1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Smith called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST** - None

3. **DEPUTATIONS, PETITIONS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS**

4. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – Items on Agenda

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

   a) **Correspondence from the County of Simcoe with respect to Closed Meeting Investigation Services – 2015**

MOVED BY R. EGO  
SECONDED BY N. BIFOLCHI  
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-31-01

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of the Whole does hereby recommend to Council that JGM Consulting Inc. be appointed as the Town of Wasaga Beach’s Closed Meeting Investigator as part of the County of Simcoe procurement.

CARRIED
b) Wings Over Wasaga 2017

MOVED BY S. BRAY
SECONDED BY B. STOCKWELL             RESOLUTION NO. 2015-31-02

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of the Whole does hereby recommend to Council that it receive the staff report advising that the Airshow event planned by the Wasaga Beach Lions Club will not be proceeding in 2017 in light of a similar Airshow being planned in a neighbouring community.

CARRIED

c) Possible site for an OLG Gaming Casino facility at Beach front

Mr. McNeill was welcomed to the table. He advised this item was deferred from the Oct. 6th Committee of the Whole meeting so that staff could look into two items. Staff had been asked to consult with the OLG to get a better understand of the timing of the site selection process and if another site was added what would the OLG evaluation criteria be. Mr. McNeill advised that he did contact the OLG and the Town is under no obligation to undertake a public consultation process and can add sites as it sees fit. Public input is at the Town’s sole discretion; however it is Mr. McNeill’s recommendation that Council engage the public. With respect to the evaluation criteria, the OLG has some basic criteria around site size and planning requirements, but defers to Council to determine the criteria to apply. He did note that it is not the intention to open up the process again whether Wasaga Beach is to be a willing host of a casino. The decision whether or not a casino comes to Town has already been made. The meeting would be about adding Beach 1 and 2 to the list of possible casino sites and that needs to be made clear.

Mr. McNeill then talked to the merits of adding these lands as they are under public ownership and the OLG thinks it might be strategically advantages to have a public site to go along with the other four sites, being privately held. If the operator wishes to select a Wasaga Beach site, it will be their choice to deal with either the private or public land owner. Once again it is the operator who makes the decision, not the Town, where the casino would be located.

Mr. McNeill recommended that the criteria applied to the others be the criteria used for the so we are consistent and everyone is treated fairly. Once a site is selected we have flexibility as to what kind of building is being built. Currently the OLG is working with other communities to build two story gaming facilities. He recommended if Beach 1 and 2 is successful it would be more of an urban style building.

Councillor Stockwell inquired of the timetable as to when they will make a decision. Mr. McNeill advised that the RFP will be issued in 2016 as they are trying to get the Woodbine facility resolved first before they move on.

Deputy Mayor Bifolchi advised that she will support going to public meeting but does not support a casino on the beach front. She felt Council is competing with the private sector and it creates an unfair playing field with four private owners. The Deputy Mayor then inquired if staff had evaluated the property and if so requested the rating before going to a public meeting.
Mr. McNeill advised that he has not evaluated the lands. Staff previously had looked at Beach 1 & 2 and it should be looked again given that the site being considered is larger. The Town is competing with the private sector and as land owners on the beachfront he believed the highest return on investment, the residents would support. Council will have to look at ways to maximize the return, as a casino is only one component that will be used to catalyze other things to help the return investment.

The Deputy Mayor noted that four land owners are holding off developing their properties and suggested that it is now unfair the Town is considering adding its own lands. She had been in discussion with some of the land owners and they are questioning why the OLG process is taking so long.

The CAO advised that he has had conversations with the landowners as well and they have expressed concern over the length of time for the process. It has been almost three years and there are concerns. The land owners are kept up to date when we receive any new information. For these land owners, the casino was going to form part of their development as a broader commercial development. Some developer’s plans are still in place and are holding off on other parts. One developer is starting to look at another development strategy for his property as he needs to move on. The landowners would appreciate the OLG announcing the RFP process as the short listed operators would then reach out to landowners and negotiations would begin. The RFP has been postponed a few times.

Mayor Smith noted that it is the developer’s choice to move forward with development on their property or not, it is a business decision. He further noted that the Town has no control when the OLG makes a decision and until the OLG makes a decision our hands are tied as well.

Councillor Smith stated that people she speaks to are upset about the decision to consider the beach front as a casino site. Councillor Smith noted she supports a public meeting and felt it was important to involve the public in the decision. It was then;

MOVED BY R. EGO  
SECONDED BY B. STOCKWELL  
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-31-03

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of the Whole does hereby recommend to Council that the Director of Economic Development and Tourism be asked to undertake the following:

1. Limit consideration of additional gaming facility locations in the Town of Wasaga Beach to Beach Areas One and Two;
2. Schedule a Public Open House to be held on December 3, 2015 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the RecPlex, to receive feedback from residents, businesses and stakeholders, pertaining to the potential addition of Beach Areas One and Two as potential gaming facility sites, and
3. Report back to Committee of the Whole following the Public Open House on the feedback received, as well as provide a recommendation to Committee as to whether or not Beach Areas One and Two should be added to the list of potential gaming facility sites.

