

Date: September 18, 2025

To: Cale Henderson, Director of Development Services and Environmental Initiatives
Township of The Archipelago

From: Rebecca Elphick, Planner

CC: David Welwood, Senior Planner
Marilyn Cameron, Planner

Subject: Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review for the Township of The Archipelago

JLR No.: 31668-002.1

Background

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited (JLR) was retained by the Township of The Archipelago (the Township) to undertake a comprehensive review of and update to Zoning By-law A2000-07 following the Township's adoption of an updated Official Plan in 2018.

To date, JLR has completed a review of best practices from other jurisdictions similar in size and geography to the Township, a technical review of the Township's Official Plan and in-effect Zoning By-law, prepared a draft updated Zoning By-law, engaged Township staff and Council to refine the by-law, and completed one round of public engagement on the draft by-law. Engagement with the public regarding the draft by-law included an online commenting window available on the Township's website, an in-person open house (August 26, 2025), and receiving comments by phone and by email.

The purpose of this memorandum, and the attached comment-response matrix, is to provide a general summary of the key themes arising from public engagement to date.

Key Themes Arising From Public Engagement

Following Council's direction, Township staff and JLR hosted an in-person open house at the West Parry Sound District Museum in the afternoon of August 26, 2025, with approximately 50 attendees. The open house featured a display of poster boards with information highlighting key changes proposed in the draft updated Zoning By-law as well as enlarged maps depicting key changes (e.g., the extent of the proposed deer wintering habitat overlay, the new Pointe au Baril Residential Zone, and the consolidated Environmental Protection Zones).

The event was structured to be an informal, drop-in style event where attendees could learn about the proposed changes by browsing the informational boards and asking any questions of Township staff and JLR staff present. Space was allocated on each of the boards to encourage attendees to provide their written feedback on a post-it note, or otherwise by completing a comment form to provide feedback in a more private manner. The online commenting window on the Township's website was left open to receive comments for an additional week following the open house to provide an additional opportunity for commentary following the event.

The comments received addressed a number of planning topics including:

- **Short-term rental accommodations:** Although beyond the scope of the Zoning By-law review project, comments received indicate an interest in a separate by-law regulating short-term rental accommodations, citing the Township of Georgian Bay as an example that the Township could look to in modelling their own regulatory approach.
- **Dark sky protection:** Although beyond the scope of the Zoning By-law review project, comments received indicate an interest in a separate by-law to regulate outdoor illumination for protection of the dark sky environment.
- **Shoreline structures:** Several comments were received regarding a minimum setback for saunas in particular due to their visual impact on the shoreline, specifically requesting that the minimum setbacks in place be increased for both small and large saunas.
- **Decks:** Several comments received noted concern with the maximum height provisions included in the Zoning By-law as they relate to decks, citing a need for more flexibility and adaptability given the varied topography of the Township. Other comments further expressed concern with the restrictions imposed on the maximum ground floor area, noting specific concern that this includes walkways and stairways in its calculation.
- **Docks:** Some comments received indicate concern with the width limitations of the shoreline portion of docks, noting that this width would limit their ability to accommodate a seating area at the water's edge. Other comments expressed concern with the inclusion of walkways and stairs within the general provisions which regulate docks and confusion over the additional provisions included in the draft by-law.
- **Accessory buildings:** Some comments received expressed an interest in further restricting accessory buildings on a lot, calling for a reduction in the permitted number of accessory buildings to one and for the maximum size of any permitted accessory building by ground floor area to also be reduced. However, other comments received requested that the maximum permitted size of sleeping cabins in particular be increased to better facilitate multi-generational use of a seasonal residential property.
- **Deer wintering habitat:** Some comments received indicated concern with the proposed approach to protecting deer wintering habitat through an overlay requiring environmental study before development could occur, citing the small extent of the overlay which is comprised of privately-owned land where property values could be adversely affected.
- **Minimum setbacks:** Some comments received indicated concern with the proposed increase in the minimum front yard setback from 7.5 m to 15 m in Ward 5 and whether this proposed change would have a positive impact on the shoreline ribbon of life, while other comments recommended that this increased front yard setback be applied more generally in the Coastal Residential Zone without scoping it only to Ward 5.
- **Floating accommodations:** While some comments received indicated support for the proposed provisions regulating floating accommodations, others expressed concern over their application to "marine vessels" and to floating accommodations that are permanently installed at a marina, built to the specifications of the Ontario Building Code, and connected to utilities, sewage, and water. Those in favour of these forms of floating accommodations cite these dwelling types as a potential solution to address the shortage of workforce housing in the Township.
- **Backyard chickens:** While comments received indicate a general support for the permissions for backyard hens in the draft by-law, several comments expressed an interest in broadening these permissions to also include other forms of small-scale livestock keeping, including, for example, the keeping of ducks on residential lots.

