



**CITY OF VAUGHAN
COUNCIL MINUTES
JANUARY 24, 2005**

Table of Contents

<u>Minute No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. PRESENTATION TO THE UNITED WAY OF YORK REGION WITH THE PROCEEDS OF THE 2004 CAMPAIGN	1
2. PRESENTATION – CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION TO THE UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN 2004 VOLUNTEERS	1
3. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA.....	1
4. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST	2
5. ADOPTION OR CORRECTION OF MINUTES.....	2
6. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION.....	2
7. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION	3
8. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.03.034 SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.03.019 PETER EDREY REPORT #P.2003.46 (Referred from the Council Meeting of November 22, 2004).....	4
9. LOCAL HEALTH INTEGRATION NETWORKS (LHIN) ENDORSEMENT OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE REGION OF YORK (Addendum No. 1).....	9
10. REQUEST FOR PROVINCIAL ASSISTANCE (ITEM 11, BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING OF DECEMBER 14, 2004) (Budget Report No. 1)	11
11. PLANNING APPLICATION FEES – FINANCIAL IMPACT OF BILL 124 (ITEM 1, SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (BUDGET) MEETING OF JANUARY 18, 2005) (Budget Report No. 2)	13
12. BY-LAWS FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS	20
13. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION	23
14. CONFIRMING BY-LAW	23
15. ADJOURNMENT	24

CITY OF VAUGHAN

COUNCIL MEETING

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2005

MINUTES

1:00 P.M.

Council convened in the Municipal Council Chambers in Vaughan, Ontario, at 1:19 p.m.

The following members were present:

Mayor Michael Di Biase, Chair
Regional Councillor Mario F. Ferri
Regional Councillor Linda D. Jackson
Councillor Tony Carella
Councillor Bernie Di Vona
Councillor Peter Meffe
Councillor Alan Shefman
Councillor Sandra Yeung Racco

**1. PRESENTATION TO THE UNITED WAY OF YORK REGION
WITH THE PROCEEDS OF THE 2004 CAMPAIGN**

Mayor Di Biase presented, Mr. Rahul K. Bhardwaj, Chief Executive Officer United Way of York Region, with a cheque in the amount of \$22, 350.86, being the proceeds raised through various fundraising events during the City of Vaughan's 2004 United Way Campaign.

**2. PRESENTATION – CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION
TO THE UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN 2004 VOLUNTEERS**

Mayor Di Biase presented a Certificate of Appreciation and expressed gratitude to the following staff volunteers for their valuable efforts in organizing fundraising events during the City of Vaughan's 2004 United Way Campaign:

Marianne Apa
Laura Consalvo
Lucy D'Acunto
Anna Dara
Rose DePaolis
Sandra DiPonio
Angie Di Martino

Hulya Eroz
Rina Farrace
Sue Fox
Franca Gatto
Milan Jekic
Paolo Mancini
Gino Martino

Dina Raso
Mary Rita
Dee Sutters
Jacqueline Thoman
Rose Tucci
Vic Vignarajah
Madeline Zito

3. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

MOVED by Regional Councillor Ferri
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

THAT the agenda be confirmed.

AMENDMENT

MOVED by Regional Councillor Jackson
seconded by Councillor Shefman

That the following addendum be added to the agenda:

- 1) LOCAL HEALTH INTEGRATION NETWORKS (LHIN)
ENDORSEMENT OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE REGION OF YORK

Report of Mayor Di Biase with respect to the above.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Upon the question of the main motion, as amended:

CARRIED AS AMENDED

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

There was no disclosure of interest by any member.

5. ADOPTION OR CORRECTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by Councillor Carella
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

THAT the minutes of the meeting of December 6, 2004, and Special Council meetings (1) and (2) of December 14, 2004 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

6. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION

The following items were identified for separate discussion:

Committee of the Whole Report No. 1

Items 18, 31, and 36

Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 2

Item 5

Referred Item

1

Budget Reports

1 and 2

Addendum Item

1

MOVED by Regional Councillor Ferri
seconded by Councillor Shefman

THAT Items 1 to 37 of the Committee of the Whole Report No. 1, with the exception of the items identified for separate discussion, BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted;

THAT Items 1 to 9 of the Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 2, with the exception of the item identified for separate discussion, BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted; and

THAT Items 1 to 7 of the Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) Report No. 3, BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted.

CARRIED

7. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT NO. 1

(Refer to Committee Report for complete recommendations and documentation on all Committee items.)

ITEM – 18 SANTA BARBARA PLACE – (WESTON DOWNS)
TURN PROHIBITION – SURVEY RESULTS

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona
seconded by Councillor Carella

THAT Item 18, Committee of the Whole Report No. 1 be adopted without amendment.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY UPON A RECORDED VOTE

YEAS

NAYS

Councillor Carella
Mayor Di Biase
Councillor Di Vona
Regional Councillor Ferri
Regional Councillor Jackson
Councillor Meffe
Councillor Shefman

ITEM – 31 10525 KEELE STREET

MOVED by Councillor Meffe
seconded by Regional Councillor Ferri

THAT Item 31, Committee of the Whole Report No. 1 be adopted without amendment.

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY UPON A RECORDED VOTE

YEAS

NAYS

Councillor Carella
Mayor Di Biase
Councillor Di Vona
Regional Councillor Ferri
Regional Councillor Jackson
Councillor Meffe
Councillor Shefman
Councillor Yeung Racco

ITEM – 36 NEW BUSINESS – WOODEN FENCING ALONG LANGSTAFF ROAD
RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

MOVED by Councillor Carella
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

THAT Item 36, Committee of the Whole Report No. 1 be adopted and amended, as follows:

By replacing “abutting” with “on” in the Committee of the Whole recommendation.

CARRIED

Referred Item

- 8. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.03.034
SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.03.019
PETER EDREY
REPORT #P.2003.46**
(Referred from the Council Meeting of November 22, 2004)

MOVED by Councillor Shefman
seconded by Councillor Yeung Racco

That this matter be referred to the Committee of the Whole meeting of February 21, 2005.

