

Appendix A Guide to City Council Minutes

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

OF THE

CITY OF TORONTO

**TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1999 AND
WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 1999**

City Council met in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Toronto.

CALL TO ORDER

- 5.1 Mayor Lastman took the Chair and called the Members to order.

The meeting opened with O Canada.

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

- 5.2 Councillor Fotinos presented the following Reports for consideration by Council:

Report No. 6 of The Works and Utilities Committee,
Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee,
Report No. 6 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee,
Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee,
Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Corporate Services Committee,
Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Scarborough Community Council,
Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council,
Report No. 5 of The York Community Council,
Report No. 4 of The East York Community Council,
Report No. 5 of The East York Community Council,
Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council,
Report No. 4 of The North York Community Council, and
Report No. 6 of The Striking Committee,

and moved, seconded by Councillor Jakobek, that Council now give consideration to such Reports, which carried.

- 5.3 Councillor Fotinos, with the permission of Council, presented the following Report for the consideration of Council:

Report No. 3 of The Board of Health,

and moved, seconded by Councillor Ootes, that in accordance with the provisions of Section 44 of the Council Procedural By-law, Council now give consideration to such Report, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

5.4 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Disero declared her interest in Clause No. 4 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed "Appeal of Interim Control By-law 1997-0321, Ontario Municipal Board", in that she is currently involved in a lawsuit in regard thereto.

Mayor Lastman declared his interest in Notice of Motion J (17), moved by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Rae, regarding the settlement of an appeal of former City of Toronto Zoning By-law No. 1996-0310, in that his son is a partner in the law firm which is acting on behalf of the appellant.

Councillor Prue declared his interest in Item (m), entitled "Toronto and Region Conservation Authority - Shoring Up of Eroding Ravine Properties", embodied in Clause No. 8 of Report No. 5 of The East York Community Council, headed "Other Items Considered by the Community Council", in that his principal residence is immediately adjacent to Toronto and Region Conservation Authority property.

Councillor Shiner declared his interest in Item (f), entitled "Preliminary Evaluation Report - Zoning Amendment Application UDC -99-09 and Site Plan Amendment Application UDSP-99-028 - Brown, Dryer, Karol (Judy Cohen in Trust) - 718 Sheppard Avenue West - North York Spadina", and in Item (g), entitled "Report - New Development Applications for North District", as it pertains to File No. UDC-99-02 and File No. UDC-99-09 - Brown, Dryer, Karol, listed in Exhibit No. 1 attached to the report (April 14, 1999) from the Acting Director, Community Planning, North District, embodied in Clause No. 25 of Report No. 4 of The North York Community Council, headed "Other Items Considered by the Community Council", in that the Solicitor for the applicant is representing Councillor Shiner on another matter.

5.5 *Election of Chair of Toronto Community Council:*

With the permission of Council, Council recessed briefly to permit the Members of the Toronto Community Council to elect its chair. Councillor Rae reported that the Toronto Community Council had elected Councillor McConnell as Chair of the Community Council, effective June 14, 1999, for the period ending November 30, 2000, or until her successor is elected or appointed. (See also Minute No. 5.23)

**CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS
CLAUSES RELEASED OR HELD FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

5.6 The following Clauses were held by Council for further consideration:

Report No. 6 of The Works and Utilities Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 13 and 14.

Report No. 5 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee, Clauses Nos. 1 and 3.

Report No. 6 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, Clauses Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee, Clauses Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7 and 11.

Report No. 5 of The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5.

Report No. 5 of The Corporate Services Committee, Clauses Nos. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13.

Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 4, 8, 9 and 11.

Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, Clauses Nos. 1, 6, 11, 36 and 50.

Report No. 5 of The East York Community Council, Clause No. 5.

Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, Clauses Nos. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Report No. 6 of The Striking Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 3 of The Board of Health, Clause No. 1.

The following Clauses which were held by Council for further consideration were subsequently adopted without amendment or further discussion:

Report No. 5 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 5 of The Corporate Services Committee, Clauses Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13.

Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, Clause No. 11.

Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, Clause No. 6.

Report No. 3 of The Board of Health, Clause No. 1.

The Clauses not held by Council for further consideration were deemed to have been adopted by Council, without amendment, in accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law.

5.7 **May 11, 1999:**

With the permission of Council, Mayor Lastman moved that:

“**WHEREAS** City Council, at its meeting held on March 2, 3 and 4 1999, by its adoption, as amended, of Notice of Motion I(2) by Mayor Lastman, seconded by Councillor Balkissoon, adopted the following Resolution:

‘NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT on a trial basis, for the next two regular meetings of City Council (to be held on April 13, 14 and 15, 1999, and on May 11, 12 and 13, 1999), the dinner break be eliminated and the afternoon session be extended until 7:30 p.m., at which time Council will recess until the next morning.’; and

WHEREAS this trial has worked well during the last two Council meetings, permitting Members of Council and staff to go home earlier and spend more time with their families; and

WHEREAS Members of Council have also been free to hold evening meetings in their communities; and

WHEREAS there is support among Members of Council and staff for the elimination of the dinner break on a permanent basis;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the dinner break be eliminated from the Council meeting schedule and the afternoon session be extended until 7:30 p.m. on the first and second days of a regular meeting of Council, at which time Council will recess until the next morning; and that the time of adjournment on the third day of meeting be extended from 4:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m.;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with subsection 134(2) of the Council Procedural By-law, notice be given to amend said By-law and the City Solicitor be requested to prepare the necessary Bill to be introduced in Council to give effect thereto.”

Council adopted the foregoing motion, without amendment.

**CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS
CLAUSES WITH MOTIONS, VOTES, ETC.**

- 5.8 **Clause No. 6 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed “Humber River Project - F.G. Gardiner Expressway Ramp Bridges Nos. 4, 5 and 6 over Humber River and Approaches Contract No. T-01-99, Tender No. 19-1999”.**

Motion:

Councillor Pantalone moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the recommendation of the Budget Committee embodied in the communication dated April 30, 1999, from the City Clerk, be adopted, viz.:

‘The Budget Committee on April 16, 1999, recommended to City Council the adoption of the supplementary report dated April 14, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, subject to amending the recommendation embodied therein by deleting the words ‘ten percent of’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘\$500,000.00 over’, so that such recommendation now reads:

“The Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be authorized to make additional expenditures under this contract, and to increase the value of the contract up to a maximum of \$500,000.00 over the original contract value to cover additional costs, provided there are sufficient funds within the Capital Works Program.” ’ ’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Pantalone carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

- 5.9 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 5 of The East York Community Council, headed “Parking Regulations on Airdrie Road”.**

Motion:

Councillor Pitfield moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the East York Community Council for further consideration.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Pitfield carried.

- 5.10 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Request for Installation of Pedestrian Crossover or Traffic Control Signals: Burnhamthorpe Road near Echo Valley Road, (Markland-Centennial)”.**

Motion:

Councillor O’Brien moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor O’Brien carried.

- 5.11 **Clause No. 14 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed “1383 Lansdowne Avenue - Ontario Municipal Board Hearing”.**

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

Motion:

Councillor Disero moved that Council adopt the recommendation embodied in the communication dated May 4, 1999, from Councillor Disero, Davenport, viz.:

“It is recommended that the City Solicitor be instructed to attend the Ontario Municipal Board hearing scheduled for May 31, 1999, in support of the Committee of Adjustment decision of February 9, 1999, and that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to assist.”

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Disero carried.

- 5.12 **Clause No. 2 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed “Prince Edward (Bloor Street) Viaduct - Measures to Deter Suicide Attempts (Don River and Midtown - Wards 23 and 25)”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Pantalone moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) authorization to increase funding by \$1.0 million for the Prince Edward Viaduct Suicide Deterrent Measures Project be approved at this time; and
 - (2) the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, in conjunction with the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, monitor capital project spending and report back in the fall on the source of funding to be utilized to offset the impact of increasing this project’s funding at this time (i.e., underspending in existing Capital or increase in debt financing).’ ”
- (b) Councillor Holyday moved that the Clause be amended to provide that Council re-affirm its previous decision to expend no more than \$1.5 million on the barrier for the Prince Edward (Bloor Street) Viaduct.
- (c) Councillor Bossons moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:
- “It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a confidential status report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on other locations similar to the Prince Edward (Bloor Street) Viaduct.”

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Holyday:

Yes - 7 Councillors: Berger, Holy day, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Nunziata, O'Brien, Tzekas
No - 39 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Layton, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair

Lost by a majority of 32.

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Pantalone:

Yes - 43

Mayor: Lastman

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas

No - 5

Councillors: Berger, Holyday, King, Mammoliti, Nunziata

Carried by a majority of 38.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Bossons:

Yes - 28

Councillors: Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Chow, Disero, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, King, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Miller, O'Brien, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

No - 21

Mayor: Lastman

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Bussin, Duguid, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone

Carried by a majority of 7.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 46

Mayor: Lastman

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

No - 2
Councillors: Holyday, Nunziata

Carried by a majority of 44.

5.13 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed “Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process - Prohibition Against Lobbying”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Disero moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendation of the Works and Utilities Committee, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that the report dated March 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, be adopted.”

Deputy Mayor Ootes in the Chair.

- (b) Councillor Fotinos moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that all persons who wish to engage in lobbying activities for the Request for Expressions of Interest (REOI) in the Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process be required to register, with the City Clerk, their names and the organizations for which they are lobbying, the Members of Council to whom they have spoken and the dates on which the lobbying took place.”

Votes:

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Disero:

Yes - 31
Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Disero, Filion, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O’Brien, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas

No - 25

Councillors: Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Brossons, Cho, Chong, Davis, Duguid, Faubert, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, Minnan-Wong, Ootes, Pitfield, Saundercook, Shaw, Walker

Carried by a majority of 6.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Fotinos was not put to a vote, having regard to the foregoing decision of Council.

5.14 **Clause No. 9 of Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, headed “1999 Business Improvement Area Budgets, Supplementary Report No. 2 - Long Branch Business Improvement Area (Ward 2 - Lakeshore-Queensway)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be received, having regard that this matter was considered and approved by Council at its Special Meeting held on April 26, 27 and 28, 1999.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

5.15 **Clause No. 8 of Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, headed “U.S.E. Hickson Products Ltd., 15 Wallsend Drive, Coronation Drive Employment District (Ward 16 - Highland Creek)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) authority be granted for the introduction of a by-law under Section 221(2) of the Ontario Municipal Act to charge U.S.E. Hickson Products Ltd. with a water rate that will be sufficient to

recover all of the capital costs associated with the construction of a new water main as will be specified in the by-law; and

- (2) appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to give effect thereto.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.16 **Clause No. 36 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Relocation of Speed Bumps in Public Laneways (Davenport)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Disero moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from “Table A” appended to the report dated April 13, 1999, from the Director, Transportation Services, District 1, the following references:

“Ward	Location
21	Lane system bounded by Goodwood Avenue, Dufferin Street, Ascot Avenue and Boon Avenue, as shown on Drawing No. 421F-5180.

Installation:

21	Lane system bounded by Goodwood Avenue, Dufferin Street Ascot Avenue and Boon Avenue, as shown on Drawing No. 421F-5351.”
----	---

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Disero carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.17 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed “New Development Charges By-law”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Gardner moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on any incentives that could be implemented to aid in the development of rental accommodation, such report to also address the possibility of amending the development charges on rental buildings.”

- (b) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the proposed development charges by-law be forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Committee for review.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Gardner carried.

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Moscoe:

Yes - 30 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Cho, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Ootes, Pitfield, Saundercook, Shaw, Tzekas
No - 2 Councillors: Miller, Silva

Carried by a majority of 28.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.18 **Clause No. 2 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed “Parks Yard Revitalization Study”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that all future reports which involve the possible closure or propose an alternative use for any Works Yards, be forwarded to Council through the appropriate Community Council.”

Votes:

Adoption of motion by Councillor Moscoe:

Yes - 24 Councillors: Adams, Augimeri, Cho, DiSero, Duguid, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, LiPreti, LindsayLuby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pitfield, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair
No - 17 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Faubert, Fotinos, Gardner, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Ootes, Saundercook, Silva

Carried by a majority of 7.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.19 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 5 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee, headed "Formal Partnership and Co-operation Between the Toronto Fire Services and the Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service, United Kingdom".**

Motion:

Councillor Pitfield moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that the Fire Chief be requested to:

- (1) submit a report to the Community Services Committee on the anticipated revenues from a Toronto Training Program, such revenues to be directed back to the budget of Toronto Fire Services to assist with the purchase of equipment and technology; and
- (2) investigate the possibility of a twinning/partnership arrangement with the City of Phoenix, Arizona."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Pitfield carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.20 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 5 of The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee, headed “Management of the Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing”.**

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by deleting Item No. (8), headed “Reporting and Decision-Making”, from the Terms of Reference for the Reference Group for the Capital Revolving Fund, as embodied in Appendix “A” to the joint report dated April 6, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new Item No. (8):

“(8) Reporting and Decision-Making:

The Reference Group will report to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, who will make recommendations to Council on the use of the Fund, such recommendations to be accompanied by information regarding the advice provided on that matter by the Reference Group.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.21 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Draft By-laws - Relocation of Advertising Sign from High Park Area to Exhibition Place (Trinity-Niagara)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Miller moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the following recommendation of the Economic Development Committee, embodied in the communication dated April 27, 1999, from the City Clerk, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that the following Recommendations Nos. (1), (2) and (3) contained in the report (February 1, 1999) from the Interim General Manager, Exhibition Place, be adopted, viz.:

- (1) That the Board enter into an agreement with Gallop and Gallop Advertising Inc. (“Gallop”) to construct, install and maintain a billboard advertising sign on Exhibition Place grounds subject to the approval of City Council and the coming into force of any amendments which may be required pursuant to Recommendation No. (4);
- (2) that the Board approve the Term Sheet attached as Appendix “A” to the report (February 1, 1999) from the Interim General Manager, Exhibition Place, as the basic terms and conditions to be included in any agreement between the Board and Gallop; and
- (3) that the City of Toronto authorize the Board to enter into an agreement with Gallop for an initial term of 9 years with an option to negotiate an additional 8 years.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Miller carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.22 Clause No. 3 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed “Speed Limit Compliance on Major Arterial Roads - Update”.

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by striking out and referring the following Recommendations Nos. (3) and (4) of the Toronto Pedestrian Committee, as embodied in Recommendation No. (2) of the Urban Environment and Development Committee, to the General Manager, Transportation Services, for a report thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee, through the Toronto Pedestrian Committee, on the experience of other jurisdictions with respect to the application of such policies and programs:

“(3) Council ask the provincial government to strengthen the ability of Section 128 of the Ontario Highway Traffic Act (Rate of Speed) to effectively address the discrepancy between posted and enforced speeds, especially on urban streets (e.g . amending the regulations to give demerit points to motorists who exceed the ‘legal’ maximum speed by any amount would send a strong message that this sort of driving behaviour is unacceptable on Ontario highways, especially urban streets); and

(4) Council take leadership in engaging the provincial government and other municipalities in discussion regarding instituting driver testing at five-year intervals;”.

(b) Councillor Miller moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

‘**WHEREAS** the City of Toronto is committed to improving traffic safety within its boundaries; and

WHEREAS staff, as part of the City amalgamation and reorganization of Transportation Services, have recommended that the role of the Traffic Data Centre be expanded to include a Traffic Safety Bureau; and

WHEREAS the proposed Traffic Safety Bureau will function as a Centre of information for traffic safety for the City with its primary objectives to:

- (a) enhance the extent of traffic analysis presently conducted;
- (b) introduce, support and co-ordinate (where applicable) successful internal and external traffic safety programs;
- (c) formalize the monitoring and evaluation of traffic safety programs;
- (d) increase the safety awareness in the planning, design, construction, installation, maintenance and operating practices within the department; and
- (e) provide city-wide traffic performance and safety measures; and

WHEREAS due to budget constraints, no funding has been identified in the 1999 Operating Budget for this expanded role;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the General Manager, Transportation Services, be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee, prior to the 2000 budget cycle, outlining the business plan and the associated costs and benefits for a Traffic Safety Bureau.’ ”

(c) Councillor Lindsay Luby moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that General Manager, Transportation Services, be requested to also address, in his report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the business plan and the associated costs and benefits for a Traffic Safety Bureau, what measures can be taken to reduce speeding on local roads that are used as by-passes.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Ashton carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Miller carried.

Motion (c) by Councillor Lindsay Luby carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.23 Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Striking Committee, headed “Appointment of Members of Council to Standing and Other Committees of Council, Various Boards and Special Purpose Bodies”.

Appointment of Community Council Chairs

With respect to the appointment of Community Council Chairs effective June 14, 1999, the Striking Committee requested the Chairs of the Community Councils to convene special meetings of their respective Community Councils during the lunch break of Council on Tuesday, May 11, 1999, for the purpose of electing a new Chair for a term of office commencing the effective date of the new governance structure. (See also Minute No. 5.5)

Deputy Mayor Ootes read the following communication dated May 11, 1999, from the City Clerk:

“The following Members of Council were appointed by their respective Community Councils on May 11, 1999, as Chairs of such Community Councils:

East York Community Council:	-	Councillor Jane Pitfield
Etobicoke Community Council	-	Councillor Mario Giansante
North York Community Council	-	Councillor Michael Feldman
Scarborough Community Council	-	Councillor Bas Balkissoon
Toronto Community Council	-	Councillor Pam McConnell
York Community Council	-	Councillor Rob Davis

The North York Community Council also appointed Councillor Joanne Flint as Vice-Chair of such Community Council.”

The recommendations of the Striking Committee pertaining to the following were held for further consideration:

- (4) Community Services Committee;
- (5) Economic Development and Parks Committee;
- (10) Nominating Committee;
- (14) Police Services Board;

- (16a) Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation, Board of Directors;
- (22) Toronto Arts Council;
- (34) Catholic Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto, Board of Directors; and
- (35) Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto, Board of Directors.

The balance of the recommendations of the Striking Committee were adopted, without amendment.

General Motions:

Councillor Mihevc moved that the election of the Chairs of the Standing Committees be conducted at the first regular meeting of the Standing Committees rather than being conducted at this meeting of Council, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

<p>Yes - 27 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Feldman, Johnston, Jones, Layton, Li Preti, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Pitfield, Prue, Sgro, Shiner, Sinclair, Walker</p>
<p>No - 28 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Moeser, Ootes, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva</p>

Lost by a majority of 1.

Councillor Ashton moved that the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law pertaining to the restriction that no Member of Council may chair the same Standing Committee or Community Council in consecutive half-terms of the same Council be waived, in order to permit him to stand for election as Chair of the Economic Development Committee for the period ending November 30, 2000, or until his successor is elected or appointed, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 43
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Adams, A Itobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Bal kissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Disero, Duguid, F aubert, F eldman, F ilion, F otinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, L ayton, L indsay Luby, Ma hood, Mammoliti, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Silva, Sinclair, Walker

No - 12
Councillors: Brown, Chow, Flint, Jakobek, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, O'Brien, Shaw, Shiner

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Councillor Prue moved that Council waive the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law respecting:

- (1) the composition of the Community Services Committee, and that the membership of the Community Services Committee be decreased from 11 Members to 10 Members; and
- (2) the composition of the Economic Development and Parks Committee, and that the membership of the Economic Development and Parks Committee be increased from 10 Members to 11 Members;

in order to permit Council to consider the request for appointment from Councillor Cho to the Economic Development and Parks Committee,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 48
Councillors: Adams, Altobello, A shton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, B rown, B ussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Dug uid, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, J akobek, J ohnston, J ones, Kinahan, King , Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Walker

<p>No - 8 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Balkissoon, Chong, Davis, Kelly, Minnan-Wong, Ootes, Tzekas</p>
--

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Councillor Tzekas moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Recommendation No. (7) of the Striking Committee pertaining to the membership of the Works Committee be re-opened for further consideration, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

<p>Yes - 42 Councillors: Adams, Atobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker</p>

<p>No - 13 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Brown, Cho, Chong, DiSandro, Faubert, Gardner, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Ootes, Shiner</p>

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Councillor Walker moved that Council waive the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law respecting:

- (1) the composition of the Works Committee, and that the membership of the Works Committee be decreased from 10 Members to 9 Members; and
- (2) the composition of the Economic Development and Parks Committee, and that the membership of the Economic Development and Parks Committee be further increased from 11 Members to 12 Members;

in order to permit Council to consider the request for appointment from Councillor Tzekas to the Economic Development and Parks Committee,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 48

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

No - 7

Councillors: Chong, Fotinos, Jakobek, Jones, Lindsay Luby, Miller, Shiner

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Councillor Brown moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Recommendation No. (49) of the Striking Committee pertaining to the appointment of Members of Council to the Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA), Noise Management Committee, be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Community Services Committee

(Recommendation No. (4) of the Striking Committee):

Motion:

Councillor Prue moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from Recommendation No. (4) of the Striking Committee the name "Cho, R."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Prue carried.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (4) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

Economic Development and Parks Committee

(Recommendation No. (5) of the Striking Committee)

Councillor Prue moved that the Clause be amended by adding to Recommendation No. (5) of the Striking Committee the name "Cho, R."

Councillor Walker moved that the Clause be amended by adding to Recommendation No. (5) of the Striking Committee the name "Tzekas, M."

Votes:

The motions by Councillors Prue and Walker carried.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (5) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

Works Committee

(Recommendation No. (7) of the Striking Committee)

Motion:

Councillor Walker moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from Recommendation No. (7) of the Striking Committee the name "Tzekas, M."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Walker carried.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (7) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

Council recessed at 6:30 p.m. on May 11, 1999, to permit the Standing Committees, the Budget Advisory Committee and the Audit Committee to meet to elect their respective Chairs, and reconvened at 6:40 p.m.

Committee Chairs:

Deputy Mayor Ootes advised the Council that the following Members of Council had been appointed as Chairs of the following Committees:

Administration Committee	-	Councillor L. Berardinetti
Community Services Committee	-	Councillor B. Duguid
Economic Development and Parks Committee	- -	Councillor B. Ashton (Chair) Councillor M. Feldman (Vice-Chair)
Planning and Transportation Committee	- -	Councillor J. Flint (Chair) Councillor P. McConnell (Vice-Chair)
Works Committee	-	Councillor B. Saundercook
Budget Advisory Committee	-	Councillor T. Jakobek
Audit Committee	-	Councillor D. Mahood

Nominating Committee

(Recommendation No. (10) of the Striking Committee)

Motion:

Councillor Bussin moved that the Clause be amended by amending Recommendation No. (10) of the Striking Committee to provide that the Nominating Committee membership include Councillor Sandra Bussin as the Mayor's designate as Chair of the Committee, and Councillor Mario Silva as a Committee Member.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Bussin carried.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (10) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

Police Services Board

(Recommendation No. (14) of the Striking Committee)

Motion:

Councillor Holyday moved that Recommendation No. (14) of the Striking Committee be amended by deleting the name "Chow, O.", and inserting in lieu thereof the name "Holyday, D."

Votes:

Adoption of motion by Councillor Holyday:

Yes - 5 Councillors: Davis, Holyday, Mahood, Mammoliti, Sinclair
No - 46 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong Chow, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 41.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (14) of the Striking Committee, without amendment, carried.

Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation, Board of Directors
(Recommendation No. (16a) of the Striking Committee)

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Augimeri moved that the Clause be amended by adding the name "Augimeri, M." for appointment to the Board of Directors of the Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation.
- (b) Councillor Lindsay Luby moved that the Clause be amended by adding the name "Lindsay Luby, G." for appointment to the Board of Directors of the Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation.

Ballots:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to motions (a) and (b), by Councillors Augimeri and Lindsay Luby, respectively, advised the Council that the following Members, including the Members recommended by the Striking Committee, are nominated for appointment to the Board of Directors of the Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation:

Augimeri, M.;
Berger, M.;
Bussin, S.;
Johnston, A.; and
Lindsay Luby, G.

Deputy Mayor Ootes suggested that Council now proceed with the appointment of three Members of Council to the Board of Directors of the Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation by written ballot.

At the request of Council, the City Clerk tallied the results of the election by ballot, the voting being as follows:

For Councillor Augimeri:

Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Chow, Disero, Faubert, Feldman, Flint, Fotinos, Jones, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Pantalone, Prue, Saundercook, Sgo, Shaw, Silva, Tzkas, Walker - 33.

For Councillor Berger:

Councillors: Berger, Cho, Chong, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Miller, Moeser, Ootes, Pitfield, Saundercook, Silva - 17.

For Councillor Bussin:

Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Duguid, Faubert, Gardner, Jones, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Li Preti, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Tzekas, Walker - 29.

For Councillor Johnston:

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Faubert, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Kinahan, Lindsay Luby, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Silva, Tzekas, Walker - 39.

For Councillor Lindsay Luby:

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Rae, Sgro, Shaw - 23.

Deputy Mayor Ootes informed the Council that Councillors Augimeri, Bussin and Johnston, having received a majority of votes of those Members of Council present, are appointed to the Board of Directors of the Hummingbird Performing Arts Centre Corporation.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (16a) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

Toronto Arts Council

(Recommendation No. (22) of the Striking Committee):

Motion:

Councillor Silva moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from Recommendation No. (22) of the Striking Committee the name "Silva, M." and inserting in lieu thereof the name "Giansante, M."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Silva carried.

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (22) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

Children's Aid Societies

(Recommendations Nos. (34) and (35) of the Striking Committee):

Motion:

Councillor Pantalone moved that the Clause be amended by striking out and referring Recommendations Nos. (34) and (35) of the Striking Committee back to the Striking Committee for further consideration, together with the report dated May 10, 1999, from the City Solicitor.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Pantalone carried.

Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA), Noise Management Committee

(Recommendation No. (49) of the Striking Committee)

Motion:

Councillor Brown moved that:

“**WHEREAS** a provision in the mandate of the Greater Toronto Airports Authority Noise Management Committee (GTAANMC) provides a represented municipality the opportunity to appoint an alternate for each voting member; and

WHEREAS that alternate member does not have to be a Member of Council; and

WHEREAS the meetings of the GTAANMC are often in conflict with meetings of Council and Council's Standing Committees; and

WHEREAS it is imperative that the City of Toronto be represented by people who are both knowledgeable about developing noise technology and the impact on local communities of all forms of airport related noises;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council representatives on the GTAANMC be requested to recommend to Council an alternate to assume their position when they are unable to attend;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the alternate for Councillor Brown be Mr. John Trembath.”

Proposal by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of the motion by Councillor Brown, proposed that such motion be referred to the Nominating Committee.

Council concurred in the proposal by the Deputy Mayor.

Vote:

The Clause, as it pertains to Recommendation No. (49) of the Striking Committee, as amended, carried.

General

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Mihevc moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the City Clerk be requested to contact the Ontario Social Development Council to determine whether this organization wishes to continue to have a Member of City Council serve on its Board of Directors.”

- (b) Councillor Johnston moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that Council extend its appreciation to the Members of the Striking Committee for their diligent efforts and hours of work involved in consolidating their recommendations to Council on the appointments for the balance of the term of Council.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Mihevc carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Johnston carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

- 5.24 **Clause No. 7 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Variance to City of Toronto Interim Control By-law No. 280-1998 to Allow Roof Signage within 400 metres of the Gardiner Expressway at 1574 The Queensway (Lakeshore-Queensway)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration at such time as the report requested of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services on the harmonization of all City sign regulations is available.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

- 5.25 **Clause No. 8 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Variance to City of Toronto Interim Control By-law No. 280-1998 to Allow Third Party Advertising Signs within 400 metres of the Gardiner Expressway at 1440 The Queensway (Lakeshore-Queensway)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration at such time as the report requested of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services on the harmonization of all City sign regulations is available.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

- 5.26 **Clause No. 9 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Variance to City of Toronto Interim Control By-law No. 280-1998 to Allow a Ground Sign within 400 metres of the Gardiner Expressway at 1544 The Queensway (Lakeshore Queensway)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration at such time as the report requested of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services on the harmonization of all City sign regulations is available.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

- 5.27 **Clause No. 10 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Variance to City of Toronto Interim Control By-law No. 280-1998 Prohibiting Third Party**

Advertising Signs within 400 metres of the Gardiner Expressway at 833 The Queensway (Lakeshore-Queensway)”.

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration at such time as the report requested of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services on the harmonization of all City sign regulations is available.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

- 5.28 **Clause No. 11 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Variance to City of Toronto Interim Control By-law No. 280-1998 Prohibiting Third Party Advertising Signs within 400 metres of the Gardiner Expressway at 423 Evans Avenue (Lakeshore-Queensway)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration at such time as the report requested of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services on the harmonization of all City sign regulations is available.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

- 5.29 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, headed “Pilot Project - Clothing Optional Beach at Hanlan’s Point (Ward 24 - Downtown)”.**

Mayor Lastman in the Chair.

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Mammoliti moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Economic Development Committee for further consideration and the hearing of deputations.

- (b) Councillor Ashton moved that motion (a) by Councillor Mammoliti be amended by adding thereto the words “at its meeting to be held in July 1999”.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Ashton:

<p>Yes - 19 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berger, Chong, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Kinahan, Li Preti, Mahood, McConnell, Nunziata, Ootes, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas</p>
<p>No - 32 Councillors: Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Disero, Faubert, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Walker</p>

Lost by a majority of 13.

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Mammoliti, without amendment:

<p>Yes - 13 Councillors: Balkissoon, Berger, Feldman, Flint, Holyday, Kinahan, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, Nunziata, Ootes, Shiner, Tzekas</p>
<p>No - 39 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Filion, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Sinclair, Walker</p>

Lost by a majority of 26.

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Duguid, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 25 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Cho, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Mahood, Moeser, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva
No - 16 Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Holyday, Jakobek, King, Layton, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Shaw, Walker

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Vote:

Adoption of Clause, without amendment:

Yes - 41 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Chong, Davis, Disero, Faubert, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay, Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Silva, Tzekas, Walker
No - 9 Councillors: Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Holyday, Li Preti, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Shiner

Carried by a majority of 32.

5.30 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed "Further Report on Proposed Use of Funds Generated from Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland Dedication".**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Filion moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services submit a joint report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on mechanisms for acquiring additional parkland in areas that are parkland deficient.”

- (b) Councillor Balkissoon moved that:

(1) the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Planning and Transportation Committee for further consideration, together with all proposed amendments; and

(2) Council also adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that a copy of the Clause be forwarded to the Community Councils with a request that they submit their comments thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee.”

- (c) Councillor Pantalone moved that motion (b) by Councillor Balkissoon be amended to provide that the Community Councils submit their comments to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration at its meeting to be held on June 14, 1999, for report thereon to Council for its meeting to be held on July 6, 1999.

- (d) Councillor Bossons moved that Part (2) of motion (b) by Councillor Balkissoon be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is recommended that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on all concerns expressed by Members of Council in regard to park deficiencies, by district and community.”

- (e) Councillor Ashton moved that Part (2) of motion (b) by Councillor Balkissoon be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on a policy and mechanism, in the context of planning applications, of identifying parks deficiencies and allocating funding therefor through the budget process.”

Vote:

Adoption of motions (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e), by Councillors Filion, Balkissoon, Pantalone, Bossons and Ashton, respectively:

Yes - 34 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Bialkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Disero, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, McConnell, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Rae, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas
No - 2 Councillors: Mihevc, Miller

Carried by a majority of 32.

In summary, Council took the following action:

The Clause was struck out and referred back to the Planning and Transportation Committee for further consideration at its meeting to be held on June 14, 1999, for report thereon to Council for its meeting to be held on July 6, 1999.

Council also directed that:

- (1) a copy of the Clause be forwarded to the Community Councils with a request that they submit their comments thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration at its meeting on June 14, 1999;
- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on a policy and mechanism, in the context of planning applications, of identifying parks deficiencies and allocating funding therefor through the budget process;
- (3) the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on all concerns expressed by Members of Council in regard to park deficiencies, by district and community; and
- (4) Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services submit a joint report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on mechanisms for acquiring additional parkland in areas that are parkland deficient.

5.31 Clause No. 4 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed "Jane and Finch Streetscape Project (Black Creek - Ward 7)".

Motions:

Councillor Augimeri, with the permission of Council, moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(10):

Moved by: Councillor Augimeri

Seconded by: Mayor Lastman

“**WHEREAS** the appropriation of \$3.5 million originally recommended for the Jane-Finch Streetscape Project was scaled back by the Budget Committee to \$850,000.00; and

WHEREAS the Budget Committee directed that of the \$850,000.00, \$418,000.00 was to be directed towards traffic safety improvements in 1999 and \$432,000.00 towards lighting improvements for 2000; and

WHEREAS the former Metropolitan Toronto Council had identified Jane-Finch as the highest risk intersection having the highest number of reported accidents in 1994; and

WHEREAS the former Metropolitan Toronto began to invest substantial resources towards safety improvements at Jane-Finch-- \$500,000.00 for road works; and over \$200,000.00 for three additional traffic signals (at Finch/Yorkgate in 1989; at Finch/east of Tobermory in 1996; and at Jane/north of Shoreham in 1996); and

WHEREAS the recently updated list of high-risk intersections shows that the intersection is operating more safely and City of Toronto Transportation staff attribute the improvement to these investments; yet there remains much more to be done to ensure that the intersection is safe; and

WHEREAS the Metropolitan Toronto Police had identified the intersection's safety problem as being one of poor engineering and not, as had been previously thought, one of enforcement; and

WHEREAS the Police, under the auspices of the Staff Inspector of North Traffic Division, recommended the extension of existing medians at the intersection and the installation of medians where they do not currently exist as a solution to the safety problem at the Jane/Finch intersection; and

WHEREAS the joint report dated May 5, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services [Communication No. 18 for consideration with Clause No. 4 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee] states that in order

to ‘avoid throw-away costs’ that ‘proceeding with the installation of pedestrian scale lighting this year . . . would allow Transportation Services staff to conduct a comprehensive review of the physical and operational characteristics of the Jane/Finch intersection and vicinity and to report further during the 2000 Capital Budget cycle . . .’;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 3 of Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed ‘1999-2003 Capital Budget and Five-Year Capital Program’, be re-opened for further consideration, insofar as it concerns the order of the work to be done on the Jane Finch Streetscape Project;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the schedule of improvements to the Jane/Finch intersection be so re-ordered to permit lighting improvements to proceed in 1999;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee, during the 2000 Budget process, on the estimated cost of installing appropriate medians at all four legs of the Jane/Finch intersection;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT staff conduct community consultations with local community stakeholders with respect to the design and nature of these medians; and that these medians conform as much as possible with the description forwarded by the local Police.”,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 33
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Sgro, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas
No - 0

Carried, without dissent.

Upon the question of the adoption of the first Operative Paragraph of the foregoing Motion, it was carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Augimeri moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendation of the Urban Environment and Development Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the second, third and fourth Operative Paragraphs of Motion J(10).

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Augimeri carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

Deputy Mayor Ootes in the Chair.

5.32 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed "Snow Management Plan".**

Motion:

Councillor Augimeri moved that the Clause be amended by inserting in Recommendation No. (3) of the Urban Environment and Development Committee, after the word "schools", the words "child care centres, retirement homes and/ or nursing homes", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- "(3) ensuring that streets where schools, child care centres, retirement homes and/or nursing homes are located are given high priority for snow removal."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Augimeri carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.33 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed "Sewer Connection Blockage Inspection and Repair Program, and Tree Root Removal and Grants Policy".**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by:

(1) amending Recommendation No. (4) embodied in the report dated April 20, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, to provide that authority for appeals related to drain grant claims be delegated, in the first instance, to the appropriate Community Council for report thereon to Council, through the Administration Committee; and

(2) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to:

- (a) provide each Member of Council with a series of emergency night service and back-up telephone numbers;
- (b) ensure that the emergency night service telephone lines are answered by a staff person, rather than by electronic means such as voice mail; and
- (c) develop a 24-hour protocol for quick responses to Councillors’ enquiries.”

(b) Councillor Pantalone moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to evaluate the experience of this program, especially in regard to the three-year limitation and the amount of assistance, and report thereon to the Works Committee no later than February 2000.”

(c) Councillor Saundercook moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee on guidelines and criteria to be followed by Community Councils in the implementation of this policy”

(d) Councillor Nunziata moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee on a harmonized tree removal policy for instances where it has been determined that the roots of a City-owned tree have caused the blockage.”

(e) Councillor Mihevc moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee on how the sewer repair program can dovetail or be harmonized with the City of Toronto’s lead pipe replacement program.”

- (f) Councillor Filion moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee on the desirability of the City establishing a list of approved contractors who would perform the work at a reasonable fee, in order to reduce the cost to the City.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Moscoe carried.

Motion (e) by Councillor Mihevc carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Pantalone carried.

Adoption of motion (d) by Councillor Nunziata:

<p>Yes - 27 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Chong, Duguid, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Nunziata, O’Brien, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker</p>
<p>No - 10 Councillors: Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giannante, Jones, Miller, Moscoe, Pantalone, Shiner, Silva</p>

Carried by a majority of 17.

Adoption of motion (f) by Councillor Filion:

<p>Yes - 10 Councillors: Adams, Augimeri, Brown, Cho, Filion, Mihevc, Miller, Pantalone, Prue, Silva</p>
--

No - 24 Councillors: Altobello, Berardinetti, Bossons, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 14.

Motion (c) by Councillor Saundercook carried.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 34 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - 1 Councillor: Kelly

Carried by a majority of 33.

5.34 **Clause No. 6 of Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed "Legal Claim Against the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto".**

Vote:

The Clause carried, without amendment.

Councillor Kinahan requested that his opposition to this Clause be noted in the Minutes of this meeting.

5.35 **Clause No. 2 of Report No. 5 of The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee, headed "Expansion of Hostel Services - Public Health Initiatives to Reduce the Spread of Communicable Diseases, in Particular TB".**

Motion:

Councillor Kinahan moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that Council request the Federal Minister of Health to meet with the Medical Officer of Health, the Chair of the Board of Health and the Chair of the Community Services Committee to review the federal government’s tuberculosis screening procedures for immigrants from countries where tuberculosis is endemic, with a view to having the federal government tighten up such procedures.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Kinahan carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.36 **Clause No. 9 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed “Residential Tax Phase-In - 3 Nassau Street (Downtown)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Chow moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, entitled ‘3 Nassau Street - Exemption from Phase-in By-law’, embodying the following recommendation, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that authority be granted for the introduction of a Bill in Council, substantially in the form of the draft by-law attached hereto as Appendix “A”, to amend By-law No. 966-1998.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Chow carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.37 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed “Phase 1 Renovations to Toronto City Hall - Recommended Actions in Response to Office Consolidation Sub-Committee Motions and Additional Budget Requirements”.**

Motions:

(a) Councillor Moeser moved that the Clause be amended by:

(1) striking out and referring Recommendation No. (6) of the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee to the Office Consolidation Sub-Committee, viz.:

“(6) the Corridors located on the second floor at City Hall be renamed to reflect their geographical location, i.e., Bay Street, Dundas Street, Queen Street, and University Avenue.”; and

(2) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the report dated May 12, 1999, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled ‘Office Space Consolidation - Report on Saving Space’, be referred to the Office Consolidation Sub-Committee.”

(b) Councillor Jakobek moved that Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Moeser be amended by adding thereto the words “and the Commissioner of Corporate Services be requested to submit a supplementary report, for consideration therewith, clearly outlining the details on the reduction of office space (i.e., where and how much) as well as the full costs involved”.

