



**Governance Review
Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Agenda**

**Monday, April 1, 2019
4 p.m.**

**Holland Room
Aurora Town Hall**

Public Release
March 25, 2019



Town of Aurora
Governance Review Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Agenda

Date: Monday, April 1, 2019

Time and Location: 4 p.m., Holland Room, Aurora Town Hall

Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

Recommended:

That a Committee member be appointed as Chair of the Governance Review Ad Hoc Committee.

That a Committee member be appointed as Vice-Chair of the Governance Review Ad Hoc Committee.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Recommended:

That the agenda as circulated by Legislative Services be approved.

2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

3. Receipt of the Minutes

4. Delegations

- (a) Michael de Rond, Town Clerk**
Re: Ad-Hoc Committee Orientation

5. Matters for Consideration

- 1. Memorandum from Town Clerk**
Re: Recent Information Regarding Electoral System Reform

Recommended:

- 1. That the memorandum regarding Recent Information Regarding Electoral System Reform be received for information.

- 2. Round Table Discussion**
Re: Electoral System Review

Recommended:

- 1. That the comments and suggestions regarding the Electoral System Review be received and referred to staff for consideration and action as appropriate.

6. Informational Items

7. Adjournment



100 John West Way
Box 1000
Aurora, Ontario
L4G 6J1
Phone: 905-727-3123 ext. 4771
Email: mderond@aurora.ca
www.aurora.ca

**Town of Aurora
Corporate Services**

Memorandum

Date: April 1, 2019
To: Members of the Governance Review Ad Hoc Committee
From: Michael de Rond, Town Clerk
Re: **Recent Information Regarding Electoral System Reform**

Recommendations

- 1. That the memorandum regarding Recent Information Regarding Electoral System Reform be received for information.**

Background

The past two terms of Council have considered electoral system reform by investigating the possibility of moving from an at-large Council to a ward-based Council. Attached to this memo are three reports to Council, since 2010, about a possible shift to a ward system in Aurora.

The first report, CLS10-13, was considered prior to the 2010 Municipal Election when Council considered putting a question on the ballot regarding a ward system in Aurora but ultimately voted not to. This report also contains comments from the public regarding the merits of a ward system.

The second report, LLS14-013, was considered prior to the 2014 Municipal Election. Council voted to include a question on the ballot asking Town residents whether they would prefer a ward system to elect their representatives. The results of that vote were 54.75% - 45.25% (6,670 – 5,512) in favour of the status quo (continuing to elect all Council by at-large vote). The last report attached to this memo, LLS15-011, analyzed the results of the 2014 ballot questions and asked Council to provide direction regarding further action. Council chose to take no action regarding implementing wards.

The Governance Review Ad Hoc Committee was struck in 2017 and tasked with, among other things, looking at whether a ward system would be appropriate for Aurora. Due to the

April 1, 2018

-2-

Recent Information Regarding
Electoral System Reform

Municipal Act, 2001 provisions mandating that a change in electoral boundaries must be in place by December 31 of the year preceding the election (December 31, 2017 in this case), the Committee recommended to Council that timelines prevented the Town from doing a fulsome review prior to the Election.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Report No. CLS10-13 – Possible Ward Question on the Ballot

Attachment 2 – Report No. LLS14-013 – Determination of Two Questions on the Ballot

Attachment 3 – Report No. LLS15-011 – Questions on the Ballot – 2014 Municipal Election
Results



Attachment 1
Customer and Legislative Services
Town Clerk
905-727-3123
info@e-aurora.ca

Town of Aurora
1 Municipal Drive,
Box 1000, Aurora, ON L4G 6J1

DELEGATION REQUEST

Requests for delegation status, any written submissions and background information for consideration by Council or committees of Council must be submitted to the Clerk's office by 4:30 P.M. ON THE MONDAY PRIOR TO THE REQUESTED MEETING

PLEASE PRINT

COUNCIL/COMMITTEE/ADVISORY COMMITTEE DATE: April 20/10

SUBJECT: WARD SYSTEM

NAME: GRAHAM WILCOX

ADDRESS: TEMPERANCE ST.

Street Address

Aurora L4G

Town/City

Postal Code

PHONE: HOME: _____ BUSINESS: _____

FAX NO.: _____ E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____

DO YOU REQUIRE ANY ACCESSIBILITY ACCOMMODATION No

NAME OF GROUP OR PERSON(S) BEING REPRESENTED (if applicable)

BRIEF STATEMENT OF ISSUE OR PURPOSE OF DEPUTATION

Comments regarding the question of whether to place a referendum on the ballot re a ward system.

Personal information on this form is collected under the legal authority of the Municipal Act, as amended. The information is collected and maintained for the purpose of creating a record that is available to the general public, pursuant to Section 27 of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Questions about this collection should be directed to the Town Clerk, Town of Aurora 1 Municipal Drive Box 1000 Aurora, ON L4G 6J1 Telephone 905 727-3123.



'10 APR 15 10:14 AM 44s



**TOWN OF AURORA
GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT**

No.CLS10-013

SUBJECT: *Possible Ward Question on the Ballot*
FROM: *John D. Leach, Director of Customer & Legislative Services/Town Clerk*
DATE: *April 20, 2010*

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Report CLS10-13 be received for information; and
THAT Council determine whether it wants to proceed to put a question on the ballot;
and
THAT should Council determine that a question is to be placed on the ballot, the
wording of the question be provided.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to comply with a Council directive to compile comments received from the public at meetings held to receive input from the public on the matter of a potential question on the ballot respecting a ward system for Aurora.

BACKGROUND

Council at its meeting held on February 2, 2010 considered a report on the process necessary to place a question on the ballot for the October 25, 2010 municipal election. As noted above Council directed that a series of meetings be held to inform the public and to receive input from the public regarding a possible ward system for Aurora. These meetings were advertised for a number of weeks in the Noticeboard and on the Town's website. As directed by Council, a Public Open Forum was held at the Town Hall on March 31, 2010. The meeting was attended by approximately twelve members of the public as well as five members of Council. A Discussion Paper was presented followed by a Question and Answer session. Some comments were submitted (Attachment 1). The Statutory Town Hall Meeting was held on April 6, 2010. No one from the public came forward to speak on the matter. In addition, a number of comments were received from the public by way of the Town's website or email to the Clerk (Attachment 2).

April 20, 2010

- 2 -

Report No. CLS10-013

COMMENTS

Should Council wish to proceed to place a question on the ballot with respect to a ward system, the wording of the question would need to be finalized and direction provided to bring forward a by-law for consideration at the Council Meeting of April 27, 2010.

The following is suggested wording for a question:

"Are you in favour of a ward system of representation for the Council of the Town of Aurora?"

ALTERNATIVE(S) TO THE RECOMENDATIONS

Council has the option of not proceeding with placing a question on the ballot.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost of placing a question on the ballot would be minimal.

CONCLUSIONS

It would be appropriate and necessary for direction to be provided on whether a question respecting wards is to be placed on the ballot and that wording of any question be finalized so that a by-law could be presented to Council on April 27, 2010 for its consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment #1 – Comments from the public from the Open House Meeting
Attachment #2 – Comments from the public submitted to the Town's website

PRE-SUBMISSION REVIEW

Chief Administrative Officer – April 15, 2010

Prepared by: John D. Leach, Director of Customer and Legislative Services ext. 4771



John D. Leach
Director of Customer & Legislative Services



Neil Garbe
Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENT #1



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: GORDON BARNES

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE) PERSONAL

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: CATHERINE AVE

CITY/TOWN: AURORA PROVINCE: ON

POSTAL CODE: L4G PHONE: _____
CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS gabarnes

COMMENTS: _____



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: REBECCA BEATON

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: HOLMAN CRES,

CITY/TOWN: AURORA PROVINCE: ONT.

POSTAL CODE: 129 CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS mrebeccabeaton@

COMMENTS: long time resident & I am
absolutely against it



ATTENDANCE FORM

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: Roger Clowater

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: myself as Candidate
(IF APPLICABLE) for Mayor of Aurora

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: Autumn Way

CITY/TOWN: Aurora PROVINCE: ON

POSTAL CODE: L4G 4P1 CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS: rogerclowater.

COMMENTS: I would like to have the list
of references consulted.



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: David Heard
GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: N/A
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: Ransom St.
CITY/TOWN: Aurora PROVINCE: Ont.
POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____
E-MAIL ADDRESS: astepintimeaurora

COMMENTS: _____
Would like to see list of
resources for research.
ie presentation.