CARRIED

Council, at its meeting of November 22, 2004, adopted the following:

That this matter be referred to the Council meeting of January 24, 2005, allowing for the election of the Ward 5 Local Councillor and subsequently a Ward 5 Sub-Committee meeting;

That the memorandum from the Commissioner of Planning, dated November 19, 2004, be received; and

That the following written submissions be received:

- a) Mr. & Ms. Jack and Ann Westerhoek, 12 Elizabeth Street, Thornhill, L4J 1X8, dated November 21, 2004; and
- b) Mr. Atul Gupta and Ms. Shirley Porjes, 26 Elizabeth Street, Thornhill, L4J 1Y1, dated November 21, 2004.

Recommendation of the Committee of the Whole meeting of November 15, 2004:

- 1) That this matter be referred to the Council meeting of November 22, 2004; and
- 2) That the coloured renderings submitted, by the applicant, be received.

Recommendation of the Commissioner of Planning dated November 15, 2004

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Planning recommends:

1. THAT Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z.03.034 (Peter Edrey) BE APPROVED, to permit a business or professional office use (an accountant's office) to operate as a home occupation use, notwithstanding home occupation uses are restricted to regulated health professionals.
2. THAT the following exceptions to the RIV Old Village Residential Zone BE APPROVED:
 - i) require a minimum interior side yard (east) of 2.29 m for the house and 1.2 m for the garage;
 - ii) require a minimum rear yard (south) of 1.2 m for the garage; and
 - iii) permit a maximum lot coverage of 26.45%
3. THAT Site Development Application DA.03.019 (Peter Edrey) BE APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:
 - a) That prior to the execution of the site plan agreement:
 - i) the final site plan, landscape plan and building elevations shall be approved by the Development Planning Department in consultation with Cultural Services Division;
 - ii) all engineering requirements shall be approved by the Engineering Department; and
 - iii) the implementing zoning by-law shall be in full force and effect.

Purpose

The Owner has submitted an application to amend the Zoning By-law to permit a business or professional office use (an accountant's office) to operate as a home occupation within a residential dwelling. The by-law currently permits only regulated health professionals as home occupation uses. The application also proposes the following exceptions to the RIV Old Village Residential Zone standards:

- a minimum interior side yard (east) of 2.29 m for the house and 1.2 m for the garage, whereas 2.5 m is required;
- a minimum rear yard (south) of 1.2 m for the garage, whereas 7.5 m is required; and
- a maximum lot coverage of 26.45%, whereas 23% is permitted.

The proposed exceptions would facilitate a Site Development Application to permit a 50m², 2-storey addition to the existing 294m² single-detached residential heritage dwelling, and to enclose the existing stairwell on the east side of the building, and a new garage, as shown on Attachments #3, #4 and #5.

Background - Analysis and Options

On September 17, 1998, the Applicant was granted permission (application for Permission A256/98) from the Committee of Adjustment to operate an accountant's office from his residential dwelling, subject to applying for a Site Plan Application and obtaining Council's approval of the site plan to facilitate the use on the subject lands. The Applicant did not address this condition of approval within the required 12 months, and the permission lapsed.

In September of 2001, the Applicant went before the Committee of Adjustment seeking relief in respect to the minimum rear yard setback proposed at 1.7m, rather than the By-law requirement of 7.5m, and a maximum lot coverage of 29.6% whereas the By-law permits a maximum of 23%. The Committee of Adjustment did not grant relief (application for Minor Variance A202/01) and were of the opinion that the variances sought were not minor and were not appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Subsequently, the Applicant revised his plans and in October of 2002 proceeded to the Committee of Adjustment for a third time (application for Minor Variance A411/02) requesting the following relief:

- a maximum lot coverage of 27.11%, whereas a maximum of 23% is permitted; and
- a minimum interior side yard of 2.11 m, whereas a minimum of 2.5m is required.

Through this process the Applicant was made aware that his permission for a change in use had lapsed as a result of not addressing the condition of Site Plan Approval. As a number of issues remained outstanding, the Applicant withdrew Minor Variance Application A411/02, and instead would address the deficiencies and use issue through a Zoning By-law Amendment Application which would run concurrently with the required Site Plan Application to facilitate the home occupation use for an accountant's office.

The site is located at the southeast corner of Centre Street and Elizabeth Street (39 Centre Street), being Lot 52 on Registrar's Compiled Plan 9834, in Part of Lot 30, Concession 1, City of Vaughan. The 640.20m² site has 21.9 m frontage on Centre Street and 27.9m flankage on Elizabeth Street.

The site is designated "Low Density Residential" by OPA No.210 (Thornhill-Vaughan Community Plan) and zoned R1V Old Village Residential Zone by By-law 1-88, subject to Exception 9(662). The surrounding land uses are:

- North – Centre Street; residential (R1 Residential Zone)
- South – residential (R1V Old Village Residential Zone)
- East – residential (R1V Old Village Residential Zone)
- West – Elizabeth Street; residential (R1V Old Village Residential Zone)

On May 23, 2003, a notice of public hearing was circulated to all property owners within 120m of the subject lands, the Society for the Preservation of Historical Thornhill, and to the Town of Markham. Staff has received written comments from the public outlining the following concerns:

- the proposed lot coverage and interior side yard setback are excessive;
- the latest application significantly changes the overall look of the house and it would not fit the historic character of the neighbourhood;
- the proposed building would become a 'monster building' on a corner lot in an area where there are 'small-size' historic houses; and
- the approval of this application would set a dangerous precedent for development in the designated historic conservation area.

The recommendation of the Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2003, to receive the public hearing and forward a technical report to a future Committee meeting was ratified by Council on June 23, 2003.

Official Plan

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Residential” by OPA No. 210 (Thornhill-Vaughan Community Plan). This designation provides opportunities for single-detached residential lots fronting on Centre Street, east of Brooke Street, within the Village of Thornhill Heritage District, to be used for residential, and business and professional offices and/or retail commercial uses not exceeding 167.2 m² in total gross floor area. The proposed use for an accountant’s office would conform to the Official Plan.

