

	Name	Comment	County Staff Comment/Recommendation
1.	Need to own the land to zone it/This is not legal	A variety of comments were received that stated the Township is not permitted to zone land that it does not own.	<p>Question 1 - DOES A CROWN PATENT LIMIT OR REDUCE A MUNICIPALITY’S AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE USE OF LAND?</p> <p>Answer -The clear answer to this question is: “No”. This issue has been considered by the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) and the courts on numerous occasions. The OLT and the courts have been unanimous in rejecting the proposition that a Crown patent limits or reduces the authority of a municipality to regulate land use.</p> <p>Question -DOES THE MUNICIPALITY HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO PLAN TO PRIVATE LANDS WITHOUT FIRST HAVING TO ACQUIRE SUCH LANDS?</p> <p>Answer - Yes, municipalities have the authority to regulate land use and pass zoning by-laws under the Planning Act (Section 34). The sections of the Municipal Act and the Planning Act referenced at the public meeting by various people are not “requirements” that a municipality must own the land. The referenced sections include provisions detailing how (requirements on) the municipality if they want to acquire land.</p> <p>Municipalities have three primary ways to acquire lands. They can:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Purchase the property on the market (willing buyer/willing seller); 2) Have land dedicated to them as part of a development approval that is associated with a municipal service (i.e. storm pond, parkland, road, etc.); 3) Expropriate land in accordance with the Expropriations Act <p>Ownership of the land is not a prerequisite for a municipality to exercise the authority to plan for private property. Municipalities are the level of government that is responsible for regulating land use and establish zoning by-laws regardless of whether they own the land or not.</p> <p>The Planning Act is the legislation that empowers municipalities to create official plans, zoning by-laws, and other planning documents to manage land use within their boundaries. These documents outline the municipality’s vision for development, land use policies, and zoning regulations that guide how land can be used and developed.</p> <p>It's important to note that while municipalities have the authority to regulate land use, they must comply with provincial policies and legislation, including the Planning Act, Environmental Protection Act, Endangered Species Act, Municipal Act, etc. The province</p>

			<p>provides a framework within which municipalities operate, and local planning decisions are to align with provincial policies and interests.</p> <p>In summary, ownership of the land is not a prerequisite for a municipality in Ontario to regulate land use and pass zoning by-laws. Municipalities have the authority to make planning decisions and control private land use within their jurisdictions, as outlined in the Planning Act.</p>
2.	Did not like Notice given/how to object	<p>A variety of comments were received regarding the type of notice and the content of the notice.</p> <p>Comments were also received regarding when/how these proposed changes take effect and how to object.</p>	<p>The notice of open house and public meeting was given in accordance with the Planning Act regulations. The Township mailed every property owner a Notice of Open House and Public Meeting. The Notice was also in the Eganville Leader and the Valley Gazette Newspapers for a 1 week period. It was also advertised on the Township Facebook page, the Municipal Newsletter, and the website (via under the news section and the newsletter section)</p> <p>A Notice of Passing will be sent to everyone who made an oral or written submission. Appeal rights will be described in the notice.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
3.	Timing of the Zoning By-law	Comments were received regarding timing of implementing the by-law	<p>Section 26(9) of the Planning Act states that no later than three years after the Official Plan is updated, the council of the municipality shall amend all zoning by-laws that are in effect in the municipality to ensure that they conform with the Official Plan. The update to the County of Renfrew Official Plan was completed in August of 2021. Municipalities across the County are now looking at and undergoing updates to their zoning by-laws.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
4.	Reason for the Zoning By-law	Comments were received asking why the zoning by-law is required	<p>Under the Planning Act, the Township is required to go through this process to ensure their by-laws are in conformity with Provincial Policy and the updated Official Plan.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
5.	Property Values	Comments were received stating that the zoning bylaw will affect property values	<p>Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) assigns assessed values to properties for the purposes of taxation. The Zoning by-law and the MPAC assessment of a property are separate items. MPAC assesses properties by analyzing the sales of similar properties that have sold in the area. There are five major factors that generally account for the property’s assessed value which include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. age of buildings on the property 2. total square footage of living area 3. location of your property

			<p>4. size of your lot, and 5. quality of construction.</p> <p>Other factors that can affect your property's value include: primary structures, secondary structures, site features, and structural features.</p> <p>MPAC assesses a property on actual use of the property not what a property is zoned for.</p>
5.	Dan Albert	<p>Comments received at public meeting.</p> <p>Property contains primary residence and operate business - Coyote Log Homes Inc. Received approval in writing from the township at that time. Under the new proposed zoning bylaw our property is designated as RU. Our business would be considered light manufacturing. We manufacture handcrafted log home shells at our current property.</p>	<p>Property changed to a Rural- Exception zone to permit the existing light manufacturing business (RU-E11).</p>
6.	Lyndon Bailey	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With respect to lake setbacks. Depending on lot depth it goes from 20m for 75 to 30m for 100. Was wondering if it would be more feasible to use a scale system. Every 5 m have a number between 75 and 100. I get the setback and am also happy to see an above sea level is now mentioned. I am also thinking it might apply to a few more areas. Like say the area along county road 58 as an example. - Was also wondering when Round Lake would be at capacity as apposed to near capacity. Are we soon there and I now understand that the MOE makes the decision? 	<p>Section 3.27.5 of the by-law requires that a minimum water setback of 30 metres is provided.</p> <p>Section 3.25.5c) provides a minimum water setback of 20 metres for an existing lot of record which has less than 46 metres of lot depth.</p> <p>The Province provides the County with a list of lakes that are considered “At Capacity” or “Near Capacity”. We are not provided with a schedule of when a Ministry is doing a review of the lakes.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
7.	Jason Bielaskie	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I'm looking to build a hunt camp in the near future; is it possible to build on land deemed mineral aggregate reserve? 	<p>Residential uses in the Mineral Aggregate Pit – Reserve (MP-R) are prohibited.</p> <p>A hunting and fishing camp has been added as a non-residential permitted use in the MP-R zone.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I own a small engine repair home industry at my location on 1506 Mask Rd; I noted its proposed to be mineral aggregate reserve. However, I'm inquiring if it should be deemed RU-E10? - Lastly, I currently have one building for boat storage located on land proposed to be deemed RU-E10. Will it be possible to build another building in the future within the RU-E10 boundary? 	<p>1506 Mask Road zoning changed from MP-R to RU to reflect accurate use of the property.</p> <p>Any proposed new buildings would be required to meet the zoning provisions.</p>
8.	Margaret Bodkin	<p>Written comments received - has partial services (sewer); legend of the EP vs EP-E; is a secondary dwelling permitted in a development zone?</p> <p>Submitted additional comments at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - error in section backyard chickens 3.4.5 refers to 3.22(a)(1) not 3.26(a)(1); - Development Zone – check height - In agreement with buffer strips 	<p>A secondary dwelling is permitted in all lots that permit a single detached dwelling. The Development (D) zone only permits existing dwellings; therefore a secondary dwelling would not be permitted.</p> <p>Legend was updated to more clearly show the EP zone and EP-E zone.</p> <p>Section 3.4.5 changed to reference correct section.</p>
9.	Scott Briscoe	<p>Written comments received - I was asking you about building a house with an attached granny suite, which the mayor and building inspector of Killaloe, Hagarty, & Richards township have led me to believe will be permitted under this new zoning bylaw</p>	<p>Secondary dwelling units are permitted in the Zoning By-law. The provisions for a secondary dwelling unit are in Section 3.9 of the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The County offers a pre-consultation service to review development proposals.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
10.	Wendell Brown	<p>Written submission - Purchased the property last year and the plan is to build a new home (40'x50 home and outside building 30X40) as soon as the contractor can do it.</p> <p>Is the Killaloe Township making changes to my property that I cannot build a home on it?</p> <p>I have spent a lot of money out of my pocket getting ready to build a new home on this property (23 Byers Creek Rd) , now to find out that I can't build on? Why did the township approve the</p>	<p>The property is zoned Rural (RU). A portion of the property is affected by the 300 metre separation distance buffer for a Mineral Aggregate Pit. The 300 metre separation distance is required in accordance with the County of Renfrew Official Plan and Provincial Policy. A dwelling is permitted on the lands zoned RU that are outside of the 300 metre buffer. If relief is required, there are options such as a zoning amendment that could be considered.</p> <p>Existing dwellings are permitted within the 300 metre buffer.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