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: MARIE LEONE

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: ADLEY COURT

CITY/TOWN: AURORA PROVINCE: ON

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS LEONEML

COMMENTS: Please ASDP- we need representation
currently none available.



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: FRANK LEONE

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

N/A

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: HADLEY CRT

CITY/TOWN: AURORA PROVINCE: ONT

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

COMMENTS: PLEASE IMPLEMENT A-S.A.P.
LONG OVERDUE, AURORA IS
NOT A SMALL TOWN ANY
MORE.



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: _____

JULIE NALAN

**GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED:
(IF APPLICABLE)** _____

N/A

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: _____

CITY/TOWN: _____

PROVINCE: _____

POSTAL CODE: _____

CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

COMMENTS: _____



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: JOHN SANDERS

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: WENDERLY DR.

CITY/TOWN: AURORA PROVINCE: ONT.

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

COMMENTS: ~~System for Aurora would~~
~~not work for all.~~

LEAVE AS IS. NOT LARGE ENOUGH FOR
WARD SYSTEM. PREFER ALL COUNCIL AND MAYOR
TO REPRESENT ME.



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: Rhonda Sanders

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: Wenderly Dr

CITY/TOWN: Aurora PROVINCE: Ont

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

COMMENTS: The question should not go on
the ballot. There should not be
a ward system in Aurora. A ward
system would 1) detract from a sense of commu
2) Aurora is not big enough in population or
geographically for such a system.
3) there would be more division & fighting in council



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: BRIAN TRUSSLER

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: Bantff Drive

CITY/TOWN: Aurora PROVINCE: ONTARIO

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS briantrussler

COMMENTS: _____



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: CAROLYNE TRUSSLER

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: Banff Drive

CITY/TOWN: Aurora PROVINCE: Ontario

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: 5 _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS carolynetrussler@ _____

COMMENTS: _____



ATTENDANCE FORM

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010
POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION
WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA**

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

FIRST & LAST NAME: GRAHAM WAIDE

GROUP/ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED: _____
(IF APPLICABLE)

CONTACT ADDRESS

NUMBER & STREET: TEMPERANCE ST

CITY/TOWN: AURORA PROVINCE: ONT

POSTAL CODE: _____ CONTACT NUMBER: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS g.waide

COMMENTS: _____

GIVEN AURORA'S POPULATION & GEOGRAPHIC
SIZE WE DO NOT NEED A WARD SYSTEM

**INDIVIDUALS IN ATTENDANCE AT
PUBLIC OPEN FORUM - MARCH 31, 2010**

POTENTIAL BALLOT QUESTION – WARD SYSTEM FOR AURORA

RESIDENTS	THEIR COMMENTS
Gordon Barnes	None
Rebecca Beaton	Absolutely against it
Roger Clowater	Would like to have the list of references consulted
David Heard	Would like to see list of resources for research re: presentation
Marie Leone	We need representation asap. Currently none is available
Frank Leone	Please implement asap. Long overdue. Aurora is not a small Town anymore
Julie Nolan	None
John Sanders	Lease as is. Not large enough for ward system. Prefer all Council and Mayor to represent me
Rhonda Sanders	The question should not go on the ballot. There should not be a ward system in Aurora. A ward system would: 1) distract from a sense of community. 2) Aurora is not big enough in population or geographically for such a system. 3) there would be more division & fighting in Council
Brian Trussler	None
Carolyne Trussler	None
Graham Wride	Given Aurora's population & geographic size we do not need a ward system

ATTACHMENT #2

From: support@protocolis.ca
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 4:50 PM
To: Dass, Chandra
Subject: Town of Aurora Website - Ward System Feedback

Name = Gary Johnson

Feedback = An Open Letter to the Public Meeting on Implementing a Ward System

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the March 31 public meeting, due a schedule conflict.

I have been an advocate for a ward system in Aurora for the last two elections. I have been in contact with the former mayor as well as the current mayor, urging them to begin the process in time for each election. Rather than Council making a decision, it was always referred to a General Government Committee who never responded positively.

While I am pleased that a Ward System is being discussed, I am frustrated with the lack of decision making by Council. A Ward System is not some new radical idea that no other jurisdiction has ever tried before. The movement on this is so glacial that if even approved by referendum, it won't be in place until 2014. Most communities of any sizeable population have a ward system.

With the kind of residential development that has taken place in recent years where the population is well on its way to 45,000, Aurora needs a ward system.

And here's why! I don't live in the downtown area. No politician running for council has ever knocked on my door. The sum total of outreach by those running for council is a few post cards in the mail. Going to the all-candidates meeting is like going to a cattle-call.

I like to participate in the democratic process by going out to vote. As a voter, I was faced with a list 20 council candidates on the last ballot. I haven't heard of most of them. I don't know what they stand for. So literally, I'm voting on the basis of eenie, meeney, miney, moe. This is no way to elect a council!

Little wonder, turnouts for municipal elections are at an all-time low - thirty-eight percent in Aurora in the last election. Ward Systems are not a panacea for this situation but it is certainly better than what we've got now. At least with a ward system, you are more likely capable of making a judgement as to who will best represent your ward and the town.

It's time the Town of Aurora became more democratically inclusive!

From: support@protocolis.ca
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 7:59 PM
To: Dass, Chandra
Subject: Town of Aurora Website - Ward System Feedback

Name = Frank & Marie Leone

Feedback = We are definaely in favour of the ward system, and it has been a long time coming. Having councillors at large may have been a good system when Aurora was 4 corners but we have grown. The current lot of councillors are primarily from the south end of Aurora and seem to have no interest in any other area of Town. If a resident has a question or a concern there is no one to talk to that knows or cares about your area. You might say that we could go to any one of them, but not one of them has ever shown an interest in our community. They don't campaign, they don't try to get to know the community, and in the years that we have lived here we haven't even see a campaign flyer or lawn sign during the elections. They don't care because they rely on name recognition or where they place on the alphabet to get elected.

From: support@protocolis.ca
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 5:26 PM
To: Dass, Chandra
Subject: Town of Aurora Website - Ward System Feedback

Name = Graham Wride

Feedback = I do not feel a ward system is necessary for the town of Aurora. I like the idea of being represented by 8 councillors rather than just 1. Our current system enables us a larger choice of candidates. I think a ward system can tend to split a town rather than making it stronger. Finally, I think Aurora is simply too small both in population and geographically to consider dividing it into wards.

From: support@protocolis.ca
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 7:13 PM
To: Dass, Chandra
Subject: Town of Aurora Website - Ward System Feedback

Name = John Clement

Feedback = I do not agree with Ward system for Aurora.
Appreciate being able to choose between Councillors to contact when there is a need.

Appreciate having more than one Councillor feeling responsive to group needs regardless of the impact on any particular sub-area (Ward) of Town.

I'd rather the Councillors all be thinking of Aurora as a whole.

From: support@protocolis.ca
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 9:45 PM
To: Dass, Chandra
Subject: Town of Aurora Website - Ward System Feedback

Name = Irene Clement

Feedback = I do not agree with a Ward system for Aurora. The town is not so large that Councillors need to focus on only 1 part. Committees enable focus on various issues. I would like Councillors to represent all of Town, to have an overall view of what is best for the Town as a whole and not just of one section. It is good to be able to select the best candidates.
Thank you.

From: support@protocolis.ca
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2010 12:14 AM
To: Dass, Chandra
Subject: Town of Aurora Website - Ward System Feedback

Name = Gordon Barnes

Feedback = I am waiting to hear at least two people who can speak so passionately about the benefits of the ward system that a hundred rush to sign a petition to institute it.

In the absence of that, I suggest that Council, and the rest of us, concentrate on issues, over which, the October election should be fought.

Attachment 2



**TOWN OF AURORA
COUNCIL REPORT**

No. LLS14-013

SUBJECT: *Determination of Two Questions on the Ballot*

FROM: *Warren Mar, Director of Legal & Legislative Services/Town Solicitor*

DATE: *March 24, 2014*

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report No. LLS14-013 be received; and

THAT Council provide direction on the wording of two questions to be placed on the ballot for the October 27, 2014 municipal election as proposed in Report No. LLS14-013; and

THAT the Clerk be directed to provide at least 10 days' notice to residents and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing of the Town's intention to pass an appropriate by-law containing the recommended questions at the April 22, 2014 meeting of Council.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council direction on the wording of the questions and on the process to be followed for the questions to be placed on the ballot for the October 27, 2014 municipal election.

BACKGROUND

On February 12, 2013, Council considered a Notice of Motion respecting two questions to be placed on the ballot for the upcoming regular municipal election. Further to that consideration, staff presented Report No. CLS13-030 to Council, outlining the process to be followed and requirements to place questions on the ballot.