Zoning

The subject lands are zoned R1V Old Village Residential Zone by By-law 1-88, subject to site-specific Exception 9(662), which permits only a single-detached residential dwelling. The applicant has proposed to amend the existing zoning in order to permit a business or professional office use, specifically an accountant’s office as a home occupation. In respect to home occupation uses, By-law 1-88 states:

- “a) Such use shall be limited to the office of a regulated health professional (notwithstanding the definition of a regulated health professional, a body-rub parlour is not permitted as an accessory use to a home occupation);”

The following exceptions are also required to facilitate an addition to the east side of the existing residential dwelling, and the east and south sides of the proposed garage, as shown on Attachment #3:

	<u>Required</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Min. Interior Side Yard (east)	2.5m	2.29m (to house)
Min. Interior Side Yard (east)	2.5m	1.2m (to garage)
Min. Rear Yard (south)	7.5m	1.2m (to garage)
Max. Lot Coverage	23%	26.45%

The existing site-specific Exception 9(662) previously addressed deficiencies for lot frontage, lot area, and front and exterior side yards.

Site Design

The existing heritage building shown on Attachment #2 is 2-storeys along Centre Street, and 1-storey in the southerly half of the building, and is located centrally on the subject lands. The applicant is proposing (see Attachment #3) a second-storey addition to the south half of the building, which would also include the enclosure of the exterior stairs on the east side of the building, and a detached garage to be located at the southeast corner of the lot. The site is to be accessed from Elizabeth Street by a 6.0m wide driveway leading to the detached garage. There is no driveway along Centre Street, thereby creating a continuous landscape strip along the lot frontage. A precast concrete walkway extends from the sidewalk on Centre Street along the exterior side (west) of the dwelling and wraps around the corner of the home. The proposed accountant’s office use will be located in the front of the building, with the residential component at the rear.

Building Elevations

The north and west elevations (see Attachment #5) both contain entrances to the dwelling. The existing north elevation (no changes are proposed) facing Centre Street has a single door entrance centrally located and framed by glass. A small porch supported by columns adds detail to the north elevation, which aside from the entrance contains 2 windows with shutters on the ground floor. Directly above the entranceway and beneath the peak in the roofline, is a third window.

The west elevation also contains a single door entry framed by glass and covered by a porch extending almost the entire length of this elevation. Windows have been proposed throughout this

elevation and includes a recessed balcony on the second-storey. The main building material used on the north and west elevations is stucco in a light yellow/beige colour, restoring the original building material. All the wood trim, including balcony railings, porch columns and railings, and window trims and shutters will be painted in a light neutral colour complimenting the stucco. The building height to the mid-point of the roof measures 6.85m and the roof is to be constructed with asphalt shingles in a grey colour.

The remainder of the building being the east and south elevations (see Attachment #4) will be constructed with the same material, but also introduces a light grey vertical board and batten, which is also being used for the detached garage.

Landscaping

The landscaping on site (see Attachment #3) is to be maintained, except in the rear yard, which will be paved with a hard surface for the driveway. A new cedar hedge is proposed along the south property line, with the existing cedar hedge located between the south lot line and the driveway on Elizabeth Street to remain, and provide screening of the parking area.

Access and Parking

The site plan (see Attachment #3) proposes 5 parking spaces, consisting of 2 within the detached garage, 2 tandem parking spaces in the driveway and a single spot in front of the residence, in compliance with the residential (3 parking spaces) and home occupation (2 parking spaces) parking standards in By-law 1-88.

Servicing

The site has access to municipal services, including sanitary and storm sewers and water. The final site plan is to be approved by the Engineering Department, and satisfy all engineering requirements.

Cultural Services/Heritage Vaughan

The subject lands are located in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, designated under the Ontario Heritage Act (Part V), and is therefore subject to the Heritage District Plan.

Heritage Vaughan at its meeting on September 15, 2004, approved the proposed site plan application and provided the following comments:

- "1. That the applicant submit specifications regarding the restoration of the heritage building;
2. That the applicant submit details regarding materials, colours and signage to Cultural Services staff for review in accordance with the Heritage Conservation District Plan; and
3. The Building Permit plans be in substantial conformance with the approved site plan application drawings."

The proposed addition to the heritage structure adheres to the guidelines requiring the retention and restoration of existing heritage buildings, and that additions are consistent/complimentary to the architectural style of the existing heritage structure. Development Planning Staff are satisfied that the proposed zoning exceptions noted in the "Zoning" section of this report are appropriate for the Thornhill Heritage District with respect to the site layout and building elevations, and supported by Heritage Vaughan.

Final details regarding materials, colours and signage are to be approved to the satisfaction of the Cultural Services Division.

Land Use/Compatibility

The application proposes permitting business or professional office uses, in particularly an accountant's office at 39 Centre Street to operate as a home occupation use. Many of the neighbouring properties have been converted to some form of commercial use or a combination of commercial and residential uses. The proposed application would be in keeping with the evolution of uses along this segment of Centre Street. OPA No.210 encourages this form of redevelopment within the Village of Thornhill Heritage District provided the character of the residence is not altered in any manner that would not be in keeping with the historical preservation of the district. Incorporating the original building material into the design, and producing an addition to the existing building reflecting the architectural style of the era will result in a proposed development which is compatible with those in the surrounding area and which is of an appropriate mass and scale.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007

This staff report is consistent with Vaughan Vision 2007, which encourages managed growth through the implementation of OPA #210.

Conclusion

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed zoning amendment for 39 Centre Street to permit an accountant's office as a home occupation use and the associated exceptions requested to facilitate the development of the second-storey and easterly additions to the heritage house and a new garage are appropriate and compatible with the existing structure and uses in the surrounding area. The proposal implements the policies of the Official Plan, which encourages low-intensity office/commercial uses within existing dwellings in the Village of Thornhill Heritage District.

In light of the above, Staff can support approval of the zoning amendment and site plan applications. Should the Committee concur, the recommendation in this report can be adopted.