(c) Councillor Minnan-Wong moved that the Clause be amended by deleting Recommendation No. (3) of the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, viz.:

“(3) the funds in the amount of \$18,000.00 be allocated to renovate the Glass House and two adjoining rooms located on the underground parking level of City Hall to accommodate the Council drivers in one location;”.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Jakobek:

Yes - 29 Councillors: Adams, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Cho, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Mahood, Mihevc, Moeser, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas
No - 9 Councillors: Ashton, Augimeri, Flint, Jones, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, O'Brien, Saundercook

Carried by a majority of 20.

Motion (a) by Councillor Moeser, as amended, carried.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

<p>Yes - 5 Councillors: Holyday, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Pitfield, Silva</p>
<p>No - 32 Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Cho, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Sandercook, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas</p>

Lost by a majority of 27.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.38 **Clause No. 6 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed "Toronto Harbour Commissioners 1999 Operating Budget".**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Chow moved that the Clause be amended by striking out and referring Recommendation No. (3) of the Budget Committee embodied in the communication dated April 30, 1999, from the City Clerk, to the Mayor's Committee on Matters Relating to the Toronto Port Authority, for review and report thereon to the Policy and Finance Committee in June 1999, viz.:

“(3) that Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report (April 27, 1999) from the Chief Administrative Officer respecting the Toronto Harbour Commissioners 1999 Operating Budget, be received.”

- (b) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the data which has been brought forward by the Harbour Commission, with respect to consulting fees and travel, be reviewed by the Chief Administrative Officer, the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer and the City Auditor, and a report thereon be submitted to Council at such time as this matter is again before Council.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Chow carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Moscoe carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.39 **Clause No. 13 of Report No. 9 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed "1 Clarendon Avenue - Application to Demolish Rental Units Potential City-wide Rent Control Loophole".**

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

Motion:

Councillor Adams moved that Council adopt the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) the report dated May 6, 1999, from the City Solicitor, entitled ‘One Clarendon Avenue - Application to Terminate Tenancy Agreements, Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal Hearing’, be received;
- (2) the joint report dated May 10, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled ‘One Clarendon Avenue - Application to Terminate Tenancy Agreements to Demolish Rental Units’, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that Council:

- (a) request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing amend the Tenant Protection Act, 1997, or take other appropriate action, to clearly define what tests must be met before demolition can be claimed as grounds for termination of tenancies;
 - (b) because this matter may have implications for other municipalities in Ontario, advise the Association of Municipalities of Ontario of this matter and request their support in requesting amendments to the Tenant Protection Act; and
 - (c) the appropriate City officials be authorized to undertake any necessary action to give effect to the above recommendations.’;
- (3) the City Solicitor be instructed to serve a Notice of Appeal to the Divisional Court, within the 30-day appeal period, to appeal the decision of the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal on its refusal to grant the City standing in this

matter, in order to preserve all of the City's rights to participate in an appeal at the Divisional Court if an appeal is brought by either the landlord or the tenants involved;

- (4) the City Solicitor also be instructed, if an appeal of the Tribunal decision is brought, to take every reasonable measure to ensure that the City's interests with respect to protecting the supply and affordability of rental housing are protected and advanced at the appeal by seeking status at the appeal and by taking such other actions as he deems appropriate; and
- (5) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services be directed to provide every reasonable assistance and support to the tenants involved if the decision of the Tribunal is appealed."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Adams carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.40 Clause No. 4 of Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, headed "Toronto, Bombardier and the Third Millennium".

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that any expansion of the DeHavilland plant be accomplished within the provisions of the Downsview Secondary Plan endorsed by Council."
- (b) Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by:
 - (1) striking out Recommendation No. (3) of the Economic Development Committee, viz.:

"(3) the GTA be requested to endorse the 'Bring the CRJ-700 and BRJ-X to Toronto' project and to meet with Bombardier to identify how Toronto can make these projects viable;"; and
 - (2) deleting Recommendation No. (6) of the Economic Development Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(6) a Strategic Planning Group be established to develop a strategic plan on lobbying key decision makers, and the following Members of Council be appointed to this Group:

- the Mayor;
- the Chair of the Economic Development Committee (Councillor Ashton);
- Councillor Giansante;
- Councillor Moscoe; and
- Councillor Walker;”.

- (c) Councillor Augimeri moved that Part (2) of motion (b) by Councillor Ashton be amended by adding the words “or his designate”, after the word “Mayor”.
- (d) Councillor Brown moved that Part (2) of motion (b) by Councillor Ashton be amended by deleting the name “Councillor Giansante” and inserting in lieu thereof the name “Councillor Brown”.

Votes:

Motion (d) by Councillor Brown carried.

Motion (c) by Councillor Augimeri carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Ashton, as amended, carried.

Motion (a) by Councillor Moscoe carried.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 40 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - 1 Councillor: Layton

Carried by a majority of 39.

5.41 Clause No. 5 of Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed “Provision of Litter Bins with Advertising”.*Motions:*

- (a) Councillor Kinahan moved that the Clause be amended:
- (1) to provide that the Terms of Reference be amended to include a provision that two proposals be submitted by each proponent; one dealing with when the Ward Councillors have a right of veto, and one pertaining to when the Ward Councillors do not have a right of veto; and
 - (2) by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee for its meeting to be held on June 16, 1999, on whether OMG Media Inc. has fully complied with its agreement with the former City of Etobicoke, in accordance with Item No. (16) of the Terms of Reference.”
- (b) Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee providing an evaluation of this project after six months, and, thereafter, on an annual basis, outlining the status of this program.”
- (c) Councillor Disero moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report directly to Council for its meeting to be held on June 9, 10 and 11, 1999, on the results of the Community Council consultations on the Request for Proposals (RFP) for litter bins with advertising, in order that the RFP can be issued in June, 1999.”
- (d) Councillor Mihevc moved that the Clause be amended by deleting the second sentence from Item No. (4) of the draft Terms of Reference embodied in the report dated March 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, so that such item shall now read as follows:

“(4) Toronto will retain responsibility for emptying the containers.”

Votes:

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (a) by Councillor Kinahan:

Yes - 13 Councillors: Augimeri, Berger, Johnston, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Moeser, Nunziata, Pitfield, Tzekas, Walker
No - 32 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Kelly, King, Layton, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Silva

Lost by a majority of 19.

Adoption of motion (d) by Councillor Mihevc:

Yes - 34 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berger, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Walker
No - 12 Councillors: Adams, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Feldman, Gardner, King, Lindsay Luby, O'Brien, Sgro, Silva, Tzekas

Carried by a majority of 22.

Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Kinahan carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski carried.

Motion (c) by Councillor Disero carried.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 44

Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Silva, Tzekas, Walker

No - 2

Councillors: Bossons, Kinahan

Carried by a majority of 42.

5.42 **Clause No. 2 of Report No. 5 of The Corporate Services Committee, headed "Policy on Tendering Outdoor Advertising Signs on Existing Locations and Proposed New Locations".**

Motions:

(a) Councillor O'Brien moved that:

- (1) the Clause be struck out and referred to the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services; and
- (2) Council also adopt the following:

"WHEREAS Toronto City Council on June 5, 1998, passed By-law No. 280-1998 to prohibit third party advertising roof signs within 400 metres of recently transferred portions of Highways 27, 2, 2A and the F.G. Gardiner Expressway; and

WHEREAS Toronto City Council on July 29, 1998, adopted Clause No. 6 of Report No. 9 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, which recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services receive applications involving minor variances from the Sign By-law relating to the recently transferred portions of Highways 27, 2, 2A and the F. G. Gardiner Expressway;
- (2) the review of these applications for minor variance be undertaken by the appropriate staff of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with staff of Works and Emergency Services, using the Ministry of

Transportation of Ontario (MTO) Commercial Sign Policy as a guideline; and

- (3) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services prepare a report on each application to be forwarded to the appropriate Community Council for approval by Council.'; and

WHEREAS the six former municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto each have Sign By-laws which, in varying degrees, regulated third party billboard advertising signs on both private and public lands; and

WHEREAS City of Toronto Corporate Services Committee has recommended that all issues pertaining to the location of advertising signboards on City-owned properties be considered by the Corporate Services Committee; and that only the Corporate Services Committee give consideration to any recommendation in regard thereto; and that Etobicoke Community Council be so advised; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of the potential inequity associated with two approval streams for billboard advertising signs, one for signs proposed to be located on City-owned lands through Corporate Services Committee to Council, and a second process for signs proposed for private lands in each of the six former municipalities, through Community Councils to Council;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) the appropriate City officials move forward with the harmonization of all City sign regulations;
- (2) sign regulations be drafted in such a manner as to regulate, with equal consideration, all third party advertising signs, whether located on private or public lands; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with other City officials which oversee the use of City-owned lands, be requested to submit a joint report to the appropriate Committee of Council, on a procedure which will ensure that only one sign approval and sign variance approval process is used for all billboard advertising signs proposed for private or City-owned lands located within the City of Toronto."

- (b) Councillor Moscoe moved that Recommendation No. (3) embodied in the Operative Paragraph of Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor O'Brien be amended by adding

thereto the words “and on the feasibility of referring each new sign request to the relevant Community Council, as it pertains to locational issues only”.

- (c) Councillor Chow moved that the Operative Paragraph of Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor O’Brien be amended by adding thereto the following new Recommendation No. (4):

“(4) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a report to the appropriate Committee of Council on the outstanding request from Community Councils regarding signs insofar as it pertains to funding required.”

- (d) Councillor Miller moved that Recommendation No. (3) embodied in the Operative Paragraph of Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor O’Brien be amended by inserting after the words “submit a joint report”, the words “as soon as practicable”.
- (e) Councillor Tzekas moved that Recommendation No. (3) embodied in the Operative Paragraph of Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor O’Brien be amended by adding thereto the words “and on how a harmonized by-law can reflect local community characteristics”.

Votes:

Motion (e) by Councillor Tzekas carried.

Motion (d) by Councillor Miller carried.

Motion (c) by Councillor Chow carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Moscoe carried.

Motion (a) by Councillor O’Brien, as amended, carried.

In summary, Council struck out and referred the Clause to the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services.

Council also adopted the following:

“**WHEREAS** Toronto City Council on June 5, 1998, passed By-law No. 280-1998 to prohibit third party advertising roof signs within 400 metres of recently transferred portions of Highways 27, 2, 2A and the F. G. Gardiner Expressway; and

WHEREAS Toronto City Council on July 29, 1998, adopted Clause No. 6 of Report No. 9 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, which recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services receive applications involving minor variances from the Sign By-law relating to the recently transferred portions of Highways 27, 2, 2A and the F. G. Gardiner Expressway;
- (2) the review of these applications for minor variance be undertaken by the appropriate staff of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with staff of Works and Emergency Services, using the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) Commercial Sign Policy as a guideline; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services prepare a report on each application to be forwarded to the appropriate Community Council for approval by Council.'; and

WHEREAS the six former municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto each have Sign By-laws which, in varying degrees, regulated third party billboard advertising signs on both private and public lands; and

WHEREAS City of Toronto Corporate Services Committee has recommended that all issues pertaining to the location of advertising signboards on City-owned properties be considered by the Corporate Services Committee; and that only the Corporate Services Committee give consideration to any recommendation in regard thereto; and that Etobicoke Community Council be so advised; and

WHEREAS in consideration of the potential inequity associated with two approval streams for billboard advertising signs, one for signs proposed to be located on City-owned lands through Corporate Services Committee to Council, and a second process for signs proposed for private lands in each of the six former municipalities, through Community Councils to Council;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) the appropriate City officials move forward with the harmonization of all City sign regulations;
- (2) sign regulations be drafted in such a manner as to regulate, with equal consideration, all third party advertising signs, whether located on private or public lands;
- (3) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with other City officials which oversee the use of City-owned lands, be requested to submit a joint report, as soon as practicable, to the appropriate Committee of Council, on:

- (a) a procedure which will ensure that only one sign approval and sign variance approval process is used for all billboard advertising signs proposed for private or City-owned lands located within the City of Toronto;
 - (b) the feasibility of referring each new sign request to the relevant Community Council, as it pertains to locational issues only; and
 - (c) how a harmonized by-law can reflect local community characteristics; and
- (4) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a report to the appropriate Committee of Council on the outstanding request from Community Councils regarding signs insofar as it pertains to funding required.”

5.43 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 5 of The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee, headed “Final Report on the Review of the Use of Motels for Homeless Families”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated April 8, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, the words “contingent on provincial funding for replacement affordable housing units”, and adding thereto the following:

“and that the Province of Ontario be requested to facilitate the phase-out of the use of motels by partnering with the City of Toronto in the planning and funding of a capital building program for emergency shelter facilities for homeless families.”,

so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- “(1) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services develop a plan to phase-out the use of motels over a three- to five-year period and that the Province of Ontario be requested to facilitate the phase-out of the use of motels by partnering with the City of Toronto in the planning and funding of a capital building program for emergency shelter facilities for homeless families;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.44 **Clause No. 50 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Portlands Industrial District Ideas Workshop”.**

Motion:

Councillor Chong moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendations of the Toronto Community Council, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) a Portlands Community Forum, based upon the Forum referenced in the Clause and with even broader representation, be brought into being, meet on appropriate locations and become a central vehicle for the City and Port Authority consultation processes regarding the Part II Plan;
- (2) the draft Letters Patent for the Port Authority be referred to the Mayor’s Committee on the Portlands for consideration; and
- (3) Members of Council and staff of Urban Planning and Development Services pursue the ‘next steps’ which emerged from the forum through the Part II process and the Mayor’s Committee on Matters Relating to the Toronto Port Authority, as appropriate.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Chong carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

5.45 **Clause No. 7 of Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed “Downspout Disconnection Program”.**

Motion:

Councillor Pitfield moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that, if the response to this program is greater than the target of 4,000 disconnections for 1999, a waiting list be established.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Pitfield carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

- 5.46 **Clause No. 11 of Report No. 7 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed “License Agreement for Performance Management Software to be Implemented under the Works Best Practices Program”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jakobek moved that consideration of this Clause be deferred to the next regular meeting of Council to be held on June 9, 10 and 11, 1999; and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report directly to Council, for consideration therewith, on why a Proposal Call was not issued for this project.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jakobek carried.

- 5.47 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 5 of The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee, headed “Operational Review of Ontario Works and Child Care”.**

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

Motion:

Councillor Chow moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that the Chair of the Community Services Committee be requested to negotiate with the Province of Ontario with respect to the provision of child care for the 34,000 children whose parents would be required to participate in the Ontario Works Program.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Chow carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

- 5.48 **Clause No. 11 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Temporary Promotional Kiosk - Queen Street West North Side, 31 Metres West of Soho Street (Downtown)”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Chow moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, be adopted, subject to amending Part B of Appendix ‘A’ by deleting the figure ‘\$1,500.00’ and inserting in lieu thereof the figure ‘\$6,500.00’.”

- (b) Councillor Layton moved that consideration of the Clause be deferred to the next meeting of Council to be held on June 9, 1999; and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to assess the monetary value of the proposal by Councillor Chow and report thereon to Council for such meeting.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Layton:

Yes - 11 Councillors: Adams, Augimeri, Kinahan, Layton, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue
No - 26 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Rae, Sgro, Silva, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 15.

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Kinahan, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 25 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Nunziata, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Silva, Tzekas
--

<p>No - 11 Councillors: Adams, Chow, Layton, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Walker</p>
--

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Vote:

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Chow:

<p>Yes - 10 Councillors: Augimeri, Chong, Chow, Kinahan, Layton, McConnell, Moeser, Moscoe, Pantalone, Sinclair</p>
<p>No - 28 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Silva, Tzekas, Walker</p>

Lost by a majority of 18.

Motion to Re-open:

Councillor Chow, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, motion (a) be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Chow moved that motion (a) be amended to read as follows:

“That the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

‘It is further recommended that the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

“It is recommended that should City Council approve the temporary installation, as a pilot project, of the commercial promotional kiosk within the public right-of-way:

- (1) the Corporate Sponsorship Committee be requested to report back to Council at the end of the pilot project on commercial promotional kiosks within the public right-of-way; and

- (2) that approval be subject to the kiosk owner agreeing to restrict the use for promotional purposes only, and not for the purpose of vending and agreeing to enter into an agreement with the City of Toronto and the conditions as set out in Appendix 'A' of this report and with such conditions as the Commissioners of Works and Emergency Services and Corporate Services may deem necessary in the interest of the City of Toronto." " "

Vote:

Motion (a) by Councillor Chow, as amended, carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

MOTIONS (NOTICE PREVIOUSLY GIVEN) AND NOTICES OF MOTION

- 5.49 Deputy Mayor Ootes called upon Notice of Motion I(1) appearing on the Order Paper, as follows:

Moved by: Councillor Cho

Seconded by: Councillor Altobello

“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Transportation staff be requested to undertake a City-wide parking study to meet the community needs and come up with a ‘Harmonized Parking Policy for Street Parking’ within the next six months;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT staff be requested to prepare a report for submission to Scarborough Community Council that would describe a process to allow for the introduction of permit parking in the area bounded by Brimley Road, Pickering Town Line, Steeles Avenue and Highway No. 401.”

Motion:

Councillor Cho moved that Motion I (1) be referred to the Planning and Transportation Committee.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Cho carried.

- 5.50 Deputy Mayor Ootes called upon Notice of Motion I(2) appearing on the Order Paper, as follows:

Moved by: Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski

Seconded by: Councillor Pitfield

“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council establish a Special Committee to develop a public education campaign outlining the impacts of provincial downloading on the City of Toronto, in order to ensure that this becomes a key election issue;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Special Committee be supported by appropriate City staff.”

Vote:

Motion I(2) was adopted, without amendment.

- 5.51 Councillor Pantalone moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(1), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Pantalone

Seconded by: Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski

“WHEREAS the joint meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee scheduled for May 3, 1999, did not convene because of lack of quorum to begin the meeting; and

WHEREAS 11 members of the two committees were present at the time of the quorum call; and

WHEREAS Section 116(3) of By-law No. 23-1998, being a by-law ‘To Govern the Proceedings of the Council and Committees thereof’, states that quorum for a joint meeting is a majority of the combined number of Members of both Committees which, in the case of the joint meeting referred to above, would require 12 members to convene the meeting; and

WHEREAS Section 113 of By-law No. 23-1998 states that a quorum of a Committee of Council shall be one-half of the Members of the Committee; and

WHEREAS, for consistency purposes, the quorum requirements for Committees of Council and Joint Meetings of Committees of Council should be the same;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT By-law No. 23-1998, being a by-law 'To Govern the Proceedings of the Council and Committees thereof', as amended, be further amended by deleting subsection 116(3) and substituting the following:

- (3) A quorum for a joint meeting pursuant to this section shall be one-half of the combined number of Members of both of the Committees involved, and the Mayor, if present, shall be counted as one member for such purposes.';

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT notice, as required in accordance with Section 134 of By-law No. 23-1998, be given at this meeting of Council to amend Council Procedural By-law No. 23-1998 and authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary Bill in Council to give effect thereto."

Motion:

Councillor Pantalone moved that Motion J (1) be amended by deleting the first Operative Paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT By-law No. 23-1998, being a by-law 'To Govern the Proceedings of the Council and Committees thereof', as amended, be further amended by deleting subsection 116(3) and substituting the following:

- (3) (a) A quorum for a joint meeting pursuant to this section shall be calculated on the basis of one-half of the combined Members of both Committees excluding ex-officio Members, unless Council decides otherwise; and
- (b) ex-officio Members, when present, shall be counted in making such quorum.' "

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Pantalone carried.

Motion J(1), as amended, carried.

- 5.52 Councillor Walker moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(2), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Walker

Seconded by: Councillor Kinahan

“WHEREAS a Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control made up of Councillors, tenants and appropriate City staff was established by City Council at its meeting held on April 13, 14 and 15, 1999, with a mandate to develop a strategy to restore rent control; and

WHEREAS Council directed that a preliminary report outlining the proposed Terms of Reference, Workplan and resource requirements be submitted to the Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control for consideration at the joint meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee scheduled for May 3, 1999; and

WHEREAS the joint meeting referred to above did not convene because of a lack of quorum to begin the meeting; and

WHEREAS Council further directed the Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control to report regularly through the Urban Environment and Development Committee and also permitted the Sub-Committee to report directly to City Council in emergency circumstances; and

WHEREAS the provincial government's new Tenant Protection Act has far reaching, serious implications for every tenant in the City of Toronto and across Ontario; and

WHEREAS it is anticipated that the Premier of the Province of Ontario will call an election within the next few weeks, after which point there will be no opportunity for legislative change until the next government is formed;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council give consideration to the recommendations of the Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control embodied in the attached report (April 30, 1999) from the Chair, Council Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, and that such recommendations be adopted.”

Council also had before it a communication dated April 30, 1999, from Councillor Michael Walker, Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, forwarding the recommendations

of the Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control pertaining to a report dated April 26, 1999, from Councillor Michael Walker, Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, outlining the elements of a City strategy to restore rent control. (See Attachment No. 1.)

Motions:

Councillor Chow moved that the recommendation of the Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control embodied in the communication dated April 30, 1999, from the Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, be amended by deleting the words “through the Corporate Contingency Account” and inserting in lieu thereof the words “and funds for this purpose be provided from the 1999 Operating Budget of the Shelter, Housing and Support Services Division of Community and Neighbourhood Services”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- “(2) Council provide funding for the campaign in the amount of \$58,000, and funds for this purpose be provided from the 1999 Operating Budget of the Shelter, Housing and Support Services Division of Community and Neighbourhood Services;”

Councillor Chow, with the permission of Council, withdrew her motion.

Votes:

Adoption of Motion J(2), without amendment:

Yes - 30 Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Duguid, Gardner, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - 15 Councillors: Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Disero, Holyday, Jakobek, King, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield

Carried by a majority of 15.

Council, by its adoption of Motion J(2), without amendment, adopted the recommendation of the Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control embodied in the communication dated April 30, 1999, from the Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, that the report dated April 26, 1999, from the Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, be adopted, subject to deleting Recommendation No. (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a new

Recommendation No. (2), so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) Council approve the proposed strategy for a campaign to restore rent control and direct the Council Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control to administer this campaign;
- (2) Council provide funding for the campaign, in the amount of \$58,000.00, through the Corporate Contingency fund; and
- (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.”

5.53 Councillor Pantalone moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion (3), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Pantalone and Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski

Seconded by: Mayor Lastman

“**WHEREAS** the joint meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee, scheduled for May 3, 1999, was unable to formally convene due to lack of quorum; and

WHEREAS the Chairs of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and Urban Environment and Development Committee agreed to hear the scheduled deputations from the general public; and

WHEREAS the Chairs of the Standing Committees and attending Committee Members agreed that the recommendations contained in the reports of the Commissioners of Community and Neighbourhood Services and Urban Planning and Development Services on the policy directions of the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force be forwarded to the May 11, 12, and 13, 1999, meeting of Council; and

WHEREAS City Council on March 2, 3, and 4, 1999, adopted, in principle, the general directions outlined in the final report of the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force; and

WHEREAS City Council has declared homelessness to be a national disaster and can play a leading role in responding to homelessness through the effective use of its planning and policy tools; and

WHEREAS the Commissioners of Community and Neighbourhood Services and Urban Planning and Development Services were directed by City Council to provide a policy response and implementation approach to the Task Force recommendations; and

WHEREAS City Council has already approved the financial commitments recommended by the Chief Administrative Officer and the Commissioners' reports do not have additional financial implications for the City's 1999 budget; and

WHEREAS the May 11, 12 and 13, 1999, is the last City Council meeting at which these reports could be adopted prior to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) annual conference of June 4 to 7, 1999, in Halifax, to be attended by the Mayor and FCM member Councillors; and

WHEREAS the FCM has established homelessness and affordable housing as a key agenda item for their annual meeting; and

WHEREAS the approval of the Commissioners' reports will reaffirm City Council's commitment to take action on homelessness and will lend critical support for the proposed FCM National Housing Policy Options Paper aimed at generating momentum for a national housing policy;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the recommendations contained in the attached reports of the Commissioners of Community and Neighbourhood Services, dated April 8, 1999, and Urban Planning and Development Services, dated April 15, 1999, on the policy directions of the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force (See Attachment No. 2) be adopted;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council consider the following motions proposed by attending committee members and request the appropriate Commissioners to report directly to this meeting of Council to provide a preliminary response to the motions:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with the City Solicitor, report on:
 - (a) the form of a by-law, similar to the former North York's Municipal Use By-law and the former City of Toronto's Section 11 Municipal Use By-law, which would accommodate affordable housing and emergency shelters in all parts of the new City;
 - (b) an extension of the City of Toronto's Rooming House By-law to other parts of the City; and

(c) recommendation No. (2) of the report (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons:

‘(2) the City adopt policies necessary to override existing zoning by-laws, across the amalgamated city, to ensure that new emergency shelter can be opened as needed.’;

(2) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services report on:

(a) the feasibility of establishing an ongoing licence represented by a one-time fee, for future secondary accommodation that would guarantee the right of City of Toronto Building Inspectors to gain entry;

(3) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report on:

(a) the FCM National Housing Policy Options Paper for endorsement in principle by City Council;

(b) Recommendation No. 1(d) of the report (April 8, 1999) from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services to include representation from the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society;

(c) Recommendation No. (1) of the report (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons:

(1) in the development of its response to the Task Force action plan, that the City of Toronto set housing targets that reflect the actual numbers of homeless people in the city to ensure we are not just ‘treading water’ but are significantly reducing the number of homeless people.;

(d) supporting the provision of rent supplement programs to be available only to people living in rent-controlled housing;

(e) a review of the City availing itself of any co-operative market units that may be available for providing additional affordable housing; and

(f) opportunities that may be available in zoned lands to provide a rent-to-own form of housing tenure for tenants within an existing

City owned/operated rental building thereby making vacated units available to residents on waiting lists; and

- (4) Recommendation No. (3) of the report (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons be referred to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee for further consideration.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, the following reports and communication (See Attachment No. 2):

- (a) (April 8, 1999) from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled “The Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Policy Directions Related to Community and Neighbourhood Services”;
- (b) (April 15, 1999) from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled “The Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Recommendations and Policy Directions Related to Housing Policies of the Official Plan”;
- (c) (May 7, 1999) from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled “Information Requests from the May 3, 1999 Joint Meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee”;
- (d) (May 7, 1999) from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled “Process for By-law Amendments to Permit Affordable Housing, Emergency Shelters and Rooming Houses Across the City”;
- (e) (May 10, 1999) from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled “The Development of a Small Landlord Education Program, a Registration By-law and an Enforcement Strategy for Second Suites”; and
- (f) (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons, entitled “Final Report of the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force”.

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Pantalone moved that Motion J (3) be amended by adding to the first Operative Paragraph the following:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) the report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled 'Information Requests from the May 3, 1999 Joint Meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee', be adopted;
 - (2) the report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled 'Process for By-law Amendments to Permit Affordable Housing, Emergency Shelters and Rooming Houses Across the City', be adopted; and
 - (3) the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled 'The Development of a Small Landlord Education Program, a Registration By-law and an Enforcement Strategy for Second Suites', be adopted;".
- (b) Councillor Feldman moved that Motion J (3) be amended by amending the first Operative Paragraph to read as follows:

“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the report dated April 8, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the report dated April 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be adopted, subject to:

- (1) deleting Recommendation No. (5) embodied in the report dated April 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled 'The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Recommendations and Policy Directions Related to Housing Policies of the Official Plan', and inserting in lieu thereof the following new Recommendation No. (5):
 - (5) (a) within 60 days, amend the City's planning documents to permit second suites as-of-right in all single and semi-detached houses, subject to appropriate building, fire and property standards being met and consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 provincial legislation;
 - (b) address the removal of unnecessary barriers to the creation of second suites, while maintaining the integrity of the building code, fire code and property standards;

- (c) in conjunction with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, report on ways to encourage homeowners to create second suites, including the feasibility, cost and possible source of funds for:
 - (i) a promotional campaign for homeowners;
 - (ii) education and support programs for small landlords; and
 - (iii) incentive programs (e.g. capital grants, interest free loans); and

- (2) adding to Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report dated April 8, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled 'The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Policy Directions Related to Community and Neighbourhood Services', the following new subsection:

- '(2) (p) requesting the Mayor and/or his designate to write and/or meet with:
 - (i) the federal and provincial governments to provide capital funding for the creation of second suites;
 - (ii) the federal government to consider relief on income tax for income from second suites; and
 - (iii) the Province to ensure that the creation of second suites does not increase the CVA of residential properties; and

directing the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services to take all action necessary to implement the foregoing;'

- (c) Mayor Lastman moved that Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the following motion be adopted:

“WHEREAS the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force recommended that a “fast-track” eviction procedure be established at the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal, applying to tenants renting rooms or basement apartments

in owner-occupied properties, in conjunction with the legalization of second suites; and

WHEREAS the Task Force noted that homeowners who rent out units in their homes are particularly vulnerable to problem tenants; and

WHEREAS the new Tenant Protection Act, while implementing a faster eviction process however, does not address the specific situation of homeowners with second suites; and

WHEREAS homeowners with second suites live with their tenants and, as a result, may experience difficulties which are different and more urgent than those experienced by landlords who do not live with their tenants;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services be requested to meet with representatives of the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to:

- (1) establish a separate class for second suites which would recognize the different relationship which exists between the homeowner and tenant by implementing a streamlined process for applications to terminate tenancies; and
 - (2) discuss legislative changes which would permit the homeowner and tenant to sign a lease with terms and conditions which might not otherwise be permitted under the Tenant Protection Act, but which are reasonable given the distinct relationship between a homeowner and a tenant living in a second suite, and permit these conditions to be cause for termination of tenancy.’ ”
- (d) Councillor Moscoe moved that Motion J (3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the former City of Toronto provisions for licensing Rooming Houses, or other appropriate regulations, be extended to areas where Rooming Houses already exist in large numbers and where identified by City Planning officials in consultation with the Ward Councillors.”

- (e) Councillor McConnell moved that motion (a) by Councillor Pantalone be amended by adding thereto the following:

“subject to amending Part (a) of the recommendation embodied in the report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled ‘Process for By-law Amendments to Permit Affordable Housing Emergency

Shelters and Rooming Houses Across the City’, by inserting the words ‘and other municipal housing uses’ after the word ‘shelters’.”

- (f) Councillor Flint moved that Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to submit a report to the Assessment and Tax Policy Task Force on the merits of establishing a separate assessment class that would recognize those single-family properties that are also income providing properties.”

- (g) Councillor King moved that Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Councillor Feldman be requested to develop a plan that would ensure that Recommendation No. (2), Parts (a) to (p), embodied in the report dated April 8, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, as amended, are addressed;”.

- (h) Councillor Filion moved that Motion J (3) be amended by adding to the first Operative Paragraph the following:

“subject to striking out and referring Part (a) of Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report dated April 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services to the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services for a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the proposal regarding the use of Section 3 7 to obtain funding for affordable housing and outlining an implementation plan for its use”.

- (i) Councillor Duguid moved that Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards, be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on mechanisms available to the City to differentiate between owner-occupied and absentee-landlord properties, with respect to enforcement and legalization of aspects pertaining to second suites;”.

- (j) Councillor Johnston moved that:

(1) Part (2) of motion (b) by Councillor Feldman be amended by adding to Parts (2)(p)(i), (ii) and (iii) the words “in owner-occupied homes”; and

- (2) Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, having regard that Section 37(1) of the Planning Act states that the Council of a local municipality may, in a by-law passed under Section 34, authorize increases in the height and density of development otherwise permitted by the by-law that will be permitted in return for the provisions of such facilities, services ‘OR MATTERS’ as a result set out in the by-law, the City Solicitor, in conjunction with the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on whether the term ‘MATTERS’ in Section 37(1) of the Planning Act, can include agreements on tenant relocation and rental rates to be set by the Council in the event that bonuses have been given;”.

- (k) Councillor Ashton moved that motion (a) by Councillor Pantalone be amended by adding thereto the following:

“subject to amending the recommendation embodied in the report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled ‘Process for By-law Amendments to Permit Affordable Housing, Emergency Shelters and Rooming Houses Across the City’, by adding the following new Part (c):

‘(c) the public consultation process to be followed to permit public input into the by-law amendments recommended in Parts (a) and (b), above, such report to be forwarded to Council through the Planning and Transportation Committee.’ ”

- (l) Councillor Chow moved that Motion J (3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the details regarding policies and mechanisms on the use of Section 37 of the Planning Act to obtain funding for affordable housing;”.

- (m) Councillor Layton moved that:

- (1) motion (b) by Councillor Feldman be amended by adding thereto the words “and requesting the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to include these initiatives in the National Policy Options Document”;

- (2) Motion J(3) be amended by adding to Recommendation No. (4) embodied in the second Operative Paragraph the words “and Dr. Anne Golden be invited to address the Committee to outline the Task Force’s rationale for a Housing Facilitator”; and
- (3) motion (d) by Councillor Moscoe be referred to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services for report thereon to the Community Services Committee.
- (n) Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski moved that Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Council express its appreciation to staff of the Urban Planning and Development Services Department and the Community and Neighbourhood Services Department for their exemplary work in this regard.”

Votes:

Motion (e) by Councillor McConnell carried.

Motion (k) by Councillor Ashton carried.

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Pantalone, as amended:

Yes - 46 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Balakisssoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihelcic, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Walker
No - 4 Councillors: Ashton, Flint, Holyday, Mahood

Carried by a majority of 42.

Adoption of motion (h) by Councillor Filion:

<p>Yes - 7 Councillors: Filion, Flint, Kelly, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Minnan-Wong</p>
<p>No - 44 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker</p>

Lost by a majority of 37.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (j) by Councillor Johnston:

<p>Yes - 50 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker</p>
<p>No - 2 Councillors: Filion, Mihevc</p>

Carried by a majority of 48.

Part (1) of motion (m) by Councillor Layton carried.

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Feldman, as amended:

Yes - 44 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong Chow, Disero, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Walker
No - 8 Councillors: Ashton, Duguid, Flint, Holyday, Kelly, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Tzekas

Carried by a majority 36.

Motion (c) by Mayor Lastman carried.

Motion (f) by Councillor Flint was not put to a vote, having regard to the decision of Council with respect to motion (b) by Councillor Feldman.

Part (3) of motion (m) by Councillor Layton, to refer motion (d) by Councillor Moscoe to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, carried.

Motion (g) by Councillor King carried.

Adoption of motion (i) by Councillor Duguid:

Yes - 46 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - 6 Councillors: Augimeri, Layton, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Rae

Carried by a majority of 40.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (j) by Councillor Johnston:

Yes - 44
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

No - 8
Councillors: Brown, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Moeser, Saundercook, Sgro, Shiner

Carried by a majority of 36.

Motion (l) by Councillor Chow carried.

Part (2) of motion (m) by Councillor Layton carried.

Motion (n) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski carried.

Adoption of Motion J(3), as amended:

Yes - 48
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Walker

No - 4
Councillors: Flint, Holyday, Mahood, Tzekas

Carried by a majority of 44.

