

## **Other Items Considered by the Committee**

*(City Council on November 23, 24 and 25, 1999, received this Clause, for information.)*

### **(a) New Practices for the Review of Development Applications**

**The Planning and Transportation Committee reports having:**

- (1) deferred the following reports (June 25, 1999 and October 19, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services, and related material, to the next meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee scheduled for November 29, 1999, and in the meantime established a Sub-Committee consisting of the following members:**

**Councillor Flint (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee)**  
**Councillor McConnell (Vice-Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee)**  
**Councillor Fillion**  
**Councillor Lindsay Luby**  
**Councillor Moscoe**

**with a mandate to meet with the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services and the Chief Planner to address the issues raised by the Community Councils and report to the Committee's next meeting on November 29, 1999 with a consolidated set of recommendations; and**

- (2) requested the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services to report to both the Sub-Committee referred to above, and to the Planning and Transportation Committee, on the feasibility of replacing a formal written notice of a meeting with a requirement that a picture and explanation of the proposed application be posted on the site in a prominent location, translated into as many languages as is deemed appropriate and explaining how the process will work and how citizens can be involved.**
  - (i) (June 25, 1999) from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services recommending that:**
    - (1) this report be referred to the Community Councils for review and comment to the Planning and Transportation Committee for its October 4, 1999 meeting;**
    - (2) Council endorse the following principles as the foundation for new practices in City Planning:**
      - (i) delegation of authority to staff, as permitted by statute, to approve applications for site plan control approval, various classes of**

consents, draft condominium approval (except for conversion of rental housing) and authority to execute, amend and release site plan agreements on behalf of the City;

- (ii) a case management system which provides for a continuity of planning staff assignment from the beginning to the completion of any project;
  - (iii) a one-window review and comment process which is streamlined to the essential agencies and which establishes time frames for responses;
  - (iv) use of preliminary evaluation reports, for applications to amend the official plan or zoning by-law, to identify issues, set up a community consultation process and to establish a target for delivery of a final recommendation report and statutory public meeting;
  - (v) provision for roundtable meetings between applicants and empowered staff from City departments to identify issues, technical studies needed and other relevant matters early in the review process;
  - (vi) use of plain language and common formats in reports to Council, notices to the public and agreements related to development approvals;
  - (vii) use of informal and formal dispute resolution throughout the approval process to avoid appeals and referrals to the Ontario Municipal Board.
- (3) the City Solicitor be directed to prepare by-laws for presentation to and approval by City Council as follows:
- (i) to delegate authority to approve applications for site plan control approval to the Chief Planner or delegate(s), subject to a provision for the Ward Councillor(s) to request a “bump-up” to City Council for approval;
  - (ii) to establish areas of site plan control on a consistent basis across the City, establishing appropriate thresholds defining the intensity of development or redevelopment which would require the submission of an application for site plan approval as detailed in this report;

- (iii) to delegate authority to grant draft condominium approvals except for applications involving the conversion of rental housing, and exemptions from draft approval as appropriate, to the Chief Planner or delegate(s);
  - (iv) to delegate approval authority for the creation of new lots by consent to the Committee of Adjustment as permitted under Section 54 of the Planning Act;
  - (v) to delegate approval authority for all consents, other than the creation of new lots, to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment or delegate(s) in accordance with Section 54(2) of the Planning Act;
  - (vi) to delegate authority to execute, amend and release agreements as required, to the Chief Planner or delegate(s).
- (4) the City Solicitor be authorized and directed to prepare and present for Council approval, standard form agreements as required and authorized by the Planning Act and any other statutes to replace standard form agreements currently in use;
  - (5) Council request the Province of Ontario to amend the Planning Act to delete the requirements for a public meeting in conjunction with plans of subdivision;
  - (6) staff be authorized to accept certificates of completion from Provincially registered professionals as proof of compliance with City requirements and Provincial statutes with regard to site plan approval and condominium registration.
  - (7) staff be directed to bring forward any amendments to the Official Plans of the former municipalities required to implement the findings of this report;
  - (8) staff be directed to bring forward a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee recommending a new structure for the Committee(s) of Adjustment;
  - (9) staff be directed to bring forward a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee recommending new practices for harmonizing the Committee of Adjustment function; and
  - (10) staff in the Urban Planning and Development Services Department, Corporate Services Department, Economic Development Culture and Tourism Department; and