Attachments

1. Location Map
2. Existing Site Plan
3. Proposed Site and Landscape Plan
4. South & East Elevations
5. North & West Elevations

Report prepared by:

Arminé Hassakourians, Planner, ext. 8368
Grant A. Uyeyama, Manager of Development Planning, ext. 8635

/CM

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

Addendum

9. **LOCAL HEALTH INTEGRATION NETWORKS (LHIN)**
ENDORSEMENT OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE REGION OF YORK
(Addendum No. 1)

MOVED by Regional Councillor Jackson
seconded by Councillor Meffe

That the recommendation contained in the following report of Mayor Di Biase, dated January 24, 2005, be approved:

CARRIED

Recommendation

Mayor Michael Di Biase, Chair of the Vaughan Health-Care Facility Study Task Force recommends:

1. That the resolution of the Vaughan Health-Care Facility Study Task Force in support of the position of York Region Council in respect of the Local Health Integration Networks be received and ratified;
2. That the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care be advised that Vaughan Council is in full support of the resolution of Regional Council, dated December 16, 2004, in respect of the recommendations contained in the report of the Regional Commissioner of Health Services entitled "Local Health Integration Networks" (Attachment No. 1);
2. That this report be sent to the Minister of Health and Long Term Care, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, York Central Hospital, Markham Stouffville Hospital, the Southlake Regional Health Centre, the Regional Clerk and the local MPP's.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the opportunity to take a position on Regional Council's resolution of December 16, 2004, in respect of newly established Local Health Integration Networks.

Background – Analysis and Options

On December 16, 2004, Regional Council adopted the report of the Commissioner of Health Services regarding the newly created Local Health Integration Networks (LHIN's). The purpose of the report was to provide comments to the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care on the Region of York's position on the new LHIN's.

One of the recommendations also directed that the report be forwarded to the local municipalities in York Region for their endorsement. The report was forwarded to the City of Vaughan by way of letter from the Regional Clerk, dated December 21, 2004.

LHIN's are part of the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care's Health Transformation Plan. The objectives of this plan are to reduce wait times for a number of medical procedures, improve access to MRI services and provide more health-care services in a community setting.

The purpose of LHIN's is to integrate health-care delivery at the local level and consolidate a number of functions including, planning, system integration and service coordination, funding and performance evaluation. It is expected that the LHIN's will commence operation in April of this year.

There will be fourteen LHIN's in the province and the City of Vaughan is located primarily in the "Central" LHIN (Attachment No. 2). However, a portion of the southwest corner of Vaughan is located in the "Central West" LHIN (Attachment No. 3).

The request from the Region was brought to the attention of the Vaughan Health-Care Facility Study Task Force at its meeting on January 18, 2005. The primary issue discussed by the Task Force was the proposed boundaries of the "Central" Local Health Integration Network, which places Vaughan in two separate LHIN's. It is also noted that Markham Stouffville Hospital is in the "Central East" LHIN resulting in York Region being split between three LHIN areas.

Recommendation No. 2 of the Region's report requests that the Province adjust the LHIN boundaries, prior to finalization, to ensure that York Region is fully contained within the boundaries of one LHIN area. Concerns have been raised that the splitting of York Region amongst multiple LHIN's will disrupt already established networks of services and relationships that have built up over the years.

As a result of its deliberations, the Task Force adopted the following resolution:

That the Vaughan Health-Care Facility Study Task Force fully endorses the recommendations of the Commissioner of Health Services adopted by York Regional Council on December 16, 2004, with respect to "Local Health Integration Networks (LHIN)".

In accordance with the request of the Region of York, this matter is being brought forward to Council for its consideration.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

Conclusion

The Local Health Integration Networks are charged with the implementation of the Province's health-care transformation agenda. As such, they will influence the delivery of services for many years to come. The Region of York is seeking the endorsement of the local municipalities for its position of December 16, 2004. The Vaughan Health-Care Facility Study Task Force, at its meeting of January 18, 2005, adopted a resolution in support the Region. In accordance with the request from the Region, this matter is being brought forward for Council's consideration. Should Council wish to support the Region's position on the new Local Health Integration Networks, then the recommendation set out in the "Recommendation" section of this report should be adopted.

Attachments

1. Report No. 1 of the Regional Commissioner of Health Services, as approved by Regional Council on December 16, 2004 (With Regional Clerk's covering letter)
2. "Central" LHIN
3. "Central West" LHIN

Report Prepared by:

Roy McQuillin, Manager of Corporate Policy, ext. 8211

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

Budget Reports

- 10. REQUEST FOR PROVINCIAL ASSISTANCE**
(ITEM 11, BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING OF DECEMBER 14, 2004)
(Budget Report No. 1)

MOVED by Councillor Meffe
seconded by Councillor Carella

That the following resolution of Councillor Meffe, dated December 14, 2004, be adopted.

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

AMENDMENT

MOVED by Councillor Carella
seconded by Councillor Meffe

That the resolution be circulated to all municipalities in Ontario with a population exceeding or equal to 240,000.

CARRIED

Upon the question of the main motion, as amended, being:

That the following resolution of Councillor Meffe, dated December 14, 2004, be adopted; and

That the resolution be circulated to all municipalities in Ontario with a population equal to, or exceeding 240,000.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY UPON A RECORDED VOTE

YEAS

NAYS

Councillor Carella
Mayor Di Biase
Councillor Di Vona
Regional Councillor Ferri
Regional Councillor Jackson
Councillor Meffe
Councillor Shefman
Councillor Yeung Racco

Recommendation

The Budget Committee recommends:

That the following resolution of Councillor Meffe (dated December 14, 2004) be adopted:

WHEREAS the Province of Ontario is receiving requests for financial assistance from the other municipalities in the Province;

WHEREAS many of the budgetary issues facing municipalities in Ontario are common to municipalities throughout the Province;

WHEREAS there are local municipal cost increases directly attributable to meeting provincial requirements;

WHEREAS the City of Vaughan has worked hard to achieve low property tax rates and the lowest property tax ratios in the province;

WHEREAS affordability and the level of property taxation is a concern to the City of Vaughan;

WHEREAS the level of property taxation is directly impacted by the funding of provincially mandated services and administering provincial social policies;

WHEREAS the ability to further increase property taxes is a concern to the City of Vaughan;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that to avoid a property tax increase greater than the rate of inflation the Provincial government be requested to provide financial assistance to the City of Vaughan in the amount of \$5.6 million;

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

That the Province of Ontario review what services are currently funded from property taxation with the objective of funding the implementation and administration of broad social policies from a source other than property taxation; and

That this resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and the local MPP's.