At the Council meeting on November 26, 2013, Council adopted the following resolution:

"THAT Council place two questions on the ballot for the next municipal election, one relating to a ward system for the Town of Aurora, and the other pertaining to reducing the size of Council."

March 24, 2014

- 2 -

Report No. LLS14-013

COMMENTS

Definitions

In order to properly consider the matter, Council and the public should be clear on the use of the terms “ward vote” and “general vote”.

A “general vote” can be defined as a method of election whereby electors vote for the candidate(s) of their choice to serve on Council, regardless of where the elector’s qualifying address is in Aurora. For example, under the current “general vote” system in Aurora (also known as the “at large” system), each elector may vote for up to eight (8) Councillors and the Mayor.

A “ward vote” can be defined as a method of election whereby electors, whose qualifying address is within a specific geographical area of Aurora, vote for the candidate of their choice to serve on Council to represent such specific geographical area of Aurora. For example, in a “ward vote” system, an elector can only vote for a Councillor who is registered to run in the elector’s ward.

In a “ward vote” system, every elector in Aurora, regardless of their qualifying address, is entitled to vote for the Mayor. This is because, in accordance with section 217(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* (the “Municipal Act”), the Mayor must always be elected by general vote.

Legislative Overview – *Municipal Act, 2001*

In accordance with section 11 of the Municipal Act, lower tier municipalities such as Aurora have the broad authority to, among other items, pass by-laws respecting the governance structure of the municipality and its local boards. This means that Council has the broad authority to determine how Councillors are elected, and the size of Council.

Section 217(1) of the Municipal Act lays down a number of rules upon which Council can determine its composition:

“217. (1) Without limiting sections 9, 10 and 11, those sections authorize a local municipality to change the composition of its council subject to the following rules:

- 1. There shall be a minimum of five members, one of whom shall be the head of council.*
- 2. The members of council shall be elected in accordance with the Municipal Elections Act, 1996.*
- 3. The head of council shall be elected by general vote.*

March 24, 2014

- 3 -

Report No. LLS14-013

4. The members, other than the head of council, shall be elected by general vote or wards or by any combination of general vote and wards.

5. The representation of a local municipality on the council of an upper-tier municipality shall not be affected by the by-law of the local municipality under this section.

(2) Repealed: 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 92 (2).

(3) A by-law described in this section does not come into force until the day the new council is organized,

*(a) after the first regular election following the passing of the by-law;
or*

(b) if the by-law is passed in the year of a regular election before voting day, after the second regular election following the passing of the by-law.

(4) The regular election held immediately before the coming into force of a by-law described in this section shall be conducted as if the by-law was already in force.

(5) Nothing in this section authorizes a change in the term of office of a member of council.”

Accordingly, should there be a positive binding result (as explained below) in the referendum regarding ward vote v. general vote or reducing the number of Councillors, any such by-law would be expected to take effect in time for the 2018 regular election.

Legislative Overview – *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*

Sections 8, 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3 of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* (the “Elections Act”) govern the conduct of submitting questions to electors on a ballot. A copy of those sections are attached hereto for Council’s reference.

Sections 8 and 8.1 of the Elections Act

Subsection 8(1) of the Elections Act permits the Council of a municipality to pass a by-law to submit questions to its electors with respect to: (a) a proposed by-law requiring their assent; (b) a question not otherwise authorized by law, but within Council’s jurisdiction; or (c) a question, the wording of which is established by a statute or a regulation under a statute.

March 24, 2014

- 4 -

Report No. LLS14-013

In the case of questions regarding the method of election to select Councillors, and the number of Councillors on Council, this falls under subsection 8(1)(b) of the Elections Act. Accordingly, such questions must comply with subsection 8.1(2) of the Elections Act, which states that any approved referendum question adopted by by-law must comply with the following rules:

- “1. It shall concern a matter within the jurisdiction of the municipality.*
- 2. Despite rule 1, it shall not concern a matter which has been prescribed by the Minister as a matter of provincial interest.*
- 3. It shall be clear, concise and neutral.*
- 4. It shall be capable of being answered in the affirmative or the negative and the only permitted answers to the question are “yes” or “no”.*”

In accordance with Regulation 425/00 to the Elections Act, matters which have been prescribed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (the “Minister”) as a matter of provincial interest and to which a municipality cannot ask a question include:

- any matter for which the municipality does not have the authority to implement all aspects of the results of the question;
- any matter for which the municipality requires an action by the Province of Ontario in order to implement the results of the question;
- “gaming sites” as defined in the *Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation Act, 1999*; and
- municipal restructuring, including the consideration, investigation, discussion, and negotiation of municipal restructuring (“municipal restructuring” is defined as annexing part of a municipality or geographic area; amalgamating municipalities; separating/joining a lower-tier municipality from/to an upper-tier municipality; dissolving all or part of a municipality; or incorporating an area as a municipality even though the area is already part of an existing municipality).

None of these restrictions apply in this situation.

Subsection 8.1(1) of the Elections Act also requires that the two questions being considered for submission to electors must be passed by by-law, and such by-law:

“(a) shall be passed at least 180 days before voting day in the election at which it is intended to submit the question to the electors;

(b) cannot be amended after the last date referred to in clause (a); and

March 24, 2014

- 5 -

Report No. LLS14-013

(c) despite clause (b), can be repealed on or before nomination day and, if the election does not include an election for an office, on or before the 31st day before voting day.”

In accordance with clause 8.1(1)(a) of the Elections Act, in order for the questions to be included on the ballot for the October 27, 2014 general election, the by-law needs to be passed by April 30, 2014.

In accordance with subsection 8.1(3) of the Elections Act, the Clerk shall give at least ten (10) days notice to the public and the Minister regarding the Town’s intention to pass a by-law placing questions on a ballot. The last day such notice can be given is April 17, 2014. Subsection 8.1(3) also indicates that one public meeting must be held to consider the matter (i.e., the questions to be placed on the ballot regarding the size of Council and method of election of Councillors).

In accordance with subsection 8.1(4) of the Elections Act, the Clerk shall give notice to the public and the Minister within fifteen (15) days after the by-law has been passed. The last day for such notice is May 15, 2014.

The contents of the required notices in subsections 8.1(3) and (4) are contained in subsection 8.1(5) of the Elections Act.

Under subsection 8.1(6) of the Elections Act, a by-law to submit a question to the electors may be appealed to the Chief Electoral Officer of the Province of Ontario within twenty (20) days after the Clerk has given notice of the passage of the by-law. The appeal can be based on the grounds that the question(s) are not clear, concise, or neutral, or that the question(s) are not capable of being answered in the affirmative or the negative with a simple “yes” or “no”. If the Chief Electoral Officer allows an appeal, he or she may make an order amending the by-law or directing the municipality to amend the by-law in the manner ordered. The last day to file an appeal is June 4, 2014.

Section 8.2 of the Elections Act

Under subsection 8.2(1) of the Elections Act, the results of a question authorized by a by-law are binding on the municipality if at least 50% of eligible electors in the municipality vote on the question AND more than 50% of the votes on the question are in favour of those results.

The implication of subsection 8.2(1) is that the results of a question authorized by a by-law are not binding on a municipality if less than 50% of eligible electors in the municipality vote on the question. As such, if voter turnout is less than 50% of the eligible electors, then the results of the referendum are not binding on the municipality, and Council would be free to proceed on the matter as it chooses.

March 24, 2014

- 6 -

Report No. LLS14-013

Section 8.3 of the Elections Act

Under clause 8.3(1)(a) of the Elections Act, if the results of a question authorized by a by-law are binding on the municipality in the affirmative, then the municipality shall do everything in its power to implement the results of the question in a timely manner (this means, pursuant to subsection 8.3(2), placing the necessary action before Council between 14 and 180 days after voting day).

Finally, under clause 8.3(1)(b) of the Elections Act, if the results of a question authorized by a by-law are binding on the municipality in the negative, the municipality shall not do anything within its jurisdiction to implement the matter which was the subject of the question for a period of four (4) years following voting day.

Running in a Ward

Pursuant to section 256 of the Municipal Act and section 17 of the Elections Act, if a municipality has wards, a qualified and eligible candidate can run in any single ward a candidate chooses. A candidate does not have to live in a particular ward in order to be its Councillor. However, if a candidate runs in a ward that they do not reside in, the candidate will not be able to vote in that ward. Additionally, having a campaign office in a ward where a candidate would not be otherwise eligible to vote does not make a candidate eligible to vote in such ward.

