

THE CITY OF TORONTO

Clerk's Division

Minutes of the Planning and Transportation Committee

Meeting No. 6

Monday, June 4, 2001

The Planning and Transportation Committee met on May 7, 2001, in Committee Room No. 1, 2nd Floor, City Hall, Toronto, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

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

Declarations of Interest Pursuant to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act

None declared

Confirmation of Minutes

On motion by Councillor Milczyn, the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on May 7, 2001, were confirmed.

6.1 Request to Amend the Former City of North York By-Law No. 7625 for Zoning Regulations Affecting ‘Through Lots’ for All the Lands within the Former City of North York

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (March 13, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services reporting on ‘through lots’ and providing a draft zoning by-law amendment for the former City of North York By-Law No. 7625 that amends the permissive provision allowing either frontage of a

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

'through lot' to be designated as the front lot line. This permissive provision is a concern for low density residential infill development and could result in an inappropriate streetscape if a property re-orientes its front lot line opposite to the surrounding properties, creating a front yard wedged between rear yards and therefore, the flexibility in determining the front lot line should be limited to uses other than one-family, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings and to give effect to the January 17, 2001 recommendation of the Midtown Community Council, and recommending that:

- (1) Planning and Transportation Committee consider an amendment to Section 6(20) of the City of North York By-Law No. 7625 substantially in accordance with the draft zoning by-law attached to this report (see Attachment 1). To this effect, the permissive provision for designating the front lot line of a 'through lot' is eliminated for one-family, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings and retained for other land uses;
- (2) the statutory public meeting required under the Planning Act be held at the Planning and Transportation Committee;
- (3) Notice for the Public Meeting under the Planning Act be given, by newspaper advertisement, according to the regulations under the Planning Act; and
- (4) copies of this report be forwarded to Southwest, Midtown, and North Community Councils for comment prior to the holding of the statutory public meeting.

The Committee also had before it the following transmittal letters:

- (May 18, 2001) from the City Clerk, Southwest Community Council advising that the Southwest Community Council, at its meeting on May 15, 2001, concurred with the recommendations contained in the report (March 13, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services;
- (May 18, 2001) from the City Clerk, North Community Council advising that the North Community Council, at its meeting on May 16, 2001, recommended to the Planning and Transportation Committee that the draft by-law, in the form of the draft by-law attached to the report (March 13, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, be enacted; and
- (May 18, 2001) from the City Clerk, Midtown Community Council advising that the Midtown Community Council, at its meeting on May 15, 2001, recommended that a by-law in the form of the draft zoning by-law attached to the report (March 13, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, be enacted.

On motion by Councillor Flint, the Planning and Transportation Committee, based on the findings of fact and recommendations contained

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

in the report (March 13, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Service, recommended to City Council, for its meeting on June 26, 2001, the adoption of the following Recommendation (1) of the aforementioned report:

“(1) Planning and Transportation Committee consider an amendment to Section 6(20) of the City of North York By-Law No. 7625 substantially in accordance with the draft zoning by-law attached to this report (see Attachment 1). To this effect, the permissive provision for designating the front lot line of a ‘through lot’ is eliminated for one-family, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings and retained for other land uses;”

The Planning and Transportation Committee also:

- (1) adopted Recommendations (2), (3) and (4) of the report, March 13, 2001, from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services which were adopted by the Committee at its meeting held on March 26, 2001; and
- (2) held a statutory public hearing on June 4, 2001 in accordance with The Planning Act and appropriate notice of this meeting was given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder and nobody addressed the Committee.

(Clause No. 1, Report No. 6)

6.2 Proposed Sign By-Law Amendments to the Former City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 297, Signs, North York Sign By-Law 30788 and Metropolitan Toronto By-Law 211-79

- West End of John Street Pumping Station (Ward 20 – Trinity-Spadina); and
- North of Transit Road on the East and West Sides of W.R. Allen Road (Wards 9 & 10 – York Centre)

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 24, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services identifying the by-law amendments required to permit Tribar Industries Inc. to install three illuminated LED (Video Pixel Board) ground signs for third party advertising purposes in connection with its proposal to contribute funds for the installation of a suicide barrier on the Bloor Viaduct. One sign is proposed north of Lakeshore Boulevard, west of Rees Street on the grounds of the John Street Pumping Station (28 Rees Street). One sign each is also proposed on either side of the Allen Road, north of Transit Road (two signs in total).

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

These By-law amendments were requested by City Council at its meeting of March 6, 7 and 8, 2001, and recommending should Council wish to approve the proposal from Tribar Industries Inc. for the location of signage at 28 Rees Street and adjacent to the Wm. R. Allen Road, it could recommend that:

- (1) the Draft By-laws attached to this report be approved and that authority be granted to introduce the necessary Bills in Council, substantially in the form of the Draft By-laws, to give effect thereto, on condition that Tribar Industries Inc. enters into the necessary agreements with the City, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services; and
- (2) the applicant be advised, upon approval of Application No. 901045 and the requested variances to the North York Sign By-law identified in conjunction with Application Nos. 01-136416 SGN and 01-136432 SGN, of the requirement to obtain the necessary permits from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

The Committee also had before it the following material:

- Clause No. 1 embodied in Report No. 3 of the Works Committee titled, "Prince Edward Viaduct – Don Section, Funding Proposal for Safety Barrier (Toronto Centre-Rosedale and Toronto-Danforth)" which was adopted, and amended, by the Council of the City of Toronto at its meeting held on March 6, 7 and 8, 2001;
- communication (April 30, 2001) from the Chair, Toronto Police Services Board responding to the Works Committee request for a report addressing any traffic safety concerns the Toronto Police Service may have regarding the installation and operation of the proposed electronic animated signage and recommending that the Works Committee forward a recommendation to City Council that if electronic signage on the Don Valley Parkway is approved, it be subject to the following seven recommendations identified in this report:
 - (1) animated video should not be permitted;
 - (2) if permitted, rapid changing animated displays should be restricted so as not to permit changes less than five seconds apart;
 - (3) images should remain static with sufficient time for the entire message to be comfortably read without the driver having to adjust the vehicle's speed or move his/her head to look at the image;
 - (4) images and messages must meet legibility standards;