11. **PLANNING APPLICATION FEES – FINANCIAL IMPACT OF BILL 124 (ITEM 1, SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (BUDGET) MEETING OF JANUARY 18, 2005)** (Budget Report No. 2)

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

That the following Special Committee of the Whole (Budget) recommendation of January 18, 2005, be approved:

CARRIED

The Special Committee of the Whole (Budget) recommends (recommendation of January 18, 2005):

- 1) That the Budget Committee recommendation of January 11, 2005, be approved;
- 2) That the following recommendation contained in the memorandum from the City Clerk, dated January 14, 2005, be approved:

“That the following proposed Committee of Adjustment Application Fees to achieve 100% Cost Recovery, be approved:

Application Type

Consent/Severances

Residential/Agricultural/Institutional	\$1,410.00
Industrial/Commercial	\$1,410.00
Changing Condition(s) of Provisional Consent	\$ 705.00
Applications requiring re-circulation due to Adjournment, revision or applicant's request	\$ 150.00
Corporation's Ontario Municipal Board Appeal Submission Fee	\$ 150.00

Certificate of Official (issued upon Completion of Consent Application	\$ 285.00
Same Day Service (issued upon completion of Consent Application, if received before noon)	
An additional	\$ 145.00

Minor Variances and Permission

Residential/Agricultural/Institutional	\$ 635.00
Industrial/Commercial	\$1,055.00
Applications requiring re-circulation due to Adjournment, revision or applicant's request	\$ 150.00
Corporation's Ontario Municipal Board Appeal Submission Fee	\$ 150.00”

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

- 3) That the confidential memorandum from the Commissioner of Finance and Corporate Services, entitled "Activity Based Costing Report from C.N. Watson and Associates Ltd.", dated January 18, 2005, be received.

Budget Committee recommendation of January 11, 2005

- 1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Commissioner of Planning, dated January 11, 2005, be approved subject to:
 - (1) Adding the following at the beginning of the Commissioner of Planning's recommendation:

"WHEREAS *the Building Code Statute Law Amendment Act, 2002*, restricts the use of building permit revenues to recover only reasonable anticipated costs of activities subject to the *Building Code Act*;

AND WHEREAS as a result, the cost of development applications approvals process activities previously funded from building permit revenues will no longer be eligible for said funding;

AND WHEREAS Section 69 of the *Planning Act* allows municipalities to establish a tariff of fees to meet the anticipated cost of processing development applications;

AND WHEREAS Vaughan's present development application fees do not recover the costs of processing said applications;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the City of Vaughan resolves as follows:"
 - (2) Deleting the words "an across the board increase of 279% representing" where it appears in Clause 1, and
 - (3) Replacing the words "by 40.6% representing" where it appears in Clause 2 with "to achieve"; and
- 2) That staff provide the Budget Committee with a copy of the activity based costing review undertaken by C.N. Watson and Associates Ltd.

Report of the Commissioner of Planning, dated January 11, 2005

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Planning in consultation with the Senior Management Team recommends:

1. That the first of a two phase process to achieve full cost recovery of Planning Application Fees for the Development Planning Department be comprised of an across the board increase of 279%, representing an initial cost recovery of 90%.
2. That Planning Application Fees for the Committee of Adjustment be increased by 40.6%, representing a full cost recovery of 100%.
3. That amending application fee by-laws be brought forward to the Council Meeting of January 24, 2005 for enactment, reflecting the revised Planning Application Fees for the Development Planning Department and the Committee of Adjustment, respectively, as set out in this report.
4. That a further report be brought forward to a future meeting of the Committee of the Whole and Council, to finalize phase two of the fee review.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide the Budget Committee with information concerning increases to the Planning Application Fees (Development Planning Department and Committee of Adjustment), related to full cost recovery.

Background - Analysis and Options

Bill 124 (Building Code Statute Law Amendment Act, 2002)

Bill 124 was given Royal Assent by the Province on June 27, 2002, and amended the Building Code Act, 1992, as it relates to the imposition of building permit fees (Section 11(2)). The amendments relating to the building permit fees will come into force on July 1, 2005.

Vaughan currently uses building permit revenues collected relatively late in the development applications approvals process (DAAP) to fund the earlier application review and processing activities subject to the Planning Act. Bill 124 restricts the use of building permit revenues to recover only the "reasonable anticipated costs" of activities subject to the Building Code Act. On July 1, 2005, the cost of DAAP activities related to the Planning Act will be ineligible for funding from building permit revenues.

Generally, application fees collected under the Planning Act have recovered a relatively small share of Planning DAAP costs in most GTA growth municipalities, such as Vaughan. Accordingly, it is considered to be appropriate to increase the Planning Application fees to recover the costs associated with the processing of development/planning applications.

Planning Act (Section 69) - Planning Application Fees

Section 69 of the Planning Act, allows municipalities to impose fees by way of a by-law for the purposes of processing planning applications. The Act requires:

"The Council of a municipality, by by-law, and a planning board, by resolution, may establish a tariff of fees for the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters, which tariff shall be designed to meet only the anticipated cost to the municipality or to a committee of adjustment or land division committee constituted by the council of the municipality or to the planning board in respect of the processing of each type of application provided for in the tariff."

The Act requires municipalities to have regard for the "anticipated cost" of providing the service. This would suggest that such fees and charges can include direct costs, capital-related costs, and indirect costs related to the service provided.