		permit to install the Septic system if they knew a new home & outside garage building could not be built on?	
11.	Elizabeth Burchat	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RU and EPA in part - What is the difference – passive and non-passive recreation use? 	<p>Passive recreation means the use of land and/or water for the purpose of passive leisure activity and shall include a park, a garden, a picnic area and the like, equestrian and hiking trails, as well as a playground with activity equipment for children. Non-Passive recreation may include private trails for motorized vehicles (ATV/dirt bike) provided they are not a course/track that results in noise concerns.</p> <p>Active recreation means the use of land, water and/or building for the purpose of organized active leisure activities and shall include an arena, a golf course, a sports field, and motorized vehicle trails.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
12.	Donna Burns	<p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has the Official Plan been approved by the Province? - Section 58 of the Planning Act – have to acquire the land - Can't zone for what you don't own 	<p>The 5 year review of the Official Plan was approved by the Province in March 2020 (and further updated by the County in August of 2021).</p> <p>See Staff Comment No. 1 above.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
13.	Maureen Cashubec	<p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do we need a building permit to go from commercial to residential? - Animals, property standards – who enforces them? - Trailers – how come resorts welcome trailers? 	<p>A change in use permit would be required to go from commercial to residential. An Environmental Site Assessment and Record of Site Condition may also be required. This is not a decision made by the Township or County; it is a provincial requirement.</p> <p>Noise and property standards by-laws are separate matters from this zoning by-law. It is a Township role to enforce them.</p> <p>Trailer question is not a question related to the zoning by-law</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
14.	Nancy Checko	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RU-EP2 (property and ANSI are identified in red on attachment). The protected area identified as an area of Life Science-Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) is primarily located on an adjacent property and straddles a (non-operating) concession road. What is the Life Science-Area of Natural Scientific Interest feature 	<p>The property is zoned Rural –Exception Two (RU-E2) with a portion of the property affected by the 300 metre buffer from the Mineral Aggregate Pit – Reserve (MP-R) Zone. There is also a very small part zoned Environmental Protection (EP). The exception zone states that the only permitted uses is forestry.</p> <p>Our mapping does not indicate an ANSI located near the property. The lands are zoned Environmental Protection (EP).</p>

		<p>which is being protected by this designation? Is this, indeed, a feature which extends over the concession road into our property?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This property is adjacent to a non-operating concession road (identified in green on the attachment). Will this proposed Zoning By-Law return the status of the concession road, in whole or in part, to "operational"? How is it possible for the owners of this property and other adjacent property owners to gain access? Shouldn't the township maintain some portion of the concession road to allow access to property on both sides but away from Highway 60, which is what concession roads were intended for? 	<p>The operation/maintenance/access of a concession road is not a zoning issue.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
15.	Council of Canadians – Ann Pohl, Spokesperson	<p>We received a very detailed submission that touched on a variety of items, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protection of Freshwater, - Collapse of the climate, - Provincial government’s use of MZO’s (Ministerial Zoning Orders), - Context for the zoning by-law not provided in the document, - Conservation Authority, - Clean Drinking Water, - Use of the County’s designations of “at capacity” or “near capacity,” to determine where additional residential development can be permitted, is seriously flawed. - Mineral Pits – number of pits - County lands not shown on map - Solar arrays and wind farms as permitted uses 	<p>The zoning by-law conforms to the County of Renfrew Official Plan as required by the Planning Act.</p> <p>At Capacity and Near Capacity Lakes are designated by the Province.</p> <p>A site-specific zoning by-law amendment would be required for solar and wind projects.</p> <p>Staff have reviewed the comments, and most of the comments were not relevant to the zoning by-law project. No change recommended.</p>
16.	Mary Crnkovich	Received comments at public meeting	Staff reviewed the mapping and the EP lands.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D zoning with Environmentally Protected areas – James/Water Street - Improve mapping - Protected areas – whose jurisdiction is it? 	<p>The Environmental Protection (EP) zone includes natural heritage features, natural water systems, and hazard lands. The EP lands are zoned based on data sets from the Province, through air photography, and site visits. Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) are established by the Province.</p> <p>Mapping of EP lands updated on maps.</p>
17.	Donna Cybulskie	<p>Written submission received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - My property at 178 Wildlife Road in KHR has been taxed for years as Residential Farm property. I have both gardened and raised animals/birds on the land over the years as have others. A barn was built about 31 years ago. There is a small cabin on the property (the main house burned down over 25 years ago) as well as some outbuildings. Over 180 loads of fill and gravel have been put down. - New zoning is EP-E1 and my understanding is that nothing will be able to be developed on the land as a result. - Won't be able to sell property and will have no value - Would a buyer be able to build a home and add onto the property as needed/desired or required in order to use it as a farm? 	<p>The lands zoned Environmental Protection – Exception One (EP-E1) are Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs). Residential uses are prohibited in the EP-E1 zone. The PSW boundary is established by the Province.</p> <p>Existing buildings and structures in the EP-E1 would be considered legal non-conforming uses.</p> <p>A small portion of the property is zoned Environmental Protection (EP).</p> <p>Staff reviewed the air photography on the property and updated the mapping of the EP lands. A portion of the property was also modified and zoned Rural (RU).</p>
18.	Peter Dickman	<p>Written comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - noticed the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are provincially Significant Wetlands labeled as EP-E1 for example. 2) There are other Environmentally Protected areas labeled EP. <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Are the Provincially Significant Wetlands (EP-E1) in effect now? 	<p>Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) are zoned as Environmental Protection – Exception One (EP-E1).</p> <p>The Environmental Protection (EP) zone includes natural heritage features, natural water systems, and hazard lands.</p> <p>1) The Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) are designated in the County of Renfrew Official Plan but are not currently zoned in the Township.</p>

		<p>2) Are the other Environmentally Protected areas (EP) in effect now?</p> <p>3) Are the Environmentally Protected areas (EP) designated exclusively by the Municipality?</p> <p>4) Does the Municipality anticipate a ‘rush’ by landowners to build on the EP areas contrary to the proposed Zoning By-law and how will the Municipality address these actions now and once the draft By-law is passed?</p>	<p>2) There are site specific EP zones in the Township.</p> <p>3) The EP lands are zoned based on data sets from the Province, through air photography, and site visits.</p> <p>4) This is unknown and not a topic that requires a change to the by-law.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
<p>19.</p>	<p>Paul Enns</p>	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formally object to any bylaws or addition of zoning restrictions on private property. I do have the Crown Patent to this property and have full rights to it. - Object to the classification in whole of any of it being zoned EP and having rights restricted. - Implication due to the setback on EP-E1. We have a garage/shed in this setback. Also, our neighbours' homes are in this EP-E1 setback. What happens to these structures? Are additional structures able to be built within the setback? - Ask that you reconsider a couple areas that are classified EP. While some areas are marsh, not all are. Specifically a 1 ha parcel at the north west corner of the property. It could be used for building a house and I may want to sever or build there one day. Can you please update accordingly. - I have plans to expand my shed in the EP-E1 setback. I would ask that you remove the setback from my property. - I have long term plans to put a pond along the north side of my property. Reroute the stream into the pond and then back under the culvert under the road. Is there any issue doing this? If there is I would like that written in that it would be allowed. 	<p>See Staff Comment No. 1</p> <p>A small portion of the property along Mountain View Rd is affected by the 120 metre Environmental Protection – Exception One (EP-E1) (the PSW) buffer.</p> <p>Buildings and structures within the 120 metre EP-E1 buffer would be considered to be legal non-conforming uses. They are permitted to remain. Any changes to the buildings and/or structures would need to meet the provisions of the by-law. No new structures would be permitted to be built with the 120 buffer without zoning relief.</p> <p>Based on the air photography of the property, there does appear to be some wetlands on the property including in the north west section of the property.</p> <p>The PSW boundary is established by the Province. Our office cannot remove or alter the PSW boundary or the 120 metre setback.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the EP zone. A portion of lands zoned EP was removed in the north west section of the property. No additional changes recommended.</p> <p>There are no permits or approvals required from the municipality for ponds. This does require permits from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and possibly Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). Diversion of watercourses and digging ponds is not a zoning issue.</p>

20.	Joshua Erskine	<p>Provided comments at open house</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The zoning by-law map is showing his property like how MPAC has it mapped but have Crown land being on his property and the Island property is also showing as Crown Land. 	<p>Crown land was removed and appropriate zoning is in place – Rural (RU) and Environmental Protection (EP) zones.</p>
21.	Wayne Etmanskie	<p>Concerns about Environmental Protection Area as what I can or can't do with it (what it means)</p>	<p>The Environmental Protection (EP) zone includes natural heritage features, natural water systems, and hazard lands.</p> <p>New residential uses are prohibited in the EP zone. Non-residential permitted uses include: Dam or other water control structure, Erosion control structure, Existing farm, Limited farm, and Passive recreation. No new buildings or structures other than for flood or erosion.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
22.	James Fauteux	<p>Our concern is maximum 30 day limit on trailer occupancy. Is this Provincial/zoning by-law? We own our property. If our "season" is basically 5 months, visiting trailer at weekends (20 weeks x2 days), not even including work vacation, why is it not 40 or 50 or even 60 day use. A 30 day visit maximum does not seem fair. What about people renting out their trailers? What about trailer parks?</p>	<p>KHR Council reviewed the proposed provisions for timing of trailers.</p> <p>KHR council received the template from the County with this provision and is of the understanding that this is a typical timeline utilized by other municipalities and wished to remain status quo with everyone else as this seemed to be a fair middle ground. Trailers are not permitted to be leased or rented (see Section 3.17.5).</p> <p>Trailer parks have their own zone, rules regarding the use, and are not subject to the "seasonal" or timing provision.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
23.	Linda Gavin	<p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural Residential vs Limited Service Residential - On a road that is LSR but not serviced - This by-law will not affect existing structures. If an existing structure has a use change, how does the by-law affect that? 	<p>Limited Service Residential (LSR) Zone refers to lots that has no frontage on a municipally maintained street, and that the owner is responsible for services such as snow clearing and road maintenance, and for ensuring the road condition is adequate for access by emergency vehicles including fire, ambulance and police. Rural Residential (RR) lots have frontage on a public road.</p> <p>Windy Shores Lane is shown as a private road.</p> <p>Existing legal structures will be permitted; current illegal structures will not be grandfathered in. A change of use building permit would be required. The building permit</p>