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- (5) images should not replicate traffic control devices;
 - (6) brightness of the display should be monitored to comply with City standards; and
 - (7) the City maintain a database for collection and analysis of motorist complaints in relation to animated signage on both the Don Valley Parkway and the Fred Gardiner Expressway;
- communication (March 21, 2001) from Councillor Pitfield forwarding a communication from Brendan Flanagan, Committee to Preserve the Don Valley Appearance, opposing the erection of two electronic billboards along the Don Valley between Eglinton Avenue and Lawrence Avenue;
 - communication (May 15, 2001) from Gail Littlejohn expressing her opposition to the proposed by-law amendments and urging the Planning and Transportation Committee to reject the proposals;
 - communication (May 22, 2001) from Ruth Anderson, Chair, Board of Directors and Sandy Dayes, MSW, RSW, Executive Director, Family Association for Mental Health Everywhere (FAME), urging Council to ensure that the Luminous Veil project not be delayed any longer;
 - communication (May 28, 2001) from Marco Polo, OAA, MRAIC, Editor and Associate Publisher, *Canadian Architect*, recognizing the Luminous Veil for its design quality and urging Council to accept the proffered solution in order to meet the projected construction date of 2001;
 - communication (May 23, 2001) from Tom Jakobek, Vice President, Business & Facilities Development, Toronto East General Hospital, urging all Councillors to see the project of erecting the Luminous Veil through to its rightful speedy conclusion;
 - submissions in support of the construction of the suicide barrier:
 - (April 8, 2001) from Jacqueline Corrigan;
 - (April 15, 2001) from Ken Magill;
 - (April 3, 2001) from Dr. Robin Richards, Division of Orthopaedics, St. Michael's Hospital;
 - (March 5, 2001) from Patricia Teskey; and
 - from Aidan Maher, Superintendent, 52 Division, Toronto Police Force
- submitted by Michael McManus, Schizophrenia Society of Ontario;

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- communication (June 1, 2001) from Inge C.M. Barthlomeiczik, Mental Health Chaplain, Office of Lay Ministry and Chaplaincy, Archdiocese of Toronto, strongly recommending that the Luminous Veil be installed immediately;
- communication (June 1, 2001) from Silvio D'Addario, Vice President and General Counsel, Sportsco International, L.P., objecting to the proposed sign by-law amendments;
- communication (May 31, 2001) from Kim M. Kovar, Aird & Berlis LLP, Barristers and Solicitors, obo Concord Adex Developments Corp., opposing the approval of the billboard sign on the site of the John Street Pumping Station, known as Block 18AB; and
- report (June 2, 2001) from the Commissioner of Works & Emergency Services assessing the suitability of the proposed locations for illuminated LED (Video Pixel Board) signs from a traffic safety perspective, and concluding that consideration could be given to the following course of action in order to expedite installation of the suicide barrier on the Bloor Viaduct:
 - (1) for the two sign locations on the Allen Road, approval be granted to enter into an agreement with Tribar Industries Inc. with terms and conditions satisfactory to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Implementation Committee;
 - (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, representatives from Tribar Industries Inc., and the Implementation Committee continue to explore possible alternative locations for a third sign location which would meet the requirements of the contribution proposal; and
 - (3) with non-approval of the Rees Street location, Tribar Industries Inc.'s contribution will be less than the \$3.5 million required to proceed with installation of the suicide barrier on the Bloor Viaduct. To proceed expeditiously with the barrier, given the shortfall in funding, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to report directly to City Council on the feasibility of providing this funding from the Capital Works Program for an interim period.

The Committee held a held a statutory public hearing on June 4, 2001 in accordance with the Municipal Act and The Planning Act and appropriate notice of this meeting was given in accordance with The Planning Act and the regulations thereunder and the Municipal Act and the following persons addressed the Committee:

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- Ruth Anderson, Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA) strongly urged the Committee not to delay the erection of the barrier especially since funds have been raised by the Steering Committee;
- Vee Ledson, partner of a suicide victim, strongly urged the Committee to vote in favour of the erection of the barrier which would be a demonstration of compassion and a renewal of hope;
- Ken Magill, Toronto Fire Department (retired), spoke of the horror and anguish of being witness to a suicide and urged the Committee to speed up the process;
- Sandy Daye, Executive Director, Family Association for Mental Health Everywhere (FAME), conveyed the frustration of families of suicide victims and strongly urged the Committee to approve the recommendations to ensure the safety of lives;
- J.A. (Al) Birney, Bridge Committee Chairman and Past President of East York Chapter, Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, advised that \$3.5 M dollars have been raised for this project by volunteers in accordance with Council's direction, and strongly urged the Committee to recommend approval of the report;
- Michael McCamus, Vice-Chair, Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee and representing the Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, conveyed the frustration of volunteers caused by the delay in the construction of the barrier and strongly urged the Committee to recommend approval;
- David Sheehan; General Manager, Neon Products, expressed opposition to the erection of signs at Rees Street;
- Ron Barr, Executive Director of Community & Government Relations, Pattison Advertising, in support of the erection of the signs on the Don Valley;
- Ellis Galea Kirkland, OAA, MRAIC, Chair, Bloor Viaduct Steering Committee, and an active participant in the fundraising for the erection of the barrier spoke in support of the Allen Road location; and
- Kim M. Kovar, Aird & Berlis, Barristers & Solicitors, representing Concord Adex Development Corporation, expressed serious concerns with the erection of signs on Rees Street.

The Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, that:

- (1) based on the findings of fact and recommendations contained in the report (May 24, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

Development Service and the memorandum (June 2, 2001) from the Commissioner, Works and Emergency Services:

- (a) on motion by Councillor Milczyn, approval be granted to enter into an agreement with Tribar Industries Inc. to install two illuminated LED signs on Allen Road with terms and conditions satisfactory to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Implementation Committee, subject to ensuring that:
 - (i) on motion by Councillor McConnell, Tribar Industries Inc. dedicate 864 5-second cycles per day, per sign, to the local communities located within Wards 9 and 10, and that each of these wards have the time divided equally on both signs to 432 5-second cycles per day; and
 - (ii) on motion by Councillor McConnell, appropriate deflectors be added to the signs to ensure that they do not impact on the local residents;
 - (b) on motion by Councillor McConnell, the applicant be advised, upon approval of Application No. 901045 and the requested variances to the North York Sign By-law identified in conjunction with Applications Nos. 01-136416 SGN and 01-136432 SGN, of the requirement to obtain the necessary permits from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services; and
 - (c) on motion by Councillor McConnell, that authority be granted to introduce the necessary Bills in Council to give effect thereto on condition that Tribar enters into the necessary agreements with the City, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services; and
- (2) on motion by Councillor McConnell, consideration of the location of the sign at 28 Rees Street be submitted to Council without recommendation having regard that a motion placed by Councillor Milczyn to approve the signage at this location lost on a tie vote.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee requested the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee to meet with appropriate City staff prior to Council's meeting

on June 26, 2001 to discuss whether the sign proposed for the Rees Street location can be modified or identify a more suitable location or financial resolution, and report directly to City Council on the outcome of these discussions.

On motion by Councillor Milczyn, the Planning and Transportation Committee requested the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to report directly to City Council on the costs of providing funding from the Capital Work Program should Council not approve the signage at the Rees Street location which would result in Tribar's contribution being less than the \$3.5 million required to proceed with the installation of the suicide barrier on the Bloor Viaduct.

On motion by Councillor Pantalone, the Planning and Transportation Committee requested the Chief Administrative Officer, in consultation with appropriate City staff, the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee and representatives from Tribar, to submit to City Council a confidential report outlining the monetary value of each of the proposed signs in order to clarify the number of signs necessary to cover Tribar's financial contributions towards the erection of the suicide barrier on the Bloor Street Viaduct.

(Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services; Interim Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; cc: Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee; Commissioner of Urban Development Services; Finance Department: Attn: John DiLallo, Budget Services; Finance Department, Attn: John Chenery, Budget Services; Dave Kaufman, General Manager, Transportation Services; and City Solicitor - June 7, 2001)

(Clause No. 2, Report No. 6)

6.3 Four Draft Plan of Condominium Applications:

- **No. 400012 (55CDM-00212) to Convert 85 Rental Units to a Residential Condominium at 44 Walmer Road (Ward 20 Trinity-Spadina);**
- **No. 400017 (55CDM-00217) to Convert 90 Rental Units to a Residential Condominium at 440 Eglinton Avenue East (Ward 22 St. Paul's);**
- **No. 400018 (55CDM-00218) to Convert 71 Rental Units to a Residential Condominium at 88 Wellesley Street East (Ward 27 Toronto Centre-Rosedale); and**

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- **No. 400019 (55CDM-00219) to Convert 957 Existing Units to Condominium at 17, 19, 21, 23 and 25 Lascelles Boulevard (Ward 22 St. Paul's).**

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a transmittal letter (May 22, 2001) from the City Clerk, Downtown Community Council advising that, in accordance with Recommendation (5) of the report (April 25, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services which recommends that this report be forwarded to the June 4, 2001 meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee, the Downtown Community Council, at its meeting on May 15, 2001, recommended that:

- (1) Council refuse Draft Plan of Condominium Applications No. 400012 (44 Walmer Road) and No. 400018 (88 Wellesley Street East);
- (2) Council direct the appropriate City staff to appear before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to oppose any appeals that may be filed in respect to the above-noted applications;
- (3) Council request City staff, in the event of more than one appeal, where appropriate, to request that the OMB consolidate the appeals to ensure these matters are dealt with in an efficient and cost-effective manner;
- (4) Council authorize the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Commissioner of Corporate Services, and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, to retain any necessary consultants to defend Council's position before the OMB in respect of any appeals related to the above-noted applications. As noted in the financial impact statement, such costs be charged to Urban Development Services Account No. UR0022-4199, subject to the City Solicitor reporting to Council on the budgetary requirements; and
- (5) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

The Committee also had before it the following material:

- transmittal letter (May 16, 2001) from the City Clerk, Midtown Community Council advising that the Midtown Community Council, at its meeting on May 15, 2001, recommended the adoption of the following Recommendations contained in the report (April 25, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services:
 - (1) Council refuse Draft Plan of Condominium Applications No. 400012 (44 Walmer Road), No. 400017 (440 Eglinton Avenue West), No. 400018 (88 Wellesley Street East), and No. 400019 (17-25 Lascelles Boulevard);

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- (2) Council direct the appropriate City staff to appear before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to oppose any appeals that may be filed in respect to the above-noted applications;
 - (3) Council request City staff, in the event of more than one appeal, where appropriate, to request that the OMB consolidate the appeals to ensure these matters are dealt with in an efficient and cost-effective manner;
 - (4) Council authorize the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Commissioner of Corporate Services, and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, to retain any necessary consultants to defend Council's position before the OMB in respect of any appeals related to the above-noted applications. As noted in the financial impact statement, such costs be charged to Urban Development Services Account No. UR0022-4199, subject to the City Solicitor reporting to Council on the budgetary requirements; and
 - (5) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto;
- communication (undated) from Dr. Samuel Kalman urging the Midtown Community Council to reject the proposal at 17-25 Lascelles Blvd.;
 - communication (June 1, 2001) from Roger Gillott & Melanie Stevenson opposing the application to convert the apartment building at 44 Walmer Road into a condominium; and
 - motion (undated) from Councillor Pantalone:

"WHEREAS Report No. 3, Clause 3 of the Urban Environment and Development Committee, adopted by City Council on March 2, 3 and 4, 1999, directs that condominium conversion applications be considered solely by Community Councils, and

WHEREAS City Council has established a protocol for identifying and processing all other planning matters which are of City-wide or local interest (Report No. 9, Clause 2 of the Urban Environment and Development Committee, adopted by City Council on July 29, 30 and 31, 1998); and

WHEREAS it is the mandate of the Planning and Transportation Committee to consider all planning matters which are of City-wide interest; and

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

WHEREAS the Planning and Transportation Committee, because of the current policy respecting condominium conversions, cannot consider these matters, even if they are deemed to be of City-wide interest;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Chief Planner and Executive Director of Urban Development Services, or his designate, be responsible for determining which condominium conversion matters are of City-wide or local interest, in accordance with the protocol previously adopted by City Council for identifying and processing all other planning matters;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Chapter 27 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code be amended accordingly."

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

- Adam Krehm;
- Brad Butt, Executive Director, Greater Toronto Apartment Association;
- Dan McIntyre, Federation of Metro Tenants Associations;
- Mira Sirotic, Brentwood Tower's Tenant's Association;
- Dr. Samuel Kalman; and
- Vance Latchford, Senior Planner, Public Policy Analysis, Research and Development, Latchford Associates.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee unanimously recommended to City Council that:

- (1) the following combined recommendations of the Downtown Community Council and the Midtown Community Council, as contained in the transmittal letters (May 22, 2001 and May 16, 2001) from the City Clerk be adopted:

“(1) Council refuse Draft Plan of Condominium Applications No. 400012 (44 Walmer Road), No. 400017 (440 Eglinton Avenue West), No. 400018 (88 Wellesley Street East), and No. 400019 (17-25 Lascelles Boulevard);

(2) Council direct the appropriate City staff to appear before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to oppose any appeals that may be filed in respect to the above-noted applications;

(3) Council request City staff, in the event of more than one appeal, where appropriate, to request that the OMB consolidate the appeals to ensure these matters are dealt with in an efficient and cost-effective manner;

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- (4) Council authorize the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Commissioner of Corporate Services, and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, to retain any necessary consultants to defend Council's position before the OMB in respect of any appeals related to the above-noted applications. As noted in the financial impact statement, such costs be charged to Urban Development Services Account No. UR0022-4199, subject to the City Solicitor reporting to Council on the budgetary requirements; and
- (5) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto."

On motion by Councillor Pantalone, the Planning and Transportation Committee with respect to City Council's Policy regarding the application, notice and meeting requirements for condominium conversion and demolition applications as adopted by Council at its meeting on March 2, 3 and 4, 1999 (Clause 3 of Report 3 of Urban Environment and Development Committee refers) recommended to Council that:

- (a) the Chief Planner and Executive Director of Urban Development Services, or his designate, be responsible for determining which condominium conversion matters are of City-wide or local interest, in accordance with the protocol previously adopted by City Council for identifying and processing all other planning matters;
- (b) where the Chief Planner and Executive Director, or his designate, has determined that an application for condominium conversion is of City-wide interest, Community Councils continue to hear depositions on the application prior to consideration by Planning and Transportation Committee with respect to the City-wide implications; and
- (c) Chapter 27 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code and City Council's Policy regarding the application, notice and meeting requirements for condominium conversion and demolition applications, be amended accordingly.

The foregoing motion carried unanimously as follows:

Yeabs:

Councillor G. Altobello
Councillor J. Flint
Councillor P. McConnell
Councillor P. Milczyn
Councillor J. Pantalone
Councillor M. Silva

(Clause No. 3, Report No. 6)

6.4 Highway 404 Extension

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (April 17, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services responding to a request from the Planning and Transportation Committee regarding Provincial plans to extend Highway 404 and recommending that City Council:

- (1) through its representation on the Greater Toronto Services Board (GTSB), press for a review of the Province's announcement concerning the overall expansion of the 400-series highway network within the context of a regional growth management strategy for the GTA based on "smart growth" principles;
- (2) request the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) to keep both the City and the GTSB informed of and involved in all planning studies on Provincial highway expansion projects in and around the GTA; and
- (3) forward a copy of this report to MTO, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Durham.

The Committee also had before it the following material:

- communications (May 3, 2001 and May 4, 2001) from Ross Snetsinger, Chair, Rail Ways to the Future, forwarding a submission respecting rail and transit as opposed to new highway spending, a submission, titled "The OECD's Environmentally Sustainable Transport (EST) Project", and comments respecting the overall expansion of the 400-series highway network within the context of a regional growth management strategy for the GTA based on "Smart Growth" strategies. Newspaper articles appended thereto are on file in the office of the City Clerk;
- communication (undated) from Wilfrid Walker, P.Eng., Board Member, Transport 2000 Ontario, submitting a map, titled "Metropolitan Plan of the

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area", Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, December, 1966;