In summary, Council adopted Motion J(3), subject to:

(1) amending the first Operative Paragraph to read as follows:

“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- (a) the report dated April 8, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled ‘The Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Policy Directions Related to Community and Neighbourhood Services’, be adopted, subject to amending Recommendation No. (2) by adding thereto the following new subsection:

- ‘(2) (p) requesting the Mayor and/or his designate to write and/or meet with:
- (i) the federal and provincial governments to provide capital funding for the creation of second suites in owner-occupied homes;
 - (ii) the federal government to consider relief on income tax for income from second suites in owner-occupied homes; and
 - (iii) the Province to ensure that the creation of second suites does not increase the CVA of residential properties in owner-occupied homes; and

directing the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services to take all action necessary to implement the foregoing, and requesting the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to include these initiatives in the National Policy Options Document;’,

so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) in keeping with the Task Force call for the City to exercise a leadership role in responding to the homeless crisis, that:
- (a) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report back to the Community Services Committee, by fall 1999, on a proposed format for a municipal report card on homelessness;
 - (b) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services meet with senior representatives in the Ministry of Community and Social Services to discuss expansion of the

abused women's shelter system in Toronto (an estimated 380 additional beds are required). As this type of expansion would take several years, the Commissioner should further request that the Province provide funding to community-based agencies to support abused women forced to use emergency shelters because of the shortfall in the abused women's system;

- (c) the City actively pursue the Task Force recommendation to establish partnerships between youth shelters and landlords to create additional housing units for youth; and
 - (d) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services convene a meeting with the Ontario Multi-Faith Council regarding the development of appropriate discharge protocols, including follow-up support, for people leaving correctional facilities;
- (2) in recognition of the need for all three levels of government to take ownership of the problem of homelessness and responsibility for solving it, Council encourage the involvement of the other levels of government in areas that fall within their jurisdictions by:
- (a) urging the Province to earmark funds from the transfer of federal monies for health and social services to a dedicated Homeless Health Fund to address the special needs of homeless persons;
 - (b) urging the federal government to designate a senior representative to work directly with the City of Toronto and representatives of Aboriginal organizations in Toronto to develop a culturally appropriate homeless strategy, building on the recommendations proposed by the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force;
 - (c) urging the federal government to designate a senior representative to work directly with the City of Toronto and representatives of the immigrant and refugee service sector in Toronto to discuss the broad range of immigration and refugee policy and program issues at the municipal level, including those related to homelessness proposed by the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force;
 - (d) urging the federal government to allow refugee claimants access to basic settlement services and to enhance access to

- and coverage of the Federal Interim Health Plan for refugee claimants;
- (e) urging the federal government to provide capital funding for an additional shelter for refugees in Toronto;
 - (f) urging the Province to appoint senior representatives from the Ministry of Health, Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services to work directly with the City of Toronto and its community partners to develop discharge protocols, including follow-up support, for all institutions who discharge people to no fixed address or to emergency shelters;
 - (g) urging the Province to ensure that the definitions of special need and eligibility for supportive housing are broad enough to include "hard-to-house" homeless people;
 - (h) urging the Province to maintain administration of the Support to Daily Living Program (representing a approximately \$3.0 million for Toronto), in recognition of the provincial responsibility for supportive housing;
 - (i) urging the Province to expand Habitat Services by an additional 200 beds for the year 2000 and to provide full 80 percent funding for this program;
 - (j) urging the Province to approve the funding proposal to expand the Breaking the Cycle program to include a new substance abuse treatment program for young mothers;
 - (k) welcoming the recent provincial announcement to make government-owned land available for housing and housing demonstration projects, and urging the Province to establish a process for working with the City to identify potential sites;
 - (l) urging the Province to support municipal affordable housing partnerships through measures such as capital grants/equity or a role in lending, where the Province does have existing capability;
 - (m) welcoming the recent provincial announcement on rent supplements, and urging the Province to consult with the City of Toronto on the design of the rent supplement program with a goal of immediate implementation;

- (n) urging the federal government to identify specific government-owned sites for use as housing demonstration projects, in co-operation with the City;
 - (o) urging Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to enhance its housing partnership role by substantially increasing its support to new affordable housing through revised mortgage insurance policies and direct lending;
 - (p) requesting the Mayor and/or his designate to write to and/or meet with:
 - (i) the federal and provincial governments to provide capital funding for the creation of second suites in owner-occupied homes;
 - (ii) the federal government to consider relief on income tax for income from second suites in owner-occupied homes; and
 - (iii) the Province to ensure that the creation of second suites does not increase the CVA of residential properties in owner-occupied homes; and

directing the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services to take all action necessary to implement the foregoing, and requesting the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to include these initiatives in the National Policy Options Document;
 - (3) this report be forwarded to the ~~new~~ federal Minister of Homelessness and the provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Minister of Community and Social Services and the Minister of Health; and
 - (4) appropriate City officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.’;
- (b) the report dated April 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled ‘The Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Recommendations and Policy Directions Related to Housing Policies of the Official Plan’, be adopted, subject to deleting Recommendation No. (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new Recommendation No. (5):

- (5) (a) within 60 days, amend the City's planning documents to permit second suites as-of-right in all single and semi-detached houses, subject to appropriate building, fire and property standards being met and consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 provincial legislation;
- (b) address the removal of unnecessary barriers to the creation of second suites, while maintaining the integrity of the building code, fire code and property standards;
- (c) in conjunction with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, report on ways to encourage homeowners to create second suites, including the feasibility, cost and possible source of funds for:
- (i) a promotional campaign for homeowners;
 - (ii) education and support programs for small landlords; and
 - (iii) incentive programs (e.g. capital grants, interest free loans); and

the Federation of Canadian Municipalities be requested to include initiatives similar to the foregoing in the National Policy Options Document;'

so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

'It is recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services:

- (1) in consultation with the City Solicitor, be requested to meet with senior staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to seek legislative authority to provide the City of Toronto with enhanced demolition control powers consistent with the provisions of the former Rental Housing Protection Act (RHPA);
- (2) be authorized, commencing immediately, to pursue contributions toward the provision of affordable housing pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act for increases in permitted height and/or density, with respect to the following situations:

- (a) site-specific amendments to both the Official Plan and Zoning By-laws that are being approved for a specific development; and
 - (b) site-specific amendments to the Zoning By-law that are being approved and in which the appropriate Official Plan provisions for the implementation of Section 37 are already in place;
- (3) be authorized to request that the Committee of Adjustment, when dealing with minor variance applications involving substantial increases in height and/or density, impose a condition under Section 45(9) of the Planning Act for a contribution toward affordable housing where the need for affordable housing is reasonably related to the variance applied for;
- (4) deposit any cash contribution in lieu of affordable housing, secured through the implementation of Recommendations Nos. (2) and (3), to the Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing;
- (5) (a) within 60 days, amend the City's planning documents to permit second suites as-of-right in all single and semi-detached houses, subject to appropriate building, fire and property standards being met and consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 provincial legislation;
- (b) address the removal of unnecessary barriers to the creation of second suites while maintaining the integrity of the building code, fire code and property standards;
- (c) in conjunction with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, report on ways to encourage homeowners to create second suites, including the feasibility, cost and possible source of funds for:
- (i) a promotional campaign for homeowners;
 - (ii) education and support programs for small landlords; and

- (iii) incentive programs (e.g. capital grants, interest free loans); and

the Federation of Canadian Municipalities be requested to include initiatives similar to the foregoing in the National Policy Options Document;

- (6) consider as a high priority, in the preparation of a housing implementation plan as part of the Official Plan process, policies on urban intensification and the inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments;
 - (7) consult with the heads of the appropriate Departments to prepare, implement and report on a plan to streamline development approvals which builds on current efforts and takes into consideration best practices;
 - (8) thoroughly review the current planning provisions and procedures respecting rooming houses and examine the opportunities for the provision of such housing City-wide in the context of a longer-term work plan in co-ordination with Buildings, Fire, Housing, Health and Legal staff; and
 - (9) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to undertake any necessary actions to give effect thereto.’;
- (c) the report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled ‘Information Requests from the May 3, 1999 Joint Meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee’, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) Council endorse, in principle, the draft report of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) National Housing Policy Options Paper (as attached) and notify FCM of this support prior to its annual meeting on June 4, 1999; and
 - (2) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.’;
- (d) the report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled ‘Process for By-law Amendments to Permit Affordable Housing, Emergency Shelters and Rooming Houses Across the

City', be adopted subject to amending the recommendation embodied therein by:

- (1) inserting the words 'and other municipal housing uses' after the word 'shelters' in Part (a); and
- (2) adding the following new Part (c):
 - '(c) the public consultation process to be followed to permit public input into the by-law amendments recommended in Parts (a) and (b), above, such report to be forwarded to Council through the Planning and Transportation Committee.'

so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

'It is recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with the City Solicitor, report further to the Planning and Transportation Committee on:

- (a) the form of a by-law, similar to the public use permissive exceptions in the former North York and Toronto Zoning By-laws, which would accommodate emergency shelters and other municipal housing uses in all parts of the new City;
 - (b) an extension of the former City of Toronto's Rooming House By-laws to other parts of the City; and
 - (c) the public consultation process to be followed to permit public input into the by-law amendments recommended in Parts (a) and (b), above, such report to be forwarded to Council, through the Planning and Transportation Committee.';
- (e) the report dated May 10, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled 'The Development of a Small Landlord Education Program, a Registration By-law and an Enforcement Strategy for Second Suites', embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

'It is recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report jointly to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the development of a small landlord education program;

- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the City Solicitor jointly report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on an implementation plan for the registration of second suites, including a draft by-law and outlining what resources may be required, if any, to support this plan; and
 - (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to undertake any necessary actions to give effect thereto.’;
- (2) adopting Recommendation No. (4) embodied in the second Operative Paragraph, subject to adding thereto the words ‘and Dr. Anne Golden be invited to address the Committee to outline the Task Force’s rationale for a Housing Facilitator’, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
- ‘(4) Recommendation No. (3) of the report (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons, be referred to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee for further consideration, and Dr. Anne Golden be invited to address the Committee to outline the Task Force’s rationale for a Housing Facilitator, viz.:
 - ‘(3) the City proceed immediately with hiring a Facilitator for Action on Homelessness, as recommended by the Mayor’s Task Force, and that the Facilitator establish a formal link with the Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons to enable ongoing consultation with this community-based group on issues related to homelessness.’;
 - and
- (3) adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraphs:

‘**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Councillor Feldman be requested to develop a plan that would ensure that Recommendation No. (2), Parts (a) to (p), embodied in the report dated April 8 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, as amended, are addressed;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, having regard that Section 37(1) of the Planning Act states that the Council of a local municipality may, in a by-law passed under Section 34, authorize increases in the height and density of development otherwise permitted by the by-law that will be permitted in return for the provisions of such facilities, services “OR MATTERS” as are set out in the by-law, the City Solicitor, in conjunction with the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on whether the term “MATTERS” in Section 37(1) of the Planning Act, can include agreements on tenant relocation and rental rates to be set by the Council in the event that bonuses have been given;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the details regarding policies and mechanisms on the usage of Section 37 of the Planning Act to obtain funding for affordable housing;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the following motion be adopted:

‘**WHEREAS** the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force recommended that a “fast-track” eviction procedure be established at the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal, applying to tenants renting rooms or basement apartments in owner-occupied properties, in conjunction with the legalization of second suites; and

WHEREAS the Task Force noted that homeowners who rent out units in their homes are particularly vulnerable to problem tenants; and

WHEREAS the new Tenant Protection Act, while implementing a faster eviction process however, does not address the specific situation of homeowners with second suites; and

WHEREAS homeowners with second suites live with their tenants and, as a result, may experience difficulties which are different and more urgent than those experienced by landlords who do not live with their tenants;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services be requested to meet with representatives of the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to:

- (a) establish a separate class for second suites which would recognize the different relationship which exists between the homeowner and tenant by implementing a streamlined process for applications to terminate tenancies; and
- (b) discuss legislative changes which would permit the homeowner and tenant to sign a lease with terms and conditions which might not otherwise be permitted under the Tenant Protection Act, but which are reasonable given the distinct relationship between a homeowner and a tenant living in a second suite, and permit these conditions to be cause for termination of tenancy.’;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards, be requested to

submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on mechanisms available to the City to differentiate between owner-occupied and absentee-landlord properties, with respect to enforcement and legalization of aspects pertaining to second suites;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the following motion be referred to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services for report thereon to the Community Services Committee:

Moved by Councillor Moscoe:

‘That Motion J(3) be amended by adding thereto the following Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the former City of Toronto provisions for licensing Rooming Houses, or other appropriate regulations, be extended to areas where Rooming Houses already exist in large numbers and where identified by City Planning officials in consultation with the Ward Councillors.”’;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council express its appreciation to staff of the Urban Planning and Development Services Department and the Community and Neighbourhood Services Department for their exemplary work in this regard.’ ”

- 5.54 Councillor Adams moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(4):

Moved by: Councillor Adams

Seconded by: Councillor Ootes

“**WHEREAS** By-law No. 231-1999 provides for the levy and collection of taxes for the 1999 taxation year; and

WHEREAS O.Reg. 400/98 prescribed the tax rate for school purposes for property in the residential/farm and the multi-residential property classes as 0.46 percent, and the tax rate for school purposes for property in the farmlands and managed forest property classes as 0.115 percent; and

WHEREAS O.Reg. 307/99, filed by the Minister of Finance on May 5, 1999, amends O.Reg. 400/98 by prescribing for 1999 and subsequent years the lower tax rate for school purposes for property in the residential and multi-residential property

classes of 0.414 percent, and the lower tax rate for school purposes for property in the farmlands and managed forest property classes of 0.1035 percent; and

WHEREAS By-law No. 231-1999 as enacted by Council on April 28, 1999, levied 1999 tax rates for school purposes for property in the residential, multi-residential, farmlands, and managed forest property classes in accordance with the rates prescribed for 1999 by O. Reg. 400/98 prior to its amendment by O. Reg. 307/99; and

WHEREAS the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer has submitted a report dated May 6, 1999, entitled '1999 Residential Education Tax Rates', outlining recommendations in this regard;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the report dated May 6, 1999, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, be considered by Council at its meeting on May 11, 1999, and that such report be adopted.”,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

<p>Yes - 43 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Cho, Chow, Davis, Di sero, Dug uid, F aubert, F eldman, Filion, Gard ner, Giansante, Holy day, J akobek, J ohnston, Kelly, Kinahan, King , L ayton, L i Preti, L indsay L uby, Mammoliti, McConnell , Mihevc , Minnan-W ong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Walker</p>
<p>No - 3 Councillors: Flint, Jones, Miller</p>

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a report (May 6, 1999) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, entitled "1999 Residential Education Tax Rates", requesting authority to amend the by-law to reflect the reduction in education tax rates for the residential and multi-residential property classes announced by the Province on May 4, 1999. (See Attachment No. 3.)

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Councillor Miller requested the Deputy Mayor to rule on whether Council could change the amount of taxes levied for municipal purposes, having regard to the reduction in education tax rates imposed by the Province of Ontario.

Deputy Mayor Ootes ruled that the taxes levied for municipal purposes could not be changed.

Councillor Miller challenged the ruling of the Deputy Mayor.

Vote to uphold ruling of Deputy Mayor:

Yes - 29 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Adams, B alkiisoon, B erardinetti, B ossons, Cho, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Feldman, Flint, Fotinos, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kinahan, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Moeser, Nunz iata, Ootes, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner
No - 11 Councillors: Fillion, J ones, Korwin -Kuczynski, L ayton, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Prue, Sinclair, Walker

Carried by a majority of 18.

Point of Privilege:

Councillor Jakobek, rising on a point of privilege, moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to permit Councillor Miller to now put a motion of referral.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard that there were speakers ahead of Councillor Miller, ruled the motion by Councillor Jakobek out of order.

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Davis moved that Motion J (4) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to submit a report to the Assessment and Tax Policy Task Force on the impact of this change on the tenant notification process, with a view to increasing the number of tenants who receive a rent reduction as a result of reduction in the education tax rate.”

- (b) Councillor Miller moved that Motion J (4) and the report dated May 6, 1999, be referred to the Budget Committee, with a request that the Committee hold a public meeting to consider the merits of maintaining the total property tax levy as originally set out in the levy by-law, including the possibility of using the estimated \$60 million to offset the \$59 million borrowed from the Province of Ontario for the 1998 Operating Budget.

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of the following portion of motion (b) by Councillor Miller, ruled such out of order:

“to consider the merits of maintaining the total property tax levy as originally set out in the levy by-law, including the possibility of using the estimated \$60 million to offset the \$59 million borrowed from the Province of Ontario for the 1998 Operating Budget.”

Vote on the balance of motion (b) by Councillor Miller:

<p>Yes - 14 Councillors: Augimeri, Bussin, Cho, Faubert, Giansante, Jones, Kinahan, Mahood, Mih evc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Saundercook, Walker</p>
<p>No - 27 Councillors: Adams, Balkissoon, Bossons, Davis, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Pr eti, Lindsay L uby, Mammoliti, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Sgo, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas</p>

Lost by a majority of 13.

Motion:

- (c) Councillor Jones moved that Council adopt the following recommendations:

“That:

- (1) the City of Toronto residential tax rate be maintained at 1.259702;
- (2) the City of Toronto implement the revised education tax rate at 0.414000;
and
- (3) the City of Toronto amend its tax rate to be 0.845702.”

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of motion (c) by Councillor Jones, ruled such motion out of order.

Motions:

- (d) Councillor Bossons moved that Motion J (4) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council request the Minister of Finance to:

- (1) move immediately to amend the Tenant Protection Act, to ensure that the benefit of the reduced education tax rate is passed on to tenants; and
- (2) co-operate with the City of Toronto, and other municipalities, to determine a cost-effective method of notifying tenants of this reduction.”

- (e) Councillor Moscoe moved that:

- (1) consideration of Motion J(4) be deferred until Thursday, May 12, 1999; and
- (2) the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to seek clarification from the Minister of Finance on how the rebate will be passed on to tenants and report thereon directly to Council on Thursday, May 12, 1999.

Vote on deferral motion (e) by Councillor Moscoe:

Yes - 12 Councillors: Adams, Augimeri, Bussin, Faubert, Flint, Gardner, Jones, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Walker
No - 27 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Ashton, Bossons, Davis, Dsero, Duguid, Fotinos, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Piffeld, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas

Lost by a majority of 15.

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Davis carried.

Motion (d) by Councillor Bossons carried.

Adoption of Motion J(4) as amended:

Yes - 36
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Sergio, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas
No - 6
Councillors: Augimeri, Bussin, Jones, Miller, Moscoe, Walker

Carried by a majority of 30.

In summary, Council adopted Motion J (4), subject to adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraphs:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council request the Minister of Finance to:

- (1) move immediately to amend the Tenant Protection Act, to ensure that the benefit of the reduced education tax rate is passed on to tenants; and
- (2) co-operate with the City of Toronto, and other municipalities, to determine a cost-effective method of notifying tenants of this reduction;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to submit a report to the Assessment and Tax Policy Task Force on the impact of this change on the tenant notification process, with a view to increasing the number of tenants who receive a rent reduction as a result of reduction in the education tax rate.”

Council also adopted the report dated May 6, 1999, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) the education tax rates levied by By-law No. 231-1999 on properties in the residential/farm, multi-residential, farmlands and managed forests property classes be reduced in accordance with Ontario Regulation No. 307/99; and
- (2) authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary bill in Council to amend By-law No. 231-1999, in the form or substantially in the form of the draft by-law attached hereto.”

5.55 Councillor Chow moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(5), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Chow

Seconded by: Councillor Rae

“**WHEREAS** Spadina Avenue has a large number of accidents between streetcars and automobiles; and

WHEREAS the Toronto Transit Commission has approved a plan to erect temporary and permanent barriers to prevent unsafe turns into the path of streetcars; and

WHEREAS the Transportation Department is committed to installing these barriers; and

WHEREAS the plan to install such barriers was delayed because of an administrative misunderstanding and Council, by its adoption of Clause No. 19 of Report No. 5 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, as amended, in effect, did not authorize the project to proceed, which was not the intent of the amendment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 19 of Report No. 5 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed ‘510 Spadina: Effects of Proposed Traffic Changes on Adjacent Neighbourhoods (Ward 24)’, be re-opened for further consideration;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) the following recommendation of the Urban Environment and Development Committee be adopted, viz.:

“(1) the report (March 18, 1999) from the General Manager, Transportation Services be adopted subject to amending Recommendation (1) by amending the times 7:00 a.m., 9:00 a.m.,

4:00 p.m., 6:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. to read '7:30 a.m., 9:30 a.m., 3:30 p.m., 6:30 p.m, and 4:00 p.m.', so as to read:

- '(1) contingent on approval of the recommendations from the Toronto Transit Commission to extend the installation of the barriers on Spadina Avenue across all of the remaining mid-block intersections, except Baldwin Street, the existing turn prohibitions, effective between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. and 3:30 pm. and 6:30 p.m., Monday to Friday, and 11:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday, at the intersections of Spadina Avenue and Clarence Square (north leg), Camden Street, Bulwer Street, Phoebe Street, Grange Avenue, Willison Square, Cecil Street, and Oxford Street, be extended to be in effect at all times;';
- (2) temporary barriers be installed on Spadina Avenue to comply with the recommendation of the Toronto Transit Commission and they be removed upon the installation of the permanent barriers by December 1, 1999;
- (3) the community be invited, with regard to streetscape, to comment on the design of the barriers;
- (4) the streetscape design barriers be prepared at the same time as the design of the lanes or edge lines for bicycles; and
- (5) the issue of the funding of permanent barriers be reported to the Budget Committee, in June 1999, as directed by the Budget Committee during its budget deliberations."

Vote:

The first Operative Paragraph of Motion J(5) was adopted.

The balance of Motion J(5) was adopted, without amendment.

5.56 Councillor Duguid moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(6):

Moved by: Councillor Duguid

Seconded by: Councillor Ashton

"**WHEREAS** City Council at its Special Meeting held on April 26, 27 and 28, 1999, adopted, as amended, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 8 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed '1999 Operating Budget', and in so doing adopted the following recommendations pertaining to the remuneration paid to Members of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority:

‘Council (EE):

- (133) (a) the Council budget be adjusted by \$16,000.00 to reflect recommended limitations to Toronto Conservation Authority remuneration;
- (b) the by-law in respect to Councillors’ salaries be changed to the normal set amount minus the amount received from ABCs and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority;
- (c) the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, through City Council, be requested to review their policy of per diem and mileage allowance to its Board Members and report back to the Budget Committee in that regard prior to the 2000 Operating Budget process;
- (d) the Councillors’ salary budget be adjusted in the event that the salary draw be reduced; and
- (e) the by-law in respect to Councillors’ salaries be changed to the normal set amount minus the amount received from Agencies Boards and Commissions and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and that it be done in a way so that it does not impact the Councillor’s pension;

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (HH):

- (140) the by-law in respect to Councillors’ salaries be changed to the normal set amount minus the amount received from Agencies Boards and Commissions and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and that it be done in a way so that it does not impact the Councillor’s pension;
- (141) the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, through City Council, be requested to review its policy of per diem and mileage allowance to its Board Members and report back to the Budget Committee in that regard prior to the 2000 Operating Budget process; and
- (142) the Councillors’ salary budget be adjusted in the event that the salary draw be reduced; and

WHEREAS Council also requested the City Solicitor to submit a report to the Administration Committee on the legal implications of Recommendation No. (140);

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 8 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed '1999 Operating Budget', be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the above recommendations;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Recommendations Nos. (133)(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e), and (140), (141) and (142) of the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, and the additional request for a report from the City Solicitor be deleted.”,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

<p>Yes - 29 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Duguid, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pitfield, Saundercook, Sinclair, Walker</p>
<p>No - 19 Councillors: Brown, Cho, Disero, Feldman, Flint, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mihevc, Ootes, Pantalone, Rae, Sgro, Shiner, Silva</p>

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Having regard that the motion to waive notice did not carry, consideration of Motion J(6) was deferred to the next regular meeting of City Council to be held on June 9, 10 and 11, 1999.

- 5.57 Councillor Minnan-Wong moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(7), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Minnan-Wong

Seconded by: Councillor Chow

“**WHEREAS** the Task Force to Review the Taxi Industry recommended a \$2.00 fare increase for evening cab rides; and

WHEREAS there have been recent objections and concerns raised by customers and the taxi-riding public; and

WHEREAS increasing cab fares in the evening may impose a hardship, particularly among women who need to use taxis late at night;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 13 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee, headed ‘Final Report of the Task Force to Review the Taxi Industry’, be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the Recommendation No. (46) of the Task Force, and that such Recommendation be deleted.”

Votes:

The portion of the Operative Paragraph pertaining to the re-opening of Clause No. 1 of Report No. 13 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee, headed ‘Final Report of the Task Force to Review the Taxi Industry’, only insofar as it pertains to the Recommendation No. (46) of the Task Force, for further consideration, carried.

The balance of Motion J(7) carried, without amendment.

- 5.58 Councillor Ootes moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(8):

Moved by: Councillor Ootes

Seconded by: Mayor Lastman

“**WHEREAS** the preservation and planting of trees enhancing Toronto’s urban forest is a City asset, making the City of Toronto an even more attractive place to live, work and visit, as well as being a proven way of combatting environmental air pollution; and

WHEREAS it will be desirable to designate a Council member to, in 1999, identify as many possible locations for tree planting in the year 2000, as part of Toronto’s millennium celebration;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council authorize the creation of the position of ‘Tree Advocate’ to identify as many publicly-owned locations as possible for tree planting (e.g. along transportation corridors);

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Councillor Joe Pantalone be appointed as the ‘Tree Advocate’;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City staff, especially Parks, Transportation and Planning Officials, provide the necessary assistance in the accomplishment of this task so that a report can be submitted in October 1999.”

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 39 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, B ussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Dug uid, F eldman, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, L ayton, L i Preti, L indsay L uby, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-W ong, Moscoe, O'B rien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfiel d, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Walker
No - 9 Councillors: Brown, Chong, Flint, Gardner, Jakobek, King, Mammoliti, Moeser, Shiner

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Vote:

Adoption of Motion J(8), without amendment:

Yes - 42 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, B rown, B ussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Du g uid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, J ohnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, L ayton, L i Preti, L indsay Luby, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield , Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Walker
No - 7 Councillors: Chong, Gardner, Ho lyday, J akobek, K ing, Mammoliti, O'Brien

Carried by a majority of 35.

- 5.59 Councillor Lindsay Luby moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(9), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Lindsay Luby

Seconded by: Councillor Bussin

“WHEREAS Canada’s Walk of Fame received a grant of \$25,000.00 from the 1998 Grants Contingency Fund, and has again requested \$25,000.00 in financial support from the City of Toronto through the 1999 Grants Contingency Fund; and

WHEREAS there is no appropriate source of funding for Canada’s Walk of Fame, which honours Canadians, past and present, who have contributed to society through the arts, culture, entertainment and sports; and

WHEREAS the Grants Contingency Fund was not set up as an annual funding source for returning applicants as is common practice with other City Grant Programs; and

WHEREAS the Municipal Grants Review Committee on May 10, 1999, had before it the attached report (May 7, 1999) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism respecting the aforementioned funding request, and directed that:

- (1) the Chair be requested to submit this funding request directly to Council for consideration at its meeting on May 11, 1999, having regard that the stars are to be installed on May 27, 1999; and
- (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to report directly to Council for its meeting on May 11, 1999, on providing for the installation of the Canada’s Walk of Fame sidewalk stars along Simcoe Street, in accordance with the terms of the agreement between the organization and the former City of Toronto; the funds for which to be provided from the Works and Emergency Services Department budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be directed to provide for the installation of the Canada’s Walk of Fame sidewalk stars along Simcoe Street, the funds for which to be provided from the Works and Emergency Services Department’s budget for sidewalks;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to report to the Works Committee on funding for this program in future years.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a report (May 7, 1999) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, entitled “Contingency Fund Request - Canada’s Walk of Fame - Ward 24”, responding to the request from Canada’s Walk of Fame for financial support of \$25,000.00 through the Contingency Fund. (See Attachment No. 4.)

Motion:

Councillor Lindsay Luby moved that Motion J(9) be adopted, subject to amending the first Operative Paragraph by adding thereto the words “up to a maximum of \$15,000.00”, so that such Operative Paragraph shall now read as follows:

“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be directed to provide for the installation of the Canada’s Walk of Fame sidewalk stars along Simcoe Street, the funds for which to be provided from the Works and Emergency Services Department’s budget for sidewalks, up to a maximum of \$15,000.00;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Lindsay Luby carried.

Motion J(9), as amended, carried.

- 5.60 Motion J(10) was considered with Clause No. 4 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed “Jane and Finch Streetscape Project (Black Creek - Ward 7)”. (See Minute No. 5.31)
- 5.61 Councillor Layton moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(11), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Layton**

Seconded by: **Councillor Fotinos**

“WHEREAS the vast majority of social assistance recipients are tenants and move often because of their financial situation; and

WHEREAS there is a brand new electoral system that has eliminated door-to-door enumeration; and

WHEREAS in the last municipal election (which used a provincial voters’ list), a large number of eligible voters were left off the list; and

WHEREAS the municipality of London recently included a notice with their social assistance cheques explaining how to register to vote in order to exercise their democratic rights;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Toronto communicate, through its monthly social assistance payments, a notice on how to register to vote in this upcoming provincial election.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a copy of the notice distributed to social assistance cheque recipients by the City of London, explaining how to register to vote, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Vote:

Adoption of Motion J(11), without amendment:

Yes - 36 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay, Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Silva, Sinclair, Walker
No - 12 Councillors: Cho, Chong, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Li Preti, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Ootes, Sandercook, Shiner

Carried by a majority of 24.

5.62 Councillor Moscoe moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(12):

Moved by: Councillor Moscoe

Seconded by: Councillor Davis

“WHEREAS the Toronto Transit Commission considered a report, entitled ‘Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan’, at its meeting on May 5, 1999; and

WHEREAS the Toronto Transit Commission endorsed the Traffic Management Plan proposed by staff for the Benson and Hedges Symphony of Fire fireworks events and, in principle, for the Canadian National Exhibition period; and

WHEREAS a ‘transit first’ traffic management strategy is the only means of effectively serving Exhibition Place/Ontario Place special events; and

WHEREAS the absence of such a plan for special events in the past has resulted in a complete breakdown of TTC service to this area; and

WHEREAS the lead time required to co-ordinate and implement such a traffic management plan in time for the first of the Benson and Hedges Symphony of Fire fireworks events, scheduled for June 19, 1999, does not allow for the normal Committee review process;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City of Toronto Council consider the recommendations of the Toronto Transit Commission embodied in the communication dated May 6, 1999 from the Interim General Secretary, TTC and such recommendations be adopted viz.:

- (3) City of Toronto Council be requested to direct the General Manager - Transportation Services, to coordinate the implementation of the Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan, beginning with the Benson and Hedges Symphony of Fire on June 19, 1999; and
- (4) City of Toronto Council be requested to provide funding in the amount of \$25,000 to pay for part of the costs of paid-duty Police Officers associated with the Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan.’;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary Bills in Council to give effect thereto, if required.”,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 36	Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Walker
No - 12	Councillors: Balkissoon, Berger, Brown, Feldman, Holyday, Li Preti, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Ootes, Pitfield, Shiner

Carried more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a communication (May 7, 1999) from the Interim General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission, forwarding the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the report entitled “Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan”. (See Attachment No. 5.)

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Miller moved that Motion J(12) be amended by deleting Recommendation No. (4) of the Toronto Transit Commission embodied in the first Operative Paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(4) the special event sponsor be requested to pay the costs of paid-duty Police Officers associated with the Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan.”

- (b) Councillor Pantalone moved that Motion J(12) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

- (a) all regulations pertaining to Bathurst Street apply only to that portion south of Queen Street West;
- (b) all regulations pertaining to Dufferin Street apply only to that portion south of the private properties immediately south of Springhurst Avenue; and
- (c) all references to the Canadian National Exhibition be referred to a process involving the Toronto Transit Commission, the General Manager, Transportation Services, the Toronto Police Service, the Board of Governors of Exhibition Place and the Members of Council for Wards 19 and 20 for report thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee for its meeting to be held on June 14, 1999.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Miller carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Pantalone carried.

Motion J(12), as amended, carried.

- 5.63 Councillor Pantalone moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(13), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Pantalone

Seconded by: Mayor Lastman

“**WHEREAS** the Metro International Caravan is an important multicultural festival activity within the City of Toronto; and

WHEREAS the Metro International Caravan is an enriching event, providing the community with many opportunities for cultural retention and sharing; and

WHEREAS the Metro International Caravan is seeking, on behalf of its participating pavilions, special occasion permits under the Community Festival section of the Ontario Liquor Licence Act; and

WHEREAS pursuant to Section 40 of the Regulations of the Ontario Liquor Licence Act, an application for a special occasion permit for an event that is a community festival must be accompanied by a Resolution approving an event as a community festival made by the local Council for the Municipality in which the event is to occur;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the City of Toronto deem the Metro International Caravan event to be a community festival.”

Motion:

Councillor Pantalone moved that Motion J(13) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** City Council grant prior approval to declare the Metro International Caravan event a community festival for the year 2000.”

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Pantalone carried.

Motion J(13), as amended, carried.

- 5.64 Councillor Flint moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(14), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Flint

Seconded by: Councillor Miller

“**WHEREAS** City Council at its meeting held on March 2, 3 and 4, 1999, established a Council Reference Group to assist in the development of a new Official Plan for the City of Toronto; and

WHEREAS Councillor Pantalone, in his capacity as Chair of the Urban Environment and Development Committee, has served as Chair of the Council Reference Group; and

WHEREAS it is important to maintain continuity on the Reference Group as the new Plan is developed and the work program unfolds; and

WHEREAS a new Chair of the Urban Environment and Development Committee (Planning and Transportation Committee) will be selected by Council at its meeting on May 11, 1999;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 3 of The Striking Committee, headed ‘Appointments to Official Plan Council Reference Group’, be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the composition of the Official Plan Reference Group;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Councillor Pantalone be added to the membership of the Council Reference Group and that the Chair be selected by the Members of the Council Reference Group from among themselves.”

Vote:

Motion J(14) carried, without amendment.

- 5.65 Councillor Miller moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(15), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Miller

Seconded by: Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski

“**WHEREAS** the Whelan’s Gate Restaurant and the Bloor By The Park BIA will hold Street Festivals on May 15, 1999, and June 12, 1999, from 12:00 noon to 8:00 p.m., respectively; and

WHEREAS the Whelan’s Gate Restaurant and the Bloor By The Park BIA have requested that the liquor licence of the relevant businesses be extended for these individual days and times only on the sidewalk and boulevard café immediately outside 1663 Bloor Street West for the May 15, 1999 party, and in the same area but also including additionally the eastbound curb lane only of Bloor Street West, from Indian Road to Alhambra Avenue - approximately 200 lineal feet for the June 12, 1999 party; and

WHEREAS we, as Ward Councillors, have received this formal request from the Bloor By The Park BIA;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council advise the Licensing and Registration Department of the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario that the request for a extension of a liquor licence by the Whelan's Gate Restaurant and by the Bloor By The Park BIA, respectively, is in the public interest having regard to the needs and wishes of the residents of the municipality, and request the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario to approve the applications."

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a communication (May 10, 1999) from the Vice-Chair, The Shamrock Pub Group, formally requesting a letter of "Non-Objection" from the City of Toronto regarding street parties endorsed and sponsored by the Whelan's Gate Restaurant and the Bloor-By-The-Park B.I.A., a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Vote:

Motion J(15) was adopted, without amendment.

- 5.66 Councillor Silva moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(16), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Silva

Seconded by: Councillor Disero

"**WHEREAS** given the negative impact of current value assessment (CVA) on small retailing when CVA is fully implemented in 2001; and

WHEREAS prior to 1998, BIA levies were treated in a manner similar to the business tax, and levied against the business tenant rather than the property owner, and given that BIA levies are now a realty tax of the property owner, rather than a tax of the occupant and are calculated on the total current value assessment for the commercial portion of the property, and, under the current system (CVA), most small retail properties have experienced large tax increases, resulting in serious financial hardship to individual commercial property owners;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following Resolution which was passed by the Bloorcourt Business Improvement Area at its meeting held on May 4, 1999, be endorsed by City Council:

‘That the leaders of the Ontario Political Parties be asked to guarantee the following, if elected:

- (1) the existing 2.4 per cent cap on small retailing will be extended beyond the year 2001;
- (2) the required legislative changes will be made to cap BIA levies 2.4 percent; and
- (3) this request will be dealt with in a responsible, expeditious and effective manner.’ ”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a joint communication (May 11, 1999) from Councillor Disero, Fotinos, Pantalone and Silva, requesting endorsement of Motion J(16). (See Attachment No. 6.)

Motion:

Councillor Adams moved that Motion J (16) be amended by deleting Recommendation No. (1) of the Resolution of the Bloorcourt Business Improvement Area embodied in the Operative Paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

- “(1) that protection mechanisms for small retail such as assessment related caps, a separate class, or other mechanisms, be available to municipalities beyond the year 2001;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Adams carried.

Motion J(16), as amended, carried.

- 5.67 Councillor Adams moved that subsections 26(4) 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(17), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Adams

Seconded by: Councillor Rae

“**WHEREAS** the Council of the former City of Toronto passed By-law No. 1996-0310 (the ‘By-law’) on June 10, 1996, amending the General Zoning By-law by deleting, as a permitted use, a ‘place of amusement’, on lands in the vicinity of Davenport Road and Yonge Street, more particularly described in the By-law; and

WHEREAS two property owners affected by the By-law appealed its passage; and

WHEREAS one of those two appellants has sold the affected property it owned and is no longer interested in this matter; and

WHEREAS the remaining appellant, Wittington Properties Limited ('Wittington'), owns 21 Scollard Street; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Municipal Board has scheduled a hearing of the Wittington appeal for May 28, 1999, before the next meetings of Toronto Community Council and City Council; and

WHEREAS Wittington has proposed to settle the appeal on the basis that the By-law would be amended to permit, only at 21 Scollard Street, a list of uses falling within the definition of 'place of amusement', but not including a billiard or pool room; and

WHEREAS the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services has advised that she can support a settlement on that basis;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Solicitor and Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be authorized to attend at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing scheduled for May 28, 1999, in support of a settlement of the appeal of former City of Toronto By-law No. 1996-0310 by Wittington Properties Limited on the basis that:

- (a) the By-law will be approved to apply fully to all affected properties except 21 Scollard Street; and
- (b) an exception to the By-law will be created by a amendment to permit at 21 Scollard Street a list of uses falling within the definition of 'place of amusement', but not including a billiard or pool room."

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a communication (May 10, 1999) from Ms. C.A. Lyons, Goodman Phillips & Vineberg, respecting OMB File No. R960247, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Vote:

Motion J(17) carried, without amendment.

- 5.68 Councillor Mihevc moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(18), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Mihevc**

Seconded by: **Councillor Bossons**

“**WHEREAS** the Works and Emergency Services 1999 Capital Sidewalk Reconstruction Programme includes the reconstruction of sidewalks and curbs on St. Clair Avenue West, from Christie Street to Bathurst Street; and

WHEREAS this work provides an opportunity to enhance the pedestrian environment by providing ‘buildouts’ of the St. Clair Avenue sidewalks on the north side at its intersections with Pinewood Avenue, Kenwood Avenue, Raglan Avenue and Wychwood Avenue; and

WHEREAS staff of the Works and Emergency Services Department advise this work can be done cost-effectively in conjunction with the planned reconstruction, with minimal impact on traffic operations or legal parking; and

WHEREAS the resultant pavement narrowings constitute a highway alteration pursuant to the Municipal Act requiring that Council’s intent to pass a bylaw to give effect thereto must be advertised for four consecutive weeks and be subject to the hearing of depositions; and

WHEREAS the construction will be commencing at these locations very shortly and time is of the essence to initiate this formal public advisory and consultation process;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following recommendations be adopted:

- (1) approval be given to realign the intersections of St. Clair Avenue West with Pinewood Avenue, Kenwood Avenue, Raglan Avenue and Wychwood Avenue, in conjunction with the scheduled reconstruction described as follows:
 - (a) the narrowing and realignment of the pavement from a width of 7.3 metres to a width varying from 5.5 metres to 7.3 metres on the east side of Pinewood Avenue from St. Clair Avenue West, to a point 13.0 metres north of St. Clair Avenue West, generally as shown on the attached print of Drawing No. SK-2219, dated May, 1999;
 - (b) the narrowing and realignment of the pavement from a width of 8.5 metres to a width varying from 6.0 metres to 8.5 metres on the east side of Kenwood Avenue, from St. Clair Avenue West, to a point 13.0 metres north of St. Clair Avenue West, generally as shown on the attached print of Drawing No. SK-2220, dated May, 1999;

- (c) the narrowing and realignment of the pavement from a width of 8.5 metres to a width of varying from 6.0 metres to 8.5 metres on the east side of Raglan Avenue, from St. Clair Avenue West, to a point 13.0 metres north of St. Clair Avenue West, generally as shown on the attached print of Drawing No. SK-2221, dated May, 1999; and
 - (d) the narrowing and realignment of the pavement from a width of 7.3 metres to a width varying from 6.0 metres to 7.3 metres on the west side of Wychwood Avenue from St. Clair Avenue West to a point 11.0 metres north of St. Clair Avenue West, generally as shown on the attached print of Drawing No. SK-2222, dated May, 1999;
- (2) the City Clerk and the City Solicitor be requested to carry out the necessary statutory advertising such that the required public hearing of the draft by-law to give effect to the proposed highway alterations referred to in Recommendation No. (1) be considered at the June 23, 1999, meeting of the Toronto Community Council; and
 - (3) the appropriate City Officials be requested to take whatever action is necessary to give effect thereto, including the introduction in Council of any Bills that are required.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, copies of Drawings Nos. SK-2219, SK-2220, SK-2221 and SK-2222, copies of which are on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Vote:

Motion J(18) was adopted, without amendment.

- 5.69 Councillor Saundercook moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(19), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Saundercook

Seconded by: Councillor Layton

“**WHEREAS** Earth Day was on April 22, 1999; and

WHEREAS Earthday Canada has been a long time supporter of Earth Day and of promoting environmental awareness in the City of Toronto and across Canada; and

WHEREAS Earthday Canada, begun in 1990, is a registered charity with a broad range of support from major Canadian corporations, foundations and citizens; and

WHEREAS Earthday Canada has been involved in promoting environmental initiatives through educational materials to schools; and

WHEREAS Earthday Canada has been engaged in an educational campaign called the 'Middle R' program which outlines the usefulness of reuse as part of the 3Rs hierarchy; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto is a supporter of the 3Rs approach to waste management; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto, along with 268 other Ontario municipalities, formally support the deposit-return system, a form of reuse;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Toronto indicate its support for Earthday Canada's 'The Middle R' program and its goal of educating students about reuse and that this be communicated to Earthday Canada."

Vote:

Motion J(19) was adopted, without amendment.

