

**CITY OF VAUGHAN  
COUNCIL MINUTES  
MARCH 18, 2002**

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Minute No.</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
70. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA.....	67
71. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST .....	68
72. ADOPTION OR CORRECTION OF MINUTES.....	68
73. TAX ADJUSTMENTS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 442 AND 443 OF THE MUNICIPAL ACT, R.S.O. 1990, AS AMENDED .....	68
74. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION.....	69
75. SIGN BY-LAW REVIEW (Referred from Council meeting – February 25, 2002).....	70
76. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION .....	79
77. COMPENSATION REVIEW (Item 1, Operational Review Committee Report No. 4) .....	80
78. COUNCIL RESOLUTION POTENTIAL PRIVATIZATION OF HYDRO CORRIDORS HYDRO ONE INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING (Addendum No. 1).....	81
79. MOBILE BLEACHERS (Addendum No. 2).....	84
80. CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY BENEFIT CONCERT – CITY PLAYHOUSE (Addendum No. 3) .....	85
81. CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS (Addendum No. 4) (Item 2, Operational Review Committee Report No. 4) .....	86
82. BY-LAW NUMBER 68-2002 .....	86
83. BY-LAW NUMBER 80-2002 .....	87
84. BY-LAWS FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS .....	87
85. ORGANIZATION CHART / CIVIC ADMINISTRATION (Item 5, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21) (Item 4, Operational Review Committee Report No. 3 – Refer to Minute No.76) .....	89
86. SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CLOSED SESSION) REPORT NO. 21 .....	90
87. BASEMENT APARTMENTS (Item 1, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21) (Refer to Minute No.86) .....	90



**CITY OF VAUGHAN  
COUNCIL MINUTES  
MARCH 18, 2002**

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Minute No.</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
88. ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD HEARING CYPRESS POINT HOLDINGS LIMITED AND NIVLOG INVESTMENTS LIMITED OPA APPLICATION FILE OP99.028 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE Z99.057 (Item 3, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21) (Refer to Minute No. 86) .....	90
89. PERSONNEL MATTER (Item 4, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21) (Refer to Minute No. 86) .....	91
90. WOODBRIDGE SOCCER COMMUNICATION (Item 6, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21) (Refer to Minute No. 86) .....	91
91. RECONSIDERATION WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS (IMPACT ON WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS – KEELE VALLEY CLOSURE) .....	91
92. WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS (IMPACT ON WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS – KEELE VALLEY CLOSURE) (Item 2, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21) .....	91
93. CONFIRMING BY-LAW .....	92
94. ADJOURNMENT .....	92

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**COUNCIL MEETING**

**MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2002**

**MINUTES**

**1:00 P.M.**

Council convened in the Municipal Council Chambers in Vaughan, Ontario, at 1:10 p.m.

The following members were present:

Regional Councillor M. Di Biase, Chair  
Regional Councillor J. Frustaglio  
Councillor B. Di Vona  
Councillor M. Ferri  
Councillor S. Kadis  
Councillor M. G. Racco  
Councillor G. Rosati

**70. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Racco

THAT the agenda be confirmed.

**AMENDMENT**

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Racco

THAT the following Addendums be added to the Agenda:

- 1) **COUNCIL RESOLUTION  
POTENTIAL PRIVATIZATION OF HYDRO CORRIDORS  
HYDRO ONE INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING**

Report of the City Manager with respect to the above.

- 2) **MOBILE BLEACHERS**

Report of the Commissioner of Community Services with respect to the above.

- 3) **CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY BENEFIT CONCERT – CITY PLAYHOUSE**

Report of Councillor Di Vona with respect to the above.

- 4) **CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS**

Item 2, Operational Review Committee, Report No. 4 - March 18, 2002.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Upon the question of the main motion:

CARRIED AS AMENDED

**71. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

There was no disclosure of interest by any member.

**72. ADOPTION OR CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

MOVED by Councillor Ferri  
seconded by Councillor Di Vona

THAT the Minutes of the meeting of February 25, 2002 and Special Council meeting of March 4, 2002 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

**73. TAX ADJUSTMENTS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 442 AND 443 OF THE MUNICIPAL ACT, R.S.O. 1990, AS AMENDED**

Deputations with respect to this matter were permitted pursuant to Section 442 and 443 of the Municipal Act.

No one appeared either in support of or in opposition to this matter.

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Racco

THAT the recommendation contained in the following report of the Director of Finance, dated March 18, 2002, be approved, subject to the following:

That Application Numbers 863 and 893 be referred back to staff for a report to be brought forward to a future Council meeting.

CARRIED

**Recommendation**

The Director of Finance in consultation with the Manager of Property Tax and Assessment recommends that the tax adjustments as outlined on the attached report be adopted.

**Purpose**

To obtain Council approval for the cancellation, reduction, or refund of taxes.

**Background - Analysis and Options**

Several applications for cancellation, reduction, or refund of taxes for the 1999, 2000, and 2001 tax years under Sections 442 and 443 of The Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended have been prepared for Council's consideration.

There are **71** applications under consideration at this time. There are various reasons for tax cancellations, such as a result of properties becoming exempt, buildings that have been demolished or razed by fire, and properties that have been over assessed by a gross or manifest clerical error.

## COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002

---

The total cancellation, reduction, or refund of taxes, as recommended, is \$ 288,508.39. The City portion of this amount is approximately 20%, or \$ 57,701.68. Please note that the tax adjustments relating to commercial and industrial properties are prior to any recalculations resulting from the capping legislation.

One application has been prepared under Section 444 of The Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1990 for Council's consideration. The property, municipally known as 12100 Weston Road, Assessment Roll Number 19.28.000.311.40000.0000, application number 927 had the 2002 assessment returned at \$32,500. The actual assessment should have been returned at \$593,000. This decrease was due to a gross or manifest clerical error on the part of the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation. The recommended 2002 tax increase on this application is \$ 6,810.20.

### **Attachments**

Tax Appeals Report.

### **Report prepared by:**

Mark Cernanec, Assessment Clerk.

(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.)

## **74. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION**

The following items were identified for separate discussion:

### **Referred Item**

Item 1

Committee of the Whole Report No. 18

Item 6

Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 19

Item 2

Operational Review Committee Report No. 3

Item 4

Operational Review Committee Report No. 4 – March 18, 2002

Item 1 (Note: 2 - refer to Minute No. 81)

Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21 – March 18, 2002

Items 1, 2, 3, 4 (Note: 5 and 6 – refer to Minute Nos. 85 and 90 respectively)

### **Addendum Items**

Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 (Item 2, Operational Review Committee Report No. 4)

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Ferri

## COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002

---

THAT Items 1 to 20 of the Committee of the Whole Report No. 18, with the exception of the item identified for separate discussion, BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted;

THAT Items 1 to 6 of the Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 19, with the exception of the item identified for separate discussion BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted;

THAT Items 1 to 7 of the Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) Report No. 20 BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted; and

THAT Items 1 to 4 of the Operational Review Committee Report No. 3, with the exception of the item identified for separate discussion BE APPROVED and the recommendations therein be adopted.

