## THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF TORONTO

#### **Clerk's Department**

#### Minutes of the Scarborough Community Council

#### Meeting No. 8

#### Tuesday, September 19, 2000

The Scarborough Community Council met on Tuesday, September 19, 2000, in the Meeting Hall, Scarborough Civic Centre, commencing at 9:37 a.m.

Members present:

| 9:37 a.m<br><u>12:30 a.m.</u> | 2:14 p.m<br><u>5:51 p.m.</u>   |
|-------------------------------|--|
|                               |  |
| Х                             | Х  |
| Х                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
| Х                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
| -                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
| Х                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
| X                             | Х  |
|                               | <u>12:30 a.m.</u><br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x |

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

#### **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Mahood declared an interest in Minute Nos. 8.36 and 8.37 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.

#### **Confirmation of Minutes**

On a motion by Councillor Sherene Shaw, the Minutes of the meeting of the Scarborough Community Council held on July 18 and July 19, 2000, were confirmed.

## 8.1 "Rouge Park Week" – Week of October 16, 2000 Request for Proclamation

The Community Council had before it a communication (August 24, 2000) from Mr. Ron M. Christie, Chair, Rouge Park Alliance, requesting that Community Council recommend to City Council the proclamation of the week commencing Monday, October 16, 2000, as "Rouge Park Week" in the City of Toronto to promote the protection, enhancement or restoration of the Rouge Park.

On a motion by Councillor Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the proclamation of the week commencing Monday, October 16, 2000, as "Rouge Park Week" in the City of Toronto.

## (Clause No. 1, Report No. 10)

## 8.2 Pedestrian Refuge Island 2301 Brimley Road, south of Huntingwood Drive (Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)

The Community Council had before it the following:

- (a) report (August 1, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, responding to the concerns raised by Community Council at its previous meeting respecting traffic operations in the vicinity of the proposed refuge island; concluding that the pedestrian crossing environment would be improved by such installation; and recommending the approval thereof.
- (b) communication (June 14, 2000) from the City Clerk (Works Committee), advising that the Works Committee:
  - 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;
  - (ii) requested that residents within a 400 foot radius of the site be so notified; and
  - (iii) requested that the Commissioner submit a report to the Scarborough Community Council on other options available for pedestrian safety in this vicinity.
- (c) communication (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.

Councillor Shaw moved that Scarborough Community Council:

- (1) strike out the recommendation in the report of the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, dated August 1, 2000 to approve the installation of a pedestrian refuge island at 2301 Brimley Road; and
- (2) recommend to the Works Committee that pedestrian-activated traffic signals be installed at this location.

(Carried)

## (Clause No. 42(a), Report No. 10)

## 8.3 Proposed Truck Prohibitions on Numerous Streets (Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)

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

- (1) the truck prohibition regulations identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted; and
- (2) the appropriate by-law be amended accordingly.

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

## (Clause No. 2, Report No. 10)

#### 8.4 Long Duration Parking on Courcelette Road (Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 1, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the parking regulation identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted; and
- (2) the appropriate by-law be amended accordingly.

Councillor Ashton moved that Scarborough Community Council:

- (1) defer consideration of the aforementioned report to the first meeting of the Community Council in the 2001-2003 Council term; and
- (2) direct that the Toronto Police Service be provided with a copy of this report and advised when Community Council will be considering this parking initiative.

## (Carried)

## (Clause No. 42(b), Report No. 10)

## 8.5 Speed Limit Reduction on McIntosh Street (Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 18, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (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 Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

#### (Clause No. 3, Report No. 10)

## 8.6 Stop Signs at Numerous Locations (Wards 13, 14, 16 and 18 – Scarborough Bluffs, Scarborough Wexford, Scarborough Highland Creek, Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 22, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the stop signs identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted; and
- (2) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

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

#### (Clause No. 4, Report No. 10)

#### 8.7 Stopping Prohibition on William Kitchen Road (Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 17, 2000) from the Director of Transportation, recommending that:

- (1) the stopping regulation identified in Appendix 1 of this report be adopted; and
- (2) 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. 10)

## 8.8 Proposed All-Way Stop Control Conlins Road at Canmore Boulevard/Chartway Boulevard (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 11, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) the all-way stop control at the intersection of Conlins Road and Canmore Boulevard/Chartway Boulevard, identified in Appendix 1 of this report, be adopted; and
- (2) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

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

#### (Clause No. 6, Report No. 10)

## 8.9 Traffic and Parking Concerns on Heather Road at Sir Alexander Mackenzie Senior Public School (Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 23, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

(1) the parking regulation identified in Appendix 1 of this report be rescinded;

- (2) the parking/stopping regulations identified in Appendix 2 of this report be adopted;
- (3) the Toronto District School Board receive a copy of this report and be requested to consider installation of an off-street loop at Sir Alexander MacKenzie Senior Public School; and
- (4) the appropriate by-laws be amended accordingly.

Councillor Shaw moved that Scarborough Community Council:

- (1) recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report; and
- (2) provide a copy of this report to the Toronto District School Board and advise the Board of Scarborough Community Council's recommendations prior to the City Council meeting to be held on October 3, 2000.

(Carried)

## (Clause No. 7, Report No. 10)

## 8.10 Traffic and Parking Concerns on Port Royal Trail at Port Royal Public School (Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 2, 2000) from the Director of 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 Shaw, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

## (Clause No. 8, Report No. 10)

## 8.11 Proposed Installation of a Pedestrian Crossover on Progress Avenue at Rosebank Drive (Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 1, 2000) from the Director of Transportation Services, District 4, recommending that:

- (1) a pedestrian crossover be installed on Progress Avenue at Rosebank Drive; and
- (2) the appropriate by-law(s) 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. 9, Report No. 10)

## 8.12 Agreement with GO Transit for Construction of Sewer Services on Dowry Street from Reidmount Avenue to the East Limit of Dowry Street (Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 29, 2000) from the Director of Engineering Services, recommending that:

- (1) City Council authorize staff to negotiate and enter into the necessary standard Secured Servicing Agreement with GO Transit for the installation of sewer services on Dowry Street from Reidmount Avenue to its east limit;
- (2) the terms of the agreement between the City and GO Transit be to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor; and
- (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On a motion by Councillor Shaw, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report; subject to adding at the end of Recommendation No. (1), the words "subject to approval of the use by the Committee of Adjustment".

#### (Clause No. 10, Report No. 10)

## 8.13 Renaming of Loblaws Lane (Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 5, 2000) from the City Surveyor, recommending that, subject to Loblaws Properties Limited agreeing to pay the City's costs, estimated to be in the amount of \$2,500.00:

(1) the public lane known as Loblaws Lane be renamed "No Frills Lane"; and

(2) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, including the introduction of any Bills that may be required.

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

#### (Clause No. 11, Report No. 10)

## 8.14 Properties Subject to City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment SC-P19990012 The Birch Cliff 2000 Initiative (1448-1496 Kingston Road and Abutting Rear Laneway and Parking Areas) – Birch Cliff Community (Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 30, 2000) from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, responding to a City Council direction from its meeting held on December 14, 15 and 16, 1999, that the Commissioner evaluate the feasibility of the City acquiring all properties subject to City-initiated Official Plan Amendment SC-P19990012, the Birch Cliff 2000 Initiative, and re-marketing same by request for proposal for development; advising that a feasibility study has been conducted; and recommending that the City not proceed with such acquisition.

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

#### (Clause No. 12, Report No. 10)

## 8.15 Report No. 2 – 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 (August 30, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (1) direct staff from Urban Development Services and Community and Neighbourhood Services, in consultation with the community, local Councillors and other relevant staff and agencies to prepare a Community Improvement Plan for the Scarborough Village lands, as a component of the Phase 4 STC Land Use Study;
- (2) authorize staff to convene Community Information Meetings, as necessary, regarding the preparation of the Community Improvement Plan; and

(3) direct staff to report further on the Phase 4 Land Use Study, including matters related to the Community Improvement Plan, during the first quarter of 2001.

Councillor Ashton moved that:

- (1) the report (August 30, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, be referred back to the Director to permit further consultation with the local communities and the Ward Councillor in order to define the intent, context, consultation model, stakeholders, workplan and expected outcomes of the Community Improvement Plan; and
- (2) the Director of Community Planning, East District, be requested to report thereon to the first Community Council meeting of the 2001-2003 Council term.

(Carried)

#### (Clause No. 42(c), Report No. 10)

8.16 Request for Direction Minor Variance Appeal – Variance Application No. A287/99SC MSPB Investments Ltd. 3132 Eglinton Avenue East and 22-40 Beachell Street Scarborough Village Community (Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 5, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council direct the City Solicitor not to attend the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing with respect to Minor Variance Application No. A287/99SC.

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

(Clause No. 13, Report No. 10)

#### 8.17 Preliminary Report

Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000005 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000012 Trusthouse 88 Inc., North Side of Ellesmere Road Progress Employment District/City Centre (Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a communication (August 11, 2000) from the City Clerk, advising that City Council, at its meeting held on August 1, 2, 3 and 4, 2000, struck out and referred back to Community Council for further consideration, the subject

report embodied in Clause No. 1 of Report No. 8 of the Scarborough Community Council.

Councillor Berardinetti moved that Scarborough Community Council:

- (1) strike out the recommendations of the Director of Community Planning, East District, embodied in his report dated June 5, 2000; and
- (2) direct Planning staff to process the amended applications for a Nursing Home and Retirement Residence on the following basis:
  - (a) staff to advise the landowners and businesses within 120 metres (400 feet) of the site about the applications and invite their input; and
  - (b) staff to give Notice of the Public Meeting under the Planning Act, targeted for the first quarter of 2001, according to the regulations; such Public Meeting to be subject to the applicant submitting the necessary supporting information to allow the staff to properly address the suitability and impacts of the proposed development.

