



Committee of the Whole Minutes

June 9, 2025, 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers
Whitby Town Hall

Present: Mayor Roy
Councillor Bozinovski
Councillor Leahy
Councillor Lee
Councillor Lundquist
Councillor Mulcahy
Councillor Shahid
Councillor Yamada

Regrets: Councillor Cardwell

Also Present: M. Gaskell, Chief Administrative Officer
M. Hickey, Fire Chief
S. Klein, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
J. Long, Head of Organizational Effectiveness
J. Romano, Commissioner of Community Services
F. Santaguida, Commissioner of Legal and Enforcement
Services/Town Solicitor
R. Saunders, Commissioner of Planning and Development
F. Wong, Commissioner of Financial Services/Treasurer
M. Dodge, Executive Advisor to the Mayor
C. Harris, Town Clerk
C. Des Granges, Legislative Specialist - Elections, Policy and
Project Management
H. Ellis, Council and Committee Coordinator
L. MacDougall, Council and Committee Coordinator (Recording
Secretary)

1. Call To Order: The Mayor

2. Call of the Roll: The Clerk
3. Declarations of Conflict of Interest

There were no declarations of conflict of interest.

4. Consent Agenda
5. Planning and Development

Councillor Lee assumed the Chair.

5.1 Presentations

5.1.1 Gene Chartier and Heather Hector representing Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited (Virtual Attendance)

Re: PDE 09-25, Planning and Development (Engineering) Services
Department Report
Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines

Refer to Item 5.4.5, PDE 09-25

Gene Chartier and Heather Hector, representing Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, provided a PowerPoint presentation. Highlights of the presentation included:

- details about the Project Work Plan including Part 1: Research and Policy Development, Part 2: Traffic Calming Guide: and Part 3: Community and Stakeholder Engagement;
- the purpose of the proposed Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines;
- the definition and goals of traffic calming measures;
- details about the policy, table of contents and structure, and traffic calming criteria;
- detailed information about the five-step Traffic Calming Study process;
- the recommended Traffic Calming Guidelines including its purpose, the development of a traffic calming plan, the toolkit of traffic calming measures, and the design considerations; and,

- the next steps including receiving and reviewing feedback from the public, refining the policy, and presenting the recommended policy and guidelines.

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee, Mr. Chartier, and Ms. Hector regarding:

- confirmation that a petition with 60 percent support from at least 50 percent of eligible households would be required to consider implementation of traffic calming measures;
- processes in other municipalities that have worked well to ensure accurate survey results from residents;
- how traffic data could be used to determine the need for traffic calming measures;
- whether reducing the number of speed humps on a street would increase the risk of not meeting the target speed, and the distance between and number of speed humps needed to keep vehicles at the target speed;
- whether there were other traffic calming measures that would reduce the average speed as effectively as speed humps;
- addressing concerns about the increase in emergency response time due to traffic calming measures such as speed humps;
- the anticipated timeline for completion of the five-step Traffic Calming Study process;
- confirmation that the six-step decision process and comparison matrix was to assist in selecting the appropriate traffic calming measures;
- following the removal of traffic calming measures on a street, the average amount of time required for a street to be eligible for consideration of new traffic calming measures in other municipalities; and,
- the rationale for the proposed Traffic Calming Request Form.

5.2 Delegations

5.2.1 Jim Dickson, Resident (In-Person Attendance)

Re: PDE 06-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report
Whitburn Street, Consideration of Traffic Calming Adjustments