			<p>would be reviewed against current by-laws and whatever you are proposing would have to meet the requirements of the new by-law.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
24.	Nancy Gavin	<p>Received written comments and spoke at public meeting - Has received an approved variance application to build on my lot closer to the water than the setback due to the fact that my lot is only 99 feet deep. Will the new zoning bylaws affect my plans for building.</p>	<p>Existing zone is Rural Residential. A minor variance was approved to reduce the water setback for a dwelling to 11.8 metres from the high water mark. Property zoned to RR-Exception Five to reduce the water setback to 11.8 metres for a single detached dwelling.</p>
25.	Steve and Linda Grieveson	<p>Detailed written comments were submitted including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bylaw effectively prevents by its zoning restrictions and setbacks improvements and replacements to older cottages/outbuildings/bunkies and boathouses resulting in a significant loss in value to owners of their properties, resulting in a reduction in the tax base to the Township as a result of the loss of value, degradation of the Lake water quality and loss of business to local suppliers and contractors. - The template used for this Bylaw does not reflect the characteristics of the Township –specifically centred on the Lake - Believe that Council should appoint a committee of residents and property owners to review the Bylaw. - Date when by-law is in effect – proposed date of Dec. 2025 - Section 1.4 provides that nothing in the proposed Bylaw prevents what is permitted by an existing minor variance; but section 1.12 contradicts this when it states: “notwithstanding...” we also believe this is a mistake and it should read in section 1.12 “notwithstanding the foregoing minor variance decisions approved under any existing bylaws remain in full force and effect where the appropriate building permit is obtained by December 31, 	<p>The zoning by-law provides provisions for the existing legal non-conforming uses for repair, replacement or strengthening (section 3.18).</p> <p>Section 3.19 provides provisions for the rebuilding, repair or renovations of a non-complying use, building, or structure which has been damaged or destroyed by fire or natural disaster provided that such rebuilding, repair or renovation does not further contravene the by-law.</p> <p>The by-law was created to reflect the characteristics of the Township of Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards Township.</p> <p>The by-law will be in force once adopted by Council.</p> <p>Section 1.4 refers to buildings that have been built with the approval of a minor variance and will stay legal.</p> <p>Section 1.12 refers to extending the time period for minor variances and would allow construction in accordance with the approved variance that would otherwise not meet provisions of this proposed by-law for a period of one year.</p>

		<p>2025". Also there needs to be stated reference to grandfathering existing minor variances on existing properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flooding on Round Lake - Much of the shoreline of Round Lake, was subject to flooding but this is now mostly avoided by the annual drawdown as per the new Water Management Plan. - Definition for "Flood" - is unclear as to what is meant by "flood", ie is it to be determined by the current situation with drawdowns or by the prior situation. It is submitted that flood should be defined in accordance with the current situation and not the pre-drawdown situation. Moreover the definition talks about "not ordinarily covered by water" without defining what is meant by "ordinarily". We all know that from October-April certain areas of the Lake bed are not covered with water that at other times, i.e April-September are covered.so what is meant by "ordinarily" . - Section 3.12.1 provides for no restoration development in areas subject to flooding or damage caused by flooding, however, as noted above what is subject to flooding is quite uncertain given the changes in the Lake brought about by the drawdowns. In addition setbacks are the same as are measured from High Water Mark. - Section 3.12.1 states anything under 171.95 geodetic contour is susceptible to flooding and an elevation survey will be required for any building permit application. - This survey will cost according to my information at least \$1000 plus taxes. We would have thought the Township should have some idea as to where that contour is around the Lake such as at the boat launch, the public parks and fire hydrants. This is a significant cost - We too would also submit that the Township should know in advance how many properties will be in effect 	<p>Flood is defined in the by-law as a temporary rise in water level resulting in the inundation of areas that are adjacent to a water course and not ordinarily covered by water.</p> <p>New buildings or structures shall not be permitted below the 171.95m geodetic contour level regardless of any drawdown. (Section 3.12)</p> <p>Section 3.12 would apply on a case by case basis, and a survey may not be required for every property.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>down zoned by the development restrictions. This down zoning will obviously reduce assessments if the seasonal properties cannot be redeveloped which will result to higher taxes on other properties. I would further submit the Township provide its estimates of the impact on the tax base in this regard before proceeding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite section 3.12, section 3.18 allows replacement anywhere as long as no change in length, size or volume of the building; in other words replacement is permitted but only to the extent of there is no change in length, size or volume. Since the concern is over flooding, my submission is that there be an allowance for increase in height to permit flood proofing. This seems to be contradicted by Section 3.27.5 f which permits the expansion of a dwelling away from the water side of the dwelling. In addition, section 3.19.2 seems to allow additions to a structure where the existing building legally existed. Because if building/cottages are legal nonconforming uses then they do legally exist. Our submission is that these clauses should be redrafted to provide far more clarity across these three sections. Obviously this would avoid uncertainties, problems with interpretation and unnecessary costs and staff time to the Township. - Existing lots the minimum lot size should be whatever the current lot size of that particular lot is, to avoid all of the delays, costs and expenses of a minor variance each time there is some building, renovation or reconstruction. - There needs to be better definitions for Main Residential Dwelling, Cottage, Boathouse, Bunkie, etc. Especially where a building falls into more than one of these definitions. Such is the case with a 55+ year old boathouse and cottage combined on our property on the shoreline of Round Lake. Maintaining the building 	<p>Added a provision to Section 3.18 of the By-law that allows a building height to be increased if it is lifting the existing structure for flood proofing purposes.</p> <p>Existing lots that do not meet the minimum lot area or lot frontage requirements would be considered non-complying lots (section 3.20).</p> <p>These are standard definitions that are widely used in the planning field.</p> <p>Staff have received the comments and have added an additional provision to Section 3.18 that permits the building height to be increased for an existing structure being lifted for flood proofing purposes.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>integrity and performing restorative repairs from fire, tornado or other unforeseen circumstances would be exacerbated if the old seasonal cottage/boathouse cannot be replaced or rebuilt as a result of the provisions of the proposed Bylaw.</p>	<p>The by-law as drafted conforms to the County of Renfrew Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) to promote development within the Township. No additional changes recommended.</p>
26.	Karen Handford	<p>Comments provided at open house</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not think the property parcel mapping is correct, and there is an issues with a neighbour putting up a gate and blocking access to road. <p>Also provided written comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed zoning is RR - Do I need an exception on my property to continue to have my mobile home located here along with my 4 season home and seasonal outbuilding sleeping quarters? If so, I want this exception in this CZB. - If there is a property boundary mapping error, what is the current process to have it corrected (ie property sold and transferred from Registry to Titles with errors and omissions by lawyers) 	<p>Staff reviewed MPAC mapping and our mapping, both look the same. Paper assessment maps were also reviewed and matches what is currently mapped.</p> <p>Access or someone blocking a road is not a zoning issue.</p> <p>Legal structures will continue to be legal with the new zoning by-law. If structures were placed there illegally, they will continue to be illegal.</p> <p>A survey would be required. If there is an existing survey, it can be provided to our office along with the address of the property in question.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
27.	Connie Hennessy	<p>Detailed written comments were received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have had insufficient time to secure contractors as they are still backlogged from covid/lack of building supplies/etc so we are at the mercy of their timelines. The proposal does not allow sufficient time to secure contractors for our planning that commenced a year ago already and for which we have had discussions with our building inspector about. (ie we are still waiting on Hydro, Bell, surveys and Soil tester despite submitting requests for this half a year ago; they are simply delayed) Until we get their inspections, we cannot proceed with floor plans in order to formally acquire the building permit. How will the County accommodate this? 	<p>This is not a zoning related question.</p> <p>If the existing trailer was legal prior to the passing of the by-law, it will be a legal non-conforming use, and is permitted to be replaced. If structures were placed there illegally, they will continue to be illegal.</p> <p>This is not a zoning by-law issue.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For a lot in which there has been an existing trailer home for 3 decades. what will the rules be when it needs to be replaced? Can a new one be set up where it currently exists? Can a permanent dwelling be erected there instead? - Concerned that neighbors have already been filling in what could potentially be wetlands along the rear of properties beside us - 3.27, my understanding is that a home could be erected on a lot between 2 already existing dwellings on neighboring lots so that it essentially runs "parallel" to them.. The draft states "the minimum water setback may be"...what does May be" entail?? and how can this get approved? - Is the County considering multi -generational living given the socioeconomic situation in our Province? The Federal Gvt offers incentives to actually create care of elderly loved ones by building ie granny flat ideas...how does this plan accommodate this? - How are AirBnB's being addressed; will they continue to be permitted? - Will the Province be required to inform residents about when Round Lake will be at full capacity and if/when that occurs, does that mean the lot we are looking to purchase cannot be built on and would be deemed useless?? Would there be adequate notice from the Province that this is happening so we could start our build sooner? 	<p>Section 3.27.5(d) states that for an existing lot of record situated between two existing dwellings separated by not more than 100 metres, the minimum water setback may be reduced to the building line established by the two existing dwellings (measured to the wall of the primary building not including decks/or sundecks), provided that it shall not be less than 20 metres from the high water mark.</p> <p>Section 3.9.2 of the by-law provides the policies for Secondary Dwelling Units.</p> <p>Air BnBs are not addressed in the proposed zoning by-law. This is a separate issue to be addressed by Council.</p> <p>Lakes are designated “at capacity” or “near capacity” by the Province. We do not know when/if a change will occur.</p> <p>An amendment to the County of Renfrew Official Plan would be required to include Round Lake as an At Capacity Lake. Following the adoption of the Official Plan amendment, the Township of Killaloe, Hagarty & Richards Zoning By-law would be required to be updated to zone Round Lake as an At Capacity Lake.</p> <p>Staff have received the comments and no additional changes to the zoning by-law are required.</p>
28.	Carolyn Hudder & Hugh Ruff	<p>Written comments were received</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It appears wetland is a hayfield 2. Are open building permits grandfathered? 3. Can we rebuild existing house if it is destroyed? 	<p>The property is affected by the Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and the 120 metre buffer. There are also lands zoned Environmental Protection (EP). Staff verified the location of the EP zones on the property. The PSW boundary is established by the Province.</p>