(Carried)

Mr. Carl Januszczak, Lorne Ross Planning Services Inc., appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter, requesting his client's amended application be processed.

#### (Clause No. 42(d), Report No. 10)

8.18 Preliminary Report Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000012 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000020 Ontario Hydro Services Company Inc. 2411 Lawrence Avenue East Dorset Park Employment District (Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 15, 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;

- (3) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act, with the Public Meeting targeted for the first quarter of 2001, subject to the applicant submitting reports and/or proposals addressing site environmental conditions, noise and vibration mitigation measures associated with the adjacent rail lines, traffic implications and suitability of the proposed new public road, site servicing and tree preservation; and
- (4) staff be directed to seek employment and residential intensification along the Lawrence Avenue frontage.

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

The Community Council also had before it a communication (June 27, 2000) from Mr. Adam J. Brown, Solicitor, requesting the expeditious processing of the aforementioned applications, a copy of which was distributed to all Members of Community Council, and a copy thereof is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre.

#### (Clause No. 42(e), Report No. 10)

#### 8.19 Request for Direction

Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000022 Minor Variance Application A75/00SC Site Plan Control Application SC-S20000024 Maroa Development, 1156 and 1158 Kennedy Road Dorset Park Community (Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 1, 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, with respect to the Zoning Amendment Application;
- (2) notice for the community consultation meeting be given to landowners and residents within 120 metres of the site;
- (3) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider this application;
- (4) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations thereunder with the meeting targeted for the first quarter of 2001; and

(5) City Council authorize the City Solicitor to attend any Ontario Municipal Board hearings of the appeal of the Committee of Adjustment's Decision on the Variance Application to represent the City's interests in ensuring a full evaluation of the proposed Site Plan, if the Board decides to deal concurrently with the Site Plan Application.

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

## (Clause No. 14, Report No. 10)

## 8.20 Preliminary Report Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000025 John Weir, 6 Magnolia Avenue Birchmount Park Employment District/Kennedy Park Community (Ward 15 – Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 30, 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;
- (3) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations under the Planning Act and be targeted for the first quarter of 2001;
- (4) City Council endorse staff's interpretation of the Official Plan, as outlined in the text of this report, that the subject property is designated Low Density Residential in the Kennedy Park Community Secondary Plan; and
- (5) staff be directed to contact abutting landowners whose properties were also rezoned to Industrial Commercial (MC) and designated Low Density Residential in 1982, to determine the level of interest in participating in the rezoning of their lands to residential uses in compliance with the Official Plan designation.

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

(Clause No. 15, Report No. 10)

## 8.21 Preliminary Report Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000011 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000019 172965 Ontario Limited, 3600 Sheppard Avenue East Tam O'Shanter Community (Ward 14 – Scarborough Wexford)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 1, 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;
- (3) staff be authorized to schedule a Public Meeting under the Planning Act to consider this application, targeted for the first quarter of 2001; and
- (4) notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given according to the regulations thereunder.

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

## (Clause No. 42(f), Report No. 10)

#### 8.22 New Applications Received (All Scarborough Wards)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 31, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising of the new applications received during the nine-week period ending August 30, 2000, and recommending that this report be received for information.

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

## (Clause No. 42(g), Report No. 10)

#### 8.23 Ontario Municipal Board Hearings (All Scarborough Wards)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 31, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising of the status of current appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board and recommending that this report be received for information.

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

#### (Clause No. 42(h), Report No. 10)

#### 8.24 Site Plan Control Approvals (All Scarborough Wards)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 31, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, advising of the 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 Moeser, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned report.

#### (Clause No. 42(i), Report No. 10)

## 8.25 Derelict Building at 334 Morrish Road (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 21, 2000) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, advising of a derelict building at 334 Morrish Road which has been subject to various Orders to Comply, the latest of which confirmed in April of this year that the building be demolished; that the owners have failed to comply with the demolition order; that the deterioration of the building is such that it has a negative impact on the surrounding community and has been the subject of complaint by neighbourhood residents; and recommending that the City authorize the expenditure of up to \$10,000.00 to effect demolition, such funds to be recovered from the owners as property taxes.

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

The Community Council also received a faxed communication (September 18, 2000) from Mr. Anthony Del Core, owner of the property, asserting that he had no knowledge of the Order to Comply to demolish and requesting that the aforementioned recommendation not be approved in that the property is up for sale and the existing structure may be repaired; a copy of this communication 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.

(Clause No. 18, Report No. 10)

## 8.26 Bank of China Building, 2095 Brimley Road (Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 23, 2000) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, reporting on the status of an Order to Comply issued for the demolition of the incomplete building at the north-east corner of Brimley Road and Sheppard Avenue East; advising that the Bank of China has requested that this Order be discharged in order to facilitate the sale of the property; that the Department proposes to accede to this request by cancelling the Order; that the progress of the new ownership group towards effecting the completion of the building will be monitored; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On a motion by Councillor Balkissoon, the Scarborough Community Council deferred the aforementioned report for consideration at the first meeting of the Community Council in the 2001-2003 Council term.

## (Clause No. 42(j), Report No. 10)

## 8.27 Billboard Signs

The Community Council had before it the following:

- (a) (September 6, 2000) and (September 19, 2000) from Ronald G. Barr, Executive Director, Government and Community Relations, Pattison Outdoor, respecting the Poster Panel Permissions for Pattison Outdoor;
- (b) (September 11, 2000) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, reporting on the current approval and selection process for Billboard Signs and recommending that:
  - (i) staff examine the need for a yearly billboard sign maximum;
  - (ii) a selection process be developed to allocate billboard sign permissions should the yearly maximum be maintained; and
  - (iii) staff be directed to bring forward a report and associated by-law amendments, as required, to the next scheduled Scarborough Community Council meeting;
- (c) (August 29, 2000) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, recommending that City Council not grant a variance to permit the following:
  - Billboard on South side of McNicoll Avenue West of Midland Avenue on C.N.R. Land Application by Pattison Outdoor Advertising;

(ii) Billboard on North side of McNicoll Avenue West of Midland Avenue on C.N.R. Land Application by Pattison Outdoor Advertising;
(iii) Billboard on South side of Passmore Avenue West of Midland Avenue on C.N.R. Land Application by Pattison Outdoor Advertising; and
(iv) Billboard on North side of Passmore Avenue West of Midland Avenue on C.N.R. Land Application by Pattison Outdoor Advertising.
On a motion by Councillor Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council referred all the aforementioned reports and communications to the City Solicitor, with the request that he undertake an investigation thereof, in

consultation with staff of the Municipal Licensing and Standards Division, and report back to the first Community Council meeting in the 2001-2003 Council term.

Mr. Ronald G. Barr appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter.

(Clause No. 42(o), Report No. 10)

## 8.28 The Greek Community of Metropolitan Toronto Inc. Festivals to be held at 1385 Warden Avenue (Ward 14 – Scarborough Wexford)

The Community Council had before it a report (August 29, 2000) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, responding to a request from The Greek Community of Metropolitan Toronto Inc. for approval to conduct Festivals in the years 2001, 2002 and 2003, and recommending that:

- (1) a public meeting be scheduled for consideration of the application at the next regularly scheduled Scarborough Community Council meeting; and
- (2) all associated costs connected with the required advertising be borne by The Greek Community of Metropolitan Toronto Inc.

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

(Clause No. 42(k), Report No. 10)

## 8.29 Assumption of Services Registered Plan 66M-2291, Reixach Bros. Company Ltd. West Side of Dean Park Road, South of Sheppard Avenue East (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 3, 2000) from the City Solicitor, recommending that:

- (1) the services installed for Registered Plan 66M-2291 be assumed and that the City formally assume the roads within the Plan of Subdivision;
- (2) upon receipt of an Acknowledgement and Release executed by the Developer, the Legal Services Department be authorized to release of the performance guarantee in the form of a Letter of Credit; subject to the receipt of a cash settlement in the amount \$7,500.00 as set out in the attached report; and
- (3) the City Clerk and Treasurer be authorized to sign any release or other documentation necessary to give effect thereto.

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

## (Clause No. 19, Report No. 10)

## 8.30 Assumption of Services

Registered Plan 66M-2299, Magnum Homes Inc. West Side of Morrish Road, South of Highway 401 (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 3, 2000) from the City Solicitor, recommending that:

- (1) the services installed for Registered Plan 66M-2299 be assumed and that the City formally assume the roads within the Plan of Subdivision;
- (2) the Legal Services Division be authorized to release of the performance guarantee in the form of a Letter of Credit; and
- (3) the City Clerk and Treasurer be authorized to sign any release or other documentation necessary to give effect thereto.

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

(Clause No. 20, Report No. 10)

## 8.31 Shaw Communications Inc. News Programming in the Scarborough Community

The Community Council had before it a communication (August 11, 2000) from the City Clerk, advising that City Council, at its meeting held on August 1, 2, 3 and 4, 2000, referred to the Scarborough Community Council and the Telecommunications Steering Committee, a Motion by Councillor Duguid, seconded by Councillor Kelly, respecting an application by Rogers Communications Inc. and Shaw Communications Inc. to the CRTC to exchange Rogers' subscribers in the Vancouver area with Shaw's subscribers in Southern Ontario (including Scarborough), which application might jeopardize the provision of local news coverage currently provided by Shaw to Scarborough residents.

On a motion by Councillor Duguid, the Scarborough Community Council received the aforementioned communication, having regard that the opportunity to make submissions to the CRTC on this matter has passed.

