

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF TORONTO

Clerk's Department

Minutes of the Scarborough Community Council

Meeting No. 7

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

The Scarborough Community Council met on Tuesday, July 18, 2000, in the Meeting Hall, Scarborough Civic Centre, commencing at 9:40 a.m.

Members present:

	July 18, 2000		July 19, 2000	
	9:40 a.m. - <u>12:40 p.m.</u>	2:10 p.m. - <u>7:55 p.m.</u>	10:15 a.m. - <u>12:45 p.m.</u>	2:11 p.m. - <u>2:44 p.m.</u>
Councillor Bas Balkissoon, Chair	x	x	x	x
Councillor Gerry Altobello	x	x	x	x
Councillor Brian Ashton	x	x	-	-
Councillor Lorenzo Berardinetti	x	x	-	-
Councillor Raymond Cho	x	x	x	-
Councillor Brad Duguid	x	x	-	x
Councillor Norm Kelly	x	x	x	x
Councillor Doug Mahood	x	x	-	-
Councillor Ron Moeser	x	x	-	-
Councillor Sherene Shaw	x	x	x	x
Councillor David Soknacki	x	x	x	x
Councillor Mike Tzekas	x	x	x	x

Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Mahood declared an interest in Minute Nos. 7.13 and 7.14 in that he may be the recipient of an OMERS pension in the near future, and took no part in the discussion or vote thereon.

Councillor Shaw declared an interest in Minute No. 7.48 in that her family home is near the site of the applications, and took no part in the discussion or vote thereon.

Confirmation of Minutes

At the request of Councillor Soknacki, the minutes of the meeting of the Scarborough Community Council held on June 20 and 21, 2000, were corrected by striking out the Councillor's Declaration of Interested identified under Minute No. 6.39 and inserting same under Minute No. 6.35, and by striking out the words "(Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)" in Minute No. 6.26, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)".

Upon the question of the adoption of the minutes, as corrected, it was carried.

7.1 Toronto Transit Commission Service Improvements for 2000-2001 (All Scarborough Wards)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 27, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that Community Council:

- (1) receive the aforementioned report for information; and
- (2) forward any comments respecting the "Service Improvements for 2000-2001" report directly to the Toronto Transit Commission.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report, and directed that the Toronto Transit Commission be advised that the Community Council had no comment to make respecting the TTC "Service Improvements for 2000-2001" report.

(Clause No. 26 (a), Report No. 9)

7.2 Proposed Turn Prohibitions at Three Private Driveways (Wards 15, 17 and 18 – Scarborough City Centre, Scarborough Agincourt and Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 27, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the driveway on the south side of Steeles Avenue, approximately 70 metres west of Midland Avenue, operate as a "right in/right out" driveway, with westbound and northbound left turns prohibited at all times, as identified in Appendix 1 of this report;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) the driveway on the north side of Progress Avenue, approximately 50 metres east of William Kitchen Road, operate as a “no exit”, right-turn entrance only, with southbound left and right turns as well as eastbound left turns prohibited at all times, as identified in Appendix 1 of this report;
- (3) southbound left turns be prohibited at all times at the driveway on the north side of Kingston Road, approximately 80 metres west of Sheppard Avenue;
- (4) all costs associated with signing the turn prohibitions at the driveways referenced in Recommendations Nos. (1), (2) and (3) of this report be borne by the developers of the properties serviced by the respective driveways; and
- (5) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 1, Report No. 9)

**7.3 Stop Signs at Numerous Locations
(Wards 15, 16 and 17 – Scarborough City Centre,
Scarborough Highland Creek and Scarborough Agincourt)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 27, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the stop signs identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted;
- (2) the All-Way Stop Control identified in Appendix 2 of this report, at the intersection of Chartland Boulevard South and Boarhill Drive, be adopted; and
- (3) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Moeser, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 2, Report No. 9)

**7.4 Traffic and Parking Concerns on Cass Avenue
at Lynngate Junior Public School
(Ward 14 – Scarborough Wexford)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the stopping regulations identified in Appendix 1 of this report be rescinded;
- (2) the parking/stopping regulations identified in Appendix 2 of this report be adopted; and
- (4) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Kelly, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 3, Report No. 9)

**7.5 Request For All-Way Stop Control
Eastpark Boulevard at Felicity Drive/Orville Road
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, on the results of a traffic study conducted on Eastpark Boulevard at Felicity Drive/Orville Road, responding to a petition received from area residents asking for all-way stop controls at this intersection; concluding that all-way stop controls are not warranted, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council that:

- (1) the recommendation embodied in the aforementioned report be struck out; and
- (2) all-way stop controls be installed at the intersection of Eastpark Boulevard and Felicity Drive/Orville Road.

Mr. Dan Bradley, Felicity Drive resident, appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and in support of the installation of all-way stop controls as requested in the aforementioned petition.

(Clause No. 4, Report No. 9)

**7.6 Traffic and Parking Concerns on
Amarillo Drive at St. Nicholas Catholic School
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the parking/stopping regulations identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted; and
- (2) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council deferred the aforementioned report, sine die, to permit the Ward Councillors an opportunity to consult with the St. Nicholas Catholic School Council.

(Clause No. 26(b), Report No. 9)

**7.7 Traffic and Parking Concerns on Marcos Boulevard at
Charles Gordon Senior Public School and
Hunter's Glen Junior Public School
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the parking regulations identified in Appendix 1 of this report be rescinded;
- (2) the parking/stopping regulations identified in Appendix 2 of this report be adopted; and
- (3) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 5, Report No. 9)

**7.8 Traffic and Parking Concerns on Brimorton Drive
at St. Andrews Junior Public School
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the stopping regulations identified in Appendix 1 of this report be rescinded;
- (2) the parking/stopping regulations identified in Appendix 2 of this report be adopted; and
- (3) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 6, Report No. 9)

**7.9 Traffic and Parking Concerns on Fawcett Trail
at Alexander Stirling Public School
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the stopping regulations identified in Appendix 1 of this report be rescinded;
- (2) the parking/stopping regulations identified in Appendix 2 of this report be adopted; and
- (3) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Cho, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 7, Report No. 9)

**7.10 Proposed Speed Limit Reduction on Old Finch Avenue
at Heritage Park Public School
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 27, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (1) the 40 kilometre per hour speed limit identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted; and
- (2) the appropriate by-law be amended accordingly.

On a motion by Councillor Cho, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 8, Report No. 9)

**7.11 Public Meeting – Alteration of a Public Highway
Pedestrian Refuge Island
Brimley Road South of Huntingwood Drive
(Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)**

The Community Council held a statutory public meeting on the construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Brimley Road south of Huntingwood Drive, notice of such meeting having been published in the Toronto Sun on June 27, July 3, 10 and 17, 2000, and notification having been given to residents within 120 metres (400 feet) of the site, as directed by the Works Committee, and had before it the following:

(June 14, 2000) from the City Clerk (Works Committee), advising that the Works Committee:

- (a) referred the report, dated May 23, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services respecting the construction of a pedestrian refuge island at 2301 Brimley Road to the Scarborough Community Council for consideration as a deputation item and recommendation thereon to the Works Committee;
- (b) requested that residents within a 400 foot radius of the site be so notified; and
- (c) requested that the Commissioner submit a report to the Scarborough Community Council on other options available for pedestrian safety in this vicinity; and

(June 30, 2000) from the City Clerk (Toronto Pedestrian Committee) providing for the information of Scarborough Community Council, a copy of a communication to the Works Committee from the Toronto Pedestrian Committee respecting warrants to justify the installation of traffic control signals, and requesting that the Community Council, when considering the issue of a pedestrian refuge island at 2301 Brimley Road, also take into account the recommendations embodied in the attached memorandum, dated June 28, 2000, from the Pedestrian Committee.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- A. Councillor Shaw moved that the Scarborough Community Council defer its decision on this matter to its meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000, with the request that the Director of Transportation, District 4, submit a report thereto addressing:
- (1) the concerns expressed at this public meeting;
 - (2) a history of the Site Plan which was approved for the adjacent Chartwell shopping plaza;
 - (3) the possible relocation of the TTC bus stop; and
 - (4) the opinion of the Chartwell plaza owner respecting traffic issues at this location.

(Carried)

- B. Councillor Ashton moved that the Scarborough Community Council advise the Works Committee that it supports the construction of the Pedestrian Refuge Island at Brimley Road south of Huntingwood Drive, which was not voted upon as the motion by Councillor Shaw carried.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Hooman Rowshanbin, area resident;
- Ms. Rhona Swarbrick, representing The Toronto Pedestrian Committee; and
- Mr. Mario Farisco, area resident.

(Clause No. 26(c), Report No. 9)

7.12 Preliminary Report
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000008
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000016
Victoria Court Ltd., 2933 Sheppard Avenue East
Sullivan Community
(Ward 14 – Scarborough Wexford)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 28, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be directed to schedule a community consultation meeting together with the Ward Councillor(s);

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) notice for the community consultation meeting be given to landowners and residents within 120 metres of the site; and
- (3) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act and notice be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act.

On a motion by Councillor Kelly, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(e), Report No. 9)

7.13 Preliminary Report
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000009
Omers Realty Holdings Inc., 300 Borough Drive
(Ward 15 - Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be directed to schedule a community consultation meeting together with the Ward Councillors;
- (2) notice for the community consultation meeting be given to landowners and residents within 120 metres of the site; and
- (3) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act, and shall be targeted for the third quarter of 2000.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(f), Report No. 9)

7.14 Preliminary Report
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000017
Omers Realty Holding Co., 300 Borough Drive
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be directed to schedule a community consultation meeting together with the Ward Councillors;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) notice for the community consultation meeting be given to landowners and residents within 120 metres of the site; and
- (3) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act, and shall be targeted for the third quarter of 2000.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(g), Report No. 9)

7.15 Preliminary Report
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000011
Hor-Tan Co., 2981 Kennedy Road
Milliken Employment District
(Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 8, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be directed to schedule a community consultation meeting together with the Ward Councillors;
- (2) notice for the community consultation meeting be given to landowners and residents within 120 metres of the site; and
- (3) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act, targeted for the third quarter of 2000, and notice be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act.

On a motion by Councillor Shaw, the Scarborough Community Council approved the aforementioned report subject to:

- (1) Recommendation No. (2) being amended by adding thereto the following:

“to all properties on the north side of Puma Drive and Wayside Avenue westerly to Silver Spray Boulevard;

all properties on the east side of Silver Spray Boulevard northerly to Perthshire Street;

all properties on the north side of Perthshire Street easterly to Kennedy Road; and

all properties on the west side of Kennedy Road southerly to Puma Drive; and”;

- (2) Recommendation No. (3) being amended by deleting the words “third quarter of 2000” and inserting in lieu thereof the words “first quarter of 2001”:

(Clause No. 26(h), Report No. 9)

7.16 Preliminary Report
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000010
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000010
K. R. Property Management, 100 Mclewin Avenue
Marshalling Yard Employment District
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 30, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council **refuse** the applications on the basis that a vehicle service garage would be inconsistent with the objectives and locational criteria established in the Vehicle Service and Repair Study for the Employment Districts, and the use would establish a precedent in the Marshalling Yard Employment District.

On a motion by Councillor Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council deferred the aforementioned report for consideration at its meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000, as requested by the applicant’s Solicitor.

The Community Council received a communication (July 14, 2000) from Nina Perfetto, Solicitor for the applicant, requesting a one-month deferral, to permit further review of the staff report.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Earl Dunlop, in support of the applications;
- Mr. Shafi Hosain, in support of the deferral;
- Mr. Barry Palmer, in support of the deferral.

(Clause No. 26(i), Report No. 9)

7.17 Preliminary Report
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000006
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000014
Gawler Holdings Ltd.
5811 Steeles Avenue East, East of Middlefield Road
Tapscott Employment District
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider these applications, subject to the owner:
 - (a) resolving the provision of services for the site, to the satisfaction of the Works and Emergency Services Department;
 - (b) submitting a traffic study addressing access to the site, the impact the proposal will have on the surrounding area and the need for new road links, to the satisfaction of the City staff, and
 - (c) submitting a site plan indicating how the proposed development will be accommodated on the property;
- (2) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act; and
- (3) staff be authorized to designate the site fronting onto Steeles Avenue subject to the Site Plan Control By-law, for Council's consideration concurrently with the proposed amendments.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council approved the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(j), Report No. 9)

7.18 Status Report – Site Plan Control Application
Parasco Morrish Inc., 34 Morrish Road
(Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

The Community Council had before it the following:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

(May 29, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, responding to a request by Councillor Moeser that the result of staff negotiations to resolve issues related to the aforementioned Site Plan Control Application be reported to Scarborough Community Council; concluding that the latest proposed site plan is satisfactory to staff, such that the site plan may now be approved, and recommending that this report be received for information; and

(July 17, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council that Site Plan Control Application SS98069 be approved for the proposed development as shown on the drawing entitled "Parasco Morrish Inc.", Site Plan Drawing Number A1, by Claudio Perez, dated June 10, 1999, revised to March 14, 2000 and date stamped May 12, 2000, save and except the grading and drainage information, conditional upon the owner and the City entering into and registering on title, the standard Site Plan Control Agreement, incorporating the following specific provisions:

- (a) the proposed development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the drawing referred to above;
 - (b) all refuse storage is to be contained within the building;
 - (c) site lighting is to be constructed such that the angle of illumination does not extend onto the adjacent lands or public streets;
 - (d) all mechanical and other equipment located on the roof must be screened or integrated into the profile of the buildings to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Planning, East District, and any changes to the roofline as denoted on the drawing shall constitute a change to the site plan, which must have prior written approval of the Director of Community Planning, East District;
 - (e) the owner shall implement the recommendations of the Arborist Report dated July 14, 1999 by David A. Reid, Willand Grounds Maintenance during all stages in the development of the property, including having a Certified Arborist present during any ground-breaking occurring within 3 metres (10 feet) of the trees mentioned in the report. The owner shall also contact the City's Urban Forestry Supervisor, East District, regarding the timing of any ground breaking work; and
 - (f) all work required by the agreement is to be completed within two years from the date the agreement is registered on title.
- A. Councillor Moeser moved that the report of the Director, Community Planning, East District, dated July 17, 2000, be deferred for consideration at the Community Council meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000, to permit the Ward Councillors the opportunity for further consultation respecting the Urban Design Study for the Highland Creek Village, with the

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

request that the Director of Community Planning, East District, provide a history of this project in chronological form.