Next Steps

Based on the feedback gathered through the public open house, online commenting window, and through email, we request that Council provide direction regarding next steps in amending the draft Zoning By-law. While many of the themes emerging from public feedback can be addressed through minor technical modifications to the draft by-law, some of the comments received are contradictory and would benefit from discussion and direction from Council before a final draft of the Zoning By-law is prepared for Council's consideration on adoption.

In particular, we request direction from Council regarding:

- Whether to increase restrictions on accessory buildings and structures in all zones
- Whether to modify the proposed changes to the front yard setback (i.e., to apply a 15 m setback Township-wide, continue to scope to Ward 5, or retain a 7.5 m setback Township-wide)
- Whether to further scope the provisions regarding floating accommodations
- Whether to expand the permissions for backyard hens to other types of small-scale livestock

We look forward to discussion of the feedback gathered on the draft Zoning By-law prepared for public input. Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact the undersigned.

J.L. RICHARDS & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:



Rebecca Elphick, RPP, MCIP, MPL
Planner

David Welwood, RPP, MCIP, MES (Pl.)
Senior Planner, Practice Lead

RE:dw

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>I would like to receive a copy of the proposed revised bylaw when it becomes available along with the current version for comparison.</p> | <p>A copy of the draft updated Zoning By-law, marked with tracked changes, has been sent.</p> |
| <p>Not all by-law infractions require a known complainant. For instance, a loud stereo or a bright spot light needs a complainant, as by the time the complaint is investigated the stereo might be turned off and the blinding spot light is off. No observed infraction to the investigator TOA employee. You need that witness/complainant for court. HOWEVER, In some cases they can and should be anonymous. In the case of a physical structure, i.e. shed/garage/bunkie that is blatantly in contravention of any number of by-law issues, i.e. size and location, it is physically there (in plain sight) to be seen by the TOA official, never mind was it built to building code standards. A neighbour can report it to the attention of the TOA anonymously. Citizens want what is best for their area. But most citizens do not want to be labelled as "the neighbour who will report you." So, the complaint process should be anonymous. You have one neighbour following the rules and a neighbour around the corner doing what ever they want hoping they don't get caught. Further to that, if a TOA employee sees an obvious infraction visible from the road or while legally on ones property and can see neighbouring property, like a new shed/garage/bunkie, where it seems close to the property line or it seems too close to the road or waterway, that employee should be able to start the process of investigating this new building because of what they observed. Once confirmed it's construction is in contravention of the by-law/building code (no permit), this building should be torn down as ordered by the TOA. Innocence is one thing but blatant, intended rule breaking is another. A physical structure that the TOA can see for themselves does not need a complainant for court purposes. That building is torn down. It is not allowed to stay. If ordered to tear down of a shed that cost \$20K to build, that news will quickly spread, others won't risk it. Fine them \$1k, and others</p> | <p>Enforcement practices and protocols are beyond the scope of the Zoning By-law review and update and are best addressed directly with Township staff by requesting modifications to the Township's standard operating procedures as they relate to the complaint process.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>will think, "Ya build what you want, where you want and if you get caught all you have to pay is a surcharge of a \$1k.</p> | |
| <p>In addition to the Draft Zoning By-law Updates shared by Council, I would also like to understand what actions Council is taking with regards to Short Term Rentals (e.g. Air BnB). I understand this is a fraught issue that needs to be managed carefully. Even if now is not the time for a by-law, it would be helpful to understand how Council is working on this subject.</p> | <p>The Township may, at their discretion, consider a short-term rental licensing by-law requiring operators to obtain a license to rent out properties for short periods, typically less than 30 consecutive days. Such by-laws typically require operators to pay a fee, obtain a license, list their property on a municipal register, and comply with rules regarding property standards, guest capacity, and rental frequency. Such a by-law is outside of the scope of the Zoning By-law review and update and would require specific direction from Council before initiating work to develop a by-law for Council's future consideration.</p> |
| <p>The TOA should contemplate a by-law regarding short term rentals i.e. BnB VRBO etc with a minimum stay requirement. Understand the Twp of Georgian Bay has a by-law in place might be an interesting template to use.</p> | |