Supporting or Opposing a Question on the Ballot

Section 39.1 of the Elections Act provides for political activity in support of or in opposition to a question on the ballot, as follows:

- Where an individual, corporation or trade union proposes to incur expenses with respect to a question placed on a ballot under clause 8(1)(b) or (c) of the Elections Act, they are required to register with the Clerk of the municipality responsible for conducting the election with respect to the question.
- Municipalities and other public bodies cannot register to support or oppose a question and may not incur expenses associated with respect to a question unless such expenses are required or authorized by the Elections Act. Accordingly, any direct or indirect financial support extended to an individual or organization by a municipality or other public body would contravene the Elections Act.
- Registrations cannot be filed earlier than the day the by-law to submit the question to the electors is passed and no later than nomination day.
- As soon as possible after receiving a notice of registration, the Clerk shall examine each notice and shall certify the registration by signing it, or reject it.

March 24, 2014

- 7 -

Report No. LLS14-013

- Where the notice of registration has been rejected, the Clerk shall give notice of the rejection as soon as possible to the individual, corporation or trade union.
- A Clerk's decision to certify or reject a notice of registration is final.

Pursuant to section 5 of Regulation 101/97 to the Elections Act, and 76(4) of the Elections Act, the maximum amount that could be spent on supporting or opposing a question on the ballot is 50 cents for each elector entitled to vote on a question (estimated to be approximately \$17,265). Should two questions be placed on the ballot, there would be a maximum amount of \$17,265 that could be spent on each question.

Proposed Questions

The suggested wording for each of the two questions is as follows:

"Are you in favour of electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote?"

"Are you in favour of reducing the number of Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, from eight (8) councillors to six (6) councillors?"

The City of Oshawa held a special Council meeting on February 26, 2014 to confirm a question on the ballot regarding whether Oshawa should return to electing councillors by wards. At its meeting, Oshawa Council adopted nearly identical wording for the question regarding ward voting.

Staff believe that the wording of the above questions are clear, concise, and neutral, and can be answered by either voting "yes" or "no", thereby meeting the requirements of rules 3 and 4 in subsection 8.1(2) of the Elections Act. However, Council is free to choose its own wording for the questions, as long as it meets the required rules.

Based on the previous direction of Council, the two questions are not dependent on one another. This means that a positive binding result is not required from both questions in order for Council to implement the result of a question. For example, should there be a positive binding result to reduce the number of councillors, but a rejection of ward voting, Council would still be required to move forward with reducing the number of councillors for the 2018 regular election, to be elected by general Town-wide vote.

Advertising

Advertising of the questions on the ballot will be built into the regular advertisements for the election, including a dedicated space on the Notice Board for 2014. Additional information will be placed on the Town's website at no additional direct cost, and the information will be circulated on social media. A media release may also be distributed

March 24, 2014

- 8 -

Report No. LLS14-013

regarding the questions on the ballot.

Staff will also place a “questions and answers” section regarding the questions on the ballot in the 2014 election webpage. This will also include the definition of a ward vote and general vote as defined in this report. Non-partisan information about the questions on the ballot will also be made available at each voting location in order to inform electors about the matter and ensure that they are familiar with the terms.

Implementation

Should Council be required to implement a ward system as a result of the referendum, then further studies and reports from staff, together with input from Council and the public, will be needed to finalize issues regarding wards, such as establishing ward boundaries. The question on the ballot regarding selecting Councillors by ward vote does not address where ward boundaries may be.

The implementation of reducing the number of Councillors from eight (8) to six (6) will still require further information from staff, but is somewhat more straightforward to implement than the establishment of ward boundaries.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN

Proceeding with a by-law to put two questions on the ballot for the 2014 municipal election achieves the objective of ***strengthening the fabric of our community*** by identifying new formats, methods and technologies to effectively and regularly engage the community.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Council could select alternative wording for either one or both of the questions to be placed on the ballot.
2. Council could receive the report for information and take no further action.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Staff have met with Elections Systems & Software (ES&S) Canada, the provider of the voting tabulators to determine if there would be any additional cost related to adding two questions on the ballot. According to ES&S, there would be no additional cost. Additional training would be incorporated into the training program for temporary staff who will be assisting with voting on election day. Printing costs for materials related to informing electors about the questions on the ballot are expected to be minimal, and can be incorporated within the election budget.

March 24, 2014

- 9 -

Report No. LLS14-013

CONCLUSIONS

Council has directed that two questions be placed on the ballot for the October 27, 2014 municipal election. Staff has reported on the process necessary to carry this out. Suggested wording for the questions has been provided herein, which requires Council to confirm the wording of the questions to be placed on the ballot, and directing that notice be provided in accordance with the Elections Act in order to pass the by-law.

PREVIOUS REPORTS

Report No. CLS13-030 – Question on the Ballot, dated November 13, 2013.
Report No. LLS14-010 – Two Questions on the Ballot, dated March 4, 2014.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Report No. CLS13-030 – Question on the Ballot, dated November 13, 2013.
2. Sections 8, 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3 of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*.

PRE-SUBMISSION REVIEW

Neil Garbe, Chief Administrative Officer – March 20, 2014.

Prepared by: Warren Mar, Director of Legal & Legislative Services/Town Solicitor – extension 4758.



Warren Mar
Director of Legal & Legislative
Services/Town Solicitor



Neil Garbe
Chief Administrative Officer



Attachment 1

**TOWN OF AURORA
GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT No. CLS13-030**

SUBJECT: *Question on the Ballot*

FROM: *John D. Leach, Director of Customer & Legislative Services/Town Clerk*

DATE: *November 5, 2013*

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT report CLS13-030 be received for information.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide Council with a report as directed.

BACKGROUND

Council, at its meeting held February 12, 2013 considered a Motion for which notice had been given respecting Council representation (Attachment # 1). The matter was referred to staff for a report.

COMMENTS

In 1991 the Valhalla Community Association petitioned the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for a ward system for The Town of Aurora. The Board dismissed the petition and stated the following in its decision "The board is loathe to impose on a municipality a change in its electoral system unless there are very clear and compelling reasons for so doing. Evidence of this kind was not forthcoming at this hearing. For the foregoing reasons therefore, the petition is refused."(Attached) More recently the matter of a ward system was considered in 2006 and again in 2010. In 2006 Council considered putting a question on the ballot. The matter was considered at General Committee on April 18, 2006 at which time three delegates had filed a delegation form in advance and a total of nine people spoke at the meeting. On April 25, 2006 at Council, three delegates spoke. A motion to put a question on the ballot at the next election was defeated.

In 2010 Council directed that the public be consulted respecting a question on the ballot regarding wards. A public Open Forum was held on March 31, 2010 where twelve residents and five members of Council attended.

November 5, 2013

- 2 -

Report No. CLS13-030

A statutory meeting published as a “Statutory Town Hall Meeting” was held on April 6, 2010 at which time no person spoke and six comments had been printed on the Towns website. The matter was again considered at a Special General Committee meeting on April 20, 2010 at which time there were seven delegations. At the following Council meeting on April 27, 2010 Council decided not to put a question on the ballot.

Council may pass by-laws to place questions on the municipal ballot subject to notice requirements and provided the matter is within the jurisdiction of Council. The question(s) must be clear, concise and neutral and capable of being considered in the affirmative or the negative. The only permitted answers to the question(s) are yes or no. The questions respecting wards and the reduction in Council size are both within the jurisdiction of Council.

A by-law to put a question on the ballot must be passed at least 180 days before voting day for the election for which it is intended to submit a question to the electors. For the October 27, 2014 municipal election a by-law would have to be passed no later than April 27, 2014. In addition, notice of intention to pass such a by-law must be provided at least 10 days prior to the passing of the by-law and at least one public meeting must be held to consider the matter. The Clerk must provide notice of passage of any by-law within fifteen days of passage. There is an appeal period of 20 days after notice of passage is provided. The appeal is to the Chief Electoral Officer of Ontario and relates to whether the question is clear concise and neutral and capable of being answered by a yes or no. In addition, Policy # 62 Notice Provision Policy would require notice that the above matters are to be considered, to be provided for a period of more than two weeks.

With respect to the size of Council it has varied over the years as set out below:

1863 – 5
1888 – 12
1899 – 7
1907 – 8
1944 – 9

The following chart shows the sizes of lower tier municipalities in York Region:

Aurora – 9
East Gwillimbury – 5
Georgina – 7
King – 7
Markham – 12
Newmarket – 9
Richmond Hill – 9
Vaughan – 9
Whitchurch Stouffville - 7

November 5, 2013

- 3 -

Report No. CLS13-030

Should a question be placed on the ballot it would be binding on the municipality in the event that at least 50% of the electors actually vote and a majority of those vote in the affirmative.