(Carried)

- B. Councillor Ashton moved that the motion by Councillor Moeser be amended by adding a request that the Director, Community Planning, East District, establish a mediating process, in consultation with the Ward Councillors, and report on a final conclusion to the meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000.

(Carried)

- C. Councillor Mahood moved that Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the supplementary report of the Director of Community Planning, East District dated July 17, 2000, which was not voted upon as the motion by Councillor Moeser, as amended by Councillor Ashton, carried.

The Community Council received a communication (undated) from Councillor Ron Moeser, requesting that the Site Plan Application by Parasco Morrish Inc., 34 Morrish Road, be “bumped up” for review by Community Council and by City Council, a copy of which was provided to all Members of the Community Council, and a copy thereof is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre.

Mr. Bill Kew and Mr. George Parasco, Parasco Morrish Inc., appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and requested that their Site Plan Application be now approved.

(Clause No. 26(n), Report No. 9)

**7.19 Status Report – Phase 4 – SC-W19990005
Scarborough Transportation Corridor Land Use Study
Scarborough Village and Guildwood Communities
(Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 28, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, submitting for the information of Community Council, the June 2000 Discussion Paper respecting Phase 4 of the Scarborough Transportation Corridor Land Use Study and recommending that Community Council direct staff to:

- (1) circulate the Discussion Paper for comment to City Departments, technical agencies, the Working Group and other individuals requesting copies; and

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) issue Notice of a Public Meeting to consider recommendations for appropriate land use designations for the Phase 4 STC lands for the September 19, 2000, meeting of Scarborough Community Council with notice to be provided by newspaper advertisement and to all persons who requested notice through the Study process.

On a motion by Councillor Ashton, The Scarborough Community Council referred the aforementioned report back to the Director of Community Planning, East District, for further consultation, as follows:

- (1) with respect to future circulation;
- (2) with the Ward Councillors and representatives of the community with respect to the method and options available for future circulation to City Departments and Agencies; and further,
- (3) that the Director submit a report on the particular issue of circulation to the Community Council meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000.

Mr. Peter Thachuk, accompanied by other representatives from the Working Group on the Transportation Corridor Study, appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and expressed support for the motion by Councillor Ashton to refer the report back to the Director of Community Planning, East District.

(Clause No. 26(o), Report No. 9)

**7.20 Impact on Scarborough Community
Design Guidelines for Infill Townhouses**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 1, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, responding to Community Council's request, at its May 2, 2000 meeting, when considering a referred report (January 31, 2000) from the Planning and Transportation Committee, respecting "Design Guidelines and Development Standards for Infill Townhouses", that the Director report to Community Council outlining the impact on the Scarborough Community of the proposed Guidelines; advising that these Guidelines were developed by West District staff to respond to a lack of standards and regulations in the Etobicoke community; that they may have some application on a city-wide basis and have therefore been circulated to begin discussions among staff, the public and Members of Council; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(p), Report No. 9)

7.21 Consent Approvals (All Scarborough Wards)

The Community Council had before it a report (June 29, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising of the various Consent Decisions granted by the Director of Community Planning, East District, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(q), Report No. 9)

7.22 Site Plan Control Approvals

The Community Council had before it a report (June 29, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising of the various Site Plan Control Approvals granted by the Director of Community Planning, East District, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(r), Report No. 9)

7.23 New Applications Received

The Community Council had before it a report (June 29, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising of the various new applications received during the four-week period ending June 28, 2000, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(s), Report No. 9)

7.24 Ontario Municipal Board Hearings

The Community Council had before it a report (June 29, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising of the status of various current appeals before the Ontario Municipal Board, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(t), Report No. 9)

7.25 Provision of Litter Bins with Advertising

The Community Council had before it the following:

(June 16, 2000), from the City Clerk, referring a Motion by Councillor Kelly, seconded by Councillor Duguid, which City Council, at its meeting held on June 7, 8 and 9, 2000, adopted, and in so doing, re-opened Clause No. 13, embodied in Report No. 6 of the Scarborough Community Council, only insofar as it pertains to the issue of OMG waste receptacles in the Community Council area of Scarborough; referred this issue to the Community Council and requested the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to submit a report to the Community Council on the implications of the second Operative Paragraph embodied therein, viz:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, within the next 30 days, the City of Toronto offer to amend its contract with OMG to include the Community Council area of Scarborough, so long as OMG is willing to provide its waste receptacles to the Community Council area of Scarborough for the same prices and under the same conditions as it does for the other Community Council areas;” and

(June 30, 2000), from the General Manager, Solid Waste Management Services, responding to the aforementioned direction of City Council; advising that OMG has advised they would be willing to provide their three-compartment litter/recycling bins with advertising in the Community Council area of Scarborough at the same prices and under the same conditions as the other areas; that these new bins would replace the existing 750 City-owned litter bins; and recommending that this report be received for information.

- A. Councillor Kelly moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council that an agreement be entered into with OMG for the provision of litter bins in the Community Council area of Scarborough, subject to a condition that the sites chosen meet with the

approval of the Transportation Division, and on terms and conditions similar to the existing contract between the City and OMG media.

(Carried)

- B. Councillor Ashton moved that Councillor Kelly's Motion be amended to include a provision that the Ward Councillors be consulted on the location of the litter bins.

(Carried)

- C. Councillor Mahood moved that the Scarborough Community Council request the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to report directly to City Council at its meeting to be held on August 1, 2 and 3, 2000 on the opportunities available to the City to tender the provision of litter bins with advertising in the Scarborough community.

(Carried)

(Clause No. 10, Report No. 9)

**7.26 Status of the Annual Volunteer Recognition Night
Scarborough Community Council Area**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 27, 2000) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, responding to Community Council's request, at its December 2, 1999 meeting, when it recommended to City Council the format and process for the Annual Recreation Recognition Night (Scarborough), that the Commissioner report to Community Council on the status of the arrangements; advising that staff are proceeding with the plans and in accordance with the approved Awards criteria for this year's event to be held on Monday, September 18, 2000; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(v), Report No. 9)

7.27 Harmonization of the Property Standards By-Law

The Community Council had before it a report (June 15, 2000) from the City Clerk, advising that the Planning and Transportation Committee, at its meeting held on June 12, 2000, referred the report (May 30, 2000) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services, respecting the harmonization of the Property Standards By-law to all

Community Councils for review and comment thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee.

On a motion by Councillor Balkissoon, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to the Planning and Transportation Committee, when it considers the proposed Property Standards By-law, that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services report on including in the By-law a provision that garbage receptacles for all residential detached, semi-detached or street townhome dwellings be stored within a garage or in the rear yard screened from the streetline; and
- (2) the City Solicitor report on including in the By-law a provision requiring kitchen exhausts in residential dwellings to be vented above the roofline in order to mitigate the impact of cooking odours on neighbouring properties.

(Clause No. 26(w), Report No. 9)

**7.28 Proposed Turn Prohibition at Private Driveway
at 2511 Markham Road, North Side of Finch Avenue
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)**

The Community Council had before it the following:

(July 11, 2000) from the City Clerk advising that City Council, at its meeting held on July 4, 5 and 6, 2000, struck out Clause 4, embodied in Report No. 7 of the Scarborough Community Council, respecting the aforementioned Proposed Turn Prohibition, and referred it back to the Scarborough Community Council for further consideration; and

(July 14, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, advising that the recommendations embodied in his previous report (June 4, 2000), which were referred back by City Council, are no longer required in that the developer of this site, Tzemis Investments Limited, has submitted supplementary documentation and minor site plan revisions such that the existing permitted turning movements at this private driveway can remain; that staff are satisfied that this access meets minimum established guidelines, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Cho, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned reports.

(Clause No. 26(x), Report No. 9)

**7.29 Request For Direction
Review of Official Plan Designations, East Side of
Port Union Road, South of Lawrence Avenue (SC-W2000003)
Port Union Village
(Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)**

The Community Council had before it a report (July 11, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, responding to Community Council's direction, at its March 23, 2000, meeting, that the Director of Community Planning, East District, review the Official Plan designations which apply to lands fronting on the east side of Port Union Road south of Lawrence Avenue and report thereon to Community Council, and recommending that:

- (1) staff be authorised to schedule a public meeting under the Planning Act for September, 2000 to consider a City-initiated Official Plan amendment to redesignate lands fronting on the east side of Port Union Road south of Lawrence Avenue and north of the Village Common from Village Mixed Use to Medium Density Residential and City initiated amendments to the Zoning By-law affecting the lands fronting on the east side of Port Union Road between Lawrence Avenue and Cherry Street to implement the Plan changes and to give notice in accordance with the regulations under the Planning Act; and
- (2) Scarborough Community Council request City Council to place the construction of Port Union Road, south of Lawrence Avenue, as a high priority for the City's 2001/2002 Capital Works Programme.

On a motion by Councillor Moeser, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 22, Report No. 9)

**7.30 Preliminary Report
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000013
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000021
Site Plan Application SC-S20000051
1290123 Ontario Inc., 20 Port Union Road
(Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)**

The Community Council had before it a report (July 11, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that staff be authorized, upon satisfactory resolution of the issues detailed in this report, to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider the Zoning and Official Plan amendment applications, and Notice be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act.

On a motion by Councillor Moeser, the Scarborough Community Council approved the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(k), Report No. 9)

7.31 Preliminary Report
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000018
Bionvest Investments Limited, North of Borough Drive
Progress Employment District
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (July 10, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be directed to schedule a community consultation meeting together with the Ward Councillors;
- (2) the applicant be required to submit Official Plan Amendment and Site Plan Control applications;
- (3) the applicant be required to submit a Traffic Impact Study, Wind and Micro-climate Study, Viewline Impact and Shadow Study, and Noise Impact Study;
- (4) staff be directed to process the application in the normal manner, having regard for the emerging Official Plan direction and City Centre Review, and work with the applicant to achieve a high quality development appropriate for the City Centre, having regard to City Centre Design Objectives, including a strong identifiable image to provide an attractive addition to the Scarborough City Centre;
- (5) staff be directed to negotiate with the applicant to secure Section 37 contributions towards the City's Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing, as established by Council, as well as other potential public benefits which may result from emerging City-wide Section 37 guidelines and the City Centre Review;
- (6) the applicant be directed to pursue the preferred access route from Borough Drive, which runs north-south from the property over the Toronto District School Board lands, as an alternative to the designated access route, which runs south-west from the property over the lands on which the Bell Building and woodlot are situated, from Borough Drive; and
- (7) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider the applications, targeted for the first quarter of 2001, subject to the recommendations above; notice of the Public Meeting under the Planning Act to be given according to the Regulations under the Planning Act.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council approved the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(l), Report No. 9)

The Community Council recessed at 12:40 p.m.

The Community Council reconvened at 2:12 p.m.

**7.32 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990015
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990026
Site Plan Control Application SC-S20000037
Petro Canada, 3270 Kingston Road and 5 Bellamy Road South
Scarborough Village Community
(Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)**

The Community Council, at its meeting held on June 20, 2000, conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; deferred its decision thereon to this meeting; and had before it the following:

(July 4, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District reviewing, as requested by Community Council, the proposed Site Plan submitted by the applicant, including the existing parking standard as it pertains to this development, and recommending that Community Council receive this report for information; and

(May 9, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District recommending that City Council:

(1) Official Plan Amendment:

amend the Scarborough Village Community Secondary Plan with respect to the property located at the northeast corner of Kingston Road and Bellamy Road, by deleting the Neighbourhood Commercial Uses designation and incorporating a Medium Density Residential designation, to permit the development of 32 townhouses;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

(2) Zoning By-law Amendment:

amend the Scarborough Village Community Zoning By-law Number 10010, as amended, with respect to 3270 Kingston Road and 5 Bellamy Road South, being Part of Block H, Registered Plan 1104 and Part of Lot1, Registered Plan 1834, by deleting the existing zoning, replacing it as follows:

- (a) permitted use: Multiple-Family Residential (M) Zone;
- (b) one dwelling unit per 110 square metres (1,184 square feet) of lot area;
- (c) minimum building setback 2 metres (6 feet) from the street line;
- (d) minimum east side-yard building setback 5 metres (15 feet);
- (e) minimum building setback 0.6 metres (2 feet) abutting the Single Family Residential (S) Zone;
- (f) the General Provisions requiring a minimum 1.5 metres (5 feet) landscaping strip abutting the Single-Family Residential (S) Zone, shall not apply;
- (g) maximum building coverage 45 percent of the area of the lot;
- (h) maximum building height 3 storeys; and
- (i) an attached garage shall be erected with each dwelling unit;

the provisions of this By-law shall apply collectively to this property notwithstanding its division into two or more parcels;

(3) Site Plan Control:

enact a Site Plan Control By-law to place 5 Bellamy Road South under Site Plan Control; and

(4) Miscellaneous:

authorize such unsubstantive technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as may be required to properly carry out the intent of this resolution.