CARRIED

### REFERRED ITEM

#### **75. SIGN BY-LAW REVIEW**

(Referred from Council meeting – February 25, 2002)

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona  
seconded by Councillor Ferri

THAT the following Committee of the Whole (Working Session) recommendation of February 19, 2002, be approved; and

THAT the memorandum from the City Clerk, dated March 15, 2002, be received.

CARRIED

(Council, at its meeting of February 25, 2002, adopted the following:

THAT this matter be deferred to the Council meeting of March 18, 2002.)

#### **The Committee of the Whole (Working Session) recommends:**

- 1) **That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Commissioner of Planning and the Director of Building Standards, dated February 19, 2002, be approved, subject to deleting Clause b i) “Posters” in the recommendation;**
- 2) **That staff be directed to send correspondence to the Region of York requesting that Transit Shelter and Bus Bench signs be approved in consultation with the City of Vaughan;**
- 3) **That staff be directed to monitor the revised provisions respecting the Home Builders “A” Frame Signs for a period of 6 months, and provide a report to a future meeting;**
- 4) **That the memorandum of the Building Standards Department, dated February 15, 2002, be received, and that Religious/Charitable/Community “fundraising” signs be defined and included in the by-law, without limiting their numbers and locations beyond those general requirements necessary to address safety concerns; and**
- 5) **That the following deputations be received:**

- a) **Mr. Nevon Velovik, Pop Signs;**
- b) **Mr. Ian Duffy, Magnetsigns; and**
- c) **Mr. Colin Edmonds, C-Us-Glow & C-Me Mobile Signs.**

**Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Planning and the Director of Building Standards recommend:

- a) That Sign By-law 203-92, as amended, be further amended to:
  - i) Tighten the requirements respecting Mobile Signs as outlined in this report;
  - ii) Incorporate former Maple Village core as a Special Sign District;
  - iii) Include Electronic Message Boards as a permitted sign type; and
  - iv) Require Commercial and Industrial ground signs to display municipal addresses.
- b) That a separate By-law regulating signs on public property be enacted to regulate the following signs (as outlined in this report):
  - i) Posters;
  - ii) Transit Shelter and Bench Signs;
  - iii) Home Builders “A” Frame Signs;
  - iv) Real Estate Open House Signs;
  - v) Charitable/Community/Religious Temporary Signs, and
  - vi) Special Event Banners.
- c) And that staff be directed to provide notice of the proposed By-law and notice of the Council meeting at which the proposed By-law is to be discussed in accordance with the Municipal Act.

**Purpose**

- i) To provide a frame work for amending the Sign By-law and to obtain direction to proceed to a Council meeting in accordance with the Municipal Act.
- ii) To create a new Sign By-law for regulating signs on public property.

**Background - Analysis and Options**

As a result of a number of deputations, concerns and complaints, particularly with respect to mobile signs, Council directed staff to review certain aspects of the Sign By-law, more specifically the following:

1. Mobile Signs
2. Special Sign District for Maple
3. Electronic Message Boards
4. Inflatable Signs
5. Signs erected on public property, e.g. Builder “A” Frame Signs
6. Signs located above the roof of Commercial Plazas
7. Municipal Addresses for Commercial and Industrial Signs.
8. Charitable/Community/Religious Temporary Signs

Infobar, Infoboxes (waste/recycling) and enforcement matters are outside the scope of this Report and will be dealt with by the appropriate City staff.

1. Mobile Signs

The Sign By-law (203-92) was amended in 1994 (212-94) to allow mobile signs as a permitted sign type. This was in response to a successful court challenge to the

Sign By-law, which prohibited the use of mobile signs. The amended By-law permitted business premises to use mobile signs for a maximum of two (2) - fifteen (15) day occasions per year.

The Sign-By-law was further amended in May 1997 (110-97) to increase the number and duration of mobile signs. The By-law permitted up to three (3) mobile signs per lot. Further, each business premises was allowed to use mobile signs for a maximum of eight (8) - fifteen (15) day occasions per year (120 days per year).

The following is a summary of the number of sign permits issued since 1996.

Year	Permits	Properties
2001	1622	285
2000	1047	235
1999	1,365	242
1998	1,170	224
1997	884	204
1996	50	38

The specific requirements as to the number of mobile signs are as follows:

- One (1) sign per lot + one (1) sign per frontage + one (1) sign for more than 20 business premises on a lot + one (1) sign if frontage greater than 125 metres up to a maximum of three (3) signs per lot.

The specific requirements as to the number of occasions and timing are as follows:

- Maximum number of days per year that a sign is allowed to remain on a Lot is 180 days.
- The maximum number of occasions that a business premises is permitted to have a Mobile Sign per year is eight (8) - fifteen (15) day occasions (120 days).

The By-law does not require a minimum length of time between the issuance of two (2) successive permits for mobile signs. Therefore, it is quite conceivable that some properties can legally have one or more mobile signs for an entire year.

In addition to mobile signs each business premises is entitled to an “A” frame sign for the whole year.

**OTHER MUNICIPALITIES**

The regulations governing mobile signs differ greatly from municipality to municipality. Some regulate all temporary/portable signs together as one sign type. In general, most municipalities have reduced the overall amount of temporary/mobile signage since the last survey. Oakville, Brampton and Vaughan permit the greatest amount of signage, with Whitby, Stoney Creek and Pickering, by far, the least. The attached, Table A, summarizes the By-law requirements for mobile signs for 14 GTA municipalities. Among the items summarized are fees, number of signs, locations, duration and restrictions. In reviewing the requirements of other municipalities there doesn't appear to be any general philosophy in regulating mobile signs other than an attempt to require their complete removal from the site before allowing them to



reappear. Most municipalities now require a minimum period between two (2) successive installation of mobile signs, e.g. 30 days on, 30 days off. Oshawa and Vaughan appear to be the only two municipalities, which do not require a mandatory off period between successive installations.