- (11) Works and Emergency Services Department, be authorized to undertake necessary actions to give effect to these recommendations.
- (ii) (October 19, 1999) from the City Clerk forwarding motions tabled by Councillor Moscoe at Planning and Transportation Committee's October 4, 1999 meeting.
- (iii) (October 19, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services providing the Committee with the City Planning Division's response to the recommendations from the Community Councils on the New Practices report and recommending that the Committee support the City Planning Division's responses as set out in this report.
- (iv) (July 30, 1999) from Councillor John Filion forwarding suggested amendments to the Planning Process together with a brief rationale for each.
- (v) (September 17, 1999) from the City Clerk, Scarborough Community Council forwarding action taken by the Scarborough Community Council taken at its meeting on September 14, 1999, and recommending that:
  - (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be directed to:
    - (i) send by First Class Mail, notification of planning applications to tenants and owners within 400 feet of an application; and
    - (ii) send by Third Class Mail, at the applicant's expense, notification of planning applications to tenants and owners beyond the 400 foot boundary, as may be determined by the local Community Council;
  - (2) site inspections on Site Plan Applications be continued in the East District, as previously carried out by the former City of Scarborough, and that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be directed to continue to review internal operations to provide this service City-wide;
  - (3) telecommunications equipment not be exempted from the Site Plan Control process; and
  - (4) Recommendation No. (6) in the report of the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be amended to read as follows:
    - “(6) staff be authorized to accept, as an alternative where site inspection resources are limited, certificates of completion from Provincially registered professionals as proof of compliance with City requirements and Provincial statutes with regard to site plan approval and condominium registration;”.

- (vi) (September 20, 1999) from the City Clerk, Toronto Community Council forwarding action taken by Toronto Community Council at its meeting on September 14, 1999, and recommending that Recommendation Nos. 2-10 of the report (June 25, 1999) from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be adopted.
- (vii) (September 20, 1999) from the City Clerk, York Community Council forwarding the action taken by the York Community Council at its meeting on September 14, 1999, and recommending that:
  - (1) with respect to the process for community consultation, that the community meetings be chaired alternately by the Ward Councillors if the process is implemented during this current term of Council;
  - (2) the Ward Councillor be responsible for chairing the community meetings, during the next term of Council; and
  - (3) regarding the Proposed Site Plan Approval Process, the Ward Councillors notify planning staff of their absences or unavailability, to allow the Councillors to submit comments on their return and to “bump-up” the issue to the Community Council, if necessary.
- (viii) (September 16, 1999) from the City Clerk, Etobicoke Community Council forwarding action taken by the Etobicoke Community Council at its meeting on September 14, 1999, and recommending that:
  - (1) Members of Council continue to chair community meetings and that staff of Urban Planning and Development Services only do so if requested by the local Councillor(s); and
  - (2) the notification to Ward Councillors of site plan approval applications contain a ‘response box’ for completion by Councillors requesting a “bump-up”.
- (ix) (October 18, 1999) from the City Clerk, North York Community Council forwarding action taken by North York Community Council at its meeting on October 12, 1999 and recommending that:
  - (1) the report (June 25, 1999) from the Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services, be adopted subject to the following amendments:
    - (a) amending Recommendation 2(i) by adding at the end thereof the words:

“but only after consultation with Councillor(s) in accordance with practices presently in use in the former City of North York;”

so as to read:

“2 (i) delegation of authority to staff, as permitted by statute, to approve applications for site plan control approval, various classes of consents, draft condominium approval (except for conversion of rental housing) and authority to execute, amend and release site plan agreements on behalf of the City but only after consultation with Councillor(s) in accordance with practices presently in use in the former City of North York;” and

(b) amending Recommendation 2(ii) by adding at the end thereof the words:

“and that the planner in charge of a project have available specific expertise that may be required, in particular urban planning design and landscape resources;”

so as to read:

“2 (ii) a case management system which provides for a continuity of planning staff assignment from the beginning to the completion of any project and that the planner in charge of a project have available specific expertise that may be required, in particular urban planning design and landscape planning resources;”

(c) adding the additional recommendation:

“2(viii) prior to preliminary reports being written, Councillors be given the opportunity to hold a community meeting if they so require so that the planners have the benefit of community input at an early stage before preliminary evaluation;”