		<p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact taxes - Current zoning by-law compared to the old by-laws. 	<p>The existing house can be rebuilt if destroyed in accordance with the provisions for non-conforming uses (section 3.18).</p> <p>See Staff Comment No. 5 above relating to taxes.</p> <p>The Township has a number of different zoning by-laws for different areas of the Township. The existing by-laws were incorporated into this draft document where appropriate. The old by-laws will be repealed.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
29.	Mark Janczarski	<p>Written comments were received</p> <p>The proposed zoning for the property is RU. We have now 3 dwellings (one side by side duplex and one 2 storey dwelling with garage). I applied for permit to build another building with the plan to become a dwelling. All dwellings are one bedroom size.</p>	<p>Legal structures will continue to be legal with the new zoning by-law. If structures were placed there illegally, they will continue to be illegal.</p> <p>The new dwelling would not be permitted in the new by-law without a site specific zoning by-law amendment. The zoning by-law amendment would most likely require studies to ensure the lot is suitable for the new development that is being proposed (such as servicing).</p> <p>The County offers a pre-consultation service to review development proposals – we are not providing development review comments through this zoning amendment process.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
30.	John Jeffrey	<p>Detailed letter was received and wants everything removed on property</p> <p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fought tree cutting by-law - People need to stick together and work together - Taxing of bush 	<p>See the general staff comments above (Nos. 1 & 2).</p> <p>Tree cutting is not a zoning issue.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
31.	<p>Killaloe and District Housing</p> <p>Janet Johnson</p> <p>Kristen Callaghan General Manager</p>	<p>Received written submission</p> <p>KDH are owners and operators of a multi-unit (28 units) residential apartment building in Killaloe (Millstream Apartments) on 2.06 acres. We would like clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our property is labelled R2 E1. Is this zoning correct? 	<p>Incorrect zoning of R2-E1. Property should be zoned Residential Two (R2). No exception zone is required. The R2 zone permits a variety of uses such as multiple attached dwelling and apartment.</p> <p>Any expansion would be required to meet the provisions of the zoning by-law.</p>

	Killaloe & District Housing Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many units are considered in R2? (Is there a range? Is there a maximum limit?) - What are those exceptions for our property? - We are interested in what potential limitations, if any, the draft CZB places (or maintains) on our corporation's ability to expand our existing building or to create an additional annex on our property to create additional housing? 	Property zone changed to Residential Two (R2).
32.	Killaloe Senior Friendship Club	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We own and operate a seniors community service club at 12 Lake Street in Killaloe. Our Club has been in operation at this location for 50 years now. Our incorporated nonprofit entity owns this building, and it is solely used for purposes determined by the Board on behalf of our members and as advocates for seniors in this area. No one lives on site - Property is zoned Residential One (R1) - Propose that the property be zoned Community Facility (CF) 	<p>The Community Facility (CF) zone permits a private club which is defined in the zoning by-law as a building or part of a building used as a meeting and social place exclusively for members of a chartered organization and their guests, and shall include a fraternal lodge (eg. Free Masons), a fraternity or sorority house, hostel, and a labour union hall.</p> <p>Property zone changed to Community Facility (CF) to reflect the accurate use of the property.</p>
33.	Ken Kuiack	<p>Received comments via a phone call</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - House, garages, workshop and barn on the property; zoned R2-E1; on town sewer, not water 	<p>Incorrect zoning on the property. Property to be zoned Development (D). The property is within the village area in Killaloe and in an area of other lands zoned Development (D). Existing dwellings and buildings are permitted.</p> <p>Zoning changed to Development (D) to reflect the zoning in the area.</p>
34.	Elizabeth Leblanc	<p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lives in a mobile home, wondering if they can have three buildings 	<p>This is a site specific zoning question, and is a separate matter to be addressed. More information would be required to provide an answer.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
35.	Jessica Lin	<p>Detailed written comments submitted including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would like to have a small vintage trailer (8x10' on the outside, it sleeps two adults) on the property. - 3.17.5 states that trailers can not be used more than 30 days in a calendar year, nor can they be leased or rented. 	<p>This is a separate matter to be addressed. This process/report is not to provide comments on specific proposals.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are zoned RU on the map provided online, and are living on a 42-acre piece of land. - In light of section 3.17.5, could you please let us know if it's possible to obtain a variance for this project of ours? And what we'd need to do in order to proceed with that? 	<p>This proposal would not be permitted in this Zoning By-law. The County offers a pre-consultation service to review development proposals – we are not providing development review comments through this zoning amendment process.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
36.	LVD Holdings	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business is commercial so wanted to double check 	<p>Property is zoned Rural (RU). There is a mini storage establishment on the property. The Highway Commercial (HC) zone permits a mini storage establishment.</p> <p>Property zone changed to Highway Commercial (HC) to reflect accurate use of the property.</p>
37.	Anna MacDonald	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - currently zoned Main Street Commercial (MSC) as is the property beside us. (Jason's and McCarthy's) - The new by-law would change our zoning to Residential 1 (R1). - We purchased this property largely because of its zoning and location with plans to open a restaurant/Inn/ B&B type business later in life 	<p>Property is currently zoned Central Commercial in the Village of Killaloe zoning by-law. MPAC shows that there is an existing dwelling on the property.</p> <p>Property zone changed to Main Street Commercial (MSC) to reflect the existing zoning.</p>
38.	Jodi Martel	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have owned our property on the lake since 2012 and purchased it with a single season Structure on it that is set back approx 75ft. - We are in the process of planning a new 4 season build - which we hope to begin in the fall of 2024. - Unfortunately, behind the current cottage is a set of boulders which could be very prohibitive in a build - and as such, we are very concerned about these new setback proposals. We live on a high and dry property - the area of the current home is at no risk of flooding. - We understand that is not all that comes into play when establishing waterfront setbacks. We'd like to know if there will be any individual considerations in these setback proposals. 	<p>A minimum water setback of 30 metres from the high water mark shall be provided in accordance with Section 3.27.5 of the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Section 3.27.5 e) of the By-law states that a legal non-complying dwelling may be moved or reconstructed to improve the existing water setback(s) of the dwelling, even if the improved setback(s) does not meet any other minimum required water setback described in the subsection, provided the dwelling to be moved or reconstructed is not increased in height, size or volume and the appropriate approvals for private sewage disposal services are obtained, and all other provisions of the By-law are complied with.</p> <p>If new dwelling is to be constructed that is larger than the existing structure/dwelling, a minor variance will be required.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