On a motion by Councillor Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, dated May 9, 2000, subject to striking out Recommendation No. (2) embodied therein in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

“(2) Zoning By-law Amendment:

amend the Scarborough Village Community Zoning By-law Number 10010, as amended, with respect to 3270 Kingston Road and 5 Bellamy Road south, being Part of Block H, Registered Plan 1104 and Part of Lot 1, Registered Plan 1834, by deleting the existing zoning, replacing it as follows:

- (a) permitted use: Multiple Family Residential (M) Zone;
 - (b) maximum number of units 30;
 - (c) minimum building setback 2 metres (6 feet) from the Kingston Road street line;
 - (d) minimum building setback 0 metres from the Bellamy Road south street line;
 - (e) minimum east side-yard building setback 5 metres (15 feet);
 - (f) minimum building setback 0.6 metres (2 feet) abutting the Single-Family residential (S) Zone;
 - (g) maximum building coverage 47 percent of the area of the lot;
 - (h) maximum building height 12.5 metres;
 - (i) an attached garage shall be erected with each dwelling unit;
 - (j) the general provisions requiring a minimum 1.5 metres (5 feet) landscaping strip abutting the Single-Family Residential (S) Zoning shall not apply;
 - (k) the provisions of Clause VI, Section 4, frontage on a street, shall not apply;
 - (l) the provisions of this By-law shall apply collectively to this property notwithstanding its division into two or more parcels.”
-

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (June 16, 2000) from Ms. Pali Tassone:

As a resident of Bellamy Rd. South I would like to bring forth my concerns and comments in regards to the proposed development of the northeast corner of Kingston Rd. and Bellamy Rd. S.

My concerns are as follows.

1. I do not agree with the density issue for this property or the proposed 3 storey town homes. Can the amount of homes not be reduced by 10 or more in order to reduce the density? I look at the development at 50 Markham Rd. (south of Kingston Rd.) a property somewhat larger than this and see 2 storey semi's and town homes with single car garages, visitor parking a total of 18 homes and designed to suit the neighbourhood. These 3 storey homes will no doubt stand out and do not complement the existing neighbourhood.
2. The roadway proposed lends itself to assume that residents will travel west only. How will they travel east? Will Bellamy Rd. become a U turn haven? Imagine the chaos during the school year with Bliss Carmen Public School located on the northwest corner. Will our driveways and the school become turning points for these residents?
3. Visitor parking has not been addressed or solved. Will they park at the school or along Bellamy Rd? I believe this was an issue when the development just east of Bellamy Rd. was built and today we can drive west along Kingston Rd. and find upwards of six plus cars, trucks, etc., parking on the street. I wonder if that will happen here!
4. Will Council or Parks and Recreation Department up grade the park on Martindale Ave. to accommodate this new development, which will obviously house children?
5. Since the Catholic schools in the area, (3 to be exact within a 5 min. drive) are at capacity; where will these children go to school? Will the residents be informed of this prior to purchasing these homes?

Secondly I would like to comment on the conclusion statements in the Recommendation Report from the Director of Community Planning East District (Ted Tyndorf).

1. This development has no residences facing Kingston Rd. what is meant by street related uses? It does however mean that over 50% of the homes will face Bellamy Rd. How do they provide a link to Kingston Rd.! As for Bellamy Rd. I do not consider it to be a major thoroughfare especially since the speed limit here is 40kpm, and comes to a dead end at Eglinton Ave.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

2. Construction is a temporary employment issue for this development (not an on going issue), and will also be accomplished if the number of homes is reduced.
3. The proposed garages are located internally: Does this mean street level or underground? Further to this, will the future residents be informed of the prior land usage namely a Petro Canada gas station? Will tests be done on the land to ensure that the soil is still "contaminant free"? (Removal occurred only 1 year ago) If health issues or other related problems should arise in the future who will be responsible: the resident, the builder, the city?
4. If the city's objective is to encourage the intensification of development along major roads then do so along Kingston Rd. not Bellamy Rd. where yes it is predominantly a single family (bungalows and 1.5 storey homes) residential neighbourhood.

That is what we want and that is why we chose to live here so many years ago. Council should consider converting some of the used car lots along Kingston Rd. to residential homes.

In conclusion I would like to say once again that low density residential housing is welcomed, not medium density housing, not on Bellamy Rd. Do not make this neighbourhood look unappealing. The planning department should work with the builder to develop homes that compliment this neighbourhood (2 storey maximum) and homes that are not crowded together.

The Scarborough Community Council received a document provided by Mr. Bernie Feintuch, Solicitor for the applicant, containing signatures from Craig Abbott and Jim Turner, residents, indicating their support of the application.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 10, 2000) from Mr. Leslie Zold:

Thank you for publicly acknowledging at the June 20th meeting that communication between the community and the City Planning Department was not as it should have been. As a matter of fact, it appears that the same communication problem exists between the councillors and the Planning Department as well.

We are pleased that the voting of the applications has been postponed to the July 18th Public Meeting. At that meeting we will have another opportunity to express and reiterate our concerns regarding the applications. In essence our main concern is the application for rezoning 5 Bellamy Road S from single-family dwelling property to medium density residential property.

According to the Recommendation Report of May 9, 2000, and I quote; "The residential properties to the north consist of deep lots that may have the potential to redevelop the

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

rear portions in conjunction with abutting Highway Commercial properties fronting Kingston Road, as of a Land assembly.” We feel that this paragraph in the Recommendation report Supports our concern of future development of medium density residential housing.

Interestingly enough, the letter supporting the projects submitted at the June 20th meeting by Mr. Pitino’s legal counsel, was provided by the individual who attended at the February 10th meeting and expressed concerns about the closeness of the townhouses to his property line. However, this individual from 7 Bellamy Road S. has since then sold his house to no other than Mr. Pitino. (Sold date May 4, 2000, closing date June 30, 2000) This is a strong indication that developers are planning to buy and develop the properties further north into medium density residential housing.

A second support for the applications came from the property owner of 9 Bellamy Road S. This individual is an absentee landlord. I have lived in this neighbourhood for over 22 years and that house has always had tenants. It appears that the verbal support given to the applications is self-serving in the hope that the development will move further north on Bellamy Road and he will be able to sell his property to a developer. There is a strong possibility that the owner of this property will be the next one to be approached with an offer to buy.

Our understanding is that at the July 18th meeting only the site plan will be discussed. In view of the new information outlined above, we would respectfully request that the rezoning issue of 5 Bellamy Road S. be put back on the agenda.

In summary, we all support the development of the vacant Petro Canada site but we are gravely concerned about rezoning 5 Bellamy Road S. which is a single-family residential property and doing so setting a precedent for the future for uninvited development. The recent change of ownership of 7 Bellamy Road S. property strongly indicates that the concerns of the community are very real. Mr. Ashton our community strongly urges you to vote against the rezoning of 5 Bellamy Road S. from a single-family dwelling to a medium density residential property.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 18, 2000) from Mr. John Cesaroni:

I have reviewed two staff reports labelled (28) and (32), dated May 9, 2000, and July 4, 2000, respectively. On June 20, 2000, I attended a Scarborough Council meeting held to discuss amendments to local by-laws in order to facilitate the construction of thirty-two (32) freehold town-homes on the north-east corner of Bellamy and Kingston Road. I expressed my concerns and objection to said amendments and we engaged in some discussion. My concerns revolved around issues of high density, traffic congestion and probable parking problems, public safety and land dedication to the city. These staff reports partially address some of the issues that I complained of, however, for the most part your office is forging ahead with plan largely unchanged from your original.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

It is proper that you require a 3-meter (10 feet) land dedication from the applicant and your office has seemingly agreed to this land dedication, however, your office has decided to ask for only half of the land dedication required. Your office has requested land dedication only on Bellamy Road and not on Kingston Road. Your argument is that you do not need that particular stretch of land at this time. This is unacceptable. Your office has not employed the strip of land in front of my home, even once, in the fourteen (14) years since you appropriated it. Of course, since you have never used the strip of land in front of my home and apparently never anticipated using it, then by the same rule you should return the land back to me, its proper owner.

It appears that no proper traffic survey has been conducted and it therefore seems impossible for your office to determine the impact of such proposals. However, your office seems to be pushing this particular agenda forward despite inadequate knowledge or understanding of the vehicular problems such a plan brings.

The increase in vehicles in the area will bring with it a number of safety issues. For example, there is a school opposite to the proposed buildings. There is immediate danger to the young citizens of the area in that more traffic in the immediate area of the school greatly increases the likelihood of accident. Difficult of access and egress to Kingston and Bellamy Road will encourage reckless and irresponsible driving and this will also increase the accident toll.

The problems associated with high-density neighbourhoods are self-evident. The benefits of movement towards high or even medium-density accommodations are not clearly argued nor are they self-evident. Your office must explain or make clear why the current residents of the area should endorse such a movement. It seems to me that a movement toward low-density housing is more beneficial to society and your objective should be to ease the stress of high-density areas, not increase it. If the purpose of high-density accommodation is to increase your tax base, then high-density accommodations benefit you and not society. This seems improper to me and was not, as I recall, part of the city election platform.

In closing, I would draw your attention to the matter of the relocation of the existing bus shelter. I would recommend that the shelter be located on the north-west corner of Kingston Road at Bellamy. I believe that this will reduce traffic problems arising from the bus obstructing the through traffic at the intersection.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council, at the Public Meeting held on June 20, 2000, in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Bernie Feintuch, Solicitor, on behalf of the applicant, who tabled a letter from two residents on Bellamy Road in support of the application, which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre;
- Mr. Peter Pitino, the applicant, in support of the application;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- Mr. John Cesaroni, area resident, in opposition to the application;
- Mr. Leslie Zold, area resident, in opposition to the application; and
- Mr. Dave Richardson, area resident, in opposition to the application.

(Clause No. 12, Report No. 9)

**7.33 City-Initiated Technical Zoning By-Law Amendments
Birchcliff, Ionview, Kennedy Park, Dorset Park,
Bendale, West Hill and Malvern Communities**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it, a report (June 28, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (1) amend the following Scarborough Zoning By-laws in order to implement the changes outlined in the attached table:

Number 8786, the Birchcliff Community Zoning By-law;
Number 9350, the Bendale Community Zoning By-law;
Number 10048, the Eglinton Community Zoning By-law;
Number 9276, the Kennedy Park Community Zoning By-law;
Number 9089, the Ionview Community Zoning By-law;
Number 9508, the Dorset Park Community Zoning By-Law;
Number 10327, the West Hill Community Zoning By-law;
Number 24982, the Employment Districts Zoning By-law;
Number 13219, the Malvern East Agricultural Holding Zoning By-Law;

and

- (2) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Zoning By-law amendments as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

On a motion by Councillor Berardinetti, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 13, Report No. 9)

**7.34 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990020
Draft Plan of Subdivision Application SC-T19990004
Parcival Developments Limited
79-91 Westcroft Drive and 30 Weir Crescent
West Hill Community
(Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 7, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Zoning By-law:

amend the West Hill Community Zoning By-law No. 10327, as amended, with respect to Part of Lots 40-42, Registered Plan 2160 and Part of Lot 8, Registered Plan 2179, by deleting the existing performance standards applicable to these lands and replacing them with the following:

- (a) one single-family dwelling per parcel of land with a minimum frontage of 13.4 metres (44 feet) on a public street and a minimum lot area of 440 square metres (4,736 square feet);
- (b) one single-family dwelling per parcel of land with a minimum frontage of 12.8 metres (42 feet) on a public street and a minimum lot area of 390 square metres (4,200 square feet);
- (c) minimum front yard building setback of 6 metres (20 feet) from the street line;
- (d) minimum side yard building setback of 1.2 metres (4 feet) from each side for a one-storey dwelling plus 0.6 metres (2 feet) for each additional or partial storey;
- (e) detached and attached garages may be erected within 0.3 metres (1 foot) of the side lot line, provided they are at least 1.5 metres (5 feet) from the dwelling on the adjoining property;

(2) Draft Plan of Subdivision:

approve the Draft Plan of Subdivision by Parcival Developments Ltd., with respect to the lands at 79-91 Westcroft Drive and 30 Weir Crescent, being Part of Lots 40-42, Registered Plan 2160 and Part of Lot 8, Registered Plan 2179, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Plan as stamped approved this date as shown on Figure 2;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (b) the owner to make satisfactory arrangements with the Toronto Hydro Electric Commission for Water and Electrical Distribution Systems, including a street lighting system;
- (c) the owner to make satisfactory arrangements with Bell Canada regarding any Bell Canada facilities required to service this development;
- (d) all road reserves shall be deeded at no cost to the City;
- (e) the owner to make satisfactory arrangements with the City regarding all services and easements;
- (f) the owner to enter into a standard subdivision agreement for the construction of Pickford Road as a fully serviced municipal road;
- (g) prior to the registration of the plan, the owner is required to acquire at his sole cost, the lands required for the servicing of the subdivision lands for sewers and watermain, and the road connection to Craggview Drive;
- (h) the owner to construct, at his sole cost, all external services required for the servicing of the proposed subdivision;
- (i) the owner to agree to practice Storm Water Management in the development of these lands;
- (j) the owner to agree to pay:
 - (i) \$300.00 per hydrant for fire hydrant maintenance;
 - (ii) \$40.00 per unit for geodetic survey and aerial mapping;
 - (iii) \$300.00 per dwelling unit for planting and maintenance of street trees on the public road allowance;
- (k) prior to the registration of the plan and lot grading, the owner to obtain the approval of the Tree Conservation By-law Co-ordinator, Scarborough Region, of a tree preservation plan for this development; and

(3) Miscellaneous:

authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Zoning By-law Amendment as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

On a motion by Councillor Moeser, the Scarborough Community Council deferred consideration of the aforementioned report to the meeting to be held on September 19, 2000 at 2:00 p.m. as a continuation of the Public Meeting under the Planning Act, with the request that the Director review these applications with respect to achieving a 50 foot frontage standard for these lots and report thereon to Community Council.

Mr. Murray Pearson, Solicitor, representing the applicant, appeared before Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and in support of the staff recommendations.