#### Comments and Recommendations

In comparison with other municipalities, Vaughan's Sign By-law appears to be both flexible and liberal. Most industrial and commercial lots are permitted to have more than one (1) sign. Each business is allowed up to 120 days exposure per year (eight (8) - fifteen (15) day periods), with a maximum consecutive exposure of 60 days (four (4) - fifteen (15) day occasions). Each mobile sign is permitted to remain on a lot for a maximum of 180 days. Consequently, where properties are permitted to have two (2) signs or more, at least one (1) sign can remain on the property for the entire year without interruption. This gives the impression that mobile signs are as permanent a fixture of some properties as fixed signs. Staff are of the opinion that Mobile Signs are temporary special occasion signs. If certain properties are to be free of mobile signs some time during the year there should be a reduction in the number of signs as well as mandatory off periods between successive installations.

Staff are, therefore, recommending that the Sign By-law be amended to allow for a maximum of one (1) sign per lot for periods of 30 day duration. Further, that each 30 day period be separated from the following by a minimum off period of 30 days, i.e. 30 days on and 30 days off. In addition, the number of occasions permitted for each business premises be reduced from eight (8) - fifteen (15) day periods to four (4) - fifteen (15) day periods per year.

#### 2. Maple Special Sign District

Presently, the Sign By-law designates three areas in the City of Vaughan namely, Thornhill, Kleinburg and Woodbridge as Special Sign Districts. The requirements for installation of signs in Special Sign Districts are generally more restrictive than other areas in the City and have regard for building architecture and heritage. Vaughan's ratepayer associations have recommended, on a number of occasions, that the Sign By-law be amended to designate parts of Maple as a Special Sign District. The boundaries specified for such a district should have regard for architecture and heritage particularly, in the Old Village of Maple.

Maple Streetscape Committee recommended the introduction of a Special Sign District bounded by: Rutherford Road to the South, Teston Road to the North, Jane Street to the West and Hill Street to the East. (See Appendix '1')

This covers a rectangle of approximately two and one-half (2 ½) Concessions.

Staff observe that this is an extremely large area encompassing a lot of new commercial developments. The present Special Sign Districts of Woodbridge, Kleinburg, and Thornhill are basically limited to heritage areas of former villages. Certain sign types such as poster panels and mobile signs are not permitted in Special Sign Districts. Further, the Sign By-law limits the size of permitted signs in these districts.

Staff are, therefore, of the opinion that the area recommended by the Streetscape Committee should be reduced to reflect the former Village of Maple commercial core. It is staff recommendation that the Sign By-law be amended to create a Special Sign District for Maple and the area of the district be limited to the Old Village of Maple commercial core as depicted in Appendix '1'.

3. Electronic Message Boards

The Sign By-law presently prohibits all signs that incorporate any flashing or moving parts or signs that vary in intensity or in colour except for those that indicate time and/or temperature. This requirement was incorporated in the Sign By-law to address traffic safety and visual impact concerns.

The result of a survey of other municipalities' treatment of Electronic Message Boards appear in Table 'B'. Some municipalities do not permit their use. Many of those that do, place restrictions on their size. Electronic Message Boards can have a very strong visual impact, causing distraction for both pedestrians and drivers. This may be attributed to the intensity of lighting as well as rapidly changing content.

Notwithstanding these concerns it is staff recommendation that the Sign By-law be amended to permit Electronic Message Boards under the following conditions:

- i) Electronic Message Boards be incorporated as an integral part of ground signs.
- ii) Area of Electronic Message Boards be limited to 25% of the total permitted area of the ground signs.
- iii) Minimum time period between two (2) successive message changes be limited to 15 seconds.

4. Inflatable Signs

The Sign By-law currently prohibits all temporary signs except for mobile and "A" frame signs. This includes the use of inflatable signs.

These signs are usually very large and are designed to create a significant visual impact. They are often at odds with industrial/commercial streetscaping achieved through the planning process. Further, staff have major concerns with the safety of these signs, i.e. anchorage, impact due to wind loads, etc.

A survey of other municipalities in the GTA indicates that only three (3) municipalities namely, Brampton, Pickering and Oshawa permit this type of sign without severe height and size restrictions. Excluding Vaughan five (5) municipalities continue to prohibit this type of sign (see Table 'B').

Staff are of the opinion that the City should continue to prohibit the use of inflatable signs.

However, should Council find it desirable to allow this type of sign in Vaughan, it is recommended that the sign be placed on the ground with no dimension of the sign exceeding eight (8) feet and the anchorage be certified by a professional engineer. Further, one (1) inflatable sign be allowed per industrial/commercial lot for a maximum of two (2) - fifteen (15) day periods per year.

5. Signs on Public Property

In the early 90's, The Supreme Court of Canada, in a landmark decision struck down that portion of the City of Peterborough's Sign By-law, which prohibited posters on public property and thus opened the door to advertising on public property. The City of Vaughan presently has no specific by-law governing posters/signage on public property other than not allowing signs on wood utility poles. The Sign By-law 203-92, as amended, prohibits all signs on/over public property except for those erected under the jurisdiction of a government agency. The City, however, has allowed certain signs on road allowances, e.g. transit shelter, bench and infobars through agreements.

Most municipalities have now completed amending their sign by-laws or enacted new by-laws governing and regulating signs on public property. For those that have not, many are in the process of creating new by-laws. This Report reviews the following types of signs on public property:

- i) Posters
- ii) Transit Shelter and Bench Signs
- iii) Home Builders “A” Frame Signs
- iv) Real Estate Open House Signs
- v) Charitable/Community/Religious Mobile Signs
- vi) Special Event Banners

i) Posters (Not Poster Panels or Billboard Signs)

A survey of GTA municipalities indicates that two basic approaches are used in regulating posters on public property. The first approach is to allow posters only in designated areas such as, on specially designed collars on designated utility poles or on community information boards. There has been some discussion as to whether or not this approach would satisfy the intent of the decision of The Supreme Court. To the best of our knowledge, however, there has been no court challenge against this approach.

The second approach is to allow posters on utility poles with more stringent restrictions on size, time and materials used. Under this approach the municipalities generally regulate size, location on the pole, materials used, date and information re: persons or organizations posting. The by-law generally allows for all non-conforming signs to be removed and disposed of immediately and without notice. No permits are usually required for posters and the removal of the signs is usually the responsibility of the municipal Public Works Department.

It is staff recommendation that posters be regulated under a separate by-law governing signs on public property. Further, that posters be allowed only on a specially designed collars on designated utility poles in specific areas of the City as approved by Council.

ii) Transit Shelter and Bus Bench Signs

Transit shelter and bus bench signs used to be regulated through agreements with the City. The administration of these agreements is now a Regional responsibility, as Transit is now a Regional service.

iii) Builders “A” Frame Signs

These signs are usually erected by the builders of new homes on Regional roads to advertise and/or direct traffic to their sales offices. They are usually erected on weekends and removed prior to the start of the work week. Any signs located on City streets that remain after the weekend are removed by the City. The City of Vaughan does not currently permit or regulate Builders “A” frames on public property.