The following chart shows the voter turnout at recent elections:

2010 – 38.5%
2006 – 38%
2003 – 33%
2000 – 41%
1997 – 33.8%
1994 – 40%

Should this occur the municipality would have to do everything in its power for a period of four years following election day to implement the measure. Conversely if this requirement is not met the municipality shall not do anything to implement the measure for four years following voting day. Consequently, in the event that a question(s) are placed on the ballot respecting wards or reducing the size of Council and requirements were not met, Council would be precluded from considering the matter for four years following election day.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN

Objective 5 of the Strategic Plan speaks to strengthening the fabric of our community by identifying new formats, methods and technologies to effectively and regularly engage the community.

ALTERNATIVE(S) TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Council could receive the Motion for information and take no action.
2. Council could adopt the Motion setting in motion the process of placing one or both of the questions on the ballot for the next municipal election.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial implications of placing a question(s) on the ballot would be minimal printing costs.

CONCLUSIONS

Council considered a Notice of Motion with respect to placing two questions on the ballot one relating to a ward system for Aurora and the other pertaining to reducing the size of Council. The motion was deferred pending a staff report. Direction is requested.

November 5, 2013

- 4 -

Report No. CLS13-030


ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Extract from Council Meeting 13-04 of Tuesday, February 12, 2013
Attachment 2 – Ontario Municipal Board Report

PRE-SUBMISSION REVIEW

Executive Leadership Team – October 23, 2013

Prepared by: Cindy Janzen, Manager of Legislative Services/Deputy Clerk, ext. 4217



John D. Leach
**Director of Customer and Legislative
Services/Town Clerk**



Neil Garbe
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment 1



**EXTRACT FROM
COUNCIL MEETING 13-04 OF
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2013**

X NOTICES OF MOTION/MOTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

(ii) Motions for Which Notice Has Been Given

**(a) Councillor Pirri
Re: Referendum on Representation**

Moved by Councillor Pirri

Seconded by Councillor Abel

WHEREAS Aurora Town Council actively seeks input from residents on a variety of matters; and

WHEREAS the question of adopting a ward system in the municipality of Aurora was prevalent during the 2006 and 2010 municipal elections; and

WHEREAS providing access and allowing participation in the political process is a means to engage individuals; and

WHEREAS the decision of how an individual is to be represented at a municipal level should be theirs to make; and

WHEREAS there is a distinct change in the population and geographic location of individuals within the Town of Aurora; and

WHEREAS the majority of the Town of Aurora will be built out by the 2018 municipal election.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT staff be directed to place two referendum questions on the ballot of the 2014 municipal elections; and

THAT staff be directed to perform any duties associated with placing these questions on a ballot as dictated by the *Municipal Elections Act*; and

THAT the first question pertain to reducing the number of councillors from 8 to 6, commencing the 2018 term of office; and

THAT the second question pertain to the introduction of a ward system commencing the 2018 term of office; and

THAT a draft of these questions be presented to a General Committee meeting during the first agenda cycle of the month of April.

Moved by Councillor Pirri

Seconded by Councillor Ballard

THAT this item be referred to staff for a report in September.

CARRIED

Attachment 2

RE TOWN OF AURORA WARD DIVISION

129

Re Town of Aurora Ward Division

[Indexed as: Aurora (Town) Ward Division (Re)]

J.A. Wheeler, Q.C., and C.M. Millar February 12, 1991.

Municipal reorganization — Division into wards — Present councillors elected at large — Consolidated, unified and cohesive community — Services provided on single community basis — No widespread support for change — No evidence of sectorization, geographically, ethnically or socially to justify separation for council representation — Application for division of town into wards, dismissed.

Statutes referred to

Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 302, s. 13

APPLICATION under s. 13(3) of the *Municipal Act* for division of a town into wards (M 900112).

L. Michelson, student-at-law, for Alan Majauska.
P.W. Thompson, for Town of Aurora.

J.A. WHEELER, Q.C., MEMBER (orally):—As mentioned before we recessed, the board has deliberated the issues at every opportunity in full appreciation of the concerns expressed by those supportive of the proposed ward system and more latterly, of course, this afternoon, having as well close regard for the evidence given on behalf of the town in opposition to the petition.

The petition comes before the board pursuant to s. 13 of the *Municipal Act*, R.S.O. 1980, c. 302, primarily at the instance of Alan Majauska, who is the president of the Valhalla Community Association, an area sectored in the northeast corner of the urbanized portion of the municipality. The petition is closely supported by the Tamarac Residents Association which, through Mary McKeigan, affirmed the testimony given by Alan Majauska.

The board has had careful regard for their concerns which, particularly considered in the light of the evidence received this afternoon, seem more related to dissatisfaction with the performance of some councillors if only because they may have voted contrary to the wishes of the petitioners. That, in itself, should not be reason to change the system that has been the basis for town government for a good number of years, in any event at least since regionalization. Of course, there are other reasons given in evidence and revealed in ex. 2, the petitioners brief, but for the purposes of this decision unnecessary to identify.

The board has had particularly close regard for the evidence of Jim Comeau, a Bradford/West Gwillimbury councillor who, as a consequence of Bill 177, participated in all necessary deliberations surrounding Bill 177 (creating this municipality) including the

creation and boundaries of appropriate ward divisions. He cited two fundamental reasons for the board to consider in rendering its decision. Namely, that where a proposed councillor or candidate for office seeks office on the basis of the more restricted electorate, election cost is much more manageable as compared with canvassing for votes or in respect of issues across a whole municipality. Generally speaking, the board would agree. The board has more difficulty agreeing with the other assertion that it is more difficult for a candidate to meet everyone within the electorate which, in the case of Aurora, takes in the whole town, than on a ward basis.

Mounted against the petitioners' reasons for ward division was the collective evidence, particularly of John West, the Mayor of Aurora, George Timpson, a former mayor and present councillor, and Robert Williams, Associate Professor of Political Science at Waterloo University, who volunteered his services to the town in opposition to the petition. Professor Williams reported on this issue in ex. 15.

In light of the hour, the board does not see it necessary to review in any great detail the evidence presented by each of these three witnesses except only to the degree necessary to support the board's conclusions in the following respects.

As the evidence of the town showed, for the most part the petitioners originate from two definite areas of the municipality, namely the Valhalla and the Tamarac areas, the latter in the southwest section of the urbanized portion of town. There is, on the evidence and from all appearances, little "at-large" interest in a division of the municipality into wards. Certainly, if the attendance at this hearing is any indication, the board would be inclined to agree with the observations made, in this regard, by Mayor West and Councillor Timpson. There is no apparent ground swell of interest or demand for change in the system. That, in itself, could very well determine the outcome of this application but the board would like to observe that, from all indications particularly as described to the board by the two members of council, the existing system seems to work very well, despite favourable reports concerning ward systems in effect in some other municipalities including some created by Act of the provincial legislature.

Aurora, throughout its history, at least in so far as this decision is concerned, has been a consolidated, unified, cohesive municipality, and has never, prior to the petition, apparently been perceived as being in need of a change in the electoral system. The evidence has revealed no sectorization, geographically, ethnically, or socially, within the municipality tempting separation for the purposes of having representation on council.

RE TOWN OF AURORA WARD DIVISION

181

a The report of Robert Williams pretty well sums the evidence up in terms of what the board has heard in this regard. Other than the views expressed in the 19 briefs set out in ex. 2 and those who testified in support of some of these briefs, there was no real, objective, compelling reason to change the system in Aurora.

b Earlier in the hearing, the board considered whether the absence of voter interest is only apparent or whether it is real and the members conjectured between themselves whether the best way of making a final determination in this regard may be by going to the electorate in a referendum at the forthcoming election. Having heard the evidence presented by the town, the board is quite confident that even if the matter went on the ballot, it is likely that the result would be no different from what the evidence shows. The board is now convinced that it should not postpone its decision pending the results of such a referendum.

c This decision may seem somewhat rambling but it is made in full appreciation of the need to make a decision as soon as possible and once the board has made up its mind on this matter, there is no need to adjourn for any lengthier a time than we did in order to convey to you present here today its decision on this matter.

d In summing up this decision, the board will now have regard for some of the points cited to the board in argument by counsel for the town, Mr. Thompson. He divided his submission into five subjects and in respect to each of his five submissions, the board finds uncontroverted support in the evidence. He had regard for the fact that this was indeed a single, cohesive community whose services have been provided, from all appearances, consistently on a single community basis such as a library, a fire hall, a cemetery, etc. (I apologize for the reference to the cemetery but it may have relevance.) He also made submissions on the fact that there has been nothing in evidence demonstrating any historical inequity with regard to distribution and representation in respect of the electorate and for that matter from the evidence supplied, namely e exs. 12, 13 and 14 respectively, being area maps showing the distribution of candidates and elected representatives over the past three elections, there is some support for this submission.

f Another submission and the last to be referred to in this decision, related to the fact that there appears to be no widespread support for the change and for the reasons earlier given the board concurs in Mr. Thompson's conclusions in this regard. Despite paying close attention to the evidence provided by those in support of the petition, the board is at some loss to appreciate how the eight members of the present council, nine including the mayor, can be any more accessible than they are at present. Having h

regard for the evidence presented by the mayor, the board can foresee little additional opportunity, despite the submissions of the petitioners, to bring about any greater degree of accountability in the Town of Aurora than is now the case.