- 5.70 Councillor Ashton gave notice of the following Motion J(20) to permit consideration at the next meeting of City Council to be held on June 9, 10 and 11, 1999:

Moved by: Councillor Ashton

Seconded by: Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski

"WHEREAS City Council in January, 1998, in appointing Members of Council to the Toronto Transit Commission, also requested the Province of Ontario to enact legislation to reduce the term of office for appointments to the Toronto Transit Commission from three years to 18 months; and

WHEREAS Section 105(1) of the Council Procedure By-law states, in part as follows:

'105. (1) In the absence of a decision by the council to the contrary or to terminate an appointment, Members appointed by the Council to Committees, agencies, boards, commissions or other bodies, ... shall be for a period of eighteen (18) months, or the terms set out in such appointments, and until their successors are appointed unless otherwise provided by law'; and

WHEREAS City Council has attempted, wherever possible, to adhere to the 18-month term for Councillor appointments; and

WHEREAS regulation 214/96, issued under the Municipal Act, would allow Toronto City Council to make certain changes to local boards by by-law, including the term of office for members of the board; and

WHEREAS the recent decision of the Superior Court of Justice in considering the ward boundaries issue held that, in interpreting provisions of the City of Toronto Act, 1997, the general powers granted by the Municipal Act were available to the City of Toronto unless there was an express reservation or exception, and consequently legislation is not required to change the term of office of appointments to the Toronto Transit Commission;

NOW BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council revise the term of office for the Members of Council appointed to the Toronto Transit Commission from 3 years to 18-months and that the term of office for those Members of Council appointed to the Toronto Transit Commission by City Council on January 2, 6, 8 and 9, 1998, be amended to expire on June 13, 1999, and until their successors are appointed;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council refer the matter of appointments to the Toronto Transit Commission to the Striking Committee, and that the Striking Committee hold a Special meeting, prior to the end of the June 9, 10 and 11, 1999, meeting of City Council, and submit its recommendations thereon directly to that meeting of Council;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT following approval of the foregoing recommendations, that Members of Council be requested to immediately notify the City Clerk if they are interested in being considered for appointment to the Toronto Transit Commission;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT consistent with City Council Standing Committee appointments, a simple majority of Council be required to approve appointments to the Toronto Transit Commission;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT authority be granted for the introduction of any necessary bill in Council to give effect to the foregoing;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council give consideration to this motion in sufficient time at its June 9, 1999, meeting to permit the Striking Committee to hold such Special meeting and submit its recommendations for appointments to the Toronto Transit Commission for consideration at such meeting of City Council.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a copy of a communication (May 11, 1999) addressed to Councillor Howard Moscoe, from Mr George H. Rust-D'Eye, Weir & Foulds, Barristers and Solicitors, providing advice with respect to the status of

Councillor Moscoe's membership on the Toronto Transit Commission, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Councillor Sinclair, with the permission of Council, gave notice of the following proposed amendment to Notice of Motion J (20) and requested that such amendment be brought forward to the next regular meeting of City Council for consideration with this Motion:

“That Notice of Motion J(20) be amended by:

(1) adding thereto the following new Recital:

‘**WHEREAS** the inclusion of a citizen component in our key Agencies, Boards and Commissions has generally worked well over the years and has given these groups a better depth and balance, all to the benefit of the City of Toronto and its citizens;’; and

(2) adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

‘**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the appointees to the Toronto Transit Commission for the period commencing June 14, 1999, include citizens.’ ”

5.71 Councillor O'Brien moved that subsections 26(4), 27(1) and 28(1) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit consideration of the following Notice of Motion J(21), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor O'Brien

Seconded by: Councillor Berardinetti

“**WHEREAS** City Council at its meeting held on April 13, 14 and 15, 1999:

- (1) adopted the Recommendations of the Corporate Services Committee contained in the confidential communication (March 26, 1999) from the City Clerk, respecting the proposed acquisition of the ‘Glen Eagles’ site;
- (2) received the confidential communication dated March 31, 1999, from the City Clerk, forwarding the recommendations of the Budget Committee in regard to the source of funds for the purchase price of the Glen Eagles site; and

- (3) adopted the confidential report dated April 12, 1999, from the Chief Administrative Officer, the Toronto and Region and Conservation Authority, embodying the following recommendation:

‘It is recommended that appropriate City staff be authorized and directed to explore the potential of satisfactory arrangements for servicing storm water from 45 Green Belt Drive in the City of Toronto, a property belonging to an associated company of the vendor, and report to the next meeting of Corporate Services Committee or, if necessary, to the next meeting of Council’; and

WHEREAS the appropriate City staff wish to report, as directed, on the results of its exploration of the issue of the potential for managing storm water from 45 Green Belt Drive, onto adjacent City-owned or managed parkland;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council give consideration to the recommendations of City staff embodied in the attached confidential report (May 12, 1999) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled ‘Acquisition of “Glen Eagles” Site Adjacent to the Rouge Park, Southeast Corner of Sheppard Avenue East and Twyn Rivers Drive (Ward 18 - Scarborough Malvern)’, and that such recommendations be adopted.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of this Motion, a confidential report (May 12, 1999) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled “Acquisition of ‘Glen Eagles’ Site Adjacent to the Rouge Park, Southeast Corner of Sheppard Avenue East and Twyn Rivers Drive (Ward 18 - Scarborough Malvern)”, such report, save and except the recommendations embodied therein, to remain confidential in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act.

Vote:

Adoption of Motion J(21), without amendment:

Yes - 44 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giannante, Ho Lyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, King Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, McConnell, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - 0

Carried, without dissent.

Council, by its adoption of Motion J (21), without a amendment, adopted the confidential report dated May 12, 1999, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) authorization be granted to provide an Acknowledgment and Undertaking relating to the installation on the subject City/Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) lands, of a storm water management system to service the lands located at 39 Green Belt Drive and 45 Green Belt Drive (former City of North York), on the terms outlined herein and on such other terms as may be required by the Commissioners of Works & Emergency Services, Urban Planning and Development Services, and Economic Development, Culture and Tourism (the ‘Commissioners’) and otherwise to be in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor; and
- (2) the appropriate City and TRCA officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect to the foregoing, including the execution of the appropriate easements for construction of the storm water management system and retention/detention pond.”

BILLS AND BY-LAWS

5.72 On May 11, 1999, at 4:17 p.m., Councillor Jakobek, seconded by Councillor Fotinos, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 274	By-law No. 234-1999	To amend By-law No. 231-1999, being a By-law “To Levy and Collect Taxes for the Year 1999, to Impose a penalty charge for non-payment of 1999 taxes, and to Provide for interest to be added to tax arrears”,
--------------	---------------------	---

the vote upon which was as follows:

Yes - 34
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Faubert, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas

No - 7
Councillors: Augimeri, Bussin, Jones, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Walker

Carried by a majority of 27.

- 5.73 On May 11, 1999, at 7:40 p.m., Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Pitfield, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 292	By-law No. 235-1999	To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 11th day of May, 1999,
--------------	---------------------	---

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 39
Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Fotinos, Gardner, Gianante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sgro, Shaw, Tzekas, Walker

No - 0

Carried, without dissent.

- 5.74 On May 12, 1999, at 7:51 p.m., Councillor Feldman, seconded by Councillor Brown, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bills, and that these Bills, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as By-laws, which carried:

Bill No. 235	By-law No. 236-1999	To adopt an amendment to the Official Plan for the former City of Toronto respecting lands known as No. 34 Noble Street.
--------------	---------------------	--

Bill No. 236	By-law No. 237-1999	To amend the General Zoning By-law No. 438-86 for the former City of Toronto with respect to lands known as No. 34 Noble Street.
--------------	---------------------	--

Bill No. 237	By-law No. 238-1999	To amend By-law No. 673-1998, a by-law "To Prohibit Excessive Idling of Vehicles and Boats".
--------------	---------------------	--

Bill No. 238	By-law No. 239-1999	To amend By-law No. 89-1999, a by-law to acquire certain interests in land for or in connection with the Sheppard Subway Project.
Bill No. 239	By-law No. 240-1999	To acquire certain interests in land for or in connection with the Sheppard Subway Project.
Bill No. 240	By-law No. 241-1999	To adopt Amendment No. 1023 of the Official Plan for the former City of Scarborough.
Bill No. 241	By-law No. 242-1999	May To amend Scarborough Zoning By-law, the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 with respect to the Wexford Employment District.
Bill No. 242	By-law No. 243-1999	To further amend By-law No. 211-79 of the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, being "A By-law to prohibit signs on lands adjacent to certain Metropolitan Roads" to permit the erection of a sign on Exhibition Place within 40 metres west of Strachan Avenue.
Bill No. 243	By-law No. 244-1999	To amend further By-law No. 20-85, a by-law "Respecting the licensing, regulating and governing of trades, callings, businesses and occupations in the Metropolitan Area", being a by-law of the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.
Bill No. 244	By-law No. 245-1999	To amend further Metropolitan Toronto By-law No. 20-85, a by-law "Respecting the licensing, regulating and governing of trades, callings, businesses and occupations in the Metropolitan Area", a by-law of the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

Bill No. 245	By-law No. 246-1999	To amend City of North York By-law 7625 in respect of lands municipally known as 1031 Wilson Avenue and to repeal City of North York By-laws No. 20855 and No. 28388.
Bill No. 246	By-law No. 247-1999	To amend the General Zoning By-law No. 438-86 of the former City of Toronto with respect to the lands known as 233 Carlaw Avenue.
Bill No. 247	By-law No. 248-1999	To amend the General Zoning By-law No. 438-86 of the former City of Toronto with respect to the lands known as 320 Carlaw Avenue.
Bill No. 248	By-law No. 249-1999	To amend By-law No. 31001 of the former City of North York, as amended.
Bill No. 249	By-law No. 250-1999	To amend By-law No. 31001 of the former City of North York, as amended.
Bill No. 250	By-law No. 251-1999	To amend By-law No. 31001 of the former City of North York, as amended.
Bill No. 251	By-law No. 252-1999	To amend By-law No. 31001 of the former City of North York, as amended.
Bill No. 252	By-law No. 253-1999	To amend By-law No. 32759, as amended, of the former City of North York.
Bill No. 253	By-law No. 254-1999	To amend By-law No. 31878, as amended, of the former City of North York.
Bill No. 254	By-law No. 255-1999	To amend further Metropolitan By-law No. 32-92, respecting the regulation of traffic on former Metropolitan Roads.

Bill No. 255	By-law No. 256-1999	To amend further Metropolitan By-law No. 32-92, respecting the regulation of traffic on former Metropolitan Roads.
Bill No. 256	By-law No. 257-1999	To amend further Metropolitan By-law No. 109-86 respecting maximum rates of speed on certain former Metropolitan Roads.
Bill No. 257	By-law No. 258-1999	To amend further By-law No. 23505 of the former City of Scarborough respecting the speed limits on Toronto Roads.
Bill No. 258	By-law No. 259-1999	To amend further By-law No. 23503 of the former City of Scarborough, respecting the regulation of traffic on Toronto Roads.
Bill No. 259	By-law No. 260-1999	To amend further the Pedestrian Crossover By-law No. 23506 of the former City of Scarborough, on Toronto Roads.
Bill No. 260	By-law No. 261-1999	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Mount Pleasant Road.
Bill No. 261	By-law No. 262-1999	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Burnfield Avenue, Gilbert Avenue, Golden Avenue, Manning Avenue, Ossler Street, Roblocke Avenue, Sunnyside Avenue.
Bill No. 262	By-law No. 263-1999	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Bernard Avenue, Queen Street East, Lane first north of Eglinton Avenue West, Windermere Avenue, Worthington Crescent.

Bill No. 263	By-law No. 264-1999	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Yorkville Avenue.
Bill No. 264	By-law No. 265-1999	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Queen Street East.
Bill No. 265	By-law No. 266-1999	To designate the property at 201 Guildwood Parkway (Guild Inn) as being of historical value or interest.
Bill No. 266	By-law No. 267-1999	To define the Hazelton Avenue Area as an area of the City of Toronto to be examined for future designation as a heritage conservation district.
Bill No. 267	By-law No. 268-1999	To define the Metcalfe Street Area as an area of the City of Toronto to be examined for future designation as a heritage conservation district.
Bill No. 268	By-law No. 269-1999	To repeal the designation of the property at 899 Queen Street West (John Cornell House) as being of architectural and historical value or interest.
Bill No. 269	By-law No. 270-1999	To authorize the alteration of Pembury Avenue by the construction of a turning circle blocking access from the ramp to Bayview Avenue southbound.
Bill No. 270	By-law No. 271-1999	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being "A By-law To authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations", respecting the alteration of Tyndall Avenue from Springhurst Avenue to King Street

		West by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 271	By-law No. 272-1999	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being "A By-law To authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations", respecting the alteration of Springhurst Avenue from Jameson Avenue to King Street West by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 272	By-law No. 273-1999	To layout and dedicate for public lane purposes certain land south of King Street West extending westerly from Blue Jays Way.
Bill No. 273	By-law No. 274-1999	To authorize the conveyance of a portion of Summerhill Avenue stopped up and closed by City of Toronto By-law No. 1996-0013.
Bill No. 275	By-law No. 275-1999	To Amend By-law No. 228-1999 being a By-law "to Dissolve the Existing Wards and to Divide the City of Toronto into Twenty-Eight new Wards".
Bill No. 276	By-law No. 276-1999	To amend former City of York By-law No. 1-83 to authorize the temporary use of lands, buildings or structures with respect to lands known as 52 Hyde Avenue.
Bill No. 277	By-law No. 277-1999	To provide for entering into an easement for the conservation of the building on lands known as No. 173 Yonge Street.
Bill No. 278	By-law No. 278-1999	To authorize the removal of certain trees growing on the highways of the Municipality.

Bill No. 279	By-law No. 279-1999	To provide for fees for services respecting birth and death registrations, marriage licences and related matters.
Bill No. 280	By-law No. 280-1999	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, with respect to speed control zones. (as amended)
Bill No. 281	By-law No. 281-1999	To designate the property at 130 Gerrard Street East (Jarvis Street Baptist Church) as being of architectural and historical value or interest.
Bill No. 282	By-law No. 282-1999	To designate the property at 337 Jarvis Street (Samuel Platt House) as being of architectural and historical value or interest.
Bill No. 283	By-law No. 283-1999	To adopt an amendment to the Official Plan for the former City of Toronto respecting lands known as 457, 459, 463, 467, 469 and 471 College Street and 301 Markham Street.
Bill No. 284	By-law No. 284-1999	To amend the General Zoning By-law No. 438-86 of the former City of Toronto with respect to lands known as Nos. 457, 459, 463, 467, 469 and 471 College Street and 301 Markham Street.
Bill No. 285	By-law No. 285-1999	To designate certain lands on a Registered Plan not subject to Part Lot Control, in the City of Toronto.
Bill No. 286	By-law No. 286-1999	To amend By-law No. 966-1998 being a By-law "To exclude Certain Properties from the Application of By-law 472-1998, being a By-law 'To Phase-in 1998 Assessment-Related

Tax Increases and Decreases for the Residential/Farm Property Class' ”.

Bill No. 287	By-law No. 287-1999	To amend By-law No. 64-87, a By-law “For Prohibiting and Regulating the Erection of Signs and Other Advertising Devices”, being a by-law of the former Borough of East York.
Bill No. 288	By-law No. 288-1999	To amend By-law No. 64-87, a By-law “For Prohibiting and Regulating the Erection of Signs and Other Advertising Devices”, being a by-law of the former Borough of East York.
Bill No. 289	By-law No. 289-1999	To amend By-law No. 64-87, a By-law “For Prohibiting and Regulating the Erection of Signs and Other Advertising Devices”, being a by-law of the former Borough of East York.
Bill No. 290	By-law No. 290-1999	To amend Chapter 400, Traffic and Parking, of the Municipal Code of the former City of Toronto to establish and set the rates for pay and display parking machines to be located where parking is currently allowed on Queen Street East, both sides, from Coxwell Avenue to Woodbine Avenue.
Bill No. 291	By-law No. 291-1999	To amend Restricted Area Zoning By-law No. 6752, as amended, of the former Township of East York.

Councillor Prue requested that his opposition to Bill No. 275 (By-law No. 275-1999) be noted in the Minutes of this meeting.

- 5.75 On May 12, 1999, at 7:52 p.m., Councillor Giansante, seconded by Councillor Rae, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 293	By-law No. 292-1999	To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 11th and 12th days of May, 1999,
--------------	---------------------	---

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 38
Mayor: Lastman
Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Sgro, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - Nil

Carried, without dissent.

OFFICIAL RECOGNITIONS:

5.76 Condolence Motion

Councillor Pitfield, seconded by Councillor Prue, moved that:

“**WHEREAS** the senseless shootings at W. R. Myers High School in Taber, Alberta, have shocked and saddened all Canadians; and

WHEREAS there has been a tragic loss of a life and serious injury to others in what is meant to be a safe and secure public facility;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Clerk be directed to convey, on behalf of the Members of City Council and the citizens of Toronto, an expression of deepest sympathy to the people of Taber, Alberta, and our condolences to the family of the youth who lost his life in the shooting at W. R. Myers High School;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT our wishes for a speedy and full recovery also be conveyed to those who were wounded in this tragedy; and that Council waive the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law in order to introduce this Motion.”

Leave to introduce the Motion was granted and the Motion carried unanimously.

Council rose and observed a moment of silence in memory of the youth who lost his life in the shooting at W.R. Myers High School.

5.77 **PRESENTATIONS/INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

May 11, 1999:

Councillor King, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced Mr. David Anthony Jowett, who had received the Bronze Cross in recognition of his heroic efforts in saving the life of a woman injured in the rapids of the Elora Gorge.

Mayor Lastman, during the morning session of the meeting, extended, on behalf of Council, the congratulations of Council to Councillor Gerry Altobello, Scarborough Bluffs, on the birth of his daughter, Patricia Pasqualina Altobello.

Mayor Lastman, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced the students of St. Nicholas School, present at the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced the students of Humbercrest Public School, present at the meeting.

May 12, 1999:

Councillor Silva, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced the following delegation from Evora, Portugal, present at the meeting:

- Dr. Henrique Troncho, Premier of Evora, and Mrs. Francisca Troncho;
- Mr. Jose Guerreiro, Mayor of Alvito, Evora;
- Mr. Norberto Patinho, Mayor of Portel, Evora; and
- Mr. Manuel Neto, Mayor of Mertola, Evora.

Mayor Lastman, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced the students of the following schools, present at the meeting:

- The Student School; and
- St. Anne's School.

Councillor Tzekas, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced Mrs. Liana Souvaltzi, a world known Archaeologist from Athens, Greece, the former Head of the Greek Mission excavating in the Tomb of Alexander the Great from 1989 to 1995, and currently the Head of the Greek/Egyptian Mission in El-Maraki Siwa Oasis in the tomb of Alexander the Great, accompanied by her husband, Mr. Manos Souvaltzi, a State Solicitor in the Supreme Court of Greece.

Mayor Lastman, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced the students of John Ross Robertson Public School, present at the meeting.

5.78 MOTIONS TO VARY PROCEDURE

Vary the order of proceedings of Council:

May 11, 1999:

Councillor Jakobek, at 10:00 a.m., moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 2 of Report No. 7 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, headed "Prince Edward (Bloor Street) Viaduct - Measures to Deter Suicide Attempts (Don River and Midtown - Wards 23 and 25)", as the first item of business, immediately following the consideration of those items that could be disposed of expeditiously, which carried.

Councillor Ootes, at 3:00 p.m., moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Striking Committee, headed "Appointment of Members of Council to Standing and Other Committees of Council, Various Boards and Special Purpose Bodies", at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11, 1999, in lieu of 6:00 p.m. on May 11, 1999, which carried.

Councillor Rae, at 4:55 p.m., moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 1 of Report No. 7 of The Economic Development Committee, headed "Pilot Project - Clothing Optional Beach at Hanlan's Point (Ward 24 - Downtown)", at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 12, 1999, which carried.

Councillor Chow, at 12:27 p.m., moved that, in accordance with subsection 11(8) of the Council Procedural By-law, Council waive the requirement of the 12:30 p.m. recess, in order to conclude consideration of Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Works and Utilities Committee, headed "Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process - Prohibition Against Lobbying", which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Councillor Gardner, at 7:27 p.m., moved that Council waive the requirement of the 7:30 p.m. recess, in order to conclude consideration of Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Striking Committee, headed "Appointment of Members of Council to Standing and Other Committees of Council, Various Boards and Special Purpose Bodies", which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

May 12, 1999:

Councillor Feldman, at 6:20 p.m., moved that Council waive the requirement of the 7:30 p.m. recess, in order to conclude consideration of all matters remaining on the Order Paper for this meeting, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 22 Councillors: Adams, Augimeri, Brown, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Tzekas
No - 23 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Gardner, King, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, Prue, Sgro, Shaw, Shiner, Sinclair, Walker

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, at 7:29 p.m., moved that Council waive the requirement of the 7:30 p.m. recess, and that Council continue in session for 30 minutes, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 24 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Berardinetti, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Silva, Sinclair
No - 16 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Bossons, Bussin, Chong, Gardner, Giansante, Layton, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Nunziata, Prue, Walker

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Councillor Layton, at 7:30 p.m., moved that Council waive the requirement of the 7:30 p.m. recess, in order to conclude consideration of Clause No. 11 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed "Temporary Promotional Kiosk - Queen Street West North Side, 31 Metres West of Soho Street (Downtown)", the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 24 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Mahood, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Sgro, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas
No - 12 Councillors: Altobello, Augimeri, Bussin, Disero, Kinahan, Layton, McConnell, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Prue, Walker

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

5.79 ATTENDANCE

May 11, 1999	9:38 a.m. to 12:40 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:15 p.m.	2:09 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.*	6:40 p.m. to 7:44 p.m.*
Lastman	x	-	x	x
Adams	x	-	x	x
Altobello	x	x	x	x
Ashton	x	x	x	-
Augimeri	x	-	x	x
Balkissoon	x	-	x	-
Berardinetti	x	x	x	x
Berger	x	-	x	x
Bossons	x	-	x	x
Brown	x	-	x	x
Bussin	x	-	x	x
Cho	x	-	x	x
Chong	x	x	x	x
Chow	x	x	x	x
Davis	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
 May 11 and 12, 1999

May 11, 1999	9:38 a.m. to 12:40 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:15 p.m.	2:09 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.*	6:40 p.m. to 7:44 p.m.*
Disero	x	x	x	x
Duguid	x	x	x	x
Faubert	x	x	x	x
Feldman	x	x	x	x
Filion	x	-	x	x
Flint	x	x	x	x
Fotinos	x	x	x	x
Gardner	x	-	x	x
Giansante	x	-	x	x
Holyday	x	x	x	x
Jakobek	x	x	x	x
Johnston	x	-	x	x
Jones	x	x	x	x
Kelly	x	x	x	x
Kinahan	x	x	x	x
King	x	-	x	-
Korwin- Kuczynski	x	-	x	x
Layton	x	-	x	-
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x	x
Li Preti	x	x	x	x
Mahood	x	-	x	x
Mammoliti	x	x	x	x
McConnell	x	x	x	x
Mihevc	x	x	x	x
Miller	x	x	x	x
Minnan-Wong	x	x	x	-
Moeser	x	-	x	x
Moscoe	x	x	x	x
Nunziata	x	-	x	x
O'Brien	x	-	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
May 11 and 12, 1999

May 11, 1999	9:38 a.m. to 12:40 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:15 p.m.	2:09 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.*	6:40 p.m. to 7:44 p.m.*
Ootes	x	x	x	x
Pantalone	x	x	x	x
Pitfield	x	x	x	x
Prue	x	-	x	x
Rae	x	x	x	x
Saundercook	x	x	x	x
Sgro	x	x	x	x
Shaw	x	x	x	x
Shiner	x	x	x	x
Silva	x	x	x	x
Sinclair	x	-	x	x
Tzekas	x	x	x	x
Walker	x	-	x	x
Total	58	35	58	53

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

May 12, 1999	Roll Call 9:45 a.m.	9:42 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:18 p.m.	2:14 .m. to 7:54 p.m.*
Lastman	-	x	-	x
Adams	-	x	x	x
Altobello	x	x	x	x
Ashton	-	x	-	x
Augimeri	-	x	-	x
Balkissoon	-	x	-	x
Berardinetti	x	x	x	x
Berger	x	x	x	x
Bossons	x	x	x	x
Brown	-	x	-	x
Bussin	x	x	x	x
Cho	-	x	-	x
Chong	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
 May 11 and 12, 1999

May 12, 1999	Roll Call 9:45 a.m.	9:42 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:18 p.m.	2:14 .m. to 7:54 p.m.*
Chow	-	-	x	x
Davis	-	x	-	x
Disero	-	x	x	x
Duguid	x	x	x	x
Faubert	x	x	-	x
Feldman	x	x	x	x
Filion	-	x	-	x
Flint	x	x	x	x
Fotinos	-	x	-	-
Gardner	x	x	-	x
Giansante	x	x	x	x
Holyday	x	x	x	x
Jakobek	-	x	x	x
Johnston	-	x	x	x
Jones	x	x	x	x
Kelly	-	x	x	x
Kinahan	x	x	x	x
King	x	x	x	x
Korwin- Kuczynski	x	x	x	x
Layton	-	x	-	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x	x
Li Preti	x	x	x	x
Mahood	x	x	-	x
Mammoliti	-	x	x	x
McConnell	x	x	x	x
Mihevc	-	x	-	x
Miller	-	x	x	x
Minnan-Wong	-	x	-	x
Moeser	-	x	x	x
Moscoe	-	x	x	x
Nunziata	x	x	-	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
May 11 and 12, 1999

May 12, 1999	Roll Call 9:45 a.m.	9:42 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:18 p.m.	2:14 .m. to 7:54 p.m.*
O'Brien	x	x	x	x
Ootes	x	x	x	x
Pantalone	x	x	x	x
Pitfield	x	x	x	x
Prue	x	x	-	x
Rae	x	x	-	x
Saundercook	x	x	x	x
Sgro	-	x	-	x
Shaw	-	x	-	x
Shiner	x	x	x	x
Silva	-	x	x	x
Sinclair	-	x	-	x
Tzekas	-	x	-	x
Walker	x	x	x	x
Total	31	57	36	57

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

MEL LASTMAN,
Mayor

NOVINA WONG,
City Clerk

ATTACHMENT No. 1

Communication dated April 30, 1999, from Councillor Michael Walker, Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, entitled "Restore Rent Control Campaign Strategy," (See Minute No. 5.52)

At its meeting held on April 30, 1999, the Council Sub-committee to Restore Rent Control had before it its report to your joint Committee dated April 26, 1999.

The Sub-Committee amended Recommendation No. (2) of the above-mentioned report by deletion of 2(b) so that Recommendation No. (2) now reads as follows:

"(2) Council provide funding for the campaign in the amount of \$58,000.00 through the corporate contingency fund;"

and recommends the adoption of the report, as so amended.

Report dated April 26, 1999, from Councillor Michael Walker, Chair, Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, entitled "Restore Rent Control Campaign Strategy."

Purpose:

To outline elements of a City strategy to restore rent control.

Funding Sources and Financial Implications:

The strategy proposed would cost \$58,000.00. It is recommended that Council provide direction about the source of funding.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) Council approve the proposed strategy for a campaign to restore rent control and direct the Council Sub-committee to Restore Rent Control to administer this campaign;
- (2) Council provide direction as to the source of funding for this campaign in the amount of \$58,000.00, either:
 - (a) funding for the campaign in the amount of \$58,000.00 be provided through the Corporate Contingency Fund; or

- (b) through an allocation from the budget of each councillor and the Mayor of \$1,000.00; and
- (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Background:

At its meeting of April 15, 1999, Council approved the establishment of a Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control. The purpose of this sub-committee is to develop a strategy to:

- restore Rent Control to ensure meaningful protection for tenants from unreasonably high rent increases;
- restore the Rental Housing Protection Act in order to prevent demolition and conversion of our limited stock of affordable rental housing; and to
- restore the Landlord and Tenant Act in order to re-establish a level playing field between landlords and tenants.

The Sub-committee held its first meeting April 22, 1999, to discuss elements of a strategy, and to prepare recommendations for Committee. As required by Council, the Sub-committee will report on progress to Council through the Urban Environment and Development Committee, beginning with the special joint meeting of the Urban Environment and Development and Community and Neighbourhood Services Committees on May 3, 1999.

This report provides some background about key areas of concern under the Tenant Protection Act, recommends a strategy and recommends a method of funding the strategy. Given that a provincial election is anticipated this spring, the strategy centres on activities to highlight the importance of "restoring rent control" as an election issue.

Review of Key Areas of Concern under the Tenant Protection Act

The Tenant Protection Act (TPA) establishes rules for rent levels, replacing the former Rent Control Act. It moves administration of the Landlord and Tenant Act from the Courts to an administrative tribunal. It also repealed the Rental Housing Protection Act, which previously gave Council authority to take local conditions (such as supply of rental housing) into account when deciding whether or not to approve an application for demolition or conversion.

Our concerns with the TPA are that landlords are now able to pass through higher rent increases, that the eviction process is faster, or that it is easier to demolish rental housing, and that this is permitted in an environment where rents are already high relative to steadily declining tenant incomes, where we already do not have a

sufficient supply of rental housing and are projecting increased demand, and where we are losing rental housing faster than it can be replaced. Toronto is the only major center in Ontario with a tight rental market as demonstrated by a vacancy rate of about just 1 percent since 1994, and more than 50 percent of our households are tenants. The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force found that tenant incomes fell 12.5 percent between 1991 and 1996, and predicts additional demand for 3,800 to 4,800 units every year between 1996 and 2001. In 1998, there were only 159 private rental housing starts, and we already have almost 1,500 units subject to applications for demolition since last June.

What follows is a summary of some changes which have occurred and their impacts. A more detailed review is provided as Appendix A.

1. Rent Setting

- rent registry, which allowed tenants to check the highest legal rent for their unit, has been discontinued (with the exception of determining June 1998 maximum rents for sitting tenants);
- tenants moving into a unit must negotiate the rent with the landlord, and the new rent can be set at any level without regard for the past history of rents on the unit;
- landlords can apply for increases above the 3 percent guideline of up to 7 percent for capital expenditure costs and even more if there have been operating cost increases (since the Act was passed, there have been 502 applications representing more than 55,000 units - 15 percent of Toronto's private rental housing stock);
- landlords and tenants must pay fees for applications about rents; and
- the issuance of order which prohibit rent increases (rent freeze) where the landlord has not complied with a municipal work order has been discontinued.

2. Repeal of Rental Housing Protection Act

- municipalities no longer have explicit authority to protect the supply of rental units by regulating the demolition and conversion of rental housing to other uses such as condominium, or renovation of rental properties.

3. Process for termination of tenancies under the Landlord and Tenant Act

- tenants now have only five calendar days to dispute a landlord's application to terminate the tenancy in contrast to 14 days under the Landlord and Tenant Act, and must file their dispute in writing.

Proposed Campaign Strategy

Although a number of the proposed activities would be “city-wide” in impact, a key component for the strategy to succeed is for councillors to participate by organizing events (rallies, meetings, mail-outs, etc.) in their own communities. Therefore, one part of the strategy includes preparing a kit for every councillor which can be of assistance to them in defining and delivering their own initiatives.

As for the overall strategy, it is proposed that a campaign coordinator be hired. The campaign coordinator would operate under the direction of the Council Sub-Committee to Restore Rent Control, report to the chair, and would undertake a number of activities.

The total cost of the campaign is estimated at \$57,000.00, and activities include the following:

- preparing and distributing a plain language, multilingual flyer to tenants outlining issues they should be aware of through a postal walk, and also by councillors and tenant advocacy organizations;
- posting the flyer and other information on a web site which can be accessed through the City’s corporate site;
- preparing a kit for councillors to use at their own information sessions and when they participate in other sessions organized in their communities, including printed materials, a short training session for councillors and their staff about the Tenant Protection Act, and a speaker to assist councillors at their sessions when required and available;
- preparing and distributing lists of questions that councillors and tenants can use when participating in candidates’ meetings or other forums where provincial election issues are discussed;
- preparing and administering a survey to candidates to determine their position with respect to tenant protection, analyzing results, and preparing/distributing information to tenants and others about the positions taken; and
- coordinating and supporting a number of media events in participation with councillors and their communities throughout the weeks leading up to the election to highlight and illustrate key impacts of the Tenant Protection Act and why changes are required.

More detailed information about the activities, costs and workplan are attached as Appendix B.

The cost of the proposed campaign is estimated at \$58,000.00. It is recommended that Council provide direction as to the source of funding. Two options are suggested:

- that funding be allocated from the Corporate Contingency Fund; or

- that all councillors and the mayor be requested to provide \$1,000.00 from their office budgets.

Conclusion:

Council has established a Sub-committee charged with taking action to ensure that the issues of tenant protection from high rent increases, loss of rental housing, and faster evictions are part of the agenda for the forthcoming provincial election. This report proposes a modest campaign strategy which can be rolled-out during the period between the announcement of the election and election day. It notes that the cost of this campaign is estimated at \$58,000.00, and requests that Council provide direction as to the source of funding.

(A copy of Appendix A, entitled "Comparison between Tenant Protection Act and Previous Legislation" and Appendix B, entitled "Campaign Strategy / Workplan", referred to in the foregoing report, is on file in the Office of the Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT No. 2

Report dated April 8, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled "Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Policy Directions related to Community and Neighbourhood Services." (See Minute No. 5.53)

Purpose:

To discuss policy directions and associated financial implications for the City of Toronto arising from the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force report related to service coordination and planning, emergency shelter, social assistance, health and mental health, housing help, supportive and affordable housing, Aboriginal peoples, immigrants and refugees, families and youth. These areas will be reviewed within the context of recent announcements and developments by each level of government since the release of the Task Force report.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no immediate financial implications for the City.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) in keeping with the Task Force call for the City to exercise a leadership role in responding to the homeless crisis, that:

- (a) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report back to Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee by Fall 1999 on a proposed format for a municipal report card on homelessness;
 - (b) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services meet with senior representatives in the Ministry of Community and Social Services to discuss expansion of the abused women's shelter system in Toronto (an estimated 380 additional beds are required). As this type of expansion would take several years, the Commissioner should further request that the Province provide funding to community-based agencies to support abused women forced to use emergency shelters because of the shortfall in the abused women's system;
 - (c) the City actively pursue the Task Force recommendation to establish partnerships between youth shelters and landlords to create additional housing units for youth; and
 - (d) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services convene a meeting with the Ontario Multi-Faith Council regarding the development of appropriate discharge protocols, including follow-up support, for people leaving correctional facilities;
- (2) in recognition of the need for all three levels of government to take ownership of the problem of homelessness and responsibility for solving it, Council encourage the involvement of other levels of government in areas that fall within their jurisdictions by:
- (a) urging the Province to earmark funds from the transfer of federal monies for health and social services to a dedicated Homeless Health Fund to address the special needs of homeless persons;
 - (b) urging the federal government to designate a senior representative to work directly with the City of Toronto and representatives of Aboriginal organizations in Toronto to develop a culturally appropriate homeless strategy building on the recommendations proposed by the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force;
 - (c) urging the federal government to designate a senior representative to work directly with the City of Toronto and representatives of the immigrant and refugee service sector in Toronto to discuss the broad range of immigration and refugee policy and program issues at the municipal level including those related to homelessness proposed by the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force;

- (d) urging the federal government to allow refugee claimants access to basic settlement services and to enhance access to and coverage of the Federal Interim Health Plan for refugee claimants;
- (e) urging the federal government to provide capital funding for an additional shelter for refugees in Toronto;
- (f) urging the Province to appoint senior representatives from the Ministry of Health, Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correction Services to work directly with the City of Toronto and its community partners to develop discharge protocols, including follow-up support, for all institutions who discharge people to no fixed address or to emergency shelters;
- (g) urging the Province to ensure that the definitions of special need and eligibility for supportive housing is broad enough to include “hard-to-house” homeless people;
- (h) urging the Province to maintain administration of the Support to Daily Living Program (representing approximately \$3.0 million for Toronto) in recognition of the provincial responsibility for supportive housing;
- (i) urging the Province to expand Habitat Services by an additional 200 beds for the year 2000 and to provide full 80 percent funding for this program;
- (j) urging the Province to approve the funding proposal to expand the Breaking the Cycle program to include a new substance abuse treatment program for young mothers;
- (k) welcoming the recent provincial announcement to make government-owned land available for housing and housing demonstration projects, and urge the Province to establish a process for working with the City to identify potential sites;
- (l) urging the Province to support municipal affordable housing partnerships through measures such as capital grants/equity or a role in lending, where the Province does have existing capability;
- (m) welcoming the recent provincial announcement on rent supplements, and to urge the Province to consult with the City of Toronto on the design of the rent supplement program with a goal of immediate implementation;

- (n) urging the federal government to identify specific government-owned sites for use as housing demonstration projects, in cooperation with the City;
 - (o) urging Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to enhance its housing partnership role by substantially increasing its support to new affordable housing through revised mortgage insurance policies and direct lending;
- (3) this report be forwarded to the new federal Minister of Homelessness and the provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Minister of Community and Social Services, and the Minister of Health; and
- (4) appropriate City Officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Executive Summary:

This report responds to a recommendation of the Chief Administrative Officer's February 17, 1999 report entitled "Response to the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report" to provide a detailed policy review of the Task Force recommendations that relate to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Department to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee. This section of the report is a summary of the more detailed analysis provided in the next section.

On March 2, 1999, Council endorsed the Task Force action plan in principle and as such made a commitment to begin implementation. The directions outlined in the Task Force report are consistent with those taken by the City to date. What is new is the provision of a comprehensive framework that brings together all of the key pieces and establishes clear roles and responsibilities for all parties including each level of government and the broader community. The City must heed the Task Force warning against implementation in a piecemeal fashion, the various strategies are inter-related and success depends upon a holistic approach.

Council has approved the development of a municipal report card on homelessness, as recommended by the Task Force, to function as a monitoring tool and accountability mechanism to ensure implementation of the City's action plan on homelessness. A format for the report card will be developed by the Fall 1999.

This report to Committee discusses each of the six key areas which comprise the framework of the Task Force action plan. These include simplifying and coordinating the service system, specific strategies for high-risk sub-groups, prevention strategies, a comprehensive health strategy and supportive and affordable housing.

(a) Coordinating and Simplifying the Service System:

A number of Task Force recommendations in this area were addressed in the Chief Administrative Officers report such as the need for a Homeless Information Line and hostel bed registry and capital funding for hostel and drop-in upgrades. Additional items for this report to Committee include the need for the City to adopt the comprehensive, integrated service planning framework proposed by the Task Force to help break down existing service silos and ensure effective service delivery for people who are homeless.

The Province recently announced plans to increase the Provincial Homeless Initiatives Fund by an additional \$6.0 million. Toronto will receive \$3.074 million bringing the annual total to \$4.724 million. The Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Financial Officer are submitting a joint report to Budget Committee on April 16, 1999, on the financial impact to the City of these new funds along with how they might be utilized to implement the Task Force recommendations. Budget Committee will forward this report to Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee for information.

(b) Specific Strategies for High Risk Groups:

While there are common issues that extend across the homeless population, such as poverty and lack of affordable housing some groups are particularly vulnerable and require targeted strategies.

Families now represent one of the fastest growing groups of hostel users. They tend to stay longer in shelters because of the lack of affordable housing for families. Longer stays require more support services and present challenges such as coping with privacy issues and stress for the children as they change schools and try to adapt to living and studying in close quarters. A report from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee on April 22 is the "Final Report on the Review of the Use of Motels as Hostels." In line with the Task Force recommendations, the report proposes short-term strategies such as how to address the education issues for children of homeless families as well as the need for a long-term strategy to distribute family hostels more equitably across the city to address the concentration issue in Scarborough. The motel review process highlighted the importance of service system planning for this group as recommended by the Task Force.

Youth are also one of the fastest growing groups of hostel users. The City funds youth shelters and community-based youth services, however, the rise in youth homelessness indicates more needs to be done. Following from the Task Force recommendation for a substance abuse treatment program for young parents, the City should urge the Province to support the Breaking the Cycle funding proposal to develop such a service. The City, in partnership with Eva's Place youth shelter, is

developing an extended youth shelter program that provides transitional housing support. The City needs to be more proactive in establishing partnerships between youth shelters and local landlords to create more housing units for youth, as recommended by the Task Force.

At least as many abused women stay in emergency shelters as stay in abused women's shelters. As of 1998, the Province is responsible for funding abused women's shelters. In order to ensure enough beds are available in the abused women's shelter system, an estimated 380 additional beds are required. The City should encourage the Province to expand the system to ensure abused women have appropriate support in this regard. Until that happens, the Province should be encouraged to fund community agencies to provide support to abused women forced to stay in emergency hostels due to lack of space in the abused women's shelter system.

Aboriginal people are disproportionately represented among the homeless and require a range of supports and services which are culturally appropriate. As a first step in developing a strategy for this group, it is recommended that the federal government be asked to designate a senior representative to work with the City and representatives of Aboriginal organizations.