A survey of other municipalities indicates that builders “A” frame Signs are generally permitted subject to limitations on size, height, location and timing. Typically, they are no more than 1.2m high by 0.8m wide (an area of approximately 1 sqm.) If they are allowed near intersections the height of the sign is reduced (0.6m) to allow drivers to have an unobstructed view of the traffic. Alternatively, they are required to be placed approximately 20 metres from an intersection. Other requirements involve setback from the

curbs (1m) or, where no curbs exist 3m from the traveled portion of the road. They are not permitted on traffic islands and are allowed to be displayed only on Saturdays and Sundays. Non-conforming signs are removed by the municipality without notice.

It is staff recommendation that Builder's "A" Frame Signs be regulated by a separate by-law governing signs on public property subject to the following conditions:

Maximum distance from construction/project site - 1 kilometer.

- I. Maximum number of signs: 3 per builder per project or per 'Permitted' sales trailer or pavilion.
- II. Minimum setback of 1m from the curb or, where no curb or sidewalk exist 3m from the traveled portion of the roadway.
- III. Maximum area - 1 sqm.
- IV. Maximum height - 1.2m.
- V. Maximum width - 0.8m.
- VI. Maximum height - 0.6m if within 20 metres of an intersection (curb or the traveled portion of the road)
- VII. Not permitted on traffic islands
- VIII. Permitted on Saturdays and Sundays only
- IX. Non-conforming signs removed by the municipality without notice
- X. Indemnity agreement with the City
- XI. Liability insurance in the amount of five (5) million dollars naming the City as co-insured.
- XII. Permits issuable on a semi-annual basis
- XIII. Fee of \$100 per "A" frame for six (6) months

iv) Real Estate/Open House Signs

The City of Vaughan does not currently permit or regulate the use of real estate/open house signs. They are placed by realtors within the City at various locations. They do not, as a whole, create a visual blight, as the numbers are not usually concentrated in a specific area.

Other municipalities surveyed allow their use subject to size, height, location and time limitations. The permitted signs are usually small (0.6m x 0.6m) with a setback of 1 metre from the curb. They are permitted to remain on public property for a maximum period of 72 hours.

It is staff recommendation that real estate/open house signs be regulated under a separate by-law governing signs on public property. It is further recommended that they be subject to the same requirements as builders "A" frame signs except that the maximum size be reduced to 0.6m x 0.6m, no limitation be imposed on the number of signs and days of display and duration be limited to a maximum period of 72 hours.

v) Religious/Charitable/Community Temporary Signs (located on public property)

City Council at its November 26, 2001 meeting directed;

"That a moratorium be placed on the enforcement of the provisions of Section 4(h) of By-Law 203-92 pending the consideration of the comprehensive Sign By-law review directed by Council."

City staff reviewed a number of Sign By-laws across the G.T.A. There are

extensive variations in the way municipalities regulate the erection of temporary signs for religious, charitable, and community organizations where they are permitted within the public road allowances.

There appears to be no common approach other than public safety. Even within the present City of Toronto, the former cities vary in their approach. (See attached Table "C"). Some municipalities surveyed are quite restrictive and some even go so far as to require Council, and/or Sign Variance Committee approvals, Special Agreements or Sign By-law amendments. The overall theme or emphasis appears to be on public safety as these signs are erected within public road allowances and they could adversely impede traffic/pedestrian safety.

The City of Vaughan Sign By-Law (Section 4(h) - Temporary Signs for Religious/Charitable, Community events) presently requires **no** permits or fees for this type of sign subject to the following:

- Maximum of three (3) signs per event.
- Maximum of one (1) sign per lot (private property).
- Maximum size 3.7 sqm (standard mobile sign).
- Maximum time period of fourteen (14) days prior to the event subject to being removed immediately following the event.
- Permitted on public road allowances provided written approval is received from the appropriate road authority. (eg., MTO, Region or City)

As evidenced by the above requirements, Vaughan's Sign By-Law is quite liberal in its treatment of religious, charitable, and community temporary signs. It is conceivable that an organization having successive events, could have three (3) temporary signs, one (1) on private property and two (2) on public property for an entire year.

It is Staff recommendation that the existing provisions of the Sign By-law for religious, charitable, and community temporary signs located on public road allowances be replaced by the following:

- Maximum two (2) signs per event by any one organization
- Maximum one (1) sign on private property (one per lot)
- Maximum one (1) sign located on public road allowance.
- Maximum size 3.7 sqm. (standard mobile sign)
- Maximum time period of thirty (30) days to be removed immediately following the event.
- Permitted on public road allowances providing written approval is received from the appropriate road authority. (eg., MTO, Region or City)
- Provisions be included within a new Sign By-law for those signs permitted on public property.

The above recommendation reduces the maximum number of signs from three (3) to two (2) that may be erected by any one organization for any one event but extends the maximum time period for each sign. Staff is of the opinion that the appropriate road authority must approve in writing the location of these signs to ensure traffic/pedestrian safety. In addition, should Council wish to allow for increased duration, the maximum time period could be increased accordingly.

vi) Special Event Banners

These are banner signs erected over public property to advertise charitable or community events. They are traditionally fastened to public utility poles located within the public road allowance and extend over the road.

Due to safety concerns most municipalities surveyed prohibit this type of sign. These signs are usually flimsy, have very high surface to weight ratio, are subject to high wind pressures and can easily be detached from their support and/or get entangled with hydro and utility lines.

The Sign By-law presently prohibits this type of sign and it is staff recommendation that these signs continue to be prohibited on public property.

6. Signs Located Above the Roof of Commercial Plazas

Section 5.8 of the City's Sign By-law presently prohibits all roof signs and all other signs, which are erected partially above the roof. These may include wall/fascia signs and canopy signs, where a portion of the sign maybe above the roof surface.

In recent years malls and plazas have developed certain architectural features for their entrances which enlarge and enhance the elevations. These fascia assemblies are usually quite large and extend above the roof.

In many instances, at the time of Site Plan Approval, the owners and architects treat these elements as architectural features and not as a framework for attaching signs. At the time of occupancy, however, the tenants often attempt to attach signs to these features taking advantage of the existing frame works. Often these signs do not comply with the requirements of the Sign By-law and therefore, relief has to be obtained through Sign Variance Committee and Council. It must be noted, that it is possible to include signs of any size, which in the opinion of Architects and City are compatible with the development at the time of Site Plan Application. Signs approved by the City Site Plan process do not have to comply with the requirements of the Sign By-law.

