

Staff Report



To	Committee of the Whole
Service Area	Office of the Chief Administrative Officer
Date	Monday, March 7, 2022
Subject	797 Victoria Road North Debrief

Recommendation

1. That the report entitled 797 Victoria Road North Debrief dated Monday, March 7, 2022, be received by Council.
-

Executive Summary

Purpose of Report

To provide a debrief on 797 Victoria Road North by outlining the methodology used, the steps taken, and the continuous improvement opportunities for future heritage planning files.

Key Findings

Utilizing the eight disciplines (8D) problem solving methodology, the City's Executive Team has reviewed and identified gaps in process which will be remediated, ensuring there are no similar issues addressing heritage buildings in the future. Containment solutions have been implemented until permanent solutions are in place. An internal working group has been established consisting of staff in the Planning, Operations (By-law), Fire, Clerk's, and Legal Departments to implement permanent solutions.

There were four major contributing factors leading to the demolition of 797 Victoria Road North. Fourteen possible solutions are being evaluated by all departments involved in this file and solutions will be implemented.

In 2023, the City's Internal Auditor will audit the implemented solutions.

Financial Implications

There are no financial impacts. The development of processes, tools, and manuals that are recommended in order to provide the permanent corrective actions mostly land in the Planning and Building Services Department. It is estimated that this work will take approximately four months to complete and could be done with existing resources, specifically the Heritage Planner I position that was approved as part of the 2022 budget process and which is in recruitment. It should be noted however, that this work will delay other heritage files that this position was originally requested for, namely the implementation of the Cultural Heritage Action Plan and timing of development applications.

Report

During the [October 6, 2021 Council Meeting](#), the CAO, on behalf of the Executive Team, committed to conducting an internal review of the 797 Victoria Road North file. This report provides Council and the public with an update on the steps taken to date and outlines next steps. Solution timelines are contained in the attachment.

In 2019, the City adopted a continuous improvement approach, which included a number of tools and methods including Lean and 8D problem-solving to support the organization in its journey to improve processes. This 8D problem solving methodology was applied to this file and the continuous improvement office supported the work conducted by an independent internal lead.

The Process

A comprehensive 8D problem solving methodology was used to review the 797 Victoria Road North file. 8D is one of the most utilized problem-solving approaches internationally recognized to ensure suitable actions are taken so the exact same problem does not reoccur, and that temporary containment is put into place quickly to prevent further problems until final solutions are implemented. Following this methodology ensured a fulsome review. The steps contained in 8D are as follows:

- D0: Identify the problem and commit to solving it
- D1: Establish the team
- D2: Describe the problem
- D3: Develop interim containment actions
- D4: Define and identify root cause(s) and escape point(s)
- D5: Choose and verify permanent corrective actions
- D6: Implement and validate permanent corrective actions
- D7: Prevent reoccurrence
- D8: Recognize team – celebrate successes

Steps D0 to D5 have been completed by an internal independent staff member. After conducting thorough interviews with all internal parties involved, the project lead, with support of the Executive Team and the General Managers involved, established the problem statement, timelines, and scope for the items to be reviewed.

"A heritage building was removed from the Municipal Heritage Register and demolished" was determined to be the problem statement to solve. The timeline established was from 2014 to the Council preview meeting on September 8, 2021.

Items considered to be in scope for this file were all internal teams and processes. Outside of scope were external parties, although how internal teams communicated with external parties was included. The independent lead worked with all internal teams to implement interim containment actions to prevent this problem from reoccurring during the time of the in-depth analysis. These interim solutions are in place until permanent solutions can be implemented.

Interviews with all internal stakeholders took place. This included Deputy Chief Administrative Officers, General Managers, Managers, and frontline staff who were

involved in this file. It also included interviews with teams that were not included in the file but should have been. After all interviews were completed, a fishbone diagram (cause and effect chart) was created. The fishbone diagram had six individual bones consisting of the following categories: people, owner, process, place, policies, and systems. In total, there were 53 contributing causes identified in this complicated file.

Using the problem statement and reviewing the 53 contributing causes, four major contributing factors were identified. Those factors are:

1. Lack of heritage property lifecycle management understanding (i.e., on registry, maintenance, conditions/services, how managed during and off registry).
2. No clear process guidelines when heritage property becomes untenanted (remote or otherwise) to determine and implement risk-mitigation prevention measures in association with property owner.
3. Overall lack of clarity and common understanding of roles and responsibilities of all parties in the process (i.e., stakeholder participation, communication between departments, and who has authority depending on situation - regular operating versus emergency).
4. Confusion about which piece of legislation takes priority (i.e., lack of clarity about how the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 (FPPA), Ontario Heritage Act, Building Code Act, 1992 and Property Standards By-law work together when issues arise (including actions and ownership)).

An in-depth review was then taken on each one of these four major contributing factors by using the 5 why methodology. Once completed, root causes were established, and potential solutions were identified. The root causes and correlating potential solutions for each major contributing factor are listed below.

1. First Major Contributing Factor: Lack of heritage property lifecycle management understanding (i.e., on registry, maintenance, conditions/services, how managed during and off registry).

Root Cause	Potential Solution
1. Lack of documented heritage property lifecycle process	1. Creation of a process on how heritage properties will be managed through their entire lifecycle (from identification, through inspection and maintenance to no longer on registry)
2. No current measures reported regularly on heritage property "status"	2. Update heritage property status/list
3. Lack of proactive approach to heritage property management	3. Proactively monitor heritage properties on the municipal

	register through By-law (Property Standards)
4. Unclear high-level process ownership through the entire end-to-end heritage property lifecycle	4. Create high-level process and identify owners

2. No clear documented process guidelines when heritage property becomes untenanted (remote or otherwise) to determine and implement risk-mitigation prevention measures in association with property owner.