## (Clause No. 42(l), Report No. 10)

## 8.32 Toronto Catholic District School Board Proposal to Lease St. John Fisher School (Ward 14 – Scarborough Wexford)

The Community Council had before it a communication (August 11, 2000) from the City Clerk, advising that City Council, at its meeting held on August 1, 2, 3 and 4, 2000, struck out and referred to Scarborough Community Council for further consideration, that portion of Clause 9, Report No. 8 of the Planning and Transportation Committee, headed: "Toronto Catholic District School Board's Proposals to Lease Schools Approved for Closure in Phase 1", pertaining to the Scarborough Community Council area.

On a motion by Councillor Balkissoon, the Scarborough Community Council, due to the absence of Councillor Tzekas, deferred the aforementioned report for consideration at the first meeting of the Community Council in the 2001-2003 Council term.

#### (Clause No. 42(m), Report No. 10)

8.33 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 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 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;
- (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;

#### - 20 -Scarborough Community Council Committee Minutes Tuesday, September 19, 2000

- (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.

The Community Council also had before it a report (August 21, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, submitting for information, a response to Community Council's request that the aforementioned applications be reviewed with respect to achieving a 15.2 metre (50 foot) frontage standard for the proposed lots.

- A. Councillor Soknacki moved that the Scarborough Community Council:
  - (i) recommend to City Council the adoption of the report dated June 7, 2000, from the Director of Community Planning, East District; and
  - (ii) receive the report dated August 21, 2000, from the Director of Community Planning.

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

Yeas: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Soknacki, Tzekas -5

Nays: Councillors Altobello, Cho, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser –5

Defeated on a tie vote.

On a motion by Councillor Mahood, the Community Council reopened the matter to permit further deputation by the applicant's Solicitor.

B. Councillor Moeser moved that Recommendations (1)(a) and (1)(b), embodied in the report, be amended to provide that all lots have a minimum frontage of 50 feet.

Upon the question of the adoption of Motion B. by Councillor Moeser, the vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Cho, Kelly, Moeser, Mahood –4

Nays: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Soknacki -4

Defeated on a tie vote.

Upon the question of the adoption of the staff recommendations, the vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Soknacki - 4

Nays: Councillors Cho, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser – 4

Defeated on a tie vote.

The applications were therefore not approved and the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council that the aforementioned applications be refused.

Mr. Murray Pearson, Solicitor for the applicant, appeared before the Community Council in support of the staff recommendation, and asserting that the frontages as proposed by his client's applications do indeed conform to frontage standards in the vicinity of the subdivision, as proposed.

(Clause No. 21, Report No. 10)

## 8.34 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990040 MSPB Investments Ltd. 3132 Eglinton Avenue East and 22-40 Beachell Street Scarborough Village Community (Ward 13 – Scarborough Bluffs)

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 (August 31, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Zoning By-law:

amend the Scarborough Village Community Zoning By-law Number 10010, as amended, with respect to the rear portion of 3132 Eglinton Avenue East, Nos. 22-40 Beachell Street, inclusive, and a portion of City-owned lands, generally being Part of Block D, Plan 1094 and Part of Lot M, Plan 1098 by:

- (a) removing the Holding Provisions (H) which apply to the majority of these lands;
- (b) deleting the existing zoning and replacing it with the following zoning:
  - (i) permitted use: Multiple-Family Residential (M) Zone;
  - (ii) maximum building height of 14 metres (46 feet);
  - (iii) minimum street yard setback of 3 metres (10 feet);
  - (iv) minimum 1.5 metre (5 feet) landscaping strip shall be provided abutting the Single-Family Residential (S) Zone;
  - (v) minimum 1.5 metre (5 feet) setback abutting the Single-Family Residential (S) Zone;
  - (vi) minimum 30 metre (98.4 feet) setback abutting the railway property line;

- (vii) minimum parking requirement of 1.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit, consisting of 1 space for residents and 0.25 space for visitors. Visitor parking may be provided in tandem, in the street yard on the driveway leading to the parking space in the garage;
- (viii) the provisions of the By-law shall apply collectively to this property notwithstanding its division into two or more parcels;
- (2) Miscellaneous:

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

(3) Implementation:

direct staff to bring forward the bills to enact the new zoning on the subject lands after:

- (a) City Council agrees to revise the previously approved disposal policy for the City-owned portion of the subject lands; and
- (b) satisfactory arrangements are made for future access across the subject lands to the remaining City-owned lands to the west.

On a motion by Councillor Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, subject to inserting under "(3) Implementation", the following words after the words "direct staff":

"to facilitate meetings with the two property owners adjacent to the public road, southern section connecting Luella Street to Eglinton Avenue, as contemplated in the Official Plan, in order to protect the City's interest in any deliberations on the public lands adjacent to the railway right-of-way, and".

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

- Mr. Julius De Ruyter, agent for the applicant, in support of the staff recommendation to permit his client's application for Multiple-Family Residential uses, consistent with the Official Plan policies; indicating that at a recent community information meeting convened by Councillor Ashton, community concerns respecting access to Eglinton Avenue were brought to his client's attention for the first time; that such concerns will be taken into consideration by his client but will require time to attempt resolution; and suggesting that this future road connection issue does not justify any delay in approval of the applications; and

Mr. Jordan Froese, Scarborough Village Triangle Homeowners' Association, advising that, while the Association does not oppose intensification of development, it is requesting that the Holding provision not be removed until the appropriate transportation infrastructure is in place, and suggests that proper measures be taken to mitigate the potentially hazardous traffic situation that could affect area residents.

(Clause No. 22, Report No. 10)

## 8.35 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P19990018 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z19990036 Shell Canada Products Limited, 3101 Victoria Park Avenue L'Amoreaux Community (Ward 14 – Scarborough Wexford)

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 (September 5, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Official Plan:

amend the L'Amoreaux Community Secondary Plan with respect to the lands on the southeast corner of Victoria Park Avenue and Finch Avenue East by:

(a) amending Numbered Policy 2 to add retail sales and car wash uses as follows:

"The Highway Commercial Uses designation shall provide for only Service Station Uses, automatic car wash uses, and retail sales.";

(2) Zoning By-law:

amend the L'Amoreaux Community Zoning By-law No. 12466, as amended, with respect to the lands located on the southeast corner of Victoria Park Avenue and Finch Avenue East, being Part of Lot 35, Concession 3, by amending the existing Highway Commercial (HC) zoning to permit retail sales and a mechanical or automatic car wash in addition to currently permitted uses, as follows:

- (a) all existing Development Standards to be retained;
- (b) a minimum of 20 vehicle stacking spaces for a mechanical or automatic car wash shall be provided on the parcel of land on which the car wash is located, and shall be arranged in a single and/or double line leading to the entrance to the car wash; and
- (3) 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 Kelly moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, subject to amending the recommendations as follows:
  - (1) under "(1) Official Plan", delete the words "and car wash uses" in the preamble and delete the words "automatic car wash uses" in the new Numbered Policy; and
  - under "(2) Zoning By-law", delete the words "and a mechanical or automatic car wash" in the preamble, and delete Recommendation No. (2)(b) in its entirety.
- B. Councillor Moeser moved that Motion A. by Councillor Kelly be amended as follows:
  - (1) under "(1) Official Plan", insert the words "not including automobile sales" after the words "retail sales" in the preamble and the new Numbered Policy; and
  - (2) under "(2) Zoning By-law", insert the words "not including automobile sales" after the words "retail sales" in the preamble.

(Carried)

Upon the question of the adoption of Motion A.(1) and (2), a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Balkissoon, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser, Soknacki –5

Nays: Councillor Shaw –1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 4.

The Community Council also had before it the following communication (September 3, 2000) from Chi Hung, Amy, Cindy and Janey Law:

On behalf of my household, 47 Hepscott Terrace, we are strongly against the proposal to permit retail sales and an automatic car wash in addition to currently permitted automobile service station. The reasons are:

- 1. We would like to live in a quiet and safe environment.
- 2. We have car wash service around our area Victoria Park Avenue and Sheppard Avenue.
- 3. We have enough retail sales stores around our neighbourhood north-east corner of Victoria Park and Finch, south-east corner of Pharmacy and Finch, one traffic light south of Finch on Victoria Park. We don't want any more to serve the community.

Please bring our concerns to the Council and Mr. N. Kelly. Thanks.

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

- Ms. Sharyn Vincent, Vincent Planning and Development Consultants, on behalf of Shell Canada, in support of the staff recommendations; advising that her client has taken into consideration concerns expressed by the abutting residents and has amended the applications accordingly, in consultation with City Urban Design and Forestry Division staff, in an attempt to respond to neighbourhood concerns respecting noise and air quality; pointing out that such operations, as proposed by her client, exist elsewhere in the Scarborough community where residences abut the use and investigations have shown that such operations have not resulted in noise complaints;
- Mr. Antonio Volpe, who tabled a 71-signature petition in opposition to the proposal; expressed his concerns regarding increased noise and air pollution, and suggested that the types of trees proposed in the revised landscaping plan may pose a clean-up problem for abutting residents;
- Ms. Anna Jurovich, signatory to the petition, agreeing with Mr. Volpe's remarks; and
- Mr. Antonio Raffa, signatory to the petition, agreeing with Mr. Volpe's remarks.

The aforementioned petition is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre.