For signs not complying with the Sign By-law relief maybe obtained in two (2) ways:

- a) through Site Variance Committee/Council; and
- b) through an amendment to the Site Plan (for those projects which have undergone Site Plan Approval).

Under both scenarios the proposed signs will be subject to some scrutiny by the City staff to ensure uniformity and compatibility with building design. One of the main reasons for creation of the Sign Variance Committee was to allow installation of signs which fell outside the requirements of the Sign By-law, but could still be justified based on merit.

Staff do not recommend amending the Sign By-law to permit signs above the roof surface as of right. In many instances this would have the effect of compromising the building architecture and destroying the roof line. This does not however, mean that no signs maybe permitted above the roof. The Sign Variance Committee provides a vehicle for review of variations from the Sign By-law. Any sign, which is compatible with building design and streetscape maybe approved by applying to the Sign Variance Committee

and obtaining Council's approval providing it can be demonstrated that the intent and purpose of the Sign By-law is being maintained.

7. Municipal Addresses for Industrial and Commercial ground signs.

This item arose over the concerns with the ability of Public and Emergency vehicles to find industrial and commercial establishments. There is, presently, no requirements, in the Sign By-law for ground signs to include municipal addresses.

The Municipal Act provides the Council with the authority to pass a By-law for numbering of buildings and lots along public highways.

Staff therefore recommend that the Sign By-law be amended to require the ground signs for industrial and commercial properties to display their assigned municipal addresses.

**Conclusion**

The framework for amending the Sign By-law on private property is presented in this Report for Council's consideration and comments. A By-law incorporating the above framework, as well as any additional comments, or suggestions that Council may have should then be brought to a future Council meeting in accordance with the Municipal Act.

Further, staff are also recommending that a new Sign By-law be created for regulating certain types of signs on public property.

**Attachments**

1. Appendix '1'
2. Tables "A", "B", "C"
3. Report No. 2, Regional Transit Committee meeting – February 14, 2002
4. Confidential Memorandum from the Director of Legal Services, dated February 22, 2002 (Members of Council only)

**Report prepared by:**

John Studdy, Manager of Customer & Administrative Services  
M. M. Navabi, P.Eng., Director of Building Standards

(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.)

**76. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT NO. 18**

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

ITEM - 6            RFP1-222  
                         PINE VALLEY DRIVE LINK CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
                         CONSULTING TEAM SELECTION

MOVED by Councillor Racco  
seconded by Councillor Di Vona

## **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002**

---

THAT Item 6, Committee of the Whole Report No. 18 be adopted, and amended, as follows:

By receiving the written submission from Mr. L. C. Angelantoni, Wycliffe Ratepayers Association, 76 Kiloran Avenue, Woodbridge, L4L 3A8, dated March 15, 2002.

CARRIED

### **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CLOSED SESSION) REPORT NO. 19**

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

#### **ITEM - 2      TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT**

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona  
seconded by Regional Councillor Frustaglio

That this matter be deferred to the Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) meeting of April 8, 2002; and

That the confidential memorandum from the Director of Legal Services, dated March 12, 2002, be received.

CARRIED

### **OPERATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 3**

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

#### **ITEM - 4      ORGANIZATION CHART / CIVIC ADMINISTRATION**

MOVED by Councillor Ferri  
seconded by Councillor Rosati

That this matter be deferred to the Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) meeting of March 18, 2002.

CARRIED

(Refer to Minute No.85 for disposition of this matter)

### **77.      COMPENSATION REVIEW** (Item 1, Operational Review Committee Report No. 4)

MOVED by Councillor Ferri  
seconded by Councillor Racco

THAT the Operational Review Committee confidential recommendation of March 18, 2002, be approved.

CARRIED



ADDENDUM ITEMS

**78. COUNCIL RESOLUTION  
POTENTIAL PRIVATIZATION OF HYDRO CORRIDORS  
HYDRO ONE INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING  
(Addendum No. 1)**

MOVED by Councillor Di Vona  
seconded by Councillor Racco

THAT the recommendation contained in the following report of the City Manager, dated March 18, 2002, be approved:

CARRIED

**Recommendation**

The City Manager recommends:

1. That the following resolution BE ADOPTED:

**WHEREAS** the hydro transmission corridors in the Greater Toronto Area represent an important public resource which was acquired on behalf of the taxpayers/ratepayers of Ontario for the betterment of the province;

**AND WHEREAS** the use of the corridor lands, for such public purposes as rapid transit and transportation, environmental management, recreational uses and other services and utilities, has the potential to play an increasingly important role in supporting economic growth, improving environmental health and in enhancing the quality of life for the residents of a rapidly growing GTA;

**AND WHEREAS** the loss of this resource to the broader public sector, through the privatization of Hydro One, would further constrain municipalities and other public agencies in their ability to provide essential services in a timely and economical manner.

**NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF VAUGHAN  
HEREBY RESOLVES:**

**THAT** the Province of Ontario is hereby requested to maintain the hydro corridors in public ownership and that these lands be made available for public use, at nominal cost, by municipalities and other public agencies;

**AND THAT** should the Province choose to include the corridors as an asset to be included as part of the Hydro One privatization, it is requested that terms and conditions be included in the transfer of the lands, which will ensure that the following principles will be adhered to:

1. Existing public uses are recognized and made permanent with no additional compensation required;
2. The corridor lands will remain available for future public uses at nominal cost to municipalities and other public agencies;
3. That no reasonable public use shall be denied;

**AND THAT** municipalities and other potentially affected public agencies be consulted prior to the privatization of the hydro corridors and that they be allowed to provide input on any detailed terms and conditions which may be attached to the transfer of such lands.

2. That this resolution BE FORWARDED to the following individuals, municipalities and agencies for their endorsement:
- The Premier of Ontario
  - Members of the Provincial Cabinet;
  - The Leader of the Opposition;
  - The Leader of the New Democratic Party;
  - Members of the Legislature for the Greater Toronto Area;
  - The Region of York;
  - The Municipalities of the Greater Toronto Area;
  - The Toronto Transit Commission;
  - GO Transit; and
  - Toronto Region Conservation Authority

**Purpose**

To adopt a resolution requesting that the Provincial Government protect the hydro corridors in the Greater Toronto Area for such public purposes as, transit and transportation uses, stormwater and environmental management measures, recreational uses and other services and utilities, when finalizing the details of the privatization of Hydro One.

**Background - Analysis and Options**

**Background**

The Province of Ontario is currently in the process of privatizing a portion of the former Ontario Hydro. Ontario Hydro was initially broken up into two main operating units, one being responsible for the generation of power and the other being responsible for its transmission. The utility now known as Hydro One is responsible for power transmission. Currently an Initial Public Offering (IPO) is being prepared for Hydro One and it will be issued sometime this year. As a result, Hydro One will become a publicly traded company.

