

# TORONTO STAFF REPORT

---

May 29, 2003

To: Policy and Finance Committee

From: Chief Administrative Officer

Subject: Establishment of four community councils.

Purpose:

To respond to Council's decision to establish four community councils by providing boundary options for a four-community-council model; to recommend a naming process to be followed once final boundaries are determined.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Implementation of four community councils may result in financial implications resulting from workload redistribution in departmental business units that provide support for community council deliberations, and possibly in meeting location adjustments. Precise financial implications cannot be determined prior to Council approval of a boundary option, however, costs are expected to be minimal and will be included in the 2004 budget process if necessary.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Policy and Finance Committee select a boundary option for recommendation to City Council;
- (2) at the time of its boundary decision, City Council assign interim meeting locations for the new community councils using the civic centres and City Hall;
- (3) upon a final boundary decision, City Council decide on appropriate names using the process and criteria outlined in this report, including:
  - (a) at the time of its boundary decision, City Council adopt interim names based on the geographic references of north, south, east, west and any variations thereof which suit the final boundary configurations; and

- (b) in the new term of Council the reconfigured community councils forward their name recommendations to the Policy and Finance Committee for consolidation and a recommendation to City Council for a final decision;
- (4) upon determination of the community council boundaries and names, and upon notice having been given in accordance with § 27-137.B of the City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Council Procedures, that a by-law substantially in the form of the draft by-law attached as Appendix 1 to this report be adopted.
- (5) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto, and authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary bill in Council.

### Background

On May 21-23, 2003, City Council approved a notice of motion resolving that:

- (1) Council elect to establish a four community council model to come into effect immediately following the next municipal election;
- (2) staff, after discussion with individual Councillors, particularly those who have dysfunctional wards, propose alternative community council groupings for consideration by the Policy and Finance Committee; and
- (3) staff further refine the administrative districts to match the political divisions selected.

### Comments

In October, 2000, City Council adopted boundaries for the existing six community councils. At that time seventeen options for four community councils were considered by Council. These seventeen options are attached as Appendix 2 to enable the Policy and Finance Committee to discuss possible configurations and make a recommendation to City Council. The rationale and implications for each option are included essentially as determined in 2000. The population information has been updated to reflect 2001 census data. While the issue of the number of community councils was raised by many Councillors during the Council governance review, staff have not had specific discussions with individual Councillors on boundary alternatives.

It is noted that ward boundaries cannot be changed as part of any adjustment to the number or boundaries of community councils, since the *City of Toronto Act* specifically precludes Toronto from determining the number, boundaries or names of wards.

### Boundary Principles Approved by Council in 2000

During the previous discussion Council approved the following boundary principles to guide its selection of community council boundaries:

- (a) Community councils must represent all of the urban area as required by section 7 of the *City of Toronto Act, 1997*.
- (b) A ward must not be represented partly by one and partly by another community council as required by section 7 of the *City of Toronto Act, 1997*.
- (c) Community council boundaries must be made up of groups of adjacent wards.
- (d) Community council boundaries should enable a relatively equal distribution of workload between each community council.
- (e) Community council boundaries should reflect local physical and neighbourhood boundaries and communities of interest.
- (f) Community council boundaries should reflect the community councils' mandate to enable a better focus on local matters of common interest than could be achieved by a city-wide standing committee of Council.
- (g) Community councils should generally have the same number of members, and have overall variations of no more than 4 members between community councils.
- (h) Community councils should not have fewer than 5 members or more than 12 members (excluding the Mayor's membership ex-officio).

Population distribution was also considered as part of the boundary decision making process.

#### Community Council Names

Once a boundary option is approved, it is recommended that the following process and criteria be used to determine community council names (this is essentially the same process that was used during the previous community council discussion in 2000):

- (a) adopt interim names based on the geographic references of 'north', 'south', 'east', 'west', or any variations thereof, to suit the final boundary configurations;
- (b) follow a 2-step process to adopt permanent names:
  - the reconfigured community councils receive community input on possible names; and
  - the reconfigured community councils forward their name recommendations to the Policy and Finance Committee for consolidation and a recommendation to City Council for a final decision.

During the previous boundary discussion, Council adopted the following criteria for naming of community councils:

- (a) names should reflect the historical context associated with the community council jurisdiction;
- (b) names should reflect the communities and neighbourhoods which make up the community council jurisdiction; and/or
- (c) names should reflect the geographic nature of the community council jurisdiction.