(Clause No. 26(d), Report No. 9)

**7.35 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000002
Draft Plan of Subdivision Application SC-T20000001
Monarch Construction Limited
Kennedy Road, South of Purcell Square
Steeles Community
(Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it a report (June 28, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (1) approve the proposed zoning by-law amendment as follows:
 - (a) amend the Agricultural Holding Bylaw 10217, by deleting the lands from it and adding the lands to the Steeles Community Zoning By-law 16762;
 - (b) zone the lands S – “Single-Family Residential”, O-DP – “Open Space District Park” and NP- “Neighbourhood Park”;
 - (c) Frontage:
 - (i) 9 metre (144 lots);
 - (ii) 12 metre (18 lots);
 - (d) ground floor area is not to exceed 50 percent of the lot;
 - (e) Setbacks:
 - (i) Street yard 3.0 metres to main wall;
 - (ii) Street yard 6.0 metres for main wall containing garage;
 - (iii) Rear yard 7.5 metres;
 - (iv) Side Yard 1.0 metres on one side;
 - (f) a garage to be provided for each dwelling;
 - (g) by exception, permit construction of 7 model homes and one temporary sales trailer prior to registration of the subdivision agreement;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Zoning By-law amendments as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution; and
 - (3) recommend the City Chief Planner approve Draft Plan of Subdivision SC-T20000001 subject to the conditions detailed in the aforementioned report.
- A. Councillor Shaw moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, as amended by the supplementary report dated July 5, 2000, recommending additional conditions of Draft Plan Approval, and subject to adding under “(3) (e)”, the following Condition of Draft Plan Approval:
- “(e) (viii) the owner agrees in the Subdivision Agreement that, in the event Lots 68 to 72 or any part thereof is sold or transferred or exchanged in any form or manner with the abutting church to the north, or any subsidiary or agent thereof, the owner will not close the sale until the lands are rezoned for church purposes;”.

(Carried)

- B. Councillor Mahood moved that the words “5 percent or less” in Recommendation No. (3) (d) (i) be struck out and the words “to 5 percent” be inserted in lieu thereof.

(Carried)

Mr. Derrick Andreychuk appeared before the Community Council on behalf of Monarch Construction Limited, and indicated support for the staff recommendations, as amended by the supplementary report, and as further amended by the Scarborough Community Council.

(Clause No. 14, Report No. 9)

**7.36 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990024
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990043
Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited
4675 Steeles Avenue
(Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it a report (June 19, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (1) deem that any adjustment to the alignment of the future Redlea extension, such as that being proposed by Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited, complies with the general intent of the Official Plan to the extent such alignment is found to be technically appropriate, without the necessity of further Plan amendment;
- (2) amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Milliken), as amended, with respect to 4675 Steeles Avenue East and abutting lands to the rear being purchased by Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited, as follows:
 - (a) delete Exception No. 39 of the By-law as it applies to 4675 Steeles Avenue East, such that the full Community Commercial (CC) zoning shall apply, permitting day nurseries, financial institutions, offices, places of worship, personal service shops, restaurant and retail stores;
 - (b) delete the existing Industrial (M) zoning on the rear portion of the site, and replace it with the same Community Commercial (CC) zoning, such that the permitted overall gross floor area over the combined site is limited to 0.30 times the lot area, and that a maximum of 1 821 square metres (19,600 square feet) of outdoor storage space in conjunction with a retail use is permitted not less than 150 metres (494 feet) from the Steeles Avenue street line;
 - (c) direct that the provisions of the new zoning to apply collectively to this land, notwithstanding its future division into two or more parcels;
 - (d) apply a Holding Provision (H) to prevent development of the rear portion of the subject site, and providing that the Holding Provision (H) shall only be lifted from the zoning, in whole or in part by amending By-law, when Council is satisfied as to the suitability and adequacy all road and access arrangements necessary to provide and maintain appropriate access to the Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited property and other affected properties; and
- (3) authorize such unsubstantive technical, stylistic or format changes as may be necessary to the Zoning By-law to properly carry out the intent of this resolution.

On a motion by Councillor Mahood, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, subject to the following amendments:

- (1) Recommendation No. (2)(a) be amended by deleting the words "Community Commercial (CC)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Special District Commercial", and inserting the words "restricted to 10,000 square feet" after the word "restaurant";

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) Recommendation No. (2)(b) be amended by deleting the words "Community Commercial (CC)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Special District Commercial"; and
- (3) Recommendation (2)(d) be amended by adding thereto the words:

"and further, Canadian Tire be required to enter into a Cost Sharing Agreement with respect to the sewer extensions on Redlea Avenue on a pro rata basis as per their previous agreement."

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 17, 2000) from Henry Chiu, Architect:

The undersigned is the agent for the owner at 4631 Kennedy Road, Scarborough, Ontario, Kennedy Medical Centre. In regard to the proposal to amend the official plan and the zoning by-law to permit the construction of the buildings as shown on the Notice of Public Meeting, my client has the following concerns:

- (1) Kennedy Medical Centre had been working on an addition on the westerly properties presently owned by my client, and also in process of acquiring more land adjoining to this property. The Canadian Tire's proposal will have major traffic circulation impact on my client's development plan.
- (2) The overpass or underpass proposals on Steeles Avenue East at the present time are not clear.
- (3) The accesses to all properties both north and south of Steeles Avenue East around this area will create a confusing traffic circulation to all properties. The location of proposed traffic signal light will ease the traffic flow; however, the proposed location by Canadian Tire may not be the best option without the clear understanding or decision of the overpass or underpass proposal on Steeles Avenue East.
- (4) The overall commercial density, parking and traffic flow onto Steeles Avenue East, generated from the current Canadian Tire's Proposal, Kennedy Medical Centre and its future expansion, Pacific Mall and Market Village to the north should be agreed upon by all property owners before rushing into a decision on this application proposed by Canadian Tire Limited.

For your information, attached is a preliminary site plan showing the addition on the Kennedy Medical Centre property and the vacant lots east of Redlea Avenue. An application may be filed shortly upon receiving confirmation of the decision to purchase the city and private owned lands.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

Please consider the above concerns addressed on behalf of the owner at 4631 Kennedy Road, Scarborough, and contact the undersigned if you need further information.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Craig Hunter, Armstrong Hunter, Planning Consultants, on behalf of Canadian Tire and in support of the staff recommendations respecting the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications and advising that Canadian Tire supports an underpass on Steeles Avenue East; and
- Mr. Gordon Bolt, owner of four lots near this application on Steeles Avenue East, expressing concerns respecting the possible outcome of the Environmental Assessment on the overpass/underpass and its potential effect on the value of his lots.

(Clause No. 15, Report No. 9)

**7.37 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990027
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990047
Bank of China (Power of Sale)
4430-4438 Sheppard Avenue East and 2095 Brimley Road
Marshalling Yard Employment District
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it a report (June 26, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Official Plan:

amend the Marshalling Yard Employment Secondary Plan with respect to the property at the northeast corner of Sheppard Avenue and Brimley Road by deleting Section 6.1 of Numbered Policy 6;

(2) Zoning By-law:

amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law Number 24982 (Marshalling Yard) with respect to the lands at the northeast corner of Sheppard Avenue and Brimley Road, being Part of Lot 24, Concession 3 by:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (a) amending the permitted uses by deleting “Hotels, excluding Adult Entertainment Parlours”, and adding a Mall Food Retail Outlet use;
- (b) deleting the performance standards pertaining to the gross floor area of uses other than Hotels and Offices, and the site specific hotel definition;
- (c) amending the performance standard restricting the gross floor area of restaurants and take-out food outlets and associated seating areas such that the gross floor area of all Restaurants and Mall Food Retail Outlets and associated seating areas are restricted to a maximum gross floor area of 1505 square metres (16,200 square feet) within which the gross floor area of all Restaurants shall not exceed 680 square metres (7,320 square feet); the associated seating areas to the Mall Food Retail Outlets shall be permanently delineated and separated from enclosed malls used for walkway purposes;
- (d) amending the performance standard regarding Section 37 requirements by: replacing the requirement for bus stop relocation and consolidation with a requirement to maintain the bus stops and shelters (northwest and southeast corners of the intersection) in conjunction with the widenings for the proposed left turn lanes; amending the provision for traffic signal plant to include any signal plant required to optimize signal timing and phasing of the intersection; and, that any Section 37 agreements be registered prior to the issuance of any building permit;
- (e) applying the following existing By-law performance standards to the lands:
 - (i) Mall Food Retail Outlet shall mean a building or structure or part thereof which abuts an enclosed climate controlled public walkway or mall, and where food and beverages are offered for sale or sold to the public for consumption on or off the premises, but does not include a Restaurant or Grocery Store;
 - (ii) minimum 6.0 parking spaces per 100 square metres (1,076 square feet) of gross floor area for Mall Food Retail Outlet uses; and

(3) Miscellaneous:

authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Councillor Cho moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

Recorded Vote:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Cho, Duguid,
Mahood, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki-10

Nays: Nil

Decided unanimously in the affirmative by the Members of Community Council
present and voting.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 14, 2000) from Mr. Dave Beaumont, President, C.D. Farquharson Community Association:

C.D. Farquharson Community Association is in support of Amendment application SC2199004. Most specifically, we are interested in completion and development of the Bank of China building on the N.E. corner of Brimley and Sheppard.

This is a boarded-up, abandoned building site for five years and has given our community many concerns. Currently, the most outstanding problem is the negative effect this abandoned site has on the vitality of Sheppard Avenue. It is detrimental to other business development on the street and affects the property values of all residents. This would be a first step in allowing Sheppard Avenue to develop and grow.

There is a proposal to complete this building from Mr. Chin and his Associates. Mr. Chin owns other properties on Sheppard Avenue which he has taken action to clean-up and develop. We need to have this abandoned site completed.

C.D. Farquharson is a Resident Community Association of 1300 homes bounded by Sheppard, Midland, 401 and McCowan.

Mr. Alfred Szeto, Architect, appeared before the Community Council on behalf of the applicant and in support of the staff recommendation.

(Clause No. 16, Report No. 9)

**7.38 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990005
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990008
Brimley Progress Development Inc.
South-West Corner of Brimley Road and Progress Avenue
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it a report (July 11, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (1) Matters to be provided under Section 37 of the Planning Act, R.S.O 1990:

direct planning staff to continue to negotiate with the applicant regarding a Section 37 agreement and report further to Scarborough Community Council on the outcome of Section 37 negotiations. The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as set out below should not be enacted by Council unless the applicant agrees to provide Section 37 public benefits, such public benefits to be further reported to Scarborough Community Council and then City Council prior to the enactment of the bills;

- (2) Official Plan:

following the settlement of Section 37 matters as outlined in Recommendation (1) above, amend the City Centre Secondary Plan with respect to the lands at the southwest corner of Brimley Road and Progress Avenue as follows:

- (a) the City Centre Land Use Plan, Figure 4.1.1, is amended by adding Numbered Policy 13 to the existing City Centre Uses designation;
- (b) the City Centre Secondary Plan is amended by adding the following Numbered Policy to Section 4.1.7, Numbered Policies:

“13. Southwest corner of Brimley Road and Progress Avenue

- 3.1 City Centre Residential Uses shall not exceed a density of 426 dwelling units per hectare (173 units per acre).
- 3.2 Lands for park or other recreational purposes for the development shall be provided pursuant to Section 42(3) and 51.1(2) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, which allows the use of an alternative parkland conveyance of up to 1 hectare of land for every 300 dwelling units or a lesser amount, which may be taken as a cash payment in lieu of a land dedication.
- 3.3 Amendments to the Zoning By-law to permit increased density or heights of development may require a financial contribution to the City's Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing or may require owners of land to enter into agreements with the City to provide for affordable housing units, and may require the provision of facilities,

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

services or matters to improve the landscaping, pedestrian, transportation, and/or community facilities available to City Centre and area residents and employees, pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990.”;

- (c) the City Centre Densities Map, Figure 4.1.2, is amended by deleting the Office Plus Retail density notation of 3 times the land area and the residential density of 150 dwelling units per hectare and adding the notation “For Density, see Numbered Policy on Figure 4.1.1.”;

(3) Zoning By-law:

following the settlement of Section 37 matters as outlined in Recommendation (1) above, amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Progress), as amended, with respect to the lands located at the southwest corner of Brimley Road and Progress Avenue, being Part of Lot 25, Concession 2, by deleting the existing Industrial (M) zoning, and replacing it with City Centre Residential (CCR) and City Centre Commercial (CCC) zoning, as follows:

- (a) maximum of 762 dwelling units, including a maximum of 100 Residential/Employment Units;
- (b) only dwelling units between the 1st and 6th floors may be used as Residential/Employment Units;

“Residential/Employment Unit” means a dwelling unit which may be combined with one or more of the following non-residential uses:

- (i) offices;
- (ii) personal service shops;
- (iii) service shops (excluding auto-related service shops);
- (iv) studios;
- (iiv) educational facilities;

occupied and operated by one or more persons residing in the dwelling unit;

- (c) City Centre Commercial (CCC) Uses shall not exceed a maximum gross floor area of 4033 square metres (43,500 square feet);
- (d) City Centre Commercial (CCC) Uses shall be limited to the following uses:

Day Nurseries;
Financial Institutions;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

Offices;
Personal Service Shops;
Places of Entertainment;
Recreational Uses;
Restaurants;
Retail Stores;
Service Shops and Studios;

- (e) the total gross floor area of all restaurants shall not exceed 400 square metres (4300 square feet);
 - (f) the total gross floor area of all places of entertainment shall not exceed 520 square metres (5600 square feet);
 - (g) minimum of 1 square metre (11 square feet) gross floor area for common indoor recreational space per dwelling unit.
 - (h) minimum of 1.2 parking spaces per dwelling unit, of which a minimum of 0.2 parking spaces per dwelling unit shall be provided for visitors.
 - (i) maximum height 90 metres (295 feet).
 - (j) the provisions of the By-law shall apply collectively to this land, notwithstanding its future division into two or more parcels of land.
- (4) Matters Under Section 42 of The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990:
- following the settlement of Section 37 matters as outlined in Recommendation (1) above, enact a By-law under the provisions of Section 42(3) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, to require that parkland or cash in lieu be conveyed at the alternative parkland rate of 1 hectare for every 300 dwelling units; and
- (5) authorize any unsubstantive technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as may be required to give effect to this resolution.
- A. Councillor Altobello moved that the aforementioned report be deferred to the next meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000 at 2:00 p.m., with the request that the noise study be completed and illustrate therein mitigating measures respecting the adjacent industrial plants; the Director of Community Planning, East District, to submit a report thereon to the Community Council.