(d) amending Recommendation 3(ii) by deleting the words “intensity of” and replacing with the words “criteria to be applied to”, so as to read:

“3 (ii) to establish areas of site plan control on a consistent basis across the City, establishing appropriate thresholds defining the criteria to be applied to development or redevelopment which would require the submission of an application for site plan approval as detailed in this report;”

(e) amending Recommendation 3(vi) by adding the words “after consultation with local Councillor(s);” so as to read:

“3 (vi) to delegate authority to execute, amend and release agreements, as required, to the Chief Planner or delegate(s) after consultation with local Councillor(s);”

(f) adding the following Recommendations:

“(11) that all studies related to a project over a certain threshold be commissioned by the City of Toronto at the expense of the applicant and that staff be requested to report further on a suitable threshold;

(12) that the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, be requested to report further on a policy that would require the removal of signage related to planning practices at the specific steps in the planning process;

(13) that pre-application meetings include Councillors, or their staff, if they so request;

(14) that Councillors be immediately notified upon receipt of an application;

(15) that informal consultation meetings be held with the community prior to a preliminary evaluation report;

(16) that notification of planning applications be sent to persons in the area including residential and business tenants and property owners;

(17) that all telecommunication applications be forwarded to the Telecommunications Steering Committee for direction;

(18) that industrial applications be exempt, unless requested by the Ward Councillor(s);

(19) that the following not be exempted:

townhouses;  
additions to commercial parking lots;  
school portables; and  
telecommunication equipment;

(20) preliminary evaluation reports not include staff comments which may prejudice the final staff recommendation;

- (21) Members of Council continue to chair planning community meetings, and planning staff chair these meetings only if requested by the Ward Councillor(s); and
  - (22) certificates of inspection be commissioned by Urban Planning and Development Services and paid for by the applicant.”;
- (g) That Appendix 3, entitled, “Site Plan Approvals” attached to the report (June 25, 1999) from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, be amended as follows:
- (i) the deletion of the words, “unless located on a designated ‘Main Street’ and have a lot frontage no more than 12.5m” in Table 2 (page 17), entitled, “Proposed Exemption”, relating to New Development: Institutional, Commercial, Office, Mixed Use, so that it now reads: “Proposed Exemption” – “All subject to Site Plan Approval”
  - (ii) the deletion of the words, “in the Port District” in Table 2 (page 18), entitled, “Proposed Exemption” relating to New Development: Industrial, so that it now reads: “Proposed Exemption” – “All Industrial exempt unless: adjacent to or opposite a residential use; adjacent to a school, park, arterial road or highway; adjacent to a ravine; or recycling”.
  - (iii) the deletion of the words, “All exempt unless located adjacent to a substandard lane or in or within 10m of a ravine” in Table 2 (page 19) entitled, “Proposed Exemption” relating to New Development: Residential - singles, semis, duplexes, fourplexes, semi-detached, triplexes and fourplexes”, so that it now reads “Proposed Exemption” – “single-family & semi-detached lots created by consent and lots which are in the Valley Impact Zone (V.I.Z.) and special policy area lots, all subject to Site Plan Approval.”
  - (iv) the deletion of the words, “The lesser of 600m<sup>2</sup> or 20% of existing g.f.a. are exempt” in Table 2 (page 19) , entitled, “Proposed Exemption” relating to Apartment “Additions”, so that it now reads “All subject to Site Plan Approval”.
  - (v) deletion of the words, “Exempt”, in Table 2 (page 22), entitled, “Proposed Exemption” relating to “Replacement, Reconstruction and Compliance Development” so that it



now reads, "Subject to Site Plan Approval if increasing the Gross Floor Area."

- (h) that "preliminary evaluation reports" be called "preliminary assessment reports";
- (i) adding the recommendations embodied in the communication (October 12, 1999) from Mr. George Belza, save and except those recommendations which overlap with Recommendations (1) (a); (1)(b);(1)(d); and (1)(e) referred to above;
- (j) ***amending the bolded portion of Recommendation (9) embodied in the communication (October 12, 1999) from Mr. George Belza so that it now reads as follows:***

"where an applicant appeals an Official Plan Amendment or rezoning application prior to the required statutory public meeting, staff shall process the application in a manner which provides Community Council with a sufficient range of options so as to minimize the risk of prejudicing Council's position before the Ontario Municipal Board."

