

**THE CITY OF TORONTO**

**Clerk's Division**

**Minutes of the Planning and Transportation Committee**

**Meeting No. 1**

**Monday, January 14, 2002**

The Planning and Transportation Committee met on January 14, 2002, in Committee Room No. 1, 2nd Floor, City Hall, Toronto, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>9:30 a.m.</b>	<b>* 11:35 a.m.</b>	<b>2:00 p.m.</b>
Councillor Joe Pantalone, Chair	X	X	X
Councillor Mario Silva, Vice-Chair	-	-	-
Councillor Gerry Altobello	-	-	-
Councillor Brian Ashton	X	X	X
Councillor Joanne Flint	X	X	X
Councillor Pam McConnell	X	X	X
Councillor Peter Milczyn	X	X	X
Councillor Howard Moscoe	X	X	X

\* The Committee recessed at 11:19 a.m. and reconvened at 11:35 a.m. due to a fire alarm being called, which required evacuation of the 2nd floor.

**Declarations of Interest Pursuant to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act**

None declared.

**Confirmation of Minutes**

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on November 12, 2001, were confirmed.

**1.1 Draft Amendments to the Former Metro and Area Municipal Official Plans and Draft City-wide Zoning By-law to Permit Seniors Community Houses City-wide**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (December 13, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

forwarding draft official plan and zoning by-law amendments to permit Seniors Community Houses across the City wherever residential uses are permitted in the existing zoning By-laws, for consideration at a January 14, 2002 public meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee, and recommending that:

- (1) the City Solicitor submit by-laws for the consideration of Council substantially as contained in Appendices A and B attached to this report, being amendments to the former Metro and area municipal plans and a city-wide zoning By-law, for the purpose of permitting Seniors Community Houses in all zones or districts where residential uses are permitted, excluding the Parkdale community; and
- (2) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, including any unsubstantive technical, stylistic or format changes to the proposed by-laws as may be necessary.

The Committee also had before it the following communications:

- (December 10, 2001) from the City Clerk advising that City Council, at its meeting on December 4, 5 and 6, 2001, adopted Clause No. 3 of Report No. 14 of the Planning and Transportation Committee, titled "Proposed City-wide Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to Permit Seniors Community Houses", and in so doing directed that:
  - (1) draft Zoning By-law amendments, generally as described in the report (November 6, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, to permit a Seniors Community House use in any zone where residential uses are generally permitted, except within the Parkdale community in the former City of Toronto, be forwarded to a statutory Public Meeting held pursuant to the Planning Act at the January 14, 2002 meeting of Planning and Transportation Committee;
  - (2) the necessary amendments to the former Metro and former Area Municipal Official Plans, as may be required to authorize the draft Zoning By-law amendments referenced above, be drafted and also be forwarded to a statutory Public Meeting held pursuant to the Planning Act at the January 14, 2002 meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee; and
  - (3) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.
- (January 7, 2002) from Hugh Wilkinson, Director, Abbeyfield Houses Society of Toronto, supporting the direction of the amendments and proposing:

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

- (1) (Ref. "Conclusions and Sec. 5.3) - that Community Senior's Houses, which will be limited to a maximum of 10 tenants, should not be restricted to housing stock of greater than 5 years; and
  - (2) (Ref. Sec. 3.6 "Non Profit and For-profit Facilities") - that these By-laws should apply exclusively to non-profit operators;
- (January 10, 2002) from Stewart Patterson, President, The Rotary Club of Toronto - Forest Hill, supporting the urgent need for quality affordable accommodation for senior citizens in the City of Toronto.

The Planning and Transportation Committee held a statutory public meeting on January 14, 2002 in accordance with the Planning Act, and Hugh Wilkinson, Abbeyfield Houses Society of Toronto addressed the Committee and advised that he was in support of the proposed by-law.

The Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting on February 13, 2002, that:

- (1) (on motion by Councillor Flint) based on the findings of fact and the recommendations contained in the report (December 13, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services this report be adopted subject to:
  - (a) (on motion by Councillor Moscoe) restricting the operators of seniors community houses to non-profit providers;
  - (b) (on motion by Councillor Flint) ensuring that seniors community houses:
    - (i) not be located in floodplains;
    - (ii) be subject to site plan control; and
    - (iii) in residential areas, be limited to one per block on local and collector roads;
  - (c) providing for a review of the by-laws, when enacted in two years time; and
- (2) (on motion by Councillor Moscoe) the Province of Ontario be requested to expand to the whole City of Toronto, the

special legislation for rooming house licensing presently applicable to the former City of Toronto.