- report (May 29, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services responding to a request from the Planning and Transportation Committee regarding transportation funding and road tolling policies in the Greater Toronto Area, and recommending that Council:
 - (1) reaffirm its position adopted in 1999, following the release of the findings of the Task Force on Transportation Funding, that the Provincial and Federal Governments be requested to enter into a Transportation Funding Partnership and revenue sharing agreements with the Cities and Regions of the GTA to ensure adequate funding for the maintenance and expansion of the region's transportation system;
 - (2) request the Greater Toronto Services Board (GTSB) and its constituent municipalities to initiate an updated review of transportation funding in the region with the view to ensuring that local governments are given the financial and legislative means by which to meet their transportation planning responsibilities;
 - (3) advise the Province of its concern over the mismatch between ambitious plans to expand the Provincial highway system and the Province's limited five-year commitment to helping fund inter-regional transit expansion, and recommend that a more balanced pattern of transportation investment be pursued through the GTSB transportation planning process and the funding partnership mechanisms referred to in Recommendations 1 and 2 above; and
 - (4) forward a copy of this report to the Federal and Provincial Ministers of Transportation, the Chair of the GTSB, the Chair of the Regional Municipalities in the GTA, the Mayor of the City of Hamilton, and the Chairs of GO Transit and Toronto Transit Commission;
- communication (May 28, 2001) from Mr. Michael J. Williams, Director, Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch, Ministry of the Environment, responding to the Committee's request at its last meeting that the Ministry of the Environment extend the 30 day consultation period to enable City Council to discuss this matter, and advising that the Government Review will be available in early June, 2001 which will be followed by a five week public review period, and that the City Clerk will receive a copy of the Review once it is published; and
- communication (June 1, 2001) from J. Craig Mather, P.Eng., Chief Administrative Officer, The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority,

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

supporting the recommendations that the commitment to the extension of Provincial Highways take into consideration the natural heritage system, including the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Dr. Gordon J. Chong, Chairman, Greater Toronto Services Board, appeared before the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

With Councillor Silva in the Chair, on motion by Councillor Pantalone, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, that:

- (1) through its representation on the Greater Toronto Services Board (GTSB), Council press for a review of the Province of Ontario's announcement concerning the overall expansion of the 400-series highway network within the context of a regional growth management strategy for the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) based on "smart growth" principles;
- (2) the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) be requested to keep both the City and the GTSB, informed of and involved in, all planning studies on Provincial highway expansion projects in and around the GTA;
- (3) a copy of the report (April 17, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be forwarded to the MTO, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Durham;
- (4) Council reaffirm its position adopted in 1999, following the release of the findings of the Task Force on Transportation Funding, that the Provincial and Federal Governments be requested to enter into a Transportation Funding Partnership and revenue sharing agreements with the Cities and Regions of the GTA to ensure adequate funding for the maintenance and expansion of the region's transportation system;
- (5) the (GTSB), and its constituent municipalities, be requested to initiate an updated review of transportation funding in the region with the view to ensuring that local governments are given the financial and legislative means by which to meet their transportation planning responsibilities;
- (6) the Province of Ontario be advised of Council's concern over the mismatch between ambitious plans to expand the Provincial

highway system and the Province of Ontario's limited five-year commitment to helping fund inter-regional transit expansion, and recommend that a more balanced pattern of transportation investment be pursued through the GTSB transportation planning process and the funding partnership mechanisms referred to in Recommendations 4 and 5 above;

- (7) a copy of report (May 29, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be forwarded to the Federal and Provincial Ministers of Transportation, the Chair of the GTSB, the Chair of the Regional Municipalities in the GTA, the Mayor of the City of Hamilton, and the Chairs of GO Transit and Toronto Transit Commission;
- (8) Council strongly endorse the resolution passed recently at the GTSB which called for a strengthened GTSB with growth management, macro planning powers across the GTA and the creation of a Transportation Authority for the Greater Toronto Area which would be responsible for transportation (roads and mass public transit) planning across the GTA;
- (9) it be impressed upon the Province of Ontario that time is of the essence in addressing this urgent transportation and planning issue; and
- (10) public transit be given equal consideration with road expansion in formulating a "Made in Ontario" smart growth strategy.

(Clause No. 4, Report No. 6)

6.5 The Use of School Bus Type Safety Swing Signs on Motorized Ice Cream Trucks

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 4, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services providing information on the use of safety swing signs on motorized ice cream trucks, similar to those used on school buses and recommending that this report be received for information purposes only.

Mr. Amo Blazys appeared before the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee reports having received the report (May 4, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services.

(Clause No. 13(a), Report No. 6)

6.6 Harmonization of the Sign By-Law concerning Posters on Public Property, including Signs on Utility Poles

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 10, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services reporting on the harmonization of the Sign By-law concerning posters on public property, including signs on utility poles and recommending that:

- (1) this report be forwarded to the Community Councils for their consideration; and
- (2) a date be set for a public meeting at the Planning and Transportation Committee to consider the draft by-law and that notice of the public meeting be given in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Act.

The Committee also had before it a report (May 29, 2001) from the City Solicitor advising on the City's ability to regulate posters on public property, including signs on utility poles, and recommending that this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Milczyn, the Planning and Transportation Committee:

- (1) adopted the report (May 10, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and in so doing forwarded this report to Community Councils for consideration at their July 10 and 11, 2001 meeting and subsequent consideration by Planning and Transportation Committee at a public meeting on September 11, 2001; and
- (2) requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to report to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration at the public meeting on September 11, 2001, on the feasibility of licensing commercial sign installers to install signs other than community signage relating to garage sales, etc.; and
- (3) received the report (May 29, 2001) from the City Solicitor.