Root Cause	Potential Solution
1. Lack of clear process for property owner and internal staff when heritage property becomes untenanted (remote or otherwise)	1. Create and implement a process on how to manage untenanted heritage buildings
2. Lack of proactive monitoring of vacant heritage buildings	2. Create a proactive monitoring process for heritage buildings based on risk level
3. No explicit requirements for property owner to maintain vacant heritage building to minimize risk	3. Create requirements for owner of heritage property to maintain in a manner to reduce risk
4. Lack of a centralized tool for all departments to access and understand property status	4. Create and implement a centralized information electronic tool that contains all heritage property information, including priority actions and processes
5. Lack of priority and/or staff capacity	5. Resources required in key departments

3. Overall lack of clarity and common understanding of roles and responsibilities of all parties in the process (i.e., stakeholder participation, communication between departments, and who has authority depending on situation - regular operating versus emergency).

Root Cause	Potential Solution
1. The City had no overall process on general roles and	1. Create process which identifies roles and

responsibilities by stakeholder (internal and external) and how to address specific issues with heritage buildings when they arise	responsibilities by stakeholder; who is assigned responsibility, and when departments need to be engaged for all potential heritage issues
2. Staff did not involve proper stakeholders at the right time	2. City needs to identify the proper Act/By-law and section allowing staff to plan appropriately
3. Fire Protection and Prevention Act risk to life (section 15) stopped communication and process even though later changed (section 21)	3. Create collaborative environment where staff can openly discuss options

4. Confusion on which piece of legislation takes priority (lack of clarity about how the FPPA, 1997 (FPPA), Ontario Heritage Act, Building Code Act, 1992 and Property Standards By-law work together when issues arise (including actions and ownership)).

Root Cause	Potential Solution
1. No documented overall process for heritage operational activities and where/how the three Acts and the By-law are involved (including roles and responsibilities)	1. Creation of a process on how heritage properties will be managed through their entire lifecycle and how the Acts/By-law integrate (from identification, through inspection and maintenance, to no longer on registry)
2. There is no issues management guidelines/ scenario checklist for what to do and who takes the responsibility in solving a particular issue	2. Creation of a heritage property issues management guideline document including, but not limited to, such things as identifying scenarios, activities, roles/responsibilities, Act/By-law priority, and communication requirements (internally and externally) for each of the specific issues

All potential solutions were then ranked by impact and effort and categorized into four quadrants:

Quadrant	Potential Solution(s)
Easy to implement, big pay-off	5
Easy to implement, small pay-off	1
Hard to implement, big pay-off	8
Hard to implement, small pay-off	0

Next Steps

All of the information gathered in steps D0 to D5 have been shared with the working team (consisting of staff in the Planning, Operations, Fire, Clerk's and Legal Departments), given that they have the accountability, authority, and skill in the relevant areas to solve the problem and implement permanent corrective actions. The team will implement the solutions outlined above and/or develop additional solutions. They will also continue the D8 methodology by completing steps D6 to D8.

Each solution will have a lead providing oversight to the development and implementation. The independent lead will continue to oversee the process along with the support of the continuous improvement office. The independent lead will continue to provide progress reports to the Executive Team.

In 2023, plans have already been solidified to have the Internal Auditor audit the solutions that have been implemented to confirm the processes, technology, etc., are being followed and working as planned.

Financial Implications

There are no financial impacts. The development of processes, tools and manuals that are recommended in order to provide the permanent corrective actions mostly land in the Planning and Building Services Department. It is estimated that this work will take approximately four months to complete and could be done with existing resources, specifically the Heritage Planner I position that was approved as part of the 2022 budget process and which is in recruitment. It should be noted however, that this work will delay other heritage files that this position was originally requested for, namely the implementation of the Cultural Heritage Action Plan and timing of development applications.

Consultations

Internal City stakeholders included representatives from the Finance; Planning and Building; Fire; Operations; City Clerk's Office; Strategic Communications and Community Engagement; and Legal, Realty and Court Services Departments.

Strategic Plan Alignment

Heritage buildings represent snapshots of Guelph's history and are an important part of Guelph's future. This is reflected in the Building our Future pillar of the City's Strategic Plan. Implementing the action plans will also support the Working Together for our Future pillar, given that teams will work more collaboratively and seamlessly together.

Attachments

Attachment-1 Solutions Timeline

Departmental Approval

Christopher C. Cooper, General Manager, Legal, Realty and Court Services / City Solicitor

Dave Elloway, General Manager, Fire Department / Fire Chief

Doug Godfrey, General Manager, Operations

Stephen O'Brien, General Manager, City Clerk's Office / City Clerk

Tara Sprigg, General Manager, Strategic Communications and Community Engagement

Krista Walkey, General Manager, Planning and Building Services

Report Author

Glenn Marcus, Strategic Business Advisor

This report was approved by:

Scott Stewart

Chief Administrative Officer

Office of the Chief Administrative Officer

(519) 822-1260 extension 2221

scott.stewart@guelph.ca

This report was recommended by:

Colleen Clack-Bush

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Public Services

(519) 822-1260 extension 2588

colleen.clack-bush@guelph.ca

Jayne Holmes
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services
(519) 822-1260 extension 2248
jayne.holmes@guelph.ca

Trevor Lee
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
Corporate Services
(519) 822-1260 extension 2281
trevor.lee@guelph.ca