

**From:** [Mark Kehoe](#)  
**To:** [PublicOnlyCouncilEmail](#)  
**Cc:** Michel Bourgeois; Guido Furlani; Jane Davis; KJ Conyers-Steede  
**Subject:** PAC/HAC Committee Policy Concerns  
**Date:** February 13, 2025 11:49:27 AM  
**Attachments:** [Feb 13 PAC HAC Committee Concerns.docx](#)

---

### **Caution [External Email]**

This email comes from an outside sender. Verify the sender and use caution with any requests, links or attachments.

---

RE: PAC/HAC Committee Policy Conflict

Good day Council. My name is Mark Kehoe, I'm a resident of Upper Vaughan and was a member of the PAC/HAC committee up until the recent unexpected termination of the resident members.

I'm concerned about the process that was used to terminate the resident committee members and the newly formed committee meeting tonight without resident members.

- First, I will address my concerns with the mayor's motion to remove resident members at the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting.

Meeting and Committee Procedural Policy, section 12.19 reads...

The following motions require a two-thirds vote

C) to amend or resend something previously adopted.

- The vote to amend the PAC/HAC member constitution was 7 to 4. That would be just short of the 2/3rds to pass. Close, but it didn't meet the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> threshold. Should this motion have even passed?

Then, due to public pressure and correspondence, the mayor addressed the council at the Feb 11<sup>th</sup> COTW meeting and apologized for not following policy with this motion stating, "I did not follow policy", "an oversight on my end, I won't go into reasons why, but it happened". He then stated he wanted to put the motion back on the table and give council 14 days to consider and follow with debate. So, is the motion that didn't follow policy carried? Council acted on a motion that didn't follow policy and then was re-tabled. Shouldn't the PAC HAC members be reinstated until the motion is properly carried?

Now my concerns for the scheduled PAC/HAC meeting for this evening Feb 13<sup>th</sup>.

- When council was questioned if PAC/HAC could be formed and meet without appointed resident members on the committee, the CAO and Clerks displayed a lack of understanding of the policy or unwillingness to address it. It reminded me of when there was a tie for the deputy mayor seat and the CAO suggested pulling a name from a hat.
- In the Municipal Meeting and Procedural Policy, APPENDIX K Planning Advisory/Heritage Advisory Committee refers to section 200 of the Municipal Government Act.
- Section 200 (3) states "A planning and advisory committee or joint planning advisory committee shall include members of the public and may include a representative appointed by a village commission."
- Something is mandatory – The term "shall" in Canadian legislation indicates that

something is mandatory. It is often used in legal documents to express an obligation.

- So basically, the PAC/HAC Committee must have appointed residents on it to be a recognized committee within our municipality.

So, my next concern. The resident PAC/HAC positions haven't even been advertised yet. Why? The mayor stated his intention wasn't to remove resident members, but to include council members (who already have the ability to attend committee meetings.) Why haven't the 2 remaining resident positions been offered to those terminated? The CAO stated they are actively recruiting to fill the positions. You have 7 great residents that were terminated that could easily fill those 2 roles, or was the intent to actually remove them?

Finally, I will admit. I'm not a lawyer or an expert on municipal law. I may have it wrong. But let's look at the spirit of the law with these policies. Its very clear that residents must be part of the committee. So instead of cooperating with the spirit of the law, our mayor and cao want to consult expensive legal advice to proceed with a committee void of residents. Why?

This has all become very messy and it's totally unnecessary. The mayor's motion should be dead and citizens should be recalled to their positions. In the very least, PAC/HAC Committee Meetings should be postponed until a committee is properly formed and supported by policy.

Thanks for your time.

Mark Kehoe