The motion to adopt the report (December 13, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, as amended, carried on the following division of votes:

Yeas: Councillors Flint, McConnell, Milczyn and Moscoe - 4

Nays: Councillors Ashton and Pantalone - 2

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee advised the Seniors Assembly that concerns were expressed by the Planning and Transportation Committee with respect to current insufficient standards for seniors housing and their enforcement, and requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to report to this body with recommendations on ways to protect senior citizens in this area.

(Seniors Assembly and Commissioner, Urban Development Services; c.c.: Commissioner, Community & Neighbourhood Services - January 29, 2002)

**(Clause No. 1, Report No. 2)**

**1.2 Harmonization of Sign Permit Application Fees and Other Sign-Related Issues**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services providing the necessary draft by-law to give effect to the proposed sign permit fee increases outlined in the report of the Commissioner of Urban Development Services dated October 26, 2001, and to provide the further information as requested by Committee at its meeting of November 12, 2001, and recommending that:

- (1) the attached by-law be approved; and
- (2) authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary bill in Council, substantially in the form of the draft by-law, to give effect thereto.

The Committee also had before it a communication (December 13, 2001) from the City Clerk advising that City Council, at its meeting on December 4, 5 and 6, 2001, adopted and amended Clause No. 1 of Report No. 14 of the Planning and Transportation Committee titled "Sign Permit and Variance Application Fee Harmonization", and in part authorized the Planning and Transportation Committee to hold a public meeting on

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

January 14, 2002, to consider a draft by-law amendment to adjust sign permit fees as outlined in the further report (October 30, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, and other sign matters that may be contained in the staff reports requested to be submitted to the January 14, 2002 public hearing, that notice of hearing be given in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Act and staff be directed to prepare a draft by-law for consideration at the public meeting.

The Planning and Transportation Committee reported to City Council that pursuant to the Municipal Act, notice with respect to the proposed enactment of the by-law amendments was advertised in a daily newspaper on December 28, 2001, and the following persons addressed the Planning and Transportation Committee:

- Brian Ridgeway;
- Blair Murdoch, Vice President, Real Estate, Viacom Outdoor; and
- Sid Catalano, Director of Legislation, Pattison Outdoor Advertising

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on February 13, 2002:

- (1) the adoption of the report from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services;
- (2) requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to report directly to City Council for its meeting on February 13, 2002:
  - (a) on the recommendation of Toronto East York Community Council that an Inspector be hired to conduct proactive inspections of illegal signs that pose a hazard to the public; and
  - (b) provide a rationale for the proposed sign permit fee increases; and
- (3) referred the following motion:

“That the Commissioner of Urban Development Services report further on:

  - (a) amendments to the draft by-law respecting necessary adjustments to reflect the cost recovery principle to enable a fee for a first party application to be adjusted so that a variance for a second party

sign be significantly lower than for a third party sign;

- (b) how the annual fee on third party signs presently enacted in the East District can be applied City-wide; and
- (c) with respect to the \$200 Sign Permit fee increase for mobile signs proposed by North York Community Council, explain how this proposal can be applied and provide appropriate draft by-law amendments.”;

to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services with a request that she:

- (a) (on motion by Councillor Ashton) incorporate these into the further report on the development of a new City-wide Sign By-law, and also incorporate therein a review of:
  - (i) mobile signs;
  - (ii) third party signs; and
  - (iii) third party advertising fees; and
- (b) report to the March 25, 2002 meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee on the proposed timing for the Committee’s consideration of the new City-wide Sign By-law and its implementation.