| <p>Saunas should have to be set back a minimum distance from the shoreline, or perhaps to the treeline. Perhaps at least set as far back as a shore dock? There have been many eyesores popping up in the Pointe au Baril area this summer.</p> | <p>The Zoning By-law contains general provisions which apply to several shoreline structures, including saunas. The existing Zoning By-law establishes a maximum height and requires that a sauna be set back at least 7.5 metres from the shoreline if its ground floor area is greater than 10 sqm. Updates are proposed which would increase this minimum setback for larger saunas (i.e., greater than 10 sqm in ground floor area) on lots which front on at- or near-capacity lakes (e.g., Blackstone Lake, Crane Lake, Forget Lake, Three-Legged Lake, or Spider Lake).</p> |
| <p>5.8 Dark Sky Provisions In the proposed revisions these restrictions have been deleted. The removal of these restrictions will then allow the mounting of lights which could; impede safety of waterways, be detrimental to wildlife and cause hardship between neighbours. If security is a concern</p> | <p>Provisions regarding dark sky protection are proposed to be removed from the updated Zoning By-law as they go beyond the authority of what a Zoning By-law can enforce. The Township may, however, choose to enact a standalone by-law to</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>then provisions could be included for that rather than the elimination of all restrictions. Other Municipalities are actually including provisions to dark skies.</p> | <p>regulate outdoor illumination to ensure responsible lighting, light pollution mitigation, and conservation of the dark sky environment.</p> |
| <p>5.7 Decks The proposed revisions maximize the height of decks to 2m above grade. It is difficult to understand the justification for this restriction and in some cases the nature of a property may require an elevation higher than that. If structural adequacy is the concern then provisions could be included that such structures are designed by a suitably qualified professional.</p> | <p>The maximum permitted height of any deck has been restated to more clearly establish that no deck may have a height greater than 2 metres, though this requirement has been carried forward from the existing Zoning By-law. For any properties with unique topography, the maximum height of the deck would be measured from the final grade once all site work has been completed.</p> |
| <p>Set back dimensions The existing and revised versions of the proposed by law include many dimensions for various setbacks yet there is no explanation of their derivation. As an example, requiring a dock to be a minimum of 6 meters from the side lot line. How was this number derived? Use by another Municipality is not a justification. Many provisions have been codified continuously over decades without being challenged and could have been simply someone's opinion many years ago and likely not even technically based. There are lots where this is not possible. It is understood that there is phrasing around safety and that is addressed below. It is suggested that an appendix be provided or a supplemental public document be provided to show derivation of not only setback provisions but many of the technical aspects of the document.</p> <p>With regards to the safety statement 5.10 c, there is no description as to how this is established and who establishes whether or not a situation is unsafe. Safety can be very subjective and allowable risk on private lands is always contentious. Some outline should be considered.</p> | <p>Many of the setbacks in the updated Zoning By-law have been carried forward from the in-effect by-law, with minor modifications to reflect new policy direction in the Official Plan following the most recent comprehensive review and update completed in 2018. However, the setback referenced (i.e., minimum side lot line setback for docks) remains unchanged from the in-effect provisions in the updated draft.</p> <p>J.L. Richards & Associates prepared a Background Report to summarize the background research and recommendations which informed any updated provisions in the Zoning By-law. A copy of the Background Report is available for public review on the Township's website: https://www.thearchipelago.on.ca/p/comprehensive-zoning-by-law-review-</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>Section 5.10 c of the Zoning By-law establishes a minimum setback between docks which requires that docking sites must be located more than 5 metres between one another. Such a requirement ensures that the shoreline does not become overly crowded with shoreline clutter (i.e., so as to maintain the shoreline character), to avoid potential conflict between use of neighbouring docks, and to preserve as much of the natural vegetation along the shoreline, for example.</p> |
