

**SIMCOE-YORK
PRINTING &
PUBLISHING
LIMITED**

Publisher of the

Innisfil Scope
The Times
King Township Sentinel
P.O. Box 310
Beeton, Ontario
L0G 1A0
705-458-4434
Fax: 905-729-2541
E-mail address
thescope@rogers.com
web site
www.innisfilscope.com

P.A.P. Registration
No. 09319

Publishers:

BRUCE HAIRE
JOHN ARCHIBALD

Editorial

Managing Editor

BRUCE HAIRE

News Editor

Michelle Minnoch

Reporter

Richard Blanchard

Advertising

Director of Sales

JOHN ARCHIBALD

Sales Reps

Diann Gaston

Annette Derraugh

Nancy Stenhouse

Aileen Robbins

David Halwig

Composing

Manager

JUDI BURKITT

Ad Designers

Penny Gilbertson

Kristen Haire

Joanne Radyk-Carrick

Lisa Rosati

Brian Valdock

Business

Anne Archibald

Jacque Archibald

Janice Coté

Sylvia DeShane

Subscription rates:

Within 65 km except
towns with letter carriers –
\$28.00 + G.S.T.

Beyond 65 km and towns
with letter carriers –
\$41.00 + G.S.T.

Single copies 71¢ + G.S.T.
or 75¢ (includes G.S.T.)

Published every

Wednesday

Copyright

The Scope 2007

The advertiser agrees that the publisher shall not be liable for damages arising out of errors in advertisements beyond the amount paid for the space actually occupied by that portion of the advertisement in which the error occurred, whether such error is due to the negligence of its servants or otherwise, and there shall be no liability for non insertion of any advertisement beyond the amount paid for such advertisement.

We acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Canada, through the Publications Assistance Program (PAP) toward our mailing costs.



Nantyr showing improvement in rankings

The Simon Fraser Institute released their rankings for Ontario High Schools last week, and our very own Nantyr Shores showed improvement; scoring a full point over last year.

That being said, Nantyr scored 5.6 out of ten.

Regarding grade 9 math, we scored .2 points higher in the academic level, and .7 points in the applied math section. In a section grading whether students passed the Ontario Secondary School Literacy Test on their first or subsequent attempts, we scored two points higher in first attempts, and two points lower for the subsequent attempts. The Failure Rate, which is the percent of tests combined, judged attempts that were unsuccessful or below Level 3 (below grade 9 math), was at 33.6, which is an almost ten point improvement over last year (in 2005, we had 44.8).

Looking at five years worth of data, Nantyr students have made quite an improvement. In

Comment

by Michelle Minnoch

2002, 8.8% of students did not submit test data for grade 9 math. This year, only 1.7% did not get graded.

There were 25.3% of the students taking the tests identified for special needs, which is the largest percentage in Simcoe County. The tests also take into account the average number of years the most educated parent in the family has, as the Fraser Institute believes that “higher values of this statistic are commonly thought to be associated with better student performance.”

The tests also show the difference in the level of achievement between girls and boys. Although over the years the boys have done

better than the girls, the difference this year is the lowest, at 0.07.

Nantyr Shores is not only improving academically, but their presence in the community is strong and positive. This Saturday, various students are giving up their day for Spin 4 Kids; a course was held last week for the students regarding Internet bullying; Nantyr is host to visiting Japanese students throughout the year.

While the Town only has one high school at this point, the kids aren't doing that bad. We have made significant academic improvements since 2003.

No matter who you are or where you went to high school, remember, it wasn't always that easy. To be honest, in this day and age, I am glad I went to high school when I did. Things seemed a lot easier back then. Or am I just getting older? Way to go Nantyr, keep it up!

Property Standards by-law ‘infringes on livelihood’

Dear editor,

Innisfil's proposed Property standards Bylaw CW-116-07 prejudicially targets people who like to boat, fish and camp in a resort, lakefront town where the main draw for tourists is the water.

This bylaw infringes on the right to carry on a livelihood. It prejudicially singles out people who drive bigger pickup trucks despite the fact that we are a mixed land use town. This bylaw restricts the type of small business residents can be involved in. It infringes on the right to freedom of choice, in what vehicle we drive.

Small pickup trucks aren't adequate for every business. Are we encouraging or discouraging small family owned business in this town? A small pickup truck does not suit all purposes.

Even if a person who requires larger pickup trucks for their livelihood owns a big enough property to comply, that livelihood had better not be a family business. I have two sons in different sectors of the construction business. That makes three right now. If this bylaw is passed, one of them will have to find somewhere else to park his vehicle every night. He'll have to find rides every day. That's a lot of wasted time, gas and added pollution in the air every night, night after night, morning after morning driving him to and from an approved place to park. And that's IF we can find an approved place to

park.