(Commissioner, Urban Development Services; c.c.: Executive Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards Division - January 16, 2002)

**(Clause No. 2, Report No. 2)**

**1.3 2002 Operating and Capital Budgets**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to the following material:

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

Analyst Briefing Notes for 2002 - 2006 Capital Program on:

- (a) Urban Development Services;
- (b) Special Corporate Projects;
- (c) Yonge Dundas Project; and
- (d) Waterfront Revitalization Initiative
- (e) 2002 Operating Budget of Urban Development Services.
- (f) 2002 New/Enhanced Services Request

The Committee also had before it the following material:

- communication (January 14, 2002) from Ann Dembinski, President, CUPE, Local 79, forwarding concerns about the lack of meaningful information regarding the operating budgets of the departments under the Committee's mandate and requesting that the budget not be cut and adequate resources be provided to continue this critical work;
- communication (undated) from Neil Beveridge, Chair, Taxicab Advisory Committee, submitting the following 2002 budget items, as approved by TAC at its meeting on September 24, 2002:

Per Diem for members	\$12,000.00	
Workshops/Incidentals	\$ 5,000.00	
TaxiWatch Programme		
Awards	\$2,000.00	
Coordinator honorarium	<u>\$4,200.00</u>	\$6,200.00

and

- presentation, titled "2002 Capital & Operating Budgets", as presented by the Commissioner, Urban Development Services.

The following persons appeared before the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Neil Beveridge, Chair, Taxicab Advisory Committee; and
- Ken Amoroso, CUPE, Local 79.

The Planning and Transportation Committee received a PowerPoint presentation from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services on the 2002 Operating Budget and the 2002-2006 Capital Budget, heard from members of the public with respect to these budgets, addressed questions to staff and, on

motion by Councillor Pantalone, deferred further consideration to its next meeting on January 18, 2002.

#### **1.4 Parkland Acquisition Strategic Directions Report**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (November 9, 2001) from the City Clerk forwarding Clause No. 10 of Report No. 10 of the Economic Development and Parks Committee which was adopted, as amended, by City Council at its meeting on November 6, 7 and 8, 2001, and advising that City Council, in part, directed that the Parkland Acquisition Strategic Directions Report be forwarded to Community Councils and the Planning and Transportation Committee for their consideration and report back to the January 21, 2002 meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee.

The Committee also had before it a communication (November 23, 2001) from the City Clerk, Humber York Community Council advising that the Humber York Community Council, at its meeting on November 20, 2001, recommended to the Planning and Transportation Committee that it ensure that a mechanism is in place for the provision of green space in communities when development applications are being considered, by requiring that the Official Plan specifically address the provision of parkland and/or green space in considering development issues; and that the Parkland Acquisition Strategic Directions Report, be also considered together with Official Plan documents.

The Planning and Transportation Committee with Councillor McConnell in the Chair:

- (1) on motion by Councillor Pantalone, endorsed the Parkland Acquisition Strategic Directions Report and requested the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism to report to the January 21, 2002 meeting of the Economic Development Committee on the feasibility of conducting a detailed parkland acquisition assessment of surplus public lands in the Scarborough Transportation Corridor as a contributing factor and interest in ongoing planning studies;
- (2) on motion by Councillor Ashton, requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to report to the Planning and Transportation Committee:
  - (a) for its meeting on January, 2003, on the feasibility of imposing specific park dedications on lands in



industrial areas adjacent to, or in areas which are, parks deficient; and

- (b) on the parkland dedication policies and whether they are consistent with the strategy being proposed in the Parkland Acquisition Strategic Directions Report and whether present parkland dedication policies are adequate and consistent across the City and if not what changes should be proposed.

(Economic Development and Parks Committee; Commissioner, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and Commissioner, Urban Development Services - January 16, 2002)

**(Clause No. 7(a), Report No. 2)**

**1.5 Harmonization of the Sign By-law concerning Posters on Utility Poles**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services reporting on alternative options to simplify the proposed by-law and suggest alternative enforcement strategies and cost recovery options, as requested by Council, and recommending that:

- (1) the Planning and Transportation Committee be authorized to hold a public meeting on March 25, 2002 to consider the proposed by-law amendments with respect to posters on utility poles and that Notice of Hearing be given in accordance with the requirements of the *Municipal Act*;
- (2) posters not be permitted on any privately-owned pole located on the boulevard;
- (3) posters be permitted only on utility poles located on a boulevard if:
  - (a) the utility pole is fitted with an approved collar;
  - (b) the poster is no larger than 22 centimetres by 28 centimetres and consists of lightweight cardboard or paper only;
  - (c) the poster is at least 100 metres from any other poster that conveys essentially identical information;
  - (d) the poster is securely attached flush to the surface of the collar using staples or removable tape;
  - (e) the poster is dated, showing the date of posting; and
  - (f) the poster is displayed for not more than 30 days or five days after the end of the advertised event, if any, whichever is earlier;