| <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft zoning by-law.</p> <p>My comments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supportive of 5.1.2 (h) as small buildings are incidental, low height and generally not an eyesore. - Opposed to 5.8 (d) - 5m width limitation on the shoreline portion of docks. Many properties have integrated a seating area with their dock area which provides a space to gather and enjoy the water. The limitation is too restrictive and should be increased to 8m or more. - Strongly opposed to 5.9. The Deer wintering overlay is completely unnecessary and has the potential to significantly erode property values in this area. The portion of private land within the deer wintering area is very small and not significant compared to the total area. I estimate private land comprises less than 5% of the deer wintering area. The restriction of a 10% increase in dwelling size is very severe given the portion of the property impacted is very small. This clause creates a significant burden on any future renovations with and has negligible impact on the deer wintering area. Furthermore, the by-law proposes that the definition of the deer wintering area can be changed without referral to Council, which gives staff unilateral ability to adversely | <p>Regarding the limitation on the width of the shoreline portion of docks, this minimum has been carried forward from the in-effect provisions of the Zoning By-law. Other jurisdictions have similar, and in some cases more restrictive, provisions regulating the width of docks.</p> <p>As for the proposed deer wintering habitat overlay, the Township’s Official Plan was updated in 2018 to include mapping delineating deer wintering habitat and policies which prohibit development and site alteration unless it has been determined through a site evaluation report that there will be no negative impacts to the natural features or their ecological functions. The provisions proposed in the updated Zoning By-law provide a mechanism to implement in-effect policy in the Official Plan as of the last comprehensive review and update.</p> <p>Concerning the size of permitted sleeping cabins, the provisions of the Zoning By-law have been crafted to balance flexibility of use with appropriate</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>impact property value.</p> <p>I also suggest increasing the size of permitted sleeping cabins. Many multi-generational families need these cabins to stay on the bay, given the cost and scarcity of properties available to adult children of property owners.</p> | <p>limitations on size and number of permitted structures. This is intended to avoid shoreline clutter and the perception of overdevelopment which threatens the recreational character and aesthetic value of the shoreline.</p> |
| <p>By law deck height review: While I understand that this regulation is in part of efforts to maintain aesthetic consistency and environmental considerations, I would like to see more insight into the reasoning behind this specific height limit. With the extreme variances in topography we see in our township we need more flexibility and adaptability to the landscape and less of a rigid approach to managing it. This bylaw will force homeowners into a corner and force them to make decisions on their property that will be less desirable to the community. It would be more effective if we had options for those seeking to integrate more sustainable or innovative solutions using landscaping and tree planting to assist in blending deck heights into the natural landscape.</p> | <p>The maximum permitted height of any deck has been restated to more clearly establish that no deck may have a height greater than 2 metres, though this requirement has been carried forward from the existing Zoning By-law. For any properties with unique topography, the maximum height of the deck would be measured from the final grade once all site work has been completed.</p> |
| <p>Looking to see if the Township would consider the allowable change of grade from 1 foot to 2 feet on the Township of The Archipelago's recent Site alteration Bylaw. Given the specific conditions and extreme variances in topography across the townships, the 1ft measurement is very restricting. A 2-foot change would allow for more effective grading, drainage and site management while still upholding the spirit of the bylaw. This would allow residents to have a garden for flowers, fruits and vegetables should they choose. Trees need more than one foot of soil realistically and constructing accessible pathways.</p> | <p>Any amendments to the Township's Site Alteration By-law are outside of the scope of this project which focuses only on reviewing and updating the Township's Zoning By-law.</p> |
| <p>It is great to see a lot of positive changes in this Draft, and PaBIA would also like to reinforce the suggestions it made in 2019/2020. Some are reflected in the current draft, and some are not. We feel</p> | |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>the below suggestions will help to ensure the OP is being adhered to and that the environment and character of the Pointe au Baril Islands are preserved.</p> <p>Where applicable, the section of the By-law Draft (and text, in some cases) has been included, with suggestions following.</p> <p>Allow a maximum of 7 total buildings on a lot, including main building, sleeping cabins, and accessory buildings.</p> <p>3.109 Lot, Coverage Shall mean the area of a lot, that is covered by the ground floor area of any buildings and shall include all roofed accessory buildings and accessory structures, the entire area of the overhang of a roof where the overhang of the roof exceeds 1.25 metres in depth, the floor area of any boathouse or boatport constructed over the Crown lake bed and the area of any deck, dock or docking slip covered by the overhang of a boathouse roof or boatport roof where the roof overhang is greater than 1.25 metres in depth.