Refer to Item 5.4.2, PDE 06-25

Jim Dickson and Mitch Martin, Residents, appeared before the Committee and stated that the installation of speed humps on Whitburn Street was due to the construction on Brock Street north of Rossland Road. Mr. Dickson advised that the increase in traffic and vehicles speeding in the neighbourhood has subsided since the completion of construction. Mr. Dickson stated that the results of the survey indicated that 70 percent of respondents wanted the number of speed humps reduced or removed. Mr. Dickson noted the cost to remove the speed humps and inquired whether the cost of \$7,500 was for the removal of all speed humps or one speed hump. He stated that a speed hump located at 111/113 Whitburn Street was removed, noting that he was advised that the removal of the speed hump was due to the speed hump sinking. Mr. Dickson indicated that there were 492 roads maintained by the Town with a total of 108 speed humps and that 8 of those speed humps were located on Whitburn Street. He stated that he has to drive over the speed humps daily and that his vehicles have sustained damage due to the speed humps. Mr. Dickson requested that Council approve the removal of the speed humps on Whitburn Street.

A brief question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee, Mr. Dickson, and Mr. Martin regarding whether the preference was to remove all of the speed humps on Whitburn Street, and confirmation that Mr. Dickson does not reside on Whitburn Street.

5.2.2 Bernie Pyra, Resident (In-Person Attendance)

Re: PDE 06-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report
Whitburn Street, Consideration of Traffic Calming Adjustments

Refer to Item 5.4.2, PDE 06-25

Bernie Pyra, Resident, appeared before the Committee and stated that it was critical for the speed humps to remain in place for the safety of residents, noting that younger families with children have moved onto Whitburn Street and that it was important to maintain slower speeds and lower traffic volumes. He stated there has been a decrease in speed and volume of traffic since the installation of the speed humps in 2023. Mr. Pyra noted that there has been a 14 percent reduction in vehicles on Whitburn Street per day, and that the 85th percentile speed was reduced from 58 km/h to 42 km/h between 2020 and 2023. He noted that Report PDE 06-25 indicated that the speed limit on Whitburn Street was reduced from 50 km/h to 40 km/h, but that the speed limit posted on the north and south portions of Whitburn Street remained at 50 km/h.

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Mr. Pyra regarding:

- whether the delegate was part of the consultation process when the speed humps were initially installed;
- whether the construction on Brock Street had an impact on the traffic volume and vehicle speeds on Whitburn Street;
- confirmation that the delegate resides on Whitburn Street and that there was a speed hump in close proximity to his property; and,
- whether the delegate has received any feedback from his neighbours regarding maintaining or removing the speed humps.

5.2.3 Christine Burns, Resident (Virtual Attendance)

Re: PDE 06-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report
Whitburn Street, Consideration of Traffic Calming Adjustments

Refer to Item 5.4.2, PDE 06-25

Christine Burns, Resident, was not in attendance when called upon to provide a delegation.

5.2.4 Kirsty March, Resident (In-Person Attendance)

Re: PDE 06-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report
Whitburn Street, Consideration of Traffic Calming Adjustments

Refer to Item 5.4.2, PDE 06-25

Kirsty March, Resident, appeared before the Committee and stated that she was not a resident of Whitburn Street but the only way to enter and exit her street was via Whitburn Street. Ms. March advised that her children take the school bus on Whitburn Street. She stated that her priority was safety, noting that the speed humps have worked to reduce traffic speed and volume. She stated that about a year prior to the installation of the speed humps three vehicles went off the road due to unsafe driving which has not occurred following the installation of the speed humps. Ms. March advised that the neighbourhood around Whitburn Street consisted of young families and elderly residents. She noted that removing the speed humps on Whitburn Street would require 13 percent of the allocated budget for traffic calming initiatives for 2025. She stated that it was difficult to comprehend the rationale for using the traffic calming budget funds to remove effective traffic calming measures that have increased safety in the community. She questioned the results of the survey regarding the speed humps noting that there was not any verification of the respondents, and that there were 98 respondents that supported the removal of speed humps even though Whitburn Street only has 77 homes. She inquired about the threshold for the removal of speed humps within the proposed Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines.