Hydro One's transmission towers are located within a number of corridors, which form part of a province-wide network, which distributes the power from the generating stations to the local utilities. With the privatization of Hydro One, concerns have been raised about the disposition of these corridors. It is not known whether the land under the towers will be included as one of the assets that will be privatized or whether they will remain in the hands of the Provincial Government.

The corridors are extensive. It has been estimated that they consume approximately 4,040 hectares (10,000 acres) of land in the Greater Toronto Area alone. Even though they are encumbered by high voltage transmission lines, they play an important public role in the provision of a number of services. These include commuter parking for public transit, the provision of stormwater management facilities, recreation uses and walkway linkages and a number of public and private services and utilities. Given the breadth of the network, the corridors are also being seen as potential public transit routes that could be used in the future for bus or rail transit services.

The concern has been raised that, if these corridors are taken out of public ownership, the opportunity to use them for public purposes would be lost. Even if public uses were permitted in the corridors post-privatization, there remains the fear that the cost of securing the lands from the private sector owner might be prohibitive.

The issuance of the Hydro One IPO is expected this year, perhaps as early as this Spring. This issue has come to the forefront recently through a number of newspaper articles, which form Attachment No. 3 to this report. Given the timing of the privatization, it will be important that the affected public agencies identify their concerns as quickly as possible and that these concerns be conveyed to the Provincial Government. Staff understand that reports are now being prepared at the Region of York, the City of Toronto and the TTC.

Preserving these corridors for public use, at nominal cost to the public agencies, should be a priority of the Province of Ontario, in the Hydro One privatization process.

Implications for the City of Vaughan

There is currently an example in the City of Vaughan, which highlights the potential importance of these corridors to the future of the Greater Toronto Area. The hydro corridor that runs from Highway No. 400 to Keele Street, between Steeles Avenue and Highway No. 407, illustrates the case of an opportunity that may be threatened by the impending privatization. (See Attachment No. 1 for location)

The City of Vaughan and the Region of York have been working to secure a rapid transit connection (Spadina Subway Extension) from the TTC's Downsview Subway Station to the Vaughan Corporate Centre. As part of this process, the City has identified, through the approval of OPA No. 529 (The Higher Order Transit Corridor Protection Study), a transit right of way that runs from a planned bus terminal on the north side of Steeles Avenue, east of Jane Street, to the Corporate Centre.

The bus terminal site, which is privately owned, was also identified in OPA No. 529 and the Region of York is now in the process of expropriating it. The bus terminal will be part of a comprehensive inter-regional gateway facility that would include 3,000 (and possibly more) commuter parking spaces to the north of the bus terminal in the hydro corridor. This parking facility would be the largest in the GTA. (See Attachment No. 2) The corridor would also provide for accesses to Jane and Keele Streets, thereby distributing commuter and bus traffic in a fast and efficient manner.

The privatization of the corridor, without specific guarantees protecting future public uses, could result in the loss of this opportunity. The availability of commuter parking is critical to increasing the use of public transit and will therefore be an important consideration in any decision to extend a rapid transit service through York University to Steeles Avenue, and ultimately into the City of Vaughan.

This only serves as one example of the public uses to which these corridors may be put. It is difficult to foretell what new opportunities may emerge over time. It would not be prudent to foreclose on future opportunities as a result of an unconditional disposal of the corridor lands. Therefore, the protection of these valuable corridors should be a public policy priority for the Province.

The Resolution

The proposed resolution requests that the Province maintain all the hydro corridors in public ownership and that public uses be permitted at nominal cost. Maintaining the status quo would be a desirable outcome. However, should the Province proceed with the privatization of Hydro One, with the corridors included as part of the new firm's assets, then it is important that these lands remain available for public use.

Three principles are identified as being necessary if these lands are to be protected in a privatization process. The first is that existing uses should be recognized and that no further compensation will be sought for such uses; second, that the corridors will remain available for future public uses at nominal cost; and finally, that no reasonable public use shall be denied. These principles would have to be reflected in the terms and conditions of the transfer of the lands to the new private sector firm. Lastly, prior to the finalization of the process, the Provincial Government should consult with municipalities and other public agencies on the terms and conditions that may be attached to the transfer of the corridor lands.

Given the importance of this issue, it is recommended that the resolution be sent to the Premier of Ontario, Members of Cabinet, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the NDP and all the Members of the Legislature for the Greater Toronto Area. In addition, it is recommended that the resolution be sent to the Region of York, all the GTA municipalities, TRCA, the TTC and GO Transit for support and endorsement. It is hoped that support for the preservation of these corridors will be broadly based and there will be a basis for a co-operatively developed, non-partisan solution.

**Conclusion**

The hydro corridors of the Greater Toronto Area represent an important resource for the future. Already they are being used for commuter parking at transit stations, for environmental and recreational uses and by public and private utilities. As the GTA grows and intensifies, there may be a number of additional uses to which these corridors could be put. One use currently being considered is public transit. The full potential for these corridors will emerge over time as the GTA evolves. As such, they are strategic public assets, many of which have been under public ownership for the better part of the last Century. Therefore, they should remain available for public use into the future.

Should Council concur, then the recommendation set out in the "Recommendation" section of this report should be adopted.

**Attachments**

1. Hydro Corridor – Highway No. 400 to Keele Street between Highway No. 407 and Steeles Avenue
2. Planned Bus Terminal and Commuter Parking Lot, North Side of Steeles Avenue, East of Jane Street
3. Recent Newspaper Articles

**Report prepared by:**

Roy McQuillin, Senior Planner, ext. 8211

/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.)

**79. MOBILE BLEACHERS**

(Addendum No. 2)

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Ferri

THAT the recommendation contained in the following report of the Commissioner of Community Services, dated March 18, 2002, be approved:

CARRIED

**Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Community Services in consultation with the Executive Director of Buildings, Facilities and Parks and the Director of Purchasing recommends:

That notwithstanding the Purchasing Policy, the City of Vaughan purchase TranSport Mobile Bleachers from Century Industries Inc. in the amount of \$96, 559.00 (U.S. dollars), plus taxes and tariffs.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council authority to single source three mobile bleacher units from Century Industries Inc.

**Background - Analysis and Options**

The development plan for the soccer complex in Vaughan Grove Park included the provision of 2,000 bleacher seats for spectators. It was not possible to provide these bleachers as the Director of Building Standards determined that twenty permanent washrooms were required to support this number of seats. As there are no funds available to construct such a large washroom complex, staff has not proceeded with the installation of any seating at that location. Small temporary bleachers have been placed at the park, but will be returned to their original location before the season begins.