39.	Bryan Mask	<p>Comments submitted at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about development - What is the minor variance process? - Who has the authority to grant that? - Cost? - Timing of minor variance? 	<p>Section 45 of the Planning Act sets out the powers of the Committee to make decisions on minor variances. Minor variances are used for small changes or revisions to provisions in the zoning by-law.</p> <p>The applicant submits an application to the Township which is reviewed by the Committee of Adjustment for a decision. The cost is determined by the Township. A minor variance hearing must be held within 30 days of receiving the application. The minor variance process, must past the four tests; 1) is it minor in nature?, 2) does it meet the general intent of the County Official Plan, 3) does it meet the general intent of the zoning by-law, 4) is it desirable for the location. Each question must be a yes for the minor variance to pass. Following the decision of the committee, there is an appeal period of 20 days (for the applicant, Ministry or specified person or public body). The Township charges a fee of \$250.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
40.	Steve & Paula Mask	<p>Comments received - mapping shows Round Lake as at capacity</p> <p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define what Round Lake is - To Council –what is your stance on this by-law, can we set up a committee? 	<p>Round Lake is a near capacity lake.</p> <p>Council feels that forming committees would encompass too much time and resources. Council has followed the legislated process as required by law. The public has had their chance to provide input into this, and this process has taken those comments into account.</p> <p>Council’s stance on this bylaw is that this process is mandated by the province for the municipality to complete. Council has worked within their power to amend provisions in the bylaw, where permitted, to better reflect the characteristics and needs of the municipality.</p> <p>Mapping fixed to show Round Lake is a Near Capacity Lake.</p>
41.	Jim McClement	<p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the new regulations? We might be okay with how we are zoned now but in five years it might be different. 	<p>We don’t know what will happen with new regulations that are coming down from the Province. We have seen over the past three years about four different changes to the Planning Act and to the regulations on how municipalities can govern and tools they can use to regulate managed land use. There will likely be changes to the Provincial Policy Statement which will have a trickle-down effect to local zoning by-laws. We have seen a relaxing of the rules with the current Provincial Government. Provisions related to limits</p>

			<p>on dwellings per lot, and a relaxing of other regulations. The municipality is obligated to keep their policies any by-laws in line with any changing provincial legislation No change recommended.</p>
<p>42.</p>	<p>Joan Miller</p>	<p>We received a detailed submission with a number of comments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - subtexts or introductory notes for the Draft only would have been so helpful for myself and other KHR residents to know what was staying the same, what was changing and why. - responses during the meeting to Comments made by participants could have been more fulsome so that the audience had a better understanding around the point being raised, rather than the “point being raised” now becoming “the truth” in the community. <p>Specific Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 3.2 – Are these the same as existing bylaws, or are they different? If different, please indicate which ones and why they are changed. 2. Section 3.2.9 – Why is a maximum of two (2) tarpaulin garages permitted – specifically for a large rural lot? What does “orderly fashion” mean? 3. Section 3.2.10A – Why is a building permit required for a shipping container/storage trailer? What is the purpose of the building permit in this instance? What will be the cost of the permit, and what rules will apply? 4. Section 3.4 – An explanation as to why this is in the By-Law, and where the limits come from would be useful (ie., an explanatory note for the purposes of this draft by-law for understanding.) 5. Section 3.9.2.2 – Please explain the basis of the selection of the minimum lot area of 0.8 Ha to be required for a secondary dwelling. In a rural area, where we have issues with housing affordability, and with limited 	<p>There are multiple zoning by-laws in the Township of Killaloe, Hagarty & Richards which makes it difficult to show the changes made from each by-law</p> <p>All of the existing Zoning By-laws in effect for the Township of Killaloe, Hagarty & Richards will be repealed and replaced with the provisions of the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The standard template indicated only one tarpaulin garage was permitted. Council has increased this number to two for the taxpayers benefit.</p> <p>For reference, c-containers have always required a permit as they are a structure under the building code. The Province recently has amended the building code to allow sheds (or c-containers used as a shed for example) up to 15m² in size to be built without a permit. This square footage would encompass many typical c-containers. However, regardless if a permit is required, they are still required to follow the zoning setbacks, lot coverage amounts, etc. Council is still requiring permits on c-containers to ensure that they meet the provisions of the zoning bylaw.</p> <p>The by-law as drafted conforms to the County of Renfrew Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) as required by the Planning Act.</p>

		<p>seniors’ homes, I would think we should be encouraging secondary dwellings to minimize cost for younger people, keep seniors in their homes. Is there a scientific/safety/engineering reason for the 0.8 hectares?</p> <p>6. Section 3.9.2.12 – a) Please provide the scientific rationale for the 300 metres. b) please identify the rationale for this restriction, regardless of the County of Renfrew Official Plan policy) – as written, it doesn’t make sense in comparison to a).</p> <p>7. Section 3.17.5 – What is the basis for these three restrictions – 30 days, 14 days consecutively, no leasing or renting? Why are these restrictions here – is it related to safety, environmental or other? Has a difference between residential or rural considered?</p> <p>8. Section 3.24.1 and .2 – This whole section is too restrictive for a largely rural municipality. Please provide your rationale for these restrictions.</p> <p>9. Section 3.26.3 – I read this as no farm use within 30 metres from any lot line, ie., no ploughing of the field within 30 metres. Is this a correct read? If so, please explain why there is this restriction.</p> <p>10. Section 3.36 – As outdoor furnaces are only permitted in rural and agriculture zones, please provide the rationale (safety or otherwise) for their location and height restrictions, to demonstrate that these restrictions are necessary. (I have not seen an outdoor furnace with a smokestack 2 storeys high, nor do I want to.)</p> <p>11. Section 4.2 – Again, an explanatory note on where these numbers come from would be beneficial to understand the rationale and reasoning for the restrictions.</p> <p>12. Section 8 – What has changed here, compared to the existing by-laws? It would be beneficial to have the applicable Parking & Loading provisions that apply to RR</p>	<p>County Planning Staff and Township Staff met with Council and came up with provisions that best met the desired growth for the Township.</p> <p>Staff have received the comments, and the comments provided do not require any changes to the by-law.</p> <p>The provisions in the Zoning By-law are based on the policies in the County of Renfrew Official Plan, and based on common provisions used in other municipalities.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>to be re-listed, as it is difficult to pick them out from Section 4.</p> <p>13. Section 22.2 – What has changed for Rural Zone compared to existing? Again, it would be beneficial to have the applicable general provisions re-stated here so that it is very clear what the proposed restrictions are, and why those restrictions are necessary for this zone. (This applies to Section 23 as well)</p> <p>14. Section 22.3 and 23.3– It would be beneficial to have a rationale stated as to why these various exception zones exist – is it due to existing practices, existing limitations, or something else? As a general reader of this Official Plan, I should know why the exceptions exist to help ensure fairness to everyone.</p> <p>15. Section 25 – Section 25.1 states residential structures are prohibited, and only buildings or structures can be built for flood or erosion control. Then Section 25.2 seems to imply that one can erect, alter or use a building or structure within the provisions listed. Can the clarity be improved here so that it is known what exactly is permitted.</p>	
43.	<p>MTO <i>Tarique Kamal</i> Corridor Management Senior Project Manager (A) Corridor Management Section East Operations Ministry of Transportation (MTO)</p>	<p>Written comments received: Highway 60 is designated as a King’s Highway. Under the authority of the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, the Ministry, through the issuance of permits, controls all land use within 45 metres of the highway right-of-way and the area within 180 metres of the center-point of the intersection of the highway and any intersecting road. As well, the Ministry’s control area extends to 800 metres for developments that are considered a larger traffic generator. All development within the control area is subject to Ministry approvals and it is the responsibility of the landowner to acquire all necessary MTO permits prior to the commencement of any activities within the control area.</p>	<p>By-law already included wording related to developments within 45 metres of any limits of Kings Highway and 180 metres of the centre point of an intersection and any access to the highway will be subject to MTO approval.</p> <p>No changes necessary.</p>

		<p>Therefore, the MTO strongly encourages early consultation of any activities that will be carried out within the control area so that stakeholders can grasp a clear picture of the MTO review process, requirements, personnel to engage, and timelines; as well as the expectations regarding associated planning, design and construction including engineering consultant qualifications.</p> <p>The MTO pre-consultation requests can be submitted online using the Highway Corridor Management Online Services at: HCMS - Highway Corridor Management System (gov.on.ca)</p>	
44.	Terry Morgan 775 John St RR5 Killaloe, ON K0J 2A0	<p>Written comments were received: Maps are grossly inaccurate and false</p>	<p>The zoning maps are based on data from the Provincial government, local datasets, existing zoning by-laws and on air photography.</p> <p>The Open House, Public Meeting and online mapping provided an opportunity for the public to review the mapping; staff have been correcting any inaccuracies that have been brought to our attention.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
45.	Mike Nagy	<p>Detailed written submission was received with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns in relation to the broad uses that a landowner can undertake on their property designated as RU (Rural) and due to the lack of environmental protection(s) that this current plan has included for both groundwater and river valley corridors, ANSIs , wetlands etc. - No buffer zones of setbacks for ‘farming’ and or other impactful activities from streams, rivers and also from other ratepayer’s property lines. - ANSIs and other environmentally sensitive-protected features were identified on the maps. - No land use buffers in place as incompatible land uses will degrade or destroy them due to inadequate or non-existent setbacks 	<p>The Zoning By-law does have buffers where deems appropriate in accordance with the Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement.</p> <p>The by-law as drafted conforms to the County of Renfrew Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) to promote development within the Township. No changes recommended.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livestock should not be permitted in natural areas including forests especially mature forests that are connected to watercourses. - Urge for setbacks of at least 30 meters (as per bylaw recommendations) of livestock and manure etc from property lines where residential dwellings exist even in areas that are designated RU, (this is not clear enough as it only states manure not livestock themselves which could be contradictory) and that livestock not be allowed in natural areas such as established forests and especially watercourses for obvious reasons with setbacks also put in place to preserve water quality. <p>Provided comments at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the process for Township to investigate illegal structures and conflict between neighbours? 	<p>The Township operates on a complaint basis. However, if the Building Official sees construction occurring without a permit, they will inspect the property and enforce the provisions of the building code.</p>
46.	Duncan Noble	<p>Comments received at public meeting – would be nice to know the process to carry forward; are Renewable Energy uses permitted</p>	<p>A Notice of Passing will be sent to everyone who made oral comments or submitted written comments.</p> <p>Large commercial scale renewable energy uses would not permitted; a zoning by-law amendment is required. Private use of renewable energy is permitted.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
47.	Nicole Olsheskie on behalf of Gerard and Jaqueline	<p>Written submission received/phone call</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Half property is zoned Environmental Protection (EP) but shouldn't be; areas are dry; property lines aren't showing on the whole property 	<p>Zoning map was amended to accurately reflect EP on property.</p>
48.	Lorraine Pecoskie	<p>Comments submitted at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asked that council give consideration to economic development. - Not doing enough for economic development and supporting those who would bring economic development to the Township 	<p>This is not a zoning related question. No change recommended.</p>

