Jackie, Jerri-Joanne

cc: Michael

Again, my sincere apologies for missing that meeting!!!

Few points I'd like to add, and open up for discussion (if I may)

First off, I am surprised to read that this checklist format was only implemented in October 2018, as my notes show that we received the final draft and approved it use back in July 2017.

However, that simply is what it is as we are all aware that the wheels of bureaucracy turn very slowly!

Positive that it is being used, and is being recognized as a valuable tool. (with examples of use)

Next is the comment about: What are we trying to achieve?

Re: am curious as to why this was even asked?

Background is that within my tenure on the committee, there were several of us that were (simply-put) inundated with email after email and site plan after site plan to "review" for accessibility compliance issues.

Yes, I agree that the AODA did legislate this level of check/review to the Advisory Committee, and yes the City is/was also mandated to provide training to the Advisory Committee to do this task in a professional manner. However reality is that the time required to review these often extremely complex site plans in a timely and effective manner was simply NOT practical for our committee (et al) to do within a monthly meeting.

Hence, time after time the sending of site-plans to the select few of our committee ,members was simply a rubber stamp requirement that the City did because they had to (versus wanted to). That, and for those times when we (mostly Michael D, and myself) did review the plans in great detail and did find errors or omissions those comments were NEVER acknowledged by staff as received and/or addressed!

Hence what WE were trying to achieve is a simple system that all site plans were to be systematically reviewed by, and one that our Committee would be confident in that required points were being recognized and addressed up front.

In other words when those site plans were sent to our committee members, and when those plans included this checklist (with all relevant points checked-off) the job of our members would be significantly easier and more effective!

And yes, this "plan" was discussed with, approved by, and supported by, the planning staff for approx. three years (first mtg April 2015) prior to the development of this final draft checklist. Hence, the question of "what are we trying to achieve" seems really out of sorts to me. (but maybe I'm reading to much into that)

Challenge comment: "difficult to compel" also raises my curiosity. Wonder what they meant by that? In that the ADA, AODA, and/or OBC requirements are clear and obvious, so to me they MUST comply. And this checklist with it's simplified format should be a clean tool to help enforce that. And/or a clean tool to show the reader aspects that are not applicable to the particular site plan review.

Re: submitter agrees to it, and signs off...so it is either done, or else. Versus being overlooked and accepted after the fact, as we pointed out many examples during my tenure.

QUESTIONS:

1) Between Oct 2018 and Oct 2019, did the reviewing members of our committee find the 49-required site-plan submissions (to them), all include this checklist? (expect answer yes, but am skeptical)

2) And if so, did those members (of our committee) find the completed checklist form valuable? (as if yes, then enough said and ignore much of above ranting)

Note: I am using the term submission intentionally, as I do not assume that site plan applications would have this tool available to them at that stage......but that's another day.

Jim Sanders