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

- (4) the purchase and installation of 2,000 collars be approved in principle;
- (5) the location and placement of all collars be determined by the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services;
- (6) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, Toronto Hydro Corporation, the Toronto Transit Commission or their designates, be authorized to remove any poster or sign in the course of periodic cleaning or maintenance or where it is found that a poster or other sign is displayed in contravention of the by-law;
- (7) where a poster or sign is removed in accordance with the provisions of the by-law, any person responsible for erecting, attaching, placing or displaying, or causing or permitting the erecting, attaching, placing or displaying of the sign in contravention of the by-law be required to pay the City the greater of a per sign removal fee of \$60.00 or the actual cost of removal and disposal of the sign, and;
- (8) if, after a public meeting, the Committee finds it desirable to adopt the draft by-law, that the City Solicitor be authorized, once all collars have been installed, to prepare and introduce in Council a bill substantially in the form of the attached draft by-law.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on February 13, 2002, that it be authorized to hold a public meeting on March 25, 2002 to consider the proposed by-law amendments with respect to posters on utility poles and that Notice of Hearing be given in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Act.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, in consultation with the City Solicitor where necessary, to report further to the public meeting on March 25, 2002, on:

- (1) (on motion by Councillor Moscoe) utilizing a system of issuing stamps, for a nominal fee, as a mean of identifying erectors of signs;
- (2) (on motion by Councillor Moscoe) permitting a percentage of advertisers to place signs free of charge for local issues such as lost pets, etc;

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

- (3) (on motion by Councillor Ashton) instances in which posters of a commercial nature can be prohibited;
- (4) (on motion by Councillor Ashton) whether the placement of posters can be limited to non-commercial advertisers;
- (5) (on motion by Councillor Moscoe) a proposal that Toronto Hydro be requested to share in the cost of purchasing the collars;
- (6) (on motion by Councillor Flint) the feasibility of utilizing Waste Management crews within the Department of Works and Emergency Services to be responsible for removing posters;
- (7) (on motion by Councillor Flint) the following proposed amendments to the report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services:
  - (a) amend Recommendation (3) by adding the following additional section:
    - “(g) the names and telephone numbers of advertisers be clearly printed on the poster”;
  - (b) (on motion by Councillor Moscoe) amend Recommendation (6) to include the words “Members of Council”, so as to read:
    - “(6) The Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, Members of Council, Toronto Hydro Corporation, and the Toronto Transit Commission, or their designates, be authorized to remove any poster or sign in the course of periodic cleaning or maintenance, or where it is found that a poster or other sign is displayed in contravention of the by-law;”.

(Commissioner, Urban Development Services and City Solicitor; c.c.: Executive Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards Division - January 16, 2002)

**(Clause No. 3, Report No. 2)**

## **1.6 Harmonization of the Division Fence By-law**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services reporting on the continuation of the current method of arbitrating issues related to division fences in the former City of Toronto and recommending that:

- (1) Council adopt the procedure outlined in the *Line Fences Act* for the entire City;
- (2) the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, be authorized to prepare and introduce in Council the necessary bill(s) to give effect to the decision of the Committee, and
- (3) the balance of this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on February 13, 2002, the adoption of the report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

**(Clause No. 4, Report No. 2)**

## **1.7 Licensing and Regulating of Mobile Signs/Trucks Towing Signage**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services providing information on the feasibility of licensing and regulating trucks towing signage in the City of Toronto and recommending that the issue of trucks towing signage be dealt with as part of the overall development of a new sign by-law for the city and that appropriate licensing regulations be considered at that time.

