAT the City Hall Cafeteria be deemed smoke-free as soon as possible to set an example instead of providing sanctuary for smokers whose own places of employment prefer to be smoke-free.*

*IN AMENDMENT*

*Moved by Councillor Langford, Seconded Roe,*

*AND THAT the cafeteria become smoke-free when the new contract is signed in May of 1997.*

*THE AMENDMENT WAS PUT AND CARRIED.  
THE MOTION AS AMENDED WAS PUT AND CARRIED  
AS FOLLOWS:*

*YEAS: Councillors Langford, McCann, Postlethwaite, Roe,  
Waygood and Birkmaier*

*6*

*NAYS: His Worship the Mayor, Councillors Atchison, Langlois,  
Steernberg and Heidt*

*5*

*Moved by Councillor Postlethwaite,*

*THAT the meeting stand adjourned.*

*CARRIED.*

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

---

Mayor

---

City Clerk

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1996  
PAGE 48**