(Lost)

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- B. Councillor Duguid moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

—————
Upon the question that the Community Council extend beyond 6:30 p.m. to complete this item, and defer the balance of the Agenda to July 19, 2000, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Balkissoon, Cho, Duguid, Kelly, Moeser, Tzekas -7
Nays: Councillors Ashton, Shaw, Soknacki -3

Carried, two-thirds of the Members of Community Council present and voting having voted in the affirmative.

- C. Councillor Berardinetti moved that the Motion by Councillor Duguid be amended by inserting the words "and review of the noise study"; and further, the City must be satisfied with the results of the noise study" after the words "Section 37 negotiations;" in Recommendation No. (1) under "Matters to be Provided under Section 37 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990:".

(Carried)

On the question of the adoption of the foregoing Motion B. by Councillor Duguid as amended by Councillor Berardinetti, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Cho, Duguid, Kelly, Shaw, Soknacki -8
Nays: Councillors Ashton, Mahood, Tzekas -3

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 5.

—————
The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 16, 2000) from Mr. Lorne Ross, Lorne Ross Planning Services Inc.:

On October 26th 1999 I wrote on behalf of Transmetro Properties Ltd. to the City Planning Department to indicate Transmetro's interest in the possible traffic impacts of the development application referred to above.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

The applicant has forwarded his traffic study to us and we are satisfied with its conclusions and recommendations.

As the owner of 8.7 hectares of land on the west side of the City Centre, Transmetro Properties Ltd. is pleased to see the Brimley Progress Development Inc. application come forward. We urge Community Council to approve the application as submitted by the applicant.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 12, 2000) from R.C. Morgan, V.P. Finance, Multifoods Inc.:

Regrettably, I will not be able to attend the meeting to approve the plans for the above development on July 18th. However this confirms that Multifoods Inc., owners of the Bick's Plant located at 333 Progress Avenue, Scarborough, do not object to the proposed development.

Due to changes in land zoning for the area, Multifoods have recently made the decision to invest in consolidating their condiment plant operation in Dunnville and within the next two years the Scarborough plant will be closed and offered for sale.

Please note our original letter dated July 9, 1999, copy attached.

(July 9, 1999) communication:

Multifoods Inc. has had a condiments plant "Bicks Pickles" located at 333 Progress Avenue that has been on this site for over 40 years. The plant employs 125 people with summer seasonal staff increasing by a further 200 employees. The plant produces bottled and pouch-packed condiment products that include pickled cumpers, relishes, mustards, peppers, and other products using various spices, herbs, ingredients, vinegars. There also are up to 500 storage tanks that keep raw material vegetables in a brine solution until required for processing. The plant usually works 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. first shift with a second shift from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. A third shift of limited numbers works 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. During the summer season, vegetable trucks arrive all through the day and night delivering product for brine tanking. Finished products are loaded in 40-48 ft. trailers and leave throughout the day commencing at 3 a.m.

Our concerns at the proposed development which abuts the Bicks property at its western and southern sides are as follows:

reclassification of the development to residential/commercial zoning creates a buffer with the industrial zoning of Bicks plant with potential conflicts where future residents may not be aware of:

- steam clouds exiting from the boiler and other plant processes during extreme cold days.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- acrid smells during the pepper processing season in September/October annually.
- occasional odours from the pickle tank farm under certain weather conditions.
- plant processing noises during the late hours of second/third shifts and weekends during fresh pack, and prior to shut down periods.
- truck noises using Progress Avenue and Brimley Road delivering raw materials and ingredients to the plant and carting away finished product.
- heavy flows of personal vehicles traffic when employees start and end shifts.
- from preliminary drawings provided by the developers, the flow of traffic from the development onto Progress Avenue may be a concern, especially traffic wishing to turn West across the flow of the East moving lane.
- view from the higher floors will not be appealing looking over the plant environment and our tank farm is not picturesque.

Due to the above concerns, we ask the planning Committee to carefully consider the economic and environmental impacts of the development and the effect on future residents who will be sited contiguous to a working plant that has been in place for many decades and provides employment, pays taxes, and produces a wide variety of consumer products to the domestic and export market valued at approximately \$55 million. If the development is approved as designed, we would ask that all potential occupiers – both commercial and residential, are fully informed of the Bicks plant and any potential conflicts/impacts.

We should be glad to discuss these points further with you if you should require a more detailed explanation.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Dennis A. Trinaistich, Solicitor for Nabisco Ltd. (Dad's Cookie Plant), requesting deferral of Community Council's recommendations on the aforementioned applications, inasmuch as a master transportation plan is not yet in place for the City Centre area; the draft preliminary noise study has been undertaken without the involvement of his client, who therefore places no confidence in its content; and suggesting that approval of these applications is therefore inappropriate and premature at this time; and

- Mr. Martin Rendl, Planning Consultant, on behalf of the applicant, in support of the staff recommendations and in opposition to the request for deferral, having regard that the projected traffic counts for the application meet with the approval of staff; advising that his client's noise study consultant did indeed attempt to contact Nabisco Ltd. without success; that the work is progressing to address all areas of concern and can be finalized at the Site Plan stage.

(Clause No. 17, Report No. 9)

**7.39 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990009
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990035
Draft Plan of Subdivision Application SC-T19990012
McAsphalt Industries Limited & Rouge River Park Ltd.
8800 Sheppard Avenue East
Rouge Employment District
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it a report (July 12, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(A) Official Plan:

- (1) amend the boundaries of the Rouge Employment District and Rouge Community Secondary Plan by deleting the lands shown for approval on Attachment 6 from the Rouge Employment District Secondary Plan and incorporating them as Neighbourhood 3 of the Rouge Community Secondary Plan;
- (2) amend the designations of these lands by:
 - (a) deleting the following land use designations and numbered policies:

General Industrial Uses with High Performance Standards
Numbered Policy 6

and substituting the following land use designations:

Low Density Residential
Medium Density Residential
Open Space
Numbered Policy 19

(b) adding a new Numbered Policy 19 as follows:

“19. North of Sheppard Avenue East, east of Conlins Road

1. That a school and site as defined under The Education Act, as amended, and under the jurisdiction of the Toronto District School Board, the Toronto Catholic District School Board, or Le Conseil des Ecoles Francaise de la Communaute Urbaine de Toronto, shall be permitted.
2. Council shall utilise the Holding Provisions, section 5.4.3.7 of the Plan, to ensure that necessary environmental remedial or mitigative measures are provided for are in place prior to development. The Zoning By-law shall indicate the conditions whereby the "H" symbol may be removed and development can proceed. These conditions will include the following requirements:
 - (a) That the applicant submit an acknowledged Record of Site Condition satisfactory to the Ministry of the Environment for more than half of the lands to be zoned residential or commercial east of the proposed East Metro Avenue, and its projection north to the Rouge Valley, prior to the lifting of the “H” symbol from the zoning of any lands zoned residential or commercial, use west of this proposed road.
 - (b) That the applicant submit an acknowledged Record of Site Condition satisfactory to the Ministry of Environment for the balance of the lands to be zoned residential or commercial east of East Metro Avenue prior to the lifting of the “H” symbol from the remaining lands to be zoned residential or commercial west of East Metro Avenue and its projection.
 - (c) Remediation of the site shall proceed in phases satisfactory to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services.”;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (3) further amend the Rouge Community Secondary Plan by adding the following General Policy:
- “4.26.2.2 Special Development Area Uses are land uses which are appropriate for an industrial or residential area, whichever is the principal abutting land use to the south, and are compatible with a Zoological Garden land use;” and
- (4) that Scarborough Community Council defer consideration of the Official Plan amendment proposing Residential Mixed Use for that part of the Sheppard Avenue East frontage of the property shown for deferral on Attachment 6 until its meeting of September 19, 2000, to allow for a process of consultation between the applicant, representatives of the community and City staff to produce satisfactory urban design guidelines and a comprehensive land use plan for this area.

Recommending that City Council:

(B) Zoning By-law:

- (1) direct Urban Development Services staff to bring forward an implementing Zoning By-law after the recommendations of Council respecting the draft plan of subdivision for those lands shown for approval on Attachment 7, the By-law to include the following provisions:
- (a) deletion of the area from the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24987 (Rouge) and its addition to the Rouge Community Zoning By-law No. 15907;
- (b) placing of a "Holding (H) Provision" on lands to be zoned for residential uses west of East Metro Avenue, with the removal of the holding provision subject to filing of a Record of Site Condition satisfactory to the Ministry of the Environment in the manner outlined in the proposed new Numbered Policy for the Secondary Plan;
- (c) an exception to permit schools and school sites and parks and related buildings throughout the area shown for approval;
- (d) retention of the existing 20 metre (66 feet) wide Open Space Zone within the 30 metres (100 feet) beyond the top of bank of the Rouge River valley;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (e) provision for the implementation of a Section 37 agreement for the increase in density resulting from the zoning changes, provided the following is secured:
 - a 52 space non-profit, finished, furnished and equipped daycare facility;
 - (f) as a condition of approval, the owner to enter into an agreement pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act, to implement this matter; and
- (2) that Scarborough Community Council defer consideration of the application for that part of the Sheppard Avenue East frontage as shown for deferral on Attachment 7.

Recommending that:

(C) Draft Plan of Subdivision:

- (1) City Council support approval of the draft plan of subdivision application for the area shown for approval on Attachment 7, subject to conditions satisfactory to the City of Toronto, the school boards and other agencies, and, specifically, the revision of the draft plan to show a community park, public elementary and separate secondary school sites in the eastern part of the property and the reservation of the school sites for an adequate period of time;
- (2) Scarborough Community Council defer consideration of the application for draft plan of subdivision approval for the area shown for deferral on Attachment 7 until its meeting of September 19, 2000;

(D) that City Council authorize such unsubstantial technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as may be required to properly carry out the intent of this resolution; and

(E) authorize the Director of Facilities and Real Estate to initiate appropriate action to close those sections of road allowances which are not required for the residential subdivision.

A. Councillor Balkissoon moved that the aforementioned report be approved, subject to the following:

- (1) strike out under (A) Official Plan, Recommendation No. (4), and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- “(4) that the Official Plan Amendment application for Residential Mixed Uses at 100 units per hectare be approved with provision for Holding categories for Urban Design and subject to Site Plan Control;”
- (2) in view of the fact that the landowner is willing to dedicate an additional 20 metres beyond the Top of Bank, without compensation, to satisfy the objective of the Rouge Park Management Plan to bring into public ownership 30 metres from top of the bank of the Rouge River Valley, that Council not require any additional compensation under Section 37 of the Planning Act for densities granted by this application and Council support the following amendments under (B) Zoning By-law:
- (i) Recommendation No. (1) (d) be deleted and the following inserted in lieu thereof:
- “(d) designation of 30 metres beyond the top of the bank as ‘Regional Natural Environment’;”
- (ii) Recommendations Nos. (1)(e) and (f) and Recommendation No. (2) be deleted in their entirety;
- (3) that under (C) Draft Plan of Subdivision:
- (i) Recommendation No. (1), the words “for the area shown for approval on Attachment 7” be deleted; the word “eastern” in the fifth line be deleted and the word “western” be inserted in lieu thereof;
- (ii) Recommendation No. (2) be deleted and the following inserted in lieu thereof:
- “(2) that Scarborough Community Council approve the application for Draft Plan of Subdivision, in principle, and direct staff to prepare conditions of draft approval for the consideration of Community Council at its meeting to be held on September 19, 2000;”;
- (iii) Recommendation No. (3) be added, as follows:
- “(3) that the developer be required to dedicate to the City or to the Conservation Authority an additional 20 metres beyond the existing 10 metres beyond the top of bank of the Rouge River Valley without compensation;”.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- B. Councillor Cho moved that the aforementioned report and the amending motion by Councillor Balkissoon be deferred to the next meeting scheduled to be held on September 19, 2000.

Recorded Vote:

Yeas: Councillor Cho -1

Nays: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki -7

Decided in the negative by a majority of 6.

- C. Councillor Moeser moved that the School Boards be encouraged to share one common school site with common outdoor amenities and consideration also be given to sharing one school building.

Recorded Vote:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Cho, Duguid, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki -8

Nays: Nil.

Decided unanimously in the affirmative by the Members of Community Council present and voting.

On the question of the adoption of Motion A. by Councillor Balkissoon, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki -7

Nays: Councillors Cho -1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 6.

On the question of the adoption of the Recommendations, as amended, a recorded vote was taken as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki -7

Nays: Councillor Cho -1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 6.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 13, 2000) from Mr. Peter D. Lauwers, Miller Thompson, Barristers & Solicitors:

We are counsel for the Toronto Catholic District School Board in connection with this matter.

The Toronto Catholic District School Board has had an opportunity to consider a proposed plan of subdivision put forward by the developer in this matter. The developer has allocated twelve acres to the Board for use as a secondary school site as an alternative to residential uses and has located it on the westerly portion of the development area.

The Board would prefer to be in a campus setting with other public uses such as a recreation centre and park. The Board's experience is that the amount of land required can be reduced, and there are construction and administration savings available to public bodies in joint developments. The concept behind the developer's proposal in locating the public uses in one area on the westerly portion of the property appears to us to be sound. In fact, if the plan proceeds in this way and leads to a joint development, the Board may be able to reduce its required land by a number of acres, depending on the design.