</p> <p>Include decks in Lot Coverage.</p> <p>5.1.2. Regulations Applicable to Residential Uses</p> <p>ii) Accessory Structures – Residential:</p> <p>b)The maximum number of accessory buildings permitted on any lot zoned for residential use is three. This number does not include: sleeping cabins, a privy, a marine storage facility, docks, decks, and a pump house, or buildings less than 10 m² in ground floor area, provided that such buildings are not used in combination with any other accessory building or use;</p> | <p>The Zoning By-law does contain provisions which limit the number of main buildings to one per lot, and further limits the number of sleeping cabins to 2-3 (depending on the Ward in which the lot is located) and other accessory buildings to 3, in effect totalling to 7 permitted structures as suggested.</p> <p>The definition for lot coverage, as currently drafted in the Zoning By-law, does include the area of any dock.</p> <p>The provisions of the Zoning By-law have been crafted to balance flexibility of use with appropriate limitations on size and number of permitted structures. Limiting the maximum number of permitted accessory buildings to one would be too restrictive on the ways in which typical landowners use and enjoy their properties and would likely result in a high volume of minor variance applications.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>Reduce the maximum number of accessory buildings permitted to one.</p> <p>c) Except as may be provided elsewhere in this By-law, any accessory building or structure, including any unenclosed, uncovered decks, which is not attached to the main building shall be erected with a minimum front yard setback of 7.5m;</p> <p>Increase 7.5m to 15m as per OP direction (except for boathouses/boatports, pumphouses, marine railways, marine storage, saunas smaller than 10m²)</p> <p>d) Notwithstanding subsection c) above or any of the other provisions of this By-law to the contrary, a boathouse or boatport, one sauna, one pump house, two marine railways and one marine storage facility may be located in the required front yard of any lot zoned for residential use. The regulations applicable to boathouses and boatports are addressed in subsection 5.3 of this By-law. The regulations applicable to a marine storage facility are addressed in Subsection 5.18 of this By-law. Regulations applicable to pump houses are addressed in Subsection 5.29 of this By-law;</p> <p>Subject saunas to 15m setback if larger than 10m², 7.5m if smaller than 10m².</p> <p>f) The maximum total floor area of an accessory building or structure is 165 m² . No accessory building or structure on any lot zoned for residential use shall have a total floor area greater than the ground floor area of the main building. This subsection does not apply to boathouses or boatports;</p> | <p>Initially, a minimum 15 metre setback for main and accessory buildings was proposed through the updated Zoning By-law, though this recommendation was subsequently removed from the updated draft following Council’s direction to maintain the existing 7.5 metre minimum setback, except in Ward 5, where a 15 metre minimum setback would apply to main structures.</p> <p>As for accessory buildings and structures, including saunas, with ground floor area of less than 10 sqm, a landowner may construct these without acquiring a building permit from the Township, as such structures are not considered buildings under the Ontario Building Code. Therefore, the Township has no mechanism to enforce a 7.5 metre setback if imposed in the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The provisions establishing a maximum total floor area of accessory structures has been carried</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>Reduce maximum total floor area to 111.4m², or the lesser area depending on type of building, size of main building, and total lot coverage. Clarify no washroom facilities/sewage in an accessory building.</p> <p>5.8 Decks</p> <p>e) Where any deck has a height of 1.2 metres or more above final grade, it shall be considered a structure for the purposes of calculating total lot coverage. No deck may have a height of greater than 2 metres as measured from final grade to the floor of the deck.</p> <p>Include all decks in total lot coverage, regardless of height.</p> <p>5.13 Floating Accommodations</p> <p>Nice and clear - great addition!</p> | <p>forward from the in-effect provisions of the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The definition for lot coverage, as currently drafted in the Zoning By-law, does include the area of any dock.</p> |