## (Clause No. 23, Report No. 10)

## 8.36 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000009 Omers Realty Holdings Inc., 300 Borough 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 a report (August 28, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Official Plan:

amend the City Centre Secondary Plan, with respect to the lands shown, by:

- (a) deleting from Figure 4.1.1, the City Centre Land Use Plan, the portion of Borough Drive between Progress Avenue and Triton Road;
- (b) deleting from Figure 4.1.2, the City Centre Densities Plan, the portion of Borough Drive between Progress Avenue and Triton Road and assigning a density to the land by extending the land use density on the adjoining lands to the centre line of the road allowance;
- (c) deleting from the Schedule "C" Roads Plan, the portion of Borough Drive between Progress Avenue and Triton Road; and
- (2) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Amendments as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

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

A recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Cho, Kelly, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki, Tzekas –10 Nays: Nil

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

The Community Council also had before it the following communication (September 18, 2000) from Sonja Joknic, Corridor Management Technician, Ministry of Transportation:

Further to your circulation, the Ministry of Transportation has reviewed the above noted submissions and we have no objection in principle to the proposed re-zoning and Official Plan Amendment subject to the following comments.

All access to the proposed development shall be restricted to Progress Avenue. The two entrances located immediately to the east of the Brimley Road structure on the south side of the Highway 401 West to Progress Avenue ramp shall be closed.

The owner is advised that all buildings (above and below ground structures) must be set back a minimum distance of 13.7 m from the highway property line. In addition, Ministry permits for all buildings within 46 m (150 feet) of our highway property line, and a radius of 400 m (1300 feet) from the centre point of the intersection of Highway 410 and Brimley Road and/or McCowan Road are required prior to any development of the land. Permits must be obtained from Mr. Ken Sherbanowski, Permits Officer at (416) 235, 5560, 1st Floor, Atrium Tower, Downsview, Ontario, M3M 1J8.

This Ministry will also require that the owner submit to this office a copy of a drainage plan indicating the intended treatment of the calculated runoff and a traffic impact study addressing the anticipated traffic volumes and their impact upon the following:

Highway 401 W & E to McCowan Road South Highway 401 W to Brimley Road South including the 401 West to Progress Avenue ramp

Brimley Road & Progress Avenue intersection

If you have any concerns or require further clarification, please feel free to contact me.

Mr. Vince Cornacchia, Walker Nott Dragicevic, Planning Consultant for the applicant, appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and in support of the staff recommendations.

(Clause No. 24, Report No. 10)

# 8.37 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000017 Omers Realty Holdings Inc. 300 Borough 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 a report (August 28, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (1) Zoning By-law:
  - (a) amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Progress) with respect to the lands outlined on Map 1 as follows:
    - (i) delete all Performance Standards and Exceptions from those lands shown as Part B and delete the zoning line separating Part A from Part B;
    - (ii) all Performance Standards and Exceptions applicable to Part A shall apply to Part B;
    - (iii) delete all Performance Standards and Exceptions for those lands shown as Area 1 and delete the zoning line separating Part A from Area 1;
    - (iv) all Performance Standards and Exceptions applicable to Part A shall apply to Area 1;
    - (v) add zoning category City Centre Office (CCO) with a Holding Provision (H) to the land use permissions for the entire site;
    - (vi) permit a maximum 44,000 square metres (473,630 square feet) of gross floor area of office space, which originally applied only to Part B, across the entire site. This permission shall be subject to a Holding Provision (H) as follows: The Holding Provision (H) used in conjunction with the "City Centre Office Zone" (CCO), shall be removed in whole or in part, by amending By-law upon submission of a Site Plan Control Application 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 all transportation improvements, infrastructure or servicing necessary to accommodate any proposed development;

- (vii) permit a maximum commercial gross floor area of all buildings plus the area of basement storage rooms minus the gross floor area of public walkways, malls, service areas, truck access, and other common facilities to not exceed 150,000 square metres (1,614,640 square feet);
- (viii) require a minimum of 4.3 parking spaces per 100 square metres (1,076 square feet) of gross floor area plus the area of basement storage rooms minus the gross floor area of public walkways, malls, truck access and other common facilities for all uses permitted in the City Centre Commercial Zone (CCC);
- (ix) maximum height for offices to 14 storeys, excluding mechanical penthouses;
- (b) amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Progress) with respect to the lands outlined on Map 2 as follows:
  - (i) by Exception, prior to the lifting of the existing Holding Provision (H), permit parking as a use on Blocks C and E, R.P. M-1410, and Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, R.P. 66R-12548 only in association with the shopping centre located at Block M and N, R.P. M-1410;
  - (ii) by Exception, permit parking to service Blocks M and N,
     R.P. M-1410, to be situated on Blocks C, D, E, F and G,
     R.P. M-1410, and Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, R.P. 66R-12548; and
- (2) Miscellaneous:

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.

The Community Council also had before it a communication (September 18, 2000) from Sonja Joknic, Corridor Management Technician, Ministry of Transportation:

Further to your circulation, the Ministry of Transportation has reviewed the above noted submissions and we have no objection in principle to the proposed re-zoning and Official Plan Amendment subject to the following comments.

All access to the proposed development shall be restricted to Progress Avenue. The two entrances located immediately to the east of the Brimley Road structure on the south side of the Highway 401 West to Progress Avenue ramp shall be closed.

The owner is advised that all buildings (above and below ground structures) must be set back a minimum distance of 13.7 m from the highway property line. In addition, Ministry permits for all buildings within 46 m (150 feet) of our highway property line, and a radius of 400 m (1300 feet) from the centre point of the intersection of Highway 410 and Brimley Road and/or McCowan Road are required prior to any development of the land. Permits must be obtained from Mr. Ken Sherbanowski, Permits Officer at (416) 235, 5560, 1st Floor, Atrium Tower, Downsview, Ontario, M3M 1J8.

This Ministry will also require that the owner submit to this office a copy of a drainage plan indicating the intended treatment of the calculated runoff and a traffic impact study addressing the anticipated traffic volumes and their impact upon the following:

Highway 401 W & E to McCowan Road South Highway 401 W to Brimley Road South including the 401 West to Progress Avenue ramp

Brimley Road & Progress Avenue intersection

If you have any concerns or require further clarification, please feel free to contact me.

Mr. Vince Cornacchia, Walker Nott Dragicevic, Planning Consultant for the applicant, appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and in support of the staff recommendations.

(Clause No. 25, Report No. 10)

8.38 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z93026 Draft Plan of Subdivision Application SC-T97006 Lawrence Avenue Group Limited West Side of Morningside Avenue, North of Military Trail Morningside Community (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

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 (August 23, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (1) Zoning By-law:
  - (a) amend the Morningside Community Zoning By-law No. 11883, as amended, with respect to the Lawrence Avenue Group Limited lands, as shown on Attachment 4, by deleting the current "Single-Family Residential (S) Zone" and "Agricultural Uses" (Ag) zoning and replacing it with the following:

Lots 1 to 24, 36 to 42 and 45 to 47, inclusive:

to be zoned "Single-Family Residential (S) Zone" with the following Performance Standards:

- (i) one Single-Family dwelling per lot as shown on the Registered Plan (minimum lot frontage 7.5 metres (25 feet) and minimum lot area 220 square metres (2,370 square feet));
- (ii) minimum front yard building setback 5 metres (16 feet) from the street line;
- (iii) minimum building setback 1.2 metres (4 feet) on one side and 0.3 metres (1 foot) on the other side lot line except flankage yards;
- (iv) minimum flankage yard setback 3 metres (10 feet);
- (v) minimum 7.5 metres (25 feet) rear yard setback;
- (vi) maximum building coverage 46 percent of the lot area;
- (vii) maximum building height: 2 storeys excluding basements and 10 metres (33 feet);

Lots 25 to 35, inclusive, and Lots 43 and 44:

to be zoned "Two-Family Residential (T) Zone" with the following Performance Standards:

- (i) one Two-Family dwelling per lot as shown on the Registered Plan (minimum lot frontage 15.3 metres (50 feet) and minimum lot area 420 square metres (4,500 square feet));
- (ii) minimum front yard building setback 5 metres (16 feet) from the street line;

- (iii) minimum building setback 1.2 metres (4 feet) on one side except flankage yards; minimum flankage yard setback 3 metres (10 feet); (iv) minimum 7.5 metres (25 feet) rear yard setback; (v) maximum building coverage 46 percent of the lot area; (vi) maximum building height: 2 storeys excluding basements and (vii) 10 metres (33 feet). Blocks 48 to 56, inclusive: to be zoned "Street Townhouse Residential" in a new "Street Townhouse Residential (ST) Zone" with the following Performance Standards: (i) maximum number of units as shown on the Registered Plan: Block 48 8 units: \_ Block 49 6 units: -Block 50 8 units; \_ Block 51 \_ 8 units: Block 52 6 units: -Block 53 6 units: -Block 54 \_ 8 units:
- (ii) minimum front yard building setback 6 metres (20 feet) from the street line;

6 units:

6 units;

(iii) minimum flankage yard setback 2.5 metres (8 feet);

\_

-

Block 55

Block 56

- (iv) maximum building height excluding basements: 3 storeys and 12.5 metres (41 feet);
- (v) maximum building coverage 60 percent of the lot area;
- (vi) minimum rear yard setback 7.5 metres (25 feet);

Blocks 57 and 58 to be zoned "Park Zone" (P) also including banquet and lounge facilities;