Under the Planning Act, there is no notification requirement or direct appeal mechanism in respect to the passing of a fee by-law. However, an applicant may protest an individual Planning Act application fee by paying the prescribed amount, and then subsequently appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), against the levying of the fee or the amount of the fee charged by giving written notice to the OMB within 30 days of the fee payment. The OMB will hear such an appeal and determine if the appeal should be dismissed or direct the municipality to refund payment in such an amount as determined by the OMB. Upon individual appeal, the OMB would be looking at cost accountability. Persons may apply to a court for an order quashing the by-law, as with any by-law, on various grounds.

Vaughan Budget Committee – December 14, 2004

On May 14, 2004, the City retained C.N. Watson and Associates Ltd. to undertake an activity based costing review of user fees, permit fees and service charges. The final report dated October 19, 2004, provided the Senior Management Team and the Bill 124 Activity Costing Steering Committee with the legislative compliance implications for fees and charges as contained in the Municipal Act,

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

Planning Act and Building Code Act, with more detailed advisory services being provided regarding fees and charges related to the development applications approvals process (ie. Planning Act and Building Code Act).

On December 14, 2004, the Budget Committee considered a report entitled "Development Application Approvals Process (DAAP), Activity Costing and User Fee Justification for Building Permits and Planning Application Fees – Financial Impact of Bill 124". Briefly, this report identified the following as it relates to Planning Application fees:

- An opportunity exists for a permanent solution to offset the negative financial impact of Bill 124 through increasing the Planning Application Fees to recover their costs as allowed by legislation. The planning applications activity costing identified an opportunity for significant fee increases totaling \$3.8 million in planning applications which would result in the fee revenue equaling the cost.
- A 100% recovery of the Planning Application Fees translates to an increase of \$3.7 million or 321% in planning fees, and an increase of \$0.1 million or 41% in Committee of Adjustment fees, for a total of \$3.8 million.
- The ability to permanently address the financial impact of Bill 124 resides with increasing Planning Application Fees to match costs as allowed by legislation. The quicker the Planning Application Fees are increased to recover costs, the quicker the financial impact of Bill 124 is addressed.

As related to Planning Fees, on December 14, 2004, the Budget Committee resolved the following (in part):

"That the fees be adjusted to achieve full cost recovery and a report be provided to the Committee of the Whole meeting of January 17, 2005."

"That the Planning Fee By-law be brought forward to the Council Meeting of January 24, 2005."

Cost Recovery of Planning Application Fees

a) Development Planning Department Application Fees (Phase 1)

The Planning Application Fees for the Development Planning Department are currently achieving 22.9% cost recovery. In order to achieve full cost recovery, Staff is proposing an immediate across the board increase of 279%, representing an initial cost recovery of 90%, being the first component of a two-phase implementation approach. The current and proposed base application fees are as follows:

<u>Application Type</u>	<u>Current Base Application Fee (22.9% Cost Recovery)</u>	<u>Proposed Base Application Fee (90% Cost Recovery; 279% Cost Increase)</u>
Official Plan	\$2,500	\$9,475
Block Plan/ Secondary Plan	\$125/ha	\$475/ha
Zoning By-law	\$1,500	\$5,685
By-law to Remove Holding Symbol (H)	\$1,000	\$3,790

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

Part Lot Control	\$1,000	\$3,790
Site Plan	\$1,000	\$3,790
Condominium	\$2,000	\$7,580
Subdivision	\$3,000	\$11,370

General Note: When both Zoning By-law and Subdivision applications are submitted within a 1-year period, the applicable per unit and per ha fees shall be required with the Subdivision application only.

In addition to the increase to the base fees, the additional fee details including but not limited to per/unit, per/ha, and surcharge fees, will also be increased by 293% to achieve 90% cost recovery, as follows:

<u>Surcharges: Application Type</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
<u>Official Plan:</u>		
a) Surcharge if application is approved:	\$750	\$2,845
<u>Zoning By-law:</u>		
a) Base Fee, plus:		
• Singles, Semis, Townhouses:	\$150/unit	\$570/unit
• Multiple Unit Blocks:	\$50/unit	\$190/unit
• Non-Residential or Mixed Use Blocks:	\$2,000/ha	\$7,580/ha
• Private Open Space (golf course/cemetery):	\$1,000/ha	\$3,790/ha
• Maximum Fee for Private Open Space:	\$50,000	\$189,500
b) Surcharge if Zoning Application is approved:	\$750	\$2,845
<u>Site Plan:</u>		
Base Fee, plus:		
• Industrial/Office/Private Institutional:	\$0.30/m ²	\$1.15/m ²
Portion of GFA over 4,500 m ² :	\$0.10/m ²	\$0.40/m ²
Maximum Fee:	\$3,000	\$11,370
• Commercial (Service, Retail Warehouse):	\$1.00/m ²	\$3.80/m ²
Portion of GFA over 4,500 m ² :	\$0.25/m ²	\$0.95/m ²
Maximum Fee:	\$5,000	\$18,950
• Residential:	\$150/unit	\$570/unit
Or if previously paid in subdivision application:	\$100/unit	\$380/unit
• Complex Revision to Site Plan Agreement requiring circulation:	\$1,000	\$3,790
• Simple Revision to Site Plan Agreement not requiring circulation:	\$500	\$1,895

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

Condominium:

Base Fee, plus:

• Industrial Plans:	\$50/unit	\$190/unit
• Commercial Plans:	\$50/unit	\$190/unit
• Residential Plans:	\$20/unit	\$80/unit

Subdivision:

a) Base Fee, plus:

• Single, Semi, Townhouse Units:	\$150/unit	\$570/unit
• Multiple Unit Blocks:	\$50/unit	\$190/unit
• Part Lots for Residential Use:	\$75/part lot	\$285/part lot
• Non-Residential or Mixed Use Blocks (excluding parks/open space, storm ponds, roads, buffer spaces):	\$2,000/ha	\$7,580/ha

b) Revision to Draft Approved Plan
requiring circulation: \$1,000 \$3,790

c) Revision to Condition(s) of Draft Approval: \$1,000 \$3,790

d) Extension of Draft Plan: \$500 \$1,895

e) Registration of Each Additional Phase of Plan: \$600 \$2,275

f) Referral of Plan to Ontario Municipal Board: \$150 \$570

Other General Fees:

Maintenance Fee for inactive files over
1 year (applicant does not wish to close file): \$100 \$380

b) Development Application Tracking (Phase 2)

As of January 2005, Development Planning Staff has initiated a study process to track the number of hours spent on various application types, and the amount of time spent by staff in other departments that review Planning applications, to refine the fee structure based on the cost of service of the various application types. This time docketing approach will track staff service hours against each of the major development applications. Time tracking will be used to refine the cost of service and adjust fees.

