

REPORT TO THE 911 AD-HOC COMMITTEE

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Date of Report: June 12, 2015 | | Date of Meeting: June 16, 2015 | |
| Subject of Report: Further Research, Options Review & Public Consultation Strategy | | | |
| Recommendation: Staff recommend that the Committee prioritize three options for further review and that the process to implement the public consultation strategy begin. | | | |
| Report Prepared By: | |  Brittany Mulhern Manager of Development Services | |
| Departmental Approval: | |  Brittany Mulhern Manager of Development Services | |
| CAO Approval: | | Michael Dwyer Chief Administrative Officer | |

Context

At the May 19th 911 Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting the Committee directed staff to complete three tasks for the following meeting:

1. Conduct further research regarding duplicate road concerns' statistics, and year round versus seasonal versus vacant properties;
2. Provide and review the recommended options provided by the agencies that have been contacted; and
3. Provide a public consultation strategy.

This report focuses on those objectives.

Further Research

Staff have re-contacted the agencies to determine if they have statistics regarding negative occurrences experienced due to the duplicate "R", "O" and "B" private roads. All agencies noted that they do not keep statistics in this regard.

Additional research was also conducted regarding seasonal, year-round and vacant/other properties that may be impacted as part of a strategy to address the duplicate private roads. While staff were able to receive information from the United Counties related to MPAC's records for the use of the properties, this information may not be entirely accurate as to the actual use of the property and it is suggested that the information be used as approximations only rather than verified statistics. Charts outlining the information can be found below.

Duplicate "R" Roads & Impacted Properties

| "R" Roads | South Elmsley | | | | Bastard & South Burgess | | | |
|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | YRR | SR | V/O | TOTAL | YRR | SR | V/O | TOTAL |
| R1 | 21 | 10 | 5 | 36 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 13 |
| R2 | 17 | 23 | 2 | 42 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| R5 | 27 | 20 | 7 | 54 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| R6 | 20 | 6 | 9 | 35 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 21 |
| R7 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| R8 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 32 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| R9 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 22 | 5 | 16 | 11 | 32 |
| R10 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 21 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 12 |
| R12 | 27 | 32 | 7 | 66 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 154 | 128 | 51 | 333 | 29 | 55 | 39 | 120 |

Property Codes

YRR: Year Round Residential Properties SR: Seasonal Residential Properties V/O: Vacant / Other Properties

Figure 1: Duplicate "R" Roads broken down into property use categories

Duplicate "O" Roads & Impacted Properties

| "O" Roads | South Elmsley | | | | Bastard & South Burgess | | | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | YRR | SR | V/O | TOTAL | YRR | SR | V/O | TOTAL |
| O2 | 14 | 25 | 1 | 40 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| O3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| O4 | 21 | 13 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 46 | 2 | 85 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 15 |

Property Codes

YRR: Year Round Residential Properties SR: Seasonal Residential Properties V/O: Vacant / Other Properties

Figure 2: Duplicate "O" Roads broken down into property use categories

Duplicate "B" Roads & Impacted Properties

| "B" Roads | South Elmsley | | | | Bastard & South Burgess | | | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | YRR | SR | V/O | TOTAL | YRR | SR | V/O | TOTAL |
| B1 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 22 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12 |
| B2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 19 | 18 | 4 | 41 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 16 |

Property Codes

YRR: Year Round Residential Properties SR: Seasonal Residential Properties V/O: Vacant / Other Properties

Figure 3: Duplicate "B" Roads broken down into property use categories

This information suggests the following:

- Duplicate "R" Roads
 - Majority of properties in SE are year-round residential
 - Majority of properties in B&SB are seasonal residential
- Duplicate "O" Roads
 - Majority of properties in SE and in B&SB are seasonal residential
- Duplicate "B" Roads
 - The amount of properties within SE and B&SB being used for seasonal vs. year round is nearly equal

Options Review

A list of 6 options (some with variations within) has been provided based on a review of agency input, past reports and Committee suggestions. Within the options some clarifying points have been added along with a cost category. The costing, while very approximate at this stage, is broken up into three categories: 1 being on the lower scale of cost and 3 being on the higher scale of cost. It is important to note that should an option be chosen in the future, the costs of implementing the option would need to be considered within the future budgets as no funds have been allotted to address the duplicate roads in 2015.

Option 1: Rename all duplicate private roads

- A. Change road names to entirely new names along with correcting all civic numbers / sequences
 - Would resolve the duplicate road issues and address the branches
 - Category 2 Costing
- B. Change road names to entirely new names however keep original civic numbers
 - Would resolve the duplicate road issues however issues would remain with the existing branches as well as the issues with the civic numbers themselves
 - Category 1 Costing

Option 2: By Impact

- A. Rename the duplicate private roads that generate the least impact based on volume in each ward (i.e. roads with the least amount of properties impacted would be renamed)
 - With the exception of R9, this scenario would mean that only B&SB roads would be impacted

- Most recommended option by agencies
 - Category 2 Costing
- B. Rename the duplicate private roads that generate the most impact based on volume in each ward (i.e. roads with the most amount of properties impacted would be renamed)
- With the exception of R9, this scenario would mean that only SE roads would be impacted
 - Larger amount of properties would receive proper road names, along with proper civic numbers and sequencing.
 - Category 3 costing

Option 4: By Consent of Owners

- A. Duplicate road names are changed based on the amount of consenting property owners on each duplicate road
- Would ensure majority support of chosen option
 - Issue if majority on both roads voted equally
 - May not address issues with branches, nor proper civic addressing and sequencing
 - Would be difficult to determine costs until vote completed, and therefore difficult to budget for
 - Unknown Category Costing

Option 5: Rename all "R", "O" and "B" roads

- Would likely be the greatest material and staff cost
- Would resolve the duplicate road issues, address the branches at the same time and ensure proper civic numbers and sequencing for all properties
- Category 3 Costing

Option 6: Rename duplicate roads with only the Ward identifier added

- Would change current road names to South Elmsley R9 for example
- This was not a recommended option by any of the agencies contacted
- Would not address the branches off of the private roads
- Is seen as a common solution to duplicate road names in amalgamated municipalities (Kingston, South Frontenac)
- Property owners would still be required to change their address
- Category 1 Costing

Public Consultation Strategy

In order to gather public input regarding whichever options the Committee decides to prioritize for review move forward with it is recommended that the focus be as follows:

- Public Meeting
 - When: August, in order to encourage participation of both seasonal and year round residents.
 - Where: Portland Hall, due to the central location to the duplicate roads.
 - What: To inform property owners of the process thus far in addressing the duplicate roads and to gather feedback on suggested options.
- Notice of Meeting / Mail Outs
 - All potentially impacted properties on the duplicate roads should be contacted through individual mail to invite them to the public meeting.
 - Notice of the meeting placed on the Township website.

- Notice of the meeting sent to all relevant lake and road associations.
- Survey
 - Within the mail-outs a survey can be provided which would outline prioritized options as decided by the Committee for property owners to indicate their preference for.
 - The surveys would be developed by staff.
 - Respondents would be able to email, drop off in person at the Township office or bring the filled out survey to the public meeting.
 - Additional copies of the survey would be available at the public meeting for interested property owners.

Recommendation

Staff recommend that the Committee prioritize three options for further review and that the process to implement the public consultation strategy begin.