| <p>5.34 Saunas</p> <p>b) If the maximum floor area of a sauna, including attached covered porches and decks, is 10 m² or less, the sauna may be permitted a 0 metres front yard setback. Where a sauna exceeds 10 m², including any attached covered porches and decks, the minimum front yard setback shall be 7.5 metres.</p> <p>Increase setback to 7.5 m for saunas smaller than 10m² and to 15m for saunas larger than 10m².</p> | <p>Regarding accessory buildings and structures, including saunas, with ground floor area of less than 10 sqm, a landowner may construct these without acquiring a building permit from the Township, as such structures are not considered buildings under the Ontario Building Code. Therefore, the Township has no mechanism to enforce a 7.5 metre setback on these structures if imposed in the Zoning By-law.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>5.39 Sleeping Cabins</p> <p>a) Wards 1, 2, 3 and 4:</p> <p>i) The maximum Total Floor Area of each sleeping cabin, including the floor area of any basement, does not exceed 50.16 m² or the ground floor area of the main dwelling on the lot, whichever is the lesser;</p> <p>Allow a Maximum Total Floor Area of 64.1m² if a covered porch is part of a sleeping cabin (up to 13.9m²)</p> <p>6.1.3 Zone Standards: (CR Zone)</p> <p>e) Minimum Front Yard Setback 7.5 metres Increase to 15 metres as per OP direction</p> <p>f) Minimum Side Yard Setback 6 metres Increase to 9 metres</p> | <p>Initially, a minimum 15 metre setback for main and accessory buildings was proposed through the updated Zoning By-law, though this recommendation was subsequently removed from the updated draft following Council’s direction to maintain the existing 7.5 metre minimum setback, except in Ward 5, where a 15 metre minimum setback would apply to main structures.</p> <p>Concerning the size of permitted sleeping cabins, the provisions of the Zoning By-law have been crafted to balance flexibility of use with appropriate limitations on size and number of permitted structures. This is intended to avoid shoreline clutter and the perception of overdevelopment which threatens the recreational character and aesthetic value of the shoreline.</p> <p>The intent of yard setback provisions is to avoid conflicts between uses on adjacent properties. The existing 6 m setback is intended to provide appropriate limitations to this while balancing flexibility for landowners. An increased side yard setback may be overly restrictive on the ways in which typical landowners, particularly those with smaller or irregular lot sizes, use and enjoy their properties and would likely result in a high volume of minor variance applications.</p> |
| <p>I am not in favour of changing the setback from 7.5 m for Ward 5. I believe that our current rules have served us well and considering the few undeveloped properties left there seems no reason to rush into this proposed change.</p> | <p>Generally accepted practices for managing shoreline properties to require a 30-metre setback between development and the shoreline highwater mark. Maintaining this as a natural vegetative buffer</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>How does moving a cottage back have a positive impact on the “ribbon of life”? I have been to many cottages on Blackstone and Crane Lake. Cottages which are further from the water do not have more natural state land, in fact they generally have less. The more space there is between the cottage and the water, the more landscaping, gardens, etc.</p> <p>What studies have you found that show this policy will have a positive impact on water quality? I understand that a septic system close to the water would be a problem, but how does a building close to the water cause problems? (Why are boathouses not a problem?)</p> <p>The proposed grandfathering allows a 50% increase. Many older cottages are only about 600 square feet. This means that the maximum increase would be 300 square feet – a very small addition. A 900 square foot cottage is still very small. Do you not think that this is rather punitive to those cottagers (mainly water access) that have smaller cottages?</p> | <p>with native plants provides food and habitat for threatened and endangered species, prevents shoreline erosion, and provides additional filtration to stormwater runoff before it enters the watershed.</p> <p>Whereas a cottage can be sited further back from the shoreline to reap these benefits, a boathouse by its very nature requires access to the water to serve its primary function.</p> <p>The proposed modification to the minimum setback provides the Township with a mechanism to implement the minimum setback of 15 metres as established through the Township’s Official Plan.</p> |
| <p>Hello. I have multiple concerns and feedback the these broad proposed changes. I will try and keep it to a minimum and brief but will be happy to be available for more in depth feedback on these proposed changes.</p> <p>Upon attending the information center and reviewing past feedback from past public meetings I struggle to see why most of these changes are required. There has been little if any communication of the problems that the current bylaw doesn't address. It is very important that when property owners have their rights curtailed for the greater good that the township communicates what the issue or problem is they are trying to solve. The township did communicate this for the additional site</p> | |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>alteration and tree bylaws but don't believe they have here.