Although the minutes of council filed as ex. 5 and as exs. 7 to 11, inclusive, may not show the degree of deliberation given to the issue by council, the board is confident that the petition was carefully and thoughtfully considered by council. This may be borne out by the appearances of the two members of council mentioned herein who gave cogent, valid reasons for refusal of the petition.

The board has had careful regard, as indicated, to the evidence presented in support of the petition and weighed the same in the light of the evidence received in opposition thereto. The board is loathe to impose on a municipality a change in its electoral system unless there are very clear and compelling reasons for so doing. Evidence of this kind was not forthcoming at this hearing. For the foregoing reasons therefore, the petition is refused.

The board so orders.

Pope v. Town of Ancaster Committee of Adjustment

[Indexed as: Pope v. Ancaster (Town) Committee of Adjustment]

A.J.L. Chapman, Q.C., Vice-Chairman December 19, 1990.

Minor variance — Appeal from site specific by-law — Prohibition on location of buildings in front yard and maximum height control — Illegal construction — Accessory building contravening site specific provisions — Compliance with accessory use concept — Proper approach to ignore construction — Relevance of lot characteristics — Purpose of land use controls to minimize conflict to cut down unacceptable planning impacts between neighbours — Absence of unacceptable adverse impacts — Desirability best judged by owner of land.

Cases referred to

Re McNamara Corp. Ltd. and Colekin Investments Ltd. (1977), 15 O.R. (2d) 718, 76 D.L.R. (3d) 609, 2 M.P.L.R. 61

Statutes referred to

Planning Act, 1983, S.O. 1983, c. 1, s. 44(1)

APPEAL pursuant to s. 44(12) of the *Planning Act, 1983*, (V900153).

F. Devries, for Town of Ancaster.

A.J.L. CHAPMAN, Q.C., VICE-CHAIRMAN (orally):—The matter before the board this morning has been the appeal by Daniel

Municipal Elections Act, 1996, S.O. 1996, c.32, Sched.

Attachment 2

Submission of by-laws and questions

8. (1) The council of a municipality may pass a by-law to submit to its electors,

- (a) a proposed by-law requiring their assent;
- (b) subject to section 8.1, a question not otherwise authorized by law but within the council's jurisdiction;
- (c) subject to section 8.1, a question, the wording of which is established by an Act or a regulation under an Act. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (1); 2000, c. 5, s. 27 (1).

Submission of question, local board

(2) A local board described in subparagraph iii of paragraph 1 of section 3 may pass a resolution to submit to its electors a question not otherwise authorized by law but within the local board's jurisdiction. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (2).

(2.1) Repealed: 2000, c. 5, s. 27 (2).

Question by Minister

(3) The Minister may make an order requiring the clerk of a local municipality to submit a question to the electors of his or her municipality. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (3).

Transmission to clerk

(4) When an upper-tier municipality acts under subsection (1), its clerk shall transmit to the clerk who is responsible for conducting the election a copy of the by-law and the proposed by-law or question. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (4).

Same

(5) When a local board acts under subsection (2), its secretary shall transmit to the clerk who is responsible for conducting the election a copy of the resolution and question. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (5).

Restriction

(5.1) For the purposes of a regular election, the clerk who is responsible for conducting the election is not required to submit a by-law or question to the electors unless on or before June 1 of the election year,

- (a) in the case of a question of the Minister, the order under subsection (3) is transmitted to the clerk;
- (b) in the case of a by-law or question of an upper-tier municipality, subsection (4) is complied with;
- (c) in the case of a question of a local board, subsection (5) is complied with; or
- (d) despite the *Fluoridation Act*, in the case of a petition under the *Fluoridation Act*, the petition is transmitted to the clerk. 2002, c. 17, Sched. D, s. 3; 2009, c. 33, Sched. 21, s. 8 (5).

Deemed transmission of petition

(5.2) Despite the *Fluoridation Act*, if a petition under the *Fluoridation Act* is submitted in the election year of a regular election after June 1, the petition is deemed to have been transmitted to the clerk on February 1 of the following year. 2002, c. 17, Sched. D, s. 3; 2009, c. 33, Sched. 21, s. 8 (6).

Notice to electors

(6) The clerk who is responsible for conducting the election shall give the electors notice of by-laws and questions referred to in this section. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (6).

Cost of giving notice

(7) The upper-tier municipality or local board or the Minister, as the case may be, shall pay the local municipality's reasonable costs of giving notice under subsection (6), as soon as possible after receiving a certificate verifying the amount and signed by the clerk of the local municipality. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (7).

Assent to by-law

(8) A by-law is assented to,

- (a) in the case of a local municipality, if a majority of the votes cast in the municipality are in favour of the by-law;
- (b) in the case of an upper-tier municipality, if a majority of the votes cast in all the local municipalities are in favour of the by-law. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (8).

Result of vote

(9) When the time for applying for a recount has expired without an application being made, or when any application for a recount has been finally disposed of, the clerk shall certify the result of the vote in his or her municipality to the clerk of the upper-tier municipality, the secretary of the local board or the Minister, as the case may be. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (9).

Waiting period

(10) A council shall not consider a proposed by-law to which the electors' assent has been obtained until the 14th day after the result of the vote is certified. 1996, c. 32, Sched., s. 8 (10).

Conflicts

(11) In cases of conflict, the Act or regulation establishing the wording of a question under clause (1) (c) or the Act authorizing the regulation establishing the wording of the question prevails over this Act or a regulation under this Act. 2000, c. 5, s. 27 (3).

Conditions re: submitting a question

8.1(1)A by-law to submit a question to the electors under clause 8 (1) (b) or (c),

- (a) shall be passed at least 180 days before voting day in the election at which it is intended to submit the question to the electors;
- (b) cannot be amended after the last date referred to in clause (a); and
- (c) despite clause (b), can be repealed on or before nomination day and, if the election does not include an election for an office, on or before the 31st day before voting day. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Rules

(2)A question authorized by by-law under clause 8 (1) (b) shall comply with the following rules:

1. It shall concern a matter within the jurisdiction of the municipality.
2. Despite rule 1, it shall not concern a matter which has been prescribed by the Minister as a matter of provincial interest.
3. It shall be clear, concise and neutral.
4. It shall be capable of being answered in the affirmative or the negative and the only permitted answers to the question are "yes" or "no". 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Notice of intent

(3)Before passing a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b) or (c), the clerk shall give at least 10 days notice of the intention to pass the by-law to the public and the Minister and hold at least one public meeting to consider the matter. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Notice of by-law

(4)Within 15 days after a municipality passes a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b) or (c), the clerk shall give notice of the passage of the by-law to the public and the Minister. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Contents

(5)A notice under subsections (3) and (4) shall include,

- (a) the wording of the question;
- (b) in the case of a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b), a clear, concise and neutral description of the consequences of the question if it is approved and the consequences if it is rejected with the special majority under section 8.2, including an estimate of the costs, if any, that the municipality may incur in implementing the results of the question; and
- (c) in the case of a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b), a description of the right to appeal under subsection (6) including, in the case of a notice under subsection (4), the last day for filing a notice of appeal. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Appeal

(6) Within 20 days after the clerk gives notice of the passage of a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b), the Minister or any other person or entity may appeal to the Chief Electoral Officer of the Province of Ontario on the grounds the question does not comply with paragraph 3 or 4 of subsection (2) by filing with the clerk a notice of appeal setting out the objections and the reasons in support of the objections. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2007, c. 15, s. 40 (1).