It would be the School Board's preference not to be located near a landfill site or on land where fly ash is present. The Board would prefer a site that is free of any environmental and subsurface structural concerns and will seek appropriate assurances from the developer and, if necessary, from the Ontario Municipal Board through condition of draft plan approval. Given that a secondary school is needed, the Board would also prefer to be located close to an arterial road for transportation purposes. These factors would support the westerly location in preference to an easterly location near the landfill site.

If it is ultimately the decision of Council to locate the City's recreation centre and park on the easterly portion of the site, then the Board will need to balance the benefits of a joint project against the locational concerns. The Board could go to the easterly location, could decide to opt for a stand alone site of 12 acres on the westerly portion. Rather than make a final decision on this matter at this point, the Board would prefer to let the planning process continue until the location of the public facilities has crystalized.

We wish to make it clear, however, that the Board does require a secondary school site in this development area in order to serve this developing part of Scarborough and will be seeking appropriate recognition in the Official Plan amendments, Zoning Bylaw amendments and in the conditions of draft plan approval.

The Toronto Catholic District School Board supports staff recommendations concerning the Official Plan Amendments and the Zoning By-law Amendments. The Board also supports the first recommendation in respect of the Draft Plan of Subdivision subject to the removal of the words "in the eastern part of the property" from the text of the recommendation. In this situation where a hearing is imminent, it would be better to preserve a reasonable degree of flexibility consistent with the observations about the Board's preferential location made earlier in this letter.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

If you have any questions or comments about the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact us. I will be speaking to this letter at the public meeting on July 18, 2000.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 13, 2000) from Calvin White, General Manager & CEO, Toronto Zoo:

I am writing to you with regard to the recent plans by McAsphalt Industries Limited to develop their property on Sheppard Avenue that borders our southern boundary. The comments below relate to our review of the McAsphalt Development Plans, based on meetings and site visits with the owner. We are aware of the zoning change being sought by McAsphalt to implement the proposed amendment to the Official Plan (OMB # 0990200) that re-designates the subject lands from primarily Industrial/Office use to primarily Residential use.

The Toronto Zoo has always preferred Industrial/Office use of the subject land and has met with McAsphalt for many years on plans for this land in the past. With regard to the Residential/Office proposal, as a member of the Rouge Park Alliance we support a full 30 metre buffer from top of bank for this development. This will help to ensure the development respects wildlife habitat corridors, and Rouge Park values and guidelines for set backs as defined in the Rouge Park Management Plan. We would request that the City of Toronto negotiate this with the owner.

It is important to the Zoo to have the residential development consistently fenced with a metal chain link barrier two metres high, to match our Zoo boundary fence in the area for security reasons. This would ensure a double fence system for our security needs.

We want to maintain our current access through Conlins Road to our south site access road in the Rouge Valley, which is our current arrangement with the City and McAsphalt. This is essential for security and maintenance reasons.

We would like to point out that the Zoo site brings with it certain boundary impacts of potential sounds, smells and other associated operating conditions that may not be compatible with a residential development. We would suggest it be a condition of the Owner/Developer, if residential development occurs here, to clearly make these impacts known to future residents.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 14, 2000) from Brad Teichman, McCarthy Tetrault:

We are the solicitors of the Toronto District School Board ("TDSB") in connection with the above noted matters which the Scarborough Community Council is scheduled to consider on Tuesday, July 18, 2000.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

The TDSB's review of the draft plan of subdivision advanced by McAsphalt Industries Ltd. has disclosed three principal issues which are as follows:

- (i) the campus setting;
- (ii) the location of the school block in the westerly area of the draft plan;
and
- (iii) the length of time the school block should be reserved.

We address these issues below.

The plan designates a parcel of approximately five acres for an elementary school located in the westerly quadrant of the plan. The plan contemplates a campus setting comprising the elementary school together with a Catholic school and a recreation centre/community park. TDSB staff anticipate that such an arrangement might serve to reduce its land requirements and associated costs given the economies which the three uses would generate.

The TDSB supports the location of the elementary school block in the westerly portion of the plan. If at all possible, the School Board would prefer not to locate an elementary school in close proximity to the former landfill which abuts the eastern perimeter of the plan. Moreover, we understand that fly ash can be found throughout this portion of the McAsphalt lands. The TDSB will require a site that is environmentally sound. It is also important that the site not require extensive remedial or structural measures to facilitate construction. The foregoing thus militates against locating the elementary school in the easterly portion of the plan.

Should City Council decide to locate the recreation centre and community park in the easterly part of the plan, the TDSB will determine at that point, after evaluating the relative benefits for the proposed campus setting, whether it will construct an elementary school adjacent to the other community uses or opt for a stand alone development in the west.

The TDSB will require that the developer reserve the elementary school block for a period of five to seven years from the date of registration of the plan in order to facilitate the acquisition thereof. We will be requesting that the City impose a condition of subdivision approval which will secure the reservation period. In this vein, the TDSB will be seeking appropriate provisions in the official plan amendment and zoning by-law to permit the elementary school use. We will also be seeking the imposition of conditions requiring that the developer erect warning signs and incorporate warning clauses in all agreements of purchase and sale. The warning signs and clauses will advise that sufficient accommodation may not be available at local schools and that, in those circumstances, alternative accommodation arrangements will have to be made.

We look forward to addressing the Community Council on July 18th.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 17, 2000) from R. M. Christie, Chair, Rouge Park Alliance:

I am writing to you with regard to the recent plans by McAsphalt Industries Limited to develop their property on Sheppard Avenue.

The Rouge Park Alliance supports a publicly owned, 30-metre from top-of-bank, Rouge Park boundary in this area as defined in the Rouge Park Management Plan. The 30 metres is an area adjacent to the stable top-of-bank which helps to protect the ecological integrity of the valley and also provides for restoration where possible.

A 30-metre boundary provides:

- protection of natural heritage features from development and vice versa
- vegetation management
- trails
- control of invasive plants and animals
- habitat
- erosion control
- slope stability
- chemical attenuation
- water quantity and quality control

Resolution #64/00 was also passed by the Rouge Park Alliance on June 16, 2000:

“THAT the Rouge Park Alliance advise the City of Toronto that Section 37 be used to meet the goals and objectives of the Rouge Park Management Plan, that is, the park boundary of 30 metres.”

We appreciate the support of the City of Toronto, Scarborough Community Council, in ensuring that the Rouge Park Management Plan is supported in this area and that the Rouge Park continues to be protected for the future of the community.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 18, 2000) from William Ash:

Please be advised I am Secretary of Great Emerald Construction Company Limited, the registered owner of 8833 Sheppard Avenue East.

The property contains 1.76 acres with 359 feet of frontage on Sheppard Avenue East and is directly south of the property owned by McAsphalt Industries Limited.

I apologize for the late notice being given in this letter, since it was my understanding that our lands were included in the proposal by McAsphalt Industries Limited, as indicated in the original Application.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

It has just come to our attention that in the Staff Report of July 12, 2000, the land south of Sheppard was omitted for consideration by Council which is contrary to the original circulated information.

It is my contention that Council consider the future development on both sides of Sheppard Avenue at the same time.

Failure to deal with the lands on the south of Sheppard would only result in spot zoning and continue the uncertainty of future development of lands in the immediate area.

Great Emerald Construction Company Limited has been the owner of the property to the south since 1966. For many years the lands were subject to a hold by the Ministry of Highways due to the intention of constructing a connecting road between Highways 401 and 407.

Since the hold was removed, no logical effort has been made for the development of the area. A visual inspection reveals an area from the past ages and should be resulted to the benefit of the community.

Great Emerald Construction Company Limited wishes to proceed with development of its property and submits that its lands now be zoned in conjunction with the Application of McAsphalt Industries Limited.

I will be attending the meeting scheduled this afternoon and would appreciate if the concerns of Great Emerald Construction Company Limited be addressed at the meeting.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (July 18, 2000) from Glen De Baeremaeker, President, Save the Rouge Valley System:

Please accept this letter as a request for Scarborough Community Council to require the dedication of a 30 metre strip of land that would become part of the Rouge Park.

To achieve the objectives of the Rouge Park Management Plan, we request that Council amend the staff report to read: "Dedication of the existing 20 metre wide Open Space strip that is now zoned Open Space" in place of the existing condition found within Zoning By-law condition 1d (found on page 4 on the staff report). We also support deletion of conditions 1e and 1f, as the value of the land dedication is similar to the day care facility requested by staff.

We believe the creation of this 30 metre, publicly owned area is essential to the protection of the natural wealth of the Rouge Park adjacent to this development proposal. We also believe securing this 30 metre strip in public ownership will provide a security perimeter for the Toronto Zoo. Protecting the Rouge Park boundary as a condition of approval is consistent with the following:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- the Rouge Park Management Plan calls for a 30 metre park boundary line
- the City of Scarborough voted unanimously to require a 30 metre publicly owned buffer on these lands in 1993; unfortunately staff were unable to secure these lands
- the Rouge Park Alliance supports the 30 metre park boundary line being in public ownership
- the Toronto Zoo supports the protection of the full 30 metres for this development
- Mr. Brian Denny, of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, has verbally supported the protection for this 30 metre strip in public ownership
- community groups such as Save the Rouge have asked for this area to be protected
- members of the public at the last public meeting supported protecting the 30 metres
- the owner is prepared to dedicate the 30 metres to the City or Conservation Authority, provided that no further amenities are required of them.

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communication (June 7, 2000) from David Williams, Planning Consultant:

Gord Petch and I have developed the attached 'POLICY' of the development of the Sheppard Avenue frontage lands.

We welcome your review and comments.

McAsphalt Avenue Frontage Development.

Suggested Official Plan Policies.

Proposed Land Use Designation – Commercial Mixed Use – Special Policy Area.

1. The lands designated Commercial Mixed Use – Special Policy Area are intended primarily for types of uses that will create significant employment opportunities and densities to allow for their integration into the development of the surrounding residential community.
2. The Commercial Mixed Use – Special Policy Area designation permits a variety of office, commercial, residential and community facility uses. These uses may be developed in separate buildings or may combine within the same building or multi-use project. Where uses are combined in the same building or project, densities may be cumulative up to a level determined by the compatibility of the development with existing or proposed surrounding land uses.
3. A) Non-Residential development may be permitted to a maximum density of approximately 0.5 times the site area, to a maximum height of 18 metres.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- B) Residential development may be permitted to a maximum density of 100 units per hectare, to a maximum height of 4 stories.
 - C) Community Facilities may be permitted at densities compatible with adjacent existing properties of proposed surrounding land uses.
4. Primary Uses within this designation include:
- A) Office uses, including medical offices and medical clinics.
 - B) Retail commercial uses, including service stations.
 - C) Restaurants, including drive through facilities.
 - D) Residential uses, including apartments, town houses and combined live/work accommodation.
 - E) Nursing home.
 - F) Retirement facility.
 - G) Employment generating uses compatible with other uses permitted under this designation.
 - H) Community Facilities in accordance with Section 3.2 of the Official Plan.
5. The provisions of Section 3.6.2.6 of the official Plan shall apply to the development of retail stores and restaurants.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Gordon Petch, Solicitor for the applicants;
- Mr. Glenn De Baeremaeker, President, Save the Rouge Valley System;
- Mr. William Ash, Solicitor and Secretary of Great Emerald Construction Company Limited;
- Mr. Peter D. Lauwers, Counsel for the Toronto Catholic District School Board; and
- Mr. Brad Teichman, Solicitor for the Toronto District School Board.

(Clause No. 18, Report No. 9)

The Community Council recessed at 7:30 p.m.

The Community Council reconvened at 10:15 a.m. on July 19, 2000.

**7.40 Review of Options for Household Waste
that Exceeds the Collection Item Limit**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 30, 2000) from the General Manager, Solid Waste Management Services, responding to Community Council's request, at its May 23, 2000 meeting, when it considered the Proposed Residential Solid Waste Collection By-law, that the General Manager report back to Community Council on a policy of accommodating exceptional circumstances which may result in more than the maximum number of items being placed at the curbside for collection; providing an update on the current review by Solid Waste Management Services staff on the options to address this issue; advising that a policy will be recommended to Works Committee in September, 2000; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

(Clause No. 26(u), Report No. 9)

**7.41 Tree Removal on Private Property
between Nos. 84 and 88 Victoria Park Avenue
(Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 20, 2000) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, advising Community Council, in accordance with By-law No. 25150, being a by-law for the protection and conservation of trees, of a request for removal of a private, shared 76 centimetre caliper red oak tree between the residential properties at Nos. 84 and 88 Victoria Park Avenue and recommending that City Council deny the request for such removal.

Councillor Altobello, moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council that:

- (1) the staff recommendation be struck out; and
- (2) the tree removal be permitted subject to two red oak replacement trees with a minimum 100 millimetre caliper trunk being planted; one to be planted at the rear of No. 84 Victoria Park Avenue and one to be planted at the rear of No. 88 Victoria Park Avenue; the timing of the planting to be at the discretion of the Urban Forestry Division, subject to tree no. 3 (red oak 50 centimetre caliper trunk) being protected to the satisfaction of the Urban Forestry Division, this to include wrapping of the trunk and the control of grade changes, and the submission of a letter of credit in the amount of \$4200.00.