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Ms. March regarding:

- whether the delegate feels safer due the installation of the speed humps;
- whether the delegate's friends living on Whitburn Street want a reduction in or removal of the speed humps; and,
- confirmation that Whitburn Street was the only way in and out of Briargreen Court, and whether the delegate has sustained damage to her vehicle due to the speed humps.

5.2.5 Michael Jefferies, Resident (In-Person Attendance)

Re: PDE 06-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report
Whitburn Street, Consideration of Traffic Calming Adjustments

Refer to Item 5.4.2, PDE 06-25

Michael Jefferies, Resident, appeared before the Committee and stated that he has lived on Briargreen Court for ten years. He advised that he has two young children that regularly use Whitburn Street for various reasons. Mr. Jefferies noted that prior to the installation of speed humps, Whitburn Street was used as a bypass from Taunton Road to Rossland Road, noting that motorists would drive at high speeds. He stated that the traffic calming measures have reduced the volume of traffic using Whitburn Street as a bypass. Mr. Jefferies indicated that removal of the speed humps would turn Whitburn Street into a busier road which would be dangerous and would not be beneficial to the community. He stated that the safety of children should not be at risk due to residents inconvenienced by slowing down as they drive through a family neighbourhood. Mr. Jefferies stated that a study was undertaken with recommendations to install the speed humps on Whitburn Street, and inquired about the Town's liability for ignoring safety studies and removing traffic calming measures knowing the number of vehicles and speed of motorists using the street. He advised that there was a cost to install the speed humps and that the cost to remove the speed humps could be used for other priorities of the Town. Mr. Jefferies advised that the speed limit posted on portions of Whitburn Street was 50 km/h. He stated that the speed humps should not be removed.

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Mr. Jefferies regarding:

- confirmation that the delegate was not a resident of Whitburn Street, but that using Whitburn Street was the only way out of his street;
- whether his vehicle has sustained damage due to the speed humps; and,
- whether the delegate was advised about the study undertaken on Whitburn Street prior to the installation of the speed humps.

5.2.6 Paul Mason, Resident (In-Person Attendance)

Re: PDE 08-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report
Garden Street Lay-by Parking

Refer to Item 5.4.4, PDE 08-25

Paul Mason, Resident, appeared before the Committee and stated that in 2020 he received correspondence from the Town indicating that traffic signals would be installed and on-street parking on Garden Street would be removed. He stated that the solution offered at that time was to park on Collette Drive and Hyland Street. He advised that in 2024 the Town presented options for the residents on Garden Street to vote on new parking alternatives, noting that the majority of residents chose Option 2, lay-by parking on the west side of Garden Street which was recommended to Council at the Committee of the Whole meeting on March 3, 2025. Mr. Mason stated that Staff were currently proposing four options, noting that Option 1 was the same parking recommendation made five years ago that the residents of Garden Street, Collette Drive and the surrounding area did not support and should not be considered. He stated that moving forward with a phased in approach with the lay-by parking would only delay the project further with a potential increase in cost. He stated that Option 4 exceeded the original goal of 16 parking spaces. He noted the increase in cost for Option 4 over a period of approximately one year. Mr. Mason advised that Options 2 and 3 provide parking spaces below the original goal. He suggested that a new design with the 16 original parking spaces or a parking lot between the two sets of homes on Garden Street should be considered. Mr. Mason noted that residents requested that on-street parking on Garden Street not be removed until a parking alternative has been constructed, noting that it would be unfair to residents not to have any parking options.

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Mr. Mason regarding:

- the number of parking spaces on the delegate's property, and whether the delegate currently parks his vehicle on Garden Street; and,

- whether the delegate would be comfortable with proceeding with Option 3.