The Committee also had before it a confidential report (December 20, 2001) from the City Solicitor respecting the City's authority to license and regulate billboard-type signs mounted on or towed by trucks ("mobile signs") having regard that the subject matter relates to the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to:

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

- (1) deal with the issue of truck towing signage as part of the overall development of a new sign by-law for the City and that appropriate licensing regulations be considered at that time; and
- (2) report to the Planning and Transportation Committee at the same meeting on the following suggestions regarding mobile signs:
  - (a) with respect to the size of the mobile signs:
    - (i) its length be limited to 50% of the length of the vehicle but no more than 8 foot;
    - (ii) its height be no higher than half its length; and
    - (iii) its width be no more than its height;
  - (b) a separate braking mechanism be required;
  - (c) there be no flashing lights on the sign; and
  - (d) there be an additional permit fee for moving parts equal to 100% of the fee and that such parts be subject to mechanical inspection and designed in such a way as to not extend beyond the limit of the sign dimensions; and
- (3) also report on how the anticipated increase in pollution as a result of emissions from anticipated additional traffic can be addressed

(Commissioner, Urban Development Services; c.c.: Executive Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards Division - January 16, 2002)

(Rev. Letter - Commissioner, Urban Development Services; c.c.: Executive Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards Division - March 13, 2002)

**(Clause No. 7(b), Report No. 2)**

### **1.8 Delegation of Authority to Enter into Limiting Distance Agreements**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services seeking authority for the Chief Building Official and Deputy Chief Building Officials to enter into limiting distance agreements under the Building Code on behalf of the City in situations where the City's interests are not affected by the agreement and recommending that:

- (1) the Chief Building Official and the Deputy Chief Building Officials be authorized to enter into limiting distance agreements under the Building Code that do not affect lands owned by the City if the agreements do not impose any obligations on the City and are in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor; and
- (2) the City Solicitor be authorized to introduce a bill in Council to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on February 13, 2002, the adoption of the report (December 12, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

**(Clause No. 5, Report No. 2)**

### **1.9 Zoning By-law Regulation of the Placement of Central Air Conditioning Units**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 11, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services responding to the Planning and Transportation Committee's request about the possibility of regulating the placement of central air conditioning units in the zoning by-laws and recommending that the Commissioner of Urban Development Services give consideration to the development of city-wide zoning provisions to regulate the placement of central air conditioning units during the new zoning by-law project process.

On motion by Councillor Flint, the Planning and Transportation Committee deferred consideration of the report (December 11, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services pending a further report detailing the most expedient way in which the placement of Central Air Conditioning Units can be regulated as a stand alone zoning by-law.

(Commissioner, Urban Development Services - January 16, 2001)

**(Clause No. 7(c), Report No. 2)**

**1.10 Urban Development Services - Building Division Review**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (December 10, 2001) from the City Clerk forwarding Clause No. 5 of Report No. 10 of the Audit Committee which was adopted by City Council at its meeting on December 4, 5 and 6, 2001 and advising that Council, in addition to adopting the report (November 13, 2001) from the City Auditor also directed that a copy of this clause be forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Committee for information.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Planning and Transportation Committee received the communication (December 10, 2001) from the City Clerk.

**(Clause No. 7(d), Report No. 2)**

**1.11 Requiring Cab Drivers Issued Ambassador Taxicab Licenses to Purchase Ultra Low Emission Vehicles**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (December 13, 2001) from the City Clerk advising that City Council, at its meeting on December 4, 5 and 6, 2001, had before it Clause No. 8 of Report No. 14 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, titled "Other Items Considered by the Committee", and received this clause for information subject to striking out and referring the following Item (c) titled "Requiring Cab Drivers Issued Ambassador Taxicab Licences to Purchase Ultra Low Emission Vehicles", back to the Planning and Transportation Committee for further consideration:

“(a) Requiring Cab Drivers Issued Ambassador Taxicab Licences to Purchase Ultra Low Emission Vehicles

The Planning and Transportation Committee reports having:

(1) referred the report (October 22, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services back to the Commissioner with a request that the Commissioner:

- (a) with representatives of the Toronto Atmospheric Fund, and including, but not targeting, representatives of the taxi industry, meet with representatives of the Natural Gas Industry to discuss:
  - (i) a proposed fee structure and economic incentives which would allow Ambassador Taxicab owners to purchase ultra low emission vehicles (ULEVs);
  - (ii) the concept of phasing in the use of ULEVs to the entire taxicab industry in the City of Toronto and incentives for moving forward to achieve this goal; and
- (b) examine any other additional incentives for requiring an Ambassador taxicab license holder to purchase ULEVs, including the issuance of additional Ambassador Licence Plates for 2002;

and report back to the Planning and Transportation Committee as early as possible in 2002 on the outcome of these discussions; and

- (2) referred this matter to the Sustainability Roundtable for discussion with a request that it report back to the Planning and Transportation Committee at the same meeting that the Commissioner of Urban Development submits her foregoing requested report.”