- (b) deem that no further notice is required to enact the zoning amendment, previously approved by Scarborough Council on September 30, 1997, with respect to the Tam Heather Community Centre and adjacent lands owned or leased by the City east of the Ontario Hydro Corridor by deleting the "Highway Commercial" (HC) and "Agricultural Uses" (Ag) zoning and replacing it with a "Park Zone" (P) to also include banquet and lounge facilities;
- (c) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Zoning By-law amendments as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution;
- (2) Draft Plan of Subdivision:

support the draft approval of the plan of subdivision application SC-T97006, Lawrence Avenue Group Limited, for its ownership between Military Trail and the Ontario Hydro Corridor, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Plan as stamped approved this date as shown on Attachment 4;
- (b) the owner to make arrangements satisfactory to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services for all services and easements;
- (c) the owner to dedicate all streets, corner roundings and road widenings as shown on the draft plan at no charge to the City;
- (d) prior to final approval and the issuance of building permits for any dwellings on the subject lands, the owner to provide the City with soil testing results demonstrating the safety of the site for residential use and agree to provide any necessary measures for monitoring safety;
- (e) the owner to make arrangements satisfactory to Toronto Hydro for an electrical distribution system;
- (f) the owner to dedicate Blocks 57 and 58 to the City as public parkland at the time of registration of the plan towards the parkland dedication requirement under Section 42(3) of the Planning Act;
- (g) the owner to make satisfactory arrangements with the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism regarding the proposed access to the development from Military Trail across the Tam Heather Community Centre property;
- (h) the owner to agree to clauses in the subdivision agreement providing for street tree planting at one tree per lot or every 12 metres (40 feet) of street

frontage, whichever is greater, and the provision of 1.8 metres (6 feet) wood fencing at the property lines of Lots 36 to 40 inclusive and Lot 47 and the rear property lines of Blocks 55 and 56;

- (i) the owner to agree to provide screen fencing between the subdivision and the adjacent residential property to the north (on Morningside Avenue) to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Planning, East District;
- (j) prior to the registration of the plan and lot grading, the owner shall submit for approval of the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, a tree inventory report identifying the location, type, size and quality of all trees within the plan of subdivision and indicate on a lot grading plan those trees which can be preserved and the methods for protecting same;
- (k) prior to the registration of the plan and lot grading, the owner shall obtain the approval of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and the Works and Emergency Services Department regarding the storm drainage system for the proposed development and agree to implement any controls required by these agencies/departments;
- prior to final approval, the owner to obtain the approval of Ontario One Networks Inc. of the lot grading and drainage plan, to agree to provide temporary fencing along the edge of the right of way prior to the start of construction, and to provide permanent fencing after construction;
- (m) prior to final approval, the owner to submit for approval, house siting plans and elevation plans for Lots 1 to 47 and for Blocks 48 to 56;
- (n) the house siting plans for Lots 1 to 47 to incorporate a driveway sufficient to park a car on each lot in front of the garage;
- (o) the owner be required to provide the Works and Emergency Services Department with a preliminary design for a centre turn lane at the Morningside Avenue access to the development and to fund the construction of the centre turn lane should the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services determine that it is required; and
- (p) the owner to agree to prepare a traffic study examining the traffic generation of the development six (6) months after occupancy and to fund a traffic signal at the Morningside Avenue access if warranted.

On a motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report. The Community Council also had before it the following communication (September 5, 2000) from Mr. B. Van Rijn:

I am Mr. William Van Rijn, the registered owner of 920 Morningside Avenue, which premises adjoin the northerly limit of the proposed development mentioned above.

Please consider this letter an objection to the:

- request to amend the Morningside Community Zoning By-law Number 11883;
- Zoning By-law Amendment Application SC-Z19930026; and
- Draft Plan of Subdivision Application SC-T19970006.

I would request to speak at the Council meeting to be held September 19, 2000, concerning these matters.

I would also ask the City Clerk to notify myself, in writing, of any future decisions the City of Toronto makes on these proposals.

In September of 1997, Ms. Jayne Naiman, then a senior planner for the City of Scarborough, suggested I look at a project being developed at Port Union Road and Lawrence Avenue East on the north-east corner. She had informed me that these townhouse units were to be similar to the Lawrence Avenue Group's townhouse condominium units. These units were  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 storey buildings with roofs tapering down on the end units. These units' roof lines were quite high, but nowhere near what is proposed for the Lawrence Avenue Group's project next to my home.

I strongly object to the street townhouses Blocks 48 to 56 inclusive, especially Block 54 - 8 units.

This street townhouse residential block lines up directly with my home and the southerly view from my kitchen and living room windows. The coverage of these units, as stated in the staff report (page 3) is 60 per cent of their lot area which would cover the full length of the area of my own home. These units are 3 storey – 12.5 metres – 41 feet high, excluding basements.

Suppose with construction, there is 4 feet of exposed basement above ground level, plus a roof which could be 10 feet to 15 feet or more higher to a possible total height of 41 feet (3 floor levels) plus 4 feet (exposed basement area) plus 15 feet (roof) equals 55 feet or more in total height.

My southern view would no longer be trees and sky but a sheer wall of solid brick and mortar. Considering also the new residents to the west of these townhouses, looking east
towards Morningside Avenue, they are also faced with the sheer heights of these huge townhouses and a blockage of the morning sun.

I find the heights of these street townhouses to be unacceptable especially in relationship to my home, property and family. I therefore ask Mr. Meisels of the Lawrence Avenue Group and Mr. Tyndorf of Community Planning, to put yourselves in my situation. I think if either of you gentlemen were faced with a similar intrusion of space, you would also object to this proposal.

I am sure that all concerned can adapt Blocks 48 to 56 street townhouses and especially Block 54 - 8 units to a more reasonable and tolerable height in relationship to my home and property. Please remember that my family has resided with open space, trees and skies for many, many years. Times change, still, consideration must be given to all concerned. When this project is done, the Lawrence Avenue Group, the City staff (its planners and zoners) and City Councillors will all move on to new endeavors. My family in turn will be living literally in a new neighbourhood with new neighbours. I hope that things tended to properly today will lead to a good life, with no regrets for tomorrow for all concerned.

Consideration should also be given to the Ontario Hydro easement over the southern portion of my property and the northern portion of Lawrence Avenue Group lands, in regard to:

- access of Ontario Hydro vehicles to service properly the southern side of the Hydro lines with a screening fence separating my property and Lawrence Avenue Group's property. This may prove a difficulty in future, as the fence will cut the southern portion of the easement in two.
- as to access to the northern portion of the easement on my property, perhaps a private driveway entrance and a proper gate installed from Street "B" would allow easy access to Hydro service vehicles in the future.

Please keep in mind, access throughout the years has always been attained from Lawrence Avenue Group's lands to the south, then over my lands to access the northern portion of the easement.

When this proposed development is complete, who will then own the land adjacent to the southern border of my property, and who will maintain both this property and the screening fence including the southern portion of the easement over what is now Lawrence Avenue Group lands.

Consideration must also be given to drainage. In a major spring thaw, ice melt water and rain water runs from the main Ontario Hydro Corridor (the Gatineau Line) across my land basically south easterly accumulating at the corner of Lawrence Avenue Group's lands near street townhouse Block 54 - 8 units, and Morningside Avenue. The waters at

this date accumulate and spill over onto Morningside and into the street drains as they have done so since time began. Depending on the grading of the Lawrence Avenue Group's lands, this may become a problem to both properties in the future.

Please note that on the Official Plan attachment No. 1, a proposed collector road is shown appearing to cross the western portion of my lands, carrying onto both Military Trail and Morningside Avenue. Also note that the property to the north of the Ontario Hydro right-of-way (the Gatineau Line) is up for sale and soil samples have been taken. Is this roadway to be a feeder from this future development area. Can you please confirm or deny this collector road. If confirmed, please detail any information to me. Please respect the trees on this parcel of land up for sale and let this be known to any who purchase these lands. Thank you.

The Community Council also had before it the following communication (September 6, 2000) from Ms. Sonja Joknic, Corridor Management Technician, Corridor Management Office, Ministry of Transportation:

Further to your circulation, the Ministry of Transportation has reviewed the above noted file and we have no objection in principle to the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision or rezoning of this property since it is located outside of the ministry's permit control area.

This Ministry does however have a concern with the proposed access to the development from Morningside Avenue and its close proximity to the W-S ramp terminal.

Should present or future needs require signal installation at the intersection of "Street A" and Morningside Avenue, then the ministry would recommend a minimum spacing of 365m be provided in order to avoid traffic hazards, to provide for efficient traffic signal progression and to maintain adequate storage. The proposed access to the development is located approximately 335m from the ramp terminal, therefore, relocation of the access should be investigated in order to meet the required distance.

If you have any concerns or require further clarification, please feel free to contact me.

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

- Mr. Steven Meizel, representing the applicant, in support of the staff recommendation and advising that an undertaking will be provided to the City in order to alleviate the concerns expressed by Mr. B. Van Rijn; and

- Mr. B. Van Rijn withdrawing his objection to the proposal in light of the commitment by Mr. Meizel to address the concerns listed in his foregoing communication (September 5, 2000) to Community Council.

# (Clause No. 26, Report No. 10)

# 8.39 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000008 Various Owners 3986, 3988 and 3992 Ellesmere Road and Bluenose Crescent Highland Creek Community (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

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 (August 24, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Zoning By-law:

amend the Highland Creek Community Zoning By-law Number 10827 with respect to the lands on the south side of Bluenose Crescent, being Part of Lots 4, 5 and 6, Registered Plan 4373 and Part of Block 62, Registered Plan 66M-2203 by deleting the existing performance standards and replacing them with the following:

- (a) one single-family dwelling per parcel of land with a minimum of 10.5 metre (34.5 foot) frontage on a public street and a minimum lot area of 370 square metres (3,985 square feet);
- (b) minimum three metre (10 foot) street yard setback except the garage main wall containing the vehicular access shall be set back a minimum of six metres (20 feet);
- (c) minimum one metre (3.3 foot) side yard setback; chimneys, pilasters, projecting columns, balconies, unenclosed porches and canopies shall not project into any required side yard of one metre (3.3 feet) or less;
- (d) a garage shall be erected with each dwelling;
- (e) the maximum floor area requirement of Clause VI, Section 16.3 shall not apply; and

(2) 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 recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

Ms. Joanne Barnett, agent for the applicant, appeared before the Community Council in support of the staff recommendation; advising that she met with the owners of No. 15 Bluenose Crescent and believes their concerns have been alleviated by provision of further Site Plan details, and that further discussion will take place to satisfy any remaining concern.