Council also said that community council names should be as familiar, logical and understandable to the public as possible.

#### Implementation issues

- (a) Service district alignment

Staff have been implementing a four-service-district organizational model as approved by Council in July 2002. Of the 17 four-community-council boundary options attached, options 1, 2, 3, and 4 most closely follow the service district model approved by Council, maintaining the Victoria Park boundary for the Scarborough community. These four options are the easiest to implement from a service district alignment perspective. Staff is prepared to refine service districts to match the selected community council boundaries for those business units that interact with the decision making function of community councils, e.g., parks and recreation, planning, building, licensing (except city-wide programs), local traffic services. Many City services do not relate to the functions of community councils and use boundaries that enhance service delivery or are delivered city-wide and it would not make sense to alter the service boundaries of those services.

New community council boundaries are likely to result in some re-distribution of work, rather than a changed workload for staff since the number of development applications and other community council related matters will not be affected. A four community council model will enhance the effectiveness of staff/community council interaction and will enable senior staff to attend community council meetings since they will be serving only one community council. During the transition to service district/community council alignment staff will continue to be assigned in the most appropriate manner to meet service demands.

Specific costs associated with service district alignment cannot be identified until a final boundary option is determined, however costs are expected to be minimal and will be included in the 2004 budget process if necessary.

- (b) Meeting locations

Implementation of revised boundaries may impact meeting location requirements. It is recommended that, at the time of making a boundary decision, Council assign interim meeting locations to ensure that newly configured community councils have an assigned

location for the new term. Any financial implications of meeting location changes will be included as part of the 2004 budget process.

#### Timeline

If Council wishes to implement a four community council model for the new term, it must make a decision on boundaries no later than its July 22-24 meeting. This will allow a by-law to be enacted at the final Council meeting on September 22, 2003 in accordance with the notice provisions of Chapter 27 of the Municipal Code.

#### Conclusions:

As requested by Council on May 21-23, this report presents seventeen possible community council boundary options based on a four community council model and recommends a process to determine names for the reconfigured community councils.

Staff of the City Clerk's Office, the Facilities and Real Estate Division, and the Finance Department have been consulted during the preparation of this report.

Chief Administrative Officer

#### Contact:

Lynda Taschereau  
Senior Corporate Management and Policy Consultant  
Strategic and Corporate Policy Division  
Chief Administrator's Office  
416-392-6783  
ltascher@toronto.ca

John Elvidge  
Manager, Corporate Policy  
Strategic and Corporate Policy Division  
Chief Administrator's Office  
416-392-8641  
jelvidge@toronto.ca

#### List of Attachments:

Appendix 1: Draft By-law  
Appendix 2: Boundary Options for a Four Community Council Model

Appendix 1

Authority: Notice of Motion No. F(4), Moved by Councillor Moscoe and Seconded by  
Councillor Holyday, adopted by City Council at its meeting of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003  
Enacted by Council:

**CITY OF TORONTO**

Bill No.

**BY-LAW No.**

**To amend the City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Council  
Procedures, to  
Change the Number of Community Councils**

WHEREAS City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Council Procedures, currently creates six community councils for the City of Toronto, names the community councils, and defines the part of the urban area which each community council includes; and

WHEREAS the subsection 7(1) of the *City of Toronto Act, 1997* provides that city council may, by by-law, establish community councils and provide for their composition; and

The Council of the City of Toronto HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

1. City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Council Procedures is amended as follows:
  - A. By deleting § 27-93. and replacing it with the following:

“There shall be four community councils established for the City of Toronto.”
  - B. By deleting § 27-94. and replacing it with the following:

“A. The community councils shall be named:  
  
[insert names of community councils]
- B. Each community council shall consist of that part of the urban area, which includes the following city electoral wards:
  - (1) The [insert name of community council] shall include:

[insert wards included in community council]

(2) The [insert name of community council] shall include:

[insert wards included in community council]

(3) The [insert name of community council] shall include:

[insert wards included in community council]

(4) The [insert name of community council] shall include:

[insert wards included in community council]”

2. This by-law shall come into effect on November 11, 2003.

ENACTED AND PASSED this            day of            , A.D. 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