The designation of a federal representative is also needed to work with the City and representatives of the immigrant and refugee service sector to discuss the broad range of immigration and refugee policy and program issues including those related to homelessness. Refugee claimants are most at risk of becoming homeless, in large part due to the limited supports and opportunities available to them upon arrival in Canada. Refugee claimants are not eligible for settlement services. Basic settlement and health services for refugee claimants as well as another shelter specifically for refugees are key areas in which the City needs to encourage federal funding.

(c) A Shift to Prevention Strategies:

The City does concur with the Task Force recommendation to shift from emergency responses to prevention strategies and has directed resources into prevention and diversion strategies while at the same time trying to address the growing demands on the emergency shelter system.

Integral to the Task Force prevention strategy are measures intended to reduce the risk of homelessness for people in receipt of social assistance. These include asking the Province to increase the shelter component of social assistance to better reflect local market conditions and creating a new shelter allowance program for the working poor. Both recommendations have been supported by Council but as yet the Province has not responded.

The City has created a new shelter fund using the municipal savings from the National Child Tax Benefit to help families who require financial assistance, such as first and last months rent or rental arrears, to secure, maintain or move to more affordable or suitable housing in an effort to prevent homelessness among families.

The Province has announced plans to download administration of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Community Partners Program, to municipalities. Toronto's share of this program is \$900,000.00. Details have not been released the devolution of this program, however, it is appropriate for municipalities to administer this fund. It provides the opportunity for a more integrated and systematic approach to funding and service delivery as the City currently funds housing help and support initiatives also funded under the Community Partners Program.

In terms of eviction prevention strategies proposed by the Task Force, the City is funding a \$50,000.00 rent bank for women and children. The rent bank is a small initiative and while preliminary results are positive, a final evaluation is needed to determine by how much the fund should be increased. The additional Provincial Homeless Initiatives Fund could be used to increase it to at least \$200,000.00 for 1999.

The Province has announced \$1.0 million in funding for the Ontario Multi-Faith Council for discharge planning, including follow up, for people leaving correctional facilities. The City should meet with this group to participate in the development of these policies. In addition, the Province must be engaged to develop appropriate discharge policies for health and mental health institutions as well.

(d) A Homeless Health Strategy:

The Task Force outlines a comprehensive health strategy to address the health and mental health needs of the homeless population. This includes ways to remove barriers to accessing comprehensive health care. The City is in the process of bringing together municipal, provincial and community partners to develop a strategy to implement the health recommendations contained in the Task Force report. The City should also call on the Province to earmark funds from the transfer of federal monies for health and social services to a dedicated Homeless Health Fund to address the special needs of homeless persons.

A motion from Council on compelling treatment for people incapable of taking responsibility for their lives is a controversial one. The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health has recently set up a Task Force to address this complex issue and will report on their findings in the Fall 1999.

Toronto Public Health provides a wide range of preventative, support and treatment services for homeless persons. They work closely with community-based service

providers to identify emerging health issues and develop solutions for homeless people. The Board of Health has adopted a report from the Medical Officer of Health outlining an action strategy for the Public Health response to homelessness that includes five positions to support underserved areas. This report will be forwarded to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee on April 22, 1999.

The Task Force recommends harm reduction strategies to address the needs of the “hardest to serve”, people with a drug and/or alcohol addiction or both a mental illness and an addiction. Many such people are not able to use existing services. Harm reduction is a non-judgmental approach that first addresses the basic needs such as food and shelter and then tries to reduce the harm resulting from the alcohol or drug addiction. Abstinence is not ruled out as a goal for some people but it is not a requirement. As more harm reduction facilities are urgently needed the City must take the lead in bringing together key government and community partners to establish these sites.

(e) Supportive Housing:

Council has already given its support urging the Province to build 5,000 new supportive housing units in Toronto over the next five years while at the same time adding 8,500 new units across the Province. The Province has committed to \$45.0 million to develop new supportive housing with \$20.0 million allocated in the first year to provide 1,000 new units. This is a smaller scale than is recommended or needed but is a positive first step. Specific details on distribution across the province are not available but Toronto should receive a significant share.

Outstanding issues involve urging the Province to ensure that the currently restricted definitions of special need and eligibility for supportive housing is broad enough to include “hard to house” homeless people whether they have a diagnosis of mental illness or not. The Province should also be urged to expand the Habitat Services program by 200 beds in the year 2000.

The Province plans to download the Support to Daily Living Program to municipalities. This program is currently administered by the Ministry of Community and Social Services and funds supports for housing for “hard-to-house” and homeless people. The total cost of this program is \$6.1 million for the province of which approximately \$3.0 million funds programs in Toronto. The City should urge the Province to maintain administration of the Support to Daily Living Program in recognition of the provincial responsibility for supportive housing.

(f) Affordable Housing:

The Task Force calls for a renewed government role in housing development, as it is not profitable for private developers to build low-rent units. It recommends that the key resources be federal and provincial, the latter being mainly for supportive housing. It recommends that the City provide a catalyst role, setting a framework to draw in senior government resources, and also that the City put forward some of its own resources to “lever” those of other governments.

The City has adopted, in principle, a “housing first” policy to facilitate the development of new affordable housing stock. It has also created a \$10.9 million Capital Revolving Fund to assist in the development of new affordable housing and is partnering with the private and non-profit sector on affordable housing demonstration projects. A Reference Group of private-sector representatives and others has been set up to provide expert advice in the operations of the fund thereby addressing the Task Force call for a private-sector roundtable to advise on strategies for affordable housing. The City has also established a special property tax class for new multi-residential rental housing. The tax rate has been set at the same rate as residential.

Council has adopted new Official Plan policies and related by-laws regarding condominium conversion and demolition of affordable rental housing. Additional authority is being sought from the Province in the area of demolition control. Other Task Force recommendations on the preservation of existing housing stock relate to second suites and rooming houses. The Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development is reporting to the Urban Environment and Development Committee in April.

Areas the City will need to address in the future include pooling issues associated with the significant social housing savings as well as decisions on these savings can be reinvested.

In response to the Task Force report, the Province has announced several housing initiatives such as a commitment to spend all of the \$50.0 million that will come from the signing of the Social Housing Agreement with the federal government on rent supplements, reallocating \$2.5 million over the next three years from expiring rent supplement contracts to help house 300-400 people with special needs grants to builders for PST paid on building materials up to \$2,000.00, making government-owned land available and commissioning an affordable housing design competition. These are welcome steps and correspond to a number of the Task Force recommendations. Details have yet to be released on these initiatives.

Council has adopted a motion asking the federal government to provide GST refunds on new development and to create the \$300.0 million annual capital program to develop low-income housing. The federal government has not responded to these Task Force recommendations as of yet. The City also needs to encourage the federal

government to increase mortgage and financing assistance and make government-owned land available for affordable housing development.

The National Symposium on Homelessness and Housing

On March 25 and 26, 1999, the City of Toronto co-hosted the first national symposium on homelessness and affordable housing with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The successful event brought together homeless people, community-based activists and service providers, faith communities, bureaucrats and politicians from each level of government and interested members of the community to discuss national issues and strategies related to homelessness.

Numerous recommendations were developed to be forwarded to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities for consideration at their annual general meeting in June in which homelessness is a key agenda item. The event also helped develop a National Housing Options Paper also for presentation at the FCM meeting. The aim of this paper is to provide a menu of national options and strategies suited for different regions throughout the country.

Contact Names:

Joanne Campbell
Phone: 392-7885/ Fax: 392-0548

Eric Gam
Phone: 392-8238/ Fax:
392-8492

Detailed Analysis of the Policy Directions related to Community and Neighbourhood Services:

Council Reference/Background/History:

On March 2, 1999, Council adopted a report, dated February 17, 1999, by the Chief Administrative Officer entitled "Response to the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report." This report provided a preliminary analysis of the main financial implications for the City resulting from the Task Force action plan and recommended that Council endorse, in principle, the general directions outlined in Task Force report.

The report also recommended that separate, more detailed reports on the policy and financial implications of the Task Force recommendations be submitted to each relevant standing committee for review by April 1999. Urban Environment and Development Committee will review Task Force recommendations on housing policies related to the Official Plan including second suites, rooming houses, main streets development, density incentives and inclusionary zoning. Corporate Services

Committee will review land management issues and a “housing first” policy for the City. Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee will review the development charges issue. Budget Committee will review a detailed financial analysis of the recommendations resulting from these policy reviews. A comprehensive report, consolidating feedback from the standing committee reviews will be submitted to the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee in late Spring.

This report to Committee discusses the policy directions and associated financial implications of the Task Force recommendations related to service coordination and planning, emergency shelter, social assistance, health and mental health, supportive and affordable housing, Aboriginal peoples, immigrants and refugees, families and youth. This report also responds to several motions arising from the discussion of the Task Force report at the March 2, 1999, meeting of City Council.

On March 23, 1999, the Province announced several initiatives in response to the Task Force recommendations (see Appendix B for a summary of these initiatives). Specific details on all of the announcements have not yet been released, however, information that is available will be discussed within the context of this report.

On March 22, 1999, the federal government announced the appointment of Claudette Bradshaw, Minister of Labour, as the new Minister responsible for homelessness. The Minister has agreed to meet with the Mayor of Toronto in April to discuss strategies to address the homeless crisis in Toronto.

The City of Toronto and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities co-hosted a National Symposium on Homelessness on March 25 and 26, 1999. This event brought people from all sectors together from across the country to discuss national homeless strategies. Further details will be discussed later in this report.

Comments and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

Homelessness is considered by many to have reached crisis proportions. Toronto City Council declared homelessness a national disaster in October 1998, sparking similar declarations across the country. In January 1999, the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force released an action plan for the City of Toronto to address this growing problem in the city.

The Task Force has produced a solid, well researched and comprehensive action plan on homelessness. The report captures the reality of homelessness in Toronto and identifies barriers that have contributed to the problem and continue to block solutions and an action plan that represents a synthesis of the best thinking on the issue from a range of stakeholders both from within the city, the country and the also the United States.

The Task Force stresses, homelessness is not just a Toronto issue, it affects communities across the province and the country. Although downtown Toronto sees more of the “visibly homeless”, people sleeping rough on the streets, suburban communities across the city and the GTA are experiencing rising numbers of “hidden homeless”, people who are doubled up, living in illegal or temporary accommodation and who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless. This reflects the changing face of homelessness. There has been a tendency for the media, public and Council to focus on the visible homeless who tend to besingle adults with mental health and/or addictions issues. While it is estimated that 30 percent of people who are homeless do have mental health issues, the vast majority do not. In fact, research by the Task Force reveals that the fastest growing groups of homeless are families with children and youth under the age of eighteen.

The growing numbers of families who are at risk of becoming homelessness is alarming. More than 100,000 people are on the waiting list for social housing in Toronto. The Task Force found that the level of poverty is getting worse for those on the waiting list with more than one-third of people having incomes of less than \$800.00 per month. The private rental market, with a .09 percent vacancy rate with few affordable units, remains the only option for people with low-incomes. At the current rate of placement for social housing units, families will wait 17 years for housing.

The Task Force report highlights the complex causes of homelessness. This includes contributing individual factors such as abuse, family breakdown, health, mental health and addiction issues. The role of societal factors, however, is seen as key to both understanding the dynamics of homelessness and developing sustainable solutions. These factors include increased poverty due to labour market changes, changes in government policy and funding arrangements such as restrictions on receipt of Employment Insurance, significant reductions in social assistance benefits, lack of affordable rental housing and long social housing waiting lists. The Task Force documents the negative impact on the rate of homelessness arising from government policy changes in the areas of income assistance, housing, health and mental health.

The Task Force was commissioned to produce an action plan on homelessness for the City of Toronto. In turn, the Task Force developed a comprehensive plan that includes the range of strategies needed to address this growing problem. Toronto City Council has endorsed this action plan in principle and as such has made a commitment to begin implementation. The directions outlined in the report are consistent with those taken by the City to date. What is new is the provision of a comprehensive framework that brings together all of the key pieces and establishes clear roles and responsibilities for all parties including each level of government and the broader community. The City must heed the Task Force warning against implementation in a piecemeal fashion, the various strategies are inter-related and success depends upon a holistic approach.

In responding to the Task Force report, the challenge is to blend both policy and operational perspectives within a current reality of fiscal constraint. Upon review, some of the recommendations have been or are being implemented by the City. In other areas, the City has not taken enough initiative and needs to re-examine how it can invest new energy. Still again, some recommendations require the establishment of partnerships, either with other levels of government or with the community. This report discusses the Task Force recommendations within this context and makes recommendations accordingly.

A Clear Role for Each Level of Government

The Task Force identifies jurisdictional squabbling as a key barrier to solving the homeless crisis. In an effort to disentangle who does what, clear roles and responsibilities are identified for each level of government.

The federal government is charged with renewing its commitment in the area of social housing by financing the construction of new affordable housing and rehabilitating existing affordable housing. In addition, the federal government is asked to finance projects which prevent and reduce homelessness among Aboriginal people and immigrants and refugees, groups for which the federal government has primary responsibility.

As the Province is responsible for health and income maintenance, the Task Force recommends that the Province adjust the shelter component of welfare to reflect local rents, establish a new shelter allowance program for the working poor, fund supportive housing and treatment programs and, continue to enhance access to health care for homeless people.

The City of Toronto is charged taking the lead with planning and managing local homeless programs. In addition, the City is called upon to use the existing urban planning tools at its disposal and to seek additional powers to provide a framework for the development and preservation of affordable housing, encouraging the involvement of all levels of government.

A Municipal Report Card on Homelessness

At its March 2, 1999 meeting Council adopted a motion for the Chief Administrative Officer to present a report card directly to Council every six months to document the state of homelessness in Toronto and report on action taken by each level of government to alleviate the problem.

This corresponds with the Task Force recommendation for a municipal report card to act as a monitoring tool and an accountability mechanism to ensure implementation of the City's action plan on homelessness. A set of key indicators

would need to be developed that reflect the pressure points in the system such as the number of evictions, the number of people using emergency shelter, the use of health and mental health facilities, social housing waiting lists and progress towards a more sufficient and equitable distribution of affordable and supportive housing and services across the city, region and province.

Developing a thorough and meaningful report card format will take some time. It is therefore recommended that the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report back to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee by Fall 1999 on a proposed format for a municipal report card on homelessness.

Analysis of the Task Force Recommendations

The action plan designed by the Task Force takes a comprehensive approach focussing on six key areas; simplifying and co-ordinating the service system, specific strategies for high-risk sub-groups, prevention strategies, a health strategy and supportive and affordable housing. (Appendix A provides an overview of the Task Force action plan). The six key areas will be discussed separately in this section.

(1) Co-ordination and Service Planning:

The Task Force identifies the need for improved co-ordination and service planning in the homeless service sector to ensure that people have access to available supports and services and to increase the quality and efficiency of service delivery. A service planning framework is proposed which the City should adopt to ensure a comprehensive, integrated approach to service planning. The framework suggests planning be organized around three sub-groups of homeless people - youth, families and single people. Within each group, specific strategies should then be developed for those at higher risk including abused women, Aboriginal people and immigrants and refugees. This approach provides the benefit of engaging service providers across sectors to enhance the coordination, accessibility and quality of the network of services. It utilizes the expertise of diverse service sectors and builds on natural linkages between different service strategies. Clear opportunities of where the City can begin to implement this approach are discussed in the section on strategies for high-risk groups, specifically in relation to families and youth.

Additional issues related to service co-ordination and planning were discussed in the Chief Administrative Officer's report, "Response to the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report". Developments since this report was written are also discussed in the next section.

(a) Municipal Funding for Homeless Service Recommendations:

In the Chief Administrative Officer's report, a number of options for financing the Task Force recommendations directed to the City were discussed. The key items for

1999 included: a \$2.2 million hostel follow-up program; expanding the rent bank program from \$50,000.00 to \$200,000.00; an amount of \$50,000.00 to conduct a feasibility plan prior to implementation of the homeless information system; and, \$50,000.00 for a facilities audit of the hostel and drop-in sector to determine the need for facility upgrades. It was proposed that funding for these initiatives come from potential savings to the 1998 hostels budget contingent upon provincial agreement to pay the full 80 percent cost-sharing for Toronto hostels.

In its recent announcement, the Province did not respond to Toronto's request for full cost-sharing. However, the Province did commit to increasing the Provincial Homelessness Initiatives Fund by an additional \$6.0 million. Toronto will receive \$3.704 million from this fund bringing the annual amount for Toronto to \$4.724 million. The City must report to the Province by June 1999 on how these new dollars will be allocated. Funding priorities for the City include prevention and diversion programs corresponding with the Task Force call for this service shift.

The Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Financial Officer are submitting a report to the Budget Committee on April 16, 1999, on the financial impact to the City of these new funds along with how they might be utilized to implement the Task Force recommendations. This report will be forwarded from the Budget Committee to Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee for information.

(b) Redirection of Hostel Funding:

The Task Force recommends that the City redirect resources away from providing hostel spaces to programs that help people find and maintain housing. The Task Force supports this only on the condition that sufficient new supply of supportive and low-cost housing is developed. In conjunction with this, the Task Force calls on the Province to fund the full 80 percent of hostel costs. As discussed, the Province has not responded to this request.

However, the Province has given municipalities the option of redirecting a portion of hostel funding to prevention programs. The details on this funding diversion have just been received and staff are reviewing the document. Key features of this initiative include the following: the amount of funding available is up to 15 percent of the emergency hostel funding based on the 1998 cost-shared levels; funds must be used for new services, not for replacement of existing services; and, at least a dollar for dollar cost savings in current or anticipated emergency hostel spending.

(2) Specific Strategies for High Risk Groups

There are common issues that extend across the groups of people who are homeless, such as poverty and the lack of affordable housing. However, there are also some groups who are particularly vulnerable to homelessness and require targeted

strategies to meet their specialized needs. The Task Force has identified these groups as families, youth, abused women, Aboriginal people and immigrants and refugees. The next section discusses the Task Force strategies for these groups.

(a) Families:

A detailed analysis of Toronto's hostels data by the Task Force revealed that families with children now represent one of the fastest growing groups of hostel users. The vast majority end up homeless because of abuse or affordability issues. Families also tend to stay for longer periods of time in the hostel system because of the lack of affordable rental housing. Longer stays require more supports in the hostel system to help parents and children cope with living in close quarters with limited privacy as well as the challenges associated with temporary enrollment in the school system.

The Task Force recommends that reception and support programs be established in Scarborough schools (where the majority of homeless families are sheltered) to provide support to children of homeless families while minimizing the disruption to the rest of the students. Further, it recommends that the City develop a long-term strategy to distribute family hostels more equitably across the city, to address the issue of concentration in Scarborough.

In 1986, Toronto authorized the use of motels to accommodate homeless families. This was intended as a temporary response to the "overflow" in the system however, motels are now an integral part of the family shelter system. The "Final Report on the Review of the Use of Motels for Homeless Families" will be submitted to the April 22 meeting of Community and Neighbourhood Services with recommendations on both short and long-term options for providing emergency shelter to families.

While the motel review focuses on the Scarborough area where the motels use is located, the review highlights a number of broader issues relevant to families who are homeless as a whole. These relate not only to the capacity of the family hostel system but also to issues such as education and the broader community service capacity. In this regard, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services will submit a report to Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee in May 1999 outlining a plan to approach the range of service issues related to families in Toronto's hostel system. The report will also respond to the recommendations by the Task Force and the motel review on a long-term strategy to distribute family hostels equitably throughout Toronto.

Issues for children of homeless families in the education system are discussed in the motel review report along with a process for bringing together both municipal representatives and both school boards to develop strategies for enhanced school resources and coordinated system-wide planning.

The range of issues associated with homeless families highlights the importance of service system planning for this group, as recommended by the Task Force. This approach provides the benefit of engaging service providers across sectors to enhance the coordination, accessibility and quality of the network of services supporting families. It utilizes the expertise of diverse service sectors and builds on natural linkages between different service strategies.

(b) Youth:

The Task Force documents the rise in homelessness among young people. Youth now represent one of the fastest growing users of hostels. Several recommendations are targeted to youth including treatment programs for young parents with substance abuse problems, dedicated supportive housing for young mothers, a harm reduction facility, partnerships between youth shelters and landlords to create new affordable housing units for youth and that the Province should provide capital funding for the Extended Youth Shelter project at 11 Ordnance Street.

Council has adopted a squeegee-diversion strategy for street-involved youth. The City dedicated \$250,000.00 to this initiative and Human Resources Development Canada contributed \$370,000.00. The City has just issued a Request for Proposals to community based agencies for an integrated service model that will provide single points of access in the east and west ends of the city, create new employment training programs specifically targeted to this population and combine existing and new programs such as stabilization services and employment training into one integrated program. Programs are expected to be up and running by the late Spring or early Summer.

In addition to funding youth shelters, the City supports a number of initiatives for youth who are homeless through its grants programs. These services include: drop-ins, resource centres, life skills and training programs, transitional housing and employment programs. However, given the rise in homelessness among youth it is clear that more support is needed.

A substance abuse treatment program for young parents which includes a child care and outreach component is also proposed by the Task Force. The majority of youth on the street come from homes characterized by violence and substance use. Therefore, many require treatment for their own addictions issues; this is a prerequisite for retaining custody of their children. However, the lack of child care is a significant barrier for parents in need of treatment. As a result, about half of these young women lose their children to the child welfare system.

Breaking the Cycle is a program involving the Jean Tweed Centre, Mothercraft, Catholic Children's Aid, the Hospital for Sick Children and Public Health that provides parenting, education and support services. This group has submitted a funding proposal to the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Community and

Social Services to create a multi-service centre that would incorporate the existing services of Breaking the Cycle and add a new treatment component whereby children could stay with their mothers. It is therefore recommended that the City urge the Province to approve the funding proposal to expand the Breaking the Cycle program to include a new substance abuse treatment program for young mothers.

The City should actively pursue the Task Force recommendation to establish partnerships between youth shelters and landlords to create housing units. Youth hostels are in an excellent position to work with local landlords to implement projects which meet the needs of homeless youth and the local community and could also supply transitional support. Landlords tend to be more interested in housing youth when there are supports available as most youth do not have a "proven track record" or housing resume.

An example of this model involves a partnership between the Second Base Youth Shelter and the Metro Toronto Housing Authority on a pilot project to place youth in MTHA units. Second Base will assess each young person for suitability. Once the youth becomes a tenant, Second Base staff help with the transition out of the shelter and into MTHA and the local community.

The Task Force also recommends that the Province be approached for capital funding for 11 Ordnance Street which is an extended youth shelter project under development. The City has committed \$500,000.00 which is being used to leverage funds from the federal government, individuals and organizations. Operating costs for the project will be cost-shared 80:20 with the Province. Human Resources Development Canada, Eva's Place and other agencies are working together to develop the youth training program which would include youth involvement in the construction of the new facility. Preliminary work on the site began in April 1999.

The range of issues associated with youth also highlights the need for a co-ordinated service planning approach for this group. The City is challenged with finding viable solutions to homelessness among youth, an issue which is often controversial. In the last year the City has responded to issues of homeless and street-involved youth, such as squeegee kids. Service planning efforts geared toward breaking down service silos and developing programs and services that complement each other would go a long way toward assisting this population.

(c) Abused Women:

There are a significant number of women and children who are forced to use shelter due to violence in their homes. There are approximately 383 beds available that are located in abused women's shelters, or specifically designated for abused women. If a woman cannot find space in an abused women's shelter she must then seek assistance from one of the emergency shelters for families. This happens on a regular basis. The Task Force research revealed that from 1988 to 1996, 52 percent

of abused women in Toronto used shelters other than those in the assaulted women's sector, primarily family and adult women's hostels. Hostel staff estimate that at least as many assaulted women with children are helped by the emergency shelter system as by women's shelters, therefore, roughly 380 more beds would need to be added to the existing abused women's shelter system to accommodate the demand.

While there are many staff in emergency shelters who are skilled at working with abused women, it would be preferable that these women be accommodated and supported in an abused women's shelter that specialize in this type of service. At the present time, however, there are no provincial plans to expand the assaulted women's system in Toronto.

In the past, the City cost-shared the operational costs of the abused women's sector. On January 1, 1998, these costs were uploaded 100 percent to the Province. Because of the division of the shelter systems, emergency shelters serving abused women are not recognized by the Province nor funded by the Province for providing this service.

It is therefore recommended that the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services meet with senior representatives in the Ministry of Community and Social Services to discuss expansion of the abused women's shelter system in Toronto (an estimated 380 additional beds are required). As this type of expansion would take several years, the Commissioner should further request that the Province provide funding to community-based agencies to support abused women forced to use emergency shelters because of the shortfall in the abused women's system.

(d) Urban Aboriginal Issues:

In Toronto, Aboriginal people are disproportionately represented among the homeless. Aboriginal peoples in Toronto identify an urgent need for youth training, housing and support services, especially for Aboriginal people living "rough" on the street. In recognition of this reality and the need for culturally appropriate programs, the Task Force proposes recommendations to address disparities in housing and training opportunities and to increase access to treatment services for people with addictions or mental health issues.

Historically, the City of Toronto has provided some community development assistance and funding for culturally sensitive Aboriginal social services to be developed. The City funds a number of Aboriginal agencies including two Aboriginal-operated shelters that are linked with transitional housing, health and outreach programs, an overnight drop-in centre and programs for children, youth and adult men and women. Municipal involvement, in respecting the Aboriginal goal of greater self-determination, seeks to strike a balance in providing support while understanding that they have a special constitutional relationship with the federal government.

Aboriginal issues, especially for peoples on-reserve, fall under federal jurisdiction. However, the responsibility is complicated for those in urban centres. The Aboriginal perspective is that the federal government has a legal responsibility to protect First Nation's interests to enact policies and legislation, to mitigate socio-economic disparities by providing support and services such as housing, regardless if they live in their home communities or in urban centres.

The Task Force report highlights a critical gap in service provision for urban Aboriginal people in Toronto. Federal financing and planning support is needed from CMHC to address the Task Force call for more housing units for Aboriginal people. In addition, other federal departments need to be engaged, for example, Human Resources and Development Canada to address the Task Force recommendations for training and job development. The Province also has a role, potentially through the Ministry of Community and Social Services and Native Community Branch.

It is therefore recommended that the federal government be requested to designate a senior representative to work directly with the City of Toronto and representatives of Aboriginal organizations to develop a culturally appropriate homeless strategy building on the recommendations proposed by the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force.

(e) Immigrants and Refugees:

Toronto is the key destination for immigrants and refugees coming to Canada receiving 56 percent of the total newcomers to Ontario and 30 percent of the total newcomers to Canada. In addition, approximately 60 percent of refugee claims in Ontario originate in Toronto. In terms of homelessness, refugee claimants are most at risk of becoming homeless, in large part due to the limited supports and opportunities available to them upon arrival in Canada. Refugee claimants are not eligible for settlement services. These supports are essential for language training, help getting documentation or translation of documentation to look for work, help finding housing and help getting around an unfamiliar city.

The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force directs several recommendations to the federal government with respect to increasing support to immigrants and refugees who are homeless. These include allowing refugee claimants to access some basic settlement services, capital funding for an additional shelter for refugees in Toronto, working with the City to address immigration and refugee issues and assisting municipalities outside Toronto to provide emergency shelter for immigrants and refugees to reduce pressure on Toronto's hostel system.

Toronto has only one hostel designed specifically to meet the needs of immigrants and refugees. Waiting lists of 50 or more people are standard for this hostel. The majority of immigrant and refugee families are sheltered in motels along Kingston

Road in Scarborough. It is estimated that 27 percent of people staying in the family hostel system are refugee claimants. Once refugee claimants are part of this system, basic settlement and health services are essential to help them secure stable, permanent housing and health care. Because refugee claimants are not eligible for these services, this process is more difficult. Shelter staff cannot easily link people to community-based services and often end up providing basic settlement services themselves to assist refugee claimants.

Settlement and immigration policy has a significant impact on the City of Toronto. First and foremost, as Toronto is the key destination for newcomers, effective settlement and immigration policies are critical to the successful adaptation and integration of newcomers to the city. Second, as a direct service provider, the effects of settlement and immigration funding and policy decisions directly impact on the demand and delivery of municipal services such as social assistance and emergency shelter.

There are several areas in which federal program and policy issues directly effect the delivery of municipal services. Lengthy waiting periods for federal documentation leave some refugee claimants stuck in the hostel system, unable to secure other supports and services. Sponsorship breakdown can result in the need for emergency shelter or social assistance. Funding cuts to the settlement services sector in some instances has resulted in a form of downloading as municipal services attempt to fill in critical service gaps. This is most notable in the emergency shelter system and is one reason that Toronto's actual hostel costs are higher than the provincial per diem funds. The financial impact on the City for emergency shelter and social assistance costs to immigrants and refugees is estimated at \$30.0 million annually.

The Task Force recommendation to add another shelter for refugees with on-site settlement services would have financial implications for the City in the long term as hostel operating costs are cost shared 80:20 with the Province. While emergency shelters constitute a discretionary program, it is in the City's best interest to support this initiative to respond for the need for this type of shelter. In addition, the City should reaffirm its position that adequate emergency shelter and settlement services must be made available throughout the province to reduce the pressure on Toronto and allow people the opportunity to settle in other areas.

In addition, the City should support the Task Force recommendation calling on the federal government to provide the same orientation to refugee claimants on arrival to Canada as government sponsored refugees. Furthermore, refugee claimants should have some access to basic settlement services such as language translation and interpretation, help to find housing and assistance in settling their claim. The City review of the use of motels as hostels for families also identified lack of access to health care as a key issue for refugee claimants, only emergency health care is available. It is therefore recommended that the federal government be asked to enhance access to and coverage of the Federal Interim Health Plan.

It is therefore recommended that the federal government be requested to designate a senior representative to work directly with the City of Toronto and representatives of the immigrant and refugee service sector in Toronto to discuss the broad range of immigration and refugee policy and program issues at the municipal level including issues related to homelessness building on recommendations proposed by the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force.

(3) A Shift to Prevention Strategies

The Task Force urges the City to use its funds to encourage a shift from emergency responses to prevention strategies. The City agrees with this shift away from a "crisis" response and has already begun to channel resources into prevention and long-term strategies. It is clear that more targeted action is needed to help people get out of hostels and into permanent housing, to help prevent people from becoming homeless in the first place and to help leverage the development of affordable rental and supportive housing.

The prevention strategies proposed by the Task Force include measures intended to reduce the risk of homelessness for people in receipt of Social assistance in particular as well as initiatives targeted to tenants in general who are at risk of homelessness.

(a) Increasing the Shelter Component of Social Assistance:

The Task Force documents an increase in both the incidence and depth of poverty in Toronto over the last decade. Their analysis links this increase to labour market changes, to policy changes regarding Social assistance, such as the 22 percent reduction in benefits in 1996, changes to eligibility criteria for employment insurance and the lack of affordable housing. To address this key issue of affordability from a prevention perspective, the Task Force recommends that the Province adjust the shelter component of Social assistance to better reflect local market conditions thereby recognizing the differential housing costs across the province.

The maximum shelter component of Social assistance, which is the same throughout the province, is too small to cover rents in Toronto, which are higher than elsewhere in the province. Raising the shelter component by an average of 20 percent, as recommended by the Task Force, would put social assistance recipients in Toronto on equal footing with the rest of the province. At the same time, because benefit levels would remain below median market rents there would still be an incentive to find housing at below average market cost.

The Task Force estimates the annual cost of \$13.0 million to increase the shelter component of Social assistance of which \$6.5 million is attributed to the City. The 20 percent municipal portion of a shelter component increase should be funded through GTA pooling. In a report to the GTA Mayors and Regional Chairs Committee on Task Force action plan, it was recommended that this initiative be adopted in principle but that implementation be deferred until consensus is reached on pooling implications unless the Province agrees to pay 100 percent of the full cost of the increase.

The Social Services Division estimates the actual costs to the City at \$8.1 million, based on January 1999 caseload numbers. This amount would need to be considered as an addition to the 1999 budget. The significant number of families in receipt of social assistance in Toronto, is a major factor reflected in the revised estimate. However, a reduction in overall costs for social assistance to municipalities could be anticipated as caseloads have continued to decline.

At its meeting in March, City Council adopted a motion urging the Province to approve the suggested increase in the shelter allowance component of Social assistance. Social assistance is a mandatory program for all municipalities, therefore, if the Province were to implement this recommendation municipalities would be subject to their cost-sharing decisions. The Province has not announced any initiatives in this regard to date.

(b) A Shelter Allowance Program for the Working Poor:

The Task Force proposes the creation of a new shelter allowance program, targeted to working poor families as a first priority and to working adults if feasible. The aim of this program, which would require annual re-application, is to reduce the risk of homelessness and to ensure that the transition from welfare to employment does not increase the risk of homelessness. The program, as set out by the Task Force, should reduce the share of income low-income people spend on housing to between 35 and 40 percent from an unsustainable 50 percent or more. This recommendation is directed to the Province for full funding as shelter allowances are consistent with the articulated goals of the provincial government's "common sense revolution."

At its meeting in March, City Council adopted a motion urging the Province to approve the Task Force recommendation to create a new shelter allowance program for the working poor. Implementation of this type of program would have no financial implications for the City and would make a significant difference for the working poor in terms of their ability to maintain their housing. The Province has not announced any initiatives in this regard to date.

(c) First and Last Month's Rent for Ontario Works Recipients:

The inability to pay a landlord first and last month's rent provides tenants a distinct disadvantage in the current housing market. In this regard, the Task Force recommends that the City provide rapid payment of first and last months rent.

Social Services used to provide first and last months rent to people in receipt of social assistance, however, there are no dedicated benefits available under the Ontario Works legislation. The City would have to absorb 100 percent of the cost in order to provide this benefit which is not financially feasible. Although not its primary purpose, last month's rent can be accessed once a year through Community Start Up Benefits (CSUB). These costs are covered under the current program and are included in the 1999 Social Services budget. These benefits are available for people leaving hostels or institutions, people who are leaving a harmful situation or who are moving to more affordable or suitable housing. It should be noted however that, even at the maximum benefit level, the CSUB rarely covers the cost of last month's rent for families due to the high cost of rental housing in Toronto.

At its March 2, 1999, meeting City Council adopted a plan to reinvest the municipal savings from the National Child Benefit into a \$6.8 million shelter fund that will provide more options for families who require financial assistance, such as help with first and last months rent or rental arrears, to secure, maintain or move to more affordable or suitable housing. This shelter fund will be a significant resource for preventing families from becoming homeless. It should be noted, however, that only families with children are eligible for this fund.

As part of its announcement on March 23, 1999, the Province committed to increasing the Community Start Up Benefit from \$799.00 to \$1,500.00 for eligible families in shelters to help them move out of the hostel system. This increase will assist families in paying some moving expenses although will not likely cover the full cost and resources from the City's new shelter fund will need to be used for a top up. As an additional source of funding this partial expansion of the CSUB program will free up some dollars from the shelter fund thereby allowing greater flexibility in the disbursement of this fund and enabling more families to benefit. As the National Child Benefit savings represent 100 percent municipal dollars and the CSUB is cost-shared 80:20 with the Province, this initiative is cost-favourable for the City.

The Province has not yet released details on this initiative. In the announcement, mention is made of an associated \$2.0 million expense to this item. It is unclear if this is an estimate of the additional cost associated with this expansion or the imposition of a provincial cap. Currently, there is no provincial cap on the CSUB. If a cap is imposed, this would significantly limit the number of families who could benefit.

(d) Eviction Prevention:

A number of eviction prevention strategies are proposed by the Task Force to assist tenants in rental accommodation to maintain their housing including a \$500,000.00 rent bank.

In 1998, the City established a number of eviction prevention programs including a one-year \$50,000.00 rent bank pilot project for women with children. In addition to providing loans for rental arrears, the rent bank project offers budgeting assistance and help with housing and social issues. Preliminary evaluations indicate this program is successful in helping people with rental arrears avoid eviction.

At the March 2, 1999, meeting of Council, a motion was passed to amend the Chief Administrative Officers report, "Response to the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report" to provide for full \$500,000.00 funding for the rent bank as proposed by the Task Force. The initial recommendation in the CAO's report was to expand the rent bank to \$200,000.00 for 1999 with the option for further expansion in the future. The current rent bank program represents a small initiative and while preliminary results are positive, a final evaluation of the program is needed to determine the viability of the program as well as the recommended size and scope of the fund. As such, it is recommended that pending the final evaluation of the rent bank pilot project in September 1999, consideration be given to increasing this fund to \$200,000.00 utilizing the additional dollars recently made available through the Provincial Homelessness Initiatives Fund.

A report which reviews the City's current eviction prevention programs and makes recommendations for future directions of this program will be going forward to Community and Neighbourhood Services in May. The report will also document significant impacts of the new Tenant Protection Act on tenancy stability and the need for ongoing monitoring. As part of the City's effort to shift away from emergency responses to preventative approaches, eviction prevention is emerging as a key area for funding and program support. In this regard, the City is building on the Task Force recommendations to target resources toward strategies which help people keep their housing.

The eviction prevention report will also discuss the Task Force recommendations relating to the need for additional legal clinic funding and fast track evictions. As requested at the March 2, 1999, meeting of Council, a report on funding for the FMTA hotline will be going forward to the Municipal Grants Committee.

(e) Housing Help:

On March 23, 1999, the Province announced the decision to devolve administration of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Community Partners Program, to municipalities. Toronto's share of this \$2.0 million province-wide program is \$900,000.00. The Province has not released details on the devolution of this program, however, it is appropriate for municipalities to administer this fund. About

10 agencies in Toronto receive support under the Community Partners Program including multi-service agencies and housinghelp centres which assist people to find and maintain housing.

The City also provides funding to these types of services through its Homeless Initiatives Fund and more recently through the Provincial Homeless Initiatives Fund. As the local service manager, the City is well positioned to co-ordinate community-based funding in this regard. In addition, it affords an opportunity for a more integrated and systematic approach to service delivery. This is in line with the service planning directions recommended by the Task Force as a means of strengthening the service sector. However, the City must ensure that administrative dollars for this fund are also downloaded.

(f) Discharge Policies:

The Task Force recommends that institutions establish and implement discharge protocols for persons with no fixed address to ensure that people are not discharged from institutions into hostels or to the street. In addition, if a person is discharged from an institution to a hostel or an unstable situation, arrangements for follow-up by hospital staff or an agency contracted by the hospital must occur within 24 hours after discharge.

The need to establish clear and effective discharge protocols has received considerable attention over the last few years, in particular by the community-based service sector. Unfortunately, the results have been limited progress. Individual institutions have shown some willingness to work in this area, however, agencies still report large numbers of inappropriate referrals from general hospitals, psychiatric hospitals and from both provincial and federal correctional facilities.

Research by the Task Force clearly shows that individuals discharged from these systems directly into hostels have a much higher probability of becoming chronic users of the system. To effect significant gains on this issue requires involvement by the Ministry of Health, Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correction Services. Policies need to be established which direct staff to ensure that when people are discharged, especially after lengthy stays, they are in possession of identification and a health card and have access to resources to find appropriate housing.

On March 23, 1999, the Province announced \$1.0 million in funding to the Ontario Multi-Faith Council and its regional committees to develop discharge plans to help divert ex-offenders from the hostel system. While this is a welcome first step, it does not address the need for discharge protocols from health and mental health facilities which also discharge people directly into hostels. Furthermore, the Province needs to be involved in developing and implementing discharge protocols, along with municipalities and community partners. It also does not address the

recommendation for follow-up within 24 hours if a person is discharged into a hostel or an unstable situation.

It is therefore recommended that the Province be urged to appoint senior representatives from the Ministry of Health, Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correction Services to work directly with the City of Toronto and its community partners to develop discharge protocols, including follow-up support, for all institutions who discharge people with no fixed address.