49.	Amanda and Jose Pinto	<p>Comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why would our property be zoned MP-R when approx. 2 miles from us is a large sand/gravel pit on Mask Road. Our property is a wooded lot and where its zoned there is no open road access 	<p>The conservation and management of mineral aggregate is considered to be a matter of provincial interest, and are required to be mapped by the Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The Province requires that the Township identify and protect mineral aggregate resources. The Provincial mapping provided to us indicates there is an aggregate resource in that area.</p> <p>The property is primarily zoned Rural (RU) with a portion at the back zoned Mineral Aggregate Pit – Reserve (MP-R).</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
50.	April Popham	<p>Detailed written comments were received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Currently is inhabited with multiple buildings and residences all in accordance with municipal regulations and taxes are paid consistently to date. - The property is to be zoned MP-R which is incorrect. It should be RU. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can we log the environment protected area which includes our existing tree plantation and MP-R area? 2. Can we still build a shed or garage by our houses which are on both Environmental protected areas and MP-R area? 3. Can we build additions on to our existing homes if necessary? 4. We have an existing sand pit in EP area. Will that be an issue? 5. Will the property taxes increase or decrease with these zoning changes? If so by how much? 6. Can we farm the EP and MP-R areas? 7. What are we currently zoned as? 8. What is the dotted are called “Separation Distances” mean? 	<p>Our office received the mineral aggregate resource information from the Province. A portion of the property is designated Mineral Aggregate in the County Official Plan. The zoning by-law is required to match the Official Plan. The Mineral Aggregate Pit – Reserve (MP-R) zone shows the location of the resource.</p> <p>A small portion of the property is zoned Rural (RU). The remainder of the property is zoned MP-R and Environmental Protection (EP).</p> <p>The dotted lines show the 300 metre separation distance from the mineral aggregate resource in accordance with the Official Plan and Section 3.26 of the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The zoning by-law does not limit logging or forestry practices. There are no municipal restrictions regarding logging in the EP or MP-R areas.</p> <p>The existing houses are considered to be legal uses, and expansions would be permitted. A new shed or garage would be considered to be accessory to the house, and would be permitted. If relief is required, there are options such as a zoning amendment that could be considered.</p> <p>Taxes are not a zoning issue.</p> <p>Limited farm is permitted within EP and MR-R areas. Limited Farm means land used for growing and harvesting field, bush, vine, forest or tree crops or grazing and does not include a farm dwelling and accessory buildings and uses.</p>

		<p>9. We have never been a licensed pit so why are we zoned to become MP-R ?</p> <p>10. Do we have any rights or say as to whether the property changes zoning?</p> <p>11. Can you send us all information on our current zoning and MP-R zoning usage rights and restrictions</p> <p>12. What is the date or time line on when these new bylaws and zoning are to be completed? I would like to make a formal request to be notified when this is to go through.</p>	<p>The exact timing is unknown. The Council will review the Staff Report prior to making a decision. A Notice of Passing or Refusal will be sent out.</p> <p>The dotted separation distance refers to the 300 metre buffer from the lands zoned MP-R.</p> <p>The zoning by-law amendment process is a public process. The open house and public meeting were held to provide the public with an opportunity to review the proposed mapping and text. and to provide public comments.</p> <p>No recommended changes.</p>
51.	Brandon Prince	<p>Written comments received I would like to know who deemed and zoned certain areas and land as agricultural and environmental? Was any survey ever done for these areas or is it just what they feel is reasonable?</p> <p>What conditions are going to be required to be met now if one wants to build on land that is close to agriculture? Am I going to have to put forward the money to have my land surveyed again because it was not done?</p> <p>Comments received at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What part of this by-law promotes younger people to build in this Township? Who decides on the zoning designations? Will be County come and access the property before we build? 	<p>It starts with the data from the province as it needs to meet provincial regulations and requirements. Staff created the zoning maps based on datasets from the province, air photography and some site inspections.</p> <p>New dwellings would be required to meet the Minimum Distance Separation I (MDS I) requirements in accordance with Section 3.26, and the buildings must meet the zone requirements of the applicable zone.</p> <p>A building permit would be required from the Township if you wish to build. Questions regarding building should be directed to the Township’s Chief Building Official.</p> <p>The County will not access properties prior to building.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
52.	Julia Prince-Borutski	<p>Detailed written comments received including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setbacks of 2 m are not sufficient where grading is required to level new construction. Building code 9.14.6.1 must be referenced in by-laws so property owners, contractors and the building official all know and respect it. The code requires new construction to be 	<p>New buildings and structures, that require a building permit, will be reviewed in accordance with the Ontario Building Code and the Zoning by-law and other requirements by the Chief Building Official.</p> <p>Please see Staff Comment No. 1 regarding the authority to zone.</p>

		<p>graded so water drains away from the building and does not negatively affect adjacent properties. This cannot be ignored in the by-laws.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I agree about encroaching on property owners’ rights. - Given that many properties are quite narrow, the two-meter setback may make sense; however, based on experience with the existing by-laws greater protection should be provided by referencing the “Surface Drainage” requirements of the Building Code whenever the side setbacks are specified. - By requiring compliance with the Building Code as a requirement for minimal setbacks near the property line, the County and the Township can better ensure that drainage is properly managed during and after any construction close to the property line to avoid surface water draining onto adjacent properties and causing water damage. - The building official claims drainage management is a civil matter! The Township claims the building official properly applied the Building Code. - Many people seem concerned about government overreaching and that such by-laws can only be established for Township/municipality owned property. - In my experience with consultations with the Federal government, we always tried to manage sensitive issues by getting ahead of them, bringing key players onsite and using messaging to guide the dialogue. I expect that there must be some authority other than section 58 giving government the authority to establish by-laws (i.e., that it is being read out of context?) I am wondering why none of the representatives responded to these concerns and clarified the authority? Everyone looked quite afraid to say anything and the mayor looked quite arrogant and 	<p>Regarding the functions of the Province vs. County vs. Township (briefly):</p> <p>Canada’s constitution recognizes two governments and assigns them different roles/responsibilities – These are Federal and Provincial.</p> <p>Provincial government through legislation created municipalities and assigned them roles and functions. Municipalities are “creatures” of the province and are required to follow the rules of the Province (municipalities are not recognized under the constitution). At any time, the Province can change legislation or the roles of a municipality – including to the extreme, dissolving the municipality in its entirety (refer the recent example of the discussions around Peel Region, or the changes to municipal boundaries under the Greenbelt).</p> <p>Through various legislation, mainly the Planning Act, the Province has delegated authorities/responsibilities to local governments for land use planning which includes the passing of Official Plans and Zoning by-laws. Under the Planning Act, the authorities are as follows regarding certain planning matters.</p> <p>County of Renfrew has decision making authority for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans of subdivision/condominium • Consent (severances) • County Official Plan Amendments • Final Approval of Local Official Plan Amendments <p>Local Township’s have decision making authority for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning By-laws • Minor Variances • Site Plans • Local Official Plans <p>Regarding this zoning project – this is a Township initiated project and the Council of Killaloe Hagarty Richards is delegated the authority for approval. In this case, because the Township does not have in-house planning staff, the Township has hired County of</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>angry that people would dare challenge him and his authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there any plan to explain the authority further to try and calm the crowd? I have not seen anything explaining the authority and believe people need to better understand it if they are expected to truly be part of the consultation process. Could you please confirm how the County functions in relation to the Township and the Province (beyond this planning role)? 	<p>Renfrew staff as a “consultant” to undertake the project of preparing the document on their behalf. The County of Renfrew does not approve the zoning by-law – we provide the staff support for the project but the Township ultimately makes the decision.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Township is bound by the Province to make decisions that align with Provincial interests and policies. So while the local Council are the decision makers, there are many matters that are “outside” of their control.</p> <p>Staff have reviewed the comments, and there are no zoning concerns to be addressed.</p>
53.	<p>Mark Prince</p> <p>Email from Debbie Prince</p>	<p>Written Comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would like to know how have you determined the zoning on Mineral Aggregates (MP-R)? - Owns properties that is zoned MP-R. On the map I noticed that there are many properties on Red Rock Road, Tramore Road, Simpson Pit and Mask Road that I think would fall under the MP-R zone, but are zoned Rural. I wonder why? If you are going to zone MP-R, then you should do all that fall into this category and not pick and choose properties. - If you decide to go with the map the way it is then there is discrimination in place, and I am against the way you arrived at the zoning on the Map. At 1318 Red Rock Road we have 141 acres, with a house, and we would like to build on this property, but 3/4 of this property is zoned MP-R and a buffer, and can you please tell me where do we build? There remainder of this property outside the buffer is all hill and rock, unable to build here, would cost a fortune. - Why is there a buffer in the Lakes? If I was able to build do I need a variance? We are paying high taxes and are now restricted as to how we are able to use the property. - This zoning is something that cannot be done in Toronto on a computer, using an APP or some other software that 	<p>The conservation and management of mineral aggregate is considered to be a matter of provincial interest, and are required to be mapped by the Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The Province requires the protection of mineral aggregate, and it is outside the Township’s control. The resource mapping was received from the Province which has indicated that there is an aggregate resource in that area.</p> <p>1318 Red Rock Road is zoned Mineral Aggregate Pit – Reserve (MP-R) and Rural (RU). Approximately half of the lands zoned RU are affected by the 300 metre buffer from the MP-R zone. A dwelling is permitted on the lands zoned RU outside of the 300 metre buffer zone. If relief is required, there are options such as a zoning amendment that could be considered. An Aggregate Impact Study in accordance with the Official Plan may also be required to justify the reduction.</p> <p>1372 Red Rock Road is zoned Rural (RU), and the entire property is within the 300 metre buffer of the MP-R zone. In accordance with Section 3.26.1 i) of the Zoning by-law, for a lot that includes a dwelling as a permitted use, and where the lot is entirely located within the separation distance of an aggregate resource, the separation distance shall not apply. The construction of a new dwelling is permitted and the enlargement, repair, or replacement of an existing dwelling is permitted. The dwelling is to be located as remotely from the aggregate zone as the lot will allow to the satisfaction of the chief building official.</p> <p>The MP-R buffer shows the 300 metres from the resource which happens to show on the lake.</p>