Appendix 2  
Boundary Options for a Four Community Council Model

**Population Distributions**

<b>Four Community Councils Model</b>								
<b>Map Option 1</b>			<b>Map Option 2</b>			<b>Map Option 3</b>		
Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average
A	649,150	6.02%	A	605,420	-1.43%	A	551,830	-10.12%
B	678,525	10.82%	B	615,995	0.29%	B	669,585	9.02%
C	532,845	-12.98%	C	646,730	5.30%	C	646,730	5.30%
D	588,665	-3.86%	D	588,665	-4.16%	D	588,665	-4.16%
<b>Map Option 4</b>			<b>Map Option 5</b>			<b>Map Option 6</b>		
Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average
A	659,405	7.36%	A	499,465	-18.68%	A	603,465	-1.75%
B	556,115	-9.46%	B	667,110	8.61%	B	607,230	-1.14%
C	652,625	6.26%	C	645,705	5.13%	C	601,585	-2.05%
D	588,665	-4.16%	D	644,530	4.94%	D	644,530	4.94%
<b>Map Option 7</b>			<b>Map Option 8</b>			<b>Map Option 9</b>		
Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average
A	554,305	-9.75%	A	496,990	-19.08%	A	554,305	-9.75%
B	667,110	8.61%	B	663,690	8.01%	B	607,230	-1.14%
C	590,865	-3.80%	C	651,175	6.02%	C	594,455	-3.22%
D	644,530	4.94%	D	644,955	5.00%	D	700,820	14.10%
<b>Map Option 10</b>			<b>Map Option 11</b>			<b>Map Option 12</b>		

Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average
A	550,580	-10.36%	A	550,580	-10.36%	A	603,860	-1.68%
B	615,995	0.29%	B	556,115	-9.46%	B	603,135	-1.80%
C	589,415	-4.04%	C	649,295	5.71%	C	603,465	-1.75%
D	700,820	14.10%	D	700,820	14.10%	D	646,350	5.23%
<b>Map Option 13</b>			<b>Map Option 14</b>			<b>Map Option 15</b>		
Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average
A	603,465	-1.75%	A	611,385	-0.46%	A	660,835	7.59%
B	609,425	-0.78%	B	635,730	3.50%	B	625,395	1.82%
C	597,570	-2.71%	C	702,550	14.38%	C	600,350	-2.23%
D	646,350	5.23%	D	507,145	-17.43%	D	570,230	-7.16%
<b>Map Option 16</b>			<b>Map Option 17</b>					
Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average	Community Councils	2001 Population	% Change from 4 Community Council average			
A	616,250	0.33%	A	597,600	-2.70%			
B	599,210	-2.44%	B	592,570	-3.52%			
C	596,625	-2.86%	C	621,915	1.26%			
D	644,725	4.97%	D	644,725	4.97%			

## Map 1

### Community Councils:

- A Composite Wards: 12 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13)  
2001 Population: 649,150
- B Composite Wards: 12 wards (10, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34)  
2001 Population: 678,525
- C Composite Wards: 10 wards (14, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)  
2001 Population: 532,845
- D Composite Wards: 10 wards (35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)  
2001 Population: 588,665

### Rationale:

- similar size community councils to distribute workload
- maintains Scarborough community council boundary
- need larger community councils to have meaningful discussions

### Implications:

- divides the communities of Deer Park, Carlton Village, High Park, Summerhill, Annex and Thorncliffe Park

## Map 2

### Community Councils:

- A Composite Wards: 11 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14)  
2001 Population: 605,420



<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	615,995
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
	2001 Population:	646,730
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	588,665

**Rationale:**

- similar size community councils to distribute workload
- maintains downtown/core which is unique
- need larger community councils to have meaningful discussions

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Thorncliffe Park, Junction, Liberty, Forest Hill, Silverthorn, Carlton Village, Roncesvalles, Fairbanks and Oakwood Vaughan, Amesbury, Belgravia, Briar Hill and Sherwood Park

**Map 3**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14)
	2001 Population:	551,830
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	669,585
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
	2001 Population:	646,730
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	588,665

**Rationale:**

- similar size community councils to distribute workload
- maintains downtown/core which is unique
- maintains traditional communities
- equal population distribution