5.2.7 Sarah Darbani, Resident (In-Person Attendance)

Re: PDE 09-25, Planning and Development (Engineering) Services
Department Report
Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines

Refer to Item 5.4.5, PDE 09-25

Sarah Darbani, Resident, appeared before the Committee and stated that she was advocating for the installation of speed humps on Christine Elliott Avenue. She stated that Christine Elliott Avenue was a collector road, but that it functions as a major connector road. Ms. Darbani advised that Christine Elliott Avenue links Country Lane and Cochrane Street and runs parallel to Taunton Road which was one of the busiest corridors in Durham Region. She stated that the eastern edge of Christine Elliott Avenue was anchored by Thermea Spa, noting that Thermea Spa has approximately 500 visitors per day Monday to Friday and up to 1,000 visitors per day on Saturday and Sunday. Ms. Darbani indicated that there was a significant and consistent influx of traffic passing through the residential community. Ms. Darbani advised that Christine Elliott Avenue was used as a detour due to traffic congestion on Taunton Road. She stated that there were approximately 85 children living on Christine Elliott Avenue that walk to bus stops during peak traffic hours. Ms. Darbani stated that they have roundabouts in the neighbourhood which are intended to calm traffic but they often do the opposite. She advised that she had reviewed traffic data for Christine Elliott Avenue and cited the data on the number of vehicles and the 85th percentile speed. Ms. Darbani stated that speed humps provide protection creating a neighbourhood where children can play safely and where motorists drive appropriately in a residential area.

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Ms. Darbani regarding:

- whether the traffic data that the delegate cited was provided by Town Staff;

- whether the delegate would be willing to lead engagement with residents to obtain the percentage of support required to initiate a traffic calming review;
- whether the delegate resides on Christine Elliott Avenue; and,
- whether residents on Christine Elliott Avenue support the implementation of traffic calming measures on the street.

5.3 Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

5.4 Staff Reports

5.4.1 PDE 05-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services) Department Report

Re: Update to Traffic By-law 8059-24, Stop Control

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- confirmation that the requests for increased stop control noted in Report PDE 05-25 were based on complaints received from residents, and whether there were other streets in Whitby where requests for all-way stops have been received;
- confirmation that there were not any other commitments for the 2025 Traffic Signage and Pavement Markings budget, and that there would not be any pavement markings for crosswalks at the intersections for the all-way stop controls;
- notifying the Durham Regional Police Service of the new four-way stop control intersections; and,
- whether there were any residents in the East Ward requesting stop signs and whether they could be included with the intersections noted in Report PDE 05-25.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Council approve the proposed amendment to the Traffic By-law 8059-24 to incorporate changes to Schedule “N” of the By-law, as identified in Attachment 1; and,
2. That a by-law to amend By-law 8059-24 be brought forward for the consideration of Council.

Carried

5.4.2 PDE 06-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report

Re: Whitburn Street, Consideration of Traffic Calming Adjustments

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- whether there was a past report from Staff regarding the speed hump on Whitburn Street that was removed due to it sinking;
- verification of survey respondents by household in the future through the proposed Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines;
- confirmation that the cost of removing the speed humps on Whitburn Street would impact the funding to install speed humps on other streets in Whitby in 2025;
- whether removing speed humps installed on Whitburn Street would increase the liability of the Town;
- confirmation that the traffic data collected in 2020 was prior to the installation of the speed humps on Whitburn Street and whether it could be used as a comparison to the traffic data that was collected in 2023/2024;
- deferring the consideration of Report PDE 06-25 to the June 23, 2025 Council meeting to allow the Ward Councillor to participate in the discussion and consideration of the report;
- whether the survey provided an option for a reduction in the number of speed humps on Whitburn Street;
- the rationale for not installing speed humps in front Jack Miner Public School; and,

- the minimum and maximum distance between speed humps for installation on a road.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. The Report PDE 06-25 be received for information; and,
2. That future requests to modify the traffic calming measures on Whitburn Street be referred to the process outlined in the future Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines.

Note: The disposition of this matter was determined through the referral motion below.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Lundquist

That consideration of Report PDE 06-25 be referred to the June 23, 2025 Council meeting.