(Clause No. 27, Report No. 10)

8.40 City-Initiated Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments SC-W20000003 Various Owners East Side of Port Union Road, South of Lawrence Avenue Port Union Village Community (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

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. No persons appeared before the Community Council in connection therewith.

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

(1) Official Plan:

amend the Port Union Village Community Secondary Plan with respect to the lands on the east side of Port Union Road, between Lawrence Avenue and the proposed Village Common by:

- (a) redesignating the lands from Village Mixed Uses to Medium Density Residential;
- (b) deleting the Village Mixed Uses applying to the lands on the east side of Port Union Road from the General Policies, Land Use section;

(2) Zoning By-law:

amend the Centennial Community Zoning By-law Number 12077 with respect to the lands fronting on to the east side of Port Union Road, between Lawrence Avenue and Cherry Street, being Blocks 160, 161, and 162, Registered Plan 66M-2313 by:

- (a) deleting the Neighbourhood Commercial zoning and replacing the site specific parking performance standard with a requirement for a minimum 1.6 parking spaces per dwelling unit;
- (b) deleting the reference to automobile stations from the site specific Exception; 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.

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

## (Clause No. 28, Report No. 10)

# 8.41 Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000013 Zoning Amendment Application SC-Z20000021 Thomas and Carol Campbell and Terry Bell 20 Port Union Road Port Union Village (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

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 (September 18, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

- (A) Deferral:
  - (1) defer the public hearing respecting the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for the Bell property and the Official Plan Amendment respecting the right-of-way for the Duthie Street extension across the frontage of the Bell property as shown on Attachment 2; and

- (2) authorize staff, upon completion of the transportation review, to give notice in accordance with the regulations under the Planning Act respecting a public hearing on the applications referenced in (A)(1).
- (B) Official Plan:
  - amend Schedule "C" Road Plan of the Official Plan for the former City of Scarborough by reducing the right-of-way for a portion of Duthie Street (Bridgend Street extension) from 27 metres (89 feet) to a minimum of 14.1 metres (46 feet) as shown on Attachment 1; and
  - (2) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan Amendment as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.
- (C) Zoning By-law:
  - (1) amend the former Township of Pickering Zoning By-law 1978, as amended, to delete the subject lands east of Port Union Road and south of Lawrence Avenue, being Lots 1 to 5 inclusive, Part of Lot 6 and Lots 7 to 17 inclusive, Registered Plan 5, Pickering and incorporate them into the Centennial Community Zoning By-law No. 12077, as amended and rezone these lands as detailed below in subsection C.(2) as shown in Attachment 2.

| Minimum Lot                | 5.48 metres (18 feet)                          |
|----------------------------|--|
| Frontage:                  |  |
| Minimum Lot Area:          | 137 square metres (1,745 square feet)          |
| Minimum Lot Depth:         | 25 metres (82 feet)                            |
| Maximum Lot Coverage:      | 60% maximum (enclosed porches included)        |
| Maximum Driveway Width:    | 3 metres (9.8 feet)                            |
| Front Yard Setback:        | 6 metres (20 feet) to a garage or house and    |
|                            | 4.5 metres (15 feet) to a porch                |
| Minimum Interior Side Yard | 1.2 metre (4 feet) side yard building setback  |
| Setback:                   | from lot lines other than street lot lines and |
|                            | 0 metres from the common lot line shared       |
|                            | by dwelling units                              |
| Minimum Exterior Side Yard | 2.4 metres (10 feet) to a house or             |
| Setback:                   | 1.5 for any projections                        |
| Rear Yard Setback:         | 6 metres (20 feet)                             |
| Building Height:           | 11.5 metres (38 feet)                          |
| Number of Storeys          | 3  |
| (excluding basements):     |  |

(2) (a) Zone Provisions:

- (b) notwithstanding Clause V(f) Definitions of the Centennial Community Zoning By-law No. 12077, the definition of "Street", minimum width shall not apply to Cherry Street and Duthie Street;
- (c) notwithstanding CLAUSE V(f) Definitions of the Centennial Community Zoning By-law, the definition of "Main Wall", projections (porches, exterior steps, balconies, etc.) shall be allowed to a maximum of 4.5 metres from the street line; the main wall definition pertaining to projections shall not apply to corner lots; and
- (d) the provisions of CLAUSE VI 16. Regulations for Single-Family, Street Townhouse Dwellings, and Two-Family Dwellings 16.3 (lot size and floor area) shall not apply;
- (3) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Zoning By-law Amendment as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution;
- (D) Development Agreement:
  - (1) authorize the City of Toronto's appropriate signing officers to execute a financially secured Development Agreement with the developers providing:
    - (a) the developer undertake a final noise and vibration analysis and provide abatement measures necessary to achieve the maximum levels limits set out by the Ministry of the Environment and CNR and agree to insert the appropriate warning clauses in development agreements and all offers of purchase and sale or lease for any dwelling unit;
    - (b) the developer submit a Record of Site Condition to the City acknowledged by the Ministry of the Environment indicating the site has been remediated to residential standards together with a letter from the Ministry of the Environment advising that the Record of Site Condition is not subject to an audit review; or in the alternative advising that the Record of Site Condition has passed a Ministry audit for compliance with the "Guideline for Use at Contaminated Sites in Ontario, February 1997", as amended, or updated;

- (c) the developer be required to make satisfactory arrangements with the City, financially and otherwise respecting:
  - provision of municipal services including, but not limited to, the design and construction of Cherry Street, Duthie Street and the intersections between a) Port Union Road and Duthie Street and; b) Cherry Street and Duthie Street, boulevards on Port Union Road, utility easements and servicing (sewer and watermain connections) for the future Village Common precinct; and
  - (ii) compensation as a result of any loss of trees as a result of final grading of the site; cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication; financing for a sidewalk on the south side of Duthie Street;
- (d) submission and approval of an arborist report and tree preservation plan indicating the location of existing trees; and
- (e) acquisition of a portion of Cherry Street for inclusion in the building lots and acquisition of City lands required to achieve the Duthie Street right-of-way.
- (E) Site Plan Agreement:
  - (1) direct that site plan approval not be granted until the development agreement referenced in recommendation 4 has been executed and registered on title; and
- (F) Part Lot Control:
  - (1) direct that a By-law lifting part lot control be brought forward to Council upon the approval of a satisfactory site plan.

Councillor Moeser moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, subject to adding the following:

"(G) Miscellaneous:

That the Commissioners of Urban Development Services and Works and Emergency Services, the Local Community, the Ward Councillors, and the Developers be requested to undertake a detailed review of the following issues and report back to Community Council regarding:

- (1) traffic calming methods in the Port Union Village area;
- (2) road systems to minimize traffic infiltration in the Rouge Landing Community;
- (3) pedestrian safety on Port Union Road and around the Village Common;
- (4) potential parking problems in the community related to the GO parking;
- (5) safety issues related to the berm, north of the CN Rail line; and
- (6) timing of traffic lights at Port Union Road and Lawrence Avenue.".

The Community Council also had before it the following communications:

(September 12, 2000) from Julius De Ruyter, Vice President, PMG Planning Consultants:

We act as planning consultants to Yellow Moon Limited, the owners of the former Manson site located on the west side of Port Union Road, south of Lawrence Avenue East, and located immediately opposite the above noted lands. The Yellow Moon Limited lands are the subject of Draft Plan of Subdivision 55T-95015 which is pending approval.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment would reduce the right-of-way for Duthie Street (Bridgend Street extension) from 27 metres to 14.1 metres or possibly a lesser width as we understand is being considered by City Staff. We note that Bridgend Street is intended to continue westerly, west of Port Union Road, onto the Yellow Moon Limited lands and that the Yellow Moon Draft Plan of Subdivision currently provides for a 27metre right-of-way.

We request that the City consider also reducing that portion of the Bridgend Street extension right-of-way on the Yellow Moon Limited lands. In our view, it is not necessary nor appropriate that there be such a major difference in right-of-way widths for two roads which are intended to align with each other at the same location on Port Union Road.

We request that the proposed Official Plan Amendment also provide for the reduction in right-of-way width on the Yellow Moon Lands. We have not determined what that right-of-way width should be but we are prepared to work with City Staff to arrive at an acceptable width.

We request to be kept notified of all actions or decisions relating to this matter together with a copy of the Notice of Decision.

(September 12, 2000) from Paul Theodore and thirty-four others:

I am writing to ask that you defer the decision regarding the application above.

I am very concerned regarding the development of the area between Duthie Street and the proposed Cherry St., and the implications this development has for my community, such as:

- traffic problems that will result from the linkage of Bridgend Road to Duthie and Cherry Streets. The community is already experiencing traffic congestion as commuters access the GO station via the west end of Bridgend Road;
- the suitability of the proposal for the existing neighbourhood;
- the increased stress that this development poses for area services such as elementary and secondary schools; and
- the uncertainty of the form of development on the current Manson site, including the additional traffic congestion it will bring.

As a resident in the immediate neighbourhood (Rouge Landing – Intracorp), I was not informed of any preliminary meetings regarding development in the area. Nor was anyone else in my neighbourhood. I understand that the preliminary process provides the main opportunity for residents such as myself to express our concerns to all involved in the planning process. We did not have any such opportunity.

In fact, I was only recently (end of August, 2000) made aware of the proposal. I am sure you will agree that a few weeks are insufficient to consider the significant implications of any new development.

Therefore I am compelled to ask you to defer this matter to give our community a reasonable period of time to consider what this proposal means for our neighbourhood, and participate in the planning process.