</p> <p>Example: The feedback received in the 2019 public meetings clearly show that while there should be not full kitchens or permeant fixed cooking facilities in sleeping cabins however the public does want the ability to heat up or make a cup of coffee and heat up have a muffin. The proposed definition of cooking facilities 3.44 does not reflect that. My question is what's the harm in mom and dad have a muffin and a cup of coffee in their sleeping cabin first thing in the morning before they head to the busy main to engage with children and grandchildren. Furthermore how is the township going to enforce this type of policy in a realistic cost-effective manner?</p> <p>3.83 re: floor area as it relates to overhang. Any overhang 4' and under does not count as part of Sqft for the building but if over 4' (say 5') the whole amount of overhang is counted. Why? Should it not be calculated on the area of overhang that is greater than 4' for fairness, consistency and easier to understand. I would point out that larger overhangs are an important factor in building life expectancy especially at exposed outer islands and as such should be treated as harshly.</p> <p>Docks Definition 3.53 includes walkways and stairs. Walkways and stairs should not be included as there are many applications that require a walkway to access a dock site safely. In many cases this walkway could encroach on the 3m setback therefore if applied the property owner wouldn't be able to install proper docking.</p> <p>Walkways and Stairs in general should not be included in any of the dock or deck provisions in the bylaw. Other bylaws like the site alteration bylaw allow for walkways that are 6.5' and under and</p> | <p>The intent of the provisions restricting the inclusion of kitchen facilities in sleeping cabins is to ensure that such structures are not used as main dwellings so as to overdevelop a property beyond one dwelling per lot. Sleeping cabins are intended only to provide accessory sleeping accommodations for guests.</p> <p>Where a building or structure incorporates an overhang above a size, it forms a functional part of the building and covers the underlying land, contributing to the building's footprint and the degree of impervious cover. Its floor area in its entirety should therefore be counted towards lot coverage as would any other portion of the building. Where a smaller overhang is featured on a building, its contribution to the building's overall footprint is, however, negligible as it relates, for example, to the degree of impervious cover.</p> <p>The inclusion of walkways and stairs in the definition of a dock has been carried forward from the in-effect provisions of the Zoning By-law.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>the same needs to apply to both docks and decks for consistency and practically.</p> <p>The additional rules and changes for docks are far too confusing. I am in the business and expressing what "near shore portion" of dock is one thing. But the way it currently reads has even more confusion. This will I read to misunderstandings and an increased level potential conflict which will result in increased costs for the township.</p> <p>Actually there has been little to no justification given as to why there is a need for changes in the dock rules. What is wrong with the way they are now? They are currently fairly restrictive.</p> <p>Decks: My comments could be numerous however i will attempt to summarize and hit on a few of the main points. Current limits on decks being no larger than the sq/ft of the building that they are attached to is currently restrictive enough so why place an additional limit on decks on mains or other cabins? The restriction of 1184 sqft. While seems generous is really way too small especially including stairs and walkways. I will cover why in my general comment section.</p> <p>Height of decks is also an issue which I will also cover in the general comments section. The current limits of 1.2 m (3.9 ft) is not nearly enough for attached decks. Again explained in general comments.</p> <p>Unfortunately I must submit the rest of my comments and the "general comments" section in a separate form submissions since this format does not allow enough room for all my comments.</p> | <p>The provisions for maximum permitted height of any attached deck (1.2 m) or detached deck (2 m) have been carried forward from the existing Zoning By-law.</p> |
| <p>General Comments: Property owners when building structures are consistence. They</p> | |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>want to save as much of the smooth Georgian Bay Rock. The Georgian Bay windswept pine and other natural features that make this area so special. Our organization is also fully aligned with this belief. As such we all wish to minimize our impact. This is done by building structures on the "crappy parts of the land" This would include things drop offs, and uneven/unsafe terrain as examples. They do this to preserve the natural features we all love and often also lowers the height of the structure thereby reducing its physical impact on the area. This means that we are building in areas that heights of attached structures like decks and walkways would be higher than the current proposed heights. They also required sufficient decks and walks ways around the cottage in order to safely enter theses structures. This belief is also consistent with the official plan. The current proposed changes will have the practical effect of in many cases cause property owners to build their structures over top of the same natural features that the official plan seeks to protect. The effect of these rules will ensure increased destruction of the vary thing we all seek to protect. I am happy to go through the details of the bylaw that will have this effect. They do relate mostly to the docks and deck changes. With an aging population the need for residents to increase walkways and level surfaces to navigate their property is growing in importance and should be taken into account in the formulation of the new bylaws.