The application tracking will be completed by May 2005, and a report and implementing fee by-law will be forwarded to the Committee of the Whole and Council meetings, respectively, in June 2005, prior to summer hiatus, with the fees to be adjusted accordingly to implement the phase two component to achieve full cost recovery of 100%.

c) Committee of Adjustment Application Fees

The Committee of Adjustment fees for Minor Variance and Consent Applications are currently achieving 71% cost recovery, and are proposed to be immediately increased by 40.6% across the board to achieve a full cost recovery of 100%. The current and proposed fees are as follows:

<u>Application Type</u>	<u>Current Fee (71% Cost Recovery)</u>	<u>Proposed Fee (100% Cost Recovery; 40.6% Cost Increase)</u>
<u>Consent/Severances</u>		
Residential/Agricultural/Institutional	\$1,000	\$1,410
Industrial/Commercial	\$1,000	\$1,410
Changing Condition(s) of Provisional Consent	\$500	\$705
Stamping of Deeds (issued upon completion of Consent Application)	\$200	\$285
Certificate of Official (issued upon completion of Consent Application)	\$200	\$285
Same day service (if received before noon) an additional	\$100	\$145
<u>Minor Variances</u>		
Residential/Agricultural/Institutional	\$450	\$635
Industrial/Commercial	\$750	\$1,055
<u>Permission</u>		
Residential/Agricultural/Institutional	\$450	\$635
Industrial/Commercial	\$750	\$1,055

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007

The recommendations forthcoming as a result of this report have significant impact to the 2005 Operating Budget and beyond. This report is consistent with the priorities set out in Vaughan Vision 2007, particularly with regards to B-1, "Ensure Short-Term & Long-Term Financial Stability" for the municipality.

Conclusion

Bill 124 will cause a significant financial impact for municipalities, particularly high growth cities like Vaughan. To address this impact, Staff has undertaken an initial review of the Planning Application Fees for both the Development Planning Department and the Committee of Adjustment, to mitigate the financial impact and to achieve Council's goal of full cost recovery.

The Planning Application Fees for the Development Planning Department are currently achieving 22.9% cost recovery. In order to achieve full cost recovery, Staff is proposing an immediate overall increase of 279%, representing an initial cost recovery of 90%, being the first component of a two-phase implementation approach. As of January 2005, Development Planning Staff has initiated a study process to track the number of hours spent on various application types, and the amount of time spent by staff in other departments that review Planning applications, to refine the fee structure based on the cost of service of the various application types. The application tracking will be completed by May 2005, and a report and implementing fee by-law will be forwarded to the Committee of the Whole and Council meetings, respectively, in June 2005, prior to summer hiatus,

with the fees to be adjusted accordingly to implement the phase two component to achieve full cost recovery of 100%.

The Committee of Adjustment fees for Minor Variance and Consent Applications, which are currently achieving 71% cost recovery are proposed to be immediately increased by 40.6% to achieve a full cost recovery of 100%.

The implementing application fee by-laws for the Development Planning Department and the Committee of Adjustment will be forwarded to the Council Meeting on January 24, 2005, for enactment.

Attachments

N/A

Report prepared by:

Grant A. Uyeyama, Manager of Development Planning, ext. 8635

12. BY-LAWS FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

THAT the following by-laws be read a First, Second and Third time and enacted:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| By-Law Number 1-2005 | A By-law to amend the Consolidated Traffic By-law 284-94 as amended, to govern and control traffic in the City of Vaughan. (Council, December 6, 2004, Item 7, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 87) |
| By-Law Number 2-2005 | A By-law to amend By-law 339-2004 to authorize the acquisition of land for a neighbourhood park and to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute an Agreement of Purchase and Sale between The Corporation of the City of Vaughan and Lanterna Group. (Council, November 22, 2004, Item 3, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session), Report No. 83) |
| By-Law Number 3-2005 | A By-Law to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute an Agreement between The Corporation of the City of Vaughan and the Block 39 Developers Group regarding cash-in-lieu of parkland. (Item 9, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session), Report No. 2) |
| By-Law Number 4-2005 | A By-law to authorize the acquisition of parkland. (Item 9, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session), Report No. 2) |
| By-Law Number 5-2005 | A By-law to adopt Amendment Number 621 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area. (OP.03.024, Z.03.084, 1541677 Ontario Limited (Liberty Development Corporation), west of Bathurst Street, through to New Westminster Drive, and south of Beverley Glen Boulevard, in Part of Lot 6, Concession 2.) (Council, November 8, 2004, Item 20, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 78) |
| By-Law Number 6-2005 | A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.04.055 & Z.04.056/DA.04.032 & DA.04.033, Amorino Ridge Developments Inc. & Intonaco Investments Corp., south side of Rutherford Road |