In addition, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services should convene a meeting with the Ontario Multi-Faith Council regarding the development of appropriate discharge protocols, including follow-up support, for people leaving correctional facilities. Several of the smaller municipalities in which the newly developed, larger prisons are located simply do not have the necessary housing and support services available to accommodate people. Appropriate discharge policies must be in place to ensure people have options other than going large cities, such as Toronto, because that is where the housing and employment opportunities are seen to be.

(4) A Homeless Health Strategy

The Task Force outlines a comprehensive strategy to address the health and mental health needs of the homeless population. Homeless people have more health problems than the general population, yet they face many barriers to receiving effective health and mental health services. This is partly because traditional approaches to treatment do not always meet their complex needs and partly because the service system is fragmented and poorly coordinated.

(a) Primary Health Issues:

The health strategy includes a number of recommendations to remove barriers to accessing appropriate health care. For example, homeless people do not meet the criteria for obtaining home care support since they do not have stable housing. While the Toronto Community Care Access Centre has interpreted the definition of "home" flexibly to enable Home Care services to be delivered in hostels and drop-ins (which are effectively substitute homes), CCAC funding allocations do not reflect the needs of Toronto's homeless population.

Homeless people tend to go to emergency rooms (ER) for treatment, whether urgent or not, since they are open 24 hours a day and appointments are not required. The ER is a place where homeless people can connect with other supports and services that may prevent future health problems, particularly in downtown hospitals which

serve large numbers of homeless people. The Task Force recommends that skilled staff be available to hospital emergency rooms to assist in working with homeless people, as required. They also include a number of recommendations to enhance access to prescription drugs, establish infirmity beds in suitable locations for homeless people recovering from illness or surgery and to address the long-term care needs of elderly chronic hostel users.

The Task Force also proposes a number of strategies to encourage more physicians to work with homeless people. These include implementing alternate payment methods such as sessional payments (i.e., fixed rates of pay for a particular period of time) to encourage more physicians to work with this population and declaring Toronto an underserved area for homeless people to enable new doctors to work at the full OHIP rate.

Implementing these recommendations will have no financial implications for the City of Toronto. They will, however, make a significant difference to the ability of homeless people to have access to the full range of health services. This can prevent future health problems as well as assist the person in maintaining the stability to stay housed.

(b) Mental Health Issues:

There is broad agreement that about 33 percent of single men and as many as 75 percent of single women in hostels, have mental illness. The Task Force describes how decreases in mental health expenditures for institutions have not been offset by increases in community mental health funding. The effects of deinstitutionalization of psychiatric patients that began in the 1960's and the failure to replace these services with viable community alternatives, has resulted in an over-representation of people with severe mental illness among the homeless population. The Task Force recognizes the need for a range of community and institutional treatment options to address the mental health needs of this population. They stress that supportive housing is an essential element in a strategy to address the needs of homeless people who have mental illness and/or addictions.

At its March 2, 1999, meeting, Council passed a motion to urge the provincial government, in its review of the Mental Health Act, to give consideration to compelling treatment for those individuals who are incapable of taking responsibility for their own lives. It is assumed that "compelling treatment" implies community treatment orders whereby people with mental illness who are living in the community are forced to take medication as a condition of their release from hospital or to remain in the community. This issue is extremely controversial. Some people feel that this legislation is essential to enable people to get the help they need while others strongly believe that forced treatment violates peoples' civil rights and that removing treatment choice can result in damage to self esteem and motivation for

recovery. The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health has recently established a Task Force to address this complex issue and will be reporting on their findings in the Fall 1999. It is therefore recommended that the City of Toronto wait for the report of this Task Force before taking any action on this matter.

The Province is in the midst of a ten year plan for mental health reform which is intended to ensure the existence of an integrated, comprehensive, cost-effective and coordinated mental health system which includes a continuum of care from prevention to community-based treatment to in-hospital care. The principles of mental health reform include: a shift from institutional care to a community-based care model; improving access to quality care in mental health services; priority supports to the severely mentally ill and a consumer/survivor driven delivery system. The City must continue to monitor Mental Health Reform and in particular mental health needs and service adequacy and advocate for sufficient resources to meet ongoing and emerging needs.

(c) Coordination and Funding Issues:

The Task Force was concerned about the lack of coordination within the Ministry of Health regarding the funding of health and mental health services specifically for the homeless population. Currently the Ministry of Health separately funds community health and community mental health programs for homeless people. The Task Force proposes establishing a Homelessness Health Fund which combines these separate sources of funds, to enable priority setting and coordination across the sector as a whole. The Task Force proposes that this fund be administered by the City of Toronto. While the Community and Neighbourhood Services Department supports the intent of this recommendation, the administration of the fund should remain with the Province. With the recent announcements pertaining to new federal health dollars transferred to the province, it is crucial that a portion of these monies be designated for such a Homelessness Health Fund. The City should also have input into priority setting for the allocation of this fund.

The City of Toronto should support the integrated approach to health care delivery proposed by the Task Force. While health services are a provincial responsibility (with the exception of Public Health), the City is well placed to act as a broker to implement these recommendations. A meeting has been set with the Commissioner of Community Services, the Medical Officer of Health, the provincial Ministry of Health and the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health to begin the development of a strategy to implement the health recommendations contained in the Task Force report. Other key stakeholders to be involved in the future include the Toronto District Health Council and the Canadian Mental Health Association.

(d) Public Health:

Toronto Public Health provides a range of preventative, support and treatment services for homeless persons. These services are brought directly to people in shelters, drop-ins and rooming houses. Programs include TB screening and vaccination clinics, disease screening, information and referral, physical and mental health assessments, dental care, crisis counselling, violence prevention, stress and anger management, advocacy and training for agency/shelter staff. The long-term trusting relationships have been established between public health nurses and homeless people. These have proved effective in supporting people enabling them to maintain their housing and stay connected to services and social supports.

Public Health works closely with community-based service providers to identify emerging health issues and develop strategic solutions for people who are homeless. For example, Public Health works with the coalition of *Youth Parents: No Fixed Address* service providers to address the issues of young families who are living rough on the streets.

On April 6, 1999, the Board of Health adopted a report from the Medical Officer of Health which outlines an action strategy for the Public Health response to homelessness. This report will also be before Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee at its April 22, 1999, meeting. This report responds to a number of recommendations directed to Public Health from the community, the Task Force and City Council proposing an increased role for Public Health with respect to homelessness.

The report includes a request for five full time Public Health staff to support to under-serviced areas, and supports implementation of the Task Force recommendations directed at Public Health. These include a call for Public Health to continue to invest in programs that address the overall health needs of people who are homeless and to work with Georg Brown College, the University of Toronto and Community Health Centres to establish a three-year pilot project to improve the oral health needs of homeless people in Toronto.

(e) Harm Reduction Strategies:

The Task Force identifies the hardest to serve among homeless people as those who have alcohol and/or drug addictions or a "concurrent disorder", that is, both a mental illness and an addiction. Many such people are not able to use existing services and this places them at significant risk. Harm reduction is both a goal of substance addictions and a philosophy that guides the service delivery. It is a non-judgmental approach with a hierarchy of goals. The first priority is to address basic needs of food, shelter, and warmth, for example, then moving on to reducing the harm resulting from the alcohol or drug addiction. Abstinence is not ruled out as a goal for some people but it is not a requirement. Harm reduction approaches are controversial, however, research conducted by the Task Force and many researchers from other jurisdictions found that a harm reduction approach is the most effective way to reach this population.

To respond to the specialized needs of this group of people, the Task Force recommends the development of additional harm reduction facilities, one for adults and one for youth, that accept the use of drugs and alcohol on site. And, also, that an addictions and mental health outreach team be set up to connect people on the street with the new facilities.

Public Health provides a variety of harm reduction services such as needle exchange programs for street-involved people. As well, the City operates The Annex, a harm reduction program which is part of Seaton House. Controlled drinking is allowed in this program and health care support is provided. Evaluations show this program is effective. A proposal has gone forward to expand this program to a rural setting and staff are currently negotiating with the Province for funding support. The Shelter, Housing and Support Division have included six months of funding for this project in their 1999 budget submission.

It is clear that more facilities like the Annex are needed, in particular a program for the Aboriginal community as recommended by the Task Force. This issue should be central to discussions with the provincial and federal governments on a homeless strategy for Aboriginal people as identified in the section on Aboriginal issues.

The City also funds The Satellite, an alternative youth shelter operated by Eva's Place. This program has been effective in reaching out to youth who do not use traditional youth shelters. The Task Force recommends that Eva's Place partner with the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health to develop a harm reduction program for this site.

(5) Supportive Housing

Supportive housing is a key element of the Task Force action plan and is targeted to address the needs of homeless people who require individual support. Supportive housing refers to housing plus support services to help the individual maintain their housing. Typically supportive housing is targeted to people with mental health problems, physical or developmental disabilities, HIV/AIDS, troubled youth, frail elderly, people with addictions and victims of family violence. The types and levels of support required by tenants vary considerably and include help with housekeeping, meal preparation, banking, life skills, medical care, counselling, referrals, employment assistance and drop-in programs. Some people need a high level of support in order to become more independent while others only need help when problems arise.

The supports that are attached to this type of housing are a key component, however, the need for supportive housing also addresses the core issue of affordability. Seven out of every ten dollars dedicated to supportive housing is used for the housing component.

(a) New Supportive Housing Units:

The Task Force research found that about 600 people on waiting lists and about 4,400 chronic hostel users also need some form of supportive housing. The Task Force recommends that the Province contribute \$14.0 million per year over five years to develop new supportive housing in Toronto (to add 1,000 units per year). A further \$18.0 million is needed to build other new supportive units across the Province. Both elements are considered necessary to make a significant difference. Building more units elsewhere in the province will help to stem the flow of people coming to Toronto looking for this kind of housing and, most importantly, will afford people the option of remaining in their own communities.

The Province downloaded its share of costs for social housing to municipalities beginning January 1, 1998. In July 1998, the Province then uploaded the cost of those supportive housing programs where 100 percent of units are dedicated to providing supportive housing. The City continues to fund supportive housing in mixed portfolios. In July 1998, Council reaffirmed its position to the Province that providing housing for people who need support to live independently is a provincial responsibility and should be fully funded by the Province, which is consistent with the Task Force recommendations. Municipal costs would be reduced if the Province agreed to "upload" the cost of supportive housing in mixed portfolios.

At its March 2, 1999, meeting, Council approved the Task Force recommendations calling on the Province to build new supportive housing units both in Toronto and across the province. On March 23, 1999 the Province announced \$45.0 million for new supportive housing for people with mental illness. The plan involves a three year roll out with \$20.0 million dedicated for the first phase to develop 1,000 units. This announcement is an encouraging step in the right direction. However, it does not meet the target set by the Task Force and will not meet the existing or future demand for supportive housing units. The impact for Toronto is unclear as details have not been released as to the program or the intended distribution of units across the province.

(b) Support to Daily Living Program:

The Province also announced plans to download the Support to Daily Living Program to municipalities. This program is currently administered by the Ministry of Community and Social Services and funds supports for housing for "hard-to-house" and homeless people. The total cost of this program is \$6.1 million for the province of which approximately \$3.0 million funds 13 programs in Toronto. The devolution of this program effectively reinforces continued downloading of supportive housing to municipalities, a responsibility best borne by the Province. This direction effectively removes MCSS from having a role in helping to house chronically homeless people without a mental illness. It therefore works against the proposed direction of a provincial responsibility for supportive housing except under the mental health label (provincial supportive housing is being transferred from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to the Ministry of Health).

It is recommended that the City urge the Province to maintain administration of the Support to Daily Living Program (representing approximately \$3.0 million for Toronto) in recognition of the provincial responsibility for supportive housing.

(c) Expanding the Eligibility Criteria for Supportive Housing:

In their March announcement, the Province did not respond to the Task Force recommendation for an overall provincial policy on supportive housing that ensures the eligibility of "hard-to-house" homeless people. Current provincial policies have narrowed the historical definition of special need that set the criteria for access to a supportive housing unit. The Ministry of Health, for example, has moved to a definition that focuses exclusively on the Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI). Of course, those people with SMI require specialized support, however, it should not come at the expense of others. Many people who are chronically homeless are considered "hard-to-house" but do not have a formal diagnosis of SMI. Those most in need are not all SMI but do require supportive housing to keep them housed and out of hostels. This issue has a significant impact on Toronto in that research shows that the 17 percent of hostel users are considered "chronic" and they use 46 percent of the hostel resources.

Ensuring that enough supportive housing units are built and that eligibility criteria are inclusive enough to reach the people who most need the housing is absolutely critical to alleviating homelessness for this group of people. This type of housing affords people the right to live in dignity. It also reduces the need for emergency shelter. It is therefore recommended that the Province be urged to ensure that definitions of special need and eligibility for supportive housing are broad enough to include "hard-to-house" homeless people.

(d) Habitat Boarding Homes:

The Task Force recommends that the Province expand the Habitat program for boarding homes and that the program expand to include rooming houses. Habitat Services is a program, funded through the City's Hostel Services. Per diem subsidies are provided to operators of private boarding homes, under contracts that requires them to maintain adequate living standards and personal care support. Habitat has been very successful in ensuring stable and basic housing for 707 very vulnerable people.

In December 1998, at the urging of the City, the Province expanded the Habitat Services program by another 100 beds to come on stream in 1999. This support is targeted to chronic hostel users and people needing mental health supports. A number of different housing models are being considered, including rooming houses which may be more effective for chronic hostel users. Funding for Habitat Services is cost-shared 80:20 between the Province and the City. However, there is a funding

shortfall due to a provincial cap on funding for this program. Toronto does not receive full 80 percent funding.

Due to the ongoing demand for this type of housing support, it is recommended that the City ask the Province to expand Habitat Services by an additional 200 beds (for the year 2000) and to provide full 80 percent funding for this program.

(6) Affordable Housing

New housing supply is an essential part of any response to homelessness. The Task Force documented the shortage of affordable housing as a key factor that increases the risk of homelessness. As the population of GTA grows each year the number of low-income households grows too, while the number of low-rent market units has shrunk sharply as rents escalate. As a result, more households are paying a majority of income on rent or are doubled up in a friend or relative's home, making them vulnerable to losing their home.

This issue applies to those whose only need is low-cost housing, as well as to those who have mental health or other problems and require supportive housing. Families represent the fastest-growing group of hostel users and the majority of them simply need affordable housing. As for people with mental health or other issues, they require not only support services but subsidized rents.

The Development of New Affordable Housing

The Task Force calls for a renewed government role in housing development, as it is not profitable for private developers to build low-rent units. It recommends that the key resources be federal and provincial, the latter being mainly for supportive housing. It recommends that the City provide a catalyst role, setting a framework to draw in senior government resources, and also that the City put forward some of its own resources to "lever" those of other governments.

Subsidies are needed for housing because the "economic" (break-even or profitable) rents for a new family unit are over \$1,200.00/month while prevailing market rents average \$808.00 for all units. Meanwhile tenants in social housing or on the waiting list can "afford" an average rent of \$300.00, based on average income of about \$1,000.00/month. One in every five tenant households in the City has an income under this level.

The Task Force approach is two-fold: first to reduce project costs and inject equity to bridge the gap between economic and market rents; and secondly to use rent

supplements to cover the gap between market and affordable rents. The Task Force recommends a “layered” approach to such cost reductions and equity and are discussed in the next section.

A Municipal Role for New Affordable Housing

The Task Force identifies a number of municipal resources to help lever the development of affordable housing: land, a capital fund, development and related charges, rental property tax, and a private sector roundtable.

On March 2, 1999, Council endorsed the Task Force report in principle, including its new supply strategy. This corresponds with the affordable housing development strategy adopted by Council in July 1998. Each of these elements have been identified as potential parts of the City’s housing development strategy.

(a) Capital Revolving Fund:

The City’s recently approved \$10.9 million Capital Revolving Fund for affordable housing responds to the Task Force recommendation for such a fund. The Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services has established a Reference Group of private-sector representatives and others to provide expert advice in the operations of the fund thereby addressing the Task Force call for a private-sector roundtable to advise on strategies for affordable housing.

A report will go forward to the April 22, 1999, meeting of Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee on the terms of reference and composition of the Reference Group and on management guidelines for the Fund. To keep pace with the growth of households and the housing market, resources for housing will need to be ongoing rather than one time. Staff will therefore report back later this year on options for ongoing funding, as requested by Council at the time it approved the fund. Options should include supporting it from the City capital budget as recommended by the Task Force, from housing benefits through density agreements and from a share of the proceeds of land sales as suggested below.

(b) City-owned Land:

Council has yet to establish “housing first” or other policies on City land for housing. Staff are currently working with several potential sites, including ones designated for housing by the former City of Toronto and ones reserved by Council in July 1998 for affordable housing demonstration projects. Also, an interdepartmental Property Management Committee has been set up. Corporate Services Committee will review these issues at their meeting in April.

(c) Development Charges:

Discussions on a possible affordable housing exemption from development charges have been taking place between the Finance Department and Community and Neighbourhood Services. The Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer will be reporting in May to the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee on this issue.

(d) Property Taxes:

The Task Force calls on the City to implement a tax rate for the new multi-unit residential property tax class at a level comparable to that for family dwellings.

Property taxes have a significant impact on the ability of a project to receive financing as they influence the valuation of a project as well as long term operating costs. The tax rate for the multi-residential property class is higher than other forms of housing. The City has recently established a special property tax class for new multi-residential rental housing. The tax rate has been set at the same rate as residential.

The Task Force also recommends that the City explore ways to reduce or mitigate the impact of the new property tax burden on rooming houses. Finance Services are undertaking a review in 1999 of the tax rate of existing multi-residential rental tax class, including rooming houses, and will report out in Spring 2000 with options and recommendations on this issue.

(e) A Municipal Framework for Affordable Housing:

The Task Force recommendations for City resources involve a mix of direct spending, support in kind, and foregone revenues. Council has taken several steps toward providing such resources. The Task Force call for a catalyst and framework-setting role for the City can most effectively be implemented by three interrelated steps.

First, the Capital Fund Reference Group can serve as a forum to develop strategies to recommend to Council, and to put to senior governments. Second, further proposal calls for affordable housing offering limited but real City resources, can be used to elicit responses and additional resources from interested non-profit or private developers. Third, sufficient staff resources are needed to support such activities. These staff positions are included in the 1999 Shelter, Housing and Support Division budget submission.

The City's ability to conduct effective proposal calls for affordable housing demonstration projects will depend on Council making resources available in the form of land, equity, financing, and favourable tax conditions. A proposal call which identifies in principle what the City is willing to contribute will send a message that the City is serious, and will evoke serious responses. It should be made clear that the

City will favour proposals that involve more private, fund-raised, or senior government inputs, with less cost to the City, and that Council must ultimately sign off on the final arrangement.

The proposal call process that staff are recommending is a more step-by-step way at arriving at final costs than the Task Force's global recipe. Costs will depend on the particular development mix pursued by the City (e.g. singles units or walk-up apartments or acquisition/rehabilitation are cheapest but not universally appropriate), the real estate opportunities that emerge, the responses to proposal calls, and the forms of private, fund-raised, and senior government support that are forthcoming. Council will be able to see potential costs in regard to specific projects, evaluate the cost-effectiveness, and make decisions on that basis and at that stage.

(f) The Cost of No Development:

The obvious consequence of no new affordable housing development is the continued rise in homelessness. Research by the Task Force clearly establishes the lack of affordable housing as a primary contributor to the city's current homeless crisis. This, in turn, translates into the need for more hostel development and therefore ongoing increases in hostel capital and operating costs. If the City share of new housing costs can be kept in range of \$300.00 to \$400.00 monthly per person, then housing will be a cost-effective response for the City. Even at higher costs, it may be worthwhile as it achieves much better outcomes in terms of quality of life and personal and family stability.

A Federal Role for New Affordable Housing:

The Task Force sees the federal government as having the key role to play in funding affordable housing. Recommendations included direct federal resources such as: the CMHC lending and mortgage insurance role, \$300.00 million in annual capital support, and the program options for providing such support. Other resources including land and tax concessions are discussed next.

Developing affordable housing comes down to obtaining the necessary funds either through equity capital or through financing the costs as mortgage loans. In contrast to home-ownership or private rental housing, the monthly revenue of affordable rental projects is not sufficient to cover the costs let alone generate profit. As such, there is no incentive for private investor involvement, and neither the occupants nor the non-profit developers come with equity. The Task Force recommends federal action to address these central issues. One-time capital contributions are proposed, in contrast to the now-cancelled federal and provincial housing programs where the entire project capital cost was mortgaged and then amortized with the help of ongoing subsidy.

The Task Force proposal is ambitious, but such steps are essential in any effective response to housing needs. Task Force proposals, along with others, are likely to become grist for a national process to identify feasible responses. At this stage, the

main elements of the proposals must be understood so that any federal response can be assessed against them. Staff will report back during the year on the progress of ideas for national housing policy options as they emerge.

(b) Mortgage and Financing Assistance:

The Task Force recommends proposals on mortgage lending (mortgage insurance and direct CMHC lending) and federal capital support (the level of support and the program options for providing such support). Lending is an easy, low-cost area for federal action while capital support is the biggest hurdle of all.

The general thrust of the lending recommendations is to use the large existing role of CMHC, and extend it to support new affordable housing. This does not involve allocating any new federal funding, and is an obvious next step to enhance the limited role played by CMHC's Centre for Public-Private Partnerships in Housing. Such approaches would reduce pressure on the City to go beyond its \$10.9 million capital revolving fund, and would reduce or remove the need for the City to step in with support such as loan guarantees.

If CMHC adjusts its criteria to resemble those seen in former decades, the affordable housing projects facilitated through the City's Capital Revolving Fund will become more feasible. This is a relatively easy area for federal action; it is within the power of CMHC to adjust policies without any significant Cabinet decision or any allocation of new funds. CMHC has in recent months started reviewing and adjusting these criteria. It is to be hoped that the process of City proposal calls and demonstration projects will flag such issues and accelerate the review.

Direct lending or other government brokering of mortgages provides the lowest-cost mortgage financing. Such approaches are used for mortgage renewals on non-profit housing, and it would be relatively easy to piggyback onto it the financing for new housing. CMHC raises mortgage funds directly on the capital markets (not from tax revenues) through its mortgage-backed securities (MBS) instruments, which achieve rates ½ to one point below prevailing rates. The Province achieves the same result by bundling mortgage renewals from many projects into large volumes that attract low rates from private sources. Direct lending has financed many thousands of home-owner and rental units over the years, and is a profitable business for CMHC.

(c) Federal Capital Funding:

Capital contributions are proposed, on top of capital cost reductions, to bridge the gap between prevailing market rents and the higher "economic" rents to carry the mortgage of a new building. Capital contributions are a simple one-time payment for which the federal government can get recognized without committing to ongoing obligations. Capital assistance can be seen as an investment; it is more cost-effective than ongoing subsidies because it involves less interest cost.

This approach would enable geared-to-income assistance to be provided through a simple rent supplement, similar to the direction being pursued in the proposed reform of the Ontario social housing programs. It would permit a rent supplement to be provided at an economical cost per unit, competitive with the costs in existing older apartments.

Capital contributions reconcile federal withdrawal from program administration with the need for ongoing federal resources. The Task Force did not see the issue as being whether the federal government administers programs, or leaves that to the provincial and municipal governments. It saw the issue as the reinvestment of recent and projected savings in federal housing expenditures. The potential sources of federal funds are discussed in the next section, on rent supplement. Prime among the sources is current underspending of \$150.0 million annually within the guaranteed federal housing envelope of \$1.8 billion.

Annual allocations are essential. A one-time allocation would not keep up with the ongoing growth of population, urban land costs, and housing needs. The Task Force recommendation of up to \$300.0 million was set based on a requirement of \$40.0 to \$60.0 million in Toronto, factored up based on GTA having approximately one-fifth of Canadian tenant households in "Core Housing Need". At its March 2, 1999, meeting, Council supported a call on the federal government to develop a \$300.0 million annual capital fund for new low-income housing.

The Task Force sets out three options for how the federal government could provide capital support. Three mechanisms for contributing this capital support are identified including an infrastructure program, local housing foundations, and also tax incentives to stimulate contributions to eligible housing funds.

Other Federal and Provincial Resources for New Affordable Housing

The Task Force recommends several measures which represent indirect forms of support for housing at both the provincial and federal levels: tax rebates on PST and GST, and land for housing. Essentially, senior governments are being asked to do the same as the City on land and taxes.

(a) Government-owned Land for Housing:

There is no history in recent years of federal or provincial governments providing below-market land for housing. Both levels have programs to sell off lands at the best price possible, to generate revenues.

The Province recently announced a willingness to make public lands available to create a minimum of 500 units. The Province acknowledges the need for more affordable housing and identifies the private sector as responsible for the construction. In order to address land-cost barriers to new development, the

Province will provide land at reduced prices or with favourable payment terms to encourage private sector development. The Province has stated that it will work with municipalities to ensure that local approvals do not delay construction of these new projects.

It is recommended that the City welcome the recent provincial announcement to make government-owned land available for housing and housing demonstration projects as a positive step and also request that the Province to establish a process for working with the City to identify potential sites. In addition, the Province should be urged to support City affordable housing partnerships through measures such as capital grants/equity or a role in lending, where the Province does have existing capacity.

The federal government has not responded to this Task Force recommendation. Given the significant role of government-owned land as part of an overall housing development strategy, it is recommended that the City urge the federal government to make land available.

(b) Waiving PST and GST:

The provincial government has announced a grant to offset PST costs for rental housing, up to \$2,000.00 per unit. This will cover all or most PST costs for low and moderate-cost units. This amounts to a direct implementation of the Task Force recommendation.

There are some precedents for GST rebates. Non-profit groups developing projects under the former housing programs were eligible for GST rebates of 3.5 percent, while buyers of new homes worth under \$350,000.00 get a rebate that reduces the effective rate to 4.5 percent. When the GST was introduced, residential rents were one of the very few transactions exempted. Most non-profit housing corporations are ineligible for registration as charities and cannot get GST exemptions on that grounds.

GST represents a far higher cost to new housing than PST, as GST applies to the full cost of production while PST applies only to the construction materials portion of the project, which account for typically about 30 percent of the cost of a unit while land, labour, and soft costs account for the rest. It would therefore be easier to provide a rebate provincially than federally. Harmonization of GST and PST in other provinces --and likely in due course in Ontario-- means increasing the tax, by applying a combined rate (e.g. 15 percent) to the full production cost.

To date the federal government has not responded to recommendations by the Task Force and the City to waive GST on new development. The federal government has strongly resisted pressure to expand the range of exemptions to GST, to avoid setting precedents. It may be more effective to seek equity in treatment of ownership and

rental housing, with the same rebate and effective rate of 4.5 percent. The federal government could look at options, following the provincial lead, such as providing a grant to offset GST.

Funding for Rent Supplement for New Affordable Housing:

The Task Force recommends channeling funds to support rent supplement in the proposed new affordable housing units. This is an essential part of the Task Force approach of first reducing project costs and injecting capital to the bridge gap between a new unit's break-even costs (e.g. \$1,200.00 monthly) and market rents (e.g. \$800.00), and then using rent supplement to cover gap between market and affordable rents (e.g. \$400.00). Rent supplement involves a payment from the government to a private non-profit landlord, and is tied to a particular unit - unlike a shelter allowance which the tenant can receive wherever they live. Being tied to the unit and project, it helps with the cash flow and therefore viability of a new rental project. In the absence of new rent supplement it may be possible to do new singles housing, but massive capital subsidies would be needed to do new affordable family housing.

The specific recommendations should be considered as part of broader issues around housing subsidy. The specific points recommended cover provincial reinvestment of surpluses within the housing envelope after federal devolution; extending GTA pooling of social housing subsidy to cover new rent supplement; and assigning to the GTSB the responsibility to allocate such funds. The underlying theme is that of reinvesting savings in housing subsidies back into housing to help meet the backlog of needs.

Reinvesting Housing Savings:

There is at present little discussion at any level of government of how significant savings in housing subsidies that have been realized and will be realized could be reinvested, to address affordability problems of rapidly growing numbers of households in Toronto and nation-wide.

There are five areas where present or future housing savings can be identified, some named by the Task Force and some not:

- (a) The federal government, in announcing devolution to the provinces in 1996, guaranteed that until agreements are signed it would maintain housing subsidy spending at \$1.8 billion annually. Federal savings since then have been large, due to declining subsidies as mortgage interest rates decline, constraints imposed by Ontario on cost-shared programs, and other factors. CMHC officials estimate savings at \$150.0 million annually nation-wide, of which \$60.0 million annually is for Ontario. (Part but not all of this is

currently being used to fund RRAP, the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program.)

- (b) Upon federal devolution to the provinces, such federal government money becomes “found” money for the provinces. In Ontario’s case, this is \$50.0 million, probably higher by the time any devolution agreement may be signed. The Province, in its March 23 announcements, committed to channeling this money into new rent supplement once a devolution agreement is signed.
- (c) Savings in the municipal share of the GTA housing subsidy pool have been substantial, mainly due to reduced mortgage costs at renewal. The Province has not confirmed that Toronto’s share of these savings (measured against the 1998 City \$254.8 million budget for subsidy download) was \$6.4 million for 1998 and is forecast at \$12.9 million (cumulative 1998 and 1999 savings) for the current year.
- (d) The terms of federal devolution include a so-called “signing bonus”, which is the transfer to the Province of a CMHC reserve fund against the risk of higher mortgage interest rates. For Ontario, this is understood to be in the range of \$70.0 million. Upon devolution this would be the Province’s to use as it sees fit; using principal as well as the earnings is an option, particularly once most mortgages have been renewed on long mortgage terms.
- (e) Federal savings after devolution, or with expiry of project operating agreements if devolution never transpires, are massive in the long run. The federal spending of \$1.8 billion annually is to tail off to zero over a 35 to 40 year period, as operating agreements expire. Little of these savings will appear for the next decade or so, but after then it accelerates rapidly. Some \$170.0 million annually of this money currently flows to projects in the City of Toronto and another \$50.0 million or so to projects in the “905” GTA.

There are competing demands for the use of such savings, even if they are retained in housing. These include major capital repairs to older public housing, RRAP funding, the need to renew expiring subsidy agreements for existing projects (starting in Toronto Housing Company buildings in 2007), and possibly rising subsidy requirements over time for existing social housing if geared-to-income rents lag the inflation of operating costs. The issue of reinvesting savings must be engaged by governments at four levels; federal, provincial, Greater Toronto, and City.

At the federal level, the Task Force strategy of emphasizing capital subsidy is probably wise. CMHC cost-shares but does not administer rent supplement, and inventing a unilateral federal rent supplement program is out of the question. The issue therefore comes down to whether federal savings will be redirected toward capital support (for rehabilitation as is the case today or for new housing as the Task

Force recommends), will be used for debt reduction, or will be passed through to the province after devolution. The current savings are of a magnitude that could fund a large portion of the capital support recommended by the Task Force.

Key decisions are at the provincial level. The Province has announced its intention to redeploy the \$50.0 million to implement the Task Force recommendation. It will also be the decision maker on the \$70.0 million signing bonus. The Province has indicated it is willing to work with municipalities to make the best use of the redeployed funding. It is therefore recommended that the City welcome the recent provincial announcement on rent supplements, and urge the Province to consult with The City of Toronto on the design of the rent supplement program with a goal of immediate implementation.

The Province still runs the housing programs that are paid for by federal and municipal subsidies. These include the newer non-profit programs where savings are being realized, and the rent supplement programs that could be extended to help more households in need.

The Province has indicated that once it has developed the new rent supplement program it will devolve it to the municipalities. It is unclear what this means in concrete terms. For example, would it be a block grant or a further uploading/downloading trade. There are advantages to having the province administer the surplus funds that may flow to it from CMHC after federal devolution. It is in the municipalities' interest to keep the provincial government involved where possible, to reduce the pressure to pay for social programs including housing from the property tax base. As well, if the province decided to devolve to municipalities the responsibility to administer such funds, the experience of provincial who-does-what devolution to date suggests there would be few assurances that the municipalities would ultimately come out with net gains.

The City also faces decisions in regard to such funds. It must decide whether it will advocate for reinvestment of such savings back into housing, and in what form. Once the administration of housing programs is devolved to municipalities, the City may be in a position to make direct decisions to reallocate any savings.

GTA Pooling Issues Associated with Social Housing Savings:

Pooling of social assistance and social housing costs was put in place to reflect the fact that Greater Toronto is a unified housing and labour market. Most of the population and tax base growth is occurring outside the City of Toronto while most of the increase in low-income, elderly, disabled, and newcomer population --and the related needs for social spending-- is inside the City. With social costs on the property tax base, overall long-term goals of social equity can be met only if the whole GTA shares the big social program costs. This applies to new as well as existing housing.

At present there is no governance structure for the pooled GTA social housing subsidy: the Province administers it. Devolution of program administration and associated program reform are expected to roll out over the next couple of years. There is a process involving GTA housing officials, reporting to the group of five GTA treasurers, to look at issues and options relating to the future of the social housing pool. These discussions may help shape, and will certainly be shaped by, upcoming provincial decisions on program reform, devolution to municipalities of program administration, and the future of MTHA and other housing authorities.

The issue of GTA pooling issues associated with social housing savings is a key issue that must be explored in greater detail. The City is currently engaged with other municipalities in the GTA through a regional Chief Administrative Officer's group which is discussing pooling issues especially in terms of financing for the key areas of housing, hostels and social assistance.

Models of Affordable Housing Development

The Task Force recommends specific forms of affordable housing development: SRO units for singles, acquisition and rehabilitation of existing private apartments, and regeneration and redevelopment of public housing.

These recommendations are generally in harmony with initiatives of the City and the Province. SRO or "single room occupancy" is a term for self-contained small suites, usually with a mini kitchen and bathroom, for low-income single persons. Toronto's social housing includes many small units for singles. The Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee received proposals last year for singles housing. City staff are initiating a proposal for a study and design "charrette" on what models of singles housing suit what types of low-income single residents. A study for the province on the costs and viability of SRO housing will soon be completed. The Province has announced that it will sponsor housing demonstration projects, with an emphasis on SRO's.

(b) Preserving the Existing Housing Stock:

In order to preserve the affordable housing that still exists, the Task Force proposes that the City adopt a goal of "no net loss" by placing controls on demolition and conversion of affordable apartments.

At its meeting of March 2, 1999, Council adopted new Official Plan policies and related by-laws regarding condominium conversion and demolition of rental housing. Additional authority is being sought from the Province in the area of demolition control.

The Task Force identifies several key planning mechanisms at the City's disposal aimed at preserving as well as increasing the affordable housing stock. Low vacancy levels and limited new affordable rental supply mean that more people are turning to second suites and rooming houses for permanent housing.

The Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services is reporting on proposals regarding the implementation of policies related to second suites and rooming houses to a meeting of Urban Environment and Development Committee in April. These two issues will require interdepartmental consultations owing to the complexity of issues involved, including: building standards, health issues, fire Code issues and public consultation requirements.

(c) Rehabilitation of the Existing Housing Stock:

The Task Force considers rehabilitation fundamental to preserving the affordable housing stock and recommends that the City urge the federal government to expand its Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program funding and further, extend this funding to rooming houses and second suites.

Rehabilitation of private apartments for non-profit use can make cost-effective use of public dollars, and is a way of targeting existing stock to those with affordability problems while also upgrading it. Rehabilitation is seen as a necessary part of a municipal housing mandate. As a delivery agent for the federal Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, the City is currently in the process of allocating more than \$6.5 million in one-time, additional federal assistance to rooming houses and rental properties in Toronto. This assistance will help repair and preserve about 500 units and will help to bring over 150 units on-stream, at affordable rent levels.

National Symposium on Homelessness and Affordable Housing

On March 25 and 26, 1999, the City of Toronto co-hosted the first ever national symposium on homelessness and affordable housing with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The event brought together people who are homeless or who have experienced homelessness, community-based activists and service providers, faith communities, bureaucrats and politicians from each level of government and interested members of the community to discuss issues and strategies related to homelessness that are shared by communities across the country.

The event was declared a success by the participants and organizers in creating a national momentum to solve this national crisis. The workshops generated numerous recommendations to be forwarded to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities for consideration at their annual general meeting in June which has homelessness as a key agenda item. In addition, the symposium was utilized as a vehicle for developing a National Housing Options Paper also for presentation at the FCM meeting. City staff are instrumental in the development of this paper. The aim of

this paper is to provide a menu of national options and strategies suited for different regions throughout the country. The paper is intended to provide a rationale for federal re-involvement and to identify the magnitude of publicly supported housing activity required to address national housing needs. The paper will be set within a broader context and link the issue of affordable housing to homelessness, poverty and other social factors.

Conclusions:

On March 22, 1999, Council endorsed in principle the Mayor's Action Task Force on Homelessness action plan and has made a commitment to begin implementation. The directions outlined in the Task Force report are consistent with those taken by the City to date. Now, the Task Force action plan provides a comprehensive framework that brings together all of the key pieces and establishes clear roles and responsibilities for all parties including each level of government and the broader community. The Task Force recommendations are inter-related and success depends upon taking a holistic approach to implementation.

Already, the City is taking action on a number of fronts to respond to the immediate needs of homeless people, help prevent homelessness and help people to leave the shelter system. In accordance with the Task Force strategy to match such short-term responses with long-term solutions, Council has adopted in principle a "housing first" policy and devoted significant resources to facilitate the development of new affordable housing. Council has also approved the development of a municipal report card on homelessness to monitor progress and serve as an accountability tool.

New areas where the City ought to direct energy and resources deal with integrating services to help break down service silos and ensure effective service delivery for homeless people. Using new resources made available by the Province, the City should ensure funding is allocated in a coordinated and integrated way, using the holistic framework recommended by the Task Force as a guide. Effort must be directed in a number of areas, for example, increasing housing for homeless youth, addressing the range of services and supports needed by families in the hostel system and to establish additional harm reduction programs for the "hard to serve" homeless.

This report also examines ways in which senior levels of government must contribute. The Province has recently announced a number of initiatives which represent positive steps in the right direction, however, they do not fulfil all of the Task Force recommendations related to the provincial government. The federal government ought to address issues related groups that fall under the ir mandate, namely homeless Aboriginal people, immigrants and refugees. As well, the federal government needs to implement reforms and dedicate resources to stimulate the development of new affordable housing. There has yet to be any announcements in this area.

While some progress has been made in implementing the Task Force action plan, considerable work remains to be done and all levels of government are needed to bring significant change to the rising rates of homelessness. This report is one of several policy reports on the Task Force action plan being reviewed by standing committees in April. A final report consolidating feedback from each review will go forward to the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee late in spring.

Appendix A

Overview of the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Report

The Task Force report contains 105 recommendations directed to all levels of government and the community-based service sector.

The Task Force identified six barriers to solving the problem of homelessness:

- (1) growing poverty;
- (2) a shrinking supply of affordable housing;
- (3) a service system that is biased to short-term emergency assistance rather than long-term solutions;
- (4) jurisdictional gridlock where different levels of government and government departments squabble over areas of responsibility;
- (5) inadequate supports for people with serious mental illness and addictions problem; and
- (6) no capacity for service co-ordination or capacity to address the different needs of the different sub-groups of the homeless population.

To overcome these barriers, the Task Force recommends changes on several fronts. The Task Force proposes that the shelter component of social assistance be adjusted to reflect local market conditions. Because rents in Toronto are so high, many social assistance recipients use all of the shelter component and part of their basic needs allowance to pay rent, often resulting in food bank usage, loss of their housing or simply going without. Setting the shelter component of social assistance at 85 percent of median market rents would put social assistance recipients in Toronto on an equal footing with those in other areas of the province and in a better position to secure an affordable unit. At the same time the Task Force proposes establishing a shelter allowance program for the working poor. This program would supplement

the income of very low income people who pay more than 50 percent of their income on rent, thereby enabling them to keep their housing.

