

Good afternoon Mayor Donaldson and members of Council.

My name is Jim Davis. I am a MLA Director and also a Director & Past President of the Gull & Silver Lakes Residents' Association.

I'm quite sure that you have grown weary of the seemingly endless number of e-mails you have received regarding this application. And although they must seem repetitive, the cogent information contained in the e-mails is pertinent and important. The lake associations and the many Gravenhurst residents who have objected to the Moody Bay Development are simply asking Council to uphold and enforce the policies and regulations within the Official Plan and those contained within some very important environmental By-laws. It is notable that this Council approved the current Official Plan just 20 months ago in December 2016, after a full year of consultations with lake associations and other citizen groups, countless hours of staff time, and an expenditure of almost \$40,000 for the services of Planscape, an outside planning consultant. One must wonder if important OP policies that are specifically designed to protect the environment and water quality can be manipulated and bend to accommodate a for profit enterprise, what was the point of the exercise.

I assume the members of Council have read the objections and concerns of the citizens and lake associations regarding this application, and I would like to acknowledge the comments the Muskoka Lakes Association, the Friends of Muskoka and the Kawshe Lake Ratepayers Association as being particularly on point. So rather than repeat all the many valid reasons why this application should be rejected, I want to address the question of deferral vs a clear approve or reject vote.

The Staff report recommends deferral to hear and consider public comments, and to review the supporting documentation. I submit that public comments have been heard to a far greater degree than any application in the past four years. And the public comments are crystal clear, they oppose this waterfront development. I would also like to remind Council that the applicant also held a public meeting on Aug. 1st that was well publicized and attended, and four Councillors were in attendance. I can only hope that in the future, all important applications dealing with Official Plan policies and Zoning Amendments will have the same magnitude of public engagement.

The Staff report also cites the need to review supporting material as a reason for deferral. The Planning Department has had this application for seven weeks and they have deemed it "complete". An application is deemed complete after the Planning Department reviews the information in the file and is satisfied that all the information they require to write a report is contained within the application, and only then will the application become an agenda item before this Planning Council. Perhaps I don't

understand the unique language of planners, but that sounds like the application has had a thorough review to me.

I would like to examine the ramifications of a deferral vote. I must assume that deferral means that the application won't be heard again until the new Council takes office in December. With the knowledge that at least 1/3 of the Council will be new and have no experience dealing with complex planning and land use applications, that strikes me as an irresponsible decision. It would also mean that many of the seasonal residents here today would find it onerous to attend another Planning Council meeting in Muskoka during the dead of winter.

I also ask, if during the deferral period, Council intends to amend the Official Plan or rewrite the Site Alteration and Tree Preservation By-laws so that different criteria will be used to evaluate this application? If not, we will have the same concerns and valid objections when this application comes before the new Council as we do today. The stipulation for a 30metre setback and a 20 metre shoreline buffer and adherence to other important OP policies will be the same in December or January, so why we alter our position in three or four months. Let me state clearly and for the record, we will not compromise on our insistence that these important environmental policies are upheld and enforced.

I ask the Council to consider the message it will be sending to the citizens and ratepayers of Gravenhurst with a deferral vote. It can only mean one thing – it's a maybe vote – it's not yes, it's not no, it's maybe this should be approved. A clear vote by Council to reject this application will state that our Official Plan policies and environmental By-Laws will be upheld and any development application that does not meet those standards will not be approved. A no vote does not mean the applicant is barred from reapplying, he has a legal right to reapply at any time.

In closing, we acknowledge that the developer, Mr. Smith does have development rights. We are not asking Council to denying him those rights. We only ask that Council apply those rights to develop based upon the rules and regulations enacted by this Council and many Councils in the past.

We request Council call for a recorded vote on any motions regarding this application.

Thank you and I will be happy to answer any questions.