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Oakwood Vaughan, Brookhaven, Junction, Roncesvalles, Forest Hill, Liberty, Silverthorn, Fairbanks, Belgravia, Sherwood Park and Thorncliffe Park

**Map 4**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17)
	2001 Population:	659,405
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	556,115
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
	2001 Population:	652,625
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	588,665

**Rationale:**

- equal population distribution
- provide economic balance (retail/commercial vs. residential) for neighbourhoods to harmonize the tax base
- will not divide ratepayer groups and ethnic/cultural neighbourhoods
- respects historical involvement of communities prior to amalgamation

**Implications:**

- divides the communities Fairbanks, Oakwood Vaughan, Briar Hill, Belgravia, Junction, Forest Hill, Sherwood Park, Hillcrest and Liberty, Roncesvalles, Silverthorn and Thorncliffe Park

**Map 5**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	9 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13)
	2001 Population:	499,465
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	667,110
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31)
	2001 Population:	645,705
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	644,530

**Rationale:**

- similar size community councils to distribute workload

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Silverthorn, Carlton Village, High Park, Fairbanks, Forest Hill, Belgravia, Sherwood Park, Danforth Village, Oakwood Vaughan, Leslieville, Junction, Roncesvalles, Liberty, Amesbury, Belgravia and Thorncliffe Park

## Map 6

### Community Councils:

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18)
	2001 Population:	603,465
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	607,230
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31)
	2001 Population:	601,585
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	644,530

### Rationale:

- equal population distribution
- equal ward distribution

### Implications:

- divides the communities of Belgravia, Silverthorn, Carlton Village, Junction, Roncesvalles, Forest Hill, Liberty, Fairbanks, Sherwood Park, Danforth Village, Leslieville, Amesbury, Oakwood Vaughan and Briar Hill

## Map 7

### Community Councils:

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14)
	2001 Population:	554,305
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	667,110
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31)
	2001 Population:	590,865
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	644,530

### Rationale:

- similar size community councils to distribute workload

### Implications:

- divides the communities of Sherwood Park, Danforth Village, Silverthorn, Carlton Village, Roncesvalles, Forest Hill, Junction, Liberty, Fairbanks, Oakwood Vaughan Amesbury, Briar Hill, Leslieville and Belgravia

## Map 8

### Community Councils:

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	9 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13)
	2001 Population:	496,990
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	663,690
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32)
	2001 Population:	651,175
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	644,955

### Rationale:

- recognize different built form characteristics across City (core vs. suburban)

### Implications:

- divides the communities of Carlton Village, Lambton, Hillcrest, Oakwood Vaughan, Belgravia, Briar Hill, Forest Hill, Sherwood Park, Danforth Village, Brookhaven, High Park and East York

## Map 9

### Community Councils:

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14)
	2001 Population:	554,305
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	607,230
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30)
	2001 Population:	594,455
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	700,820

### Rationale:

- similar size community councils to distribute workload

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Fairbanks, Oakwood Vaughan, Belgravia, Sherwood Park, East York, Danforth Village, Leslieville, Junction, Forest Hill, Roncesvalles, Amesbury, Briar Hill and Liberty

**Map 10**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13)
	2001 Population:	550,580
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	615,995
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30)
	2001 Population:	589,415
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	700,820

**Rationale:**

- need larger community councils to have meaningful discussions
- need larger community councils for checks and balances in decision-making system
- need larger community councils to be more representative of issues facing City of Toronto
- similar size community councils to balance workload

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Thorncliffe Park, East York, Fairbanks, Amesbury, Briar Hill, Sherwood Park, Leslieville, Carlton Village, High Park, Silverthorn, Oakwood Vaughan, Forest Hill, Danforth Village and Belgravia

**Map 11**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13)
	2001 Population:	550,580
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	10 wards (8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34)
	2001 Population:	556,115
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30)
	2001 Population:	649,295
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	700,820

**Rationale:**

- similar size community councils to balance workload
- maintain sense of historical communities
- equal population distribution

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Fairbanks, Forest Hill, Oakwood Vaughan, Briar Hill, Belgravia, Amesbury, Carlton Village, High Park, Sherwood Park, East York, Danforth Village and Leslieville

**Map 12**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18)
	2001 Population:	603,860
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 33)
	2001 Population:	603,135
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
	2001 Population:	603,465
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	646,350