This bylaw is prejudicial regarding financial status. Only those with a level of income great enough to afford a bigger property will be able to keep their vehicle of choice; Only people who can afford to install and maintain a so-called ‘proper’ driveway running 50 metres from any property line. CW-116.07 limits the number of vehicles parked anywhere anyway, so that even if the vehicle owner finds a big enough property and driveway to store it on, the owner of that property has a quantity limitation of two anyway, so there will be cases where people will not be able to park their pickup, their boat or their recreational vehicle anywhere in the town at least within their financial means.

This bylaw infringes on the right to security. Citizens will lose the right to oversee their own property. Can you guarantee the security of a vehicle or boat or recreational vehicle parked away from the owners watchful eye? In any case, if this vehicle restriction is based on aesthetics, I've seen some beautiful 3/4 ton pickups, and I've seen some terrible looking dented and rusty but roadworthy cars. Will you in all fairness create a bylaw that no-one can have a vehicle on their residential property with rust on it or dents in it? Again, that would be targeting lower income residents. Will you restrict vehicles that have colours you don't like? If people

don't like looking out their window at a recreational vehicle, maybe they don't like purple cars, either. Will you legislate against purple cars in all fairness? Maybe you don't like the look of your neighbour's house. Maybe you can legislate it to be torn down.

The refreshing rural recreational community we live in is being legislated into a bedroom community. We've lost the right to have marshmallow roasts in our backyards. We can't give our pets a drink from the lake on a scorching

summer day. Now we can't even keep our own boat. This is a bylaw made for someone, but it's not necessarily the kind of person who makes a good neighbour.

The town of Innisfil is losing the designation of a fun, recreational home. I'm not sure what it's becoming, but it's quickly losing the designation of a fun place to live and do business.

Signed,
Peter Deschamps
39 year resident of the Innisfil
Titanic

Another resident talking taxes

Dear editor,

Just want to put my two cents in about something I heard on Rock 95 today (April 23) about taxes, and it seems that the Town of Innisfil collected in the first three months one million dollars from Georgian Downs and that in the past five years they have collected 23 million. Question what do they do with all the extra money? Is it extra? Does it go to certain peoples pockets? Lets not forget all the tax they collect from the 30 thousand people living here and now they have to raise taxes 11.8% - wow - why don't they try something different and cut taxes? Can't do that - the only things for sure in life are death and taxes so how about lower taxes and let us worry about death? I like to know how many people out there get a 11.8% raise

at there jobs this year and next year buy a new car which of course the price went up 3% so you go to your boss and tell him or her "I need to raise my pay by 11.8%" I wonder what they would say? I have a idea leave taxes where they are make it work with what you have just like what us citizens have to do day after day. I also like to remind all us bad people out there with boats, ATV's, sleds, busses, trailers, RV's, Big Rigs, Little rigs, and anyone I forgot to go to the town on May 9 to stand up for are rights.

Thank You
Steven Paron
*Editor's note: The municipal tax potion for Innisfil was actually reduced to 9.29%
The money from Georgian Downs gets put infrastructure.*

Group not involved in all BBP meetings

Dear editor,

Based upon the recent press release of the developer, in reference to the Memorandum of Settlement offered by the Province of Ontario, one might conclude that almost every one and every group is supportive of the proposal for this project. I would choose to strongly disagree.

Three Parties did not sign this agreement. I speak for one of these Parties, The Innisfil District Association, a group of about 300 Innisfil families. We commend the strong stand on the many environmental issues taken by the Province and their insistence that all of these issues be resolved before any construction can begin.. Also, the new proposal insists that over one third of the project area be environmentally protected. In the developer's earlier proposal that forest, including trees over 100 years old, would largely have been lost!

The IDA could not support this Memorandum of Settlement because we object to the size, of the proposed development, 2000 condominium units and 1000 boat slips. We had no say in these issues. They were established in meetings between the developer and the Town and the County. We suspected these private meetings were being held but, in spite of our requests, we were not invited to join them until later, after these issues had been established.

Further, the press release on April 4 read “the staff of the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, (LSRCA) are on record as being in support of the project”. Yet, as: recently as April 12, 2007, the following statements were made to me and others by the executive of the Conservation Authority::

–“The LSRCA completed their review of Big Bay Point and provided comments in 2004.”

- “The Authority was neither a party to the settlement agreement between The Province and the other Parties, nor has the Authority seen this agreement and therefore cannot comment.”

- “This further supports the need for a watershed based plan. Currently there is no holistic growth management framework for the Lake Simcoe Basin and the LSRCA continues to advocate for this.”

The Innisfil District Association agrees with this position of the LSRCA, and stresses the need for a growth framework for the Lake Simcoe Watershed. For without this framework or policy, how can the Conservation Authority properly advise on any new large projects around Lake Simcoe and in particular those proposed for non-settlement areas.

Don Avery, President, The Innisfil District Association.