</p> <p>Back Yard Chickens: Why is this restricted to chickens? What not ducks and other farm animals? Allowing them also to be free range is an important feature for the health of the animals and quality of the food source they produce. As long as there are barriers that keep the chickens within the confines of the owners' property and ensuring that they can't leave the property is all that is required. Also with a limit of 10 chickens I belief practically the</p> | <p>While other municipalities in the Muskoka and Parry Sound Districts permit the keeping of backyard chickens only, other municipalities outside of the region permit the domestic keeping of ducks, geese, and pigeons in addition to chickens. This can be brought forward to Council for direction on whether to expand the scope to permit other types of domestic poultry for keeping on a residential lot.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>town doesn't need to be concerned about a home-based business. Someone sells a couple of dozen extra eggs to their neighbor should be allowed and not called a small business.</p> | |
| <p>Parking Requirements re Marinas: 5.28b The limits on these space requirements I assume relate to the accessibility act which must be followed. However, the requirements of painted designated parking is not realistic and will cause many of the marinas to displace current customers and ratepayers. The reality is very few individuals can access island properties and it happens very, very rarely. When it does happen we have made the appropriate accommodations to ensure all there are no barriers for people who have disabilities. I would suggest a clause is added to that section stating that Provided the marina makes provision to provide accessible parking as needed and to the extent it is needed and permanent designated area is not required.</p> <p>Floating Homes: I was involved directly with the Ontario government with the rules and intentions regarding floating homes. However, the township proposals have gone well beyond the province's intent. Floating accommodations that are permanently installed at a marina, that are built to code and have their power, water and sewage connected to the on land marina services are not an issue. As they do not pose any dangers to the environment, navigation, etc. that was the concern of the province, municipalities and the marina industry and the reason for the restrictions in the first place. Where there is a shortage of housing for staff having the option of this type of accommodation would be wise and beneficial to all concerned.</p> <p>IN particular 5.13a Includes "marine vessel" This inclusion would effectively prevent anyone from using a boat that has sleeping</p> | <p>Under the Design of Public Spaces Standard of the AODA, municipalities and other organizations building or reconstructing on-street or off-street parking spaces must make those spaces accessible to visitors with disabilities who hold accessible parking permits. The provisions included within the updated Zoning By-law are required to meet this legislated standard and must apply to marinas as to other uses.</p> <p>The definition of a floating accommodation included in the updated Zoning By-law has been extracted from Ontario Regulation 161/17 under the Public Lands Act, with provisions regarding floating accommodations modeled after other jurisdictions in the Parry Sound and Muskoka District.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|----------|
| <p>accommodations in the township. This violates some of the oldest laws in this country and is outside of the jurisdiction of the township. Quite simply the township cannot include "marine vessels" in their definition. This needs to be scrapped to avoid volitation's provincial and federal laws not to mention the legal exposure the township would open itself to within the marina and boating industries.</p> <p>Overall I would suggest it be stated stairs and walkways are not included in any calculation.</p> <p>Another suggestion would be that no bylaw will prevent the property owner from safely accessing and navigating their property.</p> <p>Lastly, I would suggest that many concerns that the township has can be addresses by making the rules simple to understand and administer. Setbacks, height limits and lot coverage are a more effective way to control development rather than adding rules and confusion to solve the issues and should be looked at. They also have the effect of fewer legal challenges and are less costly for the staff to administer as they are clearly defined and clearly understood by all.</p> <p>I could go into even more details regarding this document but three long submissions is enough and I am happy to engage with the township on further details and solutions.</p> | |