- (k) adding a further recommendation to read as follows:

"that an expanded notice radius for community and statutory public meetings and associated costs be determined in consultation with the Ward Councillors."

- (x) (September 20, 1999) from the City Clerk, East York Community Council forwarding the action taken by the East York Community Council at its meeting on September 14, 1999, and recommending that consideration of this matter be deferred until such time as the report from the Acting Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services with respect to the organizational structure for the new Committee of Adjustment is considered;
- (xi) (October 1, 1999) from Anne Dubas, President, Local 79 requesting deferral of the Commissioner's report until City staff have fully complied with the provisions of the Collective Agreement;
- (xii) (October 4, 1999) from Peter Gabor, Chair, Planning and Development Committee, The Toronto Board of Trade, supporting a one-window approach and the use of a case management system to ensure that an application moves smoothly through the process;
- (xiii) (October 29, 1999) from Neil H. Rodgers, Director of Policy, Urban Development Institute/Ontario Toronto Chapter supporting the basic principles of Staff's Recommendations;

- (xiv) (October 29, 1999) from Anne Dubas, President, CUPE Local 79 opposing the proposal that would take the work of site plan inspections currently done by the City's own employees and give it to the private sector.
- (xv) **(November 1, 1999) from Neil Rodgers, Director of Policy, Urban Development Institute submitting a copy of his verbal presentation.**

The following persons addressed the Planning and Transportation Committee in respect of this matter:

- Peter Gabor, Chair, Planning and Development Committee, Toronto Board of Trade;
- Neil Rodgers, Director of Policy, Urban Development Institute;
- Chris Lloyd, obo Greater Toronto Homebuilders Association;
- Ann Dembinski, Second Vice-President, CUPE Local 79;
- Lois James
- **George S. Belza, on behalf of four Ratepayer Groups: Yonge Street Area Ratepayer Associations; Edithvale-Yonge Community Association; Willowdale Central Ratepayer Association; and Lansing Community Association.**

**(b) Harmonization of the Sign By-laws**

**The Planning and Transportation Committee reports having requested the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services to report to the:**

- (1) next meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee on November 29, 1999 on timelines and possible guidelines regarding illuminated signs; and**
  - (2) January 10, 2000 meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee with a harmonized Sign by-law.**
- (i) (October 12, 1999) from the City Clerk forwarding Clause 24 of Report No. 8 of the North York Community Council headed "Other Items Considered by the Community Council", and advising that City Council, on September 28 and 29, 1999, notwithstanding subsection 127(5) of the Council Procedural By-law, referred Item (h), entitled "Harmonization of Sign By-law" to the Community Councils for further consideration and report thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee for its meeting to be held on November 1, 1999;
  - (ii) (October 18, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services reporting on the harmonization process for the sign by-law and recommending that this report be received for information;

- (iii) (October 13, 1999) from the City Clerk, Scarborough Community Council advising that Scarborough Community Council, at its meeting on October 12, 1999:
  - (1) requested that the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services, report directly to Planning and Transportation Committee, at its meeting scheduled to be held on November 1, 1999, on the changes to the Scarborough Sign By-law which are proposed to be incorporated into the City-wide Sign By-law;
  - (2) directed that the Planning and Transportation Committee be advised that the Scarborough Community Council is opposed to the harmonization of the Sign By-laws of the former municipalities, pending further detailed comment from the Community Councils;
  - (3) requested that the Manager, Sign Section, East District, provide a presentation to the meeting of the Community Council scheduled to be held on November 9, 1999, respecting the Scarborough Sign By-law and all issues surrounding harmonization; and
  - (4) reaffirmed its position taken at its April 13, 1999, meeting that the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services, “be requested to report to Scarborough Community Council, at the appropriate time, on the matter of harmonization of the Sign By-laws and department fees across the new City of Toronto.”;
- (iv) (October 14, 1999) from the City Clerk, East York Community Council forwarding action taken by the East York Community Council at its meeting on October 12, 1999, which recommended that the Planning and Transportation Committee defer consideration of this matter until the East York Community Council has had sufficient time to consider background information requested from the Acting Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and advising that the aforementioned communication (October 12, 1999) from the City Clerk was referred to the Acting Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services with a request that he submit a report thereon to the next meeting of the Community Council to be held on November 9, 1999, such report to provide background information;
- (v) (October 20, 1999) from the City Clerk, Toronto Community Council advising that the Toronto Community Council, at its meeting on October 12, 1999, received this matter;
- (vi) (October 14, 1999) from the City Clerk, Etobicoke Community Council advising that Etobicoke Community Council, at its meeting held on October 13, 1999, concurred in the action contained in Item (h), entitled “Harmonization of Sign By-law”, embodied in Clause No. 24 of Report No. 8 of The North York