(East Community Council; Downtown Community Council; Midtown Community Council; North Community Council; Southwest Community Council; West Community

Council; and Commissioner of Urban Development Services; cc: City Solicitor - June 8, 2001)

(Clause No. 13(b), Report No. 6)

6.7 Restructuring of the Property Standards Committee

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 11, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services reporting on the restructuring of the Property Standards Committee and recommending that:

- (1) the Property Standards Committee be reconstituted effective January 1, 2002, as one committee with four hearing panels that reflect district service delivery boundaries, and comprised of a total of 16 members;
- (2) the members be appointed for an initial term expiring on November 30, 2003 and until their successors are appointed, and that members be appointed to a three (3)-year term thereafter concurrent with the term of Council;
- (3) City Council recommend that the new committee, prior to holding any hearings, meet as a committee of the whole to establish four (4) panels consisting of four (4) members each and to:
 - (a) appoint a City-wide Chair and a Chair for each panel; and
 - (b) appoint the City Clerk as Secretary of the Committee with authority to delegate the role of Secretary for each panel;
 - (c) include the following in its Rules of Procedure;
 - (d) if the Secretary finds that a quorum is not possible from the members of any one panel, a member from another panel may be called upon to sit and form a quorum;
 - (e) the boundaries for each panel reflect the service delivery boundaries for each district;
 - (f) all hearings before the panels of the Committee commence at 9:30 a.m. and be held at North York Civic Centre, Toronto City Hall, York Civic Centre, Scarborough Civic Centre or such other location as the Secretary deems advisable;
- (4) honoraria for the Property Standards Committee be established as follows:

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- (a) \$ 75.00 per member for each hearing day attended; and
 - (b) \$300.00 extra annually for the City-wide Chair;
- (5) the criteria for selecting citizen members of the committee, as set out in this report, be adopted;
 - (6) the City Clerk be directed to begin the nomination process so that committee members may be recommended by the Nominating Committee and considered directly by Council;
 - (7) Section 27-95B(4)(b) of Municipal Code Chapter 27, Council Procedures, be deleted and that Section 7 of Appendix 1 in the *Policy for Citizen Appointments* through the Nominating Committee be amended to provide that the Nominating Committee recommend a slate of citizen nominees for appointment to local panels of the Property Standards Committee directly to Council; and
 - (8) the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the City Clerk, be authorized to prepare and introduce to Council any bills necessary to give effect to the recommendations.

On motion by Councillor Altobello, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, the adoption of the report (May 11, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

(Clause No. 5, Report No. 6)

6.8 New Toronto Secondary Plan Land Use Option

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 9, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services seeking Council's approval to carry out a detailed assessment of a revised land use option for the New Toronto Secondary Plan Study and recommending that:

- (1) Council endorse, in principle, revised Option 2, as outlined in this report;
- (2) Council direct Urban Development Services staff and the consultant team to continue discussions with the various interests in the New Toronto Secondary Plan study area in an effort to address their concerns in developing the revised Option 2 for the New Toronto area and to seek funding from the landowners to undertake further study; and,

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- (3) Planning and Transportation Committee forward this report to the West Community Council for their review and comments to Council.

The Committee also had before it the following communications:

- (May 29, 2001) from Gary Waddington, Regional Manager - Central Canada, Canadian National Railway Properties Inc., reaffirming their position in favour of Option 1, the all-employment option, and noting that any proposal that includes residential uses within 300 meters of the CN Mimico Yard is unacceptable to CN;
- (May 28, 2001) from Al Brezina, President, South Etobicoke Industrial Employers Association, requesting the necessary level of study be conducted before any options involving introduction of residential use to this industrial area are presented to City committees or Council;
- (June 1, 2001) from Brian Mirsky, Campbell's Soup Co. Ltd., objecting to the recommendations in the report which permit "mixed use" (employment and residential) for the study area which is incompatible with their operations;
- (June 1, 2001) from N. Jane Pepino, C.M., Q.C., Aird & Berlis LLP, Barristers and Solicitors, obo South Etobicoke Industrial Employers Association (SEIEA), opposing the recommendations of the report because they do not satisfy the OMB's direction, the Ministry of Environment's Guidelines for Land Use Planning, or the City's own Official Plan tests for changed land use designation;
- (June 1, 2001) from Paul De Francesca, Lang Michener, Barristers & Solicitors, obo National Silicates Partnership ("National Silicates"), objecting to the recommendations by staff;
- (June 1, 2001) from Paul De Francesca, Lang Michener, Barristers & Solicitors, obo Dominion Colour Corporation (Dominion"), objecting to the recommendations by staff and supporting Option 1 contained in the report; and
- (June 1, 2001) from A. Milliken Heisey, Kerzner, Papazian, MacDermid, Barristers and Solicitors, obo Canadian National Railway, noting that it is CN's position that the report does not satisfactorily address the Provincial Policy Statement, the Ministry of Environment Guidelines, or the OMB decision of Member Watty.

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

- Jane Pepino, Solicitor, South Etobicoke Industrial Employer's Association;
- Scott Burns, obo Urban Renaissance Group;

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- Toni Varone, Urban Renaissance Group;
- Paul DeFrancesca, Lang Michener, Barristers & Solicitor; and
- A.M. Heisey, Kerzner, Papazian, MacDermid.

On motion by Councillor Silva, the Planning and Transportation Committee deferred consideration of the report (May 9, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to its meeting on September 11, 2001.

(Commissioner, Urban Development Services; cc: Interested Persons - June 8, 2001)

(Clause No. 13(c), Report No. 6)

6.9 Proposal for the Development of a Zoning By-Law Permitting Emergency Shelters

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 18, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services responding to Council's direction to report further on appropriate zoning changes that would permit emergency shelters to be located in all areas of the City, and recommending that:

- (1) City Council direct and authorize staff to proceed with issuance of the statutory Notice for a Public Meeting at Planning and Transportation Committee on September 11, 2001 to consider amendments to the Zoning By-laws of all the former municipalities to permit an emergency shelter operated by or for the City of Toronto in any zoning district within the City; and
- (2) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Altobello, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting on June 26, 2001, that:

- (1) the report (May 18, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be adopted; and
- (2) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, in consultation with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, be requested to report to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration at the Public Hearing on:

- (a) a mechanism that ensures that Ward Councillors are advised, at an early stage, that an emergency shelter is proposed to be located in his/her ward; and
- (b) on motion by Councillor Flint, the criteria for siting, including issues such as, but not limited to, flood plains and brownfields.