(September 19, 2000) from Brenda Wretham, resident of Shoalhaven Drive and Member of the Rouge Landing Ratepayers Association:

I am writing this letter on behalf of the area residents in support of the motion for rezoning by Blue Water Development. Our community initially expressed concerns regarding this development and specifically, the linking of roads through our community. We faxed several letters through opposing the application and asked for a deferral.

Subsequent meetings with Councillor Moeser and Quest Development representatives have resolved the issues and we are now in a position to support the motion for re-zoning today.

We thank Councillor Moeser and Quest for their willingness to work with our community for a resolvement of these issues.

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

- Mr. Peter Campbell, representing Quest Homes, in support of the staff recommendations, as amended by Community Council;
- Ms. Brenda Wretham, Rouge Landing Ratepayers' Association, referring to the numerous letters of objection filed with the City Clerk and presented to the Community Council; advising that the community does have valid concerns respecting traffic, but further meetings with the developer and the Ward Councillor have resulted in these objections being withdrawn, and indicating support for the staff recommendation; and
- Mr. Irvin and Mrs. Shirley Airdrie, area residents, expressing concerns at the narrowness of the internal subdivision streets and the impact on traffic.

## (Clause No. 29, Report No. 10)

# 8.42 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000006 Morningard Developments Limited South Side of Milner Avenue, East of Morningside Avenue 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 (August 18, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) Zoning By-law:

amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law Number 24982 (Rouge) with respect to the lands on the south side of Milner Avenue, east of Morningside Avenue, being Part of Lot 2 and Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6, Registered Plan 66M-2249 by:

- (a) adding "Hotels, excluding Adult Entertainment Parlours" as a permitted use;
- (b) adding Performance Standards restricting the gross floor area of the hotel to 3,900 square metres (42,000 square feet) and the number of hotel bedroom units to 125 units;
- (c) replacing the Performance Standard pertaining to the general provision on recreational uses in the industrial zones with a requirement that all Zoning By-law provisions apply collectively to the subject lands;
- (d) applying a site specific hotel definition to include the ancillary use of "one suite for the exclusive use of the hotel manager"; and
- (2) 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 Ashton, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report.

Ms. Roslyn Houser, Solicitor for the applicant, appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter and in support of the staff recommendation.

## (Clause No. 30, Report No. 10)

# 8.43 City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment SC-W20000004 Village Securities Ltd., 311 Staines Road Morningside Heights Community (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 (August 16, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council:

(1) amend the Morningside Heights Community Secondary Plan with respect to the property bounded by the Rouge River to the east, Staines Road to the west and the Ontario Hydro Services Company corridor the south, as shown on Attachment 1, deleting the existing "P-Open Space Neighbourhood Park" designation and replacing it with an "OS-Open Space" designation; and

(2) authorize such unsubstantive, technical, stylistic or format changes to the Official Plan Amendment as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

On the question of the adoption of the aforementioned report, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

Yeas: Councillors Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Duguid, Mahood -6

Nays: Councillor Cho -1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 5.

Mr. Lorne Ross, Lorne Ross Planning Services Inc., representing Village Securities Ltd., appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter; advising that his client submits the appropriate designation for the 30 meter linear park blocks is P-Open Space Neighbourhood Park, as defined within the Morningside Community Secondary Plan; notwithstanding this submission, Village Securities will not object to the proposed redesignation to Open Space; and that whatever planning designation the City applies to these blocks, it cannot supersede the well-established planning principle that fair compensation is required to bring developable private land into public ownership.

# (Clause No. 31, Report No. 10)

# 8.44 Proposed Brimley Station on Scarborough Rapid Transit Line (Ward 15 - Scarborough City Centre)

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

- (1) request the Toronto Transit Commission to conduct a detailed design and costing study for the proposed Brimley Station on the Scarborough Rapid Transit Line; and
- (2) direct planning staff to investigate funding mechanisms to implement the construction of the station, pending the outcome of the design and costing study, and bring forward a report to the Scarborough Community Council.

On a motion by Councillor Shaw, the Scarborough Community Council recommended to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, subject to requesting that the report to Scarborough Community Council be provided by March 2001, if possible.

(Clause No. 32, Report No. 10)

# 8.45 Ontario Municipal Board Hearing Variance Application at 133 Atlee Avenue (Ward 13 - Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 6, 2000) from the City Solicitor, advising of the outcome of the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing respecting No. 133 Atlee Avenue, and recommending that this report be received for information.

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

## (Clause No. 42(n), Report No. 10)

## 8.46 Disposition of the Westerly Portion of 3100 Eglinton Avenue East (Ward 13 - Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 11, 2000) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Corporate Services be directed to provide the two prospective purchasers of the subject property one further opportunity to submit their highest and best replacement offer by 12:00 noon on September 26, 2000, and to report directly to Council for its meeting scheduled on October 3, 4, and 5, 2000; and
- (2) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On a motion by Councillor Altobello, the Scarborough Community Council approved the recommendation embodied in the aforementioned report from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, thereby authorizing the submission of a further report directly to City Council at its meeting to be held on October 3, 4 and 5, 2000.

# (Clause No. 33, Report No. 10)

# 8.47 Surplus Land Declaration and Proposed Closing and Conveyancing of a Portion of Sudbury Hall Drive (Ward 18 - Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a joint report (September 8, 2000) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that a portion of Sudbury Hall Drive, south of Dean Park Road,

be stopped up, closed, declared surplus and sold, in accordance with the conditions detailed in the Commissioners' joint report.

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

## (Clause No. 34, Report No. 10)

#### 8.48 Part Lot Control Exemption Application SL1998010 70 Guildwood Parkway (Ward 13 - Scarborough Bluffs)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 12, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, advising that the owner of the aforementioned property has requested a one-year extension to Part Lot Control Exemption By-law No. 553-1999, which will lapse on September 28, 2000, in order to allow sales of his townhouse project to be completed and the deeds registered, and recommending that City Council permit such extension.

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

The Scarborough Community Council also had before it a faxed communication (September 11, 2000) from Mr. Stephen Haller, Baker Schneider Swartz, Barristers and Solicitors, on behalf of their client, Suresh Singh, the applicant, requesting the extension of Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 553-1999, a copy of which was included in the Supplementary Agenda for the Scarborough Community Council meeting of September 19, 2000, and a copy thereof is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, Scarborough Civic Centre.

(Clause No. 35, Report No. 10)

8.49 Request For Direction Minor Variance Application No. A59/00SC Corrado Dinatale, 34 Canadine Road Bendale Community (Ward 15 - Scarborough City Centre)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 11, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, recommending that City Council authorize the City Solicitor to attend any Ontario Municipal Board hearings of the appeal of the Committee of Adjustment's Decision on the aforementioned Variance Application to represent the City's interest in ensuring a full evaluation of the proposal in accordance with the Official Plan and Zoning By-law policies on second suites.

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

# (Clause No. 36, Report No. 10)

# 8.50 Conditions of Approval for Draft Plan of Subdivision McAsphalt Industries Ltd. and Rouge River Park Limited Rouge Employment District (Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 12, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, responding to City Council's directions, at its meeting held on August 1, 2, 3 and 4, 2000; submitting recommendations respecting conditions of approval for the McAsphalt Industries Ltd./Rouge River Park Ltd. Draft Plan of Subdivision covering 57.4 hectares (142 acres) and urban design guidelines for the Sheppard Avenue East frontage of the property; and recommending approval thereof, as detailed in the Director's report.

- A. Councillor Balkissoon moved that the Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report, subject to:
  - (1) Conditions Nos. 16 and 17 being forwarded to City Council without recommendation with the request that the Director of Community Planning, East District, report directly to City Council at its meeting to be held on October 3, 4 and 5, 2000, on the outcome of a meeting of expert witness scheduled to take place on September 20, 2000;
  - (2) Condition No. 41 be amended by adding the words "unless otherwise approved by the School Boards";
  - (3) Condition No. 52 be amended by inserting the following words after the word "Department":

"to assist in determining the facilities and nature of services to be provided for the Community Recreation Centre for the subject lands";

- (4) Condition No. 56 be struck out in its entirety; and
- (5) Condition No. 57 be amended by striking out all the words after the first sentence.

On the question of the adoption of Motion A.(1), (2) and (3) by Councillor Balkissoon, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

- Yeas: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki –8
- Nays: Councillor Cho -1
- Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 7.

On the question of the adoption of Motion A(4) by Councillor Balkissoon, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

- Yeas: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki –8
- Nays: Councillor Cho –1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 7.

On the question of the adoption of Motion A(5) by Councillor Balkissoon, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

- Yeas: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki –8
- Nays: Councillor Cho -1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 7.

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

- Yeas: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki –8
- Nays: Councillor Cho -1

Decided in the affirmative by a majority of 7.

- B. Councillor Cho moved that Motion A. by Councillor Balkissoon be amended by:
  - (1) adding at the end of Condition No. 1 the words "and the Rouge Park Alliance";
  - (2) inserting after the word "Authority" in Condition No. 2 the words "and the Rouge Park Alliance";
  - (3) adding the following words to Condition No. 49:

"total removal of fly ash from the subject land to be completed prior to starting building houses on this site"; and

(4) further that two-thirds of the entire site be Residential and the other onethird remain Industrial.

Councillor Mahood, as Acting Chair, ruled Motion B(4) by Councillor Cho out of order, in that only the Conditions of Approval for the Draft Plan of Subdivision were before Community Council, the Zoning designations having been previously approved by City Council.

On the question of the adoption of Motion B.(1), (2) and (3) by Councillor Cho, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

- Yeas: Councillor Cho –1
- Nays: Councillors Ashton, Balkissoon, Duguid, Kelly, Mahood, Moeser, Shaw, Soknacki –8

Decided in the negative by a majority of 7.