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

- between Highway No.400 and Jane Street being part of Block 1 on Plan 65M-3696 (Part 19 on 65R-26825), Part Lot 14, Concession 5 and west side of Jane Street, south of Rutherford Road, in Lot 15, Concession 5) (Council, October 25, 2004, Item 17, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 73 and Council, December 6, 2004, Item 23, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 87)
- By-Law Number 7-2005 A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (DA.03.009, Z.97.108, 1226343 Ontario Ltd., northeast corner of Nashville Road and Regional Road 27, known municipally as 110 Nashville Road, in Lots 24 and 25, Concession 8) (Administrative Correction) (Council, October 25, 1999, Item 19, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 81)
- By-Law Number 8-2005 A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.00.045, zoning by-law 476-2001, southeast corner of Highway No. 50 and Rutherford Road, in Part of Lot 16, Concession 10, and comprising part of the former Road Allowance between Lots 15 and 16, Concession 10) (Administrative Correction) (Approved at OMB #2010060, November 5, 2001)
- By-Law Number 9-2005 A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.02.065, Loblaw Properties Limited, east of Regional Road #27, on the north side of Langstaff Road, being part of lot 11, Concession 8) (Council, December 6, 2004, Item 26, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 87)
- By-Law Number 10-2005 A By-law to exempt parts of Plans 65M-2754 from the provisions of Part Lot Control. (PLC.04.034, 1619051 Ontario Ltd., west of Pine Valley Drive, south of Langstaff Road being Lots 7, 8, 9, 21, 22, and 23 of Registered Plan 65M-2754) (Delegation By-Law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 11-2005 A By-law to repeal By-law 10-2005. (PLC.04.034, 1619051 Ontario Ltd., west of Pine Valley Drive, south of Langstaff Road being Lots 7, 8, 9, 21, 22, and 23 of Registered Plan 65M-2754) (Delegation By-Law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 12-2005 A By-law to exempt parts of Plans 65M-3779 from the provisions of Part Lot Control. (PLC.04.033, Maplevit Estates Inc., west of Keele Street, south of Drummond Drive being Lots 1-30 inclusive of registered Plan 65M-3779) (Delegation By-Law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 13-2005 A By-law to repeal By-law 12-2005. (PLC.04.033, Maplevit Estates Inc., west of Keele Street, south of Drummond Drive being Lots 1-30 inclusive of registered Plan 65M-3779) (Delegation By-Law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 14-2005 A By-law to adopt Amendment Number 622 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area. (OP.03.026, Maple Heights Shopping Centre Inc., northwest corner of Keele Street and Drummond Drive, in Part of Lot 24, Concession 4) (Council, February 9, 2004, Item 1, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 16)
- By-Law Number 15-2005 A By-law to adopt Amendment Number 619 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area. (OP.04.008, Z.04.024, Roybridge Holdings Limited, southeast corner of Weston Road and Ashberry Boulevard, being Block 181 on Plan 65M-334, and Parts 1, 3, 8 and 18 on Plan 65R-26299 (9551, 9555, 9587 and 9591 Weston Road),

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

- in Lot 18, Concession 5) (Council, June 28, 2004, Item 10, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 56)
- By-Law Number 16-2005 A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.04.024, OP.04.008, OPA #619, Roybridge Holdings Ltd., southeast corner of Weston Road and Ashberry Boulevard, being Block 181 on Plan 65M-334, and Parts 1, 3, 8 and 18 on Plan 65R-26299 (9551, 9555, 9587 and 9591 Weston Road), in Lot 18, Concession 5) (Council, June 28, 2004, Item 10, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 56)
- By-Law Number 17-2005 A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.03.084, OP.03.024, OPA #621, 1541677 Ontario Limited, west of Bathurst Street, through to New Westminster Drive, and south of Beverley Glen Boulevard, in Part of Lot 6, Concession 2) (Council, November 8, 2004, Item 20, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 78)
- By-Law Number 18-2005 A By-law to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute an Agreement on behalf of the City of Vaughan between The Corporation of the City of Vaughan and Civic Strategies Inc. (Council, November 8, 2004, Item 8, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 78)
- By-Law Number 19-2005 A By-law to dedicate certain lands as part of the public highway known as Avro Road. (Part of Pin – 03330-2984, agreement between Colgera Services Inc. and the City of Vaughan (DA.02.084), this 0.3m reserve, namely Part 1 of Reference Plan 65R-27209, originally known as part of Block 228 (0.3m reserve) of registered plan 65M-3543, Part of Lot 19, Concession 4) (Delegation By-Law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 20-2005 A By-law to amend By-law 57-2004 to govern Committee of Adjustment Application Fees for the City of Vaughan. (Budget Report No. 2, Council, January 24, 2005, Minute No. 11)
- By-Law Number 21-2005 A By-law to impose a tariff of fees for the processing of Planning Applications and to repeal By-law Number 406-2003, being a prior by-law imposing a tariff of fees for Planning Applications. (Budget Report No. 2, Council, January 24, 2005, Minute No. 11)

CARRIED

MOVED by Regional Councillor Ferri
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

THAT Council resolve into Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) for the purpose of discussing the following matters:

- i) the security of property of the City or local board;
- ii) personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees;
- iii) a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board;
- iv) labour relations or employee negotiations;
- v) litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the City or local board;

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 24, 2005

- vi) the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor/client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose; and
- vii) a matter in respect of which Council, boards, Committee or other body has authorized a meeting to be closed under an Act of the Legislature or an Act of Parliament.

CARRIED

Council recessed at 2:07 p.m.

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona
seconded by Councillor Carella

THAT Council reconvene at 2:52 p.m.

CARRIED

13. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CLOSED SESSION) REPORT NO. 2

(Refer to Committee Report for complete recommendations and documentation on all Committee items.)

ITEM – 5 ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD HEARING
 DREAM WORKS PROPERTY INC.
 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT ZA.02.073
 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION 19T-02V18

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona
seconded by Councillor Carella

THAT Item 5, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 2 be adopted and amended, as follows:

By approving the confidential recommendation of the Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) of January 24, 2005; and

By receiving the confidential additional report of the Solicitor/Litigation, dated January 24, 2005.

CARRIED

14. CONFIRMING BY-LAW

MOVED by Councillor Carella
seconded by Councillor Di Vona

THAT By-law Number 22-2005, being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of Council at its meeting on January 24, 2005, be read a First, Second and Third time and enacted.

CARRIED

15. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor Carella
seconded by Regional Councillor Jackson

THAT the meeting adjourn at 2:53 p.m.

CARRIED

Michael Di Biase, Mayor

J. D. Leach, City Clerk