In order to address the issue of permanent bleachers requiring permanent solutions, staff has researched large mobile bleachers. The only company that manufactures large mobile bleacher units that are suitable for our purposes is Century Industries Inc. They make the TransSport Mobile Bleacher System, which comes in three sizes: 180, 260 and 300 Seat Models. This system is a self-contained seating system capable of highway transport and fast set-up. The bleachers offer 10-row bleacher seating with guardrails, and are equipped with a hydraulic actuator, permitting one person set up. As they are portable, there will be no need to provide the additional permanent washrooms at Vaughan Grove Park.

There are additional benefits to these bleachers in that they can be used at sports fields and for special events across the City. The ease with which they can be moved will allow the rental of the bleachers to organizations for their events.

Staff are recommending the purchase of three units: one 300 seat, and two 260 seat models. This is based on the size of these units and the space available to accommodate them. A quote has been received from Century Industries for these three units in the amount of \$96,659.00 U.S. dollars. This does not include any taxes or tariffs. Funds are available in the Vaughan Grove Park 2000 and 2001 capital budgets.

**Conclusion**

The purchase of the TranSport Mobile Bleacher System will provide a new level of service for the City as well as solving a problem at Vaughan Grove Park.

**Attachments**

Mobile Bleacher System Illustration

**Report prepared by:**

G. Doris Haas ext. 8501

(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.)

**80. CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY BENEFIT CONCERT – CITY PLAYHOUSE**

(Addendum No. 3)

MOVED by Councillor Kadis  
seconded by Councillor Di Vona

THAT the recommendation contained in the following report of Councillor Di Vona, dated March 18, 2002, be approved:

CARRIED

**Recommendation**

Councillor Bernie Di Vona recommends:

That the City of Vaughan approves of applying a facility credit for the launch of this years Canadian Cancer Society Daffodil launch on April 19, 2002.

**Purpose**

To obtain approval for a facility credit for the launch of this years Canadian Cancer Society Daffodil launch on April 19, 2002.

**Background - Analysis and Options**

The City of Vaughan has entered into an agreement with the operators of the City Playhouse to provide the City of Vaughan the use of the City Playhouse for 3 events on an annual basis.

The City of Vaughan Council and staff have approved of supporting several charities including the Canadian Cancer Society, York Region Chapter. To this end, a benefactor of last years City of Vaughan Golf Tournament was the Canadian Cancer Society.

The Canadian Cancer Society, York Region Chapter has approved of a concert to be held at the City Playhouse to launch this year's drive, as last year.

To date there are two events planned for the City Playhouse by committees of the City of Vaughan - the International Day for Elimination of Racial Discrimination March 21, 2002 and an Arts & Culture event for the fall of 2002.

**Conclusion**

This motion, if approved, would ensure that a facility credit be used and thereby increase the benefits to the Canadian Cancer Society.

**Attachments**

None

**Report prepared by:**

Councillor Bernie Di Vona

**81. CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS**  
(Addendum No. 4) (Item 2, Operational Review Committee Report No. 4)

MOVED by Councillor Racco  
seconded by Regional Councillor Frustaglio

THAT the Operational Review Committee confidential recommendation of March 18, 2002, be approved.

CARRIED

**82. BY-LAW NUMBER 68-2002**

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Kadis

**COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002**

---

THAT the memorandum from the Commissioner of Planning, dated March 11, 2002, be received; and

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

By-Law Number 68-2002            A By-Law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.45.89, Langstaff Woods Development Corp., southeast corner of Dufferin Street and Summeridge Drive) (Administrative Correction) (Council, August 30, 1999, Item 7, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 65)

CARRIED

**83. BY-LAW NUMBER 80-2002**

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Kadis

THAT the following recommendation contained in the memorandum from the Commissioner of Planning, dated March 14, 2002, be approved:

1.        That the by-law implementing Council's approval of Zoning Amendment Application Z.99.002 (Roybridge Holdings Limited) include the following additional provisions:
  - a)        rezoning Block 3, and Part Blocks 4, 5 and 6, on the draft approved plan to EM1 Prestige Employment Area Zone and EM1(H) with an "H" Holding Symbol, respectively, rather than the previously approved EM2 General Employment Area Zone and EM2 (H) with an "H" Holding Symbol;
  - b)        increasing the minimum landscape strip width from 6m to 9m on lots adjacent to Regional Road 27 and Regional Road 7, and from 3m to 6m adjacent to Street "A"; and,
  - c)        restricting the easterly 1.2 ha of the C7 Service Commercial block (Block 2), to Office Building and/or Hotel uses, having a combined minimum gross floor area of 9,360 sq.m (100,753 sq.ft).
  
2.        That should Council concur, the following resolution be adopted:

“That Council deems that the above changes to Zoning Amendment Application Z.99.001 (Roybridge Holdings Limited) are minor and that a further public hearing is not required.”; and

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

By-law Number 80-2002            A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.99.002, Roybridge Holdings Limited (Formerly Sevenplex Developments Inc.), northwest corner of Regional Road No. 27 and Regional Road No. 7) (Council, July 10, 2000, Item 53, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 59)

CARRIED

**84. BY-LAWS FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS**

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Di Vona

## COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002

---

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

- By-Law Number 66-2002      An amending By-law to authorize the acquisition of land for the extension of Viceroy Road to Dufferin Street. (Part of Lot 26, Concession 3)(By-law 351-2000) (Item 4, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session), Report No. 19)
- By-Law Number 67-2002      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 Kennel Inn Inc. (Animal Control Contract – Kennel Inn Inc.) (Item 16, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 18)
- By-Law Number 69-2002      A By-law to exempt parts of Plans 65M-3549 and 65M-3550 from the provisions of Part Lot Control. (PLC.02.009, Perlato Estates Ltd., northwest of Rutherford Road and Weston Road)(Delegation By-law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 70-2002      A By-law to repeal By-law 69-2002. (PLC.02.009, Perlato Estates Ltd., northwest of Rutherford Road and Weston Road) (Delegation By-law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 71-2002      A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (1.6.6.3, City of Vaughan – Shopping Centre Definition)(Council, October 29, 2001, Item 23, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 66)
- By-Law Number 72-2002      A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (1.6.6.3, City of Vaughan – Commercial and Technical Schools Definition)(Council, October 29, 2001, Item 23, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 66)
- By-Law Number 73-2002      A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.01.070, K.L. Lai Investments Limited, northwest corner of Steeles Avenue West and Scholes Road, east of Pine Valley Drive)(Council, February 11, 2002, Item 9, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 10)
- By-Law Number 74-2002      A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (Z.01.076, Hidden Valley Construction Limited/Paul Guglietti, northwest corner of Weston Road and Astona Boulevard)(Council, February 25, 2002, Item 4, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 4)
- By-Law Number 75-2002      A By-law to adopt Amendment Number 574 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area. (OP.01.005 and Z.01.010, Majorwest Development Corp., south side of Major Mackenzie Drive, between Highway No. 400 and Weston Road)(Council, January 28, 2002, Item 16, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 5)
- By-Law Number 76-2002      A By-law to exempt parts of Plan 65M-3542 from the provisions of Part Lot Control. (PLC.02.008, Grand Orchard Construction & Development Ltd., south of Major Mackenzie Drive, east of Weston Road)(Delegation By-law 333-98)
- By-Law Number 77-2002      A By-law to repeal By-law 76-2002. (PLC.02.008, Grand Orchard Construction & Development Ltd., south of Major Mackenzie Drive, east of Weston Road) (Delegation By-law 333-98)



## COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002

---

- By-Law Number 78-2002      A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (1.6.6.3, City of Vaughan – standards for outdoor patios in Employment Area and Industrial Zones)(Council, October 29, 2001, Item 23, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 66)
- By-Law Number 79-2002      A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88. (1.6.6.3, City of Vaughan - Parking requirements for technical Schools)(Council, October 29, 2001, Item 23, Committee of the Whole, Report No. 66)

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Racco  
seconded by Regional Councillor Frustaglio

THAT a closed session of Committee of the Whole be convened for the purpose of discussing the following matters:

- a. the security of property;
- b. personal matters about an identifiable individual, including employees;
- c. proposed or pending acquisitions of land for municipal or local board purposes;
- d. labour relations or employee negotiations;
- e. litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals; and
- f. advice that is subject to solicitor/client privilege.

CARRIED

Council recessed at 1:34 p.m.

MOVED by Councillor Ferri  
seconded by Councillor Kadis

THAT Council reconvene at 6:15 p.m.

CARRIED

Council reconvened at 6:15 p.m. with the following members present:

Regional Councillor M. Di Biase, Chair  
Regional Councillor J. Frustaglio (6:20 p.m. – 6:21 p.m.)  
Councillor M. Ferri  
Councillor S. Kadis  
Councillor M. G. Racco  
Councillor G. Rosati

### **85. ORGANIZATION CHART / CIVIC ADMINISTRATION**

(Item 5, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21)  
(Item 4, Operational Review Committee Report No. 3 – Refer to Minute No.76)

MOVED by Councillor Racco  
seconded by Councillor Ferri

THAT the following Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommendation of March 18, 2002, be approved:

**COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002**

---

- 1) That the Operational Review Committee recommendation of February 27, 2002, be approved; and
- 2) That the Organization Chart for the Civic Administration be approved.

CARRIED

**86. SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CLOSED SESSION) REPORT NO. 21**

- ITEM - 1      BASEMENT APARTMENTS
- ITEM - 3      ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD HEARING  
CYPRESS POINT HOLDINGS LIMITED  
AND NIVLOG INVESTMENTS LIMITED  
OPA APPLICATION FILE OP99.028  
ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE Z99.057
- ITEM - 4      PERSONNEL MATTER
- ITEM - 6      WOODBRIIDGE SOCCER COMMUNICATION

MOVED by Councillor Kadis  
seconded by Councillor Racco

THAT the Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommendation of March 18, 2002 for Items 1, 3, 4 and 6 be adopted without amendment.

CARRIED

(Refer to Minute No. 87 (Item 1), Minute No. 88 (Item 3), Minute No. 89 (Item 4) and Minute No. 90 (Item 6))

**87. BASEMENT APARTMENTS**

(Item 1, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21)  
(Refer to Minute No.86)

**The Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommends that the confidential recommendation of the Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) be approved.**

**88. ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD HEARING  
CYPRESS POINT HOLDINGS LIMITED  
AND NIVLOG INVESTMENTS LIMITED  
OPA APPLICATION FILE OP99.028  
ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE Z99.057**

(Item 3, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21)  
(Refer to Minute No. 86)

**The Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommends that staff be directed to attend in support of Council's refusal.**

89. **PERSONNEL MATTER**

(Item 4, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21)  
(Refer to Minute No. 86)

**The Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommends that the confidential recommendation of the Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) be approved.**

Refer to Item 5, Report No.19, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session)

90. **WOODBIDGE SOCCER COMMUNICATION**

(Item 6, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21)  
(Refer to Minute No. 86)

**The Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommends that the Commissioner of Community Services initiate a policy review to work towards equality in the use of fields and fees paid by CSO organizations for all tournaments.**

91. **RECONSIDERATION  
WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS (IMPACT ON WASTE  
MANAGEMENT COSTS – KEELE VALLEY CLOSURE)**

MOVED by Councillor Ferri  
seconded by Councillor Rosati

THAT Item 4, Committee of the Whole (Working Session) Report No.16, IMPACT ON WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS – KEELE VALLEY CLOSURE, be reconsidered.

CARRIED

92. **WASTE MANAGEMENT COSTS (IMPACT ON WASTE  
MANAGEMENT COSTS – KEELE VALLEY CLOSURE)**

(Item 2, Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) Report No. 21)

MOVED by Councillor Ferri  
seconded by Councillor Rosati

THAT the following Special Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) recommendation of March 18, 2002, be approved:

That the confidential recommendation from the February 19, 2002 Committee of the Whole (Working Session - Closed) which was approved by Council on February 25, 2002, be reconsidered and that it be replaced with the following resolution:

“WHEREAS the Regional Municipality of York has awarded contracts for the design and construction of waste transfer and processing facilities and the operation of such facilities to Miller Waste Systems; and

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Vaughan believes that there may be more cost-effective methods and options available for the processing and disposal of waste;

**COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 18 2002**

---

NOW THEREFORE COUNCIL RESOLVES that staff be directed to undertake exploratory discussions with the Region of York, the City of Toronto and Royal Plastics to consider other options that may be available or pursued by the City of Vaughan that provide for a long-term strategy for the processing, transfer and disposal of the City's waste with a view to achieving cost savings and to report to Council on such options."

CARRIED

**93. CONFIRMING BY-LAW**

MOVED by Regional Councillor Frustaglio  
seconded by Councillor Ferri

THAT By-law Number 81-2002, being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of Council at its meeting on March 18, 2002, be read a First, Second and Third time and enacted.

CARRIED

**94. ADJOURNMENT**

MOVED by Councillor Rosati  
seconded by Councillor Kadis

THAT the meeting adjourn at 6:21 p.m.

CARRIED

---

M. Di Biase, Acting Mayor

---

J. D. Leach, City Clerk