Notices to be forwarded

(7) The clerk shall, within 15 days after the last day for filing a notice of appeal under subsection (6), forward any notices of appeal received to the Chief Electoral Officer. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2007, c. 15, s. 40 (1).

Other information

(8) The clerk shall provide any other information or material to the Chief Electoral Officer that the Chief Electoral Officer requires in connection with the appeal. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2007, c. 15, s. 40 (1).

Hearing

(9) The Chief Electoral Officer or his or her designate shall, within 60 days of receiving notices under subsection (7), hold a hearing and dismiss the appeal or allow the appeal in whole or in part. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2007, c. 15, s. 40 (1).

Order

(10) If the Chief Electoral Officer allows the appeal in whole or in part, the Chief Electoral Officer may make an order amending the by-law or directing the municipality to amend the by-law in the manner ordered. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2007, c. 15, s. 40 (1).

Non-application

(11) Subsections (1) and (3) to (9) do not apply to anything done pursuant to an order under subsection (10). 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Results

8.2(1) The results of a question authorized by a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b) are binding on the municipality which passed the by-law if,

- (a) at least 50 per cent of the eligible electors in the municipality vote on the question; and
- (b) more than 50 per cent of the votes on the question are in favour of those results. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Determination of number of votes

(2) For the purpose of clause (1) (a), the number of eligible electors shall be determined from the voters' lists as they exist at the close of voting. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Implementation

8.3 (1) If the results of a question authorized by a by-law under clause 8 (1) (b) are binding on a municipality,

- (a) if an affirmative answer received the majority of the votes, the municipality shall do everything in its power to implement the results of the question in a timely manner; and

- (b) if a negative answer received the majority of the votes, the municipality shall not do anything within its jurisdiction to implement the matter which was the subject of the question for a period of four years following voting day. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2006, c. 9, Sched. H, s. 3 (1).

Same

- (2) Without limiting subsection (1), the municipality shall, between 14 and 180 days after voting day,
 - (a) if a by-law or resolution is required to implement the results of the question, ensure that it is prepared and placed before council or, if a series of by-laws are required to implement the results, ensure that the first of the series is prepared and placed before council;
 - (b) despite clause (a), if passage of a by-law or resolution required to implement the results of the question is subject to a condition precedent under a regulation or statute (such as giving notice or holding a public hearing), ensure the initial steps have been taken to comply with the condition;
 - (c) if administrative action to change a policy or practice is required to implement the results of the question, instruct municipal staff to take that action. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Limitation

(3) For the purpose of clause (1) (a), it is not within the jurisdiction of the municipality to eliminate or override any substantive or procedural legal right of any person or entity who is or may be affected by the implementation of the results of the question as illustrated by the following examples:

1. If a zoning change under the *Planning Act* is necessary to implement the results, the binding effect of the question is subject to the *Planning Act* and the discretion of the municipality under that Act is not constrained. If the zoning change is approved, the municipality is bound to implement the results; if it is not approved, the municipality is not bound.
2. If the results of the question require the passage of a by-law which requires notice to be given and at least one public meeting to be held to consider the matter before the by-law is passed, the binding effect of the question is subject to these procedural requirements and the discretion of the municipality to proceed following the public meeting is not constrained. If, after the public meeting, the municipality decides not to implement the results of the question, it is not required to do so. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Order

(4) A court presiding over a proceeding in respect of a recount, an offence under this Act or a proceeding under section 83 (controversed elections) may make an order temporarily staying the requirement of a municipality to implement the results of a question under this Act if satisfied that the requirement may be directly or indirectly affected by the proceeding. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Time restriction

(5) A municipality that has passed a by-law or resolution or taken any other action to implement the results of the question shall not do anything within its jurisdiction to reverse or substantially change the action for a period of four years following the day the action took effect. 2000, c. 5, s. 28; 2006, c. 9, Sched. H, s. 3 (2).

Exception

(6) Nothing in this section requires a municipality to do anything or prevents a municipality from doing anything if,

- (a) a subsequent binding question authorizes such action or inaction; or
- (b) the council is of the opinion, reasonably held, that there has been a material change in circumstances since the time it passed the by-law under clause 8 (1) (b) to put the binding question to the electors. 2000, c. 5, s. 28.

Attachment 3



**TOWN OF AURORA
GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT**

No. LLS15-011

SUBJECT: *Questions on the Ballot – 2014 Municipal Election Results*
FROM: *Warren Mar, Director of Legal & Legislative Services/Town Solicitor*
DATE: *March 3, 2015*

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT Report No. LLS15-011 be received; and

THAT Council provide direction with respect to the 2014 Municipal Election Questions on the Ballot.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide Council with information on the results of voting on the Questions on the Ballot from the 2014 Municipal Election, and to seek Council direction on the next steps (if any) that Council wishes to take in response to the results.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the provisions of clause 8(1)(b) of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, S.O. 1996, c.32, Sched. 1, as amended (the "Elections Act"), Council passed By-law Number 5612-14 on April 22, 2014, to submit two (2) questions to the electors of the Town of Aurora at the 2014 Municipal Election. The two (2) approved questions were as follows:

1. *"Are you in favour of electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote?"*
2. *"Are you in favour of reducing the number of Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, from eight (8) councillors to six (6) councillors?"*

Both questions appeared on the ballots for the 2014 Municipal Election held on October 27, 2014. In accordance with the provisions of clause 55(4)(b) of the Elections Act, the Town Clerk declared the results of the Voting on the Questions on the Ballot on October 30, 2014 (Attachment 1). The certified results of the voting on the Questions on the Ballot are as follows:

March 3, 2015

- 2 -

Report No. LLS15-011

QUESTION #1		
<i>Are you in favour of electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote?</i>		
YES	5,512	45.25%
NO	6,670	54.75%
Total	12,182	100%

QUESTION #2		
<i>Are you in favour of reducing the number of Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, from eight (8) councillors to six (6) councillors?</i>		
YES	8,060	64.55%
NO	4,427	35.45%
Total	12,487	100%

The Town Clerk has also certified that that the total number of eligible electors in the October 27, 2014 Municipal election was **37,123**.

COMMENTS

Section 8.2 of the Municipal Elections Act

Under subsection 8.2(1) of the Elections Act, the results of a question authorized by a by-law are binding on the municipality if at least 50% of eligible electors in the municipality vote on the question.

The implication of subsection 8.2(1) is that the results of a question authorized by a by-law are not binding on a municipality if less than 50% of eligible electors in the municipality vote on the question. As such, if voter turnout is less than 50% of the eligible electors, then the results of the referendum are not binding on the municipality, and Council would be free to proceed on the matter as it chooses.

Section 8.3 of the Municipal Elections Act

Under clause 8.3(1)(a) of the Elections Act, if the results of a question authorized by a

March 3, 2015

- 3 -

Report No. LLS15-011

by-law are binding on the municipality in the affirmative, then the municipality shall do everything in its power to implement the results of the question in a timely manner (this means, pursuant to subsection 8.3(2), placing the necessary action before Council between 14 and 180 days after voting day).

Finally, under clause 8.3(1)(b) of the Elections Act, if the results of a question authorized by a by-law are binding on the municipality in the negative, the municipality shall not do anything within its jurisdiction to implement the matter which was the subject of the question for a period of four (4) years following voting day.

Analysis of Question #1 (Introduce Wards) Voting Results

Of the voters who voted on Question #1, the majority voted “No” to electing Councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote. The Total number of voters who voted “No” was 6,670 or 54.75%. The total number of voters who voted “Yes” was 5,512 voters or 45.25%.

The total number of voters who voted on Question #1 was 12,182 voters out of 37,123 eligible voters. This means that only 32.82% of eligible voters voted on the question and the results are therefore not binding on Council in view of the provisions of section 8.2 of the Elections Act. As such Council has the discretion to:

1. Implement a ward system to elect Councillors, other than the Mayor; or
2. Not implement a Ward system to elect Councillors.

If Council chooses to exercise its discretion to implement a ward system (Option #1), it is recommended that staff be directed to report back on a process to develop and implement a ward system for the Town in time for the 2018 Municipal Election. If Council wishes to proceed with Option #1, it is also recommended that the following resolutions be introduced:

THAT Council endorse the electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote; and

THAT staff be directed to report back to Council on a process to be followed in dividing the Town into wards.

If Council wishes not to proceed with introducing a ward system for electing Councillors in Aurora (Option #2), then it does not need to take any further action with regards to Question #1.