	For	Against	Conflict
Mayor Roy	X		
Councillor Bozinovski	X		
Councillor Leahy		X	
Councillor Lee	X		
Councillor Lundquist	X		
Councillor Mulcahy	X		
Councillor Shahid	X		
Councillor Yamada		X	
Results	6	2	0

Carried on a Recorded Vote (6 to 2)

It was the consensus of the Committee to hear Item 5.4.4, PDE 08-25, at this time.

5.4.3 PDE 07-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report

Re: E-scooter and E-bike By-law

A question and answer period ensued between Members of
Committee and Staff regarding:

- confirmation that e-bikes and e-scooters would be permitted on multi-use-paths (MUPs) and park trails in Whitby as long as they meet the weight and speed requirements, and that other micromobility devices such as electric hoverboards, skateboards and unicycles were not permitted on MUPs and park trails in Whitby;
- the challenges associated with enforcement of micromobility devices and whether other municipalities were successful in the enforcement of these micromobility devices;
- concerns about the weight restriction of 55 kg for e-bikes permitted on MUPs and park trails;
- communication to the public about the modes of transportation permitted on sidewalks;
- the rationale for choosing restrictions on weight versus classification for micromobility devices such as e-bikes; and,
- whether there were any exemptions for accessibility vehicles in the proposed by-law.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

That the proposed E-scooter and E-bike By-law appended to this Report as Attachment 4 be brought forward for the consideration of Council.

Carried

5.4.4 PDE 08-25, Planning and Development (Engineering Services)
Department Report

Re: Garden Street Lay-by Parking

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- confirmation that 13 parking spaces was the maximum number of parking spaces that could be provided to remain within budget;
- the timeline to complete the implementation of Option 3;
- confirmation that the traffic signals located at the extension of Dunlop Street and Garden Street would be activated in the fall of 2025;
- concerns about vehicles visiting the homes on the east side of Garden Street parking on streets on the west side of Garden Street creating an overflow of parking on those streets; and,
- the opportunity to implement Option 3 and observe whether on-street parking was impacting the adjacent neighbourhood to determine whether additional parking was needed.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Staff Report PDE 08-25 be received;
2. That Council direct staff to proceed Option 3 of the Garden Street Lay-by design, as outlined in Staff Report PDE 08-25, which includes an Intersection Pedestrian Signal at Colette Drive and parking north and south of Colette Drive; and,
3. That a 2025 Capital Project be established for the construction of Garden Street Lay-by Parking (Option 3) project, in the amount of \$609,500, funded \$304,750 from the Development Charges Roads Reserve Fund and \$304,750 from the Growth Reserve Fund.

Carried later in the meeting (See following motions)

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Lundquist

That the motion for the previous question be called.

Carried

The main motion was then carried, as follows:

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Staff Report PDE 08-25 be received;
2. That Council direct staff to proceed Option 3 of the Garden Street Lay-by design, as outlined in Staff Report PDE 08-25, which includes an Intersection Pedestrian Signal at Colette Drive and parking north and south of Colette Drive; and,
3. That a 2025 Capital Project be established for the construction of Garden Street Lay-by Parking (Option 3) project, in the amount of \$609,500, funded \$304,750 from the Development Charges Roads Reserve Fund and \$304,750 from the Growth Reserve Fund.

	For	Against	Conflict
Mayor Roy	X		
Councillor Bozinovski		X	
Councillor Leahy	X		
Councillor Lee	X		
Councillor Lundquist	X		
Councillor Mulcahy	X		
Councillor Shahid	X		
Councillor Yamada	X		
Results	7	1	0

Carried on a Recorded Vote (7 to 1)

