

Questions from September 15 Council Meeting

Why was the online petition not allowed this year but was for the wetlands issue?

The first version of the petition submitted to the Clerk's Office did not meet the Township's requirements as stipulated by the Procedure By-law. It lacked context explaining the purpose of the petition, did not include the petitioner's contact information, and did not provide printed signatures or any means to validate entries (with numerous duplicates appearing in the dataset).

When staff requested clarification from the organizer, contact information was provided, but no context for the petition and no comment on the validity of the signatures accompanied the response. Later that same day, a second petition was submitted that did meet the Township's requirements and was subsequently published as part of the September 15 Special Council meeting agenda.

If a petition has been accepted and added to a Council meeting, it would have met the requirements of the By-law.

Council was in camera for 90 minutes – did they get legal advice for this RFP?

Council convened in camera on July 9 pursuant to Section 239(c,k) of the Municipal Act to discuss the proposed lease agreement between the Township and the PPAS and to consider next steps.

What outreach was done to let people in Port Perry know that the Township requires a consultant who will have 'final vision' on this property?

The staff report was included in the meeting agenda and posted on the Township's website.

The consultant will not determine the 'final vision', rather, they will work with the community to develop a range of ideas to help shape a shared vision for the site. The ultimate decision rests with Council.

Were members of the PPAS and the Township asked to sign an NDA or conflict of interest waivers?

No one was asked to sign anything when the PPAS and the Township met.



What by-laws govern visioning exercises?

No existing by-laws in the Township relate to 'visioning exercises'. Such a thing would be atypical in any municipality. Visioning exercises are a community engagement exercise utilized to ensure the most broad-based community input can be collected before an ultimate decision from Council is made.

What is the point of having By-law 77-19 if we aren't going to follow it for the largest asset in Scugog?

By-law 77-19 guides the process with respect to buying or selling Township owned land. Land must be declared surplus by Council prior to publishing notice to move forward with land sale. No decision been made or considered to declare the Fairgrounds land surplus.

Why is there no budget money allocated for a visioning exercise?

With Council's approval of the staff recommendation, a capital project and budget have been assigned to the visioning exercise. Existing reserves are being used to fund this project.

Other proponents considered here – were there any other bids? Is the Township just choosing one consultant at one price?

The staff report contained within the September 15 Special Council Meeting agenda speaks to the procurement process followed and the proponents considered.

Isn't it important to understand whether this is a heritage site before proceeding with the visioning exercise? Have we consulted with the Heritage Trust?

No, the visioning exercise can proceed prior to any consideration about any possible heritage aspects of the property. Council made a previous decision to refer consideration of the heritage status of the Fairgrounds to staff as part of the Official Plan review process.

If we start the visioning exercise, do we need to 'apply' the provincial policy statement and priorities related to promoting more housing?

We are not obliged to abide by these mechanisms as there is no sale or development proposed currently.



What is the zoning on the property? – I see different ‘types’

The zoning for the Fairgrounds property can be viewed at <https://www.scugog.ca/building-development/planning-and-development/zoning/>

Are there any safeguards to revisit this decision with the next term of Council?

If Council makes a decision that can still be undone, it may only be reconsidered within six months by a two-thirds majority vote by way of a Notice of Motion introduced by Council. After six months, a decision can be brought back with a simple majority, however, once a decision has already been carried out in a way that cannot be undone, it cannot be reconsidered.

The PPAS submitted a tree plan for the Fairgrounds, what is the status of this?

Any plan to place trees on the property will wait for the outcome of the visioning exercise.