(Carried)

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

The Community Council received the following communications:

(July 14, 2000) from Mr. Monty Gray, applicant for tree removal, submitting a summary of the issues surrounding the tree removal application, together with photographs of the site;

(May 30, 2000) from Alan Burke, President, East Beach Community Association, expressing the strong opposition of the East Beach Community Association to the destruction of the tree;

(May 30, 2000) from John & Kathleen Pronych, expressing opposition to the proposed tree removal;

(May 30, 2000) from Lisa McGill & Bryan Shaw, in opposition;

(June 1, 2000) from Michael & Karen Quinn, in opposition;

(June 5, 2000) from Dave & Leslie Williams, in opposition;

(June 5, 2000) from Edna Hanson, in opposition;

(June 6, 2000) from Steve Benedetti, in opposition;

(June 6, 2000) from Hilda Harm, in opposition; and

(June 6, 2000) from Bill Allan, in opposition;

a copy of all of the foregoing communications was provided to all Members of the Community Council, and a copy thereof is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre.

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Alan Burke, President, East Beach Community Association;
- Mr. Monty Gray; and
- Mr. Ian Bruce, Arborist.

(Clause No. 11, Report No. 9)

**7.42 Provision of Outdoor Skating Rinks
in the Scarborough Community**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 27, 2000) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, responding to Community Council's request, on behalf of Councillor Mahood, that the Commissioner report on the various options available to provide enhanced outdoor skating opportunities in the Scarborough Community and recommending that staff continue:

- (1) to provide equipment to local volunteer groups to develop outdoor natural ice rink opportunities in the Scarborough Community; and
- (2) to offer natural ice rink opportunities at ponds located at L'Amoreaux and Milliken Parks.

Councillor Balkissoon moved, on behalf of Councillor Mahood, that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report; and further, that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, be requested to report to Economic Development and Parks Committee on the harmonization of outdoor skating rinks City-wide, including Capital Budget provisions to support such harmonization.

(Carried)

(Clause No. 23, Report No. 9)

**7.43 The Naming of a Landmark in Honour of
the Late Former Scarborough Mayor Gus Harris**

The Community Council had before it a report (July 6, 2000) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, responding to Community Council's request that staff investigate and report to this meeting on the possibility of naming a landmark in the Scarborough community in honour of the late Gus Harris, and recommending that:

- (1) a city park in the Scarborough community be named in honour of Mr. Harris; and
 - (2) staff consult with the Harris family and recommend to Scarborough Community Council the specific park to be renamed, following the parkland naming policy.
- A. Councillor Soknacki moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

(Carried)

- B. Councillor Shaw moved that the motion by Councillor Soknacki be amended by inserting the words “or the new park to be named” after the word “renamed” in Recommendation No. (2).

(Carried)

(Clause No. 20, Report No. 9)

**7.44 Ontario Municipal Board Appeals
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19997009
Zoning By-law Amendment Application SC-Z1999027
Omni at the City Centre Inc., Omni South Inc.
North-East Corners of Brimley Road & Omni Drive
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council had before it a confidential report (July 12, 2000) from the City Solicitor, respecting an upcoming Ontario Municipal Board hearing, such report to be considered in camera having regard that the subject matter may involve litigation or potential litigation.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report; and further, the City Solicitor be requested to report directly to City Council at its meeting of August 1, 2 and 3, 2000 on the retention of expert consultants to provide appraisal evidence at this and other upcoming Ontario Municipal board hearings dealing with Section 37 issues and the funding implications thereof.

(Clause No. 24, Report No. 9)

**7.45 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990013
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990016
Convention Plaza Limited Partnership
Lands on the North Side of Lee Centre Drive
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council conducted a statutory public meeting, in accordance with Section 17 and Section 34 of The Planning Act; appropriate notice of this meeting having been given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder; and had before it the following:

(July 7, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (1) Matters to be provided under Section 37 of the Planning Act, R.S.O 1990:

direct planning staff to continue to negotiate with the applicant regarding a Section 37 agreement and report further to Scarborough Community Council on the outcome of Section 37 negotiations. The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as set out below should not be enacted by Council unless the applicant agrees to provide Section 37 public benefits, such public benefits to be further reported to Scarborough Community Council and then City Council prior to the enactment of the bills.

- (2) Official Plan:

following the settlement of Section 37 matters as outlined in Recommendation (1) above, amend the City Centre Secondary Plan with respect to the lands bounded by Highway 401 on the north, Corporate Drive on the south, Toyota Place on the east, and the Highland Creek on the west by:

- (a) deleting the following from Numbered Policy 8:

“City Centre Residential Uses shall not exceed a density of 190 dwelling units per hectare. Hotel uses on this parcel shall be included in the maximum office plus retail density indicated for this site.”;

and replacing it with the following:

“8.1 City Centre Residential Uses shall not exceed a density of 304 dwelling units per hectare. Hotel uses on this parcel shall be included in the maximum office plus retail density indicated for this site.

8.2 Notwithstanding Numbered Policy 6.3(a) and 6.4 of the City Centre Secondary Plan, the following shall apply to the lands covered by Numbered Policy 8:

Amendments to the Zoning By-law to permit increased density or heights of development may require a financial contribution to the City’s Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing or may require owners of land to enter into agreements with the City to provide for affordable housing units, and may require the provision of facilities, services or matters to improve the landscaping, pedestrian, transportation, and/or community facilities available to City Centre and area residents and employees, pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990.”;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (b) the City Centre Densities Map, Figure 4.1.2, is amended for the lands covered by Numbered Policy 8 by reducing the Office Plus Retail density notation from 1.2 times the land area, to 0.5 times the land area;

(3) Zoning By-law:

following the settlement of Section 37 matters as outlined in Recommendation (1) above, amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Progress), as amended, with respect to the lands located on the north side of Lee Centre Drive, being Blocks 1 and 6, Registered Plan M-2288, by deleting the existing City Centre Office (CCO) zoning, and replacing it with City Centre Residential (CCR) and City Centre Office (CCO) zoning, as follows:

- (a) maximum of 350 dwelling units for the subject lands, excluding the eastern portion to approximately 49 metres (161 feet) west of Toyota Place;
- (b) maximum of 250 dwelling units with a Holding Provision (H), or a maximum of 26,250 square metres (282,500 square feet) of City Centre Office (CCO) Uses and Hotel Uses with a Holding Provision (H), for the eastern portion of the subject lands to approximately 49 metres (161 feet) west of Toyota Place:
 - (i) prior to the removal of the Holding Provision (H) from the zoning, permitted uses on the eastern portion of the subject lands to include only parking areas in association with the proposed residential development on the western portion of the subject lands;
 - (ii) the Holding Provision used in conjunction with the City Centre Residential (CCR) Zone and City Centre Office (CCO) Zone shall be removed in whole or in part by amending By-law upon the submission of a Site Plan to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with Section 4.1.6 of the City Centre Secondary Plan (City Centre Design) and when Council is satisfied as to the availability of transportation improvements, infrastructure and servicing necessary to accommodate any proposed development, and as to the availability of the necessary lands required for the planned Bellamy Road overpass.
- (c) Development Standards:
 - (i) minimum of 1 square metre (11 square feet) gross floor area for common indoor recreational space per dwelling unit;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (ii) minimum of 1.2 parking spaces per dwelling unit, of which a minimum of 0.2 parking spaces per dwelling unit shall be provided for visitors;
 - (iii) the provisions of this By-law shall apply collectively to this land, notwithstanding its future division into two or more parcels of land;
- (d) Existing Development Standards to be retained:
- (i) underground parking is permitted for all uses;
 - (ii) maximum height 110 metres (360 feet);
 - (iii) Height shall mean the difference in elevation between the lowest point of a lot at the front lot line to the highest point of the building or structure excluding chimneys, antennae, mechanical penthouse, mechanical air conditioning units, screens for rooftop equipment and any decorative feature;
 - (iv) gross floor area of all Restaurants and Recreational Uses shall not exceed 0.04 times the total built gross floor area of all Offices and Hotels;
 - (v) gross floor area of all Financial Institutions, Restaurants, Retail Stores, Personal Service Shops and Recreational Uses shall not exceed 0.1 times the total built gross floor area of all Offices and Hotels;
 - (vi) minimum of 1.9 and a maximum of 3 parking spaces per 100 square metres (1076 square feet) of gross floor area for all uses excluding Residential and Hotels; and

(4) Miscellaneous:

authorize any unsubstantive technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments as may be required to give effect to this resolution.

- A. Councillor Balkissoon moved, given that the developer previously provided benefits totalling \$2,028,750.00 to the city in fulfilment of subdivision obligations and an agreement under Section 37 of The Planning Act; and

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

given that the applicant has advised that the commercial permissions are not usable and, therefore, of no value; and

given that Community Council believes that, in exchange for the increased residential density on this property, it is appropriate that the developer be required to provide benefits to the City of Toronto currently under consideration at City Council;

that Official Plan and Zoning Amendment enacting Bills not be approved unless an agreement has been reached and reported to Scarborough Community Council; and, therefore, Recommendation No. (1) be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

“(1) Matters to be provided under Section 37 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990:

direct planning staff to negotiate an agreement, pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act, providing for public benefits equivalent to the lesser of :

- (i) \$2000.00 per residential unit; or
- (ii) in accordance with the Section 37 Framework Report;

with 75 percent being allocated to the Scarborough City Centre Development Reserve Fund and 25 percent to the City’s Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing;”;

(Carried)

Upon the question that the Community Council continue beyond 12:30 p.m. to 12:45 p.m. in order to complete this item, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors: Balkissoon, Tzekas, Shaw, Kelly, Soknacki, Duguid, Altobello -7
Nays: Councillors: Cho -1

Carried, two-thirds of the Members of Community Council present and voting having voted in the affirmative.

B. Councillor Duguid moved that the aforementioned report be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- (1) that Recommendation (3)(c)(ii) under Development Standards be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- “(3)(c)(ii) minimum of 1.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit, of which a minimum of 0.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit shall be provided for visitors”;
- (2) that development of the central park be given priority and be built at the earliest possible time, and in the interim, staff negotiate with the applicant on options to enhance the parkette;
- (3) that a community meeting be held with all residents of the Lee Development, the applicant, planning staff and Ward Councillors to address some of the ongoing concerns expressed by the applicants including future plans, timing of park space, and parking issues; and
- (4) that the Toronto Transit Commission be requested to review services for this area and to consider service enhancements to be specified following further consultation with the local residents, and further, that a representative of the Toronto Transit Commission be requested to attend the aforementioned community meeting.

(Carried)

The Scarborough Community Council received the following communications:

(June 30, 2000) from Councillor Lorenzo Berardinetti:

I understand that due to technical difficulties the Public Meeting for the Convention Plaza application on Lee Centre Drive will now be scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday July 19, 2000.

Unfortunately I have a previous commitment which will prevent me from attending the meeting. However, as one of two local Councillors for the area I wanted to inform the other members of Scarborough Community Council of my strong support for this application, which I will speak in support of once it reaches Toronto City Council.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

(July 4, 2000) from John Chai:

I wish to offer my opinion regarding the application for the increase in dwelling density for this project. I do not agree with the increase. I think the original 77 units per acre should not be altered. The land area in question is simply not large enough to support the

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

proposed increased unit of dwellings. We already have three high rises plus one more being built with over 900 units of condominium. Over 3,000 persons are living in this area. Adding another 2,000 – 3,000 people is simply too many.

I also would like the Council to require the developer to provide adequate visitors parking spaces for the project. Lee Centre developer had not thought of providing sufficient visitors or commercial parking spaces in the past. At present, we constantly have the visitor parking spaces fully occupied and vehicles park on both sides of Lee Centre Drive day and night. Therefore, adequate visitor parking spaces must be an important consideration for the City to ask of the developer.

I would be very much appreciated if this written submission is included for the Council's consideration. Thank You.

(July 4, 2000) from Homan and Marie Wan:

As residents in the neighbourhood of Lee Centre Drive for nearly two years we are writing to protest against the proposal to increase building density to an unacceptable degree in this area. Our concerns are:

- (1) The current five apartment buildings with their residents and trafficking situation already reflect a population saturation in the vicinity as can be witnessed during the busy rush hours and school hours.
- (2) It is currently inconceivable to have 600 units built on a small strip of land with considerable landscaping, space and privacy, not to say the eventual population growth and subsequent traffic congestion.
- (3) The lack of visitor parking is an acknowledged problem for the Hillsborough complex as vehicles are parked on the streets. This situation, if perpetuated, will not only create trafficking issues, but can also pose high risks for pedestrians especially seniors and school children, in the evening and during the winter months.
- (4) Affordable housing in the vicinity will definitely devalue properties in the area and not protecting our residents' investment and interests. The consequence can also jeopardize the profile of prominent builders who invested trustfully in the surrounding area.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposal in order to maintain this unique residential area as one of the prides in Scarborough.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

(July 2, 2000) from Ivan Lung:

I disagree with the proposal to the Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Progress), Official Plan SC-P19990013, Zoning By-law SC-Z19990016, Registered Plan M-2288, Ward 15, which involved 4-storey townhouse, 10-storey apartment and a 35-storey apartment. There is no facility such as recreation park, community centre, school around the area. The surrounding is overcrowded already. We need a park rather than more buildings.

Thanks for your attention.

(July 4, 2000) from Jackson Lun and Evangeline Chu:

We are the owners of one of the units of May Tower I affected by the captioned proposed re-zoning. In principle, we consent to the re-zoning from office use to residential use. However, we strongly oppose this re-zoning if affordable housing units are to be built within this plan. Please keep us informed of all the progress and decision accordingly.

Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

(July 11, 2000) from Evelyn Truss, President, Board of Directors, MTCC 1256:

In response to the New Notice of Public Meeting forwarded to the owners of Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 1256 located at 1 Lee Centre Drive, Scarborough, Ontario, the Board of Directors would like to request that the Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990013 and Zoning By-law Amendment Application SC-Z19990016 meeting be rescheduled to an evening time slot as many owners are working during the time slot allocated.

In your New Notice of Public Meeting, you are requesting the Applicant to possibly enter into an agreement with the City to provide affordable housing units etc. We ask for your department to clarify and clearly state the City's position in respect to the aforementioned.