Community Council, headed “Other items Considered by the Community Council”; and

- (vii) (October 18, 1999) from the City Clerk, North York Community Council reporting that the North York Community Council deferred consideration of the communication (October 12, 1999) addressed to all community Councils to its next meeting scheduled for November 9, 1999; and requested the Planning and Transportation Committee to defer consideration of this matter, which is expected to be considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee on November 1, 1999, in order to allow the North York Community Council an opportunity to forward its comments and/or recommendations regarding this issue.

**(c) Apartment Building Audit, 2737 and 2757 Kipling Avenue (Rexdale-Thistletown - Ward 5)**

**The Committee reports having received the following transmittal letter (September 21, 1999) from the City Clerk, Etobicoke Community Council.**

(September 21, 1999) from the City Clerk, Etobicoke Community Council directing that the report (August 17, 1999) from the Acting Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards Division, headed “Apartment Building Audit, 2737 and 2757 Kipling Avenue (Rexdale-Thistletown)”, be forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Committee, for information.

**(d) A Proposal to Generate a Stock of Housing for Social and Supportive Housing Purposes**

**The Planning and Transportation Committee reports having requested the Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner, Community and Neighbourhood Services to report to the Planning and Transportation Committee for its meeting on January 10, 2000 on the proposal contained in the following communication (October 12, 1999) from Councillor Moscoe regarding the development of affordable housing.**

- (i) (October 12, 1999) from Councillor Moscoe recommending that the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with the Chief Executive Officer, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the City Solicitor report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on a plan to encourage the development of affordable housing as outlined in the communication (October 12, 1999).
- (ii) (October 20, 1999) from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, addressed to the Community Services Committee, recommending that:
  - (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report back to

the January 2000 meetings of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Community Services Committee, outlining an interdepartmental process to develop policies to encourage private-sector affordable housing development; and

- (2) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

**(e) Licence Fee Equalization Fund**

**The Planning and Transportation Committee reports having recommended to Policy and Finance Committee and Council, that the following report (October 18, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services be adopted, and as the recommendations inherent therein refers to the establishment of a reserve fund, the Committee referred this matter, and the Committee's action with respect thereto, to the Policy and Finance Committee for its meeting on November 10, 1999 for subsequent submission to Council.**

(October 18, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services reporting on the feasibility of re-establishing a licence fee equalization fund to facilitate the cost recovery model, and the possibility of building a by-law enforcement program into the cost recovery model for licensing and recommending that:

- (1) a licence fee equalization fund be re-established; and
- (2) the reserve be maintained at no more than 15% of the average of the annual operating budget for licensing activities over the preceding 5 years.

**(f) Merits of Licensing Acupuncturists**

**The Committee reports having:**

- (1) referred the following report (October 18, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services to the Acting Commissioner and the Chair, Licensing Sub-Committee with a request that they meet with representatives of the acupuncturists profession to reach a mutually satisfactory solution to this matter and report back to the Planning and Transportation Committee accordingly; and
- (2) **appointed Councillor Balkissoon as the fifth member of the Licensing Sub-Committee.**
  - (i) (October 18, 1999) from the Acting Commissioner, Urban Planning and Development Services reporting as requested on the merit of licensing acupuncturists and recommending that licensing of acupuncturists continue.

- (ii) (November 1, 1999) from Dr. Richard R. Wang, MD, Chinese Medicine Specialist, Auan-Fu Zhou, Vice President of CACTHS supporting Provincial regulation/registration.
- (iii) (November 1, 1999) from Dr. Jia Li, Ontario Acupuncture Examination Committee (OAEC) requesting the City of Toronto to exclude the practice of acupuncture from the this by-law.

Dr. Jia Li, Ontario Acupuncture Examination Committee (OAEC), addressed the Planning and Transportation Committee with respect to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

JOANNE FLINT  
*Chair*

Toronto, November 1, 1999

*(Report No. 6 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, including additions thereto, was adopted, as amended, by City Council on November 23, 24 and 25, 1999.)*