## (Clause No. 37, Report No. 10)

## 8.51 Sale of a Portion of the Stormwater Channel Adjacent to No. 11 Grand Marshall Drive (Ward 18 – Scarborough Malvern)

The Community Council had before it a report (September 18, 2000) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

(1) the Offer to Purchase from 955159 Ontario Limited, the adjacent property owner of 11 Grand Marshall Drive, to purchase part of the City-owned stormwater channel, described as part of Block 19 on Registered Plan 66M-2249 (identified as Part 1 on the attached sketch), in the amount of \$15,768.00 be accepted on the terms outlined in the body of this report, and that the Commissioner of Corporate Services or the Director of Real Estate Services be authorized to accept the Offer on behalf of the City;

- (2) the City Solicitor be authorized to complete the transaction on behalf of the City, including payment of any necessary expenses and amending the closing date to such earlier or later date as he considers reasonable; and
- (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

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

# (Clause No. 38, Report No. 10)

# 8.52 Canada Lands Company – Parks Levies

The Community Council had before it a communication (September 18, 2000) from Councillor Bas Balkissoon, respecting the reimbursement of parks levies to Canada Lands Company, as approved by City Council, and recommending that:

- (1) this communication be forwarded to City Council for its information; and
- (2) Community Council request the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer to report directly to City Council at its meeting to be held on October 3, 4 and 5, 2000, respecting the repayment to Canada Lands Company of the \$100,000.00 prepaid for parks levies pursuant to the agreement made the 31st day of October, 1986, between the Ontario Land Corporation and the Corporation of the City of Scarborough.

On a motion by Councillor Balkissoon, the Scarborough Community Council forwarded the aforementioned communication to City Council and directed that the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer report thereto, as recommended.

(Clause No. 39, Report No. 10)

8.53 Ontario Municipal Board Appeal Official Plan Amendment No. 913 City-Initiated Interim Control By-Law Study W95051 KJT Group Investments Ltd., 4181 Sheppard Avenue East Agincourt Centre Community (Ward 17 – Scarborough Agincourt)

Councillor Balkissoon moved that the Community Council meet privately to discuss the matter of Ontario Municipal Board Appeal, Official Plan Amendment No. 913, 4181 Sheppard Avenue East, having regard that the subject matter may involve litigation.

The Community Council resolved itself to meet in camera to discuss the confidential report (August 11, 2000) from the City Solicitor respecting the aforementioned Appeal, such recommendations to be considered in camera having regard that the subject matter may involve litigation.

The Committee of the Whole rose and reported progress.

On a motion by Councillor Mahood, the Scarborough Community Council forwarded the aforementioned confidential report to City Council without recommendation.

# (Clause No. 41, Report No. 10)

## 8.54 No. 14 Thora Avenue

Councillor Altobello moved that the Community Council meet privately to discuss the matter of No. 14 Thora Avenue, having regard that the subject matter relates to proposed or pending acquisition of land for municipal purposes.

The Community Council resolved itself to meet in camera to discuss the confidential report (September 12, 2000) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services respecting No. 14 Thora Avenue, having regard that the subject matter relates to proposed or pending acquisition of land for municipal purposes.

The Committee of the Whole rose and reported progress.

On a motion by Councillor Altobello, the Scarborough Community Council referred the aforementioned confidential report to the Policy and Finance Committee.

## (Clause No. 42(p), Report No. 10)

8.55 Preliminary Report Official Plan Amendment Application SC-P20000010 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application SC-Z20000010 K. R. Property Management, 100 McLevin 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 <u>refuse</u> 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.

A. Councillor Cho moved that the report (June 30, 2000) by the Director of Community Planning, East District, be deferred with the request that the Director of Community Planning, East District, undertake a specific review of this site as to whether this application should be approved or not, such report to be provided to Community Council at the earliest opportunity.

The Scarborough Community Council consented to the withdrawal of Motion A. by Councillor Cho.

B. Councillor Balkissoon moved that Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the adoption of the aforementioned report to refuse the application.

(Carried)

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

- Ms. Nina Perfetto, Solicitor representing Mr. Imam Khan, Five Star Auto Service, tenant of the applicant, in opposition to the staff recommendation; and
- Mr. Imam Khan.

(Clause No. 16, Report No. 10)

# 8.56 Site Plan Control Application Parasco Morrish Inc., 34 Morrish Road (Ward 16 – Scarborough Highland Creek)

The Community Council had before it the following reports:

- (a) (September 5, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, submitting, as requested by Community Council, a chronology of this project; reporting on the outcome of the mediation process; seeking direction for the City Solicitor at the Ontario Municipal Board; and recommending that City Council approve the aforementioned Site Plan Application, subject to the conditions embodied in the July 17, 2000 report from the Director of Community Planning, East District;
- (b) (September 14, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, providing further information respecting the chronology of the Parasco Morrish Inc. Site Plan Control Application project;
- (c) (July 17, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District, responding to Councillor Moeser's request for a "bump up" on the Parasco Morrish Site Plan Application and submitting recommendations with respect thereto;
- (d) (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
- (e) (September 19, 2000) from Councillor Ron Moeser, requesting the Community Council to support the approval of the site plan control application for self storage units, subject to certain conditions.

Councillor Moeser moved that Scarborough Community Council recommend to City Council the approval of the aforementioned Site Plan Control Application S98069, subject to:

(1) the conditions detailed in the aforementioned report (July 17, 2000) from the Director of Community Planning, East District;

and subject to the following additional conditions:

(2) the provision of a minimum 1.8 metre wood privacy fence with lattice along the south property limits, excluding the portion at the rear triangular area of the property where parking exists, and between the existing dwelling and the proposed northerly storage units; and

(3) details of and written confirmation from the owner of the proposed improvements to the existing dwelling which will be undertaken being received prior to the issuance of a building permit for the storage unit.

# (Carried)

Mr. Bill Kew and Mr. George Parasco, Parasco Morrish Inc., appeared before the Community Council in connection with the foregoing matter.

## (Clause No. 17, Report No. 10)

## 8.57 OMB Decision – Ontario Hydro Corridor Lands

Under Any Other Matters on the Agenda, the Scarborough Community Council:

- (1) considered a request by Councillor Kelly that Community Council recommend that City Council request the Ontario Municipal Board to reopen its 1998 decision respecting the planning applications for the Ontario Hydro Corridor Lands, in that abutting residents concerned about traffic at the nearby Bridlewood Junior Public School are requesting that the developer, Graywood Investments, amend its Plan of Subdivision such that the proposed cul de sac exit onto Huntingwood Drive and the proposed park be moved to the south of Huntingwood Drive;
- (2) received the advice of the Director of Administrative and Tribunal Law that City Council previously requested a reopening of the OMB Decision and such request was denied by the Board;
- (3) received the advice of the Director of Community Planning, East District, that staff could meet with the developer to request such a change to the proposed Plan if directed to do so; and
- (4) requested the Director of Community Planning, East District, to approach the developer to determine whether he would be agreeable to the change put forward by Councillor Kelly on behalf of the community.

Upon the adoption of the aforementioned request by Councillor Kelly, a recorded vote was taken, as follows:

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

Nays: Nil

Decided in the affirmative by a unanimous vote of the Members of Community Council present and voting.

# (Clause No. 42(q), Report No. 10)

## 8.58 Registration Problems in the Scarborough Community

On a motion by Councillor Moeser, the Scarborough Community Council requested that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism submit a report directly to City Council at its meeting to be held on October 3, 4 and 5, 2000, respecting the problems experienced in the Scarborough community with the Parks and Recreation registration process.

# (Clause No. 40, Report No. 10)

## 8.59 Upcoming Ontario Municipal Board Hearing City-initiated Amendments to the Upper Rouge – Hillside Zoning By-law

Under Any Other Matters on the Agenda, the Scarborough Community Council:

- (1) considered the following motion by Councillor Cho:
  - "(i) that Council oppose 10,000 square foot homes one developer is proposing on Kirkhams Road and support the building of 4,700 square foot homes;
  - (ii) that Council direct the City Solicitor to hire outside experts to defend the City's position at the upcoming Ontario Municipal Board Hearing.";
- (2) received the advice of the Director of Administrative and Tribunal Law that the Hearing on this matter will be held commencing Monday, September 25, 2000; that the Solicitor representing the City's interests requires no instruction or outside assistance in this matter in that the City's by-law permitting 4,700 square foot homes will be defended by the Solicitor; that the Community Council cannot direct the City Solicitor to hire outside experts; and further, given that the City Council will meet on October 3, 2000, by which time the Hearing will be concluded, the motion is redundant; and
- (3) directed that the Director of Community Planning, East District, report on the details of the foregoing directly to the Ward Councillor(s).

# (Clause No. 42(s), Report No. 10)

#### 8.60 Vehicle Service and Repair Locations

On a motion by Councillor Shaw, the Scarborough Community Council, under Any Other Matters on its Agenda, requested the Executive Director of Economic Development to direct her staff to offer assistance to Mr. Imam Khan, operator of Five Star Auto Service at 100 McLevin Avenue in an attempt to find him alternative business premises; having regard that Mr. Khan's landlord's Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment application for this property, to permit vehicle service and repair uses, is recommended for refusal by the Community Council in Clause 16 of Report No. 10.

## (Clause No. 42(r), Report No. 10)

## 8.61 Use of School Board Gymnasiums by Community Groups

On a motion by Councillor Shaw, the Scarborough Community Council, under Any Other Matters on its Agenda, approved that the issue of community concerns respecting the use of School Board gymnasiums be referred to Councillor Ashton as Chair of the Economic Development and Parks Committee.

## (Clause No. 42(t), Report No. 10)

The Community Council adjourned its meeting at 5:51 p.m.

Chair.