(July 14, 2000) from Julie Kwan:

I'm writing in regards to the applications proposed to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law for the vacant lands located on the north side of Lee Centre Drive.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

I currently live in a north facing unit at the condominium located at 1 Lee Centre Drive, and I'm appealing to you NOT to approve this proposed amendment, especially with regards to increasing the density from 190 units per hectare to 304. This will create a highly congested and chaotic living environment for the residents in the surrounding buildings. As is currently, there is a shortage of parking spaces for the current residents of the nearby buildings and visitors are forced to park illegally on the street, and there's already a new building currently being constructed which will compound the current problem.

It's ridiculous that a 35-storey apartment affordable housing can be contemplated to be built to the north side of May Tower (at 1 Lee Centre Drive) which creates more traffic chaos. I had paid a large premium to purchase a penthouse unit for the city view and this proposed plan will totally block the whole view from my building which will drive down the property value by at least 30-40%. It's totally unfair to the residents of the building as we all purchased our homes under the impression that this was a "luxury" condo and not considered "affordable housing".

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

(July 14, 2000) from On Chang:

Without completion and occupation of May Tower 2, the public facilities such as parking, traffic congestion, community services and retail outlets, etc. in the area are already inadequate and causing a lot of inconvenience to the residents. I am sure the revised and relaxed zoning would definitely cause much greater hazards to us. Please note the builder has not allowed sufficient visitor and residential parking in the existing apartment buildings. I doubt very much how your planning guidelines could allow the existing hazards to happen. Instead of asking the builder to rectify the current situation, now you are allowing them to make the situation even worse!!!

I have a strong belief the planning guidelines would conserve our environment and enhance overall balance development. It should not be amended easily. If there is any amendment, it aims to improve, not to make it worse.

I believe you would agree with my above views and take it into serious consideration when any amendments or rezoning are approved.

(July 14, 2000) from Henry Cheng

Comments:

1. Traffic Accident caused by heavy flows of vehicle and pedestrians in the very narrow roadway between the crowded buildings.

The private roadways between the townhouses and apartment buildings are too narrow. Even a waiting car parking along the road may cause traffic accident. Surely heavy flows of vehicle and pedestrians will be the side effects of such a high density of 304 dwelling units per hectare, almost double the density of the 190 units previously proposed.

2. Unbearable Slum Landscape

The three very closed rows of long-wall like apartment buildings and townhouses give rise to very uneasy, discomfort feeling of being shut up in the high walls side by side. It really seems that one is trapped in the stacked houses. The shut-up feeling is aggravated by the continuous 6-10 storey apartment buildings surrounding the stacked townhouses in the midst. Surely the residents will feel that they are living in a slum of crowded houses and streets, instead of a pleasant community boasted by the developer.

3. May Tower 1, May Tower 2, 35 storey building and 10 storey apartment building too close together. Subject to the proposed site plan, spacious distance is left between May Tower 1 and May Tower 2. In point of fact, by aerial field survey from level 22 of May Tower 1, the two towers are very closely pressing against each other. Residents of the two towers feel that they can shake hands with their next door neighbours. Adding the 35 storey high-rise building and the 10 storey apartment building to the very small space just opposite May Tower 1 and 2, it seems that the buildings are jungly standing face to face. Those residents are the inhabitants in a jungle of tall buildings.

Suggestion:

To ease the sensation of compact and crowded environment, the 35 storey apartment building, the two 10 storey apartment buildings should be deleted, making room for recreational centre, private gardens. Take Consilium of Tridel Corporation at 68-88 Corporate Drive as a good example, the developer reserves the area overlooking the noisy Highway 401 for tennis, swimming pool, garden, creating a praise-worthy pleasant community in Scarborough. We do hope that Lee Centre community will be standing in a safe, pleasant, green atmosphere quite different from the neighbourhood industrial scenery.

Request for Field Survey:

We sincerely invite our Councillor, your planner and relevant officials to conduct a field survey so that they will have a clear picture of what is happening in the Lee Centre building site.

I wish to be notified of the adoption of the proposed amendment. Please call me to collect a copy at your office as soon as it is ready. Thank you.

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

(July 17, 2000) from J. Pierre Millette, General Counsel, Toyota:

Toyota Canada Inc. recently received notice for the request to amend the City Centre Secondary Plan and Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Progress) and we have reviewed the July 7, 2000 Staff Report on the subject matter. While we have no objections to the proposed change in use that permits the conversion of commercial space to residential, we do have some concerns with respect to the siting of the proposed 35 storey residential building to be located in the northeast corner of the development.

As you are aware, one of the major reasons why Toyota Canada selected the Scarborough site was its visibility from Highway 401. While we recognize that the approved zoning permits buildings to a height of 110 metres anywhere on the site, the original plans for the Lee Corporate Centre approved by Scarborough in 1991 provided for an open space on the northeast corner of the development site that would have allowed for long range views of our property from the eastbound lanes of Highway 401.

We are concerned that the revised plan that includes a 35 storey residential building in the northeast corner of the development, setback 13.5 metres from the Highway 401 right-of-way may compromise that long range view of our site from the highway. On July 14, 2000, we met with the proponent with respect to our concerns and they are currently forwarding drawings that will illustrate the site lines from the eastbound lanes of Highway 401 with proposed building massing. Based on their information at the meeting, it appears that the high rise building has been set back to allow for views to our property. However, we would strongly prefer that at the detailed design stage, the applicant set the building back further from the north and east property lines.

We note that the applicant has not actually designed the 35 storey high rise at this time. As set out in the Staff Report, the high rise will be subject to holding provisions until such time as a Site Plan has been approved to the satisfaction of the City. At the design stage, we trust that the applicant will consider our position and endeavour to set the building back further from the north and east property lines. We understand that we have no right of appeal to a Site Plan application and are supporting the proposed changes set out in the report on the understanding that the applicant and the City will take our concerns into account when the Site Plan application of the building is considered.

Thank you for your attention regarding this matter.

(July 18, 2000) from Mary Flynn-Guglietti, Solicitor, on behalf of the applicant:

Attached for your information is a copy of a notice which was posted in the elevator lobby of the existing residential condominium building at 18 Lee Centre Drive. This notice was also circulated door to door within this apartment tower. We have translated the notice and it would appear that certain misinformation has been included. The notice states that:

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

“The re-zoning proposal increases the unit density by 60%. This will cause traffic congestion as well as parking problems. Also, if the subsidized housing is built north of Lee Centre Drive and south of Highway 401, this will result in falling property values for Hillsborough Court and May Tower. This is unfair for the owners of the four buildings.

The attached letter asks Council to maintain the original unit density. Provide road access along the south side of 401 as well as a 90 degree intersection between the new road and existing road. This will provide relief to traffic congestion on Lee Centre Drive. Also, provide parking beside the new garden and not to include subsidized housing in the rezoning proposal.”

Firstly, the traffic issues and proposed road configuration have been reviewed by your staff and are determined to be satisfactory.

Secondly, the reference to subsidized housing is false. For the record, the proposed development will consist of individually owned residential condominium units. We are satisfied that the units will be sold within an affordable price range but no subsidized housing is proposed. Unfortunately, we understand that many objections and petitions from existing residents may be based on the false notion that the proposed development will contain subsidized housing.

(July 18, 2000) from Ralf Klopf, President, Board of Directors, MTCC 1023:

On behalf of the Board of Directors, MTCC 1023, 88 Corporate Drive, this is to advise you of our strong objection to the above mentioned applications. The objections are, but not limited to, the increase in density, future traffic congestion, “affordable housing” will lower our property values.

We hope this objection will be considered, and we wish to be notified if these applications are either adopted or rejected.

The following petitions were received from the following and are on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre:

- (i) residents of 1 and 8 Lee Centre Drive, containing 335 signatures, in opposition to the application;
 - (ii) residents/owners of 1, 8 or 18 Lee Centre Drive, containing 301 signatures, in opposition to the application; and
 - (iii) residents of 1 Lee Centre Drive, containing 9 signatures, in opposition to the application.
-

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

The following persons appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mary Flynn-Guglietti, Solicitor for the applicant, who tabled with Community Council the following list of benefits that may derive from the project:

The existing three residential towers have been constructed with great attention to design and utilizing the highest quality of materials. The proposed development will allow for the build out of the site, in keeping with both the design and quality of the existing development.

In 1991 the Provincial Housing Policy Statement defined units selling for \$165,000.00 or less as “intrinsically affordable”. The units proposed by this development will be sold for less than \$165,000.00 per unit, thus providing for significant influx of affordable housing into this area.

The existing residential towers, together with the adjacent residential towers to the west were constructed in the midst of an industrial area. There is no existing neighbourhood for residents to walk through. The proposed development would provide a neighbourhood atmosphere, thus enhancing the residential amenities in the entire area.

Substantial costs have and will be incurred by the developer in both the preparation and implementation of the Noise Study and Wind Study. The recommendations in the Noise Study will create an improved condition not only for the new development but for the entire residential units on the site. Similarly, the Wind Study concluded that the proposed development resulted in acceptable wind comfort conditions for the various activities associated with the activities proposed. Both of these elements will further enhance the neighbourhood environment that the proposed development will provide for the surrounding area.

- Francis Chan, area resident;
- Peter Su, area resident;
- Elaine Cheung, area resident;
- King Lam Wong, area resident;
- Allan Tam, area resident;
- Lynn Stadelbauer, representing the management of MTCC No. 1143;
- Evelyn Truss, President, Board of Directors, MTCC No. 1256;
- Anthony Yates, area resident;
- Nim Li, area resident;
- John Allonson, area resident;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

all of the foregoing in opposition to the proposal for the reasons outlined in the various aforementioned communications and petitions, i.e., increased traffic and noise; insufficient parking; lack of community amenities; effect on property values;

- Lorne Ross, Planning Consultant for the proposal;
- Chris Middleborough, Traffic Consultant for the proposal.

(Clause No. 19, Report No. 9)

The Community Council recessed at 12:45 p.m.

The Community Council reconvened at 2:11 p.m.

**7.46 Traffic Studies near Sacred Heart Catholic School on Hupfield Trail
(Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)**

The Community Council had before it a report (June 29, 2000) from the Director, Transportation Services, District 4, advising the results of a traffic study conducted on Hupfield Trail at the request of the Principal of the Sacred Heart Catholic School; concluding that All-Way Stop Controls are not warranted; that the intersections appear to be operating in a safe and efficient manner; that the Police Service will deal with the speeding issue and have also been requested to investigate this location for a school safety patrol programme and school crossing; and recommending that this report be received for information.

Councillor Balkissoon moved that the staff recommendation in the aforementioned report be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

- (1) that an all-way stop controls be installed at the intersection of Hupfield Trail and Rovinelli Road, having regard that the \$500.00 (approximate) funds associated with such installation are available in the Transportation Services 2000 budget, Cost Centre No. TP0226; and
- (2) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

(Clause No. 9, Report No. 9)

**7.47 The Naming of a Trail in Honour of Doris McCarthy
(Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)**

The Community Council had before it a report (July 6, 2000) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, responding to Community Council's request that staff investigate and report to this meeting on the naming of a trail in honour of Doris McCarthy, and recommending that:

- (1) the existing, unnamed pedestrian roadway adjacent to the Bellamy Ravine be named "The Doris McCarthy Trail", pending successful community consultation; and
- (2) the appropriate City official be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On a motion by Councillor Tzekas, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to Council the adoption of the aforementioned report subject to adding the following:

"That a commemorative sign replicating the original sign on the trail be presented to Doris McCarthy by Mayor Lastman at the earliest possible City of Toronto Council meeting."

(Clause No. 21, Report No. 9)

**7.48 Preliminary Report
Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000007
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000015
McCowan Centre Inc.,
North-East Corner of McCowan Road and Ellesmere Road
Progress Employment District
(Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)**

The Community Council had before it a report (July 10, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that:

- (1) staff be directed to schedule a community consultation meeting together with the Ward Councillors;
- (2) the applicant be required to submit a Traffic Impact Study, Noise Impact Study, and Site Plan Control application;
- (3) staff be directed to process the applications in the normal manner, having regard for the emerging Official Plan direction and City Centre Review, and work with the applicant to achieve a high quality development appropriate for the City

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

Centre, having regard to City Centre Design Objectives, including a strong identifiable image to provide an attractive addition to the Scarborough City Centre;

- (4) staff be directed to negotiate with the applicant to secure Section 37 contributions towards the City's Capital Revolving Fund for affordable housing, as established by Council, as well as other potential public benefits which may result from emerging City-wide Section 37 guidelines and the City Centre Review;
- (5) staff be directed to negotiate with the applicant to secure the planned extension and construction of Grangeway Avenue through the subject lands and City-owned lands to Bushby Drive;
- (6) staff be directed to have regard for the possible comprehensive development of the subject lands together with the abutting City lands to the north; and
- (7) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider the applications, targeted for the first quarter of 2001, subject to the recommendations above. Notice of the Public Meeting under the Planning Act to be given according to the Regulations under the Planning Act.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

Mr. Lorne Ross, representing McCowan Centre Inc., appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter.

(Clause No. 26(m), Report No. 9)

**7.49 Potential Acquisition of No. 14 Thora Avenue
(Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)**

The Community Council resolved itself to meet in camera to discuss the confidential report (July 12, 2000) from the Director of Real Estate Services, respecting the potential acquisition of No. 14 Thora Avenue, having regard that the subject matter relates to the acquisition of property.

The Committee of the Whole rose and reported progress.

Councillor Altobello moved that:

- (1) the acquisition of No. 14 Thora Avenue be pursued;

Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes
July 18 and 19, 2000

- (2) the Director of Real Estate be authorized to negotiate such acquisition and report to Community Council on the results, such report to include a funding source, as appropriate; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be requested to also report to Community Council, at the same time, with the results of the East District Bocce Study.

(Carried)

(Clause No. 25, Report No. 9)

The Community Council adjourned its meeting on July 19, 2000, at 2:45 p.m.

Chair.