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee received the communication (November 12, 2001) from the City Clerk and noted that its previous action stands.

**(Clause No. 7(e), Report No. 2)**

## **1.12 Fiscal Sustainability Principles and Financial Priority Setting**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (December 10, 2001) from the City Clerk enclosing Clause No. 1 contained in Report No. 16 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Fiscal Sustainability Principles and Financial Priority Setting”, which was adopted, without amendment, by the Council of the City of Toronto at its meeting held on December 4, 5 and 6, 2001, and advising that Council referred the:

- (1) fiscal principles to the Budget Advisory Committee, the Standing Committees, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Acting Chief Financial Officer, as



guidelines for use in responding to the City's fiscal issues and financial pressures;  
and

- (2) Priority Setting Guide to the Standing Committees and Budget Advisory Committee for use in assessing service level changes for City programs and setting financial priorities for the City.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee received the communication (December 10, 2001) from the City Clerk.

**(Clause No. 7(f), Report No. 2)**

### **1.13 Proposed Amendments to the Building Permit By-law No. 163-1998**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (December 15, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services advising of the addition of an administrative surcharge to building permits which are secured after construction has commenced prior to the issuance of a building permit; an increase in the deposit required to accompany a building permit application to ensure that the City collects the non-refundable permit fees portion, should the application get cancelled or abandoned; a number of clarifications and house keeping issues; and recommending that:

- (1) an additional amount of 25% of the required total permit fee or \$100, whichever is greater, be charged for a project when construction has commenced prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- (2) Building Permit By-law No. 163-1998 be amended to increase the deposit required to accompany the building permit application to ensure that the City collects the non-refundable permit fees portion should the application get cancelled or abandoned;
- (3) Schedule "A" of the Building Permit By-law No. 163-1998 be amended to include the following:
  - (a) revise Section 5. to read "Fees for classes of permits or services not described or included in this Schedule be based on:
    - a fee of \$14.70/thousand dollars of prescribed construction value,  
or
    - an hourly charge of \$63/hour, to account for processing of the permit and inspections;

- (b) revise Section 6. f) to change the permit fee refund recipient from the “current permit holder” to the person(s) who actually paid said fees;
  - (c) add a sunset clause for eligibility of permit fee refunds for withdrawal, abandonment or refusal to issue a permit application and request for revocation of a permit. This will eliminate applicants requesting refunds after an unrealistic time period;
- (4) Section 2. h) in Schedule “B” of the Building Permit By-law No. 163-1998 be amended to reflect changes to names of various corporations, boards, commissions and agencies.;
  - (5) Building Division staff in conjunction with Legal Services be directed to prepare the necessary by-law amendments for Council consideration; and
  - (6) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action, including the introduction of a bill in Council, in the form of a draft by-law to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on February 13, 2002, the adoption of the report (December 15, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

#### **1.14 Motions Emanating from the 2002-2006 Capital Program and 10-Year Capital Forecast**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (November 30, 2001) from the General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission, recommending that the following motions, approved by the Commission during its consideration of a report entitled “2002-2006 Capital Program and 10-Year Capital Forecast”, be forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Committee for its consideration:

- (1) that staff review the feasibility of creative utilization of Section 37 under the Planning Act for assistance to transit;
- (2) staff review the model that the 905 Region has used for development levies to fund public transit, i.e. GO Transit, and make recommendations with respect to development levies for public transit related projects within the City of Toronto; and

Planning and Transportation Committee  
Monday, January 14, 2002

---

- (3) that the Province of Ontario be requested to amend the Planning Act to provide for transit benefits under Section 37 and that the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be requested to report further on this proposal.

The Committee also had before it a report (January 8, 2002) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services discussing the request of the Toronto Transit Commission to report on the use of Section 37 of the Planning Act to benefit the transit system, and recommending that:

- (1) this report be received for information; and
- (2) be forwarded to the Toronto Transit Commission for information.

On motion by Councillor Moscoe, the Planning and Transportation Committee deferred consideration of the communication (November 30, 2001) from Vincent Rodo, General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission and the report (January 8, 2002) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to its next meeting on January 18, 2002.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

---

Chair