**Rationale:**

- similar size community councils to balance workload
- need larger community councils to have meaningful discussions
- fewer community councils are less confusing

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Fairbanks, Forest Hill, Oakwood Vaughan Briar Hill, Belgravia, Silverthorn, Hillcrest, Dovercourt Park, Dufferin Grove, Beaconsfield, Liberty and Sherwood Park

**Map 13**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18)
	2001 Population:	603,465
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33)
	2001 Population:	609,425
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
	2001 Population:	597,570
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	646,350

**Rationale:**

- equal population distribution
- equal work distribution

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Thorncliffe Park, Sherwood Park, Forest Hill, Belgravia, Briar Hill, Oakwood Vaughan, Fairbanks Dovercourt Park, Dufferin Grove, Beaconsfield, Liberty and Carlton Village

**Map 14**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 23)
	2001 Population:	611,385
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22)
	2001 Population:	635,730
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (24, 25, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	702,550
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	9 wards (26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36)
	2001 Population:	507,145

**Rationale:**

- use Yonge Street and Eglinton Avenue as dividing elements to create 4 community councils

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Sherwood Park, Ianview, Forest Hill, Eglinton, Scarborough Village, St. John, Westmount Park, Lambton, Carlton Village, Fairbanks Briar Hill, Belgravia, Silverthorn, Summerhill, University of Toronto and Oakwood Vaughan

**Map 15**

**Community Councils:**

<b>A</b>	Composite Wards:	12 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21)
	2001 Population:	660,835
<b>B</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (7, 8, 9, 10, 23, 24, 33, 39, 40, 41, 42)
	2001 Population:	625,395
<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (14, 18, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32)
	2001 Population:	600,350

**D** Composite Wards: 10 wards (16, 22, 25, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43, 44)  
2001 Population: 570,230

**Rationale:**

- no rationale supplied

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Maryvale, Dorset Park, Forest Hill, South Hill, Casa Loma, Annex, Rouge, Agincourt Centre, Dorset Park, High Park, Maryvale and Summerhill

**Map 16**

**Community Councils:**

**A** Composite Wards: 11 wards (1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 23, 24, 33, 39, 40)  
2001 Population: 616,250

**B** Composite Wards: 11 wards (3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18)  
2001 Population: 599,210

**C** Composite Wards: 11 wards (16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30)  
2001 Population: 596,625

**D** Composite Wards: 11 wards (31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44)  
2001 Population: 644,725

**Rationale:**

- equal population distribution
- equal ward distribution
- similar size community councils to balance workload

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Agincourt Centre, Belgravia, Oakwood Vaughan, East York, Danforth Village, Leslieville, Hillcrest, Dovercourt Park, Dufferin Grove, Maryvale, Dorset Park, Briar Hill, Westmount Park, Beaconsfield and Liberty

**Map 17**

**Community Councils:**

**A** Composite Wards: 11 wards (1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17)  
2001 Population: 597,600

**B** Composite Wards: 11 wards (5, 6, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30)  
2001 Population: 592,570



<b>C</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (10, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 39, 40)
	2001 Population:	621,915
<b>D</b>	Composite Wards:	11 wards (31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44)
	2001 Population:	644,725

**Rationale:**

- not necessarily a direct relationship between the size of a community council and citizens' access to members of meetings of community councils and the quality or integrity of the democratic process
- compelling need to reconcile the tension between, and relative priority of, "local" communities of interest and the overriding, city-wide community of interest
- in the interest of all citizens of the entire city to accommodate diversities of interest as it is to preserve commonalities
- to retain any physical semblance of local access to municipal government, there must be smaller, geographically based "nodal" councils not just one big city council
- deconstruct and/or reconfigure all existing historical communities
- create a mix of commonalities to ensure diversity of communities of interest
- respect need to balance demands made of citizens (including private sector), members and staff
- maintain downtown/core intact
- reduce number of community councils that include waterfront properties
- protect the interests of the watershed by ensuring both banks of each reach of all watercourses are contained in one community council
- structure community councils to make use of existing civic centres

**Implications:**

- divides the communities of Briar Hill, Belgravia, Oakwood Vaughan, Deer Park, Hillcrest, Lambton, Islington Village, Islington, Agincourt Centre, Dorset Park, Maryvale, Annex, Thorncliffe Park and Summerhill