Analysis of Question #2 (Reduce the Size of Council) Voting Results

Of the voters who voted on Question #2 the majority voted “Yes” to reducing the number of Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, from eight (8) councillors to six (6) councillors. The total number of voters who voted “Yes” was 8,060 or 64.55%. The total

March 3, 2015

- 4 -

Report No. LLS15-011

number of voters who voted "No" was 4,427 voters or 35.45%.

The total number of voters who voted on Question #2 was 12,487 voters out of 37,123 eligible voters. This means that only 33.64% of eligible voters voted on the question and the results are not binding on Council in accordance with the provisions of section 8.2 of the Elections Act. As such, in response to the voting results, Council may:

1. Reduce the size of Council by eliminating two (2) Councillor positions; or
2. Maintain the current size of Council as is.

If Council chooses Option #1 to reduce the size of Council, it is recommended that the following resolutions be introduced:

THAT the composition of the Council of The Corporation of the Town of Aurora be changed from nine (9) members to seven (7) members, comprised of one (1) Mayor, who shall be the Head of Council, and six (6) Councillors; and

THAT the change in the composition of Council come into force following the next regular municipal election in accordance with the provisions of subsection 217(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001; and

THAT the necessary by-law be brought forward at the March 31, 2015 meeting of Council for enactment to change the composition of Council for The Corporation of the Town of Aurora from nine (9) members to seven (7) members, comprised of one (1) Mayor, who shall be the Head of Council, and six (6) Councillors.

Based on the provisions of section 217 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, to change the composition of Council in time for the next regular municipal election in 2018, the current Council need merely pass the necessary by-law on or before December 31, 2017. Council is authorized to pass any such by-law under the provisions of subsection 217(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001*. The only limitations on this authority are:

- "1. There shall be a minimum of five members, one of whom shall be the head of council.*
- 2. The members of council shall be elected in accordance with the Municipal Elections Act, 1996.*
- 3. The head of council shall be elected by general vote.*
- 4. The members, other than the head of council, shall be elected by general vote or wards or by any combination of general vote and wards.*

March 3, 2015

- 5 -

Report No. LLS15-011

5. *The representation of a local municipality on the council of an upper-tier municipality shall not be affected by the by-law of the local municipality under this section.*

Under subsection 217(3) of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, a by-law passed under subsection 217(1) comes into force:

- “(a) after the first regular election following the passing of the by-law; or
(b) if the by-law is passed in the year of a regular election before voting day, after the second regular election following the passing of the by-law.”*

If Council wishes not to proceed with reducing the size of Council in Aurora (Option #2), then it does not need to take any further action with regards to Question #2.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN

Proceeding with a by-law to put two questions on the ballot for the 2014 municipal election achieved the objective of ***strengthening the fabric of our community*** by identifying new formats, methods and technologies to effectively and regularly engage the community.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Council may receive this report for information only and take no further action on the Questions on the Ballot at the 2014 Municipal Election.
2. Council may receive this report and direct staff to report back on a process to implement a ward system to elect members of Council AND reduce the size of Council from eight (8) Councillors to six (6) Councillors for the 2018 Municipal Election, in which case the following resolutions can be adopted:

THAT report LLS15-011 be received; and

THAT Council endorse the electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote; and

THAT staff be directed to report back to Council on a process to be followed in dividing the Town into wards; and

THAT the composition of the Council of The Corporation of the Town of Aurora be changed from nine (9) members to seven (7) members, comprised of one (1) Mayor, who shall be the Head of Council, and six (6)

March 3, 2015

- 6 -

Report No. LLS15-011

Councillors; and

THAT the change in the composition of Council come into force following the next regular municipal election in accordance with the provisions of subsection 217(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001; and

THAT the necessary by-law be brought forward at the March 31, 2015 meeting of Council for enactment to change the composition of Council for The Corporation of the Town of Aurora from nine (9) members to seven (7) members, comprised of one (1) Mayor, who shall be the Head of Council, and six (6) Councillors.

3. Council may receive this report and direct staff to report back on a process to only implement a ward system to elect members of Council for the 2018 Municipal Election, in which case the following resolutions can be adopted:

THAT report LLS15-011 be received; and

THAT Council endorse the electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote; and

THAT staff be directed to report back to Council on a process to be followed in dividing the Town into wards.

4. Council may receive this report and reduce the size of Council from eight (8) Councillors to six (6) Councillors, in which case the following resolutions can be adopted:

THAT report LLS15-011 be received; and

THAT the composition of the Council of The Corporation of the Town of Aurora be changed from nine (9) members to seven (7) members, comprised of one (1) Mayor, who shall be the Head of Council, and six (6) Councillors; and

THAT the change in the composition of Council come into force following the next regular municipal election in accordance with the provisions of subsection 217(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001; and

THAT the necessary by-law be brought forward at the March 31, 2015 meeting of Council for enactment to change the composition of Council for The Corporation of the Town of Aurora from nine (9) members to seven (7) members, comprised of one (1) Mayor, who shall be the Head of

March 3, 2015

- 7 -

Report No. LLS15-011

Council, and six (6) Councillors.

As the Questions on the Ballot for the 2014 Municipal Election did not contemplate moving from part-time Councillors to full-time Councillors, this matter was not explored in this report. Should Council desire to make this change, it is recommended that staff be directed to provide a further report examining the process, physical space requirements, staffing options, and overall costs of implementing such a change.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost of creating and implementing a ward system is estimated to be between \$50,000 and \$60,000 in one-time funding. These funds would be used to retain an expert/land planning economist to facilitate the ward boundary review process. Additional costs associated with creating a ward system may also be required for the purpose of defending any ward boundary by-law passed by Council before the Ontario Municipal Board. Additional communication costs will also be required for the 2018 municipal election. The effective implementation of a new ward system requires dedicated communication resources as part of the overall election communication strategy. If Council implements a ward system for the Town of Aurora, staff will review the election budget to determine if additional funding is required. If staff are unable to accommodate these increased expenses in the current election budget forecast, staff would be recommending an increase to the overall election budget in 2017.

If Council chooses to reduce the size of Council from eight (8) Councillors to six (6), the Town would realize savings from the salaries and benefits currently paid to Members of Council. Based on the 2015 salary and benefits paid to Councillors, the annual savings to the Town are estimated to be at least \$71,600, calculated as follows:

Councillor's Annual Salary	\$ 28,800 x 2 = \$ 57,600
Councillor's Annual Benefits	\$ 1,850 x 2 = \$ 3,700
Councillor's Annual Expenses	\$ 5,150 x 2 = <u>\$ 10,300</u>
	\$ 71,600/year

Additional minimal savings would be realized from reduced expenditure on ancillary items such as cell phones and business cards.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the voting on the two (2) Questions on the Ballot at the 2014 Municipal Election are not binding on the Town. Council can therefore take no further action in respect to the Questions on the Ballot, or can exercise its discretion to implement a ward system to elect councillors and/or reduce the size of Council.

March 3, 2015

- 8 -

Report No. LLS15-011

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Certified Election Results, Questions on the Ballot

PREVIOUS REPORTS

1. Report No. LLS14-13 – Determination of Two Questions on the Ballot, dated March 24, 2014
2. Report No. LLS14-10 – Two Questions on the Ballot, dated March 4, 2014
3. Report No. CLS13-030 – Question on the Ballot, dated November 5, 2013.

PRE-SUBMISSION REVIEW

Executive Leadership Team – January 22, 2015

Prepared by: Stephen M.A. Huycke, Town Clerk, ext. 4771

Warren Mar

Warren Mar
Director of Legal & Legislative
Services/Town Solicitor

Neil Garbe

Neil Garbe
Chief Administrative Officer



Attachment 1

CERTIFIED ELECTION RESULTS
Questions on the Ballot
Municipal Elections Act, 1996, [s.55(4)(b)]

I, Stephen M.A. Huycke, Town Clerk and Returning Officer of The Corporation of the Town of Aurora do certify the number of votes cast as set out below with respect to the Questions on the Ballot in the Municipal Election held on Monday, October 27, 2014.

QUESTION #1			
<i>Are you in favour of electing all Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, by ward vote instead of general Town-wide vote?</i>			
YES	5,512	45.25%	
NO	6,670	54.75%	
<i>Total</i>	<i>12,182</i>	<i>100%</i>	

QUESTION #2			
<i>Are you in favour of reducing the number of Aurora councillors, other than the Mayor, from eight (8) councillors to six (6) councillors?</i>			
YES	8,060	64.55%	
NO	4,427	35.45%	
<i>Total</i>	<i>12,487</i>	<i>100%</i>	

Dated this 30th day of October, 2014.

Stephen M.A. Huycke
Town Clerk and Returning Officer