5.4.5 PDE 09-25, Planning and Development (Engineering) Services
Department Report

Re: Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- whether there was any flexibility with respect to the minimum threshold to initiate a Traffic Calming Study process;
- the opportunity for Council to provide further feedback when the Final Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines were presented to Council in the fall;
- the opportunity to re-evaluate the proposed Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines should there not be any streets that meet the 51 percent threshold within a one-year timeline;
- concerns about the timeline for eligibility to request new traffic calming measures following removal of traffic calming measures on the same street;
- whether the annual allocated budget could be utilized for prioritizing the implementation of traffic calming measures on streets in front of parks and schools should there not be any streets considered for traffic calming measures;
- the timeline to complete the five-step Traffic Calming Study process;
- whether the initiation of the Traffic Study process would be led by Staff or residents;
- concerns about the shift in focus on the implementation of traffic calming measures in the vicinity of parks and schools;
- the timelines for the implementation of speed humps for streets currently on the traffic calming list;
- confirmation that the streets on the traffic calming list would be expedited following the approval of the Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines; and,
- the priority for the implementation of traffic calming measures on Christine Elliott Avenue.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That the proposed Draft Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines attached in Attachment 1 and Attachment 2 be received for information; and,
2. That staff consider the input received by Council and the Community and bring forward the Final Traffic Calming Policy and Guidelines in the fall.

Carried

It was the consensus of the Committee to hear Item 5.4.3, PDE 07-25, at this time.

5.5 New and Unfinished Business - Planning and Development

There was no new and unfinished business.

6. General Government

Councillor Lundquist assumed the Chair.

6.1 Presentations

There were no presentations.

6.2 Delegations

There were no delegations.

6.3 Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

6.4 Staff Reports

6.4.1 CAO 11-25, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer Report

Re: Hotel Feasibility Study

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee, Mr. Shi, HVS Consulting & Valuation Services, and Staff regarding:

- whether the occupancy penetration index in 2023 at 100.4 percent indicated that there was enough demand for a new hotel in Whitby;
- the rationale for the three previous potential hotels in Whitby not being developed;

- the possibility of partnering a hotel with the Canada Event Centre located in the Canada Christian College at 300 Water Street;
- whether north Whitby was considered as a location for a hotel/conference centre; and,
- the feedback received from property owners and hotel owners.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Report CAO 11-25 Hotel Feasibility Study be received for information; and,
2. That Council endorse Attachment 2 of this report to support staff in advancing and promoting the proposed hotel and conference centre in the Town of Whitby.

Carried

6.4.2 CAO 12-25, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer Report

Re: 2025 Economic Development Strategy Update

A brief question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding Staff resources to support the remaining actions in the Economic Development Strategy and whether any new positions would be requested as part of the 2026 budget process.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Report CAO 12-25 be received for information; and,
2. That Council approve the recommended updates to the Economic Development Strategy.

Carried

6.4.3 CAO 13-25, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer Report

Re: Update on Provincially Owned Employment Lands

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and staff regarding:

- confirmation that Staff's focus with the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) would be on Site 1 and Site 2 for development opportunities, and confirmation that Site 1 and Site 2 were serviced; and,
- whether other developable lands were available in Whitby should the MTO lands not be released.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

That Report CAO 13-25 be received for information.

Carried

6.4.4 CLK 04-25, Office of the Town Clerk Report

Re: Amendments to the Records Classification and Retention By-law

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Lundquist

1. That Report CLK 04-25 of the Office of the Town Clerk be received for information; and,
2. That the Clerk be directed to bring forward a by-law to repeal By-law #7707-20 and replace it with the draft Records Classification & Retention By-law substantially in the form appended as Attachment # 1 to Report CLK 04-25.