(Clause No. 6, Report No. 6)

6.10 Priority Processing of Development Applications that Include Conservation of Designated Heritage Buildings

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to the joint report (April 18, 2001) from the Commissioners of Urban Development Services and Economic Development, Culture and Tourism to recommend a mechanism for priority processing of development applications that include the conservation (preservation, rehabilitation and/or restoration) of a designated heritage building, in fulfilment of a Council directive of March 1, 2000 and recommending that Council adopt the procedures set out in this report for the priority processing of development applications that include the conservation (preservation, rehabilitation and/or conservation) of a designated heritage building, and direct all civic staff to implement the procedures by October 1, 2001.

On motion by Councillor Silva, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, the adoption of the joint report (April 18, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism.

(Clause No. 7, Report No. 6)

6.11 Integration of Rooming House Licensing with the General Licensing By-Law

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (April 17, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services advising of the status of possible integration of the Rooming House Licensing By-law with the general Licensing By-law, and recommending that this report be received for information.

The Committee also had before it a report (May 31, 2001) from the City Solicitor reporting on the process to extend existing special legislation to license rooming houses

to the entire City of Toronto and recommending that this report be received for information.

Mr. Vance Latchford, Senior Planner, Public Policy Analysis, Research and Development, Latchford Associates, appeared before the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee received the report (April 17, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the report (May 31, 2001) from the City Solicitor.

(Clause No. 13(d), Report No. 6)

6.12 Toronto's Tree Advocacy Program

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to the joint report (May 29, 2001) from the Commissioners of Urban Development Services; Economic Development, Culture and Tourism; and Works and Emergency Services responding to a request from the Planning and Transportation Committee to report on several issues related to the funding and implementation of street tree planting and the planting of front yard trees in connection with new townhouse developments, and recommending that this report be received for information.

With Councillor Silva in the Chair, on motion by Councillor Pantalone, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, that:

- (1) hereafter all works and emergency road services reconstructions include capital funding for tree planting where such tree planting, in the opinion of the City Forester and appropriate staff, is feasible;
- (2) should issues in funding, or otherwise, arise the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to consult with the Tree Advocate and report accordingly to City Council.
- (3) requested the Commissioner, Urban Development Services, in consultation with the Commissioner, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services if necessary, to report to the next meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee on the planting of trees in connection with new townhouse developments; and

- (4) received the joint report (May 29, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Commissioner, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Commissioner, Works and Emergency Services.

(Commissioner of Urban Development Services; cc: Commissioner, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism; and Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services - June 7, 2001)

(Clause No. 8, Report No. 6)

6.13 Committee of Adjustment Reporting Process

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (April 23, 2001) from the Chief Administrative Officer commenting on the reporting relationships of staff who support the Committee of Adjustment and recommending that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services review the Committee of Adjustment staffing model and reporting procedures at the end of the first year following implementation and report thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee; and
- (2) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee:

- (1) recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, the adoption of the report (April 23, 2001) from the Chief Administrative Officer; and
- (2) authorized the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to provide, if necessary, changes to the report (April 23, 2001) from the Chief Administrative Officer.

(Clause No. 9, Report No. 6)

6.14 Self-Funding Don Valley Parkway Expansion

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (May 4, 2001) from Councillor Disero forwarding a report (April 20, 2001) from Councillor Sutherland which requests staff to report on a proposal to expand the Don

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

Valley Parkway, which would include maintaining up to three existing lanes in either direction while adding two new centre toll lanes each way and funding to be provided by private firm(s) with a portion of the tolls being returned to the City for transit initiatives, and advising that this report, addressed to the Works Committee, comes within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Transportation Committee and is referred to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration in the context of the Official Plan.

The Committee also had before it the following material:

- communication (May 7, 2001) from the Acting Executive Director, Greater Toronto Services Board, advising that the Transportation Committee of the Greater Toronto Services Board considered correspondence (March 29, 2001) from Councillor Sutherland, and:
 - (1) directed that this correspondence be referred to the City of Toronto with a request that it report back to the GTSB on the status of Councillor Sutherland's proposal vis-à-vis the City of Toronto's transportation plan; and
 - (2) forwarded this material to the City of Toronto Commissioner of Urban Development Services and to the GO Board for comment;
- report (May 31, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services responding to a request to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to comment, in the context of the Official Plan, on a preliminary proposal to expand the Don Valley Parkway by adding four centre toll lanes, and recommending that Council receive for information the preliminary proposal to expand the Don Valley Parkway by adding four centre toll lanes;
- communication (May 30, 2001) from Joel Ornoy requesting that the Committee invest in better public transit options rather than widening our roadways;
- communication (June 1, 2001) from Councillor Sutherland submitting the following material:
 - correspondence from Tony Dionisio, Universal Workers Union Local 183;
 - correspondence from Kerrie MacPherson and Elyse Allan, The Toronto Board of Trade; and
 - report, entitled "Strategic Development Partnership - Parkway Transportation Express Corridor"; and
- communication (May 31, 2001) from John P. Wilson, Chair, Task Force to Bring Back the Don, opposing any plan to add traffic lanes to the Don Valley Parkway.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee reports having deferred consideration of the report (May 4, 2001) from the Chair, Works Committee and the report (May 31, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services, together with related material, to its next meeting on July 3, 2001.