		<p>might have been used. The concerns that I have should be given the highest concern right now! If you would like to discuss this, I would gladly meet with you and show you on your map!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Also, more clarification is needed on the property that is zoned MP-R, does this give the County and Municipality the right to open a Pit? Please explain to me what the procedures will be? Will there be any cost to the property owner? Will the property owner receive income generated from said sales of Aggregate? My property will have so many restrictions, so should my tax bill! 	<p>The MP-R zone does not give the County and the Municipality the right to open a pit – it protects the lands from encroaching/incompatible land uses from developing in these areas so that the resource is protected in the long-term.</p> <p>Staff have reviewed the comments, and no changes to the by-law are recommended.</p>
54.	Julie Recoskie	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property is primarily impacted by 300 metre separation buffer except for a small piece. Does this mean on this side of Cardinal Rd. we cannot build a home or if we can what are the steps that need to be done? 	<p>Portions of the property are affected by the 300 metre separation distance buffer for a Mineral Aggregate Pit. The 300 metre separation distance is required in accordance with the County of Renfrew Official Plan and Provincial Policy. A dwelling is permitted on the lands zoned RU that are outside of the 300 metre buffer.</p> <p>In order to build a dwelling on lands zoned RU but within the MP-R buffer, a minor variance or a zoning by-law amendment would be required to reduce the separation distance. An Aggregate Impact Study in accordance with the Official Plan may also be required to justify the reduction.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
56.	Robert Rossow	<p>We received a detailed written submission. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern regarding lot sizes/replacing seasonal residences/EP zoning - Minor Variance – what is or is not a minor variance - Replacement of existing seasonal residences - With respect to the reference to 3.18.3, I note that a building may be altered or repaired so long as there is no increase in height, size or volume; it's hard to imagine a building being repaired or altered without affecting the height, size or volume and I wonder what the utility of this provision is. - On the other hand the same provision does not have any restrictions on replacement so that a person could 	<p>Lots that do not meet the minimum lot size are considered to be non-complying lots (Section 3.20). Buildings and structures are permitted to erected, enlarged, repaired or renovated provided the use conforms with the By-law and the buildings or structures comply with all the other provisions of the By-law.</p> <p>Minor variances are used for small changes or revisions to provisions in the zoning by-law. (Please see No. 39 regarding the Minor Variance Process).</p> <p>For non-complying uses, Section 3.19.1 refers to the rebuilding, repairs and renovations. In order to enlarge the building or structure, a minor variance is required.</p>

		<p>replace according to this section without adhering to the heights size and volume requirements for an alteration or repair and I'm wondering if this is what is intended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finally section 3.27.5 f would allow expansion without restriction as to water setbacks so long as the expansion is no wider with the existing dwelling. - These provisions in section 3 are irreconcilable and will lead to at the least confusion and uncertainty and give little comfort and a great deal of expense to the particular owner wishing to do any of altering, repairing or replacing. Obviously they require revision. - The EP zoning along the lakeside of Red Rock Road, I understand that you intend to change this, - Affordable housing in the Township. - Assessment and zoning are "totally separate items" 	<p>Staff reviewed the air photography on the property and there are no EP area on property.</p> <p>Zoning Map updated to remove EP areas based on the review of the air photography on the property.</p> <p>Provisions for secondary dwelling units are included in the Zoning By-law. See Staff Comment No. 5 above.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the comments, and no further changes to the by-law are recommended.</p>
57.	Round Lake Property Owners' Association (Rob Norris – RLPOA President)	<p>Detailed written comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-Law has been brought to our attention during the worst possible time of the year, when most of our members are away from the lake, making it difficult for many to provide input, and participate in the open house and public meeting. - RLPOA would like to ensure that there is an opportunity for further community consultation on the Draft Zoning By-Law. - We would like to inquire as to when the KHR Township Council will be addressing this issue at a Council Meeting? - Is the Council planning to table this in 2023 or 2024, and will the Council provide ample time to inform the public of this future Council meeting? We would like to ensure that there are no last minute additions to the Council 	<p>See Staff Comment No. 2 above</p> <p>The timing of the meeting is unknown at this time. The updated version of the Zoning By-law will be available on the Township website, and the ZenCity link that was included in the original Notice of Application and Public Meeting.</p> <p>There will not be an additional public meeting. The Township Council held the required public meeting.</p> <p>A Notice of Passing will be sent to everyone who made an oral or written submission. Appeal rights will be described in the notice.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

		<p>meeting agenda on the Draft Zoning By-Law, and that changes to the Zoning By Law are not approved, without having an opportunity for further community input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We would greatly appreciate it if you could let the RLPOA know when the Council meeting on the subject of Zoning By-Law will be held (including date and time). The RLPOA would also appreciate a timely written response on this matter. 	
58.	Hugh Ruff	<p>Comments provided at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a transcript being provided? 	<p>The Township will have minutes from the public meeting.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
59.	Andrew and Marlene Shulist	<p>Concerns about Environmental Protection Area and what it means</p>	<p>The Environmental Protection (EP) zone includes natural heritage features, natural water systems, and hazard lands.</p> <p>Residential Uses are prohibited in the EP zone. Non-residential permitted uses include: Dam or other water control structure, Erosion control structure, Existing farm, Limited farm, and Passive recreation. No new buildings or structures other than for flood or erosion.</p> <p>Property is primarily zoned Rural (RU) with a portion zoned Environmental Protection (EP).</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
60.	Arthur Shulist	<p>Submitted comments at public meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asked if this is implemented; sounds like it is already the law; sounds like it is being dictated, have no say on the properties 	<p>The proposed zoning by-law is required to be passed by Council.</p> <p>There is a public process to provide the public with an opportunity to see the maps and proposed zoning. It also provides an opportunity to make oral and written comments. The Township Zoning By-law is required to be consistent with the PPS, and conform with the Official Plan. There are certain items that the Township has the opportunity to make work and customize for Killaloe, Hagarty & Richards such as lot line setbacks, height of buildings, and whether to allow or not allow the use of sea cans. There are also certain items that are outside the municipalities’ control that have to be included in the zoning by-law based on provincial interest such as: protection of identified mineral aggregate areas, setbacks to waste disposal areas, setbacks to environmentally sensitive areas, and Ministry of Transportation requirements.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