Carried

6.4.5 CMS 08-25, Community Services Department Report

Re: Gateway Removal Grant - Pilot Program

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- the possibility of removing more than two decorative masonry features as part of the Gateway Removal Grant Pilot Program;
- whether utilizing funds from the Capital Project for Fence Replacement for the removal of decorative masonry features would impact the amount of fencing installed in 2026; and,
- the rationale for the Town's cost cap of 50%, or \$14,000.00 for the removal of decorative masonry features.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Report CMS 08-25 be received for information;
2. That Council approve the Gateway Removal Grant: One-Year Pilot Program, as outlined in Staff Report CMS 08-25, and direct Staff to implement this program commencing in the first quarter of 2026;
3. That staff report back with the results of the program and recommendations on continuation or conclusion of the one-year grant pilot program; and,
4. That NUB Item #GG-0039 "That Staff be directed to report back on the opportunity for a grant program for homeowners to offset their costs of removing gateway and masonry features and columns located on private property prior to the introduction of the 2026 Strong Mayor Budget" be removed from the New and Unfinished Business Listing.

Carried

6.4.6 CMS 09-25, Community Services Department Report

Re: Commemorative Waterfront Dedication Feature Report

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- sourcing materials that were low maintenance to upkeep and that provide protection from vandalism; and,

- the opportunity to have different options for the size of the commemorative plates and pricing them accordingly.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Report CMS 09-25 be received;
2. That Council approve the installation of metal plaques of a nautical or fish theme, to be selected by Staff, with the plaques to be affixed to the existing railing along Lions Promenade as a waterfront dedication feature; and,
3. That GG-0035, related to staff investigating the installation of a commemorative dedication feature at the waterfront, be removed from the New and Unfinished Business List.

Carried

6.4.7 LS 08-25, Legal and Enforcement Services Department Report

Re: Proposed New Fence By-law

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- the rationale for the \$350.00 fee versus the \$500.00 fee for a Fence By-law Exemption request and how the fees and recovery of Town costs were determined;
- whether the four outstanding Fence By-law Exemption requests have been resolved;
- whether a Fence By-law Exemption request for a fence over three metres in height would be presented to Council for consideration; and,
- whether a decision of the Municipal Licensing and Standards Committee would be the final decision.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That report LS-08-25 be received for information;

2. That the proposed new Fence By-law, be brought forward to Council on October 6, 2025 for consideration and adoption, substantially in accordance with Attachment #1 to this Report;
3. That Council grant delegated authority for consideration of minor height exemptions (up to 10%) to the Commissioner of Legal and Enforcement Services/Town Solicitor;
4. That Council delegate the authority for consideration of additional height exemptions to the Municipal Licensing and Standards Committee in accordance with the Fence By-law Exemption Process outlined in Schedule "A" of the proposed New Fence By-law;
5. That the Clerk be directed to amend the Terms of Reference for the Municipal Licensing and Standards Committee to include consideration of Fence By-law Exemptions;
6. That staff be directed to bring forward a By-law to amend Fees and Charges By-law # 7220-17, as amended, for Minor Fence Height Exemptions and to add a new tier fee for Fence By-law Exemptions as noted in Section 5 of Report LS 08-25; and,
7. That item number GG-0038 be removed from the New and Unfinished Business List.

Carried

6.4.8 LS 09-25, Legal and Enforcement Services Department Report

Re: Proposed Traffic By-law amendment - Provisions to Address Chronic Repeat Offenders

A question and answer period ensued between Members of Committee and Staff regarding:

- whether there was an increase in the penalty costs or whether provisions for towing were being introduced for repeat offenders that meet a certain threshold;
- the threshold for determining when towing would occur; and,

- whether repeat offenders parked in school zones would be subject to the towing provisions.

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Leahy

1. That Report LS 09-25 be received for information;
2. That the proposed amendments to the Town's Traffic By-law #8059-24, as amended, appended to this report as Attachment # 1 be brought forward to Council for consideration; and,
3. That the proposed amendment to the Town's Fees and Charges By-law #7220-17 appended to this Report as Attachment # 2 be brought forward to Council for consideration.

Carried

6.5 New and Unfinished Business - General Government

There was no new and unfinished business.

7. Adjournment

Recommendation:

Moved by Councillor Shahid

That the meeting adjourn.

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 10:52 p.m.