CARRIED
d) Public Information Session for Residents (1) and Business Community (1) to ask Questions of Council Members and Department Heads

The CAO advised that he had prepared some background information in response to the Mayor’s request on that Committee consider scheduling two public information sessions. The report outlined the public information sessions that had been held by past Councils.

Discussion ensued with thoughts being tabled on how the process should be; who should be in attendance; who should answer questions; format of the open house – formal or informal, as well as time of year that would benefit most of the residents. Committee also discussed the concept of one meeting for residents – one meeting for business community or one combined meeting as well as the issues that would be addressed.

The Mayor concluded that it seemed the consensus of Committee is to move forward with a question and answer open house and details will be worked out with the options. It was then;

MOVED BY R. EGO
SECONDED BY S. BRAY

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-31-04

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of the Whole does hereby receive the Chief Administrative Officer’s report on the Public Information Session for Residents and Business Community.

CARRIED

Councillor Stockwell inquired of the next step. Committee was advised that the Mayor and CAO will sit down and look at a date when as many taxpayers as possible are in Town for this type of meeting.

Councillor Smith suggested that Council look at a webcast.

e) Development Charges Background Study

The Treasurer was welcomed to the table. She noted that the consultant has not yet arrived as she had anticipated he would not be required until 4:45 p.m. The Treasurer then spoke to the Development Charges Background Study update. She spoke to the first update and the increases recommended at that time. It was noted that the increases have been recalculated and the residential rate has been lowered to an increase of 23% per single family home and 135% for non-residential development. The rates changed due to changing some timing of projects and making some projects more grant dependent. The residential growth forecast has changed significantly compared to the previous study to about 209 units per year and projected amount of commercial development has decreased as well. The Treasurer advised that one developer had expressed concern about the narrowing of already slim profit margins with the potential development charge increase. It was noted that Wasaga Beach is the first municipality in this cycle of development charge studies and the expectation is that our municipalities in our area will be bringing forward their own studies in the next few years with recommended increases.

The Treasurer advised that she has provided three options for Committee’s consideration and is recommending that Committee recommend Option 1, which is a phase-in of residential charges over two years and a freeze on non-residential development charges
for two years. In the second year staff would do a review of non-residential development charges and recommend if Council should be considering an increase, given the market conditions at that time.

Mayor Smith noted the concern with respect to margins shrinking for the residential developers and asked why is staff recommending that Committee move ahead with a residential increase as opposed to commercial. The Treasurer advised by implementing a phase in we are keeping our charges mid-range in comparison to municipalities in our area. She received comments from one commercial developer, who expressed concern about the proposed substantial increase in non-residential rates. Discussion then ensued with respect to the level of commercial activity and the CIP project that is in progress. Committee also discussed the potential impact of development charges on proposed developments. It was noted that difference in charges collected versus what is needed would have to be funded through other means. The Treasurer thought it would make sense to freeze the commercial rate at this time for the reasons stated earlier.

The CAO clarified that the concern expressed about the impact on profit margins was made after the first draft of the study and now that the second draft has been received the proposed increase is not as large. The feedback he has received from the developers is that they don’t like to see any increase, but the increase proposed is reasonable and they appreciate the two year phase in.

Council questioned if the CIP process could be sped up. The Treasurer advised that at this point the area of Town to be covered by the CIP is not known. Establishing the development charges is the first step; then the CIP can be brought in to act as an incentive in the areas of the Town and forms of development identified.

Mayor Smith stated that if there is an increase in the commercial development charge now, once the CIP is in place, Council might be in a position to decrease development charges in the CIP area. When the CIP is in place Council will have tools to act as incentives to development.

The Treasurer confirmed that if the CIP plans to reduce or change the development charges, the Town’s taxpayers would have to fund that portion of it. This is a Town wide Development Charge By-Law.

The CAO then suggested that it is important for Council to consider where it wants to position the Town for the future. If Council were to freeze the non-residential development charge, it is a positive message that Council is sending and it will get developers looking at the Town. He believed that from an economic development standpoint it would be considered a positive action.

Mr. McNeill was welcomed to the table and he noted that Council is about to embark on a different course for the Town in terms of fostering commercial development. Up to now, the Town has seen a lot of single family residential and single commercial story development. Mr. McNeill’s opinion is that in the future we will see vertically mixed use buildings with commercial on the ground floor and residential above; how tall remains to be worked out. The pro forma the developers are using will shift and be dramatically impacted by development charges. We don’t know what it will look like today; a year from now there will be a lot more clarity. Mr. McNeill suggested that freezing the commercial development
charges today is a smart move until matters become clearer. It was then;

MOVED BY B. SMITH  
SECONDED BY N. BIFOLCHI  
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-31-05

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of the Whole of Council does hereby recommend to Council that it receive the Development Charge Background Study dated November 2, 2015, prepared by Hemson Consulting Ltd; and,

FURTHER THAT the Committee of the Whole does hereby approve Option “1” to be brought forward to the November 17th, 2015 Public Meeting for consideration and approval, and

FINALLY THAT January 1st, 2016 be established as the effective date of the new development charge.

CARRIED

6. ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS (new items)

Mayor Smith inquired if there were any new items a Council member wished to add for future meetings to which there was no response.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.