61.	Linda Schutt	<p>Comments submitted by email</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no zoning currently but the proposed zoning designation is residential. - This camp has been in business for approximately 90 years as a hunting and fishing destination for people all over the world. It has involved three generations of the family. It has huge historical significance. It was also the gateway to Algonquin Park as the permit office. 	<p>The property on the Bonnechere River side contains the main dwelling, cabins, and a washroom/shower facility. The property on the other side of Turner’s Road contain multiple cabins, trailers and campsites.</p> <p>The property is currently zoned Rural (RU).</p> <p>Recommend that the properties on both sides of Turners Road be zoned Tourist Commercial (TC) Zone to reflect the accurate commercial use of the property.</p>
62.	Jean Skapura	<p>Submitted comments at public meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports proposed changes to allow use of trailer for 30 days of the year - Can one person put me in the position to not be in compliance - Right-of-way through property – use of the residents not for public use 	<p>Enforcement of the by-law is the responsibility of the Township.</p> <p>Private right-of-way use is not a zoning issue. This by-law will not regulate who can use it.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
63.	Tania Skapura	<p>Addressing concerns</p> <p>Our property is a vacant restaurant/campground and it was zoned general commercial. We are currently renovating the campground and adding kayak/canoe rentals. This should be zoned TC – Tourism Commercial. The property is already used as a campsite so the GC designation is not accurate. Currently the property is not zoned</p>	<p>Staff reached out to Canada Post to have address updated.</p> <p>Staff requested information on historical use of the property from the owner. Owner confirmed it has been used for camping with a maximum of 4 sites.</p> <p>Recommend that the property be zoned TC-E6 to permit the maximum of 4 camping/trailer sites.</p>
64.	Tim Summers	<p>Comments received – Owner stated that property is used for commercial uses – it is used as a car dealership parking lot to display new and used vehicles for sale and a permit was issued from the MTO in Feb. 2018.</p>	<p>Property zoned General Commercial (GC) to reflect accurate use of the property and zoning in the area.</p>
65.	Dennis Surnoskie	<p>Written comments were received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the draft township of Hagarty Zoning map the property is shown as RU rural which is fine at the present. - However, it also borders property that is tourist commercial TC and it would be reasonable to expect that 	<p>If an owner of property proposes a development, there is a process to apply for an amendment to the zoning by-law.</p> <p>The County offers a pre-consultation service to review development proposals – we are not providing development review comments through this zoning amendment process.</p>

		at some time in the future this property would be better used to support tourism which would require development of buildings and whatever else is necessary.	No change recommended.
66.	Dominique Sutherland & David Findlay	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appeal the new zoning being proposed on Limited Residence specifically with regards to lot coverage. - How does limited service residential impact my property. What is the zoning doing to impact my property? 	<p>Section 9.2(f) states that the maximum lot coverage in the Limited Service Residential (LSR) zone is 25%.</p> <p>Limited Service means the lot does not have frontage on a municipally maintained street, and the owner is responsible for services such as snow clearing, road maintenance, and for ensuring that the road condition is adequate for access by emergency vehicles including fire, ambulance and police.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
67.	Beat Ulrich	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would like to have timber framing shop on the property - Is my understanding correct that home occupation use, includes homeschooling? And we could not have more than 6 pupils in our homeschool? Or is there some sort of exception to educational studies? - Do people who are carpenters have to rezone the area where their shops are due to the new bylaws? I would be on the customers site as much as I would be at my place so does it really count as commercial? 	<p>A home industry is defined in the Zoning By-law as a gainful occupation including a day nursery, carpentry, electrical shop, woodworking, window framing, welding, plumbing, machine or auto repair shop, riding stables and a kennel with a maximum of four outdoor runs; a service shop; blacksmithing; or a storage building for school buses, boats or snowmobiles and may be conducted in whole or in part in a dwelling unit or an accessory building to a single detached dwelling or to a permitted farm use.</p> <p>The home industry provisions would be required to be met. If the provisions can not be met, a zoning by-law amendment is required.</p> <p>A teacher is listed under the definition of home occupation. The provisions for home occupation are in section 3.15 of the zoning by-law. The by-law states that where instruction is carried on, no more than six pupils are in attendance at any one time.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
68.	Cynthia Walters	<p>Written comments received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am quite concerned regarding how the passing of this new Zoning By-law will affect my ability to retire on my 15 acres of land. I have been planning my retirement for 35 years and I am afraid of how these new By-laws will affect my future. It was my long-time desire to live in a tiny house on my land upon retirement. According to what I have read this will not be allowed and I cannot live on my land according to the new By-law. I seek 	<p>Property is zoned Rural (RU) which permits residential and non-residential uses. There is no minimum dwelling size required in the RU zone. Any dwelling is required to meet the Ontario Building Code (OBC).</p> <p>Comments did not indicate any specific changes to the by-law. No changes recommended.</p>

		clarification on this matter as all my 35 years of planning is now uncertain and I am devastated	
69.	Andy Whelan	<p>Written comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not agree with the draft of the zoning restrictions placed on the property - The proposed zoning of - Development “Open Space ” does not align with the current and historic use of the property. In addition, the areas outlined in the draft as EP are not accurate and border a man-made pond. - Proposed use is a contactor’s yard or shop. 	<p>The Environmental Protection (EP) zone includes natural heritage features, natural water systems, and hazard lands. The EP lands are zoned based on data sets from the Province, through air photography, and site visits.</p> <p>The property is currently zoned Topographic Restraint (TPRS) in the current zoning which permits residential uses such as a single detached dwelling and non-residential uses including, but not limited to, cabin establishment, restaurant, and roadside stand.</p> <p>A contractor’s yard or shop is not a permitted use in the current zone (TPRS). A site specific zoning by-law amendment would be required to permit a contactor’s yard or shop.</p> <p>Existing dwellings are the only permitted residential use in the Development (D) zone. Non-residential uses include, but not limited to, natural area, limited farm, and passive recreation.</p> <p>The portion of the property with frontage along Ruby Road is zoned as Rural (RU). The RU zone permits single detached dwelling and a variety of non-residential uses.</p> <p>Existing buildings would be considered legal non-conforming.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the air photography and the EP zone was removed from around the pond. No additional changes recommend.</p>
70.	Brian Whiffin	<p>Detailed written comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 3.2.8 - The minimum lot size of 4000 m2 (1 acre) is overly restrictive given the large number of lots that are already established in areas such as around Round Lake that are nowhere near an acre. The threshold for permitting one sleep cabin should be reduced to align to typical lot sizes in the area (i.e. 1200 m2). As sleep cabins provide temporary accommodation for guests or visitors, it is not apparent why they would be prohibited on waterbodies identified as “at capacity”. This restriction 	<p>A sleep cabin is permitted on a lot with a minimum lot size of 4000 square metres.</p> <p>Any legal existing sleep cabins would continue to be legal.</p> <p>The At Capacity and Near Capacity Lakes are labelled on the Schedule to the Zoning By-law. Round Lake is labelled as a near capacity lake on the zoning schedule.</p>

		<p>should be reconsidered.-(NOTE: It would be beneficial to include a listing of waterbodies in the Township that are designated “at capacity” or where this information can be found).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excessive noise is a periodic problem in some areas of the Township - Short Term Rentals (STR) are an increasing concern to many residents particularly as the expectations of renters is not well defined 	<p>Noise would be regulated under a separate noise by-law.</p> <p>Air BnBs (short term rentals) are not addressed in the proposed zoning by-law.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the comments, and no changes to the by-law are recommended.</p>
71.	Caroline Belfoi-Woodland and Tom Woodland	<p>A very detailed submission was received.</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This has nothing to do with MPAC and the property values. - No wifi at meeting so was unable to access the by-law during the meeting. - The ‘cottagers’ that have closed and returned to the city, were also not provided any accessibility to the discussion which should have had a camera and zoom for them to attend remotely and have their voices heard. - the Bylaw effectively prevents by its zoning restrictions and setbacks improvements and replacements to older cottages resulting in a significant loss in value to owners of these cottages. - Only recently hearing that the by-law has been in works since August 2021. - I would like to submit that this by-law must be delayed and the timing once it is known pushed out for the right democratic process to take place for all landowners in this Township. - A question was asked as to what benefit this provides to the Township and the resulting silence was clear that this is not providing any benefits to the property owners in 	<p>Please see Staff Comment No. 5 above.</p> <p>All property owners were notified of the open house and public meeting in accordance with the Planning Act. Property owners are able to submit written comments.</p> <p>The zoning by-law provides provisions for the existing legal non-conforming uses to repair, replacement or strengthening of an existing building or structure (section 3.18).</p> <p>Staff reviewed the comments, and no changes to the by-law are recommended.</p>

		the Township. We all want to protect the Lake and our properties.	
72.	Sarah Yanju	Provided comments at public meeting - No cell/wifi for accessibility. Asked Council about what excites them about the by-law and what was the most challenging.	The purpose of the meeting was to hear from the public; it was not a question and answer period for Council. No change recommended.
73.	Unidentified person	Comments received at public meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What part of this promotes young people from building in this Township? - Who went around and zoned these properties 	Our office receives data sets from the province. County staff created the maps from a variety of sources including Township staff, air photography and site inspections. No change recommended