(Commissioner, Urban Development Services; cc: Councillor Disero, Chair, Works Committee; Councillor Sutherland; and Interested Persons - June 8, 2001)

(Clause No. 13(e), Report No. 6)

6.15 Terms of Reference for the Toronto Cycling Committee

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a transmittal letter (May 1, 2001) from the City Clerk, Toronto Cycling Committee forwarding action taken by the City Cycling Committee that recommended that Planning and Transportation Committee:

- (1) approve an amendment to the terms of reference for the Toronto Cycling Committee, that would allow the Network Planning and Facilities Sub-Committee, to be re-named the Road and Trail Sub-Committee; and
- (2) be advised that all other Sub-Committee names of the Toronto Cycling Committee, remain the same.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommends the adoption of the recommendations of the Toronto Cycling Committee as contained in the transmittal letter (May 1, 2001) from the City Clerk.

(Clause No. 10, Report No. 6)

6.16 Maintenance of Strip Plazas

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a motion (undated) from Councillor Moscoe expressing concerns regarding the deteriorating maintenance standards of some strip malls, and recommending that his motion be referred to the City Solicitor and the Commissioner of Urban Development Services with a request that they:

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

- (1) review the feasibility of licensing strip plazas in a manner that requires all businesses within a strip plaza to be a party to a collective strip plaza license;
- (2) as a condition of this license there be a requirement to enter into an agreement for the maintenance of the collective property which shall include, but not be limited to, cleaning, snow removal, and paving; and
- (3) report jointly thereon to the Planning and Transportation Committee.

On motion by Councillor Milczyn, the Planning and Transportation Committee adopted the motion of Councillor Moscoe and in so doing referred this to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services with a request that she report to the Planning and Transportation Committee as directed therein.

(Commissioner of Urban Development Services and City Solicitor; cc: Councillor Moscoe; Director, Municipal Licensing and Standards, Urban Development Services - June 8, 2001)

(Clause No. 13(f), Report No. 6)

6.17 Removal of Bus Bays on City Streets

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to the joint report (May 24, 2001) from the Commissioners of Urban Development Services and Works and Emergency Services responding to the Toronto Transit Commission's (TTC) recommendations that the City reduce the number of bus bays on its streets, and recommending that City Council:

- (1) support the TTC's request for a joint operational review with the appropriate City officials of each of the City's 1,802 bus bays as a surface transit priority initiative aimed at facilitating bus services by reducing the number of bus bays at mid-block and near side intersection locations, subject to the review process having due regard in each case to traffic safety considerations and other traffic circumstances that might apply;
- (2) direct the joint TTC/City review to give priority attention to the 28 bus bays identified by the TTC as being of substandard width, and
- (3) implement the removal of identified bus bays over time as the roadways on which they are located come up for scheduled reconstruction and that the appropriate City officials report to the City's Works Committee at that time to provide the opportunity for public discussion and to obtain formal Committee approval.

Mr. Gary Carr, Chief Engineer, Operations Planning, Toronto Transit Committee gave a presentation to the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor Flint, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, the adoption of the joint report (May 21, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services subject to requesting that the joint operational review as noted in Recommendation (1) consider the following:

- (1) that when a near side bus bay is removed, it is ensured that a far side bus bay be installed; and
- (2) that whenever a bus makes a left turn at a signal light, there be an advance green light.

(Clause No. 11, Report No. 6)

6.18 Introduction of Bills as Required to Implement Approved Budget Proposals

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a report (May 29, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services introducing the necessary Bill to amend the Building Permit fee schedule in Chapter 363, Building and Construction, of The City of Toronto Municipal Code to implement a 5% increase to all building permit fees and providing for the removal of the current cap on Rezoning and Site Plan Application fees, and recommending that:

- (1) Chapter 363, Building and Construction, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code be amended to increase Building Permit fees by 5% effective August 1, 2001, with any complete applications received before that date being subject to the fees that applied at the time of application;
- (2) the Planning Applications Fee Schedule adopted by Council at its meeting held on April 18, 1998, as set out in Clause No. 4 of Urban Development Committee Report No. 4, be amended by deleting the reference to the cap effective July 1, 2001 with any complete applications received before that date being subject to the fees that applied at the time of application;
- (3) the Planning Application Fee Schedule as amended, be added to Municipal Code Chapter 441, Fees; and

- (4) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action, including the introduction of any bills in Council, to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor McConnell, the Planning and Transportation Committee recommended to City Council, for its meeting to be held on June 26, 2001, the adoption of the report (May 29, 2001) from Commissioner of Urban Development Services.

(Clause No. 12, Report No. 6)

6.19 Building Permit Backlog

The Planning and Transportation Committee gave consideration to a communication (May 28, 2001) from Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski expressing concern regarding the length of time Building Permit Applications are being processed, suggesting that a consulting firm be hired temporarily to deal with the current back log, and requesting the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to provide a verbal update on this matter at the Committee's meeting on June 4, 2001.

The Committee also had before it a communication (June 4, 2001) from Ann Dembinski, President, CUPE, Local 79, objecting to Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski's proposal, and requesting, instead, that additional resources be put into front-line staffing in the Urban Development Services Department.

Ms. Ann Dembinski, President, CUPE, Local 79, appeared before the Planning and Transportation Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor Flint, the Planning and Transportation Committee referred the report (May 28, 2001) from Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services with a request that she submit a brief report to the Planning and Transportation Committee outlining the extent of the current building permit backlog; which types of projects receive fast tracking privileges and why and what their effect is on other applications; and provide figures on monies accrued by building permit fees indicating how much it costs to run the building department and the percentage devoted to hiring planning examiners.

(Commissioner of Urban Development Services; cc: Ann Dembinski, President, CUPE, Local 79 - June 8, 2001)

(Clause No. 13(g), Report No. 6)

Planning and Transportation Committee
Monday, June 4, 2001

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Chair