The Task Force proposes the creation of 5,000 additional supportive housing units (i.e. housing with supports) in Toronto, to meet the needs of homeless people suffering from mental illness and/or addictions. These units should be built over five years with an additional 8,500 units built throughout the rest of the province. At the same time, the Task Force proposes a City-initiated housing development strategy to increase the supply of affordable rental housing by 2,000 units a year. The recommendations call for a layered approach since no single mechanism can bring rents down to affordable levels. Governments are asked to subsidize land costs, waive certain fees, development charges and taxes, modify property taxes, provide rent supplements and assist with mortgage insurance, and capital grants. At the same time, extensive efforts should be placed on preserving existing housing, placing controls on demolition and conversion of affordable apartments and legalizing second suites and rooming houses in selected areas under certain conditions.

At the service level, the Task Force proposes that service planning be organized around three sub-groups: youth, families and singles in order to address the different needs. By bringing together all the services that affect a particular group, agencies would be able to plan effectively and co-ordinate their efforts. The Task Force recommends the establishment of a Homeless Services Information System to provide a comprehensive database on social, health and housing services for homeless people, as well as a central hostels bed registry.

In addition, there are a number of recommendations aimed at preventing homelessness. These include: a rent bank to help people in short-term arrears; more systematic housing help services and one-on-one support to help people move from shelters to stable housing; and to keep people housed. Institutions should establish discharge policies to ensure no-one is discharged from an institution to the street or to a hostel without prior arrangement and follow-up.

The Task Force outlines a comprehensive health strategy to address the health and mental health needs of the homeless population. A number of recommendations address ways to remove barriers to accessing comprehensive health care. The Task Force also suggests that the Ministry of Health combine its community health and community mental health funding for homeless people into one single Homelessness Health Fund to enable systematic priority setting and efficient utilization of existing resources.

While emphasizing long-term solutions and prevention, the Task Force recognizes that some measures are required to reduce street homelessness. They suggest a number of improvements to hostel conditions aimed at inducing more people to come in off the streets. In addition, they recommend establishing harm reduction facilities which accept the use of drugs and alcohol on site (under controlled conditions) to

help the “hardest to serve” population, of ten people with both mental illness and addictions, obtain the help they need to get off the streets.

Appendix B

Summary of Provincial Announcements on Homeless Initiatives (March 23, 1999)

Provincial Announcement	Corresponding Task Force Recommendation
Commitment to spend all of the estimated \$50.0 million on rent supplements that will come from signing the Social Housing Agreement with the federal government.	Rec #87: Upon signing social housing devolution agreement, the Province ensure annual federal housing funds not required for existing projects be used as capital and rent supplement fund to support new projects.
An additional \$45.0 million to develop housing spaces and supports to housing for people with mental illness. Implemented over 3 years with \$20.0 million as first phase to develop 1,000 units.	Rec #64: Build 5,000 new supportive housing units for Toronto over next 5 years (1,000 per year). Rec #65: Build 8,500 new supportive housing units throughout province over next 5 years. Rec #86: The Province should maintain responsibility for supportive housing (estimated cost \$96.0 million over 3 years at an average cost \$32.0 million first 3 years).
Eliminating impact of PST on affordable multi-residential rental construction. Builders to receive a grant equal to PST paid on building materials, up to \$2,000.00 per unit.	Rec #83: The Province should rebate fully PST to developers and builders of affordable housing.
Additional \$6.0 million to Provincial Homeless Initiatives Fund, bringing annual provincial total to \$10.0 million.	No directly associated recommendation by the Task Force.
Making public lands available to create minimum of 500 affordable rental units.	Rec #82: The Province should develop policies to make suitable government sites available for affordable housing while retaining long-term public interest in these sites.
Commissioning a design competition to encourage the private sector to develop affordable housing solutions.	No directly associated recommendation by the Task Force.
Additional \$2.0 million to increase Community Start-up Benefits paid to eligible families to help them move out of hostels (an increase from \$799.00 to maximum of \$1,500.00).	Rec #45: Social Services should provide rapid payment of first and last months rent.
Reallocating \$2.5 million over next 3 years from expiring rent supplement contracts to help house 300-400 people with special needs.	Indirectly related to Rec #86 urging provincial responsibility for supportive housing, and Rec #87 to use extra federal funds upon devolution to fund capital and rent supp for new projects.
\$1.0 million to divert ex-offenders from the hostel system. Funding provided to the Ontario Multi-Faith Council and its regional committees to develop discharge plans.	Rec #47: Institutions should establish and implement discharge protocols for all persons with no fixed address.

Transferring \$8.4 million funding and administrative control to municipalities for the Community Partners Program and the Supports to Daily Living Program.	Contrary to Rec #70, the Province should fund 100 percent of supportive housing costs, including presently devolved units and, Rec #86, the Province should assume responsibility for supportive housing.
Allowing municipalities to redirect portion of hostel funding to prevention programs.	Rec #6: Resources should be redirected from providing hostel spaces to helping people find and maintain housing - <u>on condition that sufficient new supply of supportive and low-cost housing is created.</u>

Report dated April 15, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled "Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report: Recommendations and Policy Directions related to the Housing Policies of the Official Plan."

Purpose:

To provide an overview of the recommendations and policy directions proposed in the final report of the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force relating to the housing policies of the Official Plan and to present an implementation framework.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no immediate financial implications stemming from this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services:

- (1) in consultation with the City Solicitor, be requested to meet with senior staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to seek legislative authority to provide the City of Toronto with enhanced demolition control powers consistent with the provisions of the former Rental Housing Protection Act (RHPA);
- (2) be authorized, commencing immediately, to pursue contributions toward the provision of affordable housing pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act for increases in permitted height and/or density, with respect to the following situations:
 - (a) site-specific amendments to both the Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws that are being approved for a specific development; and
 - (b) site-specific amendments to the Zoning By-Law that are being approved and in which the appropriate Official Plan provisions for the implementation of Section 37 are already in place;

- (3) be authorized to request that the Committee of Adjustment, when dealing with minor variance applications involving substantial increases in height and/or density, impose a condition under Section 45(9) of the Planning Act for a contribution toward affordable housing where the need for affordable housing is reasonably related to the variance applied for;
 - (4) any cash contribution in lieu of affordable housing, secured through the implementation of Recommendations 2 and 3, be deposited to the Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing;
 - (5) prepare draft amendments to the City's Planning documents, for consideration by the Planning and Transportation Committee, Community Councils and Council, to permit second suites as-of-right in all single- and semi-detached houses, subject to appropriate building, fire and planning standards being met and consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 provincial legislation;
 - (6) consider as a high priority, in the preparation of a housing implementation plan as part of the Official Plan process, policies on urban intensification and the inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments;
 - (7) consult with the heads of the appropriate Departments to prepare, implement and report on a plan to streamline development approvals which builds on current efforts and takes into consideration best practices;
 - (8) thoroughly review the current planning provisions and procedures respecting rooming houses and examine the opportunities for the provision of such housing City-wide in the context of a longer-term work plan in co-ordination with Buildings, Fire, Housing, Health and Legal staff;
- and that
- (9) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to undertake any necessary actions to give effect thereto.

Council Reference/Background/ History:

At its meeting of March 2, 3 and 4, 1999 City Council adopted the recommendations of a report from the Chief Administrative Officer on the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report.

The CAO's report provided a discussion of the policy implications and a preliminary analysis of the financial implications for the City arising from the Task Force recommendations.

Included in the CAO's report was a recommendation that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee (UEDC) on the Task Force recommendations relating to the housing policies of the Official Plan, including: second suites, securing Section 37 contributions for affordable housing, urban intensification, inclusionary zoning, streamlining development approval and rooming house issues. This report is in response to that recommendation.

Comments and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

1. Overview of the Task Force Report and Proposed Directions

In January 1998, Mayor Lastman appointed a Task Force, headed by Dr. Anne Golden, to recommend solutions to the growth of homelessness and to respond to public concerns about its increasing visibility. This was followed in October, 1998, by the declaration of homelessness as a national disaster by City Council which prompted similar declarations by municipal councils across the country. In January of this year, the Task Force submitted its final report which contained two central themes:

- (1) prevention and long-term responses must replace the reactive, emergency responses to homelessness that have been relied on; and
- (2) everyone, including all levels of government, must take ownership of the problem and responsibility for solving it.

The Task Force identified six major barriers that have prevented effective solutions:

- jurisdictional gridlock and political impasse;
- dramatically increased poverty;
- decreasing supply of low-cost rental housing;
- a service system biased towards emergency and survival measures;
- inadequate community programs and supports for people with serious mental health and addiction problems; and
- limited capacity for service co-ordination.

To address these barriers, the Task Force made 105 recommendations comprising an action plan with multiple strategies. Thirty-four recommendations were identified as "pivotal" in that the other recommendations were seen as dependent on these being implemented. This action plan was conceived as a package and the Task Force recommended against a piecemeal implementation approach. The Task Force concluded that homelessness in Toronto can be prevented and reduced - the problems are solvable and solutions are available.

2. Reporting on the Task Force Recommendations

Owing to the diverse nature of the Task Force's 105 recommendations, staff will be reporting on these through several standing committees. The intent, however, is that each report will discuss the issues within the context of the action plan as a whole:

- as noted above, this report focuses on the Task Force's recommendations relating to the housing policies of the Official Plan;
- the Community and Neighbourhood Services Department will report on the recommendations related to: service co-ordination and planning; emergency shelter, social assistance; health and mental health; supportive and affordable housing issues; and services for aboriginal peoples and immigrants and refugees;
- the Corporate Services Committee will review the recommendations on land management and a "housing first" policy for surplus municipal lands;
- the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee will review the issue of development charges;
- the Budget Committee will consider the financial implications; and
- A final report synthesizing the proposed directions recommended by each Standing Committee will be prepared for presentation to the Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee.

3. Who is Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness in Toronto?

Homelessness is an issue which affects communities across Toronto, the GTA, the province and the country. Almost half of the people using Toronto's hostels come from outside the City. Although the downtown area sees more of the "visibly homeless" across the GTA (people sleeping rough on the streets or in parks), there are growing numbers of what is referred to as the "hidden homeless". These are individuals and families who are doubled-up, living with relatives or friends, living in hostels, or who live in smaller, inappropriate, temporary, even illegal, accommodation. The hidden homeless are people who are at significant risk of becoming homeless.

Over the past few years the face of homelessness in Toronto has changed. The Task Force has identified that the fastest growing groups of homeless are families with children and youth under 18 years of age. Data from 1996 show that almost half of all hostel users were families, including 5,300 children. There has also been a significant growth in the number of families who are at risk of homelessness. The waiting list for subsidized accommodation has reached almost 44,000 households (net of transfers). Large families must wait the longest for subsidized housing because of the very low turnover in units with three or more bedrooms.

The Task Force report underscores the complexity of the causes of homelessness, including individual issues such as: physical abuse, family breakdown, physical and mental health issues, and substance abuse, as well as larger societal factors: increasing poverty, labour market changes, changes in the housing market and changes in the social safety net.

4. The Demand for Affordable Housing in Toronto

As part of its report, The Task Force documented the lack of affordable housing in Toronto and concluded that new low-cost supply is vital to prevent further demand pressures at the low end of the rental market. Thirty of the report's 105 recommendations concern affordable housing, of which ten relate to the housing policies of the Official Plan including three that are identified as "pivotal" (see Appendix A).

In looking at the demand for affordable housing, the Task Force provided a detailed assessment of recent changes in tenant household incomes as well as changes affecting the rental housing market. Some of the key findings are:

- (1) The number of low-income households in Toronto is growing:
 - the number of households with incomes under \$20,000.00/year rose by 64,000 from 1991 to 1996;
 - average family incomes fell by 12.5 percent in the City between during the same period;
 - in 1991, 33 percent of tenant households in the City paid more than 30 percent of income in rent;
 - in 1996, 45 percent of tenant households paid more than 30 percent of income in rent, an increase of 12 percentage points over 1991.

- (2) Within the GTA, rental affordability problems are concentrated in the City of Toronto:
 - the City of Toronto has a greater proportion of lone-parent families and non-family households, particularly at the low-end of the income scale, than the rest of the GTA;
 - families with middle incomes are migrating out of the City to the surrounding regions where single-detached, ownership housing is more affordable.

- (3) Rising rents have reduced the inventory of low-cost units:

- each year between 1991 and 1996, an average of 11,000 low-cost, private rental units shifted to the middle range of rents because rents were rising faster than inflation;
- there was a net loss of low-cost rental housing over the five year period between 1991 and 1996, even after taking into consideration additions to the social housing stock and new second suites.

(4) The private sector has not met low-income housing needs:

- there has been little new rental construction in the City of Toronto;
- the economic rents of new rental buildings are higher than prevailing market rents.

Another factor affecting the future demand for affordable housing is the potential impact on the rental stock through demolitions. The Tenant Protection Act (TPA) does not provide the City with legislative powers to restrict the demolition of rental housing or to require its replacement. Without the ability to control or restrict demolition, it will be difficult for the City to meet the recommended goal of adding 2,000 units/year to the rental stock.

5. The Implementation of an Affordable Housing Action Plan

The Task Force calls upon the City to take a leadership role in ensuring the supply of affordable rental housing both through new construction and the preservation of the existing stock. The City is encouraged to use the existing planning tools at its disposal, to seek additional powers, and to engage all levels of government in the search for solutions.

This report focuses on those components of the affordable housing strategy that relate to the housing policies of the Official Plan. Other components of the affordable housing action plan address the role of the provincial and federal governments who have considerably more resources to apply to housing development, including financial assistance, tax relief, capital support, reallocation of subsidy savings, and the provision of land. The Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services will provide a more detailed assessment of these aspects of the action plan in her report to the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee.

6. Actions Taken to Date in Response to the Task Force Recommendations on the Housing Policies of the Official Plan

Recommendation 91 of the Task Force report identifies the need for the new Official Plan to incorporate the goal of preventing homelessness and to support the use of planning tools to preserve the stock of existing housing and to encourage the development of new affordable supply. At its meeting of March 2, 3 and 4, 1999,

City Council approved a report titled: "Framework for the New Official Plan", which outlined the work program, process, timing and communication strategy for the development of a new plan for the amalgamated City. The report indicated that the prime objective of the new Official Plan will be to enhance the quality of life in the City of Toronto through reinvestment in community, economy and the natural and built environments. In discussing planning for community, the report makes specific reference to the level and quality of affordable housing and stresses the importance of housing as a basic building block of the new plan.

The Framework Report also identified the importance of implementation plans for operationalizing the policies of the new Official Plan. It is intended that there will be a specific implementation plan for housing which will outline strategies and approaches to reduce the level of homelessness, preserve the existing housing stock, and encourage the creation of new affordable housing. These strategies will assist the City in meeting its goal of no net loss of affordable rental housing.

Important steps have already been taken to preserve the existing stock of affordable rental housing as proposed in Task Force Recommendations 96 and 97. At its meeting of March 2, 3 and 4, 1999, City Council approved recommendations on new Official Plan policies and related by-laws to restrict the condominium conversion and demolition of rental housing, including requesting additional powers from the Province.

Securing additional powers to control or restrict the demolition of rental housing must be identified as a priority. Housing market conditions in the City promote the redevelopment of rental properties. Over time, redevelopment will reduce the already scarce supply of affordable rental accommodation:

- planning staff are currently aware of approximately 1,500 rental units that will be demolished through condominium redevelopment proposals where additional height and/or density is being sought;
- three new applications have been received/discussed with staff since early March;
- sites are generally low-rise rentals providing unit types appropriate for families; and
- the estimated impact does not include proposed demolitions where an increase in height and/or density is not being sought.

It is recommended that in order to implement the steps taken by City Council at its meeting of March 2, 3, and 4, 1999, that enhanced demolition control powers, consistent with the former RHPA provisions, be sought as soon as possible.

The former Rental Housing Protection Act set out three criteria as the basis for approving the demolition of rental housing:

- Council could approve the demolition of a rental property if it considers the property to be structurally unsound;
- Council could require applicants: (1) to replace the units (same number, types, and level of affordability) so that the overall supply of the rental housing would not be reduced and (2) to mitigate the impacts on the existing tenants; and
- Council could take into consideration local market conditions and the adequacy of the supply of affordable rental housing when considering the approval of the demolition of rental housing.

The most effective mechanism to implement this authority would be special legislation such as an amendment to the City of Toronto Act. To this end, it is recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the City Solicitor be requested to meet with senior staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to seek legislative authority to provide the City of Toronto with enhanced demolition control powers consistent with the provisions of the former Rental Housing Protection Act (RHPA).

These actions, in response to three of the Task Force's recommendations (including a "pivotal" recommendation on condominium conversion), represent an important starting point for the City in strengthening its planning strategies to ensure a mix of housing to meet the full range of needs.

7. Toward the Development of An Implementation Framework

As outlined above, concrete steps have already been taken on 3 of the 10 Task Force recommendations related to the housing policies of the Official Plan. The following discussion on the seven remaining recommendations is organized into three subsections:

- (I) "pivotal" actions recommended by the Task Force which need to be addressed in the shorter term;
- (II) issues which will be dealt with through the Official Plan process; and
- (III) items which will require a longer-term work plan, including interdepartmental consultation.

I. Pivotal Recommendations on Affordable Housing

Of the seven remaining recommendations on affordable housing, Recommendations 92 and 100 were identified by the Task Force as “pivotal” (see Appendix A). Recommendation 92 deals with seeking contributions for low-income housing in exchange for increases in height and/or density. Recommendation 100, together with Recommendation 102, concerns permitting new second suites in certain house forms and locations and legalizing existing second suites.

1.a.1 Contributions Toward the Provision of Low-Income Housing - Legislative Framework

The Planning Act, through Section 37, provides municipalities with the authority to seek the provision of public benefits (i.e. facilities, services and matters) in exchange for increases in height and/or density in a rezoning process pursuant to Section 34 of the Planning Act. These benefits may be secured by a municipality by entering into one or more agreements with a developer. The agreement(s) may be registered against the title of the land to which it applies and the municipality is entitled to enforce those provisions contained in the agreement(s).

In order to give effect to the by-laws, a municipality must have an Official Plan in place which contains provisions relating to the use of Section 37. The former municipalities of Toronto, North York, East York and Etobicoke had specific policies relating to the use of Section 37 in their Official Plans. The former municipalities of York and Scarborough applied Section 37 on a site-specific basis where Official Plan Amendments were involved and did not have a specific Official Plan policy.

1.a.2 Policies in the Former City of Toronto

Through the Section 37 provisions in its Official Plan, the former City of Toronto was able to secure a wide range of public benefits, including: a large number of social housing units, workplace day cares, heritage preservation projects, public art projects, community service space together with improvements to the public realm (e.g. streetscapes, infrastructure). A significant amount of capital funds were also secured toward the construction of new community facilities such as schools, recreation centres and libraries. With respect to affordable housing, in the early 1980s, the private sector contributed land for approximately 6,000 social housing units and over \$19M cash-in-lieu of the land.

1.a.3 Pursuing Benefits for Affordable Housing - An Interim Approach

Section 37 of the Planning Act provides municipalities with an important tool to secure contributions for affordable housing in exchange for increases in height and/or density. This is a mechanism which the new City of Toronto should use to the benefit of its citizens and communities.

Until the new Official Plan is in place to provide a formal framework, the following interim steps are recommended: that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be authorized, in the immediate future, to pursue contributions toward the provision of affordable housing pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act for increases in permitted height and/or density, with respect to any of the following situations:

- (a) site-specific amendments to both the Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws that are being approved for a specific development; and
- (b) site-specific amendments to the Zoning By-Law that are being approved and in which the appropriate Official Plan provisions for the implementation of Section 37 are already in place.

Planning staff note that the Committee of Adjustment is dealing with an increasing number of applications involving significant increases in density and height. In the past, where substantial increases have been sought, and considered appropriate as minor variances in the site-specific circumstances, the owners provided public benefits similar to what would have been pursued in a Section 37 agreement. In similar future cases, conditions should be requested whereby public benefits are secured through an agreement which also can be registered on title. These agreements could be imposed at the discretion of the Committee of Adjustment (or the Ontario Municipal Board) as a condition of approval pursuant to Section 45(9) of the Planning Act.

The Commissioner of Urban Planning and Community Services should be authorized to request that the Committee of Adjustment, when dealing with minor variance applications involving substantial increases in height and/or density, impose a condition under Section 45(9) of the Planning Act for a contribution toward affordable housing where the need for affordable housing is reasonably related to the variance applied for.

Any cash contribution in lieu of affordable housing is to be deposited to the Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing. The Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing was established by City Council at its meeting of February 2, 3 and 4, 1999. The purpose of this fund is to provide direct City financial assistance to non-profit organizations developing affordable housing demonstration projects with the purpose of assisting groups to leverage other sources of financial assistance whether through charitable donations, financing, government subsidies and/or other contributions. The importance of cash-in-lieu contributions is that they will help to replenish the fund and allow additional affordable rental housing projects to be undertaken.

1.b.1 Second Suites as a Cost-Effective form of Affordable Housing:

The decreasing supply of low-cost rental housing was identified by the Task Force as one of the six major barriers preventing effective solutions. There is a growing affordability problem for renters in Toronto as a result of: (i) a real decline in tenant incomes; (ii) rent inflation which has reduced the number of low-cost units, and (iii) a set of economic and market circumstances which have discouraged investment in new affordable rental housing. Through Recommendations 100 and 102, the Task Force has proposed that second suites be given serious consideration as a cost-effective form of affordable housing. Specifically, it was recommended that current restrictions on the creation of new units should be addressed and that a process should be developed for the legalization of existing units.

I.b.2 Second Suites and the Toronto Rental Housing Market:

The Task Force has estimated that there are approximately 100,000 second suites in the City of Toronto representing about a fifth of the rental market. Second suites are popularly referred to by a variety of names: nanny flats, basement or accessory units, apartments-in-houses, granny flats, and in-law suites. They are a cost-effective, market-driven affordable housing option which does not require subsidization.

To get a better sense of the number and distribution of second suites across the City of Toronto, a background paper was commissioned by the Task Force which examined MLS data on home sales and newspaper real estate advertisements. Information from early 1998 showed that approximately 18 percent of Toronto resale homes included a second suite with Scarborough, North York, York and the former City of Toronto having higher proportions of second suites while Etobicoke and East York had lower proportions.

Second suites are recognized as providing a number of benefits:

- elderly homeowners can access an additional source of income which may allow them to remain in their homes and keep their ties to their community;
- young families can generate extra income to assist with mortgage expenses which may mean the difference between becoming homeowners or remaining tenants;
- families and individuals have the option of remaining in their communities when their housing circumstances change; and
- extended families are able to live together while retaining privacy and independence.

I.b.3 Second Suites - Legislative Context:

In 1994, the Provincial Government through Bill 120 made changes to a number of pieces of legislation, including: the Planning Act, the Municipal Act, the Building

Code, the Fire Code, the Landlord and Tenant Act, the Rent Control Act and the Rental Housing Protection Act, to allow a self-contained second unit as-of-right in single-detached, semi-detached and row housing. The second unit had to meet Building Code, Fire Code and reasonable planning standards. Municipal planning documents which prohibited second units in these types of houses were superseded by this legislation.

Although many issues were raised in the debate on second suites at the municipal level, most of the discussion focussed on health, safety and parking. The Fire and Building Codes set requirements for second suites which had to be met in order for the second suite to be legal. New powers of entry and enforcement were enacted to ensure compliance with provincial and municipal standards. The new legislation dictated that planning documents could not require that a house with two units have more than two on-site parking spaces and must allow the driveway to be used to meet the on-site parking requirement, including that part of the driveway which is located between the front of the facade of a house and the property line. In effect, second suites were permitted as-of-right in all single-detached, semi-detached and row houses in municipalities provided certain standards were met.

In 1996, the provincial government repealed the legislation which allowed second suites as-of-right. This meant that unless municipalities passed by-laws to allow second suites, consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 legislation, the previous by-laws which precluded second suites came back into effect. The intent of the provincial government's action was not to preclude municipalities from permitting second suites. Indeed one of the objectives of provincial devolution was to allow for a higher level of decision-making at the local level. In 1997, for example, the Borough of East York passed By-law 147-97 which permitted second suites ("accessory apartments") in single- and semi-detached dwellings.

I.b.4 Current Zoning Provisions across the Amalgamated City:

The City's current zoning provisions regarding second suites can be summarized as follows:

- East York: a second unit is permitted in detached and semi-detached dwellings;
- Etobicoke: under certain conditions, second suites are permitted in some areas of Long Branch, Mimico and New Toronto;
- Toronto: second suites are permitted, subject to conditions, in single detached, semi-detached, and row housing and accessory suites are permitted in duplexes and triplexes in most areas of the City except for Rosedale, Swansea, Forest Hill and parts of North Toronto;

York: one apartment-in-house is permitted in single- and semi-detached dwellings;

North York: second suites have a restricted permission and are limited to apartment and commercial zones (RM3+); and

Scarborough: second suites are not permitted.

Except for the former City of Toronto, the parking requirement for a second unit is one space for each unit. In the former City of Toronto, the standard is one parking space for the first dwelling unit where parking existed before the addition of the second unit, plus one parking space for each dwelling unit in excess of the first two dwelling units.

I.b.5 The Intent of the Task Force's Recommendations on Second Suites:

In framing its recommendations, the Task Force proposed that there be as-of-right permission for second suites in new developments and in areas with multi-unit residential areas (including semi-detached, duplexes and triplexes) and that steps should be taken to legalize existing suites. The exclusion of single-detached houses from consideration seems to be inconsistent with the report's strong advocacy that they be recognized as a valid part of the housing supply having filled the short-fall in the affordable rental supply for more than 20 years.

I.b.6 The Potential Supply of New Second Suites - A Preliminary Review:

As Recommendation 100 does not speak to those circumstances where second suites are currently permitted, it is assumed that the intent was to extend the permission and not to replace the current provisions that permit second suites. Recommendation 100 has three parts:

- permit second suites as-of-right wherever large scale new residential developments are approved;
- permit second suites as-of-right in areas where semi-detached, duplexes and triplexes already exist; and
- permit second suites in any residential zones that directly abut arterial roads that are well served by public transit.

Large-Scale New Development: Opportunities for large scale developments comprised of single- and semi-detached houses, duplexes and triplexes in the new City are limited. Preliminary projections suggest that less than 5,000 units of the new housing stock, to be produced in the next 10 years, will be single- and semi-detached houses in large-scale developments. Based on the Task Force estimate that

about 18 percent of resale homes in Toronto include a second suite, this would mean that potentially less than 1,000 second suites would be generated through new large-scale development.

As-of-right Where Semi-Detached, Duplexes and Triplexes Already Exist: Most second suites are in single- and semi-detached houses and most new conversions are expected to occur in these house forms as they have the most potential for accommodating second suites while maintaining a relatively low density residential neighbourhood. According to 1996 assessment information the incidence of adding a unit to duplexes and triplexes outside of the former City of Toronto is extremely low. Only 48 additional units in duplexes and 94 additional units in triplexes were reported by assessment officials. This suggests that the impact of extending permission for second suites in duplexes and triplexes outside of the former City of Toronto would not generate a significant amount of new supply. There is also an equity issue in that, because zoning is cumulative, single-detached houses in zones with semi-detached, duplexes and triplexes can be permitted to have second suites, while single-detached homes in other zones are not permitted to have second suites.

Residential Zones That Directly Abut Arterial Roads: as parking was a key consideration in previous discussions on second suites, the Task Force has proposed that community concerns might be mitigated by locating second suites in areas well-served by public transit (i.e. on arterial roads). In fact, it is unlikely that second units would be feasible in suburban locations of the City, given the auto-oriented nature of its development, without proposing parking solutions. One approach to meeting the need for adequate parking would be to permit tandem parking.

Based on this preliminary review, it would appear that the approach which has been proposed by the Task Force would result in a very limited supply of new second suites. This is not the intended effect sought by the Task Force. Currently, most second suites are supplied through single- and semi-detached housing forms most of which, outside the former City of Toronto, are located in zones that only permit single-detached dwellings.

I.b.7 Implementation of Recommendation 100 on As-of-Right Permission for Second Suites:

Implementation of Recommendation 100, as stated by the Task Force, would have the effect of establishing two policies for second suites: one for the inner areas of Toronto (Toronto, York and East York) and one for the outer areas (Scarborough, North York and Etobicoke). This would have the effect of (1) encouraging further intensification in the inner part of the City that is already densely developed and populated and (2) would provide limited opportunities for owners and tenants in the outer areas where the housing stock and nature of development is well-suited to accommodating second units. In addition, the approach recommended by the Task Force, as noted above, would generate only a very modest number of new units.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be directed to prepare draft amendments to the City's Planning documents, for consideration by the Planning and Transportation Committee, Community Councils and Council, to permit second suites as-of-right in all single- and semi-detached houses, subject to appropriate building, fire and planning standards being met and consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 provincial legislation.

The key considerations are as follows:

- most of the City's second suites, legal, legal non-conforming and "illegal", are in single- and semi-detached housing;
- single- and semi-detached housing is best-suited to accommodate second suites and, regardless of legislation, most second suites will be created in these housing forms;
- between 1994 and 1996, in accordance with Provincial legislation, all single and semi-detached housing, as well as row housing, were permitted to have a second unit;
- disparities in approaches across the City need to be addressed (e.g. permitted in East York but not North York);
- presently the City does not vigorously enforce its zoning regulations by actively searching for and eliminating "illegal" units. The former municipalities of Scarborough and North York which did not permit second suites have a significant proportion of the stock;
- there are means (e.g. registration, powers of entry and enforcement) available to the City to monitor and enforce compliance with standards; and
- there should be security and predictability for tenants and landlords with respect to second suites.

It would not be practical or appropriate to establish new zoning that prescribes one set of standards for all second suites throughout the City. Existing permissions in East York, Etobicoke (Mimico, Long Branch and New Toronto), former Toronto and York should continue. It would be appropriate to delete age requirements related to second suite permissions (e.g. buildings at least five years old in former Toronto and twenty years old in Mimico). Zoning amendments would be required for those areas where second suites in single- and semi-detached houses are precluded such as in Scarborough, North York, central and northern Etobicoke and parts of former Toronto. Amendments to Official Plans will also be necessary for those that set

density limits which could be exceeded if second suites were permitted and, in some cases, definitions may have to be amended.

I.b.8 Implementation of Recommendation 102 to Legalize Existing Second Suites:

The Task Force report estimates that there are presently 100,000 second suites in the City of Toronto and that this important source of affordable housing should be legalized. The Task Force noted that:

- second suites are already an integral part of the affordable housing supply;
- the supply of “illegal” second suites, in the past, has not been significantly deterred by the City by-laws that prohibited second suites in particular areas;
- the introduction of second suites has represented an adaptation of the housing stock to the needs of the population as it has changed over time; and
- an effective low-income housing policy should recognize this form of housing, rather than driving it underground, thereby giving it a measure of security and permanency.

The Task Force recommends that existing second suites that comply with health and safety standards should be legalized and that there be an appropriate public hearing and appeal process. In addition, the onus for making a second suite legal should be on the owner.

Currently, in cases where the zoning permits second units and the unit does not comply with all of the zoning requirements, including parking, the unit could be legalized by the applicant submitting an application for a minor variance to the Committee of Adjustment. This approval process provides an opportunity for anyone to object as well as an appeal for the applicant or objector.

Where the zoning does not permit a second unit, and the unit was created on or after November 16, 1995 (the date Bill 120 was repealed), the owner would have to submit a rezoning application to legalize the unit. As with the minor variance approval process, the rezoning process provides for an opportunity to object and an appeal procedure. If the unit is in an area where the existing zoning does not permit a second suite but the subject unit existed prior to November 16, 1995, it may be a legal non-conforming use provided it meets the planning standards prescribed at that time. An approval process that provides for a public meeting/hearing and appeal mechanism is not required for this last category of second suites as they are not illegal.

As the vast majority of second suites are currently in single- and semi-detached homes, the Committee of Adjustment process is recommended as the most

appropriate approach for legalizing those units that would not comply with the zoning provisions. In either case, the public would have an opportunity to express their views as both options would require amendments to existing zoning by-laws which includes public meetings. It should be noted, however, that once the new Zoning By-Laws are in place, assuming Council adoption, compliance would focus on the health, safety and parking requirements.

II. Task Force Recommendations to be Addressed Through the Official Plan Process

Task Force Recommendation 89 (housing opportunities through urban intensification) and Recommendation 92 (requirement for inclusion of affordable housing in new developments) will be addressed primarily through the Official Plan and associated housing implementation plan. The following discussion provides additional background on possible policy options.

II.a Main Streets Intensification and Other Opportunities to Promote Affordable Rental Housing:

Recommendation 98 of the Task Force report proposes that the City should implement the Main Streets Intensification program and explore other strategies for promoting the supply of affordable rental housing. As context for Recommendation 98, the Task Force discussed past efforts to use land use tools to promote affordable housing, such as (i) the conversion of commercial and industrial buildings to condominiums and lofts and (ii) the creation of new apartment housing above existing commercial properties along arterial roads, and proposes that their implementation be given further consideration.

The potential for creating additional housing - particularly affordable housing - through infill and intensification has been the subject of study for a number of years. Urban intensification is also a central theme in the Official Plans of both the former City of Toronto and Metro Toronto. Advocates of infill housing and intensification have stressed the financial advantages, including reduced requirements for investment in new transportation and physical infrastructure. An intensification approach is also consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement which seeks to promote efficient and cost-effective development and land use patterns across Ontario.

In discussing a new approach to planning in Toronto, the Framework Report, adopted by Council on March 2, 3 and 4, proposed that the new Official Plan establish different "lenses" for determining how different parts of the amalgamated City share common features and a common potential for reinvestment. One of the objectives of the Plan will be to identify criteria by which the degree of change can be managed or encouraged. The adaptive re-use of existing buildings, infill development and development of Main Streets and arterial corridors well-served by

public transit could provide important opportunities to channel new investment while meeting new housing needs.

In addition to the context provided in the Official Plan, strategies to increase the supply of affordable housing through intensification and the re-adaptive use of non-residential buildings will be addressed through the proposed housing implementation plan. For both of these exercises, key issues will be to determine what an intensification program means and to define appropriate reinvestment locations where residential uses can be increased. For instance, between 1991 and 1996, the City grew by 110,000 people and almost 44,000 households - essentially accommodating another East York within the city limits.

II.b.1 Inclusion of Affordable Housing in New Residential Developments

Recommendation 93 of the Task Force report proposes that the City should request that the City of Toronto Act be amended to permit the City to require the inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments. This type of approach is popularly referred to as inclusionary zoning.

Inclusionary zoning for affordable housing is a land development control measure, enacted by way of municipal by-law, which generally requires a certain portion of units within any new residential development to be set aside for low and/or moderate income households at below market prices or rents. Some programs mandate developer participation as a condition of development approval while others encourage developers to participate on a voluntary basis through density bonuses and other development incentives (see discussion of the use of Sections 37 and 45 above). Inclusionary programs are currently in place in numerous communities and municipalities in the United States. In Canada, experiments with inclusionary zoning have largely been restricted to communities in the lower mainland of British Columbia (Vancouver, Burnaby, Surrey and Richmond).

II.b.2 Inclusionary Zoning in the City of Toronto - Implementation Issues

As part of the background studies for Cityplan, in 1991 the former City of Toronto, in conjunction with the Ontario Ministry of Housing, commissioned an inclusionary zoning study for housing, primarily related to affordable ownership housing. A Phase II study was completed in 1993 and included a review of the legal issues related to inclusionary zoning. Through this work, a number of concerns were raised about the implementation and administration of an inclusionary zoning program. Some of the key issues identified were:

- should the municipality focus on a specific household group who may not be disadvantaged except for an inability to purchase housing within the City of Toronto?;

- how will the potential purchasers be qualified and who should dictate unit sizes and mix?;
- can the required inclusionary units be provided in a separate building?;
- should resale controls be put in place on inclusionary units to ensure they remain affordable and how would resale prices be established?; and
- if the City pre-qualifies potential inclusionary purchasers would this imply a legal obligation in the event of mortgage default?

In 1997, the Metro Housing Stakeholder Panel commissioned a study on options available to municipalities to provide for new lower-income housing which included a review of inclusionary zoning practices. In taking a closer look at inclusionary zoning programs in U.S. municipalities, the report concluded that incentive-based programs were more attractive as they were less likely to result in developer opposition and legal challenges than mandatory programs.

The Task Force suggested that inclusionary zoning, in conjunction with other planning tools, could be a useful approach to increasing the supply of affordable housing in the City. As noted above, a number of potential implementation and administrative issues have been identified which would need to be addressed. Appropriate policy approaches for the inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments will be considered in the development of a housing implementation plan as part of the Official Plan process.

III. Issues Requiring a Longer-Term Work Plan and Interdepartmental Consultation

Two of the recommendations on affordable housing will require the development of longer-term work plans, including the need for interdepartmental consultation. These relate to streamlining development approvals and issues concerning permission for and legalization of rooming houses.

III.a Ease of Development Approval:

In the past, the process for getting zoning and Official Plan amendments under the Planning Act has contributed to the increasing cost of producing new housing. Recommendation 94 of the Task Force Report addresses the need to reduce the time it takes to grant development approvals and building permits through streamlining the operations of all relevant departments. The report suggests that the development of affordable and other types of housing could be facilitated through the ability to build a development that conforms to broad general zoning categories, subject only to development review or development permits.

The streamlining of development approvals requires input from a wide range of City Departments, Boards and Commissions as well as some functions outside of the City's jurisdiction. In the context of municipal amalgamation, there is a real opportunity to remove barriers, to reduce duplication of effort, to evaluate processes and linkages, and to implement best practices, including a move toward more as-of-right zoning. Following a detailed internal process review and identification of benchmarks, planning staff are currently working closely with staff from Legal, Buildings, Works and Parks to identify appropriate streamlining measures. As an example, legal staff are developing standardized agreements.

As a longer-term goal, one model which may be worthy of further consideration is the "One-Window Planning Service" which has been implemented by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH). All applications under the Planning Act for which MMAH is the approval authority receive one-window service. Any provincial input to applications submitted to other approval authorities is provided through MMAH. While partner ministries (e.g. Environment and Energy, Natural Resources) are still available to provide technical support all contact is made through MMAH.

It is recommended that the UEDC direct the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services to consult with the heads of the appropriate Departments to prepare, implement and report on a plan to streamline development approvals building on current efforts and taking into consideration best practices.

III.b.1 Rooming Houses in the City of Toronto:

The final recommendations of the Task Force report focus on the need to address issues facing the rooming house stock in the City of Toronto. Specifically, Recommendation 103 proposes that: (1) there should be as-of-right permission for rooming houses in commercial areas and multiple-residential areas that abut major arterials and (2) that existing rooming houses that comply with health and safety standards should be legalized.

III.b.2 Rooming Houses - Background and Context

The Task Force has estimated that between 6,000 and 10,000 people live in rooming house accommodation in the City of Toronto. Rooming houses are one of the few types of housing that rent for \$350.00 to \$450.00 per month and would be affordable to people with annual incomes of less than \$12,000.00.

Two factors distinguish rooming and boarding houses from other forms of accommodation. (Rooming houses provide accommodation only, boarding houses provide some or all meals and may provide additional services):

- (1) unlike self-contained apartments they involve at least one shared facility: bathroom, kitchen, living room, which means that contact between the occupants is inevitable and co-operation and compromise (social rules) are required; and
- (2) this housing has weekly, as opposed to monthly, rentals.

Rooming houses are usually the first attainable housing form for many people before they are able to afford a self-contained unit at a monthly rent. However, the supply of rooming house accommodation had declined steadily in the last 25 years. In the former City of Toronto, the number of licensed rooming houses has declined steadily from 1,202 in 1974 to 393 in 1998, a decline of almost 400 percent. This may have been partially offset by an increase in the number of rooming houses which are not licenced.

There have been a number of inquiries into the rooming house sector in Toronto over the years. Many of these inquiries were in response to fire fatalities or media reports focussing on "illegal" rooms. (In the former City of Toronto, between 1981 and 1994, almost 1 out of every 4 fire deaths occurred in a rooming house). This has had the effect of having resources directed at the sector by senior levels of government only for short periods typically following a crisis and increasing regulation at the municipal level.

It should be recognized that rooming housing is a form of accommodation that is not suitable for everyone. Rooming houses, and other housing forms that involve shared facilities, require much more co-operation and interaction than is the case for people living in self-contained housing. Collective living demands constant adjustments and compromises which in turn require patience, tolerance and the ability to compromise. For many people with a history of psychiatric problems, alcoholism or substance abuse this can be too difficult, even though this is often the only form of shelter they can afford.

While rooming houses provide an affordable housing option for people who are hard-to-house or who require additional support services, this may not be the most appropriate housing option. The recommendations of the Task Force for the provision of additional supportive housing units and psychiatric beds, to be funded by the Province, would be of greater assistance for this segment of the population.

III.b.3 Current Zoning Provisions and Related Activities Across the Amalgamated City

At present, municipal regulations respecting rooming houses vary considerably across the new City. In the former City of Toronto, rooming houses are permitted in all multiple-residential zones. In Etobicoke and York, they are allowed only in specific areas subject to a distancing requirement. The East York zoning by-law

does not specifically permit rooming, boarding and lodging houses although the use may be allowed through a site-specific zoning amendment. Rooming houses were not permitted in North York and Scarborough.

Procedures also vary in those areas where rooming houses are a permitted use. The former City of Toronto and Etobicoke license their rooming houses while York is in the process of establishing a registration system. Preliminary discussions are underway on the best method for licensing rooming houses in the amalgamated city. Municipal Licensing and Standards Division will lead this review working with other appropriate Departments and Divisions. As well, a variety of municipal departments are typically responsible for approving and monitoring rooming houses, drawing on the expertise of Planning, Municipal Licensing and Standards, Buildings, Fire, Housing, Health and Legal staff.

In general, rooming houses are a very complex issue, not only City-wide, but even within each former municipality. For example, the former City of Toronto has special powers under the City of Toronto Act, which have enabled it to establish both rooming house and personal care rooming house by-laws. However, even this legislation has its limitations and problems with respect to issues such as operation, the provision of resident services, and maintenance and enforcement. Staff have been examining ways to strengthen the legislation where possible to improve procedures, encourage housing opportunities and maintain neighbourhood support.

In the former City of Toronto, there are a number of related activities underway. In the Parkdale community, a group of people consisting of tenants, operators, neighbours and community agency and business representatives have been meeting to resolve conflicts around bachelorettes and unlicensed rooming houses. As well, several rooming house cases are now before the Ontario Municipal Board which deal with a number of complicated planning and zoning issues. The results of these activities may have ramifications for the way rooming houses are treated throughout the amalgamated City.

III.b.4 Rooming Houses - Proposed Next Steps

It is not being recommended that new policies be brought forward for the legalization of rooming houses at this time given the matters that are now taking place in the former City of Toronto alone. Rather, it is proposed that staff continue to pursue the current activities with a view to identifying possible solutions which may be of help in other parts of the amalgamated City. It is further recommended that planning staff thoroughly review the current planning provisions and procedures respecting rooming houses and examine the opportunities for the provision of such housing City-wide in the context of a longer-term work plan in co-ordination with Buildings, Fire, Housing, Health and Legal staff.

8. Conclusion

This report has attempted to provide an overview of the recommendations and policy directions proposed in the final report of the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force relating to the housing policies of the Official Plan and to present an implementation framework.

The focus of this report has been on ten of the Task Force's recommendations which relate to affordable housing. We are pleased to report that steps have already been taken on three of these recommendations, including a "pivotal" recommendation on the condominium conversion of rental accommodation.

The discussion in the report has largely focussed on proposed approaches for the remaining seven recommendations on affordable housing relating to the housing policies of the Official Plan. Proposed approaches have been recommended for those issues that should be addressed in the short-term, those that will need to be addressed through the Official Plan process, and those that will require a longer-term work plan, including interdepartmental consultation.

We believe that the framework outlined here, in conjunction with the recommendations being made in separate reports to the various standing committees, will assist the City in developing an approach to homelessness which will be proactive and will address the barriers that have prevented solutions.

Contact Name:

Ross Paterson, (392-7863)
Principal Planner, Policy and Programs

APPENDIX A

Specific Recommendations related to the Housing Policies in the Official Plan with "pivotal" recommendations marked in bold:

- Rec. 89: The City should implement the Main Streets Intensification program and explore other strategies for promoting the supply of affordable rental housing such as the conversion of non-residential buildings and the purchase of condominiums;
- Rec. 91: The Official Plan should incorporate the goal of preventing homelessness and support the use of planning tools that contribute to

the preservation of existing housing and the construction of new affordable housing;

Rec. 92: Contributions toward the provision of low-income housing should be a high priority among the public benefits secured by the City in exchange for increases in height and density. These should be realised under the policy framework in the new Official Plan;

Rec. 93: The City of Toronto should request and the Province of Ontario should approve amendments to the City of Toronto Act to permit the City to require the inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments;

Rec. 94: The City should reduce the time it takes to grant development approvals or building permits by streamlining the operation of all relevant departments;

Rec. 96: Council should harmonize condominium conversion policies across the new City of Toronto. The new policy should attach conditions to approval of plans of condominium to ensure the replacement of low-cost rental units, consistent with the City “no net loss” policy;

Rec. 97: The Province should grant appropriate authority to the City of Toronto to control demolition of affordable rental properties;

Rec. 100: The City of Toronto should permit as-of-right, second suites wherever large-scale new developments are being approved. The City of Toronto should permit, as-of-right second suites in areas in which multi-unit residential buildings (including semi-detached houses, duplexes and triplexes) already exist, as well as any residential zones that directly abut arterial roads that are well served by public transit;

Rec. 102: Regardless of current zoning, existing second suites in single-family homes that comply with health and safety standards should be legalized. There needs to be an appropriate public hearing and appeal process for neighbours who object. The onus should be on the owner to come forward with an application for relief from the zoning by-law; and

Rec. 103: Council should permit roominghouses as-of-right in commercial and multiple-residential zones on arterial roads throughout the City. Existing rooming houses that comply with health and safety standards should be legalized.

Report dated April 28, 1999, from Councillor Jack Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons, entitled “Final Report of the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force.”

The Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons adopted the following motions at its meeting of Tuesday April 20, 1999. The Committee asks that these motions be considered at the special joint meeting of Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and Urban Environment and Development Committee on May 3, 1999 to review the staff reports on the policy directions proposed in the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force final report.

It is recommended that:

- (1) in the development of its response to the Task Force action plan, that the City of Toronto set housing targets that reflect the actual numbers of homeless people in the city to ensure we are not just “treading water” but are significantly reducing the number of homeless people;
- (2) the City adopt policies necessary to override existing zoning by-laws, across the amalgamated city, to ensure that new emergency shelters can be opened as needed; and
- (3) the City proceed immediately with hiring a Facilitator for Action on Homelessness, as recommended by the Mayor’s Task Force, and that the Facilitator establish a formal link with the Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons to enable ongoing consultation with this community-based group on issues related to homelessness.

Report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled “Information requests from the May 3, 1999 joint meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services and Urban Environment and Development Committee.”

Purpose:

To respond to information requests of the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services arising from the May 3, 1999 joint meeting of Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and Urban Environment and Development Committee on the policy directions of the Mayor’s Homelessness Action Task Force final report.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications for the City arising from this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) Council endorses in principle the draft report of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), National Housing Policy Options Paper (as attached) and to notify FCM of this support prior to its annual meeting on June 4, 1999; and
- (2) appropriate City Officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Council Reference/Background/History:

A joint meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and Urban Environment and Development Committee was scheduled for May 3, 1999, to discuss the policy directions of the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force final report. The meeting was unable to convene due to lack of quorum. The Chairs agreed to forward the recommendations of the Commissioners reports before the committee directly to the May 11, 12 and 13 meeting of Council. The Chairs also agreed to hear the scheduled deputations from the general public. An informal discussion with the attending committee members followed.

Several requests for further information arose from this discussion to be submitted directly to Council on May 11, 12 and 13, 1999. This report responds to the requests made of the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services.

Comments and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

The FCM National Housing Options Paper:

The "National Housing Policy Options Paper" of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) articulates a rationale for continued federal government involvement in housing and puts forward specific policy ideas on steps it could take. The document is the work of a committee of councillors and staff from FCM municipalities, with leadership from the City of Toronto, reflecting the concerns of cities across Canada. It was one focus of the National Symposium on Homelessness and Housing (cosponsored with FCM); the draft accompanying this report was endorsed at the April 29 meeting of the FCM Big City Mayors caucus. The final document will be considered for formal endorsement at the FCM annual conference in June.

It is recommended that Council endorse the draft report of the National Housing Policy Options Paper, as it is consistent with the City's position on federal involvement in housing. And, further, that FCM be notified of Council's endorsement prior to the annual conference in June.

Amending the Commissioner's Report:

A request was made to amend Recommendation No. 1(d) of the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report (April 28, 1999), to include representation from the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society. This recommendation calls for the Commissioner to convene a meeting with the Ontario Multi-Faith Council regarding the development of discharge protocols for people leaving correctional facilities. Both the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society are key community-based organizations in the area of corrections and therefore should be included among the stakeholders to participate in discussions on this issue.

Setting Meaningful Housing Targets for the City:

The joint committee had before it a report (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair of the Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons. This group asks the City to set housing targets that reflect the actual numbers of homeless people in Toronto to ensure we are not just "treading water" but are making a significant difference in the number of homeless people.

Council has approved the development of a municipal report card on homelessness to act as a monitoring tool and accountability mechanism to ensure implementation of the City's action plan on homelessness. A format for the report card will be developed by the Fall 1999 that will include key indicators such as the number of evictions, the number of people using hostels, social housing waiting lists and progress towards a more sufficient and equitable distribution of affordable and supportive housing. As such, the report card will assist in evaluating and determining meaningful housing targets for the City.

Rent Supplement Programs:

Additional information was requested on providing rent supplements exclusively for people in rent controlled housing and on the possibility of the City to avail itself of market rent co-op units for providing affordable housing.

The request regarding rent supplement appears motivated by a concern to avoid high program costs due to escalating rents. The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force proposals on rent supplement were intended as part of a cost-effective approach to housing needs, and a means to reinvest recent savings in housing expenditures. Rent supplement was one of two main forms of public support

proposed, the other being federal capital (equity) which would reduce the required rent supplement to moderate levels. It is clear in the Task Force report that most of the new housing was assumed to be operated by not-for-profit agencies, with private involvement subject to meeting affordability criteria. The provincial response to the Task Force report included a commitment to develop a new rent supplement program in consultation with municipalities, once a federal/provincial housing devolution agreement is signed. Any new rent supplement program should include cost-effectiveness criteria. A new rent supplement program could also become a way to provide assistance using existing market-rent units in non-profit and co-op projects.

Rent-to-Own Housing Models:

At the meeting it was suggested that, where opportunities exist in zoned lands, a rent-to-own form of housing be considered for tenants within an existing City-owned/operated rental building thereby making vacant units available for people on waiting lists.

In July 1998, the City approved and initiated a strategy for affordable housing to support private developers and community-based agencies to develop affordable housing. This strategy includes a number of "housing demonstration projects". These projects will utilize municipal resources from the City's Capital Revolving Fund as well as city-owned lands made available under the "housing first" policy adopted, in principle, by Council in July 1998. Submissions of proposals for rent-to-own housing may be considered among the continuum of housing development options the City explore as part of its affordable housing strategy.

Contact Name: Joanne Campbell, Phone: 392-7885/ Fax: 392-0548.

Report dated May 7, 1999, from Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, entitled "Process for By-law Amendments to Permit Affordable Housing, Emergency Shelters and Rooming Houses across the City."

Purpose:

To recommend further reports on the process necessary to amend the City's by-laws to permit emergency shelters in all parts of the City, and to extend the Rooming House By-law for the former City of Toronto to other parts of the City.

Source of Funds:

Not applicable.

Recommendations:

That the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with the City Solicitor, report further to the Planning and Transportation Committee on:

- (a) the form of a by-law, similar to the public use permissive exceptions in the former North York and Toronto Zoning By-laws, which would accommodate emergency shelters in all parts of the new City; and
- (b) an extension of the former City of Toronto's Rooming House By-laws to other parts of the City.

Background:

At the scheduled joint meeting of May 3, 1999, the Urban Environment and Development Committee and the Neighbourhood and Community Services Committee failed to gain a quorum. However, the standing committee Chairs and attending committee members agreed that the Chairs would put forward a Motion at City Council which, among other matters, requests a report directly to Council to provide a preliminary response to the following:

- “(1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with the City Solicitor, report on:
- (a) the form of a by-law, similar to the former North York's Municipal Use By-law and the former City of Toronto's Section 11 Municipal Use By-law, which would accommodate affordable housing and emergency shelters in all parts of the new City;
 - (b) an extension of the City of Toronto's Rooming House By-law to other parts of the City; and
 - (c) Recommendation 2 of the report (April 28, 1999) from Councillor Layton, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee on Homeless and Socially Isolated Persons:

the City adopt policies necessary to override existing zoning by-laws, across the amalgamated City, to ensure that new emergency shelters can be opened as needed.”

This report is in response to the above proposed motion.

Comments:

1. By-law Amendments for Emergency Shelters

The by-law sections cited above are those in the Zoning By-laws for the former Cities of Toronto and North York which provide more or less blanket permissions for uses which are for the purpose of a public service by the municipality or a local board thereof, or other government levels. In order to permit emergency shelters in other parts of the City where the relevant Zoning By-laws do not currently permit them, the Zoning By-laws would have to be amended.

The Zoning By-law amendment process mandated by Section 34 of the Planning Act would have to be followed, which means that a public meeting would have to be held for each by-law amendment. Where such amendments do not currently comply with the relevant Official Plan, the necessary Official Plan amendments would also have to be considered concurrently. It will be necessary to examine these issues in greater detail and report further to Planning and Transportation Committee on a process for, and content of, the necessary amendments, as recommended in this report.

Although the proposed motion cited above makes reference to affordable housing, affordable housing is not a land use per se. It is housing classified by economic criteria as opposed to physical or operational criteria. The recommendations of the April 15, 1999 report, and those in The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report deal with many facets of the complex affordable housing issue. Further reports on affordable housing will be forwarded, and the issue need not be further addressed in this report.

2. Extension of Former City of Toronto's Rooming House By-law

As noted in the April 15, 1999 report from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services regarding the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report, the former City of Toronto has special powers under the City of Toronto Act which have enabled it to establish both rooming house and personal care rooming house by-laws. Such by-laws address, among other matters, licensing requirements and procedures and, in the case of personal care rooming houses, building and operational standards. The extension of similar by-laws to other parts of the new City will first require amendments to Provincial legislation.

The context of this request to report appeared to be a concern with maintaining appropriate standards and licensing requirements for what are currently illegal rooming houses existing in other former municipalities. As also noted in the April 15, 1999 report, Official Plan and Zoning By-law issues would also need to be addressed in order to permit rooming houses in some locations. The recommendation contained in that report requests that Planning staff thoroughly

review the current planning provisions and procedures respecting rooming houses, and examine the opportunities for the provision of such housing city wide, in consultation with Buildings, Fire, Housing, Health and Legal staff. This recommendation remains appropriate, and will be pursued if adopted by Council. A recommendation of this report is to report back specifically on the issue of extending the Rooming House By-laws to other parts of the new City.

The City Solicitor has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

Conclusions:

Any necessary amendments to the existing Official Plan(s) and Zoning By-law(s) to permit emergency shelters citywide would have to follow the statutory amendment processes set out in the Planning Act. The extension of the former City of Toronto's Rooming House By-laws to other parts of the new City will first require legislative amendments. Further reports will be forwarded to address these issues in more detail, as per the recommendations.

Contact Name:

Ann-Marie Nasr
Policy and Research - 392-0402.

Report dated May 10, 1999, from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, "Development of a Small Landlord Education Program, a Registration By-Law and an Enforcement Strategy for Second Suites."

Purpose:

This report responds to a request that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services report to Council on the feasibility of establishing an ongoing licence for secondary suites that would guarantee the right of entry for city inspectors. The report proposes the development of a small landlord education program, a registration by-law and an enforcement strategy for second suites. The request was made in the context of the recommendation of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services that second suites be permitted as-of-right in all single- and semi-detached houses, subject to appropriate building fire and planning standards being met. The recommendation to permit second suites as-of-right was contained in a report to the special joint meeting of the community and Neighbourhood Services and Urban Environment and Development Committee from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services.

Financial Implications:

There are no immediate financial implications stemming from this report. The report includes a recommendation that if adopted would direct the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services report back on the resources required if any to support an implementation plan for the registration of second suites.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report jointly to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the development of a small landlord education program;
- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the City Solicitor jointly report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on an implementation plan for the registration of second suites, including a draft by-law and outlining what resources may be required, if any, to support this plan; and
- (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized to undertake any necessary actions to give effect thereto.

Background:

A special joint meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee was scheduled for May 3, 1999. The purpose of the joint meeting was to consider two reports from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services on the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Final Report. These reports addressed the policy directions related to Community and Neighbourhood Services and the recommendations and policy directions related to the housing policies of the Official Plan.

As the meeting was unable to formally convene due to lack of quorum, the standing committee Chairs and attending committee members agreed that:

- (1) the recommendations contained in the above-noted reports be introduced through a notice of motion to the May 11, 12 and 13, 1999 meeting of City Council; and
- (2) that they would hear the scheduled deputations from the general public.

In addition, several motions were made for Council's consideration and the appropriate Commissioners were requested to report directly to the May 11, 12 and

13, 1999, meeting of Council to provide a preliminary response to these motions. This report specifically addresses the request that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services report on the feasibility of establishing an on-going licence represented by a one-time fee, for future secondary accommodation that would guarantee the right of City of Toronto Building Inspectors to gain entry.

Comments:

1. *Second Suites and the Toronto Rental Housing Market*

The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force has estimated that there are approximately 100,000 second suites in the City of Toronto representing one-fifth of the rental market. Second suites are popularly referred to by a variety of names: nanny flats, basement or accessory units, apartments-in-houses, granny flats and in-law suites. They are a cost-effective, market-driven affordable housing option which does not require subsidization.

2. *Changing Legislative Context*

In 1994, the provincial government, through Bill 120, made changes to a number of pieces of legislation, including: the Planning Act, the Municipal Act, the Building Code, the Fire Code, the Landlord and Tenant Act, the Rent Control Act, and the Rental Housing Protection Act, to allow a self-contained second unit as-of-right in single-detached, semi-detached and row housing. The second unit had to meet Building Code, Fire Code and reasonable planning standards.

In 1996, the provincial government repealed Bill 120 which meant that unless municipalities passed by-laws to allow second suites, consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 legislation, any previous by-laws which precluded second suites came back into effect. The intent of the provincial government's action was not to preclude municipalities from permitting second suites but rather to allow for a higher level of decision-making at the local level. It should be noted that those second suites which were created prior to the repeal of the legislation continue to be legal non-conforming uses today but cannot be occupied unless they meet building, fire and planning requirements.

3. *The Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force Recommendations on Second Suites*

In developing the recommendations related to second suites in their final report, the Task Force identified three main considerations: (i) legalization; (ii) landlord-tenant relations and (iii) property standards.

Legalization:

With respect to legalization, the Task Force noted that, while second suites are not permitted in many low-density residential areas across the City, the supply of suites has not been deterred by prohibitive by-laws. As a result, second suites have become a valid part of the housingstock which should be recognized and counted rather than driven “underground”. In their final report, the Task Force stated that legalization will give security and permanency to this part of the housing supply.

In response to this proposed policy direction, the report on the recommendations and policy directions related to the housingpolicies of the Official Plan recommends that draft amendments be prepared to the City’s Planning documents to permit second suites as-of-right in all single- and semi-detached houses, for consideration by the Planning and Transportation Committee, the Community Councils and CityCouncil, subject to appropriate building, fire and planning standards being met, and consistent with the approach taken in the 1994 Provincial Legislation.

Landlord-Tenant Relations:

In speaking to the issue of landlord-tenant relations, the Task Force noted that, although tenants in second suites have a legitimate right to security of tenure, homeowners who rent out units in their own homes are particularly vulnerable to problem tenants. Consequently, the Task Force recommended that when legalizing second suites there should be corresponding changes to the eviction process under landlord-tenant legislation.

However, the Tenant Protection Act (TPA), which became law in June 1998, made a number of significant changes to the rules on the eviction process which effectively addresses the concerns of the Task Force:

- until the TPA was enacted, an eviction involved an expensive and time-consuming court process, often between 3 and 6 months, and usually requiring legal representation;
- eviction orders are now decided by a quasi-judicial agency of the province: the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal, which does not require legal representation, provides forms for free, and charges a nominal \$60.00 application fee;
- timelines are now much shorter, for example, a tenant now has five days within which to file a written dispute of an application filed with the Tribunal to terminate their tenancy as opposed to 14 days under the previous legislation;
- if the tenant does not dispute the application for eviction (and current estimates are that 50 percent of tenants do not), the Tribunal issues a default Order requiring the tenant to move; and

- if the tenant does dispute, a hearing date is usually set within a few weeks with a decision being issued shortly after the hearing. If the Tribunal decides in favour of the landlord, an Order is issued terminating the tenancy and may award the landlord costs of the action.

Tenants can be evicted if they are in arrears, if they persistently pay their rent late, if the unit is required for the personal use of the landlord and his/her family, illegal acts, impaired safety, and misrepresentation of income.

It should be underscored that while these new rules effectively address the concerns of the Task Force in the area of landlord-tenant relations, evictions are costly to the individuals and families who lose their homes, to large and small landlords who lose revenue, and to the public because evictions place pressure on the already overburdened emergency hostel system.

The Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services will be reporting to a future meeting of the Community and Neighbourhood Services Committee on the results of the 1998 eviction prevention programs and making recommendations for 1999 programs. I am recommending, in the context of preparing draft amendments to the City's Planning documents to permit second suites as-of-right in all single- and semi-detached houses, that I report back jointly with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services on the development of a small landlord education program which will assist landlords with second suites.

In discussions with landlords and tenants living in second suites, staff have identified that most problems often arise out of the fact that neither party fully understands or respects the rights and responsibilities of the other. To reduce the number of potential evictions and to assist landlords with second suites, I propose that an education program be developed with input from the Landlord Self-Help Clinic (LSHC) and Housing Help Centres, who find housing for many of their clients in second suites.

The LSHC provides general information to all landlords in a variety of ways (fact sheets, web site) as well as providing legal services to landlords who meet income eligibility criteria. A large number of their clients are landlords with 3 or fewer units. The five Housing Help Centres in the City of Toronto maintain registries of low-rent units and provide assistance to prospective tenants in finding units. The Help Centres also provide mediation services in landlord and tenant disputes with the goal of trying to save the tenancy.

Standards:

The intent of the motion on the feasibility of establishing a non-going licence represented by a one-time fee, for future secondary accommodation that would

guarantee the right of City of Toronto Building Inspectors to gain entry is to assure that with respect to second suites there are mechanisms in place to:

- promote and ensure safe, healthy and habitable housing conditions;
- prevent deterioration;
- encourage responsible management, maintenance and use; and
- allow for inspection and inventorying of units.

In this report, a registration approach is suggested for consideration rather than a licencing approach as it more closely meets the intent of the motion. With the repeal of Bill 120, changes were made to the *Municipal Act* which allow for municipalities to require the registration of second suites. Inspection for compliance with safety standards can be a requirement of registration. The legislation allows that, once the unit is registered, it would remain registered without payment of any renewal or other fees unless the registration is revoked.

There are specific powers of entry within the *Municipal Act* provisions which mirror the rights of entry contained in the *Building Code Act* for property standards by-laws. Fire Officials have stronger powers to inspect a property and they may enter without a search warrant if there is reason to believe that risk of fire poses an immediate threat to life. Where occupants do not consent and there is no reason to believe that there is an immediate threat to life, inspectors are required to obtain a search warrant.

Property standards officers typically inspect units when requested to do so by the occupant or where a complaint has been received from another source. Inspectors can enter with the consent of the occupant. If there is no consent, then a search warrant must be obtained by showing "reasonable grounds" that a property standards offence has occurred.

The former municipalities of York and East York had implemented registration By-laws (Nos. 3396-97 and 142-97, respectively). Through these by-laws, a second suite:

- was not permitted unless it was registered;
- had to comply with the Building Code, the Fire Code, and applicable zoning and property standards; and
- had an inspection and registration fee.

Both municipalities had a public awareness program. However, the registration of these units was discontinued in 1998 owing to the high administrative costs for inspections and registration, budget cut-backs and reduced staff resources.

It should also be noted that the former City of Toronto, with the longest history and experience with accessory apartments, and a substantial stock of them, had no registration by-law. However, I am mindful that concerns to maintain standards is frequently cited as a reason to resist second suites and accordingly, I am recommending that an implementation plan be developed for a registration system for second suites including the preparation of a draft Registration By-Law for second suites by the City Solicitor for consideration by the Planning and Transportation Committee should Council approve this approach, and following its approval that I report back on an enforcement strategy. A registration by-law enforcement system would respond to the Task Force's direction that second suites should be recognized and counted and would also provide a connecting point for the proposed small landlord education program. The issue of resource availability in the current environment will be a key consideration for the enforcement strategy.

Conclusion:

This report provides a preliminary response to the motion that I report on the feasibility of establishing an on-going licence represented by a one-time fee, for future secondary accommodation that would guarantee the right of City of Toronto Building Inspectors to gain entry. In this report I have proposed three specific recommendations in response to the motion:

- (1) the development of an education program for small landlords as staff have identified that a majority of problems arise from the fact that landlords and tenants often do not fully understand their rights and responsibilities;
- (2) the implementation of a plan for second suite registration; and
- (3) the implementation of an enforcement strategy which would take into account the past experience in the former municipalities of York and East York as well as address the issue of resource constraints.

I believe that these steps will be of assistance in promoting the effective implementation of the proposal to allow second suites as-of-right in single- and semi-detached houses across the City and that they are supportive of the leadership role which the City has assumed in ensuring new rental supply and the preservation of the existing stock.

Contact Names:

Ross Paterson (392-7863)

Frank Weinstock (392-0404)

Principal Planner, Policy and Programs

Manager, Policy and Transition
Licencing and Municipal
Standards.

ATTACHMENT No. 3

Report dated May 6, 1999, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, entitled "1999 Residential Education Tax Rates." (See Minute No. 5.54)

Purpose:

The 1999 levy by-law was passed by Council at its special meeting on April 26 and 27, 1999. This report requests authority to amend the by-law to reflect the reduction in education tax rates for the residential and multi-residential property classes announced by the Province on May 4, 1999.

Financial Implications:

The 1999 education tax rates for the residential and multi-residential property classes have been reduced by 10 percent. This reduction will save a taxpayer owning an average home assessed at \$220,000.00, \$101.00 in 1999. The reduction in education tax rates does not affect the amount of taxes levied for municipal purposes.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) The education tax rates levied by By-law No. 231-1999 on properties in the residential/farm, multi-residential, farmlands and managed forests property classes be reduced in accordance with Ontario Regulation No. 307/99; and
- (2) Authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary bill in Council to amend By-law No. 231-1999, in the form or substantially in the form of the draft by-law attached hereto.

Comments:

At its special meeting on April 26 and 27, 1999, City Council adopted the 1999 Levy By-law. The by-law set the tax rate for education purposes for the residential and multi-residential property classes at 0.46 percent and for the farmlands and managed forests property classes at 0.115 percent. These rates were prescribed by Provincial regulation in 1998, which was to remain in place until such time as it is changed by the Province.

On May 4, 1999, as part of the 1999 Provincial Budget announcement, the Minister of Finance announced a 20 percent reduction in residential tax rates, with the rates initially being reduced by 10 percent for 1999. On May 5, 1999, the Minister of Finance amended the regulation which prescribed the education tax rates for the residential and multi-residential property classes, and reduced the education tax rate for 1999 these property classes from 0.46 percent to 0.414 percent. The 1999 education tax rate for the farmlands and managed forests property classes was also reduced from 0.115 percent to 0.1035 percent.

It should be noted that on May 5, 1999, the Minister of Finance also filed O.Reg. 308/99 which confirms the 1999 education tax rates in By-law No. 231-1999 for the commercial and industrial property classes.

The Education Act requires municipalities to levy and collect the education tax rates as prescribed by the Province. The attached by-law amends By-law No. 231-1999 to reflect the reduction in education tax rates noted above.

Contact Name:

Lynne Ashton, 397-4203.

DRAFT BY-LAW

Authority:

Adopted by Council:

CITY OF TORONTO

BY-LAW No.

To amend By-law No. 231-1999, being a By-law “To Levy and Collect Taxes for the Year 1999, to Impose a penalty charge for non-payment of 1999 taxes, and to Provide for interest to be added to tax arrears”

WHEREAS By-law No. 231-1999 provides for the levy and collection of taxes for the 1999 taxation year; and

WHEREAS paragraph 1 of subsection 257.7(1) of the *Education Act*, as amended, requires every municipality in each year to levy and collect the tax rate prescribed by the Minister of Finance for school purposes on residential property and business property taxable for school purposes in the municipality according to the last returned assessment roll; and

WHEREAS business property and residential property are defined by section 257.5 of the *Education Act*, as amended; and

WHEREAS O.Reg. 400/98 prescribed the tax rate for school purposes for property in the residential/farm and the multi-residential property classes as 0.46 percent, and the tax rate for school purposes for property in the farmlands and managed forests property classes as 0.115 per cent; and

WHEREAS O.Reg. 307/99, filed by the Minister of Finance on May 5, 1999, amends O.Reg. 400/98 by prescribing for 1999 and subsequent years the lower tax rate for school purposes for property in the residential and multi-residential property classes of 0.414 per cent, and the lower tax rate for school purposes for property in the farmlands and managed forests property classes of 0.1035 per cent; and

WHEREAS By-law No. 231-1999 as enacted by Council on April 27, 1999, levied 1999 tax rates for school purposes for property in the residential, multi-residential, farmlands, and managed forests property classes in accordance with the rates prescribed for 1999 by O. Reg. 400/98 prior to its amendment by O.Reg. 307/99; and

WHEREAS O. Reg. 308/99, filed by the Minister of Finance on May 5, 1999, further amends O.Reg. 400/98 by prescribing for 1999 tax rates for school purposes for property in the commercial and industrial property classes which confirm the tax rates for school purposes levied on property in the commercial and industrial property classes by By-law No. 231-1999.

The Council of the City of Toronto HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

1. Section 5 of By-law No. 231-1999, being a by-law to levy and collect taxes for the year 1999, to impose a penalty charge for non-payment of 1999 taxes, and to provide for interest to be added to tax arrears, is deleted and the following substituted:

“**5.** There shall be levied and collected as taxes on the assessment of all real property in the City of Toronto rateable for school purposes according to the assessment roll for 1999 as finally altered, amended and corrected, in amounts calculated for each property class set out in Column I, the rate set out in Column II, which shall produce, when levied upon the total assessment for each property class set out in Column III of Schedule “A” attached hereto, the total tax levy for school purposes of \$1,857,005,678:

Column I

Column II

(Property Class/Subclass)

(Tax Rate)

Residential/Farm	0.414000
Multi-Residential	0.414000
Commercial	4.091405
- Vacant Units and Excess Land	2.863984
- Vacant Land	2.863984
Industrial	5.520842
- Vacant Units and Excess Land	3.588547
- Vacant Land	3.588547
- Farmland Awaiting Development	0.144900
Farmlands	0.103500
Pipelines	2.029400
Managed forests	0.103500"

ENACTED AND PASSED this day of _____, A.D. 1999.

MEL LASTMAN,
Mayor

NOVINA WONG,
City Clerk.

ATTACHMENT No. 4

Report dated May 7, 1999, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, addressed to the Municipal Grants Review Committee, entitled "Contingency Fund Request - Canada's Walk of Fame - Ward 24)." (See Minute No. 5.59)

Purpose:

This report responds to the request from Canada's Walk of Fame for financial support of \$25,000.00 through the Contingency Fund.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statements:

There are sufficient funds for the request in the Contingency Fund. There are no other financial implications.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) an amount of \$15,000.00 be allocated to Canada's Walk of Fame; and
- (2) this be the final allocation from the Contingency Fund to Canada's Walk of Fame.

Council Reference/ Background/History:

The Contingency Fund of \$200,000.00 was set up in 1998 as part of the Consolidated Grants Budget to deal with issues arising from amalgamation, emergency needs and to address requests from not-for-profit groups that were ineligible within any City of Toronto Grants Program. This source of funding has been continued for 1999 with a budget of \$150,000.00.

On June 1, 1998, the Municipal Grants Review Committee discussed and recommended a \$25,000.00 grant from the Contingency Fund to Canada's Walk of Fame. The motion, attached as Appendix A, to make this a one-time only grant lost as it was deemed too premature to deny future funding if it was required.

Comment and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

Mr. Peter Soumalias, Chairman of Canada's Walk of Fame, has submitted a letter, attached as Appendix B, seeking an additional grant of \$25,000.00. Canada's Walk of Fame honours Canadians, past and present, who have contributed to society through the arts, culture, entertainment and sports. There is no appropriate source of funding for the Walk of Fame other than the Contingency Fund. All Municipal Grants Programs have specific criteria and there is no program including the Economic Development Partnership Program under which the project would qualify. Since no conditions were placed on the funds awarded to Canada's Walk of Fame in 1998, it is appropriate for the Municipal Grants Review Committee to consider the funding request from the organization for 1999.

Conclusions:

The Contingency Fund was not set up as an annual funding source for returning applicants as is common practice with other City Grant Programs. However, since no other source of funding is appropriate, the opportunity for additional funding exists, and Canada's Walk of Fame is worthy of support, a one-time only reduced grant of \$15,000.00 is recommended.

Contact Name:

Cathi Forbes, Cultural Affairs Officer, 395-6192.

(A copy of each of the Appendices A and B, referred to in the foregoing report, is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT No. 5

Communication dated May 7, 1999, from the Interim General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission, regarding the "Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan." (See Minute No. 5.62)

At its meeting on Wednesday, May 5, 1999, the Commission considered the attached report, entitled "Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan."

The Commission adopted Recommendations Nos. 3 and 4 contained in the report, as listed below:

- “(3) City of Toronto Council be requested to direct the General Manager, Transportation Services, to coordinate the implementation of the Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan, beginning with the Benson and Hedges Symphony of Fire on June 19, 1999; and
- (4) City of Toronto Council be requested to provide funding in the amount of \$25,000.00 to pay for part of the costs of paid-duty Police Officers associated with the Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan.”

The Commission struck out Recommendation No. (1) and replaced the following wording therein:

- “(1) That the Commission endorse the Traffic Management Plan proposed by staff for the Benson and Hedges Symphony of Fire fireworks events and, in principle, for the Canadian National Exhibition period, and that staff consult further with the Canadian National Exhibition Association, Exhibition Place

and the local councillors with respect to the Canadian National Exhibition component.”

The Commission also amended Recommendation No. (2) by adding the words “and that the Chair and Vice-Chair be requested to move, on behalf of the Commission, the aforementioned Notice of Motion”, so that such recommendation reads as follows:

- “(2) Introduce this report and, notably the following two recommendations, for consideration by the City of Toronto Council at its meeting of May 11 and 12, 1999, by means of a Notice of Motion, because the lead time required to co-ordinate and implement such a traffic management plan in time for the first of the Benson and Hedges Symphony of Fire fireworks events, scheduled for June 19, 1999, does not allow this report to follow the usual committee review process, and that the Chair and Vice-Chair be requested to move, on behalf of the Commission, the aforementioned Notice of Motion.”

The Commission amended Recommendation No(5) by adding the words “Canadian National Exhibition Association Board of Directors” after Toronto Police Services, so that such recommendation reads as follows:

- “(5) Forward this report to Councillors Olivia Chow, Kyle Rae, Joe Pantalone, Mario Silva, David Miller, and Chris Korwin-Kuczynski, the Toronto Transportation and Planning Departments, Toronto Police Services, Canadian National Exhibition Association Board of Directors, Exhibition Place and Ontario Place.”

The Commission also approved the following:

- (1) that the Toronto Transit Commission notify local residents of the changes for the Symphony of Fire fireworks events, such notices to specifically state that the changes are to address the transportation issues arising from the 1998 Canadian National Exhibition, and that any comments by citizens would be welcome if changes need to be made to the plan for the 1999 Canadian National Exhibition;
- (2) that staff, after the Benson and Hedges Events, report further on the issue of Dufferin Street for the Canadian National Exhibition period, including the possibility of making Dufferin Street ‘local traffic only’ with the possible provision of passes for local residents; and
- (3) that staff confirm through a memorandum for the Commission the results of their discussions with the Toronto Police, Ontario Place and Benson and Hedges concerning the traffic plan for the Symphony of Fire fireworks

events, including clarification of any concerns Councillor Pantalone may have in relation to this component of the plan, and that this memorandum be submitted to City of Toronto Council at its meeting on May 11 and 12, 1999, in conjunction with the proposed Notice of Motion.

The foregoing is forwarded to City of Toronto Council for consideration and approval of Recommendations Nos. (3) and (4) contained in the staff report.

(A copy of the aforementioned report dated May 5, 1999, from the Interim General Manager, Toronto Transit Commission, entitled "Exhibition Place/Ontario Place Special Events Traffic Management Plan", together with a memorandum dated May 11, 1999, from the Interim General Manager, Toronto Transit Commission, entitled "Exhibition Place/Ontario Place - Special Events Traffic Management Plan", is on file in the Office of the Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT No. 6

Communication dated May 11, 1999, from Councillor Betty Disero, Davenport, Councillor Dennis Fotinos, Davenport, Councillor Joe Pantalone, Trinity-Niagara and Councillor Mario Silva, Trinity-Niagara, on behalf of local businesses, manufacturers and Business Improvement Areas in Toronto's Downtown West area, with respect to Current Value Assessment as it pertains to small retailers. (See Minute No. 5.66)

"We, the undersigned, on behalf of our local businesses, manufacturers and Business Improvement Areas (BIAs) in Toronto's Downtown West area respectfully ask Members of Toronto City Council to endorse the following

- given the negative impact of Current Value Assessment (CVA) on small retailing when CVA is fully implemented in 2001; and
- prior to 1998, BIA levies were treated in a manner similar to the business tax, and levied against the business tenant rather than the property owner, and given that BIA levies are now a realty tax of the property owner, rather than a tax of the occupant and are calculated on the total current value assessment for the commercial portion of the property, whereas under the current system (CVA), most small retail properties have experienced large tax increases, resulting in serious financial hardship to individual commercial property owners.

Recommendations:

That leaders of Ontario Political Parties be asked to guarantee the following, if elected:

- (a) to maintain or extend the existing 2.4 percent cap on small retailing beyond 2001;
- (b) to legislative required changes where BIA levies are capped at 2.4 percent; and
- (c) to deal with the issue responsibly, expeditiously and